University of Groningen

Safety First! The topic of safety in reversed integration of people with intellectual disabilities

Venema, Eleonora; Vlaskamp, Carla; Otten, Sabine

Published in:
Journal of Intellectual Disabilities Research

DOI:
[10.1111/JPPI.12179](https://doi.org/10.1111/JPPI.12179)

IMPORTANT NOTE: You are advised to consult the publisher's version (publisher's PDF) if you wish to cite from it. Please check the document version below.

Document Version
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Publication date:
2017

[Link to publication in University of Groningen/UMCG research database](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Venema, E., Vlaskamp, C., & Otten, S. (2017). Safety First! The topic of safety in reversed integration of people with intellectual disabilities. *Journal of Intellectual Disabilities Research*, 14(2), 146-153.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/JPPI.12179>

Copyright

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

The publication may also be distributed here under the terms of Article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act, indicated by the "Taverne" license. More information can be found on the University of Groningen website: <https://www.rug.nl/library/open-access/self-archiving-pure/taverne-amendment>.

Take-down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Downloaded from the University of Groningen/UMCG research database (Pure): <http://www.rug.nl/research/portal>. For technical reasons the number of authors shown on this cover page is limited to 10 maximum.

Safety First! The Topic of Safety in Reversed Integration of People With Intellectual Disabilities

Eleonora Venema, Carla Vlaskamp, and Sabine Otten
University of Groningen, Groningen, the Netherlands

Abstract

Background: Physical integration is believed to be a precondition for social integration. One might expect that in so-called reversed integration, where people without intellectual disabilities (ID) actively choose to live next to people with ID, conditions for physical integration are more optimal, and social integration is enhanced. If this hypothesized benefit of reversed integration settings indeed holds, however, is yet unknown. **Specific aims:** The aim of the present study is to examine barriers for social integration of people with ID. In this context, the present article focuses on the role of safety and safety concerns. **Method:** A semi structured interview was conducted with 28 direct support professionals (DSPs), 25 family members, and 25 neighbors, aimed at their attitude toward social integration in a reversed integration neighborhood. Several topics were dealt with, like the neighborhood and contact between people with ID and neighbors. There were no explicit questions about safety in the interview. **Findings:** The topic of safety was spontaneously mentioned 90 times by 26 DSPs, 15 times by 9 neighbors, and 36 times by 18 family members. Three main themes were found in the total group of statements touching upon the issue of safety: environmental aspects, client characteristics, and working conditions. The most often mentioned subthemes were the openness of the neighborhood and the traffic. **Discussion:** In reversed integration, safety is still a highly relevant topic and of great concern for the DSPs and the family members. DSPs are more concerned with controlling risks and keeping everybody safe than looking at the opportunities the new environment offers, like enhancing social integration.

Keywords: direct support professional, family members, intellectual disability, neighbors, reversed integration, safety

Introduction

Since the 1960s, the predominant approach to the support of people with intellectual disabilities (ID) gradually shifted from care in residential facilities to support integrated within the community. Countries differ in the manner in which this paradigm shift was implemented. For example, in countries such as the United States, the United Kingdom, and Scandinavia (Chowdhury & Benson, 2011; Mansell, 2006; Tøssebro et al., 2012), many residential facilities were closed and were replaced by community-based homes. Some countries, such as the Netherlands, have a twofold policy where people with ID live in the community but residential facilities also continue to exist (Mansell & Beadle-Brown, 2010; Nieboer, Pijpers, & Strating, 2011). Continuing the use of residential facilities is also reflected in the choice for those “who are left behind”: mostly those with high support needs such as people with severe or profound ID (European Intellectual Disability Research Network, 2003; Mansell, 2006) and people with a combination of ID and psychiatric or behavior problems (Mansell & Beadle-Brown, 2010).

However, specific projects have been developed within Dutch policy to enable these specific groups of people to become part of the community; these are known as “reversed integration” projects. While in regular integration projects people with ID move into the community, in reversed integration the mobility is the other way round: people without ID move into the grounds of a residential facility where people with ID are already living (European Intellectual Disability Research Network, 2003). In other words, reversed integration is transforming the residential facility into a neighborhood where people without ID choose to live next to people with ID. This type of integration is relatively new and has been first initiated thirty years ago (Hansen, 2007). Since 2000 more residential facilities were transformed into reversed integration neighborhoods. At the moment, there are about 15 reversed integration settings in the Netherlands.

When reversed integration is implemented, care organizations sell part of the grounds of the residential facility to investors. These investors will build houses on these grounds, ranging from detached houses to terrace and social houses, both rentals and privately owned houses. The income level of the people without ID in these neighborhoods varies from low to high. In this context, the present study investigates the obstacles for social integration in the transition from institutional care to such a reversed integrated facility for people with high support needs. Herein, the emphasis is specifically on the topic of safety.

