

Abstract

The aim of this study is to provide an account of the ways in which the issue of integration is being dealt with on behalf of civil society actors. By specifically focusing on and looking into Copenhagen-based the Trampoline House, this study will probe into the function of this space, as viewed by some of the people affiliated with it. The study partially clarifies the issue of migration, above all in the light of the current and past couple of decades' asylum, immigration and integration policies in Denmark, the role played by civil society actors and the ways in which they have picked up the mantle in doing so. In this connection, a significant change is detected with regards to how those issues have been and are being dealt with politically over this timespan.

By applying a partially social constructivist stance, the aim of this Thesis will be to provide this account of the Trampoline House from within the Trampoline House itself, for which reason I myself have become engaged as a volunteer there to 'gain access' to the social space that is the Trampoline House.

Through the investigation realized in connection with its coming-into-existence, this study concludes that the Trampoline House serves as an instrumental space for personal empowerment by means of a wide range of activities offered at the house. Despite of certain similarities with the formal asylum system, such as the asylum centers, which will be briefly accounted for, this study finds that, in very basic terms, the Trampoline House offers *something* that the formal asylum system in Denmark does not. Apart from a range of concrete empowerment and vocational initiatives and other types of attention, that, in some cases, might actually resemble those offered at an asylum center, the study concludes that the Trampoline House essentially offers a general introduction to Denmark and a wide range of the norms and values traditionally associated with this country. Thus, the study concludes that, through its work, the Trampoline House serves as a catalyst for integration, since, through its efforts, this institution brings people together across national, ethnic and cultural divides with the issue of mutual respect as the basic underlying value, keeping the entire space together. Through the data collected for this Thesis, it will be argued that the Trampoline House provides the asylum seekers associated with it with a sense of belonging, autonomy, community and ownership in a national environment, which, in many other

regards, constitutes a widespread sense of up-rootedness, anxiety and uncertainty with regards to what daily life and the future hold in store for those groups. Thus, apart from its somewhat formal 'vocational' programs, the more social and perhaps, slightly intangible aspects of the Trampoline House will be accounted for. Through this, this study will investigate how some of the actors associated with the Trampoline House feel that they benefit from being there.

Finally, certain core ideas on democracy in the form of civil society initiatives and its traditions in contemporary Danish society are outlined as a means to provide an account of why, despite of its highly diverse ethnic, cultural and national composition, the core values associated with and proposed at the Trampoline House could be viewed as something quintessentially Danish. Thus, this Thesis finds that the Trampoline House serves as a facilitator in funneling its users into Danish society.

Table of Contents

Abstract	1
Introduction.....	4
Structure.....	6
Field of Research	7
The Debate on Integration and a Historical Overview	7
After 1945.....	9
After 1951.....	9
The Post 9/11 Turn	11
Integration.....	12
The Trampoline House	14
The Users	17
Methodology	18
Interviews	19
<i>Praktik</i> uncovered.....	19
Choice of participants and briefing	20
Style of interview.....	21
Discourse analysis.....	23
The Interview situation.....	26
Analyzing the Data.....	28
Inductive working method	28
Theoretical framework.....	30
Literature Review	30
Social Identity	31
Recognition theory.....	35
The Individual Aspect of Honneth's Works	39
Summary.....	40
Analysis	40
Initial Outreach.....	41
First Impression	45
The Composition of the House.....	48

Daily Use of the House	53
House Meetings.....	54
Self-Perceived Gain.....	55
Conclusion	62
Limitations of Koch's Ideas	65
Other Findings	65

Introduction

During the past year, the entire area of asylum and integration in Denmark has undergone significant shifts. On a governmental macro-level, a range of political decisions have posed big challenges onto relevant (national) stakeholders. As for asylum seekers, the Danish Government has issued 34 new restrictions on the area of asylum in an attempt to lower the influx of individuals applying for asylum in Denmark, as well as to discourage people from doing so in future. According to the Government, the primary goal of those restrictions is:

To shield Denmark in the best possible way in a time when there is a gap in Europe¹

Thus, it could be said that a recurrent theme in current Danish asylum policies (as well as a significant part of public discourse on the topic) is that it is not just a matter of "how refugees are to be received, but also whether they ought to be received at all"², which, in turn, touches upon the rights of newly arrived asylum seekers and refugees who have resided in the country for a longer period of time. This issue then proposes us with a certain attitude taken up by the Government/State, and, to a certain degree, also a significant segment of the Danish population, in other words a certain kind of *volksgeist*³. This occurs within the frames of a wider public discourse, which is shaped by the times that we live in and the issues and phenomena we are presented with, creating a certain overall *zeitgeist* in various segments of Danish society.

Apart from those aforementioned restrictions, over the past six months there have also been several discussions regarding the very 1951 UN Refugee Convention (RC) and Denmark's

¹ Jørgensen, *Her er alle regeringens 34 udlændingestramninger*, link: <http://www.b.dk/politiko/her-er-alle-regeringens-34-udlaendingestramninger> [Accessed 26/10 2016]

² Böttcher Messell, *My House, Your House*, 1

³ Honneth, *The Struggle for Recognition*, 56

future commitment to it⁴. In a nutshell, the 1951 RC presents individuals with a string of rights and States with a range of duties in terms of asylum and (due) asylum processes. It thus sets some international standards for an area, which was historically characterized by inconsistent *ad hoc* solutions by individual countries⁵. Since this Convention lies at the crux of the entire asylum system (inter)nationally, it has gained a significant place in the current debate. The opinions on this matter are many and so are the immediate motivations that lie behind those opinions. Just to mention a few: some are in favor of liberalizing the entire asylum system in Denmark, some want to maintain the status quo, while others have contemplated the possibility of Denmark stepping out of the 1951 RC. A somewhat widely held view on behalf of those why Denmark should renounce its commitment to the Convention is that, taking into account the current state of affairs and the historical evolution of migratory patterns (where people flee from and where to), the 1951 RC has become obsolete and doesn't adequately address the challenges that we face in the 21st century. Over the year, in Denmark this has been fiercely debated, alongside other aspects of the current migratory situation.

Having accounted for those events on the macro level, I will now turn to the micro level, namely the Trampoline House, which will be my main case. The main emphasis of this Thesis will be on the Trampoline House as a supplementary counterpart – and in some instances an alternative – to the more formal asylum system in Denmark. With regards to the Trampoline House and their views on the asylum system in Denmark, they seem to find that this system clientizes people to a degree where they may be left without any sense of personal autonomy and perhaps even self-esteem. I will probe into this phenomenon by emphasizing the user-perspective. In other words, I will look into the Trampoline House's role as an institution and how it deals with the presence of the users at the house. Apart from this perspective, throughout this Thesis, I will also probe into these different activities as possible key empowerment strategies. I will thus look at the possible capacity of the Trampoline House, as an institution, to, despite that its users might hold different views, constitute a joint commitment to a somewhat common cause, a so-called "community of shared concerns" or

⁴ Brandsen & Therkildsen, *Løkke klar til opgør med flygtningekonventioner*, link: <http://nyheder.tv2.dk/2015-12-27-loekke-klar-til-opgoer-med-flygtningekonventioner> [Accessed 26/10 2016]

⁵ Fenger-Grøn & Grøndahl, *Flygtningenes danmarkshistorie*, 9-10

*Sachsgemeinschaft*⁶. This way, I will look at the interaction and the synergy created in the interplay between the Trampoline House and its users.

A great deal of my emphasis will be on how the people who use the Trampoline House on a daily basis conceive of this place in its own right. Thus, by and large, my perspective will be user-oriented. A great deal of this will consist of a number of interviews with some of the users of the house. The final purpose of those inquiries will be to answer the following research question:

“How does the Trampoline House serve as a catalyst for integration?”

Structure

Using the interviews as my primary sources, this Thesis will take a social constructivist approach by entailing individual experience into an account of a greater societal institution (the Trampoline House) and its role and place in Danish society. In terms of denoting the issue of integration via various forms of empowerment, I will draw upon Honneth’s notion of recognition. Apart from this, I will use Jenkins’ notion of social identity to denote the form of identity that the Trampoline House conveys to its users and interns.

The data I will provide throughout this Thesis will consist of interviews with users of the house, a few official statements from house representatives and others and my own observations. Since this Thesis will predominantly focus on the users and their experiences at the Trampoline House, my main level of inquiry will be the *micro* level (the Trampoline House). Furthermore, there will also be an overall empirical part, focusing on the formal and overall system of integration in Denmark and the, at times, fierce debating that this particular field has been subjected to in recent Danish history, thus also placing a part of this Thesis on the macro level.

Towards the conclusion, I will focus on the Trampoline House as a possible catalyst for integration, inclusion and democracy. This I will do by applying some of the ideas about (conversational) democracy and democratic processes proposed by Danish ‘political philosopher’ Hal Koch, since he has been mentioned as a direct inspiration for the social and

⁶ Honneth, *The Struggle for Recognition*, 94

democratic forum that is the Trampoline House⁷. The relevant ideas of his will be outlined in the conclusion along with the main findings of this study.

Field of Research

In the following, I will account for my main field of research throughout this Thesis as a means to 'set the scene'. As I have already mentioned in the introduction – and, above all, through my research question – the main theme of this study will be the issue of integration and the steps and measures that have been and are being taken in Denmark with regards to addressing this issue. Although my main emphasis is on the Trampoline House and the ways in which it serves as tool for facilitating the process of *integration*, I will also briefly focus on the overall issue of integration across Denmark. In line with what I have already mentioned in the introduction, I will divide this into four parts, all of which focus on different societal levels and processes: the historical debate on migration in Denmark, the current and contemporary public debate on the issue, civil society organizations, such as the Trampoline House, and, lastly, the role and function of *interns* and users of the house, that is, the individual level. Thus, I will start from the outside and, from then, move towards my specific field of research. My main topic of inquiry – and the main topic in the analytical main part of this Thesis – will be the individual level, that is, the data that I have derived from my interviews.

The Debate on Integration and a Historical Overview

Throughout the past three-four decades, the issue of *integration* has become ever more present on the overall socio-political agenda in Denmark, as immigration numbers have increased⁸. The current political course that we see on the issue of migration is a somewhat significant contrast to Denmark's historical stance on the area (at least in post-WW2 history in Denmark): Denmark has, historically, been a rather liberal country with regards to the formulation, elaboration and enforcement of their immigration and asylum laws, and for a long time it was not a main topic of concern among the general public. There are numerous reasons for this: first, before the 20th century, immigration numbers *into* Denmark were

⁷ Grønkjær, *Vi har en kontrakt, hvor flygtninge skal gøre noget til gengæld*, Information, 18/3 2016, link: https://www.information.dk/debat/2016/03/kontrakt-flygtningene-goere-gengæld?utm_content=buffer5fab5&utm_medium=social&utm_source=facebook.com&utm_campaign=buffer [Accessed 21/7 2016]

⁸ Pedersen, *Integration af Indvandrere og Flygtninge*, 3

relatively low, for instance compared to emigration numbers *from* Denmark to other countries (mainly the United States and Argentina, where significant Danish communities can still be found⁹). Herein also lies one of the main aspects of the overall history of migration in Denmark (as well as many other European countries). *Emigration* has, historically, been more commonplace than *immigration* (and some of the countries that people were historically migrating to actively sought out immigrants, for instance to work the land). Apart from this, at least in Denmark, much of the immigration that did take place was restricted to the European continent. This ensured a relative homogeneity within Denmark¹⁰. This also implied that the groups that did go here were somewhat similar to the Danish population, one way or another. An example of this could be the Huguenots, French Protestants fleeing the religious persecution and other discriminatory practices carried out by the Catholic Church in France in the 17th century¹¹. However, already in this period of time, it was also oftentimes a multitude of triggering mechanisms or *push* factors that forced people to leave their countries of origin, such as for instance the Dutch protestants that went to Denmark, also in the 16th and 17th century and worked with land draining and gardening (and, for instance, as a result, practically shaped and rendered habitable the island of Amager at Copenhagen). However, the main reason why those groups were allowed in was likely to be their ability and willingness to work, rather than the fact that they were being persecuted by superior ecclesiastical authorities in other countries¹².

At that time, there was no official migration or asylum system in place in Denmark. This resulted in a somewhat *ad hoc* approach to the issue without any formal or general provisions on how to legally treat the people who ended up settling there. The first legal provision in Denmark, that is, the 1875 Alien's Act¹³, defined immigrants and 'foreigners' under a widely spanning umbrella term, not distinguishing ordinary migration from forced migration¹⁴ (as

⁹ *Deciding to leave*, link: <http://www.danishmuseum.org/explore/danish-american-culture/immigration> [Accessed 24/10 2016]

¹⁰ Bach, *Indvandring I Danmark*, link: <http://www.historie-online.dk/special/indvand/> [Accessed 4/10 2016]

¹¹ Huguenotter, link:

http://denstoredanske.dk/Sprog,_religion_og_filosofi/Religion_og_mystik/Reformerte_kirke/huguenotter [Accessed 26/9 2016]

¹² Fenger-Grøn & Grøndahl, *Flygtningenes danmarkshistorie*, 11

¹³ Danish: Fremmedloven

¹⁴ Winnie Maria Bach, *Indvandring I Danmark*, link: <http://www.historie-online.dk/special/indvand/> [Accessed 19/10 2016]

opposed to the 1951 RC). This resulted in a somewhat “random and practically oriented” treatment of immigrants and refugees¹⁵.

After 1945

In Denmark, a main turning point with regards to the treatment of and attitude towards the issue of forced migration was the Second World War, and it was in the wake of those epoch-making five-six years that much of what we now know as the asylum system (along with the general international system, the United Nations) was initially conceived. However, the first refugees entering Denmark after the end of the war were not covered by the UN Refugee Convention, which wasn’t passed before 1951¹⁶. The first ‘refugees’ in Denmark were Germans (predominantly women, children and elderly people) fleeing Germany as the Red Army swept across vast parts of eastern Germany¹⁷ just before the end of the war¹⁸. Although, after the end of the war, Danish authorities originally wished to send those refugees back to Germany as soon as possible, the UK government stepped in and made it clear that the newcomers would have to stay for a while¹⁹. However, large-scale resettlement programs were initiated in 1946, with the last German refugees being resettled in the spring of 1949²⁰. Then in December 1950, the UN General Assembly established its own body for the treatment of asylum seekers and refugees, namely the UNHCR²¹.

After 1951

Throughout the second half of the 20th century, Denmark saw numerous waves of forced immigration, i.e. people entering the country with the aim of gaining (political) asylum on various grounds. This gradually changed the overall socio-ethnic fabric of Denmark, constituting its role as a country of both *immigration* and *emigration*. The first waves of refugees in Denmark, legally falling under the 1951 RC, were the Hungarians fleeing Hungary

¹⁵ Fenger-Grøn & Grøndahl, *Flygtningenes danmarkshistorie*, 11

¹⁶ Flytningekonventionen af 1951, link

[http://denstoredanske.dk/Samfund, jura og politik/Jura/Territorialret/Flytningekonventionen af 1951](http://denstoredanske.dk/Samfund,_jura_og_politik/Jura/Territorialret/Flytningekonventionen_af_1951)

[Accessed 11/10 2016]

¹⁷ By this, I mean the easternmost parts of Germany, and not the GDR

¹⁸ Pedersen, *Tyske Flygtninge*, link: <http://www.befrielsen1945.dk/temaer/befrielsen/flygtninge/> [Accessed 4/10 2016]

¹⁹ Ibid, link: <http://www.befrielsen1945.dk/temaer/befrielsen/flygtninge/> [Accessed 4/10 2016]

²⁰ <http://www.befrielsen1945.dk/temaer/befrielsen/flygtninge/> [Accessed 4/10 2016]

²¹ Fenger-Grøn & Grøndahl, *Flygtningenes danmarkshistorie*, 10

when Russia annexed the country on November 4th 1956²². Another historically significant group was the Chileans fleeing Chile upon the military coup on September 11th 1973²³. What makes those two specific groups worthwhile mentioning is the inherently political nature and triggers of both of these flows, which significantly affected the public opinion in Denmark, constituting them as political refugees deserving of moral and other types of support. In this sense, the issue of asylum was initially highly politicized^{24,25}.

