V&Runipress

Transkulturelle Perspektiven
Band 7

herausgegeben von

Sylvia Hahn, Christiane Harzig
und Dirk Hoerder

Finding the Way Home

Young People's Stories of Gender, Ethnicity, Class,
and Places in Hamburg and London

Herausgegeben von
Nora Räthzel

mit
Phil Cohen, Les Back,
Michael Keith, Andreas Hieronymus

V&R unipress

FSC

Mix

Produktgruppe aus vorbildlich
bewirtschafteten Wäldern,
kontrollierten Herkünften und
Recycl ngholz oder -fasern

Zert.-Nr. GFA-COC-1229
www.fsc.org
© 1996 Forest Stewardship Council

„Dieses Softcover wurde auf FSC-zertifiziertem Papier gedruckt. FSC (Forest Stewardship Council) ist eine nichtstaatliche, g e m e i n n ü t z i g e Organisation, die sich für eine ökologische und sozialverantwortliche Nutzung der Wälder unserer Erde einsetzt."

Gedruckt auf alterungsbeständigem Papier.

For Erkan Şahın and Janna Steenfatt

Contents

Acknowledgements

First and foremost we want to thank Annika McPherson for converting what was a pile of written papers into a book manuscript: She translated the German parts of the manuscript, transformed Nora's faulty English into a readable language with dedicated precision, and found bigger and smaller errors in the text. She posed exactly the right question when she found sentences that did not make sense. It is often said, as a formula of politeness, that a book would not have been possible without the help of other people. In this case this is literally true. Without Annika there would be no book.

Of course, in order for texts to be written, teachers needed to support our research aims: We thank the teaching staff in all the schools who took a very active part in the research process, and the council and police officers, youth workers, and community activists who consented to be interviewed for the policy study.

The research would not have been possible without young people willing to work with us during the course of two years. Their patience with us, our package of methods, and our never-ending questions was admirable and we can never thank them enough for their co-operation and their willingness to share their stories with us. This book is dedicated to two of them, Janna Steenfatt and Erkan Sahin from Hamburg. We stayed in contact until today and they never tired to ask: When is this book going to come out? It was their insistence on seeing the results of their commitment that provided a great deal of the energy and motivation to pursue this publication in spite of changing countries, workplaces, and research projects.

With the amount of young people and adults involved in the project it would have been impossible to do any serious work without the support of a number of researchers. They did a tremendous work, not only working with the young people, but also sharing their ideas, observations and analyses with those who finally wrote down the texts contained in this book. Many thanks to Monika Brakhage, Hülya Eralp, Jürgen Garbers, Tatjana La Mura Flores, Vassilis Tsianos, Turgay Yilmaz, and Ünal Zeran, who worked in Altona and Bergedorf, and, on the London side, to Landé Olumide Pratt and Sarah Newlands working in Deptford and to Tim Lucas and Tahmina Maula working on the Isle of Dogs. We are greatly indebted to the enthusiasm, commitment and sensitivity with which they undertook a complex research task, often working under considerable pressure in very difficult circumstances.

In London the project enjoyed the continued support of Mike Rustin, Dean of the Faculty of Social Sciences, who funded the pilot study from which the

larger research project grew, as well as colleagues in the Department of Cultural Studies. We would like to thank Richard McKeever and Linda John at CNER for seeing an earlier version of the English research project through the production stages.

Dirk Hoerder has accompanied the German part of the project as its co-director from the beginning. His comments on the research application were invaluable, he provided advice at every stage of the project, shared his knowledge about his hometown Hamburg, commented on several parts of the manuscript, took part in the conferences we organized, and took some of our analyses as departure points for his own thoughts and analyses of parts of the material. Finally, he made this publication possible with his kind insistence on the need to finish the work and by providing a space in the series he edits with Christiane Harzig and Sylvia Hahn. Thank you. Very special thanks also go to Christiane Harzig, who, many years ago, helped to get the project off the ground in the first place.

Many young people, teachers, social workers, and members of the police force, who shared their knowledge and their opinions with us, do not appear directly in this book. The material we collected was simply too much to be dealt with, even with the time we took to complete this publication. However, their information and their views were decisive for us to understand school institutions and the everyday lives of the young people with whom we worked. We want to thank them sincerely for their support and understanding and we hope that this book will be useful for them and for all the others who participated, even after such a long time.

Previous versions of some of the texts in this volume have appeared before. Parts of Chapter 3 have been published as: Räthzel, Nora, Creating Spaces of Fear and Spaces of Safety: Young Natives and Migrants in Metropolitan Neighbourhoods, in: Ethnologia Europaea, 34.2004, No.3, 141–157.

Parts of Chapter 4 previously appeared in: Räthzel, Nora, Youth Groups and the Politics of Time and Space, in: Cook, Theron D./Maria I. Diedrich/Flip Lindo (eds.), Crossing Boundaries: African American Inner City and European Migrant Youth, Hamburg 2004, 95–113, as well as in Räthzel, Nora, Living Differences: Ethnicity and Fearless Girls in Public Spaces, in: Social Identities, 6.2000, No. 2, 119–142.

Parts of Chapter 5 have been published as: Räthzel, Nora, Antagonistic Girls, or: Why the Foreigners are the Real Germans, in: Harzig, Christiane/Danielle Juteau (eds.), The Social Construction of Diversity: Recasting the Master Narrative of Industrial Nations, New York 2003, 40–61.

