



**HAL**  
open science

# Teenagers' Mobilities and Sense of Belonging in the Parisian Sensitive Urban Areas

Nicolas Oppenheim

► **To cite this version:**

Nicolas Oppenheim. Teenagers' Mobilities and Sense of Belonging in the Parisian Sensitive Urban Areas. Watt P.; Smeets P. Neighbourhoods, Mobilities and Belonging in the City and Suburb, p145-163, 2014. hal-01092702

**HAL Id: hal-01092702**

**<https://hal.science/hal-01092702>**

Submitted on 13 Jun 2016

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

# Teenagers' Mobilities and Sense of Belonging in the Parisian Sensitive Urban Areas

Nicolas Oppenheim,

Université François Rabelais, Laboratoire Citeres

## Introduction

This chapter aims at documenting the spatial mobility practices of teenagers who live in segregated neighbourhoods, and analyzing these practices in relation to the teenagers' sense of territorial belonging. This issue is addressed through the case of the Sensitive Urban Areas (SUA) in the Parisian region, neighbourhoods that have been targeted by French urban policy since 1996. Best known as 'banlieues' (Wacquant, 2008), these are areas which have come to the forefront of the mass media since the 2005 riots. They are mainly located in the suburbs, but some are in the inner city.

Focusing on the mobilities of teenagers in SUA contributes to the work on residential segregation, that is the unequal distribution of social groups in urban residential space. Thus, I consider the concentration in some SUA of vulnerable populations of foreign extraction (Preteceille, 2009). However, rather than investigating the mechanisms leading to that concentration or the policy measures that might lead to its eradication, purpose here is to address the consequences of the absence of residential mixity concerning the inhabitants of these neighbourhoods.

As a matter of fact, the intervention targeting the underprivileged population is now mainly centred on space, as the evolution of French urban policy shows; priority neighbourhoods of urban policy are becoming 'problems' as such (Dikeç, 2007). The goal of that policy is currently mostly the introduction of social mixing, mainly because of mooted 'neighbourhood effects' – the proposition that living in a poor neighbourhood has an impact on their residents' life chances over and above that of their social characteristics (Martin, 2003). This reconstruction in the political discourse of social problems of *people* into problems of *place* is not however a uniquely French phenomenon, but is widespread in contemporary European, US and Australian urban policy (Darcy, 2010). The present chapter enables us to complete that postulate of the negative externalities of the absence of mixed residential areas for teenagers, when serious conceptual and methodological issues challenge these effects as far as the oldest inhabitants are concerned (Darcy, 2010). The territorialization of public action might even have had a negative impact contributing, for instance, to the creation of a territorial stigma superimposed on the already existing stigma associated with poverty or postcolonial immigrant status (Garbin and Millington, 2012).

As for the teenagers themselves, urban segregation may have a harmful influence on their scholastic achievements as well as on their socialization: the absence of more positive role models in the neighbourhood might lead to particular ways of behaving that would make their social integration more difficult (Wilson, 1987). Yet, reflecting on the negative consequences of segregation upon the ways the teenagers behave implies our taking into account the

socializing role of mobilities at this stage of their lives: residential location in a segregated neighbourhood alone cannot summarize the urban practices of teenagers. The interactions associated with daily mobility are as socializing as the interactions in the residential district or those in the family sphere (Joseph, 2007). There is some UK research showing that young people construct and contest their identities through their use of different urban spaces, be that the local area or out-of-town (Watt, 1998). As for teenagers, this socialization is mainly connected to the frequentation of a public space different from their residential districts and also to their learning of how to be present with unfamiliar people. In fact adolescence is characterized by the transition from a familiar environment in which the child possesses landmarks to the experiencing of a public space in which he/she must find marks (Breviglieri, 2007).

It is thus necessary to link up that socialization exerted by mobilities to that exerted by the neighbourhood. Indeed, if mobility is involved in the socialization of teenagers, it is a practice relying on habits. Taking suburban trains, haunting the urban public spaces, interacting with strangers are not unconditioned skills. Those are skills that need to be learnt: there is a socialization to mobility. As a matter of fact, the ways the teenagers move are deeply influenced by the family context that surrounds them (Kaufman et al., 2004). Yet, these ways are also determined by geographical location and the urban context of the area they live in (Depeau, 2008) as well by their residential anchoring.

Thus, the chapter is in keeping with the roots/routes perspective that considers there is not any necessary contradiction between space attachment and mobility (Gustafson, 2001). Individuals develop a sense of territorial belonging in residential space as they may develop one also in the spaces they visit during their various mobilities (Urry, 2007). More broadly, I wish to show in this chapter that it is necessary to foreground the mobility of teenagers in order to understand their neighbourhood belonging, that is the way they use their neighbourhood, their sociability with the other inhabitants and the role played by the local space in their construction of identity. The chapter considers the influence of the residential and social environment of teenagers on how they link their belonging to a residential neighbourhood and their mobility together, taking into account the specificity of the SUA context as well as the socio-spatial distinctions within these neighbourhoods. These neighbourhoods do not share the same accessibility and connectivity with other parts of the city, the same morphological characteristics, or the same symbolic decay in the minds of other city-dwellers. Similarly, the teenagers of these districts can be distinguished by their gender, social class, ethnic origins, scholastic and professional achievements, as well as by their relationships to state institutions or to the territorial stigma they bear (Kokoreff, 2007).