Then in the early 1980s, once again the issue of *immigration* with the aim of seeking asylum was brought up, above all on account of a particularly liberal law, which was passed in parliament in 1983, and has since frequently been referred to as one of the most liberal immigration laws in Europe²⁶. Already upon issue and in the following years²⁷, this law encountered significant resistance in some parts of Danish society, in which a general concern or fear was that this would leave the country wide-open for mass-migration, possibly forever altering the socio-ethnic fabric of Denmark. One of the main reasons for this concern was the fact that this law provided all persons who entered Denmark as their first country of asylum with a *legal claim* to enter the country and apply for it²⁸. Furthermore, it also provided those who had been granted asylum with a *legal claim* to family reunification²⁹, drawing on fundamental international human rights standards, such as the right to family life. For some of the most vocal opponents to this law, the main issue lay in the very phrase 'legal claim to asylum'. Apart from this, the legal treatment of asylum cases was moved from the Aliens Police to a newly established decision-making body called the Directorate for Foreigners³⁰. This was also the first national law on the issue of how refugees should be adequately

²² Ibid, 23

²³ Ibid, 85

²⁴ Ibid, 30-31

²⁵ Ibid, 83-84

²⁶ Udlændingeloven af 18. juni 1983, link: <http://danmarkshistorien.dk/leksikon-og-kilder/vis/materiale/udlaendingeloven-af-8-juni-1983/> [Accessed 19/9 2016]

²⁷ Rasmussen, *Et Nyt Protesttema*, link: http://denstoredanske.dk/Danmarkshistorien/Gr%C3%A6nser_forsvinder/Et_land_i_opbrud/Fremmedmodstand_og_udl%C3%A6ndingepolitik/Et_nyt_protesttema [Accessed 27/10 2016]

²⁸ Udlændigelov, link: http://denstoredanske.dk/Danmarkshistorien/Lavv%C3%A6kst_og_frontdannelser/Polarisering_indadtil_og_udadtil/Nationalstaten_under_udfordring/Udl%C3%A6ndingelov [Accessed 26/9 2016]

²⁹ Udlændingeloven af 18. juni 1983, link: <http://danmarkshistorien.dk/leksikon-og-kilder/vis/materiale/udlaendingeloven-af-8-juni-1983/> [Accessed 19/9 2016]

³⁰ Danish: Direktoratet for Udlændinge

received and dealt with in Denmark, without direct reference to the 1951 RC³¹. A main reason behind this new law was the fact that the 1951 RC does not explicitly obligate contracting States to implement a formal asylum policy, although it does prohibit the expulsion of individuals eligible for asylum³². During those years, migration numbers increased, and, in particular, the influx of residents of non-Western countries, that is, countries outside Europe and North America, increased significantly³³, implying noteworthy alterations to the overall socio-ethnic fabric of Denmark.

By means of the 1999 'Integration Act', we saw a number of restrictions. As for immigrants and asylum seekers from outside Scandinavia and the EU, a range of requirements were set in place as components of an overall 'program of integration' This implied mandatory Danish classes, education programs and traineeship programs at different companies and organizations³⁴. Thus, the issue of asylum and residence permits was altered from something that you were automatically granted, into something, that you would have to earn through an active effort. This is still a prevailing principle in the realm of integration policies in Denmark and gave a taste of things to come. It is also a main point in this Thesis, since it also touches upon a place like the Trampoline House and the interns working there.

The Post 9/11 Turn

Around the turn of the century, especially with the election of the center-right Government in late 2001 (in the wake of significant international events, such as 9/11, which was used as an official explanation of the political necessity of the election), the issue ultimately made its way into the Danish parliament, and thus, the national arena of politics³⁵. Politically we saw a significant change of course with regards to the issue of immigration³⁶, where, in particular, two things happened. Firstly, a series of restrictions were carried out to put immigration to a halt, among other reasons. Through this, the very field of asylum and the prerequisites for

³¹ Fenger-Grøn & Grøndahl, *Flygtningenes danmarkshistorie*, 11

³² Institut for Menneskerettigheder, *Asyl: Status 2014-15*, 8

³³ Udlændigelov, link:

http://denstoredanske.dk/Danmarkshistorien/Lavv%C3%A6kst_og_frontdannelser/Polarisering_indadtil_og_udadtil/Nationalstaten_under_udfordring/Udl%C3%A6ndingelov [Accessed 26/9 2016]

³⁴ Pedersen, *Integration af Indvandrere og Flygtninge*, 14

³⁵ Folketingsvalget 2001, link: http://danmarkshistorien.dk/leksikon-og-kilder/vis/materiale/folketingsvalget-2001/?no_cache=1&cHash=9a7077497327415e80645a563f24b31a [Accessed 27/9 2016]

³⁶ Pedersen, *Integration af Indvandrere og Flygtninge*, 18-20

obtaining it were significantly restricted³⁷. Furthermore, a political ‘contract’ was ‘drafted’ between the newly elected center-right government and its electors, promising to stabilize and maintain certain policies and political fields, come what may. The policy on migration, asylum and foreigners and the strict course which had now been hammered out by the Government was among those overall political fields³⁸. In line with this, a wide range of restrictions were effectuated on issues such as asylum and the right to family reunification. Secondly, a wide-spanning debate was ‘initiated’ with regards to the foreigners (asylum seekers, refugees, and other types of migrants) already residing in Denmark. This raised wide range of questions about this group of people: how should they be dealt with? How many more should be granted asylum and/or residence permits? Should residence permits be infinite or subjected to re-evaluation after a certain period of time?, etc. This – oftentimes heated – debate is still going on today³⁹, and has been fueled by contemporary (inter)national phenomena, such as the historic migratory situation that we are currently experiencing, with the highest number of forceful internal and external displacements ever registered by the UNHCR⁴⁰. This also brings to mind one of the initial sentences of this Thesis, namely the overall issue of this influx and the subsequent political discussion about how it should be dealt with, or even, *if* it should be dealt with. Those restrictions are, in part, explained through the previous decades of a very liberal set of politics on the area⁴¹. Although this political ‘contract’ no longer ‘applies’ to the current state of affairs, it would be fair to say that the issues of immigration and integration still play a significant role in Danish politics.

Integration

In Denmark, all of this has brought to the fore the issue of *integration* of the people entering the country as asylum seekers (and, in some cases, subsequently, refugees, who are granted asylum) and how this can be carried out in the most convenient manner. This debate not only touches upon newly arrived asylum seekers, but in some cases also the descendants of asylum seekers or refugees, addressing the ‘requirements’ they need to ‘meet’ in order for them to

³⁷ Udlændingelove 1983-2002, danmarkshistorien.dk, link: <http://danmarkshistorien.dk/leksikon-og-kilder/vis/materiale/udlaendingelove-1983-2002/> [Accessed 27/9 2016]

³⁸ Folketingsvalget 2001, link: http://danmarkshistorien.dk/leksikon-og-kilder/vis/materiale/folketingsvalget-2001/?no_cache=1&cHash=9a7077497327415e80645a563f24b31a [Accessed 27/9 2016]

³⁹ Fenger-Grøn & Grøndahl, *Flygtningenes danmarkshistorie*, 15-16

⁴⁰ UNHCR, *Global Trends*, 2

⁴¹ Pedersen, *Integration af Indvandrere og Flygtninge*, 18

become fully-fledged members of society. Gunvor Christensen, a researcher at the Danish Institute of Social Research provides a basic description of *integration* of foreigners in Denmark as:

A process, leading to that the single citizen possesses a full membership of society with the rights and possibilities to follow his or her visions of living the good life along with an active citizenship⁴²

I find this quote useful for my research, since, apart from being one of the cornerstones of the general democratic model in Denmark, the issue of *active citizenship*, as well as the role which is played by civil society and the Third Sector⁴³, is paramount with regards to the general philosophy that seems to characterize the Trampoline House, which still lies at the crux of this study. This will be further outlined, both in terms of some of the theory I will present, and in the analytical section. Furthermore, Christensen's notion of *integration* also implies a strong emphasis on the role of voluntary (social) work, be it in the form of volunteering, as I do at the Trampoline House, or an unpaid internship, as in the case of my interviewees. Christensen offers a notion of *voluntary social work* as:

Unpaid work, the participation and execution of which is voluntary. It is, at the same time, formally organized, for instance in an association, a private company, or in association with an offer by the public sector⁴⁴

Another special trait about voluntary social work, it is said, is the way in which it is structured. At the crux of voluntary social work lies "the encounter between the user and the volunteer"⁴⁵, and this allows for this social work to be organized in a more informal fashion than for instance municipal programs^{46,47}. Apart from this, paying attention to the wishes and desires of the users is important⁴⁸. Elaborating on this, Christensen and Christensen extracts three main phases in the overall process of integration through voluntary social work: *participation*, *interaction* and *integration*, where participation is seen as "a precondition for interaction, and interaction" as "a precondition for integration"⁴⁹. Furthermore, Christensen

⁴² Christensen, *Veje til Integration*, 6 (own translation)

⁴³ As opposed to the Public (first) sector and the Private (second) sector, who both, in general hold other views and values, the notion of the Third Sector is oftentimes used to encompass civil society initiatives, organizations and NGOs, who are not directly affiliated or associated with the former two sectors

⁴⁴ Christensen, *Veje til Integration*, 6 (own translation)

⁴⁵ Ibid, 12 (own translation)

⁴⁶ Da: Kommunale tilbud

⁴⁷ Christensen, *Veje til Integration*, 12

⁴⁸ Ibid, 11

⁴⁹ Christensen & Rønn Christensen, *Etniske Minoriteter, Frivilligt Socialt Arbejde og Integration*, 25

and Christensen make a distinction between organization working *for* ethnic minorities and organizations working *with* ethnic minorities⁵⁰. This also serves as an example to showcase the somewhat dual nature of the Trampoline House as an organization and institution, since, through their work, they are working *with* and *for* ethnic minorities, simultaneously.

However, still drawing on Christensen's concepts, the Trampoline House, it could be argued, is not an association in the traditional sense, since 'traditional' associations oftentimes charge a monthly payment from their members. This principle does not entirely apply to the Trampoline House. Rather, they, for instance, encourage the users to pay what they feel that they can afford to pay for the daily meals, a concept known as 'pay what you can'⁵¹. In this sense, it would be more appropriate to coin it as a certain form of community center and social drop-in center⁵², although, on their own, neither of those two notions seems to fully grasp the nature of this house.

The Trampoline House

The Trampoline House is an independent and user-driven 'community center' in the Northwestern part of Copenhagen⁵³ (an area characterized by great cultural and ethnic diversity). The house was founded in 2010 as an immediate response to the current situation and treatment of asylum seekers in Denmark. It was initially conceived of at a number of workshops held by three Danish artists, attended by Danish students and asylum seekers from nearby centers⁵⁴, which ended up as a think tank by the name of 'the Asylum-Dialogue Tank', or ADT⁵⁵. Initially, their primary focus was on the effect that the physical design of the asylum centers was having upon asylum seekers and the idea that the stress and trauma experienced by asylum seekers there could be mitigated through altering the design and architecture of the asylum centers. However, this idea was quickly abandoned in favor of

⁵⁰ Ibid, 49

⁵¹ Böttcher Messell, *My House, Your House*, 66

⁵² Danish: Socialt værested

⁵³ About the Trampoline House, link: <http://www.trampolinehouse.dk/about-trampoline-house/> [Accessed 14/9 2016]

⁵⁴ Udvalget for Udlændinge- og Integrationspolitik 2011-12 *Trampolinhuset*, 7

⁵⁵ Danish: Asyl-Dialog-Tanken

creating long-term projects as a means to engage asylum seekers at a joint space and get them to meet other people there. As argued by Morten Goll, head of the Trampoline House⁵⁶:

Asylum seekers live in isolation, poverty and with the inability to act, and that is far worse than the conditions under which they live. Even if they lived in a tent, the other problems would matter more. So, we forgot about the idea of altering architecture and design⁵⁷

This statement underscores Christensen's notion of the importance of dialogue and the fact that the actual needs of those you wish to assist are adequately addressed. Furthermore, this sense of 'isolation', it is argued, stems from various factors, such as the remote and isolated location of the asylum centers in Denmark⁵⁸. Moreover, the demographic composition of the centers also oftentimes contributes to a strong sense of personal insecurity, especially with regards to certain groups of people⁵⁹. This was also one of the key motivations for establishing a permanent space.

Financially, the house is funded through public and private donors, "support events" and other donations⁶⁰. Through their work, the people engaged at the Trampoline House are trying to offer activities that meet the capacities that are already held by the participants at the house⁶¹ (both asylum seekers and refugees). Apart from this, through their activities, they are also trying to meet the concrete needs that some of its users might have. An example of this is the Women's Club, which is held every Saturday as a means to mitigate the effects of the social control, which is, unfortunately, taking place at some of the asylum centers. This activity is exclusively for women, and some of them prefer this space as a forum to discuss certain issues, which might be so sensible and delicate that the discussion could be compromised by the presence of men⁶². Thus, one of the main concerns at the Trampoline House is to try to strike a balance between the capacities and the needs of their users. They also assist in launching concrete projects, which can lead into full-time employment, either through helping people find a job or helping them in launching initiatives by themselves. An example of this is

⁵⁶ Rottbøll, *Asylansøgere træder ud af offerrollen*, Information, link: <https://www.information.dk/indland/2009/03/asylansoegere-traeder-offerrollen> [Accessed 30/9 2016]

⁵⁷ Ibid

⁵⁸ Link: <http://refugees.dk/fakta/asylproceduren-i-danmark/asylcentrene/> [Accessed 19/7 2016]

⁵⁹ Link: <http://refugees.dk/fakta/asylproceduren-i-danmark/minoriteter-og-chikane-i-asylcentrene/> [Accessed 19/7 2016]

⁶⁰ *About Trampoline House*, link: <http://www.trampolinehouse.dk/about-trampoline-house> [Accessed 29/9 2016]

⁶¹ Udvalget for Udlændinge- og Integrationspolitik 2011-12 *Trampolinhuset*

⁶² Note from a meeting at the Trampoline House on March 2nd 2016

a catering firm called 'Sisters' Cuisine', which is established and run by migrant and refugee women, who cater for the parties held at the Trampoline House, as well as other events⁶³.

Through their work, the people working at the house try to mitigate the (legal) limbo that many asylum seekers find themselves in during the period in which their cases are being processed by Danish immigration authorities. A main concern is the somewhat widespread idea that, through its work and activities, the official asylum system in Denmark clientizes the people who find themselves in it⁶⁴. This also goes in line with some of the main findings in a study conducted by Danish humanitarian organization Dansk Flygtningehjælp, mapping out the main motivating factors in the general public in Denmark for engaging in voluntary groups. Among reasons such as learning more about foreign cultures, a felt indignation caused by the perceived treatment of immigrants and refugees is also presented as a main triggering factor for such initiatives to arise⁶⁵.