Received February 12, 2014; accepted March 12, 2016

Correspondence: Eleonora Venema, University of Groningen, Special needs education and child care, Grote Rozenstraat 38, 9712 TJ Groningen, The Netherlands. Email: eleonora.venema@rug.nl

The policy aim of countries such as the Netherlands is for all people with ID, including those with high support needs, to eventually be integrated into the community. This integration contains three aspects: physical integration (being present within the community), functional integration (using public facilities such as shops or joining the local soccer club), and social integration (van Alphen, 2011; Nieboer et al., 2011). This last aspect is defined as having valuable relationships with other members of the community, in which the person with ID is accepted and appreciated (van Alphen, 2011).

Many studies have been conducted on the integration process and its effects. In a review study, Chowdhury and Benson (2011) found that moving to the community improves the quality of life of people with ID. Other studies, however, have shown that, in practice, people with ID are often only physically integrated, but not functionally or socially (Chowdhury & Benson, 2011; den Daas, Nakken, Smrkovsky, & van der Struik, 2007; van Gennep & Ruigrok, 2002). Indeed, people with ID living in ordinary neighborhoods tend to continue to use the facilities directed at their specific group (i.e., people with ID) rather than engage with the broader community. They participate in activities especially targeted at people with ID or make use of transport facilities for people with ID (Cardol, Speet, & Rijken, 2007).

The literature discusses various *obstacles to the social integration* of people with ID (Clement & Bigby, 2009; Cummins & Lau, 2003; van Alphen, Dijk, Borne, & Curfs, 2010). A very prominent point here is the possible *reduction in safety* when people with ID are integrated in ordinary neighborhoods. Safety is defined as “the absence of unwanted outcomes such as incidents or accidents” (Hollnagel, 2014). Some people with ID find it difficult to deal with changes in the living environment, and the unpredictable aspects of a new environment, such as meeting unfamiliar people, can give a sense of insecurity (Alaszewski & Alaszewski, 2002; Cardol et al., 2007; van Alphen, Dijk, Borne, & Curfs, 2009). Residential facilities typically adapt their entire environment to the lives of people with ID. Clients are protected from the dangers caused by influences from the outside world. Once integrated support is introduced, the environment changes automatically. People with ID can come into contact with all aspects of the so-called ordinary world, including its dangers. Sometimes this results in a restriction in their freedom of action, especially if there are not enough direct support professionals (DSPs) to accompany them outside (Den Daas et al., 2007). Therefore, if people with ID are not taught the functional skills necessary to cope with various aspects of the new environment, the potential dangers “out there” will hinder both functional and social integration processes (Thorn, Pittman, Myers, & Slaughter, 2009).

One might assume that safety is a less prominent topic when people with ID live in a “*reversed integration*” setting. The effectiveness of reversed integration is an as yet under-researched topic. Looking at the three aspects of integration mentioned above, in reversed integration the physical integration is achieved through the choice people without ID make in moving into the grounds of a residential facility. The buildings of the residential facility become part of the neighborhood. For people without ID, it can be expected that they would know of the presence of the people with ID. The deliberate choice to live in close proximity to people with ID carries with it the potential to create an environment of acceptance and openness, and should enable

functional and social integration processes. People without ID are expected to take those people with ID into greater account, and to be open to some specific adaptations in their living environment. For example, the traffic rules can be adapted to enhance the safety and functioning of people with ID (e.g., stricter speed limits or more parking restrictions), resulting in more freedom of movement for those with ID. Another advantage is that people with ID can continue to use the facilities they are familiar with. Moreover, they can continue to live in the same home with the same people and, quite often, the same DSPs. The hope is that it should be easier in such an environment for people with ID to become part of community living.

Taken together, the expectation is that the conditions for integration are more optimal in a reversed integration setting than within “ordinary” community living. As the boundaries for *physical* integration are low, one might expect that the limitation in the *social* integration of people with ID will also decrease. People with ID are known in the neighborhood, and, therefore, neighbors should be more willing and prepared to take into account their specific needs and limitations. Accordingly, DSPs and family members of people with ID are expected to be less concerned about their safety. But does the assumption of less concern about safety within reversed integration, correspond with practice? Do safety and safety concerns play a role in the attitude of the parties involved in reversed integration? The research question in this study is: Are the DSPs, family members, and neighbors concerned about safety of the parties involved in a reversed integration setting, and if there are such concerns, which are these?

