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Abstract
In view of the augmenting spatial, socio-economic and ethnic segregation in Sweden over the last 30 years, the purpose of this study is to examine, illustrate and enhance the understanding of mundane segregation processes by studying how social actors collaboratively interact in Swedish online forums regarding in which areas it is “good” or “bad” to live in. The theoretical and methodological framework used to guide the collection, coding and analysis of empirical data is based on ethnomethodology and its applied methods conversation analysis, discursive psychology and membership categorization analysis. This implies a data-driven approach in which the analysis is solely based on the observable-and-reportable understandings of the interactants themselves. The results of the study show that the participants collaboratively orient to and assemble normative spatial categories by connecting these with spatial identities. Simply put, “good places” are treated as inherently linked to “good people”, and vice versa. Because of the way in which interactants treat these spatial-social categories as both inherently and normatively linked, the thesis introduces the concept normative-spatial-identities, in order to facilitate the investigation of how social actors collaboratively make sense of, orient to and assemble normative spatial boundaries and in this fashion, contribute to enhancing the understanding of everyday inclusion-and-exclusion practices.
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1. Introduction
During the last 30 years, Sweden has seen an increasing spatial, socio-economic as well as ethnic polarization and segregation in urban spaces (Andersson & Magnusson Turner 2014; Andersson & Kährik 2015; Andersson & Hedman 2016). To begin with, the socio-economic polarization has increased noticeably, in which groups with better and worse socio-economic position have become more separated in urban space. This has been related to macro-level changes such as national economic recession, in which already poor areas become even poorer. Moreover, the “bad reputation” of economically inferior neighborhoods generates a collective flight from these areas by the population with sufficient economic means to live elsewhere (Andersson & Hedman 2016).

Polarization processes have further been studied in relation to the neo-liberal turn, in which public housing has been privatized, renovated and transformed into expensive condominiums. This forces inhabitants who cannot afford the augmented costs to move to cheaper areas, termed gentrification. Hence, people with higher socio-economic position have become wealthier and more spatially concentrated, while there has been a so called residualisation of the lower class, in which this group has become progressively poorer (Andersson & Magnusson Turner 2014). In general, economically superior actors become concentrated in the centralized city-areas, in which living-conditions and costs are high. In contrast, those who cannot afford to live in these neighborhoods become concentrated in the outskirts of the city, which are characterized by low-priced, rental apartments. In addition, these processes are ethnically marked. This means that there is a notable spatial and socio-economic difference between the Swedish-born population and the population born elsewhere, especially from non-European countries. Thus, the relationship between socio-economic position and ethnic affiliation has increased (Andersson & Kährik 2015).

Furthermore, segregation research is generally based on quantitative methods. These investigate correlations between macro-level variables such as national economy; welfare systems; demographic changes; socio-economic distributions; collective moving patterns and neighborhood-effects (Sassen 1991, 1993; Esping-Andersen 1993; Massey & Denton 1993; Hamnett 1994a 1994b; Preteceille 1995; Musterd & Ostendorf 1998; Sampson 2012). In other words, the emphasis is on associations between social structures and how these might or might not impose on people’s personal lives. Additionally, while there are a few studies with qualitative approaches, such as Molina (1987); van der Burgt (2007); Pred (2000); and Fainstein (1993), these attempt to understand the “underlying” thoughts and meanings of social actors through interviews or discourse-analysis.
There is no question whether this existing quantitative as well as qualitative body of research is of great importance, as it describes how larger structures are interrelated and how people tend to move in specific, patterned ways. However, there is a “missing link” between the evidence that socio-economic and ethnic segregation is increasing and that people “tend” to move collectively in segregation-generating ways: How actors collaboratively assemble meanings regarding spatial categories and spatial identities in real-life, situated, practical interaction. In contrast, by specifically examining interactions in which actors seek and give advice regarding either “good” or “bad” areas to live in, this thesis attempts to get a glimpse of at least one aspect of the decision-making process concerning where to live and consequently, bring these mundane social segregation processes to light.

a. The Aim of the Study and Research Question
Thus, the purpose of this thesis is to contribute to the theoretical and empirical understanding of mundane, everyday segregation processes “in the making”, by investigating how actors collaboratively orient to and assemble spatial-social categories in online forums regarding in which areas it is “good” or “bad” to live in. This study thus aims to answer the questions:

In which ways do actors collaboratively orient to, assemble and connect spatial categories and spatial identities in mundane, online interaction?

Which segregation-related processes do these interactions make discernable?

b. Disposition
The structure of this thesis will be as follows: Firstly, there will be a short description of earlier research regarding segregation processes. After this, the theoretical framework consisting of ethnomethodology, conversation analysis, discursive psychology and membership categorization analysis will be presented. This is followed by a methodological section in which the approach; study design; data selection; research process, as well as ethical considerations will be deliberated. The results will then be presented in conjunction with the analysis. Lastly, the results and their implications are summarized and more thoroughly discussed in relation to the research question, former segregation research as well as forthcoming research.
2. Previous Segregation Research
This section will provide a brief summary of relevant segregation research, focusing mainly on Swedish research. According to Andersson, Bråmå & Hogdal (2009), the concept of segregation is defined as systematic variation (p. 12) in space. Therefore, it is not a specific area that is “segregated”. By contrast, segregation is a relational term which denotes a patterned differentiation in a place, whether it concerns a country, a city or another spatial room. This variation can be characterized by for example socio-economic, demographic or ethnic differentiations, but is most commonly a complex combination of these. For instance, there is a higher proportion of younger, poorer people in the population born outside of Sweden compared to the Swedish-born population (Andersson, Bråmå & Hogdal 2009).

Swedish as well as international segregation research tend to study segregation processes by using quantitative methods. For instance, by focusing on correlations and causal relationships between variables such as the national economic situation; political affiliations and welfare systems; demographic organization; immigration patterns; socio-economic positions; ethnic variations; and housing tenures (Sassen 1991, 1993; Esping-Andersen 1993; Massey & Denton 1993; Hamnett 1994a 1994b; Preteceille 1995; Musterd & Ostendorf 1998; and Sampson 2012; Andersson 2009; Andersson, Bråmå & Hogdal 2009; Andersson & Magnusson Turner 2014; Andersson & Kährk 2015; Andersson & Hedman 2016). While there are some contextual differences in Swedish and international segregation processes due to historical aspects – such as Sweden’s long tradition of a universal welfare state – recent studies have shown that economic recession in combination with neo-liberalism may be rendering greater international similarities. For instance, the recently augmented role of ethnic affiliation in Swedish urban segregation (Andersson & Magnusson Turner 2014).

As to social consequences of segregation, neighborhood effect theories contend that people’s immediate neighborhoods impact living-standards and life-choices, for instance education; profession; health; attitudes and interactions. Thus, segregated structures tend to generate even more segregation. In addition, there are different kinds of neighborhood effects. Endogenous effects are direct effects, such as neighbors playing loud music late at night. Exogenous effects are indirect, for instance a sense of discomfort, lack of safety or adjusted behavior because of a specific “characteristic” attributed to the neighbors, such as their skin-color or dress-code. Correlated effects are more structural, such as the neighborhood being far from employment-places, having run-down service facilities or being socially stigmatized (Andersson 2009). In this way, quantitative studies tend to focus on how social structures supposedly “affect” the lives of social actors in different ways.
In addition to larger structural explanations such as economic recession, segregation research (see Anderson, Bråmå & Hogdal 2009) also shows how collective, actor-based processes affect segregation. There is thus a theoretical understanding of a processual and reciprocal association between social structures and social actions. For instance, people tend to move in certain segregation enhancing patterns, which has been classified into categories. The first category is named segregation generating movements, which augment the ethnic differentiation between “Swedish dominated” and “Swedish scarce” neighborhoods. The second movement pattern is segregation generated movements, in which the contemporary segregated organization of the city and its connected discourses regarding “good” and “bad” neighborhoods works as a platform for people continuing to move in ways which enhance the segregation. Institutionally generated movements are direct results of institutional – such as political – decisions. One example is how municipalities place asylum seekers in specific areas and buildings. Finally, network generated movements occur when people move in accordance with their social connections, for instance moving to a neighborhood because one has family or friends who live there or recommend it. When groups marked by a specific ethnic characteristic move in order to live together, it is further called congregation. While this lastly mentioned phenomenon has been seen to occur in other countries, it is less common in the Swedish context since the “non-Swedish” population is constituted by a great number of different ethnicities. However, some research supports that it is the “Swedish” population that tends to move to areas with mostly “Swedish” inhabitants while actively avoiding “immigrant areas”, generating ethnic congregations in space (Anderson, Bråmå & Hogdal 2009).

Although segregation research is typically of a quantitative character there are a few qualitative studies, including studies regarding urban racialization (Molina 1987), discourses regarding African-Americans (Fainstein 1993); racism discourse (Pred 2000); as well as neighborhood effects on children’s social networks (Danielle van der Burgt 2007); parent’s school-choices (Allison & Stuart Wells 2013), and civic engagement (Widestrom 2015). These approaches aim to examine “underlying” segregation mechanisms by either studying abstract, pre-determined discourses or by using interviews to gain knowledge about subjective meanings. In other words, they study people’s accounts in speech or text and perceive these as “reflections” of inner cognition, attitudes, world-views, and so on. For example, by asking what people “think” about certain areas, if they could imagine moving there, or not and why. The epistemological question remains however, regarding the link between on the one hand what people say in interviews and write in questionnaires or
newspapers and on the other hand, what they actually do. That is, if people’s accounts truly “reflect” underlying meanings or if it in the end comes down to mere “speculation”. The matter of fact is however, that it is not people’s thoughts and attitudes per se that generate social change, but their concrete, social actions. Hence, what is missing in existing quantitative and qualitative segregation research is the study of how actors actually do social and spatial differences in naturally-occurring, mundane interactions. In light of this, even though this thesis shares the aim of former segregation research of enhancing the understanding of segregation processes, it goes beyond mere speculation regarding what people might “think” and how this might or might not affect social action. In contrast, it puts real-life, social action in the spotlight by investigating how actors themselves collaboratively make sense of spatial-social categories when interacting about where it is “good” or “bad” to live and consequently, unintentionally making inclusion-exclusion practices observable.

3. Theoretical Framework
This section presents the theory, perceived as guiding frameworks and tools, through which the empirical data is analyzed. The overall approach is ethnomethodological, in combination with its applied methods conversation analysis, discursive psychology and membership categorization analysis. Firstly however, we will take a few steps back and acknowledge how this specific study can be related to classical approaches and the principal interests of sociology.

a. A Throwback to Classical Sociology
Since the establishment of sociology, the same difficult and complex questions have been pursued by classical and contemporary scholars: How is order created and maintained; how and why does social change occur; and what role does social action play? Some examples include: Émile Durkheim’s (1982/1895; 1984/1893) structural, social facts approach to social statics and dynamics; Max Weber’s historical comparative research and theories of social action (2011/1904-1905; 1978/1924) and ethnographic studies by Charles Horton Cooley (1909; 1918; 1922). Before all of these however, Auguste Comte attempted to lay a foundation for solving the “disorder” in post-revolution France by introducing Positive Philosophy (2000/1830). However, Comte’s fairly overlooked volume System of Positive Polity (1875/1852) further add the “subjective” social phenomena thoughts, feelings, and actions (Comte 1875, volume 1: 6), which highlight the importance of social actors.

As follows, not only positivistic approaches can be traced back to Comte, but
also micro-level, action-based approaches. This study aims to investigate discourses from a pragmatic (Mills 1964) point of view, in which discourses are perceived as concrete, contextually specific, collaborative social actions by which members actively engage in, define, reinforce or alter social reality (Potter et al. 1990). Tracing this back to Comte (1875/1852), discourses could therefore be seen as belonging to his third essential, social phenomena of social action. Consequently, since the origin of sociology, there has been a common interest in understanding and explicating the social processes that either maintain or alter society: A common interest this thesis aims to share and – optimistically – contribute to by putting the how of practical social action (Garfinkel 1967; 1996) under close inspection.

b. Ethnomethodology
Influenced by Durkheim’s internalization of social facts (1982/1895; 1984/1893) and Weber’s theories of the importance of social action (1978/1924), Talcott Parsons developed systems theory as well as a theory of social action. According to Parsons’, external social structures become internalized within social actors, which then generate certain dispositions towards social action (1937; 1951). Internalized social structures are thus treated as an “invisible hand” that guides behavior, reducing social actors to mindless robots or as Harold Garfinkel famously put it, “judgmental dopes” (1967: 68). Hence, according to Garfinkel (1967; 1996) such “formal theories” (1996) perceive social action as being independent of the actors themselves as well as of their specific context, resulting in an over-simplified explication of social action. In addition, by applying pre-determined theories while neglecting the understanding of the actors themselves, these formal theories tend to convey a kind of normative superiority towards social actors, becoming ironic and normative. Also, although Parsons may have succeeded in constructing a theory of disposition to act, he failed to construct a theory of social action per se (Garfinkel 1967: vii-34; 1996 & Heritage 1987).