The main philosophy of the Trampoline House is conceived of as one which is based on the principles of "integration, learning, exchange, networking and unconditional respect"⁶⁶. This philosophy and social practice serves as a means to mitigate "the social isolation and sense of powerlessness that many refugees and asylum seekers experience"⁶⁷. Throughout the presentation of the data I have gathered I will elaborate on this aspect of the Trampoline House. For the asylum seekers, the house serves as a space where they can "recharge and gather the energy and support needed for jump-starting a better life"⁶⁸. As for the Danish public, the house, in its own words, serves as tool to get people "motivated to reform the current refugee and asylum system"⁶⁹. This sense of trying to mitigate the effects of long-term stays at asylum centers by bringing people together (asylum seekers, Danish and foreign volunteers) is also reflected in the slogan 'join us – it's also your house'⁷⁰, which seems to convey this sense of an open atmosphere, where people can get together, talk about and discuss different subjects of interest in open-minded manner. Coining the two, through its

⁶³ Link: <http://www.trampolinehouse.dk/news/2015/9/29/sisters-cuisine> [Accessed 26/9 2016]

⁶⁴ Udvalget for Udlændinge- og Integrationspolitik 2011-12 *Trampolinhuset*

⁶⁵ Christensen & Rønn Christensen, *Etniske Minoriteter, Frivilligt Socialt Arbejde og Integration*, 34

⁶⁶ Udvalget for Udlændinge- og Integrationspolitik 2011-12 *Trampolinhuset*

⁶⁷ About the Trampoline House, link: <http://www.trampolinehouse.dk/about-trampoline-house> [Accessed 22/7 2016]

⁶⁸ Ibid

⁶⁹ Ibid

⁷⁰ Ibid

working philosophy, the Trampoline House offers a notion of ‘integration’ as cultural encounters which are characterized by a sense of unconditional mutual respect on behalf of both parties⁷¹.

Another main component of the overall philosophy of the Trampoline House is the notion of *solidarity*. In applying this concept, a clear definition is also made with regards to the type of solidarity which is strived for at the house, somewhat setting it apart from traditional notions of material aid and charity. Thus, the Trampoline House is constituted as a place of *solidarity* and *unconditional respect*, through the basic argumentation that:

What we have learned is that, if you want to build up a democratic space, it needs to be based on the principle of unconditional mutual respect, but if one half of the participants are clients who receive handouts from the other half, you have an uneven relationship, and then the democratic conversation falls apart. Charity is an evil at the Trampoline House. It is simply of no use for us⁷²

This statement can be seen as another aspect of the overall effort to break with a somewhat prevailing way of dealing with asylum seekers, a way which, according to the philosophy proposed at the Trampoline House, clientizes asylum seekers and makes for an uneven relationship between the people who attend the house. Here, the twofold nature of this alleged clientization – stemming from the formal asylum system, as well as overly benevolent donors, who donate goods without expecting anything in return – is also addressed as one of the main contributing factors to this supposed ‘downfall’ of the democratic conversation. This is where the notion of mutual respect and solidarity comes in as main constituting factors of the social space that is the Trampoline House. This issue will be further accounted for in the analytical paragraphs.

The Users

The Trampoline House engages a wide range of people with different backgrounds as volunteers, interns and users. Among the users of the Trampoline House, my particular group of interest is the *interns*, asylum seekers, who are doing *praktik* at the house. The field of

⁷¹ Udvalget for Udlændinge- og Integrationspolitik 2011-12 *Trampolinhuset*

⁷² Grønkjær, “Vi har en kontrakt, hvor flygtninge skal gøre noget til gengæld”, *Information*, 18/3 2016, link: https://www.information.dk/debat/2016/03/kontrakt-flygtningene-goere-gengæld?utm_content=buffer5fab5&utm_medium=social&utm_source=facebook.com&utm_campaign=buffer [Accessed 21/7 2016] (own translation)

praktik ranges from administrative work, curating and exhibition in the exhibition space of the house (also known as the Center for Art on Migration Politics, or CAMP), to practical tasks, such as, cleaning, cooking or translation at counselling sessions (such as my three interviewees). The concept of *praktik* thus goes in line with Christensen's basic notion of voluntary/unpaid (social) work.

However, due to the somewhat fluid and loose structure of the house, there is no clear-cut limitation of those activities. Although, as an *intern*, you choose one more days in which you want to attend the house to do a certain activity, this doesn't exclude you from participating in other activities offered on that or other days. Apart from this, some users also use the house solely for social reasons, and this is also something that some of my interviewees have stated as an important reason and motivation for being at the house. Apart from this, since the house was originally established by (political) artists, this is also a group which is very present and visible at the house, both in terms of artists and political activists, which is sometimes a quite interlinked group.

With regards to the *interns*, who are my particular group of interest, many of them seem to be somewhat hand-picked from the asylum centers on the basis of certain skills that may be of use to the house, English proficiency being one of them. However, some of them also hold personal 'profiles' that somehow correspond the fundamental DNA of the Trampoline House as a place which was originally founded by artists and political activists (such as Soran, one of my interviewees, who is also, himself, an intellectual and a political activist).

Methodology

Throughout this chapter, I will outline the overall methodology of this Thesis as well as an account of my primary motivation to apply this exact methodology over another. This methodology is divided into two main parts:

1. Interviewing as a standard working method for the collection of my data
2. My theoretical framework, from which I will try to derive a fit theory by applying various theories and theoretical concepts which will then be applied onto the data collected by means of the interviews

Interviews

As has already been mentioned with regards to my choice of data, the empirical basis of this Thesis will be interviews. Within social sciences and anthropology, interviews (mostly qualitative) are frequently used as a standard working method, usually for the purpose of gaining specific, in-depth knowledge about a certain issue or topic. However, one of the major shortcomings about interviews (and particularly qualitative interviews) is of course the degree to which it can be said to convey a sufficiently wide and satisfactory picture of the topic or trend that it intends to grasp. This phenomenon is also known as the *generalizability* of the interviews or data⁷³. Throughout this Thesis, I will be aware of this aspect of working with interviews as a standard working method.

The participants of the interviews are three Kurdish asylum seekers (one Iraqi and two Syrians), who are doing *praktik* at the house, all of them as translators. In order for the house to do its job in the most convenient manner, they are heavily reliant on translators to assist at counselling sessions, among other things. In most cases, these translators are sought out straight at the asylum centers. Throughout the interviews, the main issue I wanted to uncover is what one could coin as the interviewees' self-perceived gain from doing *praktik* (as well as just being) at the Trampoline House. I have chosen to conduct those interviews as three separate interviews, instead of a group interview. The main purpose of these interviews was to get the perspective of an intern/user of the house. I have specifically turned my attention to asylum seekers over refugees, because I wanted to address the ways in which the Trampoline House works from an asylum seeker's point of view and emphasize the possible dynamic between the Trampoline House and the asylum center, a dynamic which has also been brought up by the Trampoline House itself.

Praktik uncovered

The notion of *praktik* (here using the terminology of the Trampoline House) refers to the mandatory unpaid work that asylum seekers will have to do once in Denmark: seven work-days after arriving in Denmark, the individual asylum seeker will sign a legally binding contract with the Danish State. By signing this contract, the asylum seeker commits to two main tasks: a special course for newly arrived asylum seekers as well as various compulsory

⁷³ Kvale & Brinkmann, *Interview*, 350

tasks at the center, such as cleaning and maintenance of the center. After three months, you sign a new contract, confirming that you enter the stage known as 'phase one', where you are granted the right to engage in activation programs and internships. Technically speaking, the solutions that are offered at the Trampoline House are not internships, since, in terms of an internship, the institution providing the internship is not allowed in any way to assist or provide the interns with anything (which the Trampoline House *does* by paying transportation costs, offering hot meals, and so forth)⁷⁴.

The Trampoline House offers those 'internships' on equal terms as other organizations, businesses and individual business owners. The internships vary greatly, both in terms of the field of work as well as their outcome with some ending out better than others. However, it appears that the groups and segments that are the easiest to get into the Danish labour market are either the highly-educated (who perhaps already know English) or those with little or no education, who can be assigned to low-skilled jobs, such as cleaning. Those at the middle of the specter with shorter training tend to be harder to get into the labor market, mainly due to the fact that a certain level of Danish is usually required in order for one to hold a job at the middle of the job specter⁷⁵. As for my interviewees, this could be seen as somewhat comforting, since, apart from knowing English, which is a major advantage, two of them hold or have partially completed a university education.

Choice of participants and briefing

The interviews were conducted in late June 2016 and involved three young Kurdish asylum seekers (two men and one woman: Suran, Allan and Viane, now aged 22, 20 and 20, respectively) who, apart from doing translation at the house, participate in an activity called Art Tuesday, which consists of a range of drama workshops and takes place every Tuesday. I met the three participants for the first time at a weekly house meeting which is the forum where researchers such as I usually present their projects. Afterwards I had a word with them, got to know them a bit before giving them a preliminary briefing about the frame for the interviews. Apart from this, I also took part in Art Tuesday that day.

⁷⁴ Note from a meeting 12/10 2016

⁷⁵ Field note from my visit to the asylum center at Roskilde 18/4 2016

The three interview participants are chosen as a 'nationally' and ethnically homogenous group (all of them are from different parts of Kurdistan. Suran is from the Iraqi part, while Alan and Viane are from the Syrian part). Moreover, they are chosen as a somewhat homogenous group with regard to their age (although there are many people of different ages at the house, there seems to be a strong representation of young people, aged between 18 and 30, roughly). Besides this, they are chosen as a group of interns, rather than refugees who, despite the fact that they might have attended various activities and events at the house for a long time, may not be directly affiliated with the house as volunteers or interns. Third but not least, their English proficiency is also a key factor in my choice of interviewees. So while I appreciate that their cases and the treatment of those cases might differ a bit on account of their different nationalities (Syrians tend to be *fast-tracked* through the asylum system, on account of the gravity of the humanitarian situation in Syria⁷⁶), I still regard them as a sufficiently 'homogenous' interview group, for which reason I have chosen them.

In order for me to acquire an informed consent, the participants were duly informed about the purpose of the interviews and my main interest in a user's perspective of the house and, above all, an intern's perspective of the house as the prospected main theme of the interviews. However, I did not explicitly mention my interest in their experience at the Trampoline House as opposed to their experience at the asylum center. This came somewhat naturally throughout the interviews, in part due to the open and somewhat free-associations-based style of interview that I had chosen. This aspect will be further uncovered in the analytical chapter. However, as a researcher this *is* one of my main motivations for choosing asylum seekers over refugees.

Style of interview

My main motivation of conducting the three interviews is to gain a certain insight in what my interviewees experience in their daily work as interns at the Trampoline House. In order for me to do this, the most convenient thing to do seemed to carry out the interviews in the form of semi-structured *life-world* interviews with a main emphasis on uncovering the *life-world* of the interviewees. Steinar Kvale and Sven Brinkmann describe the notion of *life-world* as:

⁷⁶ Note from an info meeting 17/6 2016

The world as you face it in your daily life and as it is as a direct and immediate experience, independent of and prior to scientific explanations⁷⁷

Furthermore, the *life-world* is coined as the social sphere from which we derive the knowledge that is subsequently elaborated and explained by means of the theories and theoretical notions that one chooses to apply in order for one to adequately grasp this very *life-world* description⁷⁸. In other words, the notion of *life world* comes to entail “a pre-scientific world of experience”⁷⁹. This also goes in line with the quote above, placing the *life world* before the different explanations and explanatory models provided by different theories. This goes hand in hand with an overall qualitative stance of the science known as phenomenology as a standard research method. As a point of departure, this science tries to understand and grasp various social phenomena as they are explained and outlined by the social actors themselves⁸⁰. With regards to my research, those actors are my three interviewees and the social phenomena that I will try to uncover through their statements are the ways in which the Trampoline House works in terms of a wide-ranging discussion of its function as a social, empowering, vocational and democratic space and how this could be said to affect the issue of integration.

Thus, with the ‘crude’ interviews as my starting point, the *life-world* of my interviewees will later on be placed in a greater context regarding their personal experience of being at the Trampoline House, doing *praktik* there, thus further mapping out certain aspects of their *life-world*⁸¹, while placing it in a greater context by means of the theories I intend to apply. Subsequently, the theoretical framework will be applied to map out the specific topics and mentions addressed in the interviews. As some argue, accounts like those can play an important role in clarifying and gaining knowledge about key structural processes and conditions in society⁸². In the case of these interviews, those key structural processes could be coined as the experiences of three users and interns at the Trampoline House (in some cases directly opposed to their experiences at the asylum center). Thus, the main purpose of these interviews has been the production of knowledge by means of a process of mutual interaction

⁷⁷ Kvale & Brinkmann, *Interview*, 351 (own translation)

⁷⁸ Jacobsen et al, *Fænomenologi*, 188

⁷⁹ *Ibid*, 187

⁸⁰ *Ibid*, 195

⁸¹ Kvale & Brinkmann, *Interview*, 126

⁸² Andersen et al., *Fortolkende Socialvidenskab*, 7

between me and my interview persons⁸³. The final goal of this strategy is to get an account of reality from the perspective of the social actor, that is, my three interviewees. Thus, through this process, I am trying to acquire some sense of understanding of the *life-world* of my interviewees, from their own perspectives⁸⁴. Furthermore, the interviews will take the form of scientific interviews, which are characterized by the fact that their primary function is the production of knowledge⁸⁵.

Discourse analysis

Thus, apart from being a so-called *life-world* interview, one could also argue that, to a certain degree, the interviews will take the form of *discursive* interviews, since, throughout the interviews, a given type of discourse might be conveyed or uncovered. Although highly contested among a wide range of scholars, there seems to be a certain consensus on the fundamental nature of ‘discourse’ as:

Constituting forces in the construction of reality⁸⁶

As for my account on discourse, drawing particularly on ideas developed by Heidegger and Laclau & Mouffe, the constant discursive influence of particular social surroundings should be mentioned as a key point of departure for understanding the data derived by means of the interviews, emphasizing the constructive and constitutive interplay between social actors and the physical and social milieus within which they find themselves. According to Heidegger:

Human beings ... are ‘hurled’ into a world of meaningful discourses and practices, and it is that world which makes them able to identify and deal with the objects they encounter⁸⁷

In concrete terms, following Heidegger’s analogy, this ‘world’ that I have in mind evolves around *discourse*, which, drawing on Foucault, is coined as “historically specific systems of meaning which form the identity of subjects and objects”⁸⁸. In other words, people are, oftentimes simultaneously, shaped *by* and *shaping* their immediate social and physical environment by means of ‘specific systems of meaning’, governing the overall functioning of

⁸³ Kvale & Brinkmann, *Interview*, 34

⁸⁴ *Ibid*, 44-45

⁸⁵ *Ibid*, 18

⁸⁶ Phillips, *Diskursanalyse*, 265 (own translation)

⁸⁷ Howarth, *Diskurs*, 20 (own translation)

⁸⁸ *Ibid*, 20 (own translation)

society and the ways in which people think of and address certain aspects of and topics in society. Those systems of meaning are constantly open for re-interpretation and negotiation by means of people addressing certain issues which they find to be relevant.

Apart from this, as mentioned above, I will put a certain emphasis on the ideas developed by Laclau and Mouffe. One of the ideas that I will elaborate on in terms of my analysis is the notion of socio-political antagonisms. One of their main arguments on this point is that politics, that is, an interest driven struggle for influence, plays a particular role in the overall ‘‘social ontology’’⁸⁹. Furthermore, they elaborate that:

Systems of social relations, which are understood as quantities of articulated discourses, are always political constructions which entail the construction of antagonisms and the exercise of power⁹⁰

The actions undertaken by the Trampoline House and its affiliates could be viewed as such processes of re-interpretation and negotiation of relevant systems of meaning, in concrete terms, the overall functioning of the formal asylum system in Denmark, which they, apparently, find not to adequately address the problems experienced by asylum seekers. Apart from this, by offering a special forum for its users, as an institution, the Trampoline House, of course, also exercises power, in this sense.

Here, further elaborating on Laclau and Mouffe, the antagonisms which are created can convey somewhat shared social experiences, for instance the experience that there are certain social ‘goods’ or ‘attributes’, that you, as a social actor, lack. This way, by ascribing to a certain discourse that may ‘grant’ you the things that you lack, antagonisms may come to play an overall constituting role in terms of social objectivity and place you, as a social actor, within a given social formation, which might mitigate this feeling of ‘lacking’ certain social goods⁹¹. This can be done by placing people within a given social formation, such as the Trampoline House.