The fact of taking into account the socio-spatial distinctions within these neighbourhoods leads us then to wonder whether the teenagers of SUA in the Parisian region have specific and homogeneous ways of linking up neighbourhood belonging and mobilities. In order to address this question, I shall first present the methods and data set. The empirical findings are then discussed in order to show how the mobility of teenagers living in SUA is strongly influenced by the social and territorial context in which they grow up. This discussion is then followed

by the presentation of a typology of the SUA teenagers according to their daily mobility and sense of belonging to their neighbourhood. This typology is used to illustrate the argument that there is no univocal relationship between the use of space inside and outside the district.

## **Methodology**

Before developing the substantive arguments further, it is necessary to present the methods that were used to establish the data set based as it is on three main sources. These sources enable a distinction to be made between the teenagers under the double angle of their district and social background. Firstly, a secondary analysis was undertaken of the Parisian metropolitan mobility survey (EGT, 2002), which records all trips made on a typical working day and on each day of the weekend by all the individuals living in the Parisian region. This allowed the social practice of mobility to be placed in context. The following class indicator was used: a teenager is 'working-class' when he/she lives in a family composed only of workers, employees or clerks and out-of-work people; when the income per consumption unit is below the average, and when neither of his parents has received higher education. A distinction was also made between 'middle-class' teenagers and 'upper-class' teenagers: the latter live in households where no workers, employees, clerks or intermediate professions and out-of-work people can be found, or in households where the income is above the eighth decile. Thirty per cent of the teenagers in our sample are thus considered as working-class, 45 per cent as belonging to the middle classes and 25 per cent to the higher classes. One third of the working-class teenagers live in SUA while, symmetrically, 65 per cent of the teenagers from the SUA are working-class. Each results table (Tables 1-5 below) displays a double entry system distinguishing working-class teenagers from other teenagers and distinguishing those who live in SUA from those who do not. Yet, this material suffers from the size of the sample (2309 teenagers during the week, 810 in the weekend). It enables one to distinguish the profiles inside the SUA only on the criterion of gender and that of the distance from the city centre.

The second data source is an ethnographic study of about one year with young boys (aged 13 to 18) frequenting the local community centres of a municipality in the outer suburbs (one hour from the centre of Paris). Being with these youths on a daily basis - in their living areas and on the trains, staying with them during their outings - as well as 20 ethnographic interviews - allowed me to see the interdependence between neighbourhood belonging and the practices of mobility. However, the major drawback of this ethnographic study lies in the fact of only having an access to a single category of teenagers from these districts, those strongly present in the public space and involved in associative networks of the neighbourhood. Those frequently on the move or, on the contrary, those staying at home, were largely untargeted. These teenagers being mostly from economically weak households, the teenagers from other social backgrounds and/or from other areas could not be used as comparing tools either.

The third data source is seven in-school research projects consisting of thematic work on mobility (photos and writing mainly) plus 92 one-hour interviews, analyzed through various

themes such as the places the teenagers go to, their learning of mobility or their residential anchoring. These projects allowed me to reach those teenagers who are not usually found in the public spaces of the neighbourhood. Despite the homogenization of educational structures in these districts, the presence of pupils from the middle or working classes not living in SUA also allowed a comparison between the practices of mobility of the teenagers living in SUA with those of the teenagers from other districts. Relying on the available data and the school registers, I considered as working-class the teenagers holding a school maintenance allowance and not living in a two-car household, a household which is exclusively composed of workers, of non-state employees and of unemployed. Amongst these teenagers, 54 live in SUA while 15 live next to a SUA. Twenty three students come from the middle classes, 12 from these students live in SUA. No higher-class teenagers were interviewed as all interviewees lived in households in which at least one clerk or one worker could be found.

### **The teenagers of SUA have a mobility potential that is lower than that of other teenagers**

The use of space inside and outside the district is strongly influenced by socio-economic factors. The correlation between the presence in the residential public space in SUA, the economic resources of the parents and the size of accommodation has been shown already (Sauvadet, 2006). As for mobility outside the district, the teenagers living in SUA have a mobility potential that is different from that of other teenagers. The main constraints on their mobility are the inferior availability of their parents in time and in vehicles as well as their lower financial resources. A better public transport (PT) service partially makes up for these constraints as most of them live in the inner suburbs.