In contrast, Harold Garfinkel (1967) developed ethnomethodology in order to study the “the rational properties of indexical expressions and other practical actions as contingent ongoing accomplishments of organized artful practices of everyday life” (Garfinkel 1967: 11). In other words, the main analytical interest concerns how actors use observable, taken for granted social actions in order to make reality meaningful to themselves as well as to others. Unlike normative approaches then, the analyst attempts to “bracket” prior theoretical understandings and focus on “observable-and-reportable” (Garfinkel 1967: 1), naturally occurring social actions. Solely the social meanings, categories, structures that the actors themselves make clearly visible to one another through interaction – and thus also to
the researcher – is used in the analysis. This manner of “bracketing” is commonly referred to as *ethnomethodological indifference*, while the exclusive use of “observable-and-reportable” information is known as *account-ability*. Moreover, “knowledge” is perceived as being continually and collaboratively produced in the course of social interaction, which is termed *intersubjectivity*. Social actions are further *reflexive* and *indexical*. That is to say, they are results of a sequential, non-determined interplay between the action itself and its contextually specific, shared social knowledge or “norm” (Garfinkel 1967: vii-34; Heritage 1987).

As follows, social structures are not perceived as “forcing” social actors to act in certain ways, which – even if it occurs – is difficult to confirm empirically. On the other hand, it is possible to study how actors practically *orient to or defy* the social structures made observable in the interaction. This renders the view of social action as being *morally accountable*, for instance how actors *legitimize* social actions. Thus, social structures are understood as being less abstract and universal and more “loose” and contingent in character. This “looseness” has its exceptions though, such as when actors are induced to certain behavior by explicit or implicit force and power-relations. Also, the possibility of opposing social rules does not mean that such actions have no social consequences. For instance, Garfinkel’s “breaching experiments” illustrate how some taken-for-granted norms can be broken, leading to some kind of observable social disturbance (Garfinkel 1967; Heritage 1987). In short, since social actions do not occur in a social and contextual vacuum, one should optimistically take this into consideration when investigating them.

Nevertheless, it is important to note that ethnomethodology is not opposed to “formal analysis” (1996), but can in fact be used *in conjunction with* formal approaches. For instance, Durkheim’s aphorism: “The objective reality of social facts is sociology’s fundamental principle” is perceived as ethnomethodology’s principal, academic mission. However, while the fundamental principle remains the same, Garfinkel perceives the “objective reality of social facts” as more *contingent* to specific contexts and the actors’ practical, social actions (Garfinkel 1996: 10-11). In this fashion, while formal theories are appropriate to answer questions regarding the “what” and “why” of social phenomena, ethnomethodology’s program is to specifically ask *how* (Garfinkel 1967; 1996).

c. Conversation Analysis, Discursive Psychology and Membership Categorization Analysis

The ethnomethodological approach has resulted in particular methods for the inquiry of commonsense, everyday interaction. Conversation Analysis (CA), developed by Harvey Sacks and his colleagues (1974), focuses specifically on the detailed organized forms of *talk-*
in-interaction. The main premise in this approach is that speech is organized and constituted by taken-for-granted, indexical social rules. A vital insight is that each utterance is chosen out of many alternative formulations, in order to perform a specific social action. Hence, CA does not take utterances for granted but perceives them as specific social actions and attempt to comprehend what they actually “do”, what the social consequences are and what common-sense, intersubjective knowledge the actor is orienting to when using them (Sacks et al. 1974; Schegloff 1972). Collective knowledge can thus be observed in each doubly contextual utterance. This means that the meaning of an utterance is conditioned by and reflects the preceding social action, as well as the utterance itself conditions the next social action. In this fashion, speech is sequential. One famous sequence is the adjacency pair, in which the first pair part conditions the second pair part in a specific way, for instance asking a question or greeting someone. The second pair part can then be preferenced and complete the first pair part, for example answering the question or greeting back. Relatedly, second assessments are usually upgraded if preferenced. If the second pair part does not fulfill the conditions however, the actor usually provides an explanation, making visible how a social norm has been breached (Goodwin & Heritage 1990; Sacks et al. 1974; Schegloff 1972; 1997).

Moreover, Discursive Psychology emphasizes how actors use and orient to common-sense knowledge in practical interaction and hence produce certain contingent versions of reality (Edwards 2012). DP has for instance shown how actors exploit discursive devices such as: extreme case formulations (Heritage 2009); modal formulations (Edwards 2006); lists, especially three-part-lists (Jefferson 1990); epistemic reasoning (Heritage 2012; Iversen 2014); the management of the subjective-objective side of accounts (Edwards 2005; Finkfeldt 2016); as well as other devices (see Wiggins 2016: 123-125); in the distribution of moral responsibility; legitimization of social actions; as well as orientation towards and assembling of normative structures. For instance, according to Edwards (2005), the management of the subjective side of complaints results in actors treating them as either legitimate or illegitimate and, in the latter case, treating the actor as an “inherent complainer”.

To continue, Membership Categorization Analysis or MCA (Stokoe 2012) tends to highlight how actors use and orient to diverse Membership Categorization Devices (MCDs) when referring to themselves and other social actors. The purpose of MCA is therefore to “explicate the actions being done by the particular categories that are used in talk” (Benwell & Stokoe 2006: 66). Moreover, there are certain general “rules of application” regarding the use of MCD’s (Sacks 1992, vol. 1; Benwell & Stokoe 2006; Schegloff 2007; Stokoe 2012).
Firstly, categories usually are connected and come in common-sense *collections*:

> My attention shall be exclusively limited to those categories in the language in terms of which persons may be classified. For example, the categories: 'male', 'teacher', 'first baseman', 'professional', 'Negro', etc., are the sort I shall be dealing with. Frequently such 'membership' categories are organized, by persons of the society using them, into what I shall call 'collections of membership categories', categories that members of society feel 'go together' (Sacks 1966: 15-16; quoted in Jayyusi 1984: 212).

According to the *economy rule*, the use of one category usually is sufficient for the purpose of the action. In addition, the *consistency rule* refers to how when two or more categories are treated as belonging to the same device, other members of the same collection may be referred to as categories from the same device. Moreover, when two categories are intimately and normatively connected, for example teacher-student, they are termed *standardized relational pairs*. Here, the normative and moral side of membership categorization becomes visible, for instance how certain activities are treated as appropriate or not in a teacher-student relationship. Importantly, the use of MCD’s goes beyond simply “referring”, as they are non-neutral and *inference rich*. This means that social categories can be connected to specific *category-bound activities* as well as convey other implicit characteristics or *predicates*, which are attributed to an incumbent of a category (Benwell & Stokoe 2006: 64-68; Schegloff 2007; Stokoe 2012). Sacks (1992) illustrates this with the example of listing noticeably Jewish names in economic crime trials in the Soviet Union, creating the picture that these categories go together in a consequential fashion and that “Jews” inherently are “economic criminals”.

Accordingly, MCD’s are often used in management of accountability and distribution of moral responsibility (Sacks 1992, vol. 1: 42).

d. **Social Identities: Conversational Identities and Spatial Identities**

From an ethnomethodological point of view, “identities” are not essential or self-given but products of continuous social actions. According to Antaki & Widdicombe (1998), there are five principles that constitute the ethnomethodological approach to identity. Firstly, the attribution of a social identity implicitly infers a specific, category-membership with its connected category-bound characteristics. Secondly, identities are indexical, that is, they are contingent to their specific context. Thirdly, using social categories “makes relevant the identity to the interactional business going on” (Antaki & Widdicombe 1998: 3). This means that the use of social categories may affect the course of the interaction. Lastly, all of the
above principles are made observable in the conversational structure used by the participants (Antaki & Widdicombe 1998).

Benwell & Stokoe (2006) use the concept of identity as “who people are to each other” (p. 71), which highlights how identities are formed through social interaction. For instance, how people can be treated as belonging to a specific “group” according to some characteristic, which is called collective identities. Relatedly, categorical identities refer to how actors ascribe membership category identities when referring to themselves and others; while relational identities highlight a distinct relation towards another category (Benwell & Stokoe 2006: 70-84). The authors further describe spatial identities, which focus on the social identities connected to place and space. This thesis will focus on the role of “place/space as produced in and as a topic of discourse” (Benwell & Stokoe 2006: 204, emphasis in the original). While the aspect of space as the location of discourse also is of importance, this will not be dwelt upon except to acknowledge that the studied interactions take place in Swedish online forums, which may affect the structure and nature of the interaction compared to face-to-face interaction. This will be further discussed in the method section. To continue, Benwell & Stokoe (2006) argue for the importance of the social production of space and its link to discourse and identity, which they call the “spatial turn” in the academic sphere:

...space and place, though ‘material’ and ‘physical’, is not ‘real’ beyond the practices that produce it. It is contestable, provisional and contingent upon those practices... Moreover, who gets to occupy spaces (in terms of asymmetrically organized identity categories such as gender, ethnicity, sexuality, relationships and age), is a crucial part of understanding identity within the recent “spatial turn” (Benwell & Stokoe 2006: 210).

By the “spatial turn”, the authors mean that while studies of social life often have neglected the role of place and space – or have perceived it as a “neutral” aspect – its role has become increasingly acknowledged. The main theoretical position is that “who we are” and “what we do” de facto is affected by “where we are”. Quoting Dixon (2005), the authors acknowledge that “all aspects of our social lives unfold within material and symbolic environments (‘places’) that are both socially constituted and constitutive of the social” (Dixon 2005, quoted in Benwell & Stokoe 2006: 210-211). From a traditional CA approach, Schegloff (1972) shows how location-formulations can be used to “do” different actions. For instance, when using “location-terms”, the actor can be doing other things than formulating place, such as formulating an occupation, a stage of life or social activities. In contrast, participants may
use other terms than location-terms to formulate place, such as membership category terms. Also, certain formulations are “right” and adequate while others are not, which for example depends on the interaction’s location; what participants are involved and what their relationships are. It is further contingent upon the collaborative use of membership categories, which illustrates the common-sense knowledge of the members; as well as to the specific topic or activity of the interaction. Thus, when studying spatial organizations in interaction, it is essential not to take location-formulations for granted but to examine how participants use place-formulations to perform specific social actions and alternatively, use non-place terms to formulate place, in light of what kind of member-based, common-sense categories and knowledge this demonstrates. Lastly, Schegloff (1972) points out that this theoretical frame is widely applicable as it can be applied to other categorical formulations than location.

Nevertheless, there are relatively few ethnomethodologically-inspired studies that investigate the social organization of space and its relationship with social identities and conduct (Smith 1978; Crabtree 2000; Dickerson 2000; Durrheim & Dixon 2001; Carlin 2003). Crabtree (2000) argues that while many spatially interested studies have produced competent “theorizing” concerning the centrality of space and its relationship with social identities and conduct, they tend to be theoretically abstract while the study of “space as a member’s oriented-to concern” (Benwell & Stokoe 2006: 221), that is, as social actions that are a part of sense-making in everyday life, usually goes “unnoticed” (Crabtree 2000: 25).

Some insights from earlier research highlighted by Crabtree (2000) include how certain spaces have a normative connection to specific “appropriate conduct”, for example, restaurants are a place for eating while supermarkets are designated for shopping. This may seem like an arbitrary observation, but the social behavioral norms tied to specific places are quite set, which is made clear when these norms are broken. Moreover, some conducts are treated as morally appropriate according to membership categories and the specific space they are located in, while others are morally spurned. For instance, while some membership categories are perceived to “naturally” belong with certain places, others are treated as “deviant”. Thus, this normative association between spatial- and social categories is used in implicit or explicit inclusion-exclusion practices. In another study, Carlin (2003) illustrates how participants complaining about their neighbors collaboratively assemble membership categories of “otherness” in contrast to a normative “us”. Consequently, the complainants intersubjectively assemble moral organizations of space, connecting it to membership categories and “appropriate behavior”. In addition, Stokoe (2003) shows how neighbor disputes are morally organized according to space and gender, for instance in how differences
are attributed to women as being mothers, single-women or sluts.

Lastly, although this concept is used in quite a different context concerning the discourses regarding fishing quotas in Iceland, I would also like to include the concept of moral landscapes (Helgason & Pálsson 1997: 466) as a theoretical guideline, as this concept appears well adaptable to the ethnomethodological and spatial interest of this paper. By “moral landscapes”, the authors mean that actors actively assemble context-specific moral spaces through on-going discourse, and that these moral landscapes also affect the social lives of the actors (pp. 451-471). This can be described by the following quotation:

While discourse is embedded in social relations, it is precisely through discourse that people redefine their relations to one another and their place in the world. The moral landscape is both reconstructed and traversed by individuals in their everyday lives – and it is their actions that either provoke or thwart alterations (Helgason & Pálsson 1997: 466).