Finally, Laclau and Mouffe argue that the very existence of one discourse can outright *block* the emergence of another⁹². However, by doing so, people still find themselves positioned in a certain way and can still undertake certain subjective positions and choose to act in a certain

⁸⁹ Ibid, 150

⁹⁰ Ibid, 150 (own translation)

⁹¹ Ibid, 154

⁹² Ibid, 154

way as an immediate response to this scenario. Laclau and Mouffe describe this as the nexus between *subject positions* and *political subjectivity*⁹³. Both of these concepts serve as overall explanations in clarifying the relation between the different systems of meaning (subject positions) to which social actors can ascribe and the individual *actions* (political subjectivity) that they can realize within the frames of those very systems of meaning. In terms of my case, an example of this could be the participation in the weekly house meeting at the Trampoline House where people can defend, subscribe to, or contest different *opinions* and *viewpoints*, articulated by other social actors, i.e., the other participants at those meetings. Laclau and Mouffe claim that a main triggering mechanism for subject positions to form is the surrounding structure (or 'society'), which, depending on the processes taking place within this structure, may force relevant social actors to re-evaluate their position in society. This is the very process that shapes the actor's political subjectivity⁹⁴. Here, again, Fairclough's notion of the inter-constitutive nature between social actors and their immediate surroundings, be it the case of the Trampoline House, the asylum centers or other particular surroundings and milieus, becomes relevant.

Although I will mainly apply the particular strand of discourse analysis proposed by Laclau and Mouffe, I will also bear in mind key elements of other strands. In this connection, I have found some of the traditional empirical and positivist notions particularly useful in grasping what individual 'discourse' is. One such account describes discourse as:

'Frames' or 'cognitive schemata', whereby they refer to human groups' deliberate, strategic efforts to elaborate common understandings of the world and themselves, thus motivating joint action⁹⁵

However, I will not merely focus on those frames as closed entities, but parts of a whole, emphasizing Norman Fairclough's notion of the innately and "mutually constitutive relation between discourses and the social systems within which they work" and emanate⁹⁶. I will, thus, not view the different discourses as closed systems and entities in their own right, but as parts of a greater structure, within which different discourses are often intertwined.

⁹³ Ibid, 157

⁹⁴ Ibid, 158

⁹⁵ Ibid, 13 (own translation)

⁹⁶ Ibid, 15 (own translation)

With regards to this Thesis, this structure consists of the Trampoline House and other parts of the more formal asylum system in Denmark, particularly the asylum centers. However, I will also argue that this 'grand structure' implies, smaller sub-structures. In other words: discourses within the discourse (specifically, the particular discourse derived by means of the interviews). Drawing, once again, on Laclau and Mouffe, I will probe into the originally anthropological notion of a 'discursive' and, thus also constitutive, 'other' which is viewed as an absolute prerequisite for the formation and existence of any kind of discourse⁹⁷. However, in terms of this constitutive 'other' my main emphasis will be on the interplay between two concrete physical milieus (the Trampoline House and the asylum centers) rather than individual social actors. Although this notion is usually applied onto individual subjects, throughout this Thesis, I will try to ally them onto physical settings as concrete outcomes of relevant discourses. Specifically, I will address the mentioned interplay between the Trampoline House and the Asylum centers, in accordance with what my interviewees have mentioned with regards to this matter. In other words this interplay could be said to rest upon the dynamic between a social *actor* and a social *factor*.

The Interview situation

With regards to the interview situation surrounding the three interviews, I have chosen to adopt a post-modernist stance to knowledge produced by means of interviews. By doing so, I conceive of interview-produced knowledge as "produced, relational, conversation-based, contextual, linguistic, narrative and pragmatic"⁹⁸, thereby taking into account the inherently dialogue-based nature of interviews and the acquired data as an immediate outcome of this process of knowledge production. Furthermore, the fact that I will be granted a certain narrative within a certain context must also be taken into consideration, since, as a volunteer at the Trampoline House, I share a certain frame of reference with my interviewees.

Through my choice interviewing style, instead of formally steering the interview, I have, to a certain degree, tried to encourage my interviewees to talk and tell me what is on their mind, thus applying the method that Hollway and Jefferson have coined as the free associations

⁹⁷ Howarth, *Diskurs*, 151

⁹⁸ Kvale & Brinkmann, *Interview*, 71-72 (own translation)

narrative interview⁹⁹. In terms of this Thesis, this knowledge will thus evolve around the role that the Trampoline House plays with regards to dealing with the influx and presence of asylum seekers and how some of these people experience the ways in which this is being dealt with. I will probe into how the house is used on a daily basis. Ultimately, I will try to uncover this through my final question which directly addresses the participants' 'self-perceived gain' from being at the Trampoline House, both in terms of their individual experience of 'gain' as well as their ideas and notions of the Trampoline House as a social space. This last question will constitute my main subject of inquiry and interest.

As a researcher, I have, through my four months as a volunteer at the Trampoline House and by participating in some of the activities at the house and working voluntarily as an integration counselor, already gained some knowledge about this particular environment and how the social structures work in this particular setting. It could be argued that this, in turn, gives me certain knowledge about what my interviewees might want to talk about¹⁰⁰. This knowledge is useful for me, in order for me to try to manage and steer the single interviews, thus hopefully equilibrating the loose structure of the interviews. Besides, it gives me the capacity to be specific about the information that I would like to acquire in the course of the interviews, which is also a vital requirement for a successful interview to take place¹⁰¹. This notwithstanding, one of my main motivations of conducting those interviews is my interest, through those interviews, in gaining information I do not have to begin with¹⁰².

However, in the course of my interviews, I have endeavored to get my interviewees to talk. The reason for this is twofold: firstly, by doing so, I would like to slightly alleviate the innately skewed power relations that surround all interviews¹⁰³. Secondly, the nature of the interviews – as well as my choice of participants – does not to a high degree necessitate me putting the same emphasis on steering the interview as strictly as other styles of interviews, such as elite-interviews, for instance¹⁰⁴.

⁹⁹ Andersen et al., *Fortolkende Socialvidenskab*, 10

¹⁰⁰ Kvale & Brinkmann, *Interview*, 128

¹⁰¹ *Ibid*, 48

¹⁰² Tanggaard & Brinkmann, *Interviewet: Samtalen som Forskningsmetode*, 34

¹⁰³ Kvale & Brinkmann, *Interview*, 51

¹⁰⁴ *Ibid*, 349

After some initial considerations, I have chosen to divide the analytical part into four parts, corresponding to Chamaz' notion of *coding* of the data. I will thus make a distinction between certain main aspects, drawing on all three interviews in order for me to categorize the data I have gathered by means of the interviews. This will be further elaborated in the analytical part.

Analyzing the Data

In this section I will outline my overall analytical framework as well as present the different theories I intend to use in order for me to grasp the Trampoline House according to what I have gathered through my interviews and categorize the different statements according to a certain and adequate theoretical concept.

Inductive working method

The data that I find will be partially analyzed and probed through an inductive approach framework (also known as *grounded theory*). *Grounded Theory* is a sociological working method developed by US sociologists Barney Glazer and Anselm Strauss. In a nutshell, *grounded theory* refers to "the discovery of theory through data"¹⁰⁵. As for this Thesis, this means that I will not have a completely fixed set of theories to either verify or falsify a given hypothesis. Contrarily, various theories and theoretical concepts will be applied when fit in relation to the data that will be analyzed. This also implies that I will not work with a set hypothesis that I would either have to verify or falsify. Rather, through the data that I have gathered (in this case my interviews and other observations at the Trampoline House), I will find and use the theories that I see as relevant in order for me to adequately investigate into the qualitative data. In other words, I will let the data shape the theory, and not vice-versa, in line with Glazer and Strauss' basic idea of 'creating' grounded theory as:

A way of arriving at a theory suited to its supposed uses¹⁰⁶

This quote emphasizes my intention to let the collected data shape my theoretical framework, and not vice-versa. Through this, I will end up at the inductive evolvement of a certain 'theory'

¹⁰⁵ Glazer & Strauss, *The Discovery of Grounded Theory*, 1

¹⁰⁶ *Ibid*, 3

by de-coding the expressions of experience as expressed by my interviewees¹⁰⁷. This also means that I might not apply entire theories, rather bit and pieces of already established theories when I see them fit. The immediate goal of this approach is to avoid applying entire theories which might not be entirely applicative (or over-opportunistically applied) onto concrete data¹⁰⁸. Thus, in order for the researcher to do his/her job in the most convenient manner (and as faithfully towards the data as possible) one should possess a theoretical sensitivity, which, in turn allows you to “conceptualize and formulate a theory as it emerges from the data”¹⁰⁹. This way:

The literature is accessed as it becomes relevant: It is not a given special treatment. Glaser makes the point that most research including qualitative research is hypothesis testing. The literature is given more weight than your data. In emergent research it is not so¹¹⁰

This work mainly consists of what could be termed as analytical ‘coding and de-coding’ of the empirical material which has been gathered (in my case, the three interviews). With regards to qualitative data gathered by means of interviews, Chamaz describes *codes* as immediate and short, defining the action or experience as described by the interviewee¹¹¹. However, it should be mentioned that, throughout this Thesis, I will not endeavor to make a completely in-depth categorization and subsequent analytical comparison of various statements made by my three interviewees in an individual fashion. Rather, I will use the different sequences to back up one another when fit.

The main reason for using an inductive theoretical framework is that I have chosen a relatively broad perspective in order for me to grasp as many aspects about the outcome of my interviews (and the very nature of the Trampoline House) as I possibly can. Apart from taking an inductive stance, the theoretical framework will also to a high degree consist of *mixed methods*, although the primary focus of investigation will be a qualitative one and not a quantitative one.

By applying an overall qualitative framework rather than a quantitative one, in general terms, my main emphasis will be on the nature of the data gathered rather than the mere quantity.

¹⁰⁷ Kvale & Brinkmann, *Interview*, 224

¹⁰⁸ Glazer & Strauss, *The Discovery of Grounded Theory*, 4

¹⁰⁹ *Ibid*, 46

¹¹⁰ Dick, *Grounded Theory*, 4

¹¹¹ Kvale & Brinkmann, *Interview*, 224

In other words, I focus on *which* kind of data I have gathered, rather than *how much* data I have gathered¹¹².

Theoretical framework

In the following couple of paragraphs, I will outline the theories I intend to apply onto the gathered data in the analytical chapter. As mentioned in the introductory part, the two main theoretical strands that will be used in analyzing and decoding the data used for this Thesis will be some of Jenkins' widely spanning notions of social identity, on one hand, and Honneth's ideas of recognition and the immediate prerequisites for such recognition to occur, on the other. I will furthermore account for the intellectual traditions that have paved the way for those two sets of theory.

Literature Review

I will now account for my concrete choice of literature for this Thesis. As I have already mentioned, the two main theoretical strands for the analysis of this study will be some of Jenkins' notions of social identity and Honneth's ideas on recognition.

Honneth's ideas stem from the traditions of critical theory, drawing, among others, on the ideas developed by Habermas. Apart from this, he also derives many of his ideas from major German philosophers such as Immanuel Kant and Friederich Hegel. He derives many of his ideas on recognition from Hegel's notion of morality or *Sittlichkeit*¹¹³. Many of Honneth's ideas on recognition stem from an intellectual tradition, originally emphasizing the notion of 'justice' in a sense that goes beyond the fair distribution of resources. Apart from that, he draws on the likes of Hegel and Mead in order for him to coin the importance and need of mutual, recognition when dealing with situations of social interaction¹¹⁴. As I shall outline in the chapter on Recognition Theory, it is this strand of social psychology which is applied by Honneth when he tries to grasp the sometimes affective connection between social actors as immediate prerequisites for the development of social recognition and social esteem¹¹⁵.

¹¹² Ibid, 138

¹¹³ Nørgaard, *Axel Honneth og en Teori om Anderkendelse*, 63

¹¹⁴ Anderson, *Translator's Introduction*, x

¹¹⁵ Nørgaard, *Axel Honneth og en Teori om Anderkendelse*, 64

The other main strand of my theory will be the ideas proposed by British social-anthropologist Richard Jenkins. As a scholar, Jenkins shows a great interest in the issue of identity (both in social and ethnic/national terms)¹¹⁶ and he does so both from a sociological and anthropological perspective, thus revealing the inherently close relationship between those two fields of investigation¹¹⁷. This he does to provide a widely spanning account of the issue of (cultural) identity, in some cases within entire societies (he has performed field studies and done research in Northern Ireland, England, Wales and Denmark). Two main ideas that he coins with this approach is the (predominantly sociological) notion of *socialization* and the (predominantly anthropological) concept of *identity*, specifically national identity and the perceived adherence to a particular social, national and/or ethnic collectivity. He also subscribes to a particular strand of sociology, which is highly influenced by the critical thinkers of the so-called Frankfurt School. Other main influences in Jenkins' works are George Herbert Mead and Erwin Goffman, two of the founding fathers of the field of *symbolic interactionism*. From those two, Jenkins derives the overall active and performative nature of *identity* and *identification*. In other words, he perceives *identity* as something that you *do*, rather than something that you *are*¹¹⁸. This, along with the other aspects mentioned in this paragraph, will be further outlined and accounted for in the following theoretical chapter.

Social Identity

Jenkins provides us with an in-depth account of social identity by focusing on *individual* identity as much as *collective* or *group identity*, but, in a nutshell, he describes the very notion of 'identity' as:

The human capacity – rooted in language – to know 'who's who' (and hence 'what's what'). This involves knowing who we are, knowing who others are, them knowing who we are, us knowing who they think we are, and so on. It is a multi-dimensional classification or mapping of the human world and our place in it, as individuals and as members of collectivities¹¹⁹

¹¹⁶ Institut for Sociologi og Socialt Arbejde AAU, *Richard Jenkins*, link: <http://www.soc.aau.dk/om/adjungerede-professorer/richard-jenkins/> [Accessed 14/9 2016]

¹¹⁷ Jenkins, *The Future of Sociology*, link: <http://sociologicalstudies.dept.shef.ac.uk/?p=1349> [Accessed 14/9 2015]

¹¹⁸ Sølling, *Richard Jenkins – Understanding Identification*, link: <https://blogit.itu.dk/denc2014/2014/09/11/richard-jenkins-understanding-identification/> [Accessed 6/10 2016]

¹¹⁹ Jenkins, *Social Identity*, 6

Jenkins thus claims that definitions of identity are constant and multi-dimensional, involving numerous parties of interest who possess various types and varying degrees of knowledge about themselves and others.

He goes on to bring in another main aspect on terms of the notion of *identity* and how, in very basic terms, people identify themselves as well as others, namely the somewhat linked concept of 'identification', which he then goes on to mention as a crucial aspect in the pursuit of interests, individually and collectively. This process is highly negotiable in terms of the relevant actors and factors that affect and influence it:

It is a process – *identification* – not a 'thing'; it is not something that one can *have*, or not, it is something that one *does*¹²⁰

Thus, identity and identification come to constitute processes of *action* as much as *understanding* and *comprehension*. In other words, rather than just being a somewhat passive mapping of one's surroundings, people can actively shape their own identity by means of action. This is where certain social settings and milieus that can allow for a certain process of identification to unfold become interesting. Thus, people can actively decide to subscribe to the values associated with certain larger groups and collectivities. This can be seen as an example of this individual action that Jenkins describes as *identification*. This also goes in line with the notions of discourse which, following the strands that I have chosen for this Thesis, is never a final or settled matter, but always open for re-negotiation and formulation, thus simultaneously constructing and constituting main aspects and sectors of society. By means of the data, I will endeavor to argue that the Trampoline House could be viewed as an environment that allows for such identification to take place.