Methods

Participants and Setting

The research was carried out in a neighborhood in the northern Netherlands, where a reversed integration project had been in operation since 2008. In this specific setting 154 people with ID live, with the vast majority of these people having high support needs (e.g., severe to profound ID or a combination of ID and psychiatric or behavior problems). DSPs, family members of the people with ID, and neighbors were interviewed about their attitudes toward reversed integration. The goal was to get 25 persons from every group participated in the study, a sample size that has been recommended in phenomenological research (Creswell, 2007).

By the time the data were collected, there were 307 DSPs working in this specific setting of reversed integration. DSPs are trained professionals who support the clients in their daily activities and outside their homes, and depending on the severity of the ID, they assist in the clients' personal care tasks (e.g., see Mansell, 1995; Todd, 2000).

The DSPs who participated in this study met the following inclusion criteria: (1) worked in a residential facility before the reversed integration project started, (2) worked at least one year in this reversed integration setting, and (3) have been appointed for at least three days per week. Of the total of 307 DSPs, 237 met these requirements. The goal was to have 25 DSPs participate; moreover, from every home in the setting of reversed integration at least one DSP was interviewed. To reduce the probability of

TABLE 1
Workplaces of participating DSPs

Location	Number of participating DSPs
Home for people with profound intellectual and multiple disabilities	3
Home for people with ID and psychiatric or behavior problems who need constant support	9
Location where people with ID work and participate in daily activities	7
Home for people of heterogeneous levels of ID and behavior problems	9

dropouts as much as possible, the DSPs obtained permission to be interviewed during their working hours. If necessary, there was an option to hire stand-in DSPs to cover while the interview was being conducted. Because of the small probability of dropouts, 28 DSPs were chosen randomly using a stratified sample. Ultimately, there were no dropouts and all the selected DSPs participated in this study. The participants were randomly chosen to represent the same age and gender ratio as the whole DSP population working at this specific setting of reversed integration. They were aged between 25 and 56 (average age is 38 years), and worked at various locations in the setting of reversed integration (see Table 1). Eight DSPs were men and twenty were women.

The *family members* sample was gathered using stratified sampling: one family member from one client with ID was randomly chosen from every home in the setting of reversed integration. Two participating family members had two siblings with ID in this setting, they provided information about both clients. Twenty-five family members were interviewed for this study: this number of participants was achieved after a total of 35 family members had been selected and approached. If a family member did not want to participate, a family member of a different client from the same home was approached. The participating family members were 10 parents, six brothers, five sisters, two cousins, and two mentors. The mentors were not relatives, but they had adopted this role because the person with ID had no surviving family members or no family members were involved in their support. They were predominantly friends of the deceased parents. Mentors often visit the clients on a regular basis and can therefore be considered comparable to relatives. The people with ID lived between 2 and 43 years (average stay is 33 years) in this location.

The participating *neighbors* were recruited using quota sampling: the neighborhood consists of eight streets and a total of 83 homes. The researcher (i.e., the first author of this article) went from door to door in every street till four or five neighbors in the street agreed to participate. A total of 27 neighbors were approached until 25 participants were found (indicating a high degree of compliance). Of the total of 25 participating neighbors, 21 neighbors had one or more children (aged between 2 months and 22 years) living at home and 22 of the neighbors interviewed

were from a two-income household. Twelve of the participating neighbors had contact with people with ID before living in the reversed integration setting. Eight neighbors were men and 16 neighbors were women.

Procedure

The DSPs chosen received information about the study and an invitation for the interview via email. They were given the opportunity to indicate which dates suited them best.

The family members of the people with ID were given information about the study before they were invited for an interview. They received a letter by regular mail with information about reversed integration and about the research. This letter also informed them about the possibility of being invited for an interview. The participating neighbors also received information about this study before they were approached by the researcher. They received a letter by regular mail with information about reversed integration and about the research. They were also informed about the possibility of being invited for an interview. The interviews took place in the period from September 2012 to January 2013. The DSPs were interviewed first, followed by the neighbors and finally the family members. The interviews were recorded and processed verbatim. The interviews lasted approximately half an hour. Participation was voluntary and not linked to any rewards.