To conclude, the investigation of how actors produce spatial categories and identities is both theoretically and empirically imperative. The main reason for the emphasis on spatial categories, its connections to membership categories and social identities is intimately connected with the larger empirical interest of this paper: The increasing urban segregation in Swedish cities. Since marginalization can be understood as the lack of entitlement to certain places and spaces, it seems quite problematic to neglect the role of space when investigating processes of social exclusion. Furthermore, space itself can become incumbent of different kinds of normative and moral social meanings, which can be linked to certain groups in society. Putting it very simply, “good spaces” are usually put together with “good people”, while “bad spaces” are connected to “bad people”. The organization of space can in this fashion be seen to legitimize the inclusion and exclusion of certain membership categories, as well as illustrating normative and moral meanings (Benwell & Stokoe 2006: 213-216). Hence, while ethnomethodologically inspired research on spatial categories and identities generally investigate mundane normative constructions, this study combines the ethnomethodological findings with results of former segregation research and places it in the specific context of social polarization. Thus, this study does not perceive space as a “neutral” aspect of social life. On the contrary, the main purpose is to analyze and explicate the theoretical links between spatial- and identity categories in the interaction at hand.
A Few Comments on Philosophy of Science and Common Criticisms

Because if its attentiveness to practical, situated interaction, ethnomethodology is sometimes perceived as a highly “micro” approach that neglects the role of social structures and power relations (Alexander & Giesen 1987; Hillbert 1990; Potter 2003). However, the focus on actor-based interaction does not mean that there is no reality external to these interactions, such as “actual” urban segregation. Ethnomethodology does therefore not stand in opposition to realism. It is however quite uninterested in the ontological “truth” or “false” of the matter, focusing instead on the practical and observable production of collective meaning. In other words, what is interesting is how actors either treat certain social aspects as real, appropriate and significant in the interaction or not, and what the social consequences are. The concept of “constructionism” is thus perceived from an epistemological point of view, opposing an essentialistic approach to social categories and identities as being pre-determined or set in stone. Conversely, they are perceived as contingent productions of on-going social actions (Benwell & Stokoe 2006: 48-51; Edwards, Ashmore & Potter 1995).

In addition, some writers (see Alexander 1987) accuse the approach of being “anti-cultural”. However, the argument stems from a marked difference in how culture de facto is understood. The ethnomethodological approach rejects the idea of culture as being a sui generis or independent, universal force that makes actors do things independently of the specific context. In contrast, Hester & Eglin (1997) argue that culture is inherent to social actions. Furthermore, Sacks defines culture as “an apparatus for generating recognizable actions” (Sacks, 1992: 226). This perspective moves the focus away from how an “abstract force” may or may not affect social action to what people actually do in specific situations and what social consequences the actions have. Shared rules of conduct as well as commonsense meanings can thus be seen through practical actions. Furthermore, ethnomethodology is not opposed to the influence of power-relations in social life such as class, gender and race. While it declines to adopt a pre-determined view on the empirical data as “gendered”, if gender is observably treated as being oriented towards in the interaction at hand, this will be acknowledged in the analysis (Benwell & Stokoe 2006: 48-86, Schegloff 1987 & 2007).

Hence, ethnomethodology by no means neglects social structure. Rather, it can be seen as the study of the small-scale “building blocks” as well as construction process of both micro and macro social structures (Hillbert 1990). In light of this, ethnomethodology may be perceived as an appropriate and useful framework for the investigation of the assembling, maintaining or altering of social structures.
4. Methods and Research Process

a. Research Design
This thesis takes a synthetic ethnomethodological approach, combining applied Conversation Analysis, Discursive Psychology and Membership Categorization Analysis in order to assemble, code and analyze the empirical data (see Flinkfeldt 2016: 36, 55-58). Compared to other kinds of qualitative methods based on either interviews or written texts, this synthetic, topically-oriented and applied ethnomethodological approach emphasizes the ways in which actors collaboratively assemble social knowledge in naturally-occurring, situated, interaction.

If we are going to place this approach within a more general spectrum of research methods, one can therefore say that this study is overall of a qualitative nature. A quite recent, detailed and inclusive definition of “qualitative methods” has been formulated by Patrik Aspers and Ugo Corte: “Making new distinctions in a process of getting closer to the phenomenon studied and resulting in an improved understanding of it” (Aspers & Corte 2016: 15). The academic interest in this kind of meaning-focused knowledge can be traced back to Max Weber’s verstehen (1978/1924), in which the ultimate task of the researcher is to deeply understand and explicate the meanings of the actors with regard to its context. Hence, while the purpose of quantitative research methods is to study correlations or causal relationships between pre-formulated variables and compare the results to a hypothesis – a tradition that can be traced back to Durkheim’s social facts – qualitative research methods are more interested in the distinctions of member-based essences or meanings (Aspers 2013: 29-46, 245). To gain access to this kind of knowledge, qualitative researchers commonly use naturalistic methods in order to gain closeness to the phenomenon of interest through a long process of research. In this process, the theoretical framework and the empirical data can affect one another in a reciprocal fashion, leading the study into creative paths and knowledge that otherwise may have gone unnoticed. Consequently, the knowledge of the specific phenomena of interest is increased and deepened on a theoretical level (Aspers & Corte 2016).

The ethnomethodological foundation of the study renders a “data-driven” design in which the researcher aims to “bracket” former normative knowledge, attempting to solely investigate concrete social practices and their collective meanings from the perspective of the members themselves (Goodwin & Heritage 1990: 226-232, Flinkfeldt 2016: 55-58). In other words, the aim is to use inductive analysis and try to represent the understandings of the participants while not falling into the trap of normative, formal analysis (cf. Garfinkel 1967). According to Atkinson & Hammersley (2007) however, the realistic likelihood of completely
“bracketing” former normative and cognitive knowledge is questionable, which has been the main criticism of so called purely “naturalistic” approaches. In addition, a foundation of contextual knowledge, for instance cultural and linguistic knowledge, is in fact necessary in order to comprehend whatever is going on in the empirical world. On the other hand, approaches which try to manipulate the environment to generate “objective” knowledge have also been criticized for being naïve in the belief that all subjectivity can be abstracted. Simply put, one of the most complicated methodological aspects of studying the social world is that we all are a part of it. Hence, while the naturalistic approach may be too simplistic in aiming to bracket former cognitive knowledge when studying the empirical world, the positivistic or objective approach may be seen as being too simplistic in the opposite direction. In line with the authors then, this study aims to view the data with the least pre-conceptions possible by applying reflexivity, which avoids this dichotomy. In accordance to this, the researcher is aware that there are no objective, universal “social laws” and that subjectivity affects the formation, reception, interpretation, understanding and representation of the empirical data. Consequently, all knowledge – including “scientific knowledge” – is an incomplete, specific version of the social phenomenon (Atkinson & Hammersley 2007: 15-19).

Nevertheless, ethnomethodological studies on actor-based, observable knowledge renders a standpoint in which meanings treated as empirically “real” by the actors are analytically significant, regardless of the researcher’s opinion. Thus, ethnomethodological analysis is not as intimately connected with the world-view of the researcher, although there is no escaping it entirely. This can be contrasted with for instance interview-based research, which may have more concerns regarding credibility due to the issue of “vague links” between empirical data and theoretical conclusions. In ethnomethodological studies however, readers should be able to conduct the same methodological analysis as the author and make their own judgements whether the theoretical conclusions are sensibly empirically grounded or not. In other words, they are quite transparent (Vetenskapsrådet [Swedish Science Council] 2011: 12, 17).

In sum, the research design is a synthetic, ethnomethodological approach based on its applied methods conversation analysis, discursive psychology and membership categorization analysis. These have guided the assembling, coding and analysis of the empirical data. In comparison to some studies of for instance accounts, these approaches are fairly transparent and thus robust against criticisms regarding lack of empirical grounds for any theoretical conclusions. The principle of reflexivity is however important in any analysis and will thus be applied.
b. Selection of Empirical Data and Urban Setting

According to the ethnomethodological approach, no grand theories will be attributed to the data in the coding and analysis. Only the intersubjective, observable-and-reportable understandings conveyed as meaningful by the participants themselves will be used in the data-analysis. However, the choice of empirical material has been directly guided by the general topical interest as well as the more specific aim of the study: Segregation processes in Sweden and the spatial and membership category organizations in situated interaction. Based on these topical interests, the selection of empirical evidence has concentrated on advice-seeking-and-giving, text-in-interactions in Swedish online-forums. Additionally, the study specifically focused on interactions relating to what neighborhoods participants treat as “good” or that should be “avoided” in Uppsala, Sweden.

The selection of this kind of advice-seeking-and-giving interaction is intimately related to the purpose of enhancing the theoretical understanding concerning – at least one part of – actors’ decision-making process regarding where to live. This can be related to the existing body of research concerning how actors tend to move in certain segregation-enhancing patterns. Instead of asking people how they “think” regarding this issue by the use of for instance interviews or questionnaires, this study examines how actors practically make sense of where it is “good” and “bad” to live through studying how they connect spatial- and membership categories in naturally-occurring interaction. In purposefully aiming to catch a glimpse of the actual decision-making process, one might ask whether studying conversations in which only one participant initiates the thread with a direct advice-seeking question would not result in a too limited amount of empirical data. However, while it is “only one” participant that initiates a thread, sometimes new participants use the same thread to ask their own questions. In addition, all participants partake in the assembling of collective meanings and organizations of spatial- and social categories. Finally, the group of social actors related to the interaction is not limited to “interacting participants” but include a large number of non-writing “viewers”. For instance, while a thread may “only” have a total of 45 participants, the amount of unique readers amounts to 31,385 (flashback, thread 1). Seeing that Uppsala has around 200,000 inhabitants, such an amount of actors reading about other actors’ normative views of Uppsala’s specific neighborhoods – in only one thread – is rather large. Although there is no way of knowing whether these readers have a personal decision-making interest, a general topical interest or if they simply “stumbled upon” the interaction, they have been more or less subjected to the intersubjective sense-makings in that thread. Thus, instead of perceiving each thread as one individual’s way of gaining decision-making
advice, this study takes an approach in which all active interactants as well as active readers are included in the social processes surrounding the construction of normative space.

Lastly, the selection of the city of “Uppsala” is primarily analytical. While Uppsala is considered a larger town, more specifically Sweden’s fourth largest town, it has fewer neighborhoods than for instance Stockholm and is therefore less complex in its spatial structure. In this manner, categorical organizations of space and their connection to social identities may be easier to distinguish. Additionally, while quantitative Swedish segregation studies have been performed on the larger cities Stockholm, Malmö and Gothenburg, the studies show the same macro-level processes regardless of the specific city. For instance, the correlations between social class; ethnic affiliation; type of accommodation and particular neighborhood. Hence, even though there may be certain contextual differences depending on the “specific city”, interaction practices regarding the normative organization of space most likely follow similar patterns.

c. Studying Online Discourses and Online Advice-giving

Due to the increasing digitalization, more and more research uses “online” empirical data. In ethnomethodological approaches, there have been studies of for instance “virtual identities” (Benwell & Stokoe 2006: 243). Earlier CA studies have done more “traditional” conversation analysis of online interaction, for instance studying structure differences depending on if it is face-to-face talk-in-interaction or digital text-in-interaction (Giles et al. 2015; 2016); sequential structures (Antaki & Varyeda 2009) and how members do repair (Hutchby 2001; Meredith and Stokoe 2014). In addition, there is some research on the conversational structures in the specific social action of “advice-giving”, mostly in institutional interactions that do not occur online, such as advice-giving in prison (Jing-ying 2012); evaluation interviews, university lectures and talk shows (Sandlund 2014). There are also some studies on “online advice-giving”, in which participants ask and receive advice regarding peer-response activities (Tsai & Kinginger 2015) as well as health matters (Locher 2006; Antaki & Varyeda 2009; Stommel & Meijman 2011). However, most studies are either focused on the structural and linguistic aspects of online conversation and advice-giving as well as on specific institutional interaction-forms.

In contrast, this study is less interested in the “classical” conversation analysis approach and takes a more “topical” and “applied” approach (Paulus, Warren & Lester 2016). The emphasis is thus less on conversational structure and more on how participants use membership categories in connection to space, which in this case happens to occur in peer-
based, advice-giving, digital text-in-interaction. While identities and categories constructed in “cyberspace” may seem abstract, the chosen approach simply perceives the category-organizational work that occurs online as any social interaction in the form of text or “text-in-interaction”. The online-interaction is therefore not treated as a completely “different” form of social interaction, but simply as regular interaction that happens to take place online. Subsequently, “online-category-work” is perceived as just as “real” as the category-work done in face-to-face interaction (Benwell & Stokoe 2006: 243-279). From this perspective, research on digital interaction is not to “get to” the people behind the screen, but sees it from the ethnomethodological perspective as every-day, social action (Lamerichs & te Molder 2003, Flinkfeldt 2016: 59-61).

d. Research Procedure
On a more practical level, the specific online-forums and text-in-interaction discourses were chosen in accordance with the purpose and research question. Two Swedish online-forums were selected due to their size and relevance to the kind of discourse that is of interest: flashback and familjeliv. In the beginning of the study, I first thought of only using flashback as online-forum, since it is the largest in Sweden with over one million registered users, around 2.3 million unique visitors per week and 57 148 305 posts in writing time (May 2017). However, because of its known bias towards the political right (Törnberg & Törnberg 2016), I chose to include the online-interactions from familjeliv, a forum designated for parents with around one million unique visitors per week (Damberg 2016). Unfortunately, the exact number of total posts in this forum could not be found. I would also have liked to include interactions from other forums, as well as spoken interaction, in order to render a more general picture of mundane, segregation processes. This was however not possible with regard to the time-frame of this study, which resulted in prioritizing quality over quantity. Nevertheless, the distinct, patterned employment of specific spatial and social categories throughout the investigated interactions regardless of forum or thread finally rendered the conclusion that the collected data is quite sufficient for providing trustworthy answers to the research questions and consequently, fulfilling the aim of this thesis.