One process of identification usually hinges upon other processes of identification and how they work together: how one person or collectivity is viewed by another person or collectivity may very well influence how the former views him or itself, thus possibly affecting and shaping the overall interests of that person or collectivity¹²¹. Thus, according to Jenkins, identity and identification is something which, oftentimes simultaneously, implies *similarity*

¹²⁰ Ibid, 6

¹²¹ Ibid, 8

and *difference*¹²², in line with the basic notion of *identity*, as mentioned above. Jenkins goes on to put this in a somewhat popular, but nonetheless, highly comprehensible manner by claiming that:

One thing that *we* have in common is our difference from *others*¹²³

According to Jenkins, this is also the basic dynamic which sets in motion the very process of *identification*:

‘Differentiation from’ permits ‘identification with’ to happen and is thus logically prior and apparently more significant. Difference almost appears to have become the defining principle of collectivity, the fulcrum around which the human world revolves¹²⁴

As I move on to elaborate on the qualitative data, this nexus between *differentiation* and *identification* will be a key point in some parts of the interviews, if not in terms of social groups, then with regard to different social settings: in some parts of the interviews, the relation between the Trampoline House and the asylum centers is directly addressed.

Another major strand of Jenkins’ work revolves around the specific, collectivized idea of *group identification*. In terms of group identification, Jenkins goes on to make a distinction between two main types of *collectivities*:

1. ‘‘A collectivity which identifies and defines itself (a group *for* itself)’’, also known as *group identification*
2. ‘‘A collectivity which is identified and defined by others (a category *in* itself)’’, also known as *categorization*¹²⁵

With regards to my field of research, this part is particularly interesting, since, throughout this Thesis, I will try to account for the role that the Trampoline House plays as a physical and social collectivity, with reference to the data derived from my interviews. I will thus try to make up how the functioning of the Trampoline House reflects back onto my interviewees. This I do because I want to probe into how they see the former notion of group identification, in some cases in order for them to mitigate the effects of the latter.

¹²² Ibid, 18

¹²³ Ibid, 104

¹²⁴ Ibid, 21

¹²⁵ Ibid, 45

With regards to the asylum system, it would be fair to say that there is some categorization taking place, at least with regards to the legal area where the term ‘asylum’ seeker’ is a legally binding term enforced and formulated by a contracting State, that is, a State which has signed the 1951 UN Refugee Convention (in this case, the State of Denmark). This, I would argue, is a textbook example of external identification, or categorization, whereby, to a certain degree, one social group is defined (and, subsequently, legally dealt with) by another. With regards to my interviewees, I would like to probe into their perception of the outcome of this identification – in concrete terms, interplay between the Trampoline House and the asylum centers, which was uncovered, although I didn’t mention that specifically in any of my main questions – and the ways in which ‘the possibility of re-defining certain traits of their individuality by participating at some of the activities offered at the Trampoline House, might provide them with the opportunity of re-defining their individual and collective identity as members of a somewhat self-defined *group*.

Moving on from this, Jenkins sheds light on the possible dynamic and interplay between two such collectivities. He goes on to distinguish a particular, commonly negatively biased, type of external identification as *labelling*. Firstly, he points out the somewhat self-evident fact that ‘labelling by others has *consequences*’ for the group that is being labelled. This is oftentimes due to a certain hegemonic asymmetry between the labelling group and the group that is being labelled. One clear reason for this is that the monopoly of interpretation in terms of the *categorized/labelled* part lies with the *categorizing/labelling* part¹²⁶.

Secondly, however, he also reminds us that another possible outcome of labelling might be some sort of (joint) action or even resistance towards that very labelling¹²⁷. Jenkins, in rather broad terms, then goes on to politicize any action taken by relevant stakeholders in terms of any process of general group identification, be it internal or external:

Problematizing the group-category distinction also underlines again the centrality of power, and therefore politics, in identity maintenance and change. Asserting, defending, imposing or resisting collective identification are all definitively political¹²⁸

¹²⁶ Ibid, 106

¹²⁷ Ibid, 45

¹²⁸ Ibid, 45

Here we must keep in mind that Jenkins is most likely referring to the most broad and basic notion of *politics*, namely an interest-driven struggle for influence, possibly spanning across various societal strata and sectors, and, hence, not a strictly party-political notion of *politics*. Furthermore, by means of the statement above, Jenkins touches upon the very nature of categorization and the consequences it entails with regards to both individuals and groups. The most basic outcome of this could be argued to be the interplay which is created between social *inclusion* and *exclusion* in terms of people's (perceived) affiliation with a given type of collectivity¹²⁹. This sense of 'inclusion vs. exclusion' can be further determined by the abovementioned interplay between internal and external social identification. Here, the Trampoline House's self-declared goal to mitigate the effects of social isolation emphasizes this interplay between social *inclusion* and *exclusion*.

Moreover, with regards to my case, the quote above also brings forth the oftentimes 'dual' nature of organizations like the Trampoline House, which, although they might not be overtly political, might still account for a somewhat value-based agenda, thus moving into the field of politics in an effort to maintain and foster the interests associated with their particular identity. As I will elaborate later on, the Trampoline House could be seen as a social entity that, through its work, both *asserts*, *defends* and *resists* a certain type of internal/external identification on behalf of themselves and some of their affiliates and interest groups. Some parts of this external identification might be viewed as *labelling*. However, it should be mentioned that the main part of the data I will apply in the analysis is derived directly from the interviews and thus not official statements and opinions presented by the Trampoline House per se. This notion of asserting and defending a certain type of overarching group identity will be further probed into in the following paragraph on Honneth's theory of recognition.

Recognition theory

The second part of my theoretical part will consist of the ideas on social recognition formulated by German professor of philosophy Axel Honneth. Since this Thesis is, in part, centered on the dynamics between individuals and collectivities (in concrete terms, the

¹²⁹ Ibid, 104

interplay between my interviewees and the Trampoline House), I find it apt for grasping a significant part of the data gathered in connection with this Thesis.

In general terms, recognition theory evolves around different conflicts or 'struggles' of (collective) recognition in different social settings and milieus. In the case of this study, I will try to constitute the Trampoline House as such a setting and milieu. A main point of departure for Honneth is the point where a 'struggle for recognition' takes on a 'collectivized' form, this way evolving "from a conflict between single subjects into a confrontation between social communities" and where "ultimately, after they have taken on the challenges posed by different crimes, individuals no longer oppose each other as egocentric actors, but as 'members of a whole'"¹³⁰. This hinges upon a process of *mutual recognition*, where an ethical relationship is formed between different legal subjects. This relationship consists of "a process of altering stages of both reconciliation and conflict"¹³¹. In the case of my study, this 'process of altering stages of both reconciliation and conflict' could be argued to be the overall interplay between the Trampoline House and the asylum centers as well as the dynamics which are created through the fact that many of the users at the Trampoline House are also residents at an asylum center.

Drawing on Hegel's elaboration on "a form of reciprocal relations between subjects that goes beyond merely cognitive recognition", thus possibly "extending into the sphere of the affective", Honneth outlines what could be perceived as the initial prerequisites of *recognition*, or, as he coins it, "the communicative basis upon which individuals, who have been isolated from each other by legal relations, can be reunited within the context of an ethical community"¹³². Thus, the fact that communication takes place, addressing a certain type of *crime* or (commonly) perceived injustice, can pave the way for a social forum where social recognition is sought. An inherent prerequisite in order for this to happen is some sort of agreement about the problems at hand and "the existence of an inter-subjectively shared value-horizon"¹³³. As Honneth points out:

¹³⁰ Honneth, *The Struggle for Recognition*, 24

¹³¹ *Ibid*, 17

¹³² *Ibid*, 24

¹³³ *Ibid*, 121

In modern societies, relations of social esteem are subjects to a permanent struggle, in which different groups attempt, by means of symbolic force and with reference to general goals, to raise the value of the abilities associated with their way of life¹³⁴

So, put in a different way, according to Honneth, conflict and the exposure to various types of ‘crimes’ can ultimately forge community in a particular ‘struggle’ with the overarching goal of defending the attributes associated with a certain way of living. Drawing on Hegel’s ‘System of Ethical Life’, Honneth claims that:

Conflict represents a sort of mechanism of social interaction into community, which forces subjects to cognize each other mutually in such a way that their individual consciousness of totality has ultimately become interwoven, together with that of everyone else, into a ‘universal’ consciousness¹³⁵

This ‘universal consciousness’ can span across various societal strata and institutions. This has been outlined by various theorists who have formulated several explanatory models. However, there seems to be some consensus on a distinction between the following entities: ‘the individual’, ‘family’, ‘civil society’ and ‘the State’¹³⁶. Although I do not intend to make this overtly polemic, with regards to my case, I would still address the somewhat conflicting values between the official State apparatus and certain civil society actors which seem to be at stake in the case of general procedure in terms of the (legal) treatment and recognition of asylum seekers.

Apart from the ‘forums’ in which the abovementioned *universal consciousness* and *recognition* takes place, comparatively drawing upon the ideas originally proposed by Hegel and Mead, respectively, one can also discern between three different types of relationships of ‘recognition’ and ‘social integration’, distinguishing them from the source from which they occur and emanate. By making this distinction, Honneth proposes three such sources¹³⁷:

1. Emotional bonds
2. The granting of rights
3. A shared orientation to values

¹³⁴ Ibid, 127

¹³⁵ Ibid, 28

¹³⁶ Ibid, 94

¹³⁷ Ibid, 94

As I will try to clarify by means of this Thesis, it is not easy to make an absolute and clear-cut distinction between the three sources of recognition when applied onto a specific case. Usually (and most certainly in my case), the three different categories are interwoven into and somewhat complementary with regards to one another. Specifically in terms of organizations (which is the social entity that constitutes the empirical basis of this Thesis) oftentimes, more than just one of the three abovementioned aspects is at stake. Needless to say, in order for an organization like the Trampoline House to function in a meaningful manner, a certain agreement and “shared orientation to values” is required. This is the social mechanism that can ultimately forge the ‘community of shared concerns’ and common devotion to a certain issue or cause, or *Sachsgemeinschaft*, as Honneth calls it¹³⁸.

As has already been mentioned, one of the main triggers for communities of solidarity is the existence of some kind of ‘affectional’ or emotional connection or bond. Here, in lack of better words, once again drawing on concepts and ideas originally developed by Hegel, Honneth extracts the notion of *love*, describing it as “being oneself in another”¹³⁹. Put in another way, a basic triggering mechanism of communities of solidarity could be said to be a certain degree of self-projection into the life situation of someone else. One clear prerequisite for this to occur is a well-balanced, sometimes simultaneous, experience of individuality and merging with other individuals, or as Honneth puts it:

The form of recognition found in love... represents not an intersubjective state so much as a communicative arc suspended between the experience of being able to be alone and the experience of being merged; ‘ego-relatedness’ and symbiosis here represent mutually required counterweights that, taken together, make it possible for each other to be at home in the other¹⁴⁰

Since the notion of *love* is somewhat difficult to grasp and apply onto a case like the Trampoline House, I will apply this idea onto what has been mentioned by Trampoline House officials as one of the cornerstones of the general functioning of the place, namely the importance of absolute and unconditional *respect* between the different people who attend the house.

¹³⁸ Ibid, 94

¹³⁹ Ibid, 96

¹⁴⁰ Ibid, 105

The Individual Aspect of Honneth's Works

On the individual basis, a great deal of Honneth's ideas evolves around the matter of individuals and their personal self-esteem, oftentimes by virtue of them being members of larger collectivities. Drawing on Ihering, Honneth makes a distinction between the concepts of *legal recognition* and *social regard*. While the former refers to various civil legal rights and duties, the latter is trying to grasp the somewhat intangible and highly individual feeling of 'social regard' and 'the 'worth' of an individual, insofar as it can be measured according to criteria of social relevance''¹⁴¹. In an effort of further explanation, Honneth infers that:

We are dealing in the first case with universal respect for the 'freedom of the will of the person', and in the second case, by contrast, with the recognition of individual achievements, whose value is measured by the degree to which society deems them significant¹⁴²

Thus, through its position on a certain attribute and ability of the individual, the surrounding society can 'vouch for' that particular individual ability by deeming it relevant and significant for the overall achievement of a common good.

While this serves as an explanation of the affective and legal dimensions, there is some consensus about the fact that people also need to feel a certain sense of *self-esteem* and individual worth:

In order to be able to acquire an undistorted relation-to-self, human subjects always need – over and above the experience of affectionate care and legal recognition – a form of social esteem that allows them to relate positively to their concrete traits and abilities¹⁴³

In this Thesis, this aspect of Honneth's ideas will be applied onto the individual feelings my interviewees express with respect to their every day at the Trampoline House and what they feel this gives them in turn.

Honneth goes on to claim that if an overall appreciation and esteem of these traits can be realized in society, we become able to deem it *a society of solidarity*¹⁴⁴. Such a 'society' prerequisites that the individuals associated with it experience the aforementioned relations

¹⁴¹ Honneth, *The Struggle for Recognition*, 111

¹⁴² *Ibid*, 111-12

¹⁴³ *Ibid*, 121

¹⁴⁴ *Ibid*, 129

of recognition¹⁴⁵. This is the sentiment that this very Thesis will evolve around, as well as the main question that I will try to answer and uncover by means of the interviews, although I am aware that it is not the exact wording of the question or the answers I have had.

Summary

Thus, to summarize the two theoretical parts, I intend to use Jenkins' ideas to make sense of the Trampoline House as a social space, according to the views expressed by my interviewees and Honneth's concepts to convey and describe what I have earlier formulated as my interviewees' self-perceived gain from working as interns and doing *praktik* at the Trampoline House. By combining those two main theories (as well as applying other relevant concepts that I have not mentioned yet), I hope to clarify the main issues uncovered by means of the qualitative data in order for me to gain an in-depth insight to the views of three users and interns at the Trampoline House. This will be further accounted for in the following analytical chapter.

Analysis

Through my interviews and my – up until now – almost six months as a volunteer at the Trampoline House, I have personally observed that the house as a social setting seems to convey something which instantly affects you and attracts your attention as a person from the outside, regardless of whether you are Danish or foreign, regular user or an intern. This is also what I have learnt throughout my interviews: in lack of better words, the Trampoline House, as a social space, seems to give the people associated with it *something* that other social settings don't (in the case of my three interviewees, this other social setting is the asylum center). Throughout this part, I will try to put a finger on what exactly the Trampoline House gives its users as a social space, apart from the somewhat 'formalized work' in terms of my three interviewees and other asylum seekers who are doing *praktik* at the House. I will then apply the overall theoretical framework onto those data and observations in order for me to analyze the notions and phenomena described and acquired by means of the inquiries made throughout the interviews.

¹⁴⁵ Ibid, 129

The analysis will be divided into four main parts, each of which will emphasize on different common topics uncovered throughout the three interviews: *initial outreach*, *first impression*, *daily use of the House* and *personal gain*.

Initial Outreach

As I claimed in the introduction to the analysis above, the Trampoline House, through its work and daily activities, seems to convey something which serves as a general pole of attraction. This *something* also seems to be a general point of reference in terms of ‘recruiting’ and engaging asylum seekers by means of the outreach efforts house ‘members’ undertake in order for them to attract residents at the asylum seekers as interns at the house, in the first place. This then might go hand in hand with certain individual attributes and abilities which might be of use to the daily functioning of the House:

It was when I arrived to Denmark, after one month I met [some] volunteers. They came to my school in the camp.

They say... I help the in translation, so they said to me: why you don't go to Trampoline, it's [a] very good and beautiful place to be in¹⁴⁶

From my other interviews, I have gathered similar statements about this initial contact with the Trampoline House, namely the concrete outreach efforts where, for specific individual reasons, residents at the asylum centers might be ‘singled out’, so to speak. Among other things, as I have already mentioned in the part about the interviews, English proficiency is something which is highly appreciated at the Trampoline House, since it is crucial for various house activities to take place, facilitating various communicative situations by means of *interns* working as translators. In general terms, the efforts of unpaid volunteers and interns are crucial for the daily functioning of the House. This aspect is further solidified by the fact that there are only five paid staff members at the house¹⁴⁷.