**Table 1. Characteristics of the teenagers according to their social categories and their districts**

	Working class	Middle Class	Higher Class
Household ranking in the first and second decile of income			
- In the SUA	<b>62,9%</b>	22,7%	Insignificant
- In the Parisian region	<b>54,5%</b>	<b>9,8%</b>	<b>3,1%</b>
Teenagers with at least two siblings			
- In the SUA	<b>50,5%</b>	43,5%	Insignificant
- In the Parisian region	<b>48,8%</b>	<b>28,1%</b>	<b>25,7%</b>
Families with one parent having to go to work before 7 am or after 7 pm			
- In the SUA	<b>32,6%</b>	13,5%	Insignificant
- In the Parisian region	<b>27,9%</b>	<b>16,9%</b>	<b>9,4%</b>

Families with 2 vehicles (outside of inner Paris)			
- In the SUA	<b>13%</b>	22%	Insignificant
- In the Parisian region	<b>25,5%</b>	<b>49,5%</b>	<b>68%</b>
Teenagers living at more than 30 minutes from the centre of Paris in PT			
- In the SUA	<b>15,7%</b>	8,2%	Insignificant
- In the Parisian region	<b>21,6%</b>	<b>24,6%</b>	<b>15,8%</b>

Reading: 48,8% of the working class teenagers have at least two siblings; 50,5% amongst those living in S.U.A.

Source: EGT (2002), author's calculations

In comparison with others, teenagers living in SUA are less often accompanied during their trips and rarely taken where they wish to go by car since their parents are less frequently car-owners (see Table 2). This partly counterbalanced by an earlier autonomous use of public transport, as seen in Table 3. It leads to a concentration of extra-curricular activities around their place of residence and an underrepresentation of leisure activities that must be paid for. Working-class teenagers thus favour calling on friends and going for walks, notably when they live in SUA.

**Table 2: Teenagers transported by their parents in the weekend for extracurricular activities**

11-18 years old	Working-class	Middle Class	Higher Class
- In the SUA	<b>16,4%</b>	36,1%	Insignificant
- In the Parisian region	<b>35,2%</b>	<b>45,9%</b>	<b>47,9%</b>

Source: EGT 2002, author's calculations

**Table 3: Teenagers under 14 having used public transport without their parents in the weekend**

	Working-class	Middle Class	Higher Class
- In the SUA	<b>18,3%</b>	Insignificant	Insignificant

- In the Parisian region	<b>10,4%</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>8,5%</b>
--------------------------	--------------	-----------	-------------

Source: EGT 2002, author's calculations

The inferior availability of parents has a distinct impact according to the gender of the teenager; a large minority of girls of SUA have scarcely any activity in the weekend, at night notably; see Table 4.

**Table 4: Girls without weekend extracurricular activities outside their homes**

	Working-class	Middle Class	Higher Class
- In the SUA	<b>30,7%</b>	Insignificant	Insignificant
- In the Parisian region	<b>21,4%</b>	<b>12,7%</b>	<b>12,8%</b>

Source: EGT 2002, author's calculations

The differential parental control of the girls' practices of mobility is neither a specificity of the SUA nor a specificity of the working-class categories. However, it is accentuated in SUA by the possible repercussions of rumours that can be spread throughout the neighbourhood. These rumours are mostly about a girl's romantic and/or sexual life and, hence the educational example set by the parents; being a girl who goes out would indicate that she escapes the influence of her parents in this domain. These rumours can circulate on different levels—among the family, the district, and the local community—and, independently of how trusting the parents are, they can restrict the mobility of girls. The weight of these rumours is all the more problematic when the trust between the parents and the teenager is weak. These rumours partly explain why the presence of girls is less visible than that of boys in residential public space. Besides the hindrance of rumours and the unequal parental control, girls have less opportunity to gain a certain financial autonomy compared to the boys of these districts. Many boys begin to work at 14/15 years old, in particular as sales assistants in clothes or cell phone shops. If some girls work at this age, they are generally paid in the form of clothes and other presents rather than in money. In every case, the girls are less likely than the boys to exercise a paid activity, but not less to work; the activities that restrict their mobility on Sundays are the domestic tasks that are more or less unburdening to boys and homework, the latter activity being more mentioned by girls than by boys.

The parents' lack of available time in SUA very often leads them to delegate the task of monitoring the mobility of teenagers to older siblings or cousins. Sometimes members of the local community, who have more or less close family ties to the teenager, could be involved; some teenagers only have the right to go out when a member of the local community is present or when accompanied by young people from their extended family. This makes it all

the more necessary for girls to have good understandings with the older members of their families since it allows them more significant mobility. The evolution of this supervisory control with the rise in age is complex. On the one hand, the fear for the girls' safety seems to decrease, as the girls get older since they are considered more able to defend themselves. On the other hand, the end of adolescence also means the end of the girls' 'age of innocence' for some parents, which can lead them to restrict the mobility of their daughters because of their own fears or more widely because of neighbourhood rumours.