The threads were found by searching these chosen online-forums for specific advice-giving threads in which a participant directly asks for advice concerning what neighborhoods that are “good” or “bad” to live in Uppsala, as well as threads with questions regarding the “normative quality” of specific neighborhoods. I also limited the number of threads with regard to a time-frame of discussions which have taken place during these last 10
years, that is, interactions ranging between 2007 and 2017. While this reduces the amount of material, this decision was also based on analytical grounds since the spatial and social composition of Uppsala gradually changes, for instance new buildings, neighborhoods and population. Thus, the study of interactions too far back in time become irrelevant – if the aim was not to examine interactional temporal change – which undeniably is an interesting approach but not incorporated in the purpose of this paper.

After finding the topic- and time-relevant threads in the two forums, the coding-process followed three main steps. The first step was to attain a more general understanding of their main topics, subtopics and conversational patterns. At this point, I also looked for similarities and differences, in order to see if there were any marked dissimilarities between the forums and threads. After this, threads with less than five answers or that were focused on other subject matters were weeded out, while the topically-relevant conversations were chosen to conduct a more detailed applied CA, DP and MCA line-by-line analysis. In flashback, 11 of 14 threads, which translates to 324 out of 344 posts, were chosen. In familjeliv, the selection included 10 of 13 threads and 309 out of 328 posts. In total, the final amount of DP and MCA analyzed data amounts to 21 threads and 632 posts (see tables 1 and 2 in appendix). Lastly, the excerpts selected as empirical illustrations were translated from their original language (Swedish) to English. Rather than performing a purely literal translation however, the translations aim to convey the participant-based meaning. Relatedly, as long as spelling mistakes do not alter the meaning, they will be kept. The translation was further done after the coding and analysis procedure, in order to be able to analyze the original data. Both the Swedish original discourse and the English translation will be presented as empirical evidence (Benwell & Stokoe 2006: iix-xii, Flinkfeldt 2016: 61-65).

e. Ethical Considerations
These forums are “open” for the public to read. Because of this, the data was perceived and used as any other published text, in other words, as material that can be freely used for research purposes. Furthermore, the individuals per se are not of interest for this study, only their published utterances as digital text-in-interaction. Because of this, there appears to be no necessity in trying to locate the specific individuals behind their log-in names. Moreover, attempting to trace the identity of each and every-one of the members in order to ask for permission to use their comments would be nearly impossible. Hence, while complete anonymity cannot be promised, the information is treated as confidential. This means that no attempt will be given to demonstrate the origin of the specific texts in order to respect the
integrity of the participants. In addition, the “profile-names” will be coded to synonyms with a similar style or tone, in order to maintain the “feeling” of the persona while maintaining the principle of confidentiality. A further reason for giving synonyms, in contrast to keeping the original profile-names, is that the same “persona” or ”profile-name” may appear in different forums and threads (Vetenskapsrådet 2011: 18-24, 42-69, 105-107).

5. Results and Analysis
The ways in which interactants collaboratively connect spatial- and membership categories (cf. Benwell & Stokoe 2006; Stokoe 2012) and assign meaning to them follows similar patterns throughout the studied ten-year period. The selected excerpts illustrate these main patterns and will be presented with their respective analysis. First, the analytical focus will be on how advice-seeking is performed. This is followed by how participants collaboratively categorize areas as normatively “good”, “in between” or “bad” by making normative connections with the collective identities (cf. Benwell & Stokoe 2006) “good people” and “bad people”, which are treated as naturally and inherently morally entitled to or as morally legitimately excluded from “good spaces”. In this fashion, actors are assembling spatial-social boundaries between a normatively superior “us” and the morally inferior “others” by the attribution of distinctively normative, spatial identities, which I propose terming normative-spatial-identities, which will be applied and further discussed in the concluding discussion.

Before we turn to the more detailed analysis however, let us begin by presenting the general context of the interactions (cf. Schegloff 1972). The location, main topic and activity are defined as advice-seeking-and-giving interactions in Swedish online-forums concerning where it is “good” or “bad” to live in Uppsala. With regard to the configuration of participants, the only known association is that they are interacting on the same forum and thread as well as most likely have some kind of connection to Uppsala. Otherwise, the participants treat each other as if they are anonymous strangers throughout the interactions (cf. Schegloff 1972). As to the sequential structure, the fact that the threads are initiated as advice-seeking-questions means that they can be regarded as first pair parts of a longer sequence of adjacency pairs. The first post thus decides the subject and sets certain preconditions for the following interaction (cf. Sacks et al. 1974).
## Table 1. Excerpts of How Participants do Advice-Seeking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excerpt</th>
<th>Thread-topic, Writer, Date and Time</th>
<th>Line-numbers</th>
<th>English Translation</th>
<th>Original, Swedish Post</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Where in Uppsala should one live? Red Eyed Jack 2009-01-25, 15:57</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>Where in Uppsala should one move? My sis has gotten a job in Uppsala, but knows no-one there and doesn’t know where it is to live. She’s going to buy an apartment. Are there any dangerous places or is it only sleepy country-lifestyle all around town?</td>
<td>Var i Uppsala ska man bosätta sig? Min syra har fått jobb i Uppsala, men känner ingen där och vet inte var det är ok att bo. Hon ska köpa en bostadsrätt. Finns det ställen som är farliga eller är det bara sömnigt lantliv i hela stan?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Where does one want to live in Uppsala? Sassysass 2009-02-07, 14:49</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15</td>
<td>Well, as you see in the topic: does one want to live in Uppsala and in that case, where? there is a chance that I get a reason to move to Uppsala for work, I bring my wife and two small kids. as a typical Skåning it all feels very exotic but we live in weird times and I am not the one to complain. the biggest “problem” is housing. I’m looking for something calm, relatively in the center of town and Swedish. I’ve looked around at some older threads but there doesn’t seem to be any consensus regarding where one should and should not live. thanks for advice!</td>
<td>Ja, som ni ser i rubriken: vill man bo Uppsala och i fall var? det finns en chans att jag får anledning att flytta till Uppsala för arbete, med mig har jag fru och två barn i dagisåldern. som den inbitne Skåning man är känns det hela väldigt exotiskt men vi lever i konstiga tider och jag är inte den som är den. det största “problemet” är bostad. jag söker något som är lugnt, relativt centralt belaget och svensk. Har kollat runt lite i gamla trådar men det verkar inte finnas någon konsensus kring var man bör och inte bör bo. tackssam för råd!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Where should one live and not live in Uppsala? Complainzeek 2012-05-20, 22:25</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>In case of ev. moving to Uppsala I’m wondering where one should and should not live. What neighborhoods are these? I’ve taken the list from Uppsalahems’ homepage. I know absolutely nada about Uppsala.</td>
<td>Vid en ev flytt till Uppsala undrar jag lite var man ska bo, och inte bo. Vad är detta för områden? Har tagit listan som finns på Uppsalahems hemsida. Jag kan absolut nada om Uppsala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Neighborhoods in Uppsala Andrew’s chick 2007-06-01, 07:41</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>I don’t really know Uppsala very well. Which neighborhoods do you think are nice? Which neighborhoods should one avoid? Which neighborhoods are classified as “fancy”/exclusive?</td>
<td>Jag kan inte Uppsala så jättebra. Vilka områden är trevliga tycker ni? Vilka områden bör man akta sig för? Vilka områden klassas som ”fancy”/exclusiva?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 “Skåne”: the southernmost county of Sweden
2 Website for searching for rental apartments, the list has been excluded as irrelevant
I have a few questions about this. My girlfriend and I are thinking about moving from Sundsvall to Uppsala in January 2008. My girl is a trained nurse and I will be a trained tiler when we move there. Our questions are. How is Uppsala as a city to live in? Safe? A lot of robbery etc.? What neighborhoods should one live in and which should one avoid? Where is it most expensive to live? What organizations rent homes in Uppsala? (Rentals) How does the price-range for rentals look like in different areas in Uppsala? If you have any other information to offer, we’ll be grateful for it.

Hey there. My wife and I are buying a house in Sävja and after having read the posts we’ve become a little unsure. The question is if it’s like rinkeby, tensna and similar places? how many percent are Swedish and how many are immigrants? Maybe not so dangerous with variation but if the majority are immigrants maybe one should aim to buy at more expensive areas (more Swedes)

I am anonymous because I don’t want people to know that we’re planning to move and get cross. We’re planning to move to Uppsala and would like some advice about which neighborhood one should live in. A few wishes: apartments (3-4-rooms) for sale that are fresh and cost around 1 million or less, not too far from the center of town (one should be able to take the bus), and optimistically a nice neighborhood where seniors or families with children live.

First of all, these examples illustrate the way in which participants make advice-asking legitimate (cf. Edwards 2005; 2006) in this specific context. The first way of doing this is stating a reason for being in genuine need of this information, mostly due to a prominent move to Uppsala. Furthermore, many initiators also communicate that they somehow are “strangers” to Uppsala and because of this, do not know much about its normative, spatial

Creating Legitimacy for Advice-Seeking and Discursively Orienting to Normative Structures


Tjena. Jag och min fru ska köpa hus i Sävja och efter att ha läst inläggen har vi blivit lite tveksamma. Frågan är om det är som rinkeby, tensna och liknande ställen? hur många procent är svenskar och hur många är invandrare? kanske inte är så farligt med en blandning men är övervägande majoriteten invandrare kanske man ska sikta på att köpa på dyrare (mer svenskar) ställen.

Jag är anonym för att inte folk ska veta att vi planerar flytt och bli sura. Vi planerar att flytta till Uppsala och skulle vilja ha tips om vilken stadsdel man bör bo i. Några önskemål: bostadsrätter (typ 3a-4a) som är fräscha och kostar kring 1 miljon eller mindre, inte för långt från stadsärrn (man ska kunna åka en buss), och gärna ett trevligt område där det bor äldre eller barnfamiljer
organization. For example: “My sis’ has gotten a job in Uppsala, but doesn’t know anyone there and doesn’t know where it is ok to live” (excerpt 1, lines 3-4); “there is a chance that I get a reason to move to Uppsala... as an out-and-out Skåning it all feels very exotic” (2, lines 3-4, 6-7); and “In case of eventual moving to Uppsala... I know absolutely nada about Uppsala” (3, lines 2-3, 5-6). In addition, it is also common that advice-seekers state that they have looked for information before they turned to the forum but nevertheless are in need of further advice, portraying it as a last resort in lack of other ways of gaining this necessary information. For instance: “I’ve looked around a little at some older threads” (2, lines 13-14) and “What neighborhoods are these? I’ve taken the list from Uppsalahems’ homepage” (3, lines 3-5). This enhances the legitimacy of doing “advice-asking” by depicting them as having epistemic (Heritage 2012; Iversen 2014) reason for it, instead of for instance appearing as inherently lazy or idle in wasting their own and other participants’ time on the online-forum. This management of legitimacy can for example be connected to Edwards’ (2005) study of how participants depict themselves as legitimate or inherent complainers.