Throughout all of my interviews, alongside with the initial mentioning of the Trampoline House as a good place to be, the prospected opportunity of doing translation there has been a significant motivating factor for my interviewees to get involved as *interns* at the house:

I think Immigration Service sent some people to hang out with us and find funny time for us; and I meet one guy, he told me about my language. He told me: ``your English is very good and you can help us in the Trampoline

¹⁴⁶ Interview, Viane, 00:59-01:22

¹⁴⁷ Link: <http://www.trampolinehouse.dk/staff-and-board-of-directors/> [Accessed 11/10 2016]

House. For people cannot speak English, you can translate for him and... it's very good for you to hang around there and spend your time. [It's] better than the center..." and I told him: "why not?"¹⁴⁸

Both of these statements serve as examples of the linguistic codes that Chamaz speaks of. They are fragments of a larger piece of conversation, revealing certain aspects of a given social reality. In other words, they refer to a similar phenomenon, although they are taken out of two different data collections, both of which, however, circulated around the same main questions. Throughout this Thesis, I will try to categorize the different statements so that they correspond to a larger common context, within which they will be adequately probed and analyzed.

At first glance, merely drawing upon what has been said in the two quotes above, it would seem that the verbal 'strategy' that the people who carry out these outreach activities at the asylum centers is twofold: firstly, they focus on concrete individual traits and abilities which might be of use to the Trampoline House, thus 'justifying' the elaboration of an internship contract. In this case, that concrete trait is the *interns'* knowledge of English language, which is useful for the daily functioning of the Trampoline House in terms of assistance at translation tasks (counselling, meetings, 'normal' conversations, etc.). Secondly, they put a certain emphasis on the Trampoline House as a social space where you can "hang around", "spend your time" and do various recreational activities. Together with the other statement, suggesting that the Trampoline House is "a very good and beautiful place to be in", it would seem that an initial motivating factor in joining up with the Trampoline House as an *intern* could be this apparent stated antithesis between the Trampoline House and an asylum center, in some regards. This way, it seems that, apart from the mentioned possibility to do *praktik*, a main verbal strategy for the Trampoline House in carrying out its initial recruitment strategies, a big emphasis is put on the very physical space of the Trampoline House and its apparent and immediate attributes and, at least in Alan's case, directly opposed to the asylum center. I will return to this specific issue later on in this Thesis.

Thus, it would seem that a main discursive tool which is being applied in order for the Trampoline House to attract *interns* is one in which a notion of *difference* and *differentiation* between two distinct social spaces (and, to a certain degree, also the people residing there) is

¹⁴⁸ Interview, Alan, 01:52-02:20

evoked. In other words, the Trampoline House, it seems, is initially described as a good place to be and spend your time. This sense of *difference* and *differentiation* of course also has to do with a national divide between Danes and foreigners, on one hand, and fully-fledged national citizens who enjoy certain rights and asylum seekers, who enjoy completely different rights, on the other. Thus, this, to a high degree, has to do with group identification, which follows different demarcation lines. Drawing on the ideas proposed by Ernesto Laclau and Chantal Mouffe, this could be coined as a certain sort of discursive and hegemonic struggle, since it establishes a certain relation between specifically articulated elements¹⁴⁹, namely the Trampoline House and the asylum centers or ‘the camps’. In both cases, you get a sense of a certain ‘bias’, favoring the Trampoline House over the camps, since it is represented as a ‘nice and beautiful place to be in’ and ‘better than the asylum center’.

Of course, one needs to bear in mind that, strictly speaking, neither of the abovementioned statements emanate ‘directly’ from Alan or Viane. Rather, they are recapitulations of what they have been mentioned as the advantages of enrolling at the Trampoline House as an intern in the context of these efforts of community outreach that volunteers at the house perform in order for them to attract interns. Their individual experiences as interns will be dealt with in the following chapters.

When you consider the nature of many of the asylum centers in Denmark, it becomes comprehensible why you would want to put an emphasis on the Trampoline House as something of an antithesis to those centers. A central point in this is the notion of isolation as consequence of a lengthy stay at an asylum centers. First and foremost, this sense of isolation is a direct outcome of the very nature of the centers which are oftentimes also located at remote and ‘isolated’ localities¹⁵⁰, thus innately conveying a strong sense of concrete, physical isolation from the rest of society. The Trampoline House and other such organizations are very aware of this particular issue, both in terms of the impacts this has upon the people residing there, as well as practical issues, such as transportation costs, which have to be paid by the Trampoline House.

¹⁴⁹ Phillips, *Diskursanalyse*, 279

¹⁵⁰ Asylcentrene, link: <http://refugees.dk/fakta/asylproceduren-i-danmark/asylcentrene/> [Accessed 22/8 2016]

In terms of both of the abovementioned statements, one could argue that, already here we see an example of Honneth's notion of some kind of external acceptance of individual "concrete traits and abilities" which are 'accepted and acknowledged, if not by society then by a larger social collectivity, deeming this relevant for their particular community. In the first instance, it could be argued that this recognition is mostly material, since it rests upon the acceptance of *aspects* of a human being, rather than the human being in its own right (in both cases, this aspect is English proficiency). I will elaborate on this in my paragraph on my interviewees' self-perceived gain, which will take on a more socially centered emphasis, whereby I will probe into my interviewees' more personal perspective.

Apart from this, especially the statement made by Viane brings forth what could be described as a discursive strategy which serves to convey a certain sense of difference and differentiation between the Trampoline House and the asylum centers as social spaces, thus possibly constituting the Trampoline House as place where a certain type of social identity can emerge by virtue of the people at the centers enrolling there.

While the first two of my three interviewees heard of the Trampoline House from officials from the house and other formal institutions, the third one heard of the Trampoline House via a friend:

First I heard about the Trampoline House with my friend. Her name is Viane, she's a Syrian refugee in Avnstrup camp, so she told me that I can come to that house and make a *praktik*. And when I came to Trampoline House, when I saw the environment and... special about the House meeting, it was a democratic debate and everyone was expressing themselves in an equal way and in a strong way. No matter if they were refugees or Danish citizenships or other... European citizenships. All the same... equality¹⁵¹

While providing a third account of the initial contact with the Trampoline House, this statement can also be seen as a minor teaser to some of the topics that will be dealt with later on in this analysis (in general, coding these interviews has shown to be quite a challenge, since it is hard to adequately categorize the different statements, since they overlap quite a bit with regard to their content). It, of course, also shows another main method of attraction to the Trampoline House, namely word-of-mouth, where people initially hear about the

¹⁵¹ Interview, Soran, 01:32-02:16

Trampoline House by means of people that they know, either from other translation tasks at the centers other sources.

First Impression

Another key code of the categorization of my data is about my interviewees' immediate first impression of the Trampoline House (through the interview questions, I chose to coin this as a description of their first day at the house). Here I found, among other things, that some conceived of the Trampoline House as something which could be coined as a 'social icebreaker':

The first day [there was] like a small party here. So it was very fun, the first time I say: ``oh, it's a very good place to be, it's much better than if you stay in the camp and you don't know, you don't do anything and you don't... make this conversation with the peoples, especially the Danish people...¹⁵²

This statement somewhat goes hand in hand with one of the self-declared goals of the Trampoline House as an institution, namely their desire to function as a social icebreaker. Here, Christensen's notion of 'voluntary social work' as a means to facilitate the interaction between 'the volunteers and the users' also becomes key, although, in the case of the Trampoline House, we are dealing with a slightly more complex and nuanced picture, since the 'users' constitute different concrete groups, namely *interns* and other 'ordinary' users (such as refugees, who already hold residence permits).

It could also be said that another goal of engaging in an internship (which, as I have mentioned earlier, is a possibility within the asylum process) could be viewed as a means to mitigate the sense of ``powerlessness and social isolation`` the Trampoline House has declared to try to mitigate through their respective efforts and activities¹⁵³. Here, I would also seem convenient to bear in mind the self-declared main principles of the House¹⁵⁴, since they seem to go hand in hand with what Viane just said. It also serves as a textbook example of Jenkins' notion of social *inclusion*. Moreover, it brings forth the notion of *integration* and the efforts which are being undertaken at the Trampoline House for integration to occur. This is something that, on numerous occasions, has been outlined in official statements:

¹⁵² Interview, Viane, 01:52-02:18

¹⁵³ Source: About Trampoline House, link: <http://www.trampolinehouse.dk/about-trampoline-house> [Accessed 8/9 2016]

¹⁵⁴ Udvalget for Udlændinge- og Integrationspolitik: *Trampolinhuset*, 4

What refugees need is a continuous common space where they can meet Danish people in their everyday life. The Trampoline House is built around an idea that it should be a place where you can come for as long as you need it, and we are working in the local sphere, so that it is nearby asylum seekers and volunteers who come here¹⁵⁵

Although this statement addresses refugees and not asylum seekers, I would argue that their individual requirements might have certain similarities, especially in terms of their needs for social integration and the feeling of leading a 'normal life', as opposed to the legal and social limbo they might experience at the asylum centers. Those statements also follow the lines of the nexus between *participation*, *interaction* and, subsequently, *integration*, as proposed by Christensen. According to his ideas, providing the asylum seekers and refugees with a social space where they can meet and interact with 'ordinary' Danes is a major requirement for *integration* to take place in a convenient manner. Although the social space in which this interaction takes place is only a fragment of Danish society, one could still argue that it represents an aspect which is so elementary and crucial for Danish society, namely the wide range of civil society organizations found in this country, that the activities that are being provided there can serve as a means to fortify social interaction under the particular circumstances provided by the house (see Goll's statement).

Both of these quotes put a certain emphasis on the role of the Trampoline House as a social setting which might be key for creating a sense of community and togetherness between Danes and foreigners (asylum seekers and refugees alike). Here, I strictly refer to the physical setting of the Trampoline House, as I will later on build upon its symbolic role and value. In this sense, at a first glance, the role that the Trampoline House plays might somewhat resemble that of community centers. However, most community centers of that sort tend to have a certain ethnic or national 'bias' or emphasis, mainly attracting people of a certain ethnicity, nationality or people from a certain geographical region. In this statement (as well as the Viane's statement) we also see the notion of a community with a shared emphasis on a given issue, namely a place where asylum seekers and "refugees ... can meet Danish people in their everyday life" and "make this conversation", thus forging a certain degree of dialogue,

¹⁵⁵ Grønkjær, "Vi har en kontrakt, hvor flygtninge skal gøre noget til gengæld", *Information*, 18/3 2016, link: https://www.information.dk/debat/2016/03/kontrakt-flygtningene-goere-gengaeld?utm_content=buffer5fab5&utm_medium=social&utm_source=facebook.com&utm_campaign=buffer [Accessed 21/7 2016]

that crosses socio-ethnic boundaries, such as culture, ethnicity and nationality. This can be seen as an example of a common space with a joint devotion to this (cultural) encounter. Apart from this, by means of those encounters, to a certain degree, the Danish volunteers can serve as a 'connecting link' to the surrounding society by means of them engaging in dialogues and activities with the foreign users and interns at the house¹⁵⁶. This, it could be argued, can then serve as a somewhat mitigating factor in terms of breaking the vicious circle of social isolation which, as has already been argued, seems to be the Trampoline House's *raison d'être*. This encounter, although set in a commonly 'acknowledged' space with certain commonly shared values, also implies a sense of similarity and difference, in line with some of Jenkins' notions on (collective) identity. In this case, it becomes evident that there is no absolute or clear-cut differentiation between the two phenomena at stake, since they are happening simultaneously: a group of Danish volunteers meet with a – possibly quite diverse – group of foreigners. However, all of the parties involved share a partially common connection and point of reference by attending a given facility on a regular basis, thus perhaps evolving into a joint social group, following the lines of this particular setting. They nonetheless still belong to different national and socio-ethnic groups.

However, this encounter could create a certain sense of intersubjective trust between the relevant actors, which, according to Honneth, is presupposed upon the community of shared concerns – *Sachsgemeinschaft* – where certain issues and concerns can be freely articulated among the parties involved in this social forum¹⁵⁷. In this case, it is this 'international' interaction along with this somewhat shared concern towards certain key issues in society that can pave the way for this community to form, and perhaps, subsequently, that this community gains a certain (political) influence in society¹⁵⁸. This will be further elaborated in the final part of the analysis.

Apart from this, through her statement, Viane seems to emphasize a certain dynamic or interplay between two different social settings, namely the Trampoline House and the asylum centers or 'the camp' as she calls it. During my five months at the Trampoline House, I have found that the naming of the asylum centers as 'camps' is commonplace and that many of the

¹⁵⁶ Christensen, *Veje til Integration*, 38

¹⁵⁷ Honneth, *The Struggle for Recognition*, 94

¹⁵⁸ Christensen, *Veje til Integration*, 7

house members use it, interns, volunteers and staff alike. This obviously suggests a somewhat common and integrated discourse which is commonplace within larger social entities, such as the Trampoline House. By being and working together for a certain period of time, people usually begin to talk in a somewhat similar fashion, especially regarding the words that they use to describe the same things. Throughout the Thesis, in order for me to be as truthful as possible towards the original wording of the interviews, I will apply the same concept, although I am aware that the physical entity I am actually referring to is an Asylum center and not a Refugee camp.

However, since one might not get the full picture of a new place at a first glance, the following visits to the Trampoline House might also be important in order for you to get a basic idea of what the place is like:

Yeah, the first day when I came to Trampoline House, there was a lot of refugees and non-refugees people, so [...] but I did not participate in the House meeting. So I came back the next week so... I can say, my second time felt just like the first time, because I got the idea of that house, because there was a House meeting and there was debating. Because my first day was not so much... so long at there¹⁵⁹

Both statements derived from the interviews seem to emphasize the impression of a wide representation of actors and participants at those activities. They both emphasize the notion of dialogue, either through the form of 'conversations' or 'debates', both of which could be argued to serve as a means to foster some sort of 'social intimacy' between Danes and foreigners.

The Composition of the House

As has been outlined in the paragraph above, a particular aspect of the very DNA of the Trampoline House has been outlined as the interaction and, to a certain degree, 'social intimacy'. Apart from the prospect of doing *praktik* there, this particular aspect, seems to be a major source of attraction in terms of getting involved at the Trampoline House as an asylum seeker. Some also specifically mentioned the fact that there were people from their own country as something which conveyed a certain sense of calm and security to them:

¹⁵⁹ Interview, Soran, 02:52-03:25

My first time... when I see the face... in the Trampoline House, it's very happy to me and make me like... in my area ... it's like, in my area I see all the faces, the same faces in my area ... and it's a very good feeling to me...¹⁶⁰

He then goes on to say that:

I feel comfortable, completely comfortable... like in my house¹⁶¹

Here, Alan talks about the presence of fellow-countrymen as something which gave him 'a very good feeling' and that he felt 'like in his area', that is, Syrian Kurdistan. In lack of better words and concepts, one could argue, that this sense of feeling 'comfortable' could refer to a certain sense of individually perceived security. In this case, this sense of security stems from one's immediate physical surroundings, that is, the Trampoline House and, in particular, the fact that you are able to identify with some of the other people attending it. In this connection, I find some of Kinvall's ideas surrounding the issue of *ontological security* particularly useful for grasping this phenomenon. Originally, the notion of *ontological security* was coined by Giddens, who, among other things, said that:

Ontological security refers to a 'person's fundamental sense of safety in the world and includes a basic trust of other people. Obtaining such trust becomes necessary in order for a person to maintain a sense of psychological well-being and avoid existential anxiety'¹⁶²

With regard to Alan's statements, one could argue that, by claiming that he felt like he was 'in his area', due to the presence of other Syrians, he was feeling some kind of personal security (or, as he said: he felt comfortable), unlike the sense of uprooting and (existential) anxiety that Kinvall proposes as a direct opposite to the sense of ontological security. With regards to the Trampoline House, this could also be transferred onto the feeling of living at an asylum center. If we follow Kinvall's ideas, it is common for people who experience this sense of insecurity or even the rather more extreme sense of 'existential anxiety' to seek out places where they can feel this sense of security that they so lack. Besides the needs to feel secure, people might also seek out a 'new home', so to speak:

When home as a category of security is lost due to rapid socio-economic changes, then new avenues – or a new 'home', a new identity – for ontological security are sought¹⁶³

¹⁶⁰ Interview, Alan, 04:33-04:55

¹⁶¹ Interview, Alan, 05:05-05:08

¹⁶² Kinvall & Lindén, *Dialogical Selves between Security and Insecurity*, 598

With regards to Kinvall's quote, those 'new avenues' are already sought out by people deciding to do internships at the Trampoline House (or perhaps, even earlier, when unsustainable life conditions force them to leave their homes and seek out a new life). Although Kinvall mainly addresses this as an outcome of economic hardship, I would argue that this notion also applies to more urgent matters, causing forced displacement, as proposed, above all by the 1951 RC.