However, the constraints on mobility should not mask the teenagers' strategies used to escape from parental control. These strategies are elaborated in proportion to the fear of parental control and the importance of this control: mobiles are left at home, teenagers lie about where they are going (for example, they say they are going to the library) and the people with whom they are meeting, they leave their residential areas when their mother has left, etc.

### **Six ways of linking mobility and territorial belonging together**

Though the influence of gender on the use of space by the teenagers of SUA should not be neglected, the internal differences attached to these teenagers are much larger than the gender distinction. If the girls in SUA are, on an average, less mobile than the other working-class teenage girls, this is only an average when some of them may move much more frequently than other teenage girls or boys of their district. Also, if boys are more often to be found than girls in their public space of residence, some of them spend very little time in their districts. From the interviews and ethnographic study, one can construct a typology showing the six major ways of living in or close to a segregated neighbourhood, according to neighbourhood belonging and mobility out of the district (see Table 5).

The teenagers living in SUA can be characterized by three major types of neighbourhood belonging, already examined in other studies (Beaud, 2002). First, they are characterized by a very strong attachment to and an important presence in the public space of the neighbourhood. Secondly, they are characterized by an attachment to the district, in particular to fellow inhabitants, yet by a weak presence in public space and a certain tiredness towards the neighbourhood. Thirdly, they are characterized by a rejection of the neighbourhood and invisibility in public space. Neighbourhood belonging must none the less be studied in connection with the practices of mobility. Indeed, they bear the marks of the different types of neighbourhood belonging, be it with the youths who enjoy 'taking their district with them' or with those who, on the contrary, cut themselves off from the way they use space in the district once they are outside it. Last but not least, the teenagers experiencing a similar feeling of neighbourhood belonging may have quite different practices of mobility.

Crossing the teenagers' neighbourhood belonging with the different dimensions of their practices of mobility (the learning of autonomy, the relationship to the crowd, the places they go to, the co-presence with other city-dwellers in the public transports and in the places of mobility) means six groups emerge, as set out in Table 5. These six groups enable us to



classify the whole of the interviewed teenagers and to depict the heterogeneousness of the SUA and of its inhabitants. Without assuming that these figures are statistically representative, the Table shows the number of teenagers within each group out of the 92 interviewees. This typology remains flexible enough. On the one hand, some teenagers have practices differing very much according to the time and space of their mobility. This is a very particular situation, but one teenager actually belongs for example to two groups, partly because before moving to a SUA, he used to live in a very different neighbourhood. This explains why the sum of teenagers from each category is superior to the total number of interviewed teenagers. On the other hand, the biographical background exposed in the interviews and the evolution of some of the teenagers during the ethnographic study reveal transitions from one group to another that are linked to their growing older. Beyond the notion of age, this typology is strongly influenced by the economic resources of the household, by social class, gender, residential localization, family structures, academic history and ethnic origin. It also bears the mark of the characteristics- identified before- of the teenagers living in SUA, that is an early use of public transport, a less important presence of the parents in mobility, and the greater immobility of girls.

**Table 5: Main Groups of Teenagers in the SUA**

	<i>District Teenagers</i>	<i>Association Boys</i>	<i>Strollers</i>	<i>Teenagers with Passions</i>	<i>Exclusive Strollers</i>	<i>Under control teenagers</i>
<b>Number of teenagers in the sample</b>	20	11	23	13	12	14
<b>Gender</b>	Boys exclusively	Boys exclusively	Boys in general	Boys in general	Girls in general	Girls in general
<b>Age</b>	Average of the sample (15-17 years old)	Average of the sample	Older (16-18 years old)	Average of the sample	Average of the sample	Younger (14-16 years old)
<b>Social origin</b>	Working-class	Working-class	Middle-class	Working and Middle-Class	Working and Middle-Class	Middle-class
<b>Residential origin</b>	SUA	SUA	SUA with a good PT service	Districts in the vicinity of a SUA	Districts in the vicinity with a good PT service	Districts in the vicinity with a poor PT service
<b>School</b>	Very poor	Poor	Good	Good	Very good	Average

achievements						
--------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

**Teenagers with a strong sense of belonging: ‘*district Teenagers*’ and the ‘*association boys*’**

These first two groups are composed of teenagers characterized by a strong sense of belonging to their neighbourhoods, which not only expresses itself through a regular presence in the public space of the neighbourhood, but also corresponds to a definition of the self in which belonging to the neighbourhood plays a determining part. These two categories are none the less differently anchored in their districts, which also explains their different practices of mobility.