Moreover, by doing advice-seeking regarding where “one should” and “should not” live, participants make observable the objective and normative character of space. For instance: “Where in Uppsala should one move? ... Are there any dangerous places or is it only sleepy country-lifestyle all around town?” (1, lines 1, 6-7); where “one should and should not live” (2, lines 1-2, 16-17 & 3, lines 4-5); and “Which neighborhoods do you think are nice... should one avoid?” (4, lines 4-5). Firstly, advice-seekers consistently use contrasts (cf. Wiggins 2016: 123) and the modal formulation (cf. Edwards 2006) “should”, creating a dichotomous picture in which neighborhoods either are homogenously “good” or “bad”. The formulation “should” versus “should not” reflects a sense of social obligation pertaining to the decision regarding where to move, which could be compared with alternative formulations such as “could” or “can”. In addition, this normative spatial dichotomy is portrayed as being “objective” by the specific management of the subjective-objective side of the advice-asking (cf. Edwards 2005; 2006). Even though advice-seekers make observable that they are asking for specific people, such as themselves and their families, they regularly use the non-specific pronoun “one”. In doing this, the question becomes more objectively oriented, making observable how the participant is orienting to a more general social standard. In other words, there is a detachment of “subjective side” of the advice-seeking-post and the “objectively-oriented” advice. In sum, the combination of the modal verb (cf. Edwards 2006) “should”, the pronoun “one” and contrasts (cf. Wiggins 2016: 123) make observable how advice-seekers orient to objective and normative structures of either “good” or “bad” neighborhoods.
Orienting to Normative Structures by Linking Spatial Categories and Spatial Identities

In addition, advice-seekers construct normative, *spatial collective identities* by connecting *spatial categories* and *membership categories* (cf. Benwell & Stokoe 2006; Stokoe 2012). For example: “How many percent are Swedish and how many are immigrants? Maybe not so dangerous with variation but if the majority are immigrants maybe one should aim to buy at more expensive areas (more Swedes)” (4, lines 5-11). Here, the participant makes rational links between “more expensive” areas and a “Swedish” population, and in contrast, “dangerous” and by deduction “cheaper” areas with a dominant “immigrant” population. The *membership category* (Stokoe 2012) “immigrant” is thus oriented to as inherently dangerous, while “Swedes” are inherently benign. Subsequently, “Swedish” and “immigrant” could be perceived as *categorical, collective identities* (cf. Benwell & Stokoe 2006).

This can also be seen in how some participants *list* (Jefferson 1990) “desirable” characteristics regarding the kind of neighborhood they would like to live in. Such lists make visible how certain categories and *predicates* (cf. Stokoe 2012) rationally and practically “go together”. For instance: “calm, relatively in the center of town and Swedish” (2, lines 11-13) and “for sale”; “fresh”; “not too far from the center”; “nice”; where “seniors” and “families with children live” (excerpt 7, lines 6-13). Both examples make clear the desired spatial location of a “good” neighborhood-category as being near the “center” of the city, depicting “the center” as an important predicate in the normative spatial category “good neighborhood”. They also state the membership categories: “Swedish”, “seniors” and “families with children”, which are linked with the *predicates* (cf. Stokoe 2012) “calm” and “nice”. According to the *consistency rule* and how membership categories are *inference rich* (cf. Stokoe 2012), these membership categories could be classified as being parts of the same *collective identity* (cf. Benwell & Stokoe 2006) “good people”. Likewise, in seeking a “good neighborhood” where “good people“ inherently belong, advice-seekers are implicitly portraying *themselves* as belonging to this positive *collective identity* (cf. Benwell & Stokoe 2006) and as *morally entitled* to “good spaces”, as well as to actively avoid “bad spaces”.

Conversely, while these lists do not explicitly state the membership categories included in the collective identity “bad people”, this can be deduced by finding their categorical opposites. In this interaction, these would for instance include the *membership categories* (cf. Stokoe 2012) “immigrants”, “single-person-homes” and “young people” These are implicitly treated as essentially “not calm” and “not nice” and subsequently, as being *morally legitimately excluded* from “good spaces”. Furthermore, since the *collective identities* “good” and “bad” people are treated as having a specifically “conflicting”, normative
association, they could be compared to relational identities (cf. Benwell & Stokoe 2006) as well as standardized relational pairs (cf. Stokoe 2012).

Consequently, in seeking advice regarding “good” and “bad” neighborhoods to live in, participants make taken for granted, inherently-depicted normative links between spatial categories and spatial identities. In other words, they are making sense of normative space and constructing spatial-social boundaries by orienting to and attributing what I propose calling normative-spatial-identities. In comparison to the more general concept “spatial identities”, this concept highlights the inherently depicted, normative character of certain spatial identities exploited by interactants in their normative construction of space. In order to further illustrate its application and meaning, this concept will be used in the subsequent analysis and finally be discussed in more depth in the concluding discussion.

b. The Collaborative Assembling of Normative Space and Attribution of Normative-Spatial-Identities

Let us now turn to how the following text-in-interactions evolve. In short, the interactions follow specific patterns which relate to how the advice-seeking post was formulated. These patterns include providing legitimacy for advice-giving regarding normative, spatial evaluations by managing objective-subjective formulations (cf. Edwards 2005; 2006); making normative and inherently portrayed connections between spatial categories and spatial identities (cf. Benwell & Stokoe 2006); and – in this fashion – engaging in implicit inclusion-exclusion practices by the attribution of normative-spatial-identities.

The Basic Categorization of “Good”, “In Between” and “Bad” Neighborhoods

Table 2. Excerpt 1. “Where in Uppsala should one live?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Post-number</th>
<th>Writer, Date and Time</th>
<th>Line-numbers</th>
<th>English Translation</th>
<th>Original, Swedish Post</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Red Eyed Jack 2009-01-25, 15:57</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>Where in Uppsala should one move? My sis’ has gotten a job in Uppsala, but doesn’t know anyone there and doesn’t know where it is ok to live. She’s going to buy an apartment. Are there any dangerous places or is it only sleepy country-lifestyle all around town?</td>
<td>Var i Uppsala ska man bosätta sig? Min syrra har fått jobb i Uppsala, men känner ingen där och vet inte var det är ok att bo. Hon ska köpa en bostadsrätt. Finns det ställen som är farliga eller är det bara sömnigt lantliv i hela stan?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tentpicket, 2009-01-25, 16:04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The Center of town, Fålhagen, Luthagen, Fyrislund and Vaksala are good neighborhoods. Gottsunda, Gränby and Salabacke can very well be avoided. Everything depends on what budget your sister has.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Budget around a million. She needs a two-bedroom apartment at least</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Budget är runtt miljonen. Hon behöver minst en trea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Oh, then it’s probably Salabacke or Gränby if it’s supposed to as close to town as possible. Läby in Gamla Uppsala should also have apartments in that price-range, but is farther away from the center. All of these neighborhoods are on the East part of town. To the West you find Flogsta which is a marked student-area but it probably also has cheap apartments for sale. Uppsala isn’t particularly cheap FYI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ah, då blir det förmodligen Salabacke eller Gränby om det skall vara så nära stan som möjligt. Läby i Gamla Uppsala bör också ha lägenheter i den prisklassen, men med större avstånd till stan. Samtliga dessa områden ligger öster om stan, till väster finns det Flogsta som är ett utpräglat studentområde men det har förmodligen även billiga BR. Uppsala är inte särskilt billigt FYI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Shit. And I was thinking it was a sort of cheap country-place. 😞</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shit. Jag som trodde det var en ganska billig håla. 😞</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This first excerpt makes visible how participants use discursive devices to *legitimate* (cf. Edwards 2005; 2006) the accounts and collaboratively orient to normative spatial categories by classifying them as either “good”, “in between” or “bad”. In the first response from Tentpicket, names of different neighborhoods are *listed* (cf. Jefferson 1990) within each normative category (lines 8-13), being treated as belonging to the same spatial categories “good” and “bad” neighborhoods. Hence, the normative, spatial contrasts between good and bad neighborhoods in Red Eyed Jack’s advice-seeking post (line 1) are agreed upon. In other words, the *second pair part is preferenced* and fulfills the *first pair part* (cf. Sacks et al. 1974). Also, in response to Red Eyed Jack’s more general assessment of normative space in asking *if* there are “any dangerous places” in Uppsala (line 6), Tentpicket answers that certain areas “very well can be avoided” (line 11). By adding “very well”, he *upgrades* (cf. Wiggins 2016: 123) Red Eyed Jack’s first assessment and strengthens the intersubjective knowledge regarding normative space. The *objective formulation* further gives the impression that these areas should be avoided in general and that they thus are “objectively bad”, providing *legitimacy* (cf. Edwards 2005; 2006) for the advice. This can be contrasted to simply “informing” that such places exist in Uppsala. The response thus reflects the normative, objectively-oriented advice-seeking first pair part was formulated (line 1).

Moreover, Tentpicket adds *economic* and *spatial dimensions* to this decision-
making situation and neighborhood categorization, making visible the existence of “in between neighborhoods”. First, in the sentence “Everything depends on what budget your sister has” (lines 12-13), the specific formulation “everything depends” can be seen as an extreme case formulation (cf. Heritage 2009) instead of the more neutral “it depends”, creating a picture that the subjective decision regarding where to live in Uppsala does not solely depend on one’s personal, normative opinions but also is limited by one’s economic assets. In other words, the participants are orienting to structural boundaries (cf. Hillbert 1990) in society. Red Eyed Jack then answers: “around a million. She needs a two-bedroom apartment at least” (lines 14-15). While the number of rooms is precisely formulated, the budget is formulated more vaguely, providing more space for forthcoming advice. As a response to this new information, Tentpicket’s answer begins with: “Oh, then it’s probably...” (line 16), showing a change of epistemic stance (cf. Heritage 2012) and listing entirely different neighborhoods than in the first answer, showing how the range of “good neighborhoods” has become scarce with the stated budget and apartment-size and that Red Eyed Jack most likely will have to settle with a cheaper, “in between neighborhood” instead. The economic aspect is thus treated as a definite limitation in this decision-making process. In addition, the participant adds another dimension regarding the decision-making, the spatial location with regard the distance to the “center” of town and if it is on the East or West “student” side of the city (lines 17-18, 21-23). Tentpicket’s advice and less-than-pleasant information is furthermore legitimized by depicting it as an objective fact: “Uppsala isn’t particularly cheap FYI” (lines 27-28). By using “particularly” and “FYI”, the participant is also portraying himself as being more knowledgeable than Red Eyed Jack, who is made to appear naïve to believe that (only) one million would be sufficient to buy an apartment in a truly “good neighborhood” like those listed in post 2. Lastly, Red Eyed Jack answers: “Shit. And I was thinking it was a sort of cheap country-place”. The advice-seeker thus acknowledges how his epistemic knowledge (cf. Heritage 2012) has been altered as a result of the interaction in an expressively disappointed way, using a curse-word and a sad emoji.

In sum, this excerpt illustrates how responses reflect and fulfil the objectively-oriented, normative structure in the advice-seeking post, contributing to the collective normative categorization of space. Participants categorize neighborhoods as “good”, “in between” or “bad” neighborhoods by using lists (cf. Jefferson 1990), and treat economic assets and spatial location as important categorization factors. Advice-givers also legitimize the advice by using objective and epistemic formulations (cf. Edwards 2005;2006 & Heritage 2012), making visible how they also are orienting towards an objective “social norm”
regarding the normative organization of urban space. The following table shows the
continuation of the interaction in the same thread, highlighting how participants orient to
normative space by linking the spatial categories with specific, normative membership
categories (cf. Benwell & Stokoe 2006; Stokoe 2012).

Linking Spatial Categories and Spatial Identities: Attributing Normative-Spatial-Identities

Table 3. Excerpt 2. Continuation of “Where in Uppsala should one live?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Post-number</th>
<th>Writer, Date and Time</th>
<th>Line-numbers</th>
<th>English Translation</th>
<th>Original, Swedish Post</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Swing-Pete, 2009-01-25, 16:44</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Gottsunda is probably the most “ghetto-like suburb”, where apparently cars burn every week nowadays. Flogsta, Stenhagen and a certain part of Kvarngärdet are also counted as inferior neighborhoods. Luthagen is kind of the equivalent of Stockholm’s Östermalm. It’s nice, and the niiciiest addresses are located here as well. (after Kåbo, but there there’re almost only big villas.) The front of Fålhagen is almost as nice and niicii.</td>
<td>Gottsunda är väl den mest &quot;ghettobetonade förorten&quot;, där brinner det tydliigen bilar varje vecka nuförtiden. Flogsta, Stenhagen och till viss del Kvarngärdet räknas väl också till de sämre områdena. Luthagen är lite som motsvarigheten till Stockholms Östermalm. Det är fint, och här ligger dessutom de fiiinaste adresserna. (Näst efter Kåbo, men där finns nästan bara stora villor.) Främre Fålhagen är nästan lika fint och fiiint.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Parts of Salabackar are okay. Eriksberg is nice, but somewhat off in location. Tunabackar is charming!</td>
<td>Kollade hemnet lite snabbt: Delar av Salabackar är okej. Eriksberg är fint, men lite avsides. Tunabackar är charmigt! Sommarro är urgulligt! Stabby är bra, ligger precis bortom Luthagen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Sommarro is adorable! Stabby is good, it’s situated just beyond Luthagen.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3 Well known Swedish website for searching houses and apartments for sale
In this interaction, participants continue orienting to the same normative spatial categories as above. For instance, Swing-Pete also responds to the advice-seeking post by listing and categorizing specific neighborhoods as “bad”, “good” or “in between”. He begins with the “bad”: “Gottsunda is probably the most ‘ghetto-like suburb’, where apparently cars burn every week nowadays” (lines 2-3). Although the words “probably” and apparently” show a degree of uncertainty, which reduces the risk of being held accountable (cf. Wiggins 2016: 123-125) to a normatively strong account, the overall formulation is objective, providing...