I find the two quotes above useful for grasping the very notion of ontological security as well as the triggering mechanisms for the search of such a sense of security. These concepts will be further elaborated on in paragraph about the interviewees' self-perceived and personal gain of being at the Trampoline House, along with Kinvall's key notion of 'home'.

Here, of course some of Jenkins' notions of collective identity also become relevant in order for us to fully grasp the meaning of this statement. It could be argued, that, through meeting other people, that gives you a sense of being 'in your own house' you are provided with a welcoming space, that allows you to be a part of a somewhat independently and *internally* defined collectivity, thus mitigating the effects of *external* (collective) identification. What is more, this internal identification takes place within a given social space, namely within the very walls of the Trampoline House.

As a personal note, although, at first glance, Alan's statement could seem to be a bit extreme (the fact that he felt at home from the first day onwards), I must admit, that I quickly got the same feeling from volunteering at the house.

With regards to my interviewees' first impression of the house, another main point also seemed to be the political and democratic functioning of the place. This also seems to be an overall factor in terms of the Trampoline House as a potential pole of attraction, so to speak. Among the people attending the house, there is a significant number of artists, political activists, apart from other groups (university students, people with short or medium-length education, etc.). This aspect of the house was also directly mentioned as a primary trigger of interest, although it was not upon the first visit to the house, but the second:

¹⁶³ Ibid, 601

My second time was ... very attractive and I like the way they're debating and they're talking about cases, they're talking about problems and the way that people are supporting refugees and the way that refugees express themselves...¹⁶⁴

This statement is by Soran, one of my interviewees, who, on the meeting where I presented my project and got the agreements for the interviews set, acted as a moderator at the house meeting. This is also an example of the sometimes very flexible and ad hoc structure and daily functioning of the house (as I mentioned in the paragraph, on my choice of interviewees, Soran, along with the two others, works as a translator, both at the Trampoline House, but also at the asylum centers, since people who know English are highly appreciated in various sectors of the (in)formal asylum system).

Another point of interest seemed to be the house's officially apolitical nature and emphasis on an issue in a way that apparently transcends traditional political boundaries and divides:

They were very... and the people they were... not... they were neutral, not supporting any political party, not supporting any system, supporting the sense of equality and the sense of truth. The way I got it at that time. So it was mostly about supporting the truth and the right dimensions of refugee cases¹⁶⁵

This apparent non-political nature and functioning of the Trampoline House thus seems to constitute another main pole of attraction, despite the fact that, like Soran, some of the people who attend the house, either as users or interns, are originally writers, intellectuals artists and/or political activists, who have left their countries of origin precisely on account of political reasons and grievances, oftentimes as an immediate result of their work. However, there still seems to be this agreement about the treatment of asylum cases resulting in the formation of a support of 'the truth and the right dimensions of refugee cases', in line with Honneth's notion of the formation of an inter-subjectively shared value-horizon within a community of shared concerns. In the case of Soran's statement, this shared value-horizon touches upon this 'support' of the truth surrounding refugee cases, the ways in which they are being treated by formal asylum authorities in Denmark and the things that are done at the Trampoline House to address eventual suspicious or outright flawed verdicts. With regards to the apparent a-political sense of those meetings, I would still argue, that, in accordance with Jenkins' notion of politics in identity formation and maintenance, there is a certain political

¹⁶⁴ Interview, Soran, 03:26-03:41

¹⁶⁵ Interview, Soran, 04:08-04:38

activity taking place, since, through those meetings, there still seems to be an overarching goal in reaching a certain compromise in terms of making this 'truth' prevailing with regards to the house meetings as interest-driven and biased space.

I then probed into this feeling that Soran described and asked him if, by referring to this support of "the sense of truth" he meant that he experienced the environment at the house meetings as characterized by a certain sense of *honesty*. To this, he replied:

Yeah, they have been honest and they have been very straightforward and delicate, so it has made me feel very comfortable, because it's about honesty and it's about support and unconditional environment for everybody. I did not have to have a conditionality to be accepted, I just have to be a human being and then accepted in this house. And also I can speak English, but there are some refugees who cannot speak English, and there's translators for those refugees. And in the House meeting they're always stopping and translating. Stop until translated, yeah, talking and translating¹⁶⁶

This statement goes in line with the abovementioned statement, constructing and constituting the Trampoline House as a place which rests upon a general and overarching philosophy of absolute and unconditional respect between the different people attending the house, regardless of who they are or what they do. It could be argued that this allows for the existence of subject positions within the house. Apart from this, it would also be important to mention the issue of inclusion into a democratic space by virtue of the discussion being translated so that more people can chip in, so to speak. This, again, underlines the vital role that translators such as my three interviewees play with regards to the daily functioning of the house, assuring that activities like house meetings can take place in a democratic and meaningful fashion. Apart from this, it, of course also shows the ways in which individual actors might take over larger, somewhat established, discourses within larger entities, from the mere fact of being exposed to those discourses and this way of talking on a daily basis. In concrete terms the phrase "unconditional environment" is not far from the slogan of the Trampoline House as place of "unconditional respect". Apart from this, it goes without saying that the concrete translation efforts at the meeting enhances the overall state of social inclusion, since it enables everybody present at the meetings to actively participate in the discussion and debate. This, in line with the quote by Heidegger, might make for a common understanding of an issue, thus incentivizing and motivating joint action from whatever

¹⁶⁶ Interview, Soran, 04:44-05:32

consensus or discussion might be extracted from discussing individual cases or general trends in the current asylum system. In the next paragraph, I will further outline some of the main activities taking place at the house.

Daily Use of the House

In this third part of my analysis, I will probe into how my interviewees use the house on a daily basis (the days that they attend the Trampoline House and the activities in which they participate). The aim of this is to arrive at a better understanding at the ways in which the house is being used and, subsequently, provide an answer to the fourth and main point of my analysis, namely what my interviewees themselves feel that being at the Trampoline House gives them. This is what I have chosen to coin as the self-perceived gain.

With regards to this issue, I chose to coin the question in a somewhat popular manner, asking my interview persons what an average week at the house looks like for them. Thus, this part will take on a quite practical outlook, probing into the daily activities that my interviewees participate in. In this connection, it should be mentioned that the Trampoline House works in a manner whereby *interns* assign for one or more specific weekdays on which the Trampoline House will help them with transportation to and from the asylum centers in order for the interns to participate in the activities that they would like to participate in.

Since I initially met up with my interviewees in connection with the weekly general meeting and subsequent Art Tuesday, I presumed that this would be their day of choice. This was also confirmed in the interviews:

You know there is Art every Tuesday, I'll always be with them to do this theatre, art, games. It's after the dinner.

We use the house like... you know, sometimes there's lawyers coming to the house and they help me in my case...yeah, my special case, so they help me a lot¹⁶⁷

First and foremost, Christensen's notion of voluntary social work as the overall encounter between the volunteer and the user is useful here, although, in the case of the Trampoline House, it has its shortcomings: Viane herself is working at the Trampoline House, so while being a recipient of the services at the house, in some cases, she also provides concrete services, that is, translation, in others. Furthermore, this statement underlines the dual role

¹⁶⁷ Interview, Viane, 03:41-04:06

that the house plays as a space for practical work, guidance and counselling on different manners, as well as social communication via different common activities, such as communal meals which are served on all days when the house is open. This statement also shows one of the cornerstones on the way to a feeling of recognition and a positive relation-to-self, following Honneth, namely, if not the granting, then at least a sense of clarity and clarification with regards to one's rights and 'status', from a strictly legal perspective. Although this example is not strictly in line with Honneth's notion (the granting of legal rights, in a strict sense, would traditionally be conceived of as the granting of rights by a large decision-making societal institution) it could still be viewed as an announcement of crucial information relevant for the users' subsequent gaining of the rights they might originally be entitled to.

Apart from this, the daily joint dinner was also mentioned as a main part of the daily use of the house:

Every day, there is dinner, and we relax in the house, we do ... we know everything about Denmark, if you have a question, you just come here, it's just really... a good place, actually, especially for those who came new I Denmark, not just for refugees. Even if you are Danish and you wanna meet new people, you just come here, it's [a] very nice place¹⁶⁸

Here the joint dinner is also described as a part of the daily use of the house, particularly as another way to get to talk to and communicate across the different languages, cultures and ethnicities that make up the entire social space that is the Trampoline House. This statement furthermore suggests that there is a great deal of exchange in cultural capital going on, with people being able to talk about what they like and ask the questions they would like. This way those forums might serve as somewhat informal spheres of exchange of a given type of knowledge (such as knowledge about Denmark) or social capital.

House Meetings

The house meetings which take place on every Tuesday have also been mentioned as a main activity in terms of the daily use of the house. One of the main functions of the house meetings is to provide a certain weekly briefing as well as inform on current cases in the overall asylum system affecting the Trampoline House. This is also another pole of attraction with regards to my interviewees:

¹⁶⁸ Interview, Viane, 04:17-04:43

Tuesday is essential of the House because the House meeting is on Tuesday. It's about all the problems, announcements, great debate, and introducing with each other... so it's mostly... Tuesday's the day hat Trampoline House works according to the refugees' cases. Generally, not individually. They have days for individual cases, but general cases and general problems are mostly on Tuesdays¹⁶⁹

Here, the house meetings are put forth as a grand meeting, for instance unlike Wednesday and Thursday, which are dedicated to individual counselling sessions. Since the house meetings are forums open for discussion, they could also be seen as a main pole of attraction for people who have a history of socio-political commitment, through their work, in line with the original founders of the Trampoline House. From briefly talking to some of the other participants at the house meetings, there also seems to be a significant representation of former political activists and people engaged in different forms of political activism in their countries of origin. In that light, the open structure of then Trampoline House would seem highly appealing as an open democratic space, which is trying to encompass and involve a wide array of different people with different interests and individual orientations under the same roof.

Self-Perceived Gain

In this last part of my analysis, I wanted to probe into what my interviewees themselves feel that they 'gain' or get out of being at the Trampoline House, as a final means to answer my research question.

In inquiring into this aspect of my interviewees' experience, there has been a great overall emphasis on the Trampoline House as a space which, apparently, provides a sense of *home* and freedom in terms of people's individuality to unfold in the way they would like to do this:

I think it's my place and your place and everybody's place and we can come there and we can come there and... what you have feelings, you can get out. It's a very democratic area. You can do everything there¹⁷⁰

First of all, adopting a critical view, it could be argued that this is also an example of a certain standardized discourse, which is commonplace in many larger social entities: when people work together and spend much time together at the same place, it is normal for them to start speaking in a similar fashion: the wording is very similar to the standard slogans at the Trampoline House, such as 'my house, your house' and 'join us, it's also your house'. This also

¹⁶⁹ Interview, Soran, 08:41-09-19

¹⁷⁰ Interview, Alan, 08:06-08:25

goes in line with the quote by Heidegger in the theoretical paragraph on *discourse*, as well as Foucault's notion of the mutually constructive and constitutive relation between social actors and their immediate surroundings. Put in another way, being in a certain social environment, forum or institution for a certain period of time can alter one's way of talking so that, to a certain degree, it comes to resemble that of this formally institutionalized entity that he or she is in. However, the function as a democratic space where people can actually express their feelings and views about a certain issue is also brought up.

However, through the second half of the statement, Alan also mentions the possibility of active agency, which apparently is provided by the overall framework of the Trampoline House as "a very democratic area". Thus, this quote comes to represent the overall dual nature of *discourse* as something which, simultaneously, plays a constructive and constituting role in terms of various processes of social formation, also in accordance with the ideas of both Foucault and Heidegger. Although apparently already set with a somewhat fixed structure with certain attitudes, ideas and values associated with it, the social space which is the Trampoline House also allows for a certain degree of individual agency, allowing for the people associated with it to directly influence it in the ways they see fit.

Apart from this, this statement could also be said to convey a sense of perceived co-ownership of the house by referring to it as one's own house. This suggests a certain group dynamic that allows the free articulation of people's actual feelings and views on a certain matter, thus possibly allowing a process of internal group identification to occur, drawing on Jenkins' ideas on this matter, above all the ideas of social inclusion and collective identity.

The social dimension of the Trampoline House is also mentioned as a main point in terms of this sense of gain:

I have a lot of friends here. You do a lot of things together. If I stayed in the camp without this *praktik* at Trampoline, I don't know what would happen to me... I would just become sad and always cry, maybe, because... I wanna do something, I wanna do something, I came here to know this culture, new life, new country, so I have to learn a lot about that... yeah¹⁷¹

Here, once more the interplay between the Trampoline House and the asylum centers is brought up as somewhat contrary social spaces. By saying that if she "stayed in the camp",

¹⁷¹ Interview, Viane, 05:10-05:41

Viane “would become sad and always cry” she articulates a somewhat conflictive and dichotomist relation between the Trampoline House and the asylum centers, associating the Trampoline House with a range of positive connotations, as opposed to the asylum center. This feeling is well known at the Trampoline House. Upon arrival in Denmark and lodging at an asylum center, where, after having been subjected to a tremendous amount of physical and psychological stress that people calm down in their new environment and relate positively to their surroundings, which, however harsh they might be, are nonetheless less stressful than the conditions that have left them with no other choice than to migrate to somewhere else. However, after a certain period of time (in the Trampoline House, there is a certain experience of this time lasting no more than a month or two¹⁷²), this feeling of insecurity and anxiety sets in.