*The ‘district teenagers’*

The ‘district teenagers’ are mainly boys living in SUA with a relatively chaotic academic history. They come from households with the lowest incomes and are often from single-parent families with numerous siblings. The ‘district teenagers’ spend most of their time in the public space of their residential district. They value the friendly sociability in the district because of the high density of young people there. They have a number of acquaintances in the district where they meet young people of any age, but they have generally a core group of five to six friends. They demonstrate the strongest identification with their neighbourhood, displayed, for instance, on t-shirts bearing the name of the place they live in. That sense of belonging is engendered by common experiences with the other teenagers living in the neighbourhood and also by the feeling they live in a stigmatized district strongly opposed to the other areas of the city. That conflicting feeling is mainly built up during their trips outside their districts.

They began to use public transportation without their parents at about 11/12 years old, for visits to the family, to go to sports clubs outside the district or cheating public transport to go for a run with older teenagers. They may also be given an occasional lift by senior youngsters of the district in return for favours done. Almost all the trips are made in groups composed exclusively of boys; these groups may gather up to twenty people or so. The trips made in groups can be partly explained by an age effect in connection to some shyness in confronting teenagers of the opposite sex. One of the other advantages of large numbers appears in the case of conflict with other teenagers during the journey.

Trips outside the district are hardly planned. The decision to move is often made when there is not much to do in the district; they search for some excitement (flirting or provoking other young people) to temporarily escape the boredom of home. This may explain ‘the institutionalization’ of certain movements on Saturday afternoons, as the teenagers

appropriating the train at '2:30 pm' (other users know perfectly about the practice) know that they will find excitement on the train if they find nothing to do in the district.

This excitement is sought in the frequented places as much as in the spaces of transport. The relationship of teenagers to crowds of people in public places is not much appreciated, except on special events such as New Year's Day or July 14<sup>th</sup>. These crowds are not perceived as a source of anonymity, and neither are they regarded as offering a weaker social control than in the district. Crowded public places offer excitement; they allow the teenagers to be in contact with other teenagers with the nature of that contact going from seduction to provocation or more openly conflictual relationships, without taking much risks to be checked by the police.

The feeling of opposition teenagers build up between 'us' and 'them' – between the youths of the residential district and the other city-dwellers – determines their use of space outside the district. This feeling is actualized in interactions with city-dwellers from other social backgrounds who would make them feel unwelcome because of a social, ethnic and age 'triple mark' which 'district teenagers' feel they have attached to them. They are led to feel that hostility by different signs: disagreeable looks, offensive judgments on their behaviours such as their listening to music, invading the train and refusing to get involved into interactions. They are deeply aware of the picture they give of themselves as they are aware of the mistrust they arouse. Yet they can make use of it in an aggressive posture and a show of themselves and of their masculinity. That would not necessarily be possible in their own districts for fear of those older than they are. That triple mark is strengthened in the interactions with people in charge of space (vigilantes, ticket inspectors, police officers) who are suspected of being willing to restrict their mobility, acting differently with them when they, for instance, check their identities repetitively in the Parisian places popular with tourists.

As a consequence, these teenagers develop a mental map in which the space outside the district appears as an urban world apart. That map is mostly drawn by the distinction between the places frequented by teenagers of the same social and ethnic background and the places frequented by the other city-dwellers (especially the teenagers living inside Paris). So, these teenagers are generally little attracted by Paris, except for the spontaneous search for excitement. They are critical of the cold and anonymous nature of the capital city they put in contrast to the solidarity ruling in the district. On that point, they are close to the "chavs", described by Elias le Grand (see Chapter 2), for whom the central parts of London appear at both a cultural and spatial distance for most respondents who rarely go there. That vision of an urban world which is apart does not totally restrict their mobility, but they favour trips to places they are used to going, places they find welcoming due to some characteristics (particular shops and restaurants, architecture, presence of acquaintances working there, presence of youths of the same origins, etc.). Yet, if they would rather go to familiar places, the unfolding of mobility can become haphazard. Apart from the search for excitement bestowed by the fact of travelling in groups, they do not necessarily have a particular goal when they take the decision to move.

### *The 'association boys'*

Most of the 'association boys' live in SUA but they come from working-class categories that are more integrated than the 'district teenagers' (higher income, presence of the two parents at home). Their residential belonging is also quite different as regards their use of the neighbourhood, their sociability with the other inhabitants or the part played by the local space in the construction of their identity.

Intermittently present in the public space of their neighbourhood, they mainly frequent the local associations (community centres or football clubs). Their networks of friends mostly involve teenagers living in their neighbourhoods and who are the same age, even if they are known and respected by the other youths living in the place. They have also developed friendly relationships with girls from their neighbourhoods at school. Eventually, their neighbourhood plays a role of minor importance in their construction of identity in comparison to the 'district teenagers'. The 'association boys' define themselves as belonging to a group of teenagers living in their neighbourhood rather than defining themselves as belonging to the neighbourhood itself. For instance, they only take part in street fights with youths from other neighbourhoods if one of their friends is targeted.