UNT: Uppsala Nya Tidning, Local newspaper in Uppsala
legitimacy to the account by portraying it as “fact” (cf. Edwards 2005;2006). The legitimacy is further strengthened by the use of a three-part list (Jefferson 1990) of other “inferior” neighborhoods (lines 3-5) and statement that the information in post 2 is based on an “official website” (line 13). Once again then, the objectively-oriented, normative formulation of the advice-seeking post is reflected in the advice-giving response.

Furthermore, as a direct response to the question if there are any “dangerous” places in Uppsala (excerpt 1, post 1, line 6), “Gottsunda” is referred to as being the most “ghetto-like” neighborhood. This specific formulation infers specific, negative predicates (cf. Stokoe 2012) corresponding with “dangerous places”. In addition, Swing-Pete offers certain category-bound activities (cf. Stokoe 2012), for instance that “cars burn every week” (lines 2-3), constructing an image of regularly occurring vandalism in this specific area. Hence, “Gottsunda” is depicted as an inherently dangerous neighborhood. In a similar fashion, “good neighborhoods” are listed with the predicates “nice”, “adorable”, “charming” and “good” (lines 6-18), though “Salabacke” seems to once again fall in the “in between” category as only “parts of” it are judged as being “okay” (line 14). “Luthagen” with the “niicest addresses” is also compared to “Östermalm” in Stockholm (lines 6-8), displaying an assumption that the advice-seeker might be familiar with Stockholm’s normative spatial organization. While “Kåbo” is treated as even nicer, it “only has big villas” (line 10), displaying how the decision-making is limited by economic assets. On the other hand, no further clarification or category-bound activity is provided as to why these neighborhoods are classified as “good”, showing how the participant is treating “good” as the norm – needing no further explanation – while “bad” is depicted as deviant.

Post number 3 by Hippietiger begins with “Gränby and Gottsunda should of course be avoided at all cost” (lines 19-20). By referring back to earlier valuations of “bad” neighborhoods, which can be seen in the use of “of course”, the participant is displaying how he agrees with the former, collaborative categorization of neighborhoods. The term “of course” also suggests that something is obvious and non-negotiable, which when used in combination with the extreme case formulation (Heritage 2009) “at all cost” results in a depiction of these neighborhoods as exceptionally and objectively bad. Additionally, the use of the modal verb “should” enhances how Hippietiger also is orienting to a “general standard” regarding the normative value of neighborhoods. He thus portrays the account as legitimate by using the same objective, normative formulations as the other participants. Further down in the post when speaking of how “Eriksberg” has been “dreggified” however, the account is legitimized by exploiting subjective formulations: “I’m speaking from personal experience”
(lines 37-40), creating the image of a reliable witness to the account. Hence, Hippietiger exploits objectivity as well as subjectivity in different parts of the account, portraying the accounts as “trustworthy” (cf. Edwards 2005; 2006).

The interactant continues to classify neighborhoods by linking their normative value with the membership categories (cf. Stokoe 2012) living there. For instance, while he agrees with the categorization of “Gränby” and “Gottsunda” as “bad”, the previous classification of “Luthagen” as a “good neighborhood” is questioned by listing arguments in a three-part-list (Jefferson 1990) portrayed as objective “facts” (cf. Edwards 2006) from the local newspaper UNT. These include a “heterogeneous”, “low-payed” population as well as “ordinary” buildings (lines 26-34). Hence, the normative value of the neighborhood is treated as worse due to a multiethnic, poorer population and the quality and appearance of the buildings. In addition, “bad neighborhoods” are populated by “riffraff” (line 21); “misfit rabble” or simply “rabble” (lines 25, 41); “brats” (line 42); and “packs of disgusting, worthless underclass-kids” (lines 45-46). He further describes “Salabacke” and “Eriksberg” as having been nice at one time but since then been “dreggified” (lines 22-23, 37-38). In this fashion, the term “dreggified” suggests a process of deterioration of normative value directly connected to the increased presence of “dregs”. This is further marked as dangerous with the warning “CAUTION!!!” (line 37).

Hence, the participant is orienting to and assembling normative space by the attribution of the normative-spatial-identity “bad people”, which is treated as inherently linked to the normative value of “bad places”. This is contrasted with the normative-spatial-identity “good people” or “decent people” (line 21). The category “bad people” is moreover associated with the category-bound activities (cf. Stokoe 2012) “run around doodling, vandalizing, stealing bikes, raging and harassing people” and “beating” old people (lines 42-49). The last activity is depicted as the worst, which is legitimized by providing a time-specific, detailed example (lines 44-49, cf. Wiggins 2016: 123-125). Additionally, these “bad people” are not solely linked to specific neighborhoods but to specific kinds of buildings, which can be related to how Swing-Pete connects “good neighborhoods” with “big villas” (line 10). This can be seen in the “tragic” depiction of how the “beautiful forest and nature-reserve” is contrasted with “ugly high-raisers” (lines 48-55), treating these two aspects as being inherently opposed. Interestingly, Hippietiger only describes “bad neighborhoods” and their inherent “bad people”, without mentioning “good neighborhoods”. This corresponds to how Swing-Pete does not clarify why “good neighborhoods” de facto are “good”, strengthening the collective portrayal of “bad” as abnormal and “good” as the norm.
To summarize these results, participants *legitimize* advice-giving-accounts by the use of *objective* as well as *subjective* formulations (cf. Edwards 2005; 2006). Additionally, they collaboratively make taken for granted, normative connections between “good spaces” and “good people”, which is contrasted to “bad spaces” and “bad people”. The *normative-spatial-identities* “good people” and “bad people” are further linked to specific, normative *category-bound activities* and are treated as *inherently* good or bad (cf. Stokoe 2012). Finally, by ascribing the “good” *normative-spatial-identity* to each other and treating this as the norm, interactants are making *moral entitlements* to “good spaces” while *morally legitimately excluding* “deviant bad people”.

**Additional Illustrations of Major Interaction Patterns**

The following excerpts further illustrate how the collaborative construction of normative space and attribution of *normative-spatial-identities* follow the same main patterns, regardless of forum or thread. While the analysis of the former excerpts have been presented in a more traditional line-by-line analysis, the analysis of the next excerpts will be presented in accordance with each main analytical point.

**Table 4. Except 3. Where does one want to live in Uppsala?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Post-number</th>
<th>Writer, Date and Time</th>
<th>Line-numbers</th>
<th>English Translation</th>
<th>Original, Swedish Post</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>SassySass 2009-02-07, 14:49</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Well, as you see in the topic: does one want to live in Uppsala and in that case, where? there is a chance that I get a reason to move to Uppsala for work, I bring my wife and two small kids. as a typical Skåning it all feels very exotic but we live in weird times and I am not the one to complain. the biggest “problem” is housing. I’m looking for something calm, relatively in the center of town and Swedish. I’ve looked around at some older threads but there doesn’t seem to be any consensus regarding where one should and should not live. thanks for advice!</td>
<td>Ja, som ni ser i rubriken: vill man bo Uppsala och i fall var? det finns en chans att jag får anledning att flytta till Uppsala för arbete, med mig har jag fru och två barn i dagisåldern. som den inbitne Skåning man är känns det hela väldigt exotiskt men vi lever i konstiga tider och jag är inte den som är den. det största ”problemet” är bostad. jag söker något som är lugnt, relativt centralt beläget och svenskt. Har kollat runt lite i gamla trådar men det verkar inte finnas någon konsensus kring var man bör och inte bör bo. tacksam för råd!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Von Heidegger 2009-02-07, 15:30</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>If you avoid Gränby, Gottsunda, Stenhagen and maybe one more neighborhood there is a big chance that it is Swedish in Uppsala.</td>
<td>Undvikar du Gränby, Gottsunda, Stenhagen och kanske något område till är det stor chans att det är svenskt i Uppsala.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

5 “Skåne” is the most southern state in Sweden.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Post-number</th>
<th>Writer, Date and Time</th>
<th>Line-numbers</th>
<th>English Translation</th>
<th>Original, Swedish Post</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Complainzeek 2012-05-20, 22:25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>In case of eventual moving to Uppsala I’m wondering where one should and should not live. What neighborhoods are these? I’ve taken the list from Uppsalahems’ homepage. I know absolutely nada about Uppsala.</td>
<td>Vid en ev flytt till Uppsala undrar jag lite var man ska bo, och inte bo. Vad är detta för områden? Har tagit listan som finns på Uppsalahemshems hemsida. Jag kan absolut nada om Uppsala.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Eraynee 2012-05-20, 22:51</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Gottsunda, Stenhagen &amp; Sävja are no places I would like to live anyway. But in Gottsunda you have a chance of getting an apartment very quickly, compared to</td>
<td>Gottsunda, Stenhagen &amp; Sävja är ingenstans jag skulle vilja bo iallafall. Men i Gottsunda har du chans att få en lägenhet väldigt snabbt, jämfört med</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Website for searching for rental apartments, the list has been excluded as irrelevant*
11 Everyone wants to live in Sala Backar and Luthagen so there it’s 12-13 years of queue-time. Tuna Backar is also nice, quite central. Kåbo is nice and expensive. A lot of old villas there. In flogsta there are many students. Nice place if you don’t live at the high-raisers. Sunnersta is a little “high-class”. A lot of villas in Nåntuna and Valsättra, a lot of families with kids
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11 other areas. Almunge is far from town.

många andra delar. Almunge är en bit utanför stan.

12 Everyone wants to live in Sala Backar and Luthagen so there it’s 12-13 years of queue-time. Tuna Backar is also nice, quite central. Kåbo is nice and expensive. A lot of old villas there. In flogsta there are many students. Nice place if you don’t live at the high-raisers. Sunnersta is a little “high-class”. A lot of villas in Nåntuna and Valsättra, a lot of families with kids


22 I live near Länna, there’re not many apartments here but they become available from time to time. It’s a small town... mostly villas with "regular folk", close to the lake and good bus-lines to town.

Jag bor nära Länna, det finns inte så många lägenheter här, men det kommer ut nån ledig då och då. Det är en liten by... mest villor med "vanligt folk", nära sjön och bra bussförbindelser till stan.

23 Is it rental apartment you’re in search of? In that case one have to take what one gets... If you want to buy a house there are more neighborhoods than what the list shows. Stenhagen can be ok. a lot of villas and houses have been built the last yeas which has made it a little "nicer" neighborhood. The houses and area is nice as well. The problem has been that it’s been somewhat rowdy, but is fortunately a little better now with the new buildings. Not my first-hand-choice but worth looking at because of the long queue-time in other areas

Är det hyreslägenhet som ni söker? Då är det lite att man får ta vad man får... Om ni ska köpa hus så finns det fler områden än vad listan anger. Stenhagen kan vara ok. Har byggts mycket villor och radhus där de senaste åren som gjort att det har blivit ett lite "bättre" område. Själva husen och området är fint också. Problemet har varit att det varit stökigt, men förhoppningsvis lite bättre med den nya bebyggelsen. Inte mitt förstahandsval men med tanke på kötider till andra områden så kan det vara värt att titta på.

28 Thanks for responding! It would be nice to have good pre-schools and schools close by. My husband is going to commute to Stockholm so preferably not too far towards Timbuktu.

Tack för svar! Det får gärna finnas bra förskolor och skolor i närheten. Min man kommer tågpendla till Sthlm så inte allför långt åt tjotahejti 😊

29 Gottsunda is the only area I had stayed away from...Sävja is nice in my opinion, despite its reputation. I only lived there one year though. Sure, it could have been a somewhat better, but it’s still a very nice neighborhood. Nature, horses and sheep(!) close to supermarket...cozy! Except the supermarket there is, hmmm... a health center, drug store, two kiosks, pizzerias, school, library. If one has a car it’s very easy to get to Boländerna (IKEA etc). I had stayed away from the apartments close to one of the kiosks (one can collect mail-deliveries there by the way),

Gottsunda är det enda området jag hade hållit mig borta ifrån... Sävja är bra enligt mig, trots rykten. Bodde dock bara där i ett år. Visst hade det kunnat vara ännu lite bättre, men det är ändå ett väldigt bra område. Natur finns plus häst och får(?) nära ICA... mysigt! Förutom en ica finns det väl, hmm... vårdcentral, apotek, två kiosker, pizzerier, skola, bibliotek. Har man bil är det ju väldigt lätt att ta sig till Boländerna (IKEA osv). Jag hade dock hållit mig borta från lägenheterna nära ena kiosken (man kan förövrigt hämta paket där), tror det är Gotlandsresan. Sävja hade kunnat vara ett perfekt litet...
think it’s Gotlandsresan. Sävja could’ve been a perfect little “society”, could imagine living there again. It’s so cozy and not so far from town, but to be blunt the immigration, in my opinion, lowers the “cozyness”.