Instrument

A semi structured interview format was developed for each group of participants (DSPs, family members, and neighbors). The format was tested with a pilot involving a DSP, a family member, and a neighbor. The questions were subdivided into three categories for each group of participants. The first category of questions differed for the three groups: DSPs were asked about their experiences with reversed integration, family members about the information they received about reversed integration, and the changes it implied for their relatives, and neighbors about their opinions about the neighborhood. The two other categories were the same for each group: the contact between the people with ID and their neighbors, and their attitudes towards reversed integration. Together, these categories provided a clear impression of the three parties' experiences with and the practice of reversed integration. The categories were addressed via a list of open questions. Where necessary, participants were asked to further explain or specify their answers. Examples of questions include: What is your opinion about reversed integration? What is your opinion about the neighbourhood? What do you know about the contact between your child/family member and the neighbours? Importantly, participants were not explicitly asked about the subject of safety in the setting of reversed integration, because we did not want to push this issue. Therefore, any comments about the safety issue can be regarded as having been made spontaneously, and not triggered by a response bias.¹

¹In the context of the present article, we only focus on the issue of safety. Other data from the interviews regarding the attitudes towards reversed integration are analyzed and discussed elsewhere (Venema, Otten, & Vlaskamp, 2016).

TABLE 2

Number of quotations by DSPs, neighbors and family members about safety in a context of reversed integration and number of participants referring to the theme

		Number of quotations			Number of participants		
		DSPs	Neighbors	Family members	DSPs	Neighbors	Family members
Environmental aspects	Openness of the neighborhood	14	0	11	12	0	9
	Traffic	15	3	13	13	3	10
	Dogs without a leash	7	0	1	7	0	1
	Strangers	6	0	1	6	0	1
	Ditches	3	2	2	3	2	2
Client characteristics	Problem behavior	20	3	4	15	1	3
	Ignorance of neighbors	2	3	2	2	3	2
	Safety of children	5	3	2	4	3	2
Working conditions	Tasks	15	1	0	13	1	0
	Safety of the DSPs	3	0	0	2	0	0

Analysis

Atlas.ti (Fries, 2012), a qualitative data analysis program, was used to analyze the interviews. We focused on the issue of safety in our analysis for this article. Quotations about safety were coded using open coding, meaning that we did not use a list of codes at the start of the analysis. Every explicit mention of safety by the participants was coded. The mentioned cause of their sense of safety or unsafety was the name of the code. For example, DSP 13 stated that “Some clients were walking outside on their own, but that isn’t safe anymore. There is too much traffic now.” This quotation was coded as “traffic.” If a new quotation did not suit the used codes, a new code was made. After all the quotations were coded, the code list was checked for codes that could be merged into a new, more inclusive code. For example, the code “aggressive behavior” and the code “aberrant sexual behavior” were merged to the code “problem behavior.” When codes were merged, all quotations with these codes were carefully checked regarding the fit with the new, overarching code. After the final code list was created, the codes could be linked to one of three themes: (1) environmental aspects, (2) characteristics of the clients, or (3) working conditions of the DSPs. The inter-rater reliability was measured by two researchers, the first author of this article and a researcher who was not involved in this study, based on a random sample of 10% of the interviews using Cohen’s kappa. Both raters independently selected statements about safety. Next, they coded the statement with one or two words that contained the cause of the sense of safety or unsafety. An inter-rater reliability of 85% was found, which is very good (Landis & Koch, 1977).

Results

The subject of safety was spontaneously mentioned in the interviews at least once by 26 DSPs, 9 neighbors, and 18 family

members. This issue was therefore especially prominent for the DSPs (only two did not mention safety issues), followed by family members, and to a much lesser extent for the neighbors. The total number of safety-related quotes underlines this picture: in total, the DSPs mentioned the issue of safety 90 times, followed by family members (36 quotations) and the neighbors (15 quotations). This signals that safety is clearly an important concern for DSPs working in a setting of reversed integration.

Next, all available quotations touching upon the issue of safety were categorized into themes and sub-themes (see Table 2).

Three main themes were found: environmental aspects, client characteristics, and working conditions. In the DSP interviews, quotations about safety especially referred to the openness of the neighborhood, traffic, problem behavior, and the DSPs’ tasks. The neighbors mostly construed a link between safety or the lack thereof and the clients’ characteristics, while family members, similarly to the DSPs, worried most about the openness of the neighborhood and the traffic. In the following we will provide more details of specific examples within the three broader categories.

Aspects of the Environment

In general, the openness of the neighborhood had various negative consequences. The family members and the DSPs experienced the residential facility as a safe environment before reversed integration was put into practice. By turning the residential facility into a general neighborhood the protective environment was lost according to the DSPs and family members (Quotes of DSPs, family members, and neighbors about safety).

If you talk about safety, you shouldn’t change the whole residential facility. You take away all their certainties. (family member 2)

The risk of clients running away was perceived as having increased after reversed integration was introduced. Clients are able to leave their homes and there is nothing to obstruct them. They can easily end up on a busy road. On the other hand, three family members mentioned that housing their relatives in the same home with the same people and the same DSPs preserved a sense of safety for them despite the openness of the neighborhood.