This specific belonging very much influences their mobility which mostly consists of short trips close to the neighbourhoods. They do not feel the need to move to farther places using public transport for they have access to a large number of local resources; their friendly or love relationships with girls living in the neighbourhood and the activities that are offered by the associations. Often, they know before the other teenagers about the trips organized by these associations outside their neighbourhood. They occasionally move to the nearby shopping centres with their girlfriends willing to try clothes on, for instance. Following the girls, they may also pay for activities they do in common, activities to which only a restricted number of boys has access, for example going to the cinema, bowling or swimming.

Contrary to the 'district teenagers', the 'association boys' do not account for the low number of trips to Paris in terms of the hostility of other city-dwellers towards them. If they make a distinction between 'us' and 'them' – between the teenagers living in SUA and those coming from other social classes – they do not perceive the cohabitation with the other city-dwellers as stigmatizing. This absence of a stigmatizing feeling can be explained by two elements. On the one hand, these teenagers have never had to face any hostility from other city-dwellers on the occasion of a trip to Paris. On the other hand, they feel they live in a neighbourhood different from the others, marked by social and ethnic homogeneity, in which it is nevertheless possible to find resources enabling them to do activities adapted to their age.

### **Teenagers with a sporadic presence in the neighbourhood: *the 'strollers' and the 'teenagers with passions'***

These two groups involve teenagers who are attached to their neighbourhoods, but who are only sporadically present there. They make a distinction between the residents for whom they have a liking and the atmosphere in the district. As they are tired of some negative aspects of the residential segregation, notably the absence of ethnic and social diversity as well as the social control reigning there, they spend lot of time out of their district. Yet, the practices of mobility are different for these two categories of teenagers, who also have different social and residential origins. The 'strollers' belong almost exclusively to the working and middle classes living in SUA, whereas the practices of 'the teenagers with a passion' are extremely close to those of the middle-class teenagers who do not live in SUA.

### *The 'strollers'*

This profile represents as many girls as boys but it is more widely to be encountered with working-class teenagers living in SUA than it is to be found with those who do not live there. This overrepresentation is reinforced with middle-class teenagers; most of those living in SUA are 'strollers'. What is more, the prevalence of this profile is higher in those SUAs that are well served by public transport and located close to Paris.

As they are tired of their district, the 'strollers' are in search of a diversity of encounters and of anonymity in places exterior to the district. They were used from an early age to using the public transport with their parents or older cousins and then began moving autonomously around the age of 14. They mainly go to Paris, where they like the change of architecture and, above all, they enjoy the presence of tourists and other youths with other social and geographical origins. They do their trips in the company of one or two friends from their districts or with older people who have settled elsewhere. These trips are planned, with, in general, a meeting-point in the centre of Paris. Yet, once on the spot, the 'strollers' enjoy walking, getting lost and leaving chance play a predominant part in the unfolding of the afternoon. In fact, they have no predetermined goal while moving around, apart from what the diversity of urban crowds may bring: meeting up with other youths' acquaintances and watch the different ways the other teenagers dress; being entertained by street shows or spontaneous happenings; fleetingly encountering other teenagers whether it should lead to lasting relationships or not; showing off and adopting, under cover of anonymity, behaviour not tolerated in their own districts. The 'strollers' also find these opportunities in the public transport where they like spending time.

Their specific use of space implies a familiarization with the anonymity of a big city. Many of them thus discovered Paris in their childhood, either with family members working or living there, or because they themselves have lived there. When that familiarization was accompanied by other teenagers, the process was a progressive one; the youths having started to go to places which were not completely unfamiliar before, started to explore other districts once they got used to the crowd. That case generally concerns former 'district teenagers' who positively connect the change in their use of space to a liberation as regards their districts. They claim skills in building relationships that allow them to be as much at ease in their socializing with other city-dwellers as with the teenagers in their districts. As the 'strollers'

keep on being occasionally present there, they have become skilled in switching from the district codes to the codes of the places they go to in their mobility. They also make a clear distinction between the places where they like ‘strolling’ and the places they go to in groups, with the ‘district teenagers’, generally for the New Year’s Day or July 14<sup>th</sup> festivities. The way they dress and their behaviours thus evolve according to where and when they move, which they summarize with the phrase ‘be in a so and so mode’; ‘be in a chav mode’, ‘be in a good-looker mode’. Some may then take an active part in fights in shopping malls around their districts, while they will not fight in the places they frequent in Paris for fear of bringing discredit upon themselves in the eyes of other city-dwellers.

### *The ‘teenagers with passions’*

This profile comprises working-class teenagers whose mobility practices are very much akin to those of middle-class teenagers. Their distancing from the districts is concomitant with the practice of a passion (hip hop dance, mangas, music) which led them to meet teenagers from other social backgrounds. We notice the particular case of ‘district teenagers’ who became ‘teenagers with passions’ putting a lot into one passion, often the practice of a sport, because they associate it with a personal and beneficial evolution. The older members of the family, many of whom have left the district, often play a part in the discovery of that passion that may also prove to be profitable as it may give them early financial autonomy. As far as the use of space outside the district is concerned, owing to their parents’ tighter control of their mobility, these teenagers were less precocious than the other teenagers in their autonomous use of public transport. They generally experienced that autonomy when in third form, even though they are still occasionally transported by older members of the family.