Firstly, the advice-giving responses reflect the objectively-oriented, normative advice-seeking post, for instance by using modal formulations (cf. Edwards 2006) and normatively contrasting lists (cf. Jefferson 1990) of “good” and “bad” neighborhoods (excerpt 3: 16-19, 25-42; excerpt 4: 7-21). In this fashion, interactants are collaboratively orienting to and assembling what they treat as an “objective standard” of normative space. These normative evaluations are further legitimized by using both objective and subjective formulations (cf. Edwards 2005; 2006). When employing objective formulations, the account is portrayed as objective “fact”. In excerpt 3 for instance, it is not a personal opinion that “good places” are “calm” while “gottsunda isn’t a specifically calm neighborhood... a lot of crime and criminality happens there” (lines 29-35). In excerpt 4, “Kåbo” is objectively presented as being “nice and expensive” (lines, 15-16) while the “problem” with “Stenhagen” is that it has “been somewhat rowdy” (lines 36- 37). Participants also legitimize the accounts by managing subjectivity, portraying the accounts as trustworthy by basing it on “personal experience”. For example: “I have been beaten down myself” (excerpt 3, lines 48-49); “…no places I would like to live anyway” and “Gottsunda is the only area I had stayed away from...Sävja is nice in my opinion” (4, lines 7-8, 47-49).

Furthermore, participants attribute normative values to space by linking them with normative membership categories, their predicates and category-bound activities (cf. Stokoe 2012). In other words, by the attribution of normative-spatial-identities. For example, in excerpt 3: “If you avoid...there is a big chance that it is Swedish in Uppsala” (lines 16-19); “calm areas...not many criminals or crimes that happen there” (lines 29-31) and “Thick with immigrants and rowdy as hell” (lines 38-39). In excerpt 4: “a lot of families with kids” (lines 20-21); “mostly villas with ‘regular folk’” (lines 24-25) and “to be blunt the immigration, in my opinion, lowers the ‘cozyness’” (lines 64-66). Hence, “good people” are depicted as “Swedish” with predicates (cf. Stokoe 2012) such as “calm” and “regular” are treated as the norm and as a morally superior group. Relatedly, “good spaces” are portrayed as close to the “center” of the city (3: 28; 4: 15); close to “nature” (lines 52-54); “calm” (3: 29-31); and consisting of expensive condominiums and houses (see 3: 22-23, 40-41; 4: 21-26, 33-39). In contrast, “bad people” include “immigrants” and “criminals” (3: 29-35, 38-39), which are
treated as inherently immoral and dangerous and as living in a specific kind of “bad spaces” characterized by cheap, rental, high-raisers far from the center of the city (3: 24-25).

Lastly, Summerbird (table 5, excerpt 4) treats “Stenhagen” as having increased in normative value due to the specific kind of buildings there, which can be seen in the sentence “lot of villas and houses have been built the last years which has made it a little ‘nicer’ neighborhood” (lines 33-35). This corresponds to how Hippietiger treats neighborhoods as being able to decrease in normative value by “dreggification” and its connection to “ugly high raisers” (table 3, excerpt 2). Hence, neighborhoods are treated as being able to either increase or decrease in normative value depending on their dominant kind of accommodation-buildings and the normative-spatial-identities referred to as “naturally belonging” in them: wealthier, Swedish “good people” in “nice villa-areas” contrasted to poorer, immigrant “bad people” in “ugly high raiser-areas”. Participants thus orient to economic, spatial as well as social aspects when ascribing normative values to neighborhoods, which are treated as inherently and naturally correlated with one another.

Accordingly, interactants orient to what they portray as an “objective standard” regarding the normative value of neighborhoods. At the same time however, they are collaboratively assembling spatial-social boundaries by making taken-for-granted links between spatial categories and spatial identities, in other words, by attributing normative-spatial-identities. Also, in advising one another to avoid “bad neighborhoods”, participants are implicitly categorizing themselves as belonging to the normative-spatial-identity “good people”. When treating “good” as the norm and “bad” as deviant, they are further partaking in implicit inclusion-exclusion practices in which “our kind of people” are morally entitled to live in “good neighborhoods” and avoid “bad neighborhoods”, while the inherently bad “others” are treated as morally legitimately excluded from “good neighborhoods”.

Not so “Deviant” Interactants
In this final excerpt, the principal analytical point in is to illustrate how although some participants argue against the collaboratively established normative categorization of certain neighborhoods, they continue orienting to and assembling the same normative structures as their fellow participants. This merely results in a “superficial conflict” in the interaction, which nonetheless maintains the collaborative ways in which the interactants normatively and inherently connect spatial and social categories.
### Table 6. Excerpt 5. Continuation of “Where in Uppsala should one live?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Row</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Tentpicket</td>
<td>2009-01-26, 22:30</td>
<td>Tentpicket: To avoid Salabacke? What do you base that on? The neighborhood is mixed co-operatives and rentals. To get a rental in the area normally takes 15 years and are thus no &quot;slum&quot; dens which are rented out to social services to a greater extent. I would pick luthagen if I didn’t want to live in the exact center of town, or the front of luthagen if I wanted to live more centrally. For 1 million I would without a doubt buy two-bedroom apartment in NICE cozy salabacke. Really don’t understand the criticism. Even gränby is getting in order but is a little more of a problem-neighborhood than the other neighborhoods (except for gsunda”).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Hippietiger</td>
<td>2009-01-26, 23:07</td>
<td>No, it takes 8 years on average according to the information on Uppsalahem’s website. Supercozy Tunabackar and beautiful Svartbäcken have the longest queue-time: 11 years. Disgusting underclass Gottsunda is of course on the bottom with “only” 3 years queue-time. Damn it, I wouldn’t live out there even if I got paid for it. So bloody fucking disgusting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Hippietiger</td>
<td>2009-01-26, 23:07</td>
<td>Hippietiger: Åren går... Det är ganska länge sedan jag lämnade Uppsala, när jag tänker efter... Du verkar veta bättre vad som gäller i dagsläget! 😎</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Swing-Pete</td>
<td>2009-01-27, 12:23</td>
<td>Hippietiger: The years pass... It’s been a pretty long time since I left Uppsala, when I think about it... You seem to have a better idea of what the deal is nowadays! 😊</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>Swing-Pete</td>
<td>2009-01-27, 12:23</td>
<td>To really put it bluntly; everyone seems to be in agreement that Luthagen is the best – Gottsunda is the worst. Regarding the rest there are mixed opinions... for example Salabacke. luthagen (alright, but hard to find parking and can be rowdy in the evenings), But I think it all depends on where one lives within each neighborhood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Swing-Pete</td>
<td>2009-01-27, 13:37</td>
<td>To really put it bluntly; everyone seems to be in agreement that Luthagen is the best – Gottsunda is the worst. Regarding the rest there are mixed opinions... for example Salabacke. luthagen (alright, but hard to find parking and can be rowdy in the evenings), But I think it all depends on where one lives within each neighborhood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>Swing-Pete</td>
<td>2009-01-27, 13:37</td>
<td>För att verkligen hårddra det hela; alla verkar eniga om att Luthagen är bäst - Gottsunda sämst. Annat råder det delade meningar om... exempelvis Salabacke. luthagen (okej, men svårt med parkering och kan vara stökt på kvällarna), Men jag tror det helt och hållet beror på var man bor inom resp område.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

7 gsunda: short for the neighborhood Gottsunda
8 excluded section due to irrelevant part in conversation
That Salabacke would be dangerous is probably the silliest thing I’ve heard, it’s sleepier than Luthagen. Same thing when one starts talking about Flogsta, and Kvarngärdet as bad neighborhoods. There are even parts of Gränby that are at least as calm as the “nicer” neighborhoods, same thing with Gottsunda. There are considerably more calm than non-calm addresses in Gottsunda.

Hippie-tiger is right, we have lived in Salabacke (half-slummy at the “nice” skomakargatan, thefts, social service cases etc.) For the case of justice I will point out that there is a pretty big difference to live in salabacke compared with the other slums (gränby, stenhagen, gottsunda, flogsta, etc.)...

While Hippietiger, Swing-Pete and Professor agree on the normative classification of specific neighborhoods, both Salin and King_Lenin argue against this classification. For example, Salin questions the attribution of “Salabacke” (lines 1-2), “Luthagen” (lines 7-11) and “Gränby” (line 15) in the “bad” neighborhood category. Regarding “Salabacke”, he argues that the neighborhood not only has rental-apartments; that it takes a long time to get an apartment there and that they therefore are no “slum dens” (lines 2-7). In fact, he himself could imagine living in “NICE cozy Salabacke” (lines 12-13). He also states that: “Even Gränby is getting in order but is still a problem-neighborhood... (except for gunda)” (lines 15-18). Nevertheless, “good places” are still depicted as nice; cozy and consisting of less rentals, which is contrasted with disorganized, problematic “slum dens”. Moreover, King_Lenin also positions himself against the general classification of neighborhoods by arguing that these neighborhoods or parts of them de facto are “calm” (post 5). In this manner, both Salin and King_Lenin are orienting to the collaboratively assembled, “objective standard” of what constitutes “good” and “bad” spaces.

Hence, even seemingly “deviant” participants continue to orient to the same normative organization of space. What first would seem as conflicting perspectives, in which the collective “order” of knowledge would be threatened – the conflict merely occurs on the surface and does not question the basic, normative organizations of space and social identities – resulting in the upholding of the intersubjective, normative knowledge in the interaction.
6. Concluding Discussion

The aim of this thesis is to examine and make discernable how social actors collaboratively engage in mundane, situated segregation processes and in this fashion, fill a “knowledge gap” in existing segregation research. The specific research questions are as follows:

*In which ways do actors collaboratively orient to, assemble and connect spatial categories and spatial identities in mundane, online interaction?*

*Which segregation-related processes do these interactions make discernable?*

In general, the patterned, inherently portrayed normative connections between spatial categories and spatial identities are consistent regardless of forum and thread throughout the examined 10 years. However, while the investigated interactions follow similar inclusion-exclusion patterns, a few flashback comments use more extreme formulations when referring to *membership categories* (cf. Stokoe 2012) compared to familjeliv, for instance the employment of the term “dregs” in excerpt 2. This coincides with the noticed bias in Flashback towards the right in the political spectrum (Törnberg & Törnberg 2016). It is further interesting that the participants in both forums consistently interact *about* “immigrants” as the deviant others and speak of themselves as representing the “Swedish” norm. Relatedly, actors portraying themselves as “immigrants” are discernably absent in this context. According to this, the interactions may not only be politically biased but ethnically one-sided as well. While these biases may be seen as problematic from a point of view of rendering “representative” results, this thesis is distinctly qualitative and therefore not interested in this kind of generalization. In light of the purpose of this study then, the fact that the interactions may be politically or ethnically biased is quite uninteresting and in no way makes the qualitative findings regarding how participants make normative spatial-social connections invalid. It would however be interesting for future research to examine how actors orient to normative space and attribute *normative-spatial-identities* in completely different empirical circumstances as well. For instance: In interactions depicting other ideological standpoints; in groups where participants ascribe other social/ethnic identities; as well as in interactions regarding completely different kinds of normative spaces and spatial identities, such as schools, athletic-teams and aesthetic groups. We will now turn to the more specific results of this thesis and discuss how they can be related to existing segregation
research, demonstrating how this “micro” approach can be useful in illustrating mundane, naturally-occurring segregation processes.

When seeking-and-giving-advice regarding where it is “good” or “bad” to live, interactants provide legitimacy (cf. Edwards 2005; 2006) to the accounts. Advice-seekers commonly portray themselves as having legitimate, epistemic cause (cf. Heritage 2012) for advice-seeking in the online-thread. For example, by making observable that they are “strangers” to Uppsala with none or little knowledge concerning its normative spatial structure; that they are going to move there prominently and that they formerly have searched for information elsewhere. When responding, advice-givers regularly exploit both objective “matter-of-fact” and subjective “personal experience” formulations, which portrays the normative advice as being factual and trustworthy. This can be related to Flinkfeldt’s (2016) study of sick-leave legitimacy-work, as well as Edwards’ (2005) study concerning the formulation of “legitimate” complaints. Moreover, interactants use modal, objective formulations (cf. Edwards 2006) making visible an orientation towards what is treated as an “objective standard” regarding the normative value of neighborhoods. Thus, advice-seekers categorize urban space in normatively “good” and “bad” categories and in this fashion, create normative, objectively-oriented first pair parts (cf. Sacks et al. 1974), which advice-givers respond by providing objectively-oriented, normative advice. In other words, they fulfil the first normative, advice-seeking action by offering preferred second pair parts (cf. Sacks et al. 1974), which sequentially and collaboratively reinforces and legitimizes the normative, spatial categorization in the interaction.