According to the DSPs, traffic created a feeling of insecurity for their clients. The family members even experienced traffic as the greatest danger for their relatives. Despite the speed restrictions, it was still considered too high in the neighborhood. Since many clients were unfamiliar with traffic rules, this resulted in clients no longer being allowed to go outside on their own.

We have a few clients who went out on their own. Now they can't do that anymore because they aren't safe with all the traffic around. In the past it was like a big holiday resort, you were warned at the gate about the speed reduction of 15 km/h and that you had to watch out for the clients who were walking around in the residential facility. You were warned about that. Nowadays the residential facility is public and people drive fast. It's not safe for the clients anymore. (DSP 5)

Many family members also experienced the restriction of freedom as a great loss for their relatives. On the other hand, some neighbors mentioned that the clients often walked in the middle of the road and would not move out of the way. According to them, there were often only one or two DSPs accompanying a group of clients, which was felt to be irresponsible by some.

Another source of insecurity mentioned in the interviews, especially by the DSPs, was people walking with dogs without a leash. Many clients were afraid of the dogs. Despite a rule requiring that dogs be kept on a leash, not all of the neighbors abide by this rule.

We have clients who are anxious about dogs that aren't on a leash. (...) I once experienced a client becoming very afraid. Clients look to the DSPs for safety, so he looked to me. This client was so afraid that he would try to hide behind me. (...) In these situations you try to talk about it with the neighbors but they react differently. Mostly, they understand and put their dog on a leash. Once, a neighbor told me that I should put my client on a leash. (...) If they don't listen I try to avoid meeting them. (DSP 6)

In a reversed integration, anyone could in principle enter the homes where the people with ID live. The DSPs were concerned about the kind of strangers their clients would meet when walking through the neighborhood. For example, some kids would hang around and behave rudely toward the clients. In addition, the DSPs were also concerned about their client's reactions when being talked to by strangers.

They are already scared when a stranger walks up. I'm worried about what might happen if somebody speaks to them on the street. (DSP 5)

There are also people, like [client's name], who are naïve and will walk away with a stranger. (DSP 25)

Another point of concern was the deep, water-filled ditches found in the neighborhood, into which people with ID could fall and drown. One of the family members recounted her experience of her relative falling into a ditch:

He always walked some distance in front of the group. They could still guide him by calling out to him and he would listen. Once he didn't listen and walked into a ditch. The DSP quickly went after him and a neighbor called an ambulance. It turned out that he had an epileptic seizure in the water, probably because of the shock. This startled me. (family member 20)

One of the neighbors stated that she had to help a client out of a ditch. Another neighbor had been afraid that a client would fall into a ditch while looking for frogs. She felt responsible for the safety of that client.

Client Characteristics

Several interviewees mentioned that the new environment is less predictable than previously, which could increase the clients' behavior problems. The DSPs mentioned that they never know how the clients are going to react when they walk through the neighborhood and that they, especially those DSPs working with people with behavior problems, were concerned about the neighbors' safety. For example, they knew that some clients might hit children. The DSPs working with these clients were more alert and scanned the environment for potential problems when going outside. Some neighbors spoke of situations they had experienced in which they felt insecure. These situations were all related to the specific problematic behaviors of some clients, such as striking and screaming.

Once I was driving through the neighborhood with my mother when a tall man stepped in front of the car. He looked very angrily at us. I thought that he would jump on the car so we stopped and waited. Eventually someone came and took the man away. That wasn't nice. I found it very intimidating. (neighbor 2)

Aberrant sexual behavior was also mentioned as a risk for the clients and for the neighbors. The relevant DSPs found that they were able to offer less protection than they had been able to previously.

If the stress builds up, it will escalate. He learned not to hurt us but to step out of a situation and get a breath of fresh air. Nowadays he can run away and he has told us that it gave him a sense of insecurity. The question is whether he can control himself. We have no control over this except by adapting the protocols. (DSP 2)

Similarly, family members of clients with aberrant sexual behavior were concerned about the clients' safety, but also about the neighbors' safety. The protection that a residential facility offers was absent and this makes it more difficult for those clients to resist temptation. Women and children walk by daily and it is hard for clients with sexual behavior problems to ignore them and ignore their feelings when seeing those women and children. There had never been an incident but it was definitely a fear for some family members.

He really glued himself to women when aged 18, women with high heels, but also children. You won't get it out of him and the temptations become more intense if you aren't alert to them for a while. It will be a problem for him, especially in his head (...) Once he realized that he liked girls, it became difficult when children were walking around. He has to restrain himself. It would be much easier if the children weren't there. Sometimes I ask myself when it will stop and how you can structure it for him. (family member 24)

A safety issue mentioned by the neighbors who moved to the setting of reversed integration is that they are not familiar with the clients' specific characteristics, which gives them a sense of insecurity, especially when a client is walking outside on his or her own.