They may move on their own when no other youths in the district share their passions. Yet, as a rule, they move in groups and their trips are always organized. They know the routes beforehand and they know exactly where they will meet up with the youths who live outside the district. They have a particular reason to move, in general to Paris, the atmosphere of which they favour as they favour the urban amenities that are more developed there than in their own districts. The ‘teenagers with passions’ would rather stay at home when they have no particular reason to move. Their passions provide structure to their use of space since, contrary to the ‘strollers’, they only move for functional reasons. They do not like spending time sauntering, getting lost in the urban crowds and using public transport. They express the wish to take their driving tests as soon as possible. Their use of space outside the district is exclusively devoted to the practice of a passion or to that of an activity shared with people they have met in that context. They are different from the other teenagers of SUA because their use of cars is more important and also because they go to semi-private places (hookah lounges, community parties) or private places (parties at the homes of teenagers of the same age).

## **Teenagers who reject their neighbourhoods: *the 'exclusive strollers' and the 'under control teenagers'***

The last two categories of teenagers mainly involve girls who limit their presence in the public space of residence. The weight of social control, of rumours and the division between boys and girls are more strongly felt than by the other teenagers and explain that invisibility. When they live close to SUA, the working-class teenagers, just as those belonging to the middle class, are more numerous in underlining those negative aspects in comparison to those living in SUA. This leads them to dissociate themselves from their cities and from the other teenagers of their district, notably from those they call the 'racailles' (similar to 'chavs'), the presence of whom they avoid. The network of friends in the district is tighter and restricted to a strong friendship with one or two people. Yet, if these two categories of teenagers reject their neighbourhoods, their use of space outside it is radically different, which can be explained by the way they have learnt how to move and by the relationship to mobility their parents have.

### *The 'exclusive strollers'*

This profile mostly deals with the working and middle-class teenagers living close to SUA. The "*exclusive strollers*" live in a family context that very much develops the mobility of teenagers and their discovery of the outer world. Their parents often experienced long distance mobility, be it national or transnational, at an early age. They generally settled in the district quite a long time ago; a district they would leave because of the deterioration of its atmosphere if they had the financial means to do so. These teenagers have been used very early on to using public transport with their parents so that they know how to use the network perfectly well. Last but not least, they have received a transportation card before the other youths in their districts and that card has played an important part in their accession to autonomy as it has significantly increased their mobility. They are on friendly terms with youths who live outside their districts (they met on the Internet or they are friends who formerly lived in their own districts) whom they see on a more regular basis than the '*strollers*' because they have a lower number of friends in their own districts. Their use of space outside the district is very much akin to that of the '*strollers*' but it is also different in two ways: firstly they are absent from the shopping malls for fear of meeting up with other youths from their districts, and secondly they enjoy moving about on their own, noticeably in public transport where they may spend hours and which they consider as a place in itself.

### *The 'under control teenagers'*

This last profile is more prevalent with the middle-class teenagers living close to SUA. It is also more frequently found in those districts located at a distance from the city centre. Paradoxically, among the youths living in SUA, the '*under control teenagers*' do not come from the middle classes but from socioeconomically fragile, often single-parent families with ethnic origins that are minority in the district (Asian or European).

They share the same invisibility in the district as the *'exclusive strollers'*, but they live in a family context that firmly controls their mobility because of fear of muggings. Those fears are mostly focused on trips to Paris, the underground and the suburban trains they rarely use. These teenagers seldom hold a transportation card, they have no mastery of the network of transports and they share most of their parents' fears. For them, the use of buses is much less a cause of anxiety due to the presence of a driver. They feel more at ease in means of transport which does not run under-the-ground and of which they feel they can get out more easily. They also wish they could take their driving tests soon.

For the moment, these teenagers are accompanied in the public transport by someone older than they are or, when moving by car, by their parents. They are accompanied on their way to leisure activities, when these can be afforded, or to do shopping in malls. These trips are perceived as functional only and are not opportunities for walks or for an appropriation of the place as they merely follow their parents. When these two ways of accompanying them are not possible - this is mainly the case in SUA - these teenagers spend a lot of time at home which can be hard to bear if they are rarely allowed to let friends in. They use the Internet - when they have an access to it - to broaden their network of friends or to keep in touch with their countries or regions of origin. The community or family links are mostly composed of that network of friends. They apprehend the few times when they can go out, often without their parents' knowledge, as a breath of air as regards their confinement at home or in a district they dislike. These outings are generally outings in nearby shopping malls, rarely trips to Paris where they might go following friends who use the public transport autonomously. They are quite distrustful but nonetheless like the change of scenery, the anonymity and the diversity they can find there. They are particularly seduced by the shortness of the urban interactions that allow them to make fun of the other city-dwellers, and possibly to become targets themselves, all this without having to face the consequences, which is not the case in their own districts.