Within social psychology, this phenomenon is also known as *the honeymoon period*. It is used to grasp a variety of social relationships and issues, and essentially, it is described as:

An early stage in an activity before problems set in¹⁷³

Furthermore, by means of her statement, Viane emphasizes that being at the Trampoline House as an intern seems to expand her notions of Denmark and Danish society in terms of relevant points of reference. When I inquired into Viane’s experience of the Trampoline House as a potential ‘social icebreaker’, she replied:

You know, the camps, they are outside the countries... when I lived in the camp, when I stayed... the first time I arrived, I didn’t know anything about Denmark, I felt that “this camp this is Denmark”, I didn’t know¹⁷⁴

Through this statement, it could be argued that the Trampoline House has fundamentally given Viane a different view and notion of what Denmark is like, apart from the asylum centers. I found the very statements that the camps are “outside the countries” and gave her an initial idea that this was all that there is to Denmark, particularly interesting. By claiming that they are “outside the” country the idea is conveyed that they, in a certain sense, function outside the surrounding socio-political fabric in Denmark. Here, Agamben’s fundamental notion of refugee camps (and, as I would argue, also asylum centers) as socio-political ‘non-

¹⁷² Notes from an info meeting on 17/6 2016

¹⁷³ Link: <http://idioms.thefreedictionary.com/honeymoon+period> [Accessed 3/10 2016]

¹⁷⁴ Interview, Viane, 05:52-06:08

spaces', becomes relevant to bear in mind in the construction of the interplay between the Trampoline House and the asylum centers that she proposes by means of this statement. This way, the *camps* also come to serve as a constitutive outside. Contrarily, she articulates the Trampoline House as a category, which, as well as one of Alan's previous statements, comes to constitute is as 'home', according to Kinvall. She goes on to mention the potential of the Trampoline House as a possible facilitating 'tool' in the overall facilitation of integration:

You know Trampoline House is a good place for integration. It's a very good place. Because this is the first and only house in Denmark, maybe, that are... for refugees and help them in integration ... into the society¹⁷⁵

With regards to this statement, the Trampoline House is directly constructed and constituted as a catalyst for integration, which, through its work, facilitates the 'transition process', whereby, refugees can obtain the help that they need in order for them to integrate into society in a convenient fashion. It also shows one of the basic notions of group discourse, namely the idea of it being a commonly shared frame of reference, which can subsequently motivate and justify joint action with regards to a certain matter. Apart from this, the notion of integration – still bearing in mind the house's general notion of the term – comes to constitute an example of the active (and perhaps, even political) aspect of (group) identification, since, by providing this open environment, where the apparent free articulation of thoughts and ideas is rendered possible, a certain common identity can start to unfold. Taken together, Viane's two statements above also serve as an example of the apparent necessity of a space like the Trampoline House, which was also one of the main reasons for establishing this space, as argued in the paragraph on the house and Goll's statement on the views on establishing a physical space for asylum seekers over altering the physical outlook of the asylum centers.

Another main point seems to be the somewhat free nature of the space with no formal or mandatory requirements with regard to people's socialization:

I'm ready now ... and of course, the house helped me to find myself into the society. They didn't tell me: "Viane, you have to do this and this", no, they just helped me to find myself into the society...¹⁷⁶

¹⁷⁵ Interview, Viane, 06:17-06:35

¹⁷⁶ Interview, Viane, 07:12-07:30

Through this statement, Viane talks about her self-perceived 'readiness' to engage in various activities associated with the surrounding society and the role of the Trampoline House as significant facilitating factor (as well as an overarching community of shared concerns) for this to happen. Here, Honneth's specific notion of *social esteem* becomes key, since, theoretically speaking, this can be seen as the principal feeling which is conveyed to Viane, since, apparently, she has gotten the help and support that she needs to funnel herself into Danish society. Furthermore, the non-compulsory nature of the Trampoline House that she mentions, could also be viewed as a basic description of the alleged nature of the place as a space of support, dialogue and respect and somewhat different take on social work. This statement also somewhat coins the Trampoline House as a space where a shared concern to a given problematic is addressed, namely the issue of successful integration (using Christensen's notion) as well space where this is a main concern, thus somewhat constituting as a community of shared concerns (*Sachsgemeinschaft*), once again using Honneth's terminology. Apart from this, drawing on Honneth's ideas about the spheres in which recognition can be 'granted', although formally a civil society actor, through the way the Trampoline House represents itself (as is represented by my interviewees), one could argue that it almost makes up a sort of 'mix' between 'civil society' and a 'family', with an emphasis on working towards the granting of rights as well as developing somewhat affective relations, as seen within family constellations.

The fact that she states that this is done in a way which does not imply the people at the Trampoline House telling her exactly what to do, I would argue, strengthens this notion of social esteem as one of the final achievements in Honneth's notion of recognition and individual regard, that is, on the merely individual level. This "help", which has "helped" Viane to "find her own place in society" could be viewed as a positive and undistorted relationship to self and her own traits and abilities, to use some other of Honneth's main concepts on this area. Apart from this, in this case, the sense of social esteem also seems to be linked with a sense of ontological security – as outlined above – since a feeling of ontological and existential security and the simple feeling of feeling safe in a concrete social environment – that is, the Trampoline House – must be viewed as an underlying prerequisite for a feeling of social esteem to arise within an individual.

This notion of the Trampoline House as a main component in the immediate betterment of the current life situation for some of the people attending it is frequently addressed:

This place is heaven for a lot of people. It is a place where you can be free and forget about your identity as a refugee for a moment. Without the Trampoline House, people would be stuck in the asylum centers, become desperate without seeing any possibilities for themselves. Although some think, that it is just a house, it is a really big thing in the lives of many people¹⁷⁷

Another aspect in this part is also about the Trampoline House as a political space, which is trying to encompass a wide range of people, emanating from a multitude of different cultural backgrounds. This, it appears, implies a wide range of benefits:

The benefits are different. One of them is about integration, because it's not forced integration, it's optional integration. You can just be with them and you can integrate with them, not by force by not anything, just optionally. You can adapt to their system, you can adapt to their culture. Because it's a culture for everybody, it's a House everybody and for different cultures. You can have a basic culture for everybody¹⁷⁸

When asked about how this 'basic culture' works in terms of 'development', he then goes on to say that the creation of this 'basic culture' hinges upon the individual ability to accept oneself and one's cultural background:

When they learn to accept it, I mean... for example, I came from the Middle-eastern culture, when I see that it's okay to... like, I come from that culture, that it's okay. When it's accepted, I can work on it, I can easy develop, but doing this... being denied and being excluded, I will find it difficult to work on it. Like, there is always potential for individuals to develop and grow gradually, but it must be in an accepted environment. Their personality, their behavior must be accepted, at least when they are not harming anybody, when it's not harmful. I am not talking in a criminal sense, I am talking in a cultural sense¹⁷⁹

This 'basic culture', again, brings forth the fundamental principle of respect from the basic 'set of values' proposed by the Trampoline House as the basic building block for the very house to work and function in a convenient and meaningful manner. Since the house engages with people holding different legal statuses (asylum seeker in different legal phases, refugees and rejected asylum seekers) I would argue that the common ground, that is, legal recognition is in place. Apart from this, using Jenkins' notions, this 'basic culture' can also be viewed as a

¹⁷⁷ Bølling-Ladegaard, *Passiviteten er den Værste Fjende*, link: <http://metiermagasin.dk/10/2016/03/25/passiviteten-er-den-vaerste-fjende/> [Accessed 2/10 2016]

¹⁷⁸ Interview, Soran, 12:31-13:05

¹⁷⁹ Interview, Soran, 17:20-18:12

wide-spanning identity-fostering social group, which, through its activities, both asserts, defends (and perhaps also slightly imposes) certain identity traits onto the people associated with it. However, those processes of identification must be seen in the light of other processes of identification, since the association to the Trampoline House also hinges upon a certain degree of dissociation from the asylum centers.

Then, once the cultural differences are accepted, upon this are built the factors of a somewhat interpersonal affective relation and the practical relation of recognition, in line with Honneth's 'three-step-model' on recognition in terms of social collectivities in order for those collectivities to foster self-esteem within the collectivity¹⁸⁰, thus nurturing the issue of integration within the community and a social entity, in accordance with Jenkins' ideas of group identity and (joint) actions of identification.

This common culture, of course might also serve as a building block in order for the house to channel people into society on their own terms. Drawing on Jenkins' ideas on collective identity, this 'culture for everybody' can also be viewed as an example of a somewhat self-defined collectivity, also known as a 'group for itself', since, by means of a collectivized process of *integration*, a sort of common ground is sought in order for the participants of this collectivity to find a way to define themselves as they would like to do it, rather than being externally defined by others.

Another main component of Soran's statement is the issue of 'voluntary' integration, where people can seek their own identity within the group, one again in accordance with Jenkins' ideas about group identification and the issue of a social group seeking out its own particular identity, instead of being externally defined by others. Furthermore, this goes in line with Viane's statement above, although the two statements are addressing different 'levels' within the Trampoline House: while Viane is talking about her own experience as an *intern*, Soran addresses what could be coined as the 'meta-effects' of the house and the overall issue of integration. However, both statements uncover the core issue of integration and the ways in which the Trampoline House seems to provide the people associated with it with a basic sense of freedom in order for them to maneuver and navigate socially to find their particular place

¹⁸⁰ Böttcher Messell, *My house, your house*, 26

within this self-defined social collectivity. Here, again the notions of group identity and its dynamics, as proposed by Jenkins, become key to grasp this particular phenomenon.

As I have tried to uncover throughout this paragraph, the Trampoline House, as a social space, seems to provide an overall framework that allows for such an identity to form. First and foremost, this identity seems to hinge upon the sort of common ground which is created by the notion of unconditional respect and the fact that the users are engaged in the decision-making processes, as well as the daily functioning of the house through the fact that there is this relationship of mutual dependence between the house and the *interns*, preventing the effects of one part of the house becoming dependent on the other, in line with one of Goll's statements in the empirical chapter. Thus, all of those contributing factors seem to convey this sense of personal empowerment as well as sense of belonging with regards to the Trampoline House as a physical space. Apart from this, drawing on some of Viane's statements, the issue of personal social navigation and empowerment within the context of the Trampoline House is also key in understanding the ways in which, on an individual level, the users at the house benefit from being there and participating in the activities provided at the house.

Conclusion

In this Thesis, I set out to uncover the ways in which the Trampoline House functions and serves as a catalyst and a contributing factor to 'positive' and 'successful' integration. In this final paragraph, I will account for the main findings of this study as well as presenting some of the main thoughts about democracy proposed by the late Danish theologian and ecclesiastical historian Hal Koch¹⁸¹ in an effort of further elaboration, conclusion and recapitulation of the main findings of this study.

Through my user-oriented approach to the institutionalized function of the Trampoline House, I have gathered various pieces of qualitative data which suggest that the Trampoline House, through its somewhat unconventional take on 'integration, plays a part in improving the issue of integration of newly arrived asylum seekers in a number of ways. Firstly, the range of typical 'empowerment activities', such as the issue of language acquisition and work

¹⁸¹ Hal Koch, link:

http://denstoredanske.dk/Sprog,_religion_og_filosofi/Religion_og_mystik/Danske_folkekirke/Hal_Koch [Accessed 14/10 2016]

(in the case of this study, translation), which can ultimately, pave the way for a livelihood of a sort for my interviewees, as well as other *interns* at the house. Secondly, the Trampoline House and the way it works can be seen as a means to enhance the foreign users' understanding of the crucial role that associations play in the overall functioning of society and this particular branch of democracy in Denmark¹⁸², in other words an in-depth cultural comprehension of Danish society. This is also something that I have uncovered through the interviews. With regards to this, I find some of the ideas of Koch's particularly relevant for grasping the political philosophy behind the issues that have just been mentioned.

Apart from the concrete notions that he proposes throughout his, in Denmark, widely acclaimed book 'What is Democracy?' and their apparent relevance for this study, a main reason for including some of Koch's notions about democracy is that, back in 2011, The Trampoline House was awarded the *Hal Koch Prize*, which is an annual award, granted to relevant social actors (individuals and organizations alike) that, through their work, foster and nurture democracy and democratic conversations and debates. The press release, justifying the nomination, states:

It is concrete initiatives and engagement which makes democracy grow. To Hal Koch, democracy was much more than a mere form of government with free, returning elections and a representative system. It is also about, what enterprising individuals are doing in their everyday lives¹⁸³

The very establishment of the Trampoline House out of a perceived lack of a space and a "place of support, community and purpose"¹⁸⁴ for asylum seekers outside the centers could evidently be perceived as a product of those everyday thoughts and actions by a group of "enterprising individuals", that, according to Koch, keep democracy alive and well. One of the findings of this study has been the democratic function of the Trampoline House and the ways in which activities, such as the weekly house meetings, have been brought up as something nurturing and fostering the democratic tradition witnessed within the house. A main argument here is that *democracy* is put forward as a life form, rather than an established system, per se, in accordance with one of the main points by Koch¹⁸⁵. In other words, one of

¹⁸² Danish; Foreningslivet

¹⁸³ Udvalget for Udlændinge- og Integrationspolitik: *Trampolinhuset*, 11 (own translation)

¹⁸⁴ About Trampoline House, link: <http://www.trampolinehouse.dk/> [Accessed 16/10 2016]

¹⁸⁵ Koch, *Hvad er Demokrati*, 13

the main points of these discussions and debates is the discussion and the overall democratic conversation itself, rather than the specific views which are presented:

It is not about political doctrines or holding the right views. What are crucial are the words of the people and constructive speech, which can contribute in creating a human community, which can clarify life and its conditions before us – both as individuals and in our popular and political contexts¹⁸⁶

Thus – according to Koch – the beating heart of *democracy* comes to be the overall conversation and subsequent comprehension and understanding, uncovering the true nature of democracy, a nature that:

Rests upon the fact that, through conversation, one reaches a better and more reasonable understanding and, from there, is able to make a decision, which not only serves a single individual or class, but appropriately takes into consideration the well-being of the totality¹⁸⁷

This also brings forth the relations between human beings and the overall system within which they function, and here Koch puts his main emphasis on human being as the main creators of those social relations¹⁸⁸. Furthermore, the idea of making decisions that serve a greater good for the wider totality, it could be argued, becomes particularly crucial and important within a space like the Trampoline House, which is characterized by a high degree of diversity, with a plethora of different people attending it. The issues mentioned above also underlines the non-compulsory nature of the Trampoline House as a social space, something which I have also accounted for in the analytical part.

Koch also emphasizes the importance of mutual respect throughout the conversational process¹⁸⁹, in line with some of the main philosophic strands proposed at the Trampoline House in the empirical paragraph and further outline in certain parts of the analysis. One of the statements that go in line with Koch's notion is the alleged establishment of an overall democratic and 'popular'¹⁹⁰ culture based on dialogue, conversation and general informative

¹⁸⁶ Ibid, 15 (own translation)

¹⁸⁷ Ibid, 20 (own translation)

¹⁸⁸ Ibid, 99

¹⁸⁹ Ibid, 16-17

¹⁹⁰ Danish: Folkelig

efforts¹⁹¹ in terms of the weekly house meetings, as proposed by Soran in one of the interviews, as well as some of the other activities mentioned throughout this Thesis.

Limitations of Koch's Ideas

Thus, far Koch's arguments seem to go in line with a variety of the ideas and values expressed about the Trampoline House. However, we must of course bear in mind that the concrete context of 'What is Democracy?' is Denmark in the immediate aftermath of WW2. Although transferable to some of the phenomena outlined in the analysis, we must of course bear in mind that the core intention of the book was not to address the concrete issue of integration-related work, which is one of the main purposes of the work that is done at the Trampoline House. Rather, the aim of Koch's works seems to be a general effort in the strengthening of public informatory work, among other sources, through associations, mainly restricted to a Danish audience.

Other Findings

Another main finding of this study has been the sense of security that the Trampoline House, as a social space, has given my interviewees, in line with Kinvall's notion of ontological security. A main argument here is that, stemming from various processes of *recognition*, the existence as a such sense of security as a fundamental prerequisite for a place like the Trampoline House to function in a convenient manner in the general effort of nurturing the overarching goal of integration into wider Danish society by means of the house as a social space. As we have seen in the analytical chapter, there are a number of statements which verify this preliminary assumption about the Trampoline House, both in terms of individually experienced security (some of Alan's and Viane's statements) but also in a more collective and 'cultural' sense (some of Soran's statements). This can be argued to constitute the Trampoline House as a main pole of attraction by constituting a place with a certain sense of calm.

Furthermore, I have found that the house, through its work, conveys a sense of togetherness and a specific forum, where various forms of recognition can be sought, in accordance with Honneth's notions on the matter. This recognition both comes in legal terms with the house accepting a wide range of users (refugees, asylum seekers and rejected asylum seekers, who

¹⁹¹ Koch, *Hvad er Demokrati*, 13

on account of the rules of repatriation, might find themselves stuck in the system) in their *praktik* programs.

Taken together, all of these factors make possible this sense of co-ownership and respect which is generated within the very walls of the Trampoline House, thus justifying one of their many catchy slogans, which seems to resonate with many of the people who happen to be associated with it: my house, your house.