I wouldn't just start talking to them. You don't know the severity of the client's intellectual disability and if they understand what I'm talking about. You also don't know if they want to talk to you or if they are in a bad mood. (neighbor 14)

As a coping strategy to deal with this insecurity, some neighbors instructed their children about how they should react when they meet a person with ID.

I told my children that if a client acts strange and you don't know what to do, you just have to go away. Don't talk, just walk away and tell us about it. (neighbor 13)

Working Conditions

More than half of the DSPs mentioned safety in relation to their tasks. The DSPs believed that it was their duty to take care of their clients' and also the neighbors' safety. They experienced a change in their tasks after the introduction of reversed integration. Their greater level of alertness when going outside with the clients was most frequently mentioned. Previously, the client was able to walk on ahead. In the new setting this was considered unsafe for many reasons, such as children playing in the street or traffic.

When I go outside I'm alert and I scan the environment. If there are people outside I have to pay closer attention. (DSP 11)

We have clients with a profound intellectual disability, so you have to think about safety. We try to talk to people we find driving too fast. (DSP 5)

DSPs also spoke of the deterioration of their own safety. In their new environment, anybody can walk into the residential facility, which creates a sense of insecurity. Moreover, when the DSPs go outside in the dark, they do not know who they will come across.

I don't feel safe. When it's dark you have to walk a long way to the car. (...) Before there was a person at the gate who controlled who came in and out of the residential facility. Things sometimes happened then too, but now anybody can enter the residential facility. (DSP 12)

Discussion

The aim of this study was to investigate whether, in a reversed integration setting, the topic of safety and safety concerns still play a role in the attitude of DSPs, family members of the people with ID, and neighbors. Our data clearly reveal that safety remains a highly relevant topic for DSPs and family members, also in a reversed integration setting. Especially traffic safety is a point of concern, which has also been found in other studies that investigated "ordinary" integration settings (e.g., Den Daas et al., 2007; van Alphen et al., 2009).

The participating DSPs observed that the clients do not feel or simply are not safe in a setting of reversed integration because of various aspects of the new environment. Importantly, this sense of insecurity, in addition to the sense of insecurity felt by the DSPs themselves about their responsibility, is an obstacle to social integration. Reversed integration intends to create contact between the people with ID and their neighbors, but this contact needs to be initiated and/or facilitated by the DSPs (Abbott & McConkey 2006; van Alphen, 2011; Venema, Otten, & Vlaskamp, 2015). Correspondingly, all concerns about safety that the DSPs have, most probably affect the frequency and intensity of that contact. As a result, many people with ID spend less time outside their homes because of anticipated or actual problems in interaction with neighbors and/or because of traffic in the neighborhood.

This reasoning may also explain why neighbors were much less concerned about safety. The frequency of interaction between neighbors and clients is quite low, which could have also lowered the neighbors' perceived safety concerns. Nevertheless, some neighbors feel insecure about meeting people with ID. All these problems make social interactions more difficult and less probable.

Many concerns found in this study were also found in the study by van Alphen et al. (2009) in which people with ID were asked about their experiences with neighboring, comparing two situations: living in an ordinary neighborhood and living in an institutional setting. It is therefore a highly relevant task for the DSPs to facilitate social interactions with the neighbors, also in a "reversed integration" setting. Moreover, DSPs could play a role in better preparing their clients for these contacts with the

neighborhood, for example, by teaching their clients certain functional skills such as how to say “hello,” how to make small talk or how to “hang out.” In this way, clients would have a better chance of feeling safe and comfortable, which could have a positive influence on the process of integration (Thorn et al., 2009). However, this necessitates a change in professional attitude for the DSPs. In our interviews, almost all DSPs were concerned about the safety of their clients in the new setting. At the same time, and comparable with the findings by Bigby, Clement, Mansell, and Beadle-Brown (2009), the DSPs in our study see very little point in the integration of these clients into this new environment. Several DSPs mentioned that their clients’ disabilities were too severe and that their psychiatric or behavior problems too hazardous for the environment. This is in line with Emerson (2001), who found that the clients’ behavior can affect the safety of the people working with them and living around them.