## **Conclusion**

By describing the different ways the teenagers living in SUA link mobility and neighbourhood belonging together, this chapter has facilitated a better understanding of the social heterogeneity of the inhabitants of these districts. Some uses of space inside or outside their neighbourhood are peculiar to working-class teenagers of SUA, while others can also be found with teenagers living close to SUA. These uses are obviously influenced by the context of the residential district: the teenagers living in SUA are characterized by an early use of public transport and by an immobility which is stronger with girls than with boys. The mobilities of these teenagers are also determined by their age, academic history, family structures, their residential trajectory, the trips to the city centre made while they were young and their parents' views on mobility. The teenagers of SUA have a mobility potential that is lower than that of other teenagers, but living in a segregated neighbourhood, in the suburbs noticeably, does not necessarily mean an *absence* of relationships with other urban areas such



as the inner-city. Also, while some teenagers of SUA feel they bear a territorial stigma when they move, others do not perceive the cohabitation with the other city-dwellers as stigmatizing.

This chapter has also shown that a sense of belonging to the local neighbourhood is not antinomial to very frequent trips, as is the case for the 'strollers'. Also, the fact of rejecting one's neighbourhood is not always synonymous with frequent mobility as with the 'under control teenagers'. Studying the sense of belonging to a neighbourhood in connection with mobility then allows one to identify those teenagers who suffer the most strongly from the negative externalities of residential segregation: a number of the 'district teenagers' for whom the triple social, ethnic and age mark they feel they bear may lead to a withdrawal into the district and to an uneasy social integration; the 'under control' teenagers who rarely leave their districts where they do not feel good. No doubt that the various politicians and community leaders should exert actions in favour of the mobility of teenagers of these two categories. These actions should not be limited to the mobility potential of the teenagers in SUA. They should also help these teenagers to face the experience represented by the discovery of the public urban space. Satisfying public transport services are a necessary condition, although they are not always adequate to allow teenagers to move. These teenagers should also be given the opportunity to enjoy living in their districts; they should be able to leave them while feeling like remaining there. Hopefully this chapter can be used as a tool to facilitate comparison with other poor neighbourhoods in Europe, in which, as is the case in France, policies aiming at introducing a larger social mix are implemented without considering the diversity and the mobility practices of the very inhabitants of these districts.

## References

Beaud, S. (2002) *80% au Bac et Après?* Paris: La Découverte.

Breviglieri, M. (2007) *Adolescences Méditerranéennes. L'Espace Public à Petit Pas*. Paris: L'Harmattan.

Darcy, M. (2010) De-concentration of Disadvantage and Mixed Income Housing: a Critical Discourse Approach, *Housing, Theory and Society* 27(1): 1-22.

Depeau, S. (2008) Radioscopie des territoires de la mobilité des enfants en milieu urbain. Comparaison entre Paris intra-muros et banlieue parisienne, *Enfances, Familles, Générations*, 8 [online].

Dikeç, M. (2007) *Badlands of the Republic*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Garbin, D. and Millington, G. (2012) Territorial Stigma and the Politics of Resistance in a Parisian Banlieu: La Courneuve and beyond, *Urban Studies* 49(10): 2067-2083.

- Gustafson, P. (2001) Roots and Routes: Exploring the Relationship Between Place Attachment and Mobility, *Environment and Behavior* 33(5): 667-686.
- Joseph, I. (2007) *L'Athlète Moral et l'Enquêteur Modeste*. Paris: Economica.
- Kaufmann, V., Bergmann, M., Joye, D. (2004) Motility: Mobility as Capital, *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 28: 745-756.
- Kokoreff, M. (2007) Du stigmaté au ghetto. De la difficulté à nommer les quartiers, *Informations Sociales*, 141 : 86-95.
- Martin, D. (2003) Enacting neighbourhood, *Urban Geography* 24(5): 361-385.
- Preteceille, E. (2009) La ségrégation ethno-raciale dans la métropole parisienne, *Revue française de sociologie*, 50(3) : 489-519.
- Sauvadet, T. (2006) *Le Capital Guerrier*. Paris: Armand Colin.
- Urry, J. (2007) *Mobilities*. London: Polity Press.
- Wacquant, L. (2008) *Urban Outcasts: A Comparative Sociology of Advanced Marginality*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Watt, P. (1998) Going Out of Town: Youth, Race and Place in the South East of England, *Environment & Planning D: Society and Space* 16: 687-703.
- Wilson, W. J. (1987) *The Truly Disadvantaged—The Inner City, the Underclass, and Public Policy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.