In addition, participants collaboratively categorize neighborhoods and parts of neighborhoods as belonging to either “good”, “bad” or “in between” normative spatial categories, for example by using contrasting lists (cf. Jefferson 1990; Wiggins 2016: 123). Neighborhoods are placed in a specific normative category depending on its “characteristics”, for instance economic station. In other words, if the neighborhoods primarily are more or less expensive, which is related to if the area is dominated by co-operatives and “villas” or rental “high-raisers” respectively. Thus, “bad neighborhoods” have many cheap, rental-apartments in which the poorer population live, while “good neighborhoods” are more exclusive and expensive, resulting in the inhabitation of more economically prosperous individuals and families. The “in between neighborhoods” are treated as areas where apartments are neither too expensive nor too cheap or as being constitutive of mixed housing tenures. These are however portrayed as second-hand-choices, which actors with less economic assets have to “settle” with. This makes visible how economic structures are treated as important factors in
the normative valuation of neighborhoods as well as in the decision-making-process. Another characteristic that the participants treat as important is the neighborhood’s spatial location in city, especially with regard to its distance to the “center” of town and to nature. While the designation of specific neighborhoods into either normative category can differ – especially “in-between neighborhoods” such as Salabacke – the same normative, spatial structures continue to be constructed as taken-for-granted, common knowledge. In relation to existing neighborhood effect theories (cf. Andersson 2009), such aspects could therefore be perceived as structural, correlated neighborhood effects.

Furthermore, interactants treat the normative classification of space as inherently linked to specific membership categories and their inherent “good” or “bad” predicates and category-bound activities (cf. Stokoe 2012). Throughout the interaction, “good places” and “good people” counter to “bad places” and “bad people” are treated as “naturally” belonging together. The collective identity (cf. Benwell & Stokoe 2006) “good people” is depicted as “Swedes” with predicates (cf. Stokoe 2012) such as “economically stable”, “calm”, “decent” and “regular”. However, participants provide no specific category-bound-activities (cf. Stokoe 2012) to illustrate why they are treated as “good”, implicitly treating “good people” and “good behavior” as the norm. On the other hand, the collective identity (cf. Benwell & Stokoe 2006) “bad people” are referred to as “immigrants”; “criminals”; “low-payed” and “packs of underclass kids”. These categories are depicted as fundamentally linked and dangerous by using explicit, detailed lists (cf. Jefferson 1990) and stories (cf. Wiggins 2016: 124) regarding specific category-bound activities (cf. Stokoe 2012) such as “robbery” and ”beating” people. That is to say, interactants are implicitly treating “bad people” and “bad behavior” as deviant. Based on these “dangerous” qualities then, interactants collaboratively agree that neighborhoods dominated by this social category “should be avoided”.

Subsequently, direct neighborhood effects such as robbery as well as its related indirect effects, for instance advice-giving concerning avoidance strategies, can be related to the segregation processes endogenous and exogenous neighborhood effects respectively (cf. Andersson 2009). Thus, the results support earlier segregation research which suggest that “Swedes” actively and intentionally tend to move in accordance with where other “Swedes” live, and through such collective practices, create ethnic congregations in space (cf. Anderson, Bråmå & Hogdal 2009). Moreover, neighborhoods are treated as being able to either increase or decrease in normative value. According to the participants, this depends on the kind of expensive or cheap buildings there, which are treated as naturally connected to a population of either mostly “wealthy Swedes” or “poor immigrants”. These processes of
“normative deterioration” or “normative improvement” could for example be related to the concepts of *residualisation* and *gentrification* (cf. Andersson & Magnusson Turner 2014).

Consequently, while the conclusions of this study are supported by its own empirical data, they are further reinforced as trustworthy when placed in relation to the results of earlier segregation studies. In other words, although this empirical study focuses on so-called “micro-level”, situated interaction, the results make observable and analyzable how actors orient to macro-level segregation processes established in former research, in which there are significant correlations between centrally located neighborhoods; Swedish/middle-aged inhabitants; and expensive apartments/houses on the one hand, and neighborhoods in the outskirts of the city with cheap, rental-high-raisers and a dominantly immigrant, younger population on the other hand (cf. Andersson 2009; Andersson, Brămå & Hogdal 2009; Andersson & Magnusson Turner 2014; Anderssson & Kährk 2015; Andersson & Hedman 2016). Nevertheless, while earlier segregation studies have shown that such macro-structures are correlated, this paper makes visible how social actors actively and practically orient to and assemble normative spatial and social structures and implicitly engage in *inclusion-exclusion practices* related to segregation processes. Similar to the concepts of *segregation-generating-movements* and *segregation-generated-movements* then (cf. Anderson, Brămå & Hogdal 2009), these practices could be perceived as segregation-generating and segregation-generated interactions, which contribute to patterned, spatial-social separations in society.

In brief, the results show how participants treat “bad people” as morally legitimately excluded from “good spaces” and as naturally belonging to “bad spaces”. In contrast, “good people” are treated as naturally belonging to and as morally entitled to “good spaces”. In this fashion, actors are collaboratively treating normative spatial value as inherently and normatively connected to specific collective identities (cf. Benwell & Stokoe 2006). As a result of this, I have introduced the concept normative-spatial-identities, in order to facilitate the examination and understanding of these spatial-social processes. In contrast to *spatial-identities* (cf. Benwell & Stokoe 2006), which more generally implies a social identity somehow connected to space, this concept emphasizes the inherently normative character of how certain spatial-identities are used when orienting to and making sense of space. This concept can thus be defined as a normative, relational, collective identity (cf. Benwell & Stokoe 2006), by which normative and moral values are attributed to certain people based on them being incumbents of a specific spatial-social category. For example, how interactants treat personal strangers as inherently “bad” because of the ascription “immigrant from Gottsunda” or in contrast, as inherently “good” due to the category “Swede from Luthagen”.

In brief, the results show how participants treat “bad people” as morally legitimately excluded from “good spaces” and as naturally belonging to “bad spaces”. In contrast, “good people” are treated as naturally belonging to and as morally entitled to “good spaces”. In this fashion, actors are collaboratively treating normative spatial value as inherently and normatively connected to specific collective identities (cf. Benwell & Stokoe 2006). As a result of this, I have introduced the concept normative-spatial-identities, in order to facilitate the examination and understanding of these spatial-social processes. In contrast to *spatial-identities* (cf. Benwell & Stokoe 2006), which more generally implies a social identity somehow connected to space, this concept emphasizes the inherently normative character of how certain spatial-identities are used when orienting to and making sense of space. This concept can thus be defined as a normative, relational, collective identity (cf. Benwell & Stokoe 2006), by which normative and moral values are attributed to certain people based on them being incumbents of a specific spatial-social category. For example, how interactants treat personal strangers as inherently “bad” because of the ascription “immigrant from Gottsunda” or in contrast, as inherently “good” due to the category “Swede from Luthagen”.

In brief, the results show how participants treat “bad people” as morally legitimately excluded from “good spaces” and as naturally belonging to “bad spaces”. In contrast, “good people” are treated as naturally belonging to and as morally entitled to “good spaces”. In this fashion, actors are collaboratively treating normative spatial value as inherently and normatively connected to specific collective identities (cf. Benwell & Stokoe 2006). As a result of this, I have introduced the concept normative-spatial-identities, in order to facilitate the examination and understanding of these spatial-social processes. In contrast to *spatial-identities* (cf. Benwell & Stokoe 2006), which more generally implies a social identity somehow connected to space, this concept emphasizes the inherently normative character of how certain spatial-identities are used when orienting to and making sense of space. This concept can thus be defined as a normative, relational, collective identity (cf. Benwell & Stokoe 2006), by which normative and moral values are attributed to certain people based on them being incumbents of a specific spatial-social category. For example, how interactants treat personal strangers as inherently “bad” because of the ascription “immigrant from Gottsunda” or in contrast, as inherently “good” due to the category “Swede from Luthagen”.

In brief, the results show how participants treat “bad people” as morally legitimately excluded from “good spaces” and as naturally belonging to “bad spaces”. In contrast, “good people” are treated as naturally belonging to and as morally entitled to “good spaces”. In this fashion, actors are collaboratively treating normative spatial value as inherently and normatively connected to specific collective identities (cf. Benwell & Stokoe 2006). As a result of this, I have introduced the concept normative-spatial-identities, in order to facilitate the examination and understanding of these spatial-social processes. In contrast to *spatial-identities* (cf. Benwell & Stokoe 2006), which more generally implies a social identity somehow connected to space, this concept emphasizes the inherently normative character of how certain spatial-identities are used when orienting to and making sense of space. This concept can thus be defined as a normative, relational, collective identity (cf. Benwell & Stokoe 2006), by which normative and moral values are attributed to certain people based on them being incumbents of a specific spatial-social category. For example, how interactants treat personal strangers as inherently “bad” because of the ascription “immigrant from Gottsunda” or in contrast, as inherently “good” due to the category “Swede from Luthagen”.
Furthermore, based on how interactants treat the spatial-social connection as being normatively as well as inherently linked, it is quite enough – in this specific context – to refer to someone as living in “gottsunda”, which will automatically infer the collective identity (cf. Benwell & Stokoe 2006) “immigrant” with the predicate “morally inferior behavior” and its related category-bound-activities (cf. Stokoe 2012) such as “robbery” and “beating people”. Correspondingly, living in “Luthagen” infers the ascription to the collective identity (cf. Benwell & Stokoe 2006) “Swedish” and the predicates (cf. Stokoe 2012) “decent”, “regular” and “calm”. In other words, as belonging to the morally superior norm. It is important to note however, that the contingency of social identities renders that the particular normative meanings and category connections in these interactions are “loose” in character. In light of this, the specific spatial category and its normatively linked spatial identity and inferences may vary in different contexts (cf. Benwell & Stokoe 2006). For example, while “Gottsunda” and “immigrant” are normatively and inherently linked as “bad” in this context while “Luthagen” and “Swede” are treated as essentially “good”, other interactional contexts may result in different normative, spatial-social combinations with completely altered implications to normative space. Hence, while the concept of normative-spatial-identities has been constructed in order to comprehend the specific interactions in this study, it is generally applicable and may be useful in forthcoming research related to the collaborative assembling of spatial-social boundaries.

To conclude, the results of this study not only support the results of former segregation research but make visible and enhance the understanding of how social actors collaboratively partake in mundane, segregation processes. By attributing normative-spatial-identities to one another and to themselves in a recurrent, patterned fashion throughout the interaction, the participants can be seen as engaging in collaborative inclusion-and-exclusion-practices, that is, as collectively and practically assembling spatial-social boundaries. Here, “good people” are treated as being naturally belonging to and morally entitled to live in “good spaces”, as well as being morally entitled to – and explicitly advised to – avoid “bad neighborhoods” and “bad people”. Correspondingly, “bad people” are treated as morally legitimately excluded from “good spaces” and as naturally belonging in “bad spaces”. Lastly, while “bad” is treated as deviant, participants collaboratively treat “good” as the norm. In this fashion, social actors are collaboratively orienting to, assembling as well as legitimizing segregated moral landscapes (cf. Helgason & Pálsson 1997).
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8. Appendix
Below, information regarding all topic- and time-relevant threads (included in step one of the coding process) is provided in two tables, one for each forum. The highlighted threads are the threads chosen for deeper analysis in step two and the threads in boldface are the ones from which the final excerpts for empirical demonstration were chosen. Lastly, a map of the different neighborhoods of Uppsala from the municipality of Uppsala is provided.

Table 1. Flashback Threads

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thread Number</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Date and Time</th>
<th>Posts</th>
<th>Viewings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Var i Uppsala bör man bo? / Where in Uppsala should one live? By: Red Eyed Jack</td>
<td>2009-01-26, 15:57 - 2016-12-29 11:04</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>31 385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Var vill man bo i Uppsala? / Where does one want to live in Uppsala? By: sassafras</td>
<td>2009-02-08, 14:49 - 2015-12-02 07:03</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>4 283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Att bo i Uppsala / To live in Uppsala By: Yellow River</td>
<td>2008-06-16, 19:24 - 2008-06-22 11:22</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>9 259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Bra och dåliga villaområden inom 5 mils radie från Uppsala? / Good and bad villa neighborhoods within a 5 (Swedish) mile radius? By: Måttlig</td>
<td>2014-11-02, 01:4 - 2017-04-29 00:28</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>8 678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Hur viktigt är det att bo centralt i Uppsala? / How important is it to live in the inner-city of Uppsala? By: Inotcomeback</td>
<td>2012-03-20, 20:01 - 2012-03-22, 15:56</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1 172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thread-Number</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Date and time</td>
<td>Posts</td>
<td>Viewings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Var bo i Uppsala / Where to live in Uppsala By: familjeneriksson</td>
<td>2008-03-23 18:35 – 2008-03-26 19:04</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1101</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Familjeliv threads.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>By:</th>
<th>Date Range</th>
<th>Downloads</th>
<th>Views</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Bo i Sävja? / Live in Sävja</td>
<td>Anonym</td>
<td>2012-03-29 10:24 - 2012-03-29 15:22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Bo i Gränby, Uppsala? /Live in Gränby, Uppsala?</td>
<td>Silverchair</td>
<td>2010-10-06 19:25 - 2010-10-07 14:35</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Bostadsområden i Uppsala / Neighborhoods in Uppsala</td>
<td>Dan Larsson79</td>
<td>2011-12-28 06:50 - 2011-12-30 15:25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Område i Uppsala/Neighborhood in Uppsala</td>
<td>1977Ma-ria Theres-e</td>
<td>2009-02-04 18:15 – 2009-02-17 17:37</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Summation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>328</strong></td>
<td><strong>62,485</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>