The DSPs who work with people with severe or profound ID or with people with a combination of ID and psychiatric or behavior problems are usually principally concerned with controlling risks (McConkey & Collins, 2010) and keeping everybody safe. Moreover, McConkey and Collins (2010) found that DSPs consider assessing health and safety risks as one of the most important tasks for professionals who engage in social activities with clients. This is opposed to one of the ideals of integration and reversed integration: the new environment must be regarded as a challenge, not as a restriction. Hence, accepting the challenges presented by a neighborhood where people with and without ID live together, and recognizing the opportunities this setting offers, is an important task for DSPs, neighbors, and the family members. To achieve this goal, the organizations involved in reversed integration need to support the DSPs in coping with the challenges of the new environment and the problematic situations it can provoke. In this context, safety should be judged in a different, not exclusively restrictive way, which should enable DSPs to invest more time and effort in creating and facilitating interactions between their clients and the neighbors in the reversed integration setting. Only if such measures are taken will there be a fair chance that the intended added value of such integration efforts can realistically be harvested.

Care organisations who are planning to create a reversed integration neighborhood, should take the aspects found in this study, into account. First and foremost, DSPs need to reflect on their view about integration: what does social integration entail, and do they believe such integration to be possible for their clients? Can their clients make mistakes, are they allowed some “trial and error” experiences in their new neighborhood? Can DSPs teach their clients what “being social” actually is in everyday practice? Next to such an investment in preparing a teaching course for DSP, organizations should also take an active viewpoint in designing the neighborhood. For example, the physical environment should be well designed. This includes for example that the traffic rules should be adapted to the people with ID (e.g., strict speed limits; and prohibited parking on sidewalks). Family members should be prepared for the new environment as well, and be given the assurance that safety of the clients is taken seriously by the facility. All together this would increase the sense of safety for DSPs and family members, and, thereby, the

probability that indeed more contact between clients and neighbors without ID will take place within a reversed integration setting.

In our view, a clear strength of our study is that it reveals the perspectives of the three different parties involved in reversed integration. In addition, in the interviews we did not prompt discussion of the issue of safety, but only recorded how often and in which contexts it was mentioned spontaneously. We thus obtained a more realistic picture of the prominence of this issue in a setting of reversed integration. At the same time, our study is not without its limitations. First, all the participants lived in homes belonging to the same care organization, located in the same neighborhood. Second, there is a possibility of selection bias in the neighbors and family members interviewed. The DSPs are representative, but the neighbors and family members were selected through, respectively, quota and stratified sampling. Nevertheless, we did not have to approach many neighbors or family members—27 and 35 respectively—to reach the maximum of 25 participants for each group. Therefore, the chance of a selection bias is quite small.

Although our data reveal that the perceived lack of safety remains a highly relevant problem in reversed integration, it would be an interesting topic for further investigation to directly compare how the parties involved in ordinary and reversed integration projects perceive the situation, and their relative concern about safety issues. Moreover, it would be valuable to analyze the subject of safety also from the perspective of the clients. The DSPs’ and family members’ assumption that clients are not safe in the reversed integration context could be examined, for example by investigating the incidents that happened and/or by observing the clients, DSPs, and neighbors in the setting of reversed integration.

References

- Abbott, S., & McConkey, R. (2006). The barriers to social inclusion as perceived by people with intellectual disabilities. *Journal of Intellectual Disabilities, 10*, 275–287.
- Alaszewski, A., & Alaszewski, H. (2002). Toward the creative management of risk: Perceptions, practices and policies. *British Journal of Learning Disabilities, 30*, 56–62.
- Bigby, C., Clement, T., Mansell, J., & Beadle-Brown, J. (2009). ‘It’s pretty hard with our ones, they can’t talk, the more able bodied can participate’: Staff attitudes about the applicability of disability policies to people with severe and profound intellectual disabilities. *Journal of Intellectual Disability Research, 53*, 363–376.
- Cardol, M., Speet, M., & Rijken, M. (2007). *Anders of toch niet? deelname aan de samenleving van mensen met een lichte of matige verstandelijke beperking [different or not? participation in society of people with a mild or moderate intellectual disability]*. Utrecht: NIVEL.
- Chowdhury, M., & Benson, B. A. (2011). Deinstitutionalization and quality of life of individuals with intellectual disability: A review of the international literature. *Journal of Policy and Practice in Intellectual Disabilities, 8*, 256–265. doi: 10.1111/j.1741-1130.2011.00325
- Clement, T., & Bigby, C. (2009). Breaking out of a distinct social space: Reflections on supporting community participation for people with severe and profound intellectual disability. *Journal of Applied Research in Intellectual Disabilities, 22*, 264–275. doi: 10.1111/j.1468-3148.2008.00458

- Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry and research design. Choosing among five approaches* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Cummins, R. A., & Lau, A. L. D. (2003). Community integration or community exposure? a review and discussion in relation to people with an intellectual disability. *Journal of Applied Research in Intellectual Disabilities*, 16, 145–157. doi: 10.1046/j.1468-3148.2003.00157
- den Daas, H. M., Nakken, H., Smrkovsky, M., & van der Struik, C. (2007). *Gewoon wonen. Een onderzoek naar de effecten van deconcentratie op de kwaliteit van bestaan van mensen met een verstandelijke beperking. [Normal living. A study about the effects of deinstitutionalization on the quality of life of people with an intellectual disability]*. Groningen: Talant/stichting kinderstudies
- Emerson, E. (2001). *Challenging behaviour: Analysis and intervention in people with severe intellectual disabilities* (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- European Intellectual Disability Research Network. (2003). *Intellectual disability in Europe: Working papers*. Canterbury: Tizard Centre.
- Friese, S. (2012). *Qualitative data analysis with ATLAS.Ti*. London: Sage.
- Hansen, N. (2007). *Wonen zonder zorgen in de zorg [living in care without concerns]*. Delft: TU Delft.
- Hollnagel, E. (2014). *Safety-I and safety-II: The past and future of safety management*. Dorchester: Henry Ling Limited.
- Landis, J. R., & Koch, G. G. (1977). The measurement of observer agreement for categorical data. *Biometrics*, 33, 159–174.
- Mansell, J. (1995). Staffing and staff performance in services for people with severe or profound learning disability and serious challenging behaviour. *Journal of Intellectual Disability Research*, 39(1), 3–14.
- Mansell, J. (2006). Deinstitutionalisation and community living: Progress, problems and priorities. *Journal of Intellectual & Developmental Disability*, 31, 65–76.
- Mansell, J., & Beadle-Brown, J. (2010). Deinstitutionalisation and community living: Position statement of the comparative policy and practice special interest research group of the international association for the scientific study of intellectual Disabilities. *Journal of Intellectual Disability Research*, 54, 104–112. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2788.2009.01239
- McConkey, R., & Collins, S. (2010). The role of support staff in promoting the social inclusion of people with an intellectual disability. *Journal of Intellectual Disability Research*, 54, 691–700. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2788.2010.01295
- Nieboer, A. P., Pijpers, V., & Strating, M. M. H. (2011). Implementing community care for people with intellectual disability: The role of organizational characteristics and the innovation's Attributes. *Journal of Applied Research in Intellectual Disabilities*, 24, 370–380. doi: 10.1111/j.1468-3148.2010.00613
- Thorn, S. H., Pittman, A., Myers, R. E., & Slaughter, C. (2009). Increasing community integration and inclusion for people with intellectual disabilities. *Research in Developmental Disabilities*, 30, 891–901. doi: 10.1016/j.ridd.2009.01.001
- Todd, S. (2000). Working in the public and private domains: staff management of community activities for and the identities of people with intellectual disability. *Journal of Intellectual Disability Research*, 44(5), 600–620.
- Tøssebro, J., Bonfils, I. S., Teittinen, A., Tideman, M., Traustadóttir, R., & Vesala, H. T. (2012). Normalization fifty years beyond—Current trends in the nordic Countries. *Journal of Policy and Practice in Intellectual Disabilities*, 9, 134–146. doi: 10.1111/j.1741-1130.2012.00340
- van Alphen, L. M. (2011). *Social integration of people with intellectual disabilities in neighbourhoods: Sitting on the fence*. Maastricht: BOXpress b.v.
- van Alphen, L. M., Dijker, A. J. M., Borne, H. H. W., & Curfs, L. M. G. (2009). The significance of neighbours: Views and experiences of people with intellectual disability on neighbouring. *Journal of Intellectual Disability Research*, 35, 745–757.
- van Alphen, L. M., Dijker, A. J. M., Borne, H. H. W., & Curfs, L. M. G. (2010). People with intellectual disability as neighbours: Towards understanding the mundane aspects of social Integration. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology*, 20, 347–362.
- van Gennep, A., & Ruigrok, H. (2002). Tussen deinstitutionalisatie en integratie: Op weg naar inclusie? [between deinstitutionalisation and integration: On the way to inclusion?]. *Nederlandse Tijdschrift Voor De Zorg Aan Mensen Met Verstandelijke beperkingen*, 2, 104–119.
- Venema, E., Otten, S., & Vlaskamp, C. (2015). The efforts of direct support professionals to facilitate inclusion: The role of psychological determinants and work setting. *Journal of Intellectual Disability Research*, 59(10), 970–979. doi: 10.1111/jir.12209
- Venema, E., Otten, S., & Vlaskamp, C. (2016). Direct support professionals in reversed integration of people with intellectual disabilities: The impact of attitudes, perceived social norms and meta-evaluations. *Journal of Policy and Practice in Intellectual Disabilities*, 13(1), 41–49. doi: 10.1111/jppi.12145