Illustrations

Les Back, Nora Räthzel, Andreas Hieronymus
1. Introduction: Aims, Methods, and Sample

Aims

The aim of our parallel projects in London and in Hamburg was to compare the ways in which young people from different ethnic backgrounds related to each other in different spatial contexts on the level of neighbourhood, cities, and nation states. We wanted to know if and to what degree national histories, national policies, and urban settings influence the ways in which ethnic relations are lived in the everyday lives of young people. By using the same methodology and choosing similar areas in both cities we wanted to find out if it was possible to identify different national models of identifications within contexts defined by migration processes and changing patterns of (de)industrialization. Our interest was nurtured by the contradictory observation that although the German and the British migration patterns were as different as their policies concerning ethnic minorities and racism, the statistics showing an overrepresentation of ethnic minorities in vulnerable economic and social positions were quite comparable.

As the Hamburg and London teams were rooted in the particular German and English scholarly discourses and current policy debates, the actual research and the subsequent interpretation of the data modified the comparison. For the London team, the aim was to plot the ways in which young adolescents relate their spaces of identity to the identity of places and to establish the range of factors that combine to racialize and ethnicize this process in specific urban settings. The key objective was to improve our understanding of the way in which issues of public safety and danger are perceived by different groups. The German team in turn wanted to look at the conditions under which ethnic, gender, and class categories played a role in the everyday lives of young people, that is the ways in which they related to each other.

Our respective questions were of course the result of the dominant issues discussed in our countries. While in Britain, issues of safety and danger in the urban setting were continually racialized, constructing young people of ethnic minorities as the dangerous perpetrators, the German discussion in academia – though including such racializations – revolved mainly around questions of ethnicization vs. functional modernity. Those who wanted to refute the racialization of danger argued that ethnicity did not play any role in modern functional societies, that people related to each other according to their functions and interests, while ethnicity was only important in the private realm.

This rejection of cultural or ethnic identifications as a legitimate form of community construction was of course also an effect of the German history of genocide based on racism. What we in the German part of the project wanted to do was to find out if and in which way ethnicity played a role in everyday life. Our hypothesis was that we would find problematic, that is essentializing ways in which ethnicity was played out, as well as progressive, shifting ways of using ethnicity as one element of self-constructions and constructions of others.

Thus, the two teams used the same methods in different ways. In both cities, though, the methods were also meant to benefit the young people we worked with, allowing them insights into their (self-)positionings through different ways of expressing what they felt and thought about their everyday lives. In the last interview, in which we presented a summary of our preliminary findings to the young people and asked them to comment on them and on the project in general, many young people expressed their satisfaction with the project and its methods. One young girl summarized what she had gained from working with us in the following way: "I have never thought so much about who I am and what I am actually doing the whole day long." We can hope that even if we could not make use of all the material gathered through our methods, it was at least possible for many of the young people who took part in our project to take advantage of them.

Over the past years we have published a range of articles in different journals and books. What we present here are slightly revised versions of articles published about the London project. As for the Hamburg case study, it consists partly of longer versions of previously published articles, partly of unpublished texts.[1] The conclusion tries to make sense of the material as a whole, drawing out some similarities and differences based on our respective findings in London and Hamburg.

---

1 For previously published articles see Cohen/Keith/Back 1999, Back/Räthzel/Hieronymus 1999, Räthzel 2000a, 2000b, and 2002b, Räthzel/Hieronymus 1998 and 2000.

Les Back and Nora Räthzel
Writing the Lives of Young People in the City

Spaces of Departure

The line of longitude that separates East from West runs through Greenwich Park in South London. From this hill and its famous observatory astronomers peered up at the stars and imperial mapmakers took their bearings. Everywhere there are ghost-like traces of the British Empire. The buildings, the seafaring connections and even the measurement of time itself seem like reminders of a period when London was the pre-eminent imperial city in the western world. From this place explorers ventured out along the Thames downriver to the hinterlands of colonial expansion. Equally, the spoils of their conquests were returned along this same river route from the heart of darkness, as Joseph Conrad once put it, into the veins of the metropolis. But one day in 1998 this ground witnessed something magical, a moment when an imperial past came literally face-to-face with a post-colonial present. On this summer afternoon the *Finding a Way Home Project* brought together a group of ethnically mixed German teenagers from Hamburg with an equivalent group from London. In these former spaces of empire the young people seemed to be re-drawing the terms of national inclusions as they sat eating their picnic food, playing music and games.

A young kid from East London whose parents were from Bangladesh challenged a young Hamburg kid whose parents are of Turkish origin to a finger-wrestling duel. As they locked hands the bystanders gave encouragement: "England, England" shouted the Londoners; "Türkiye, Türkiye" responded the German boys and girls. As the boy from Hamburg triumphed his peers shouted "Germany has won!" He walked away from the duel claiming proudly "I have saved Germany's honour."

Elsewhere in the park, an impromptu 'soccer international' was taking place with a 'German' team composed of Turks and Africans battling an English team that included Somalis, Bengalis, white English and African-Caribbean players. As they passed the ball between them, the English players referred to each other not through their personal names but by their country of origin. One boy shouted "Hey, Somali! Pass me the ball" while others responded "Bengali! Over here, I am through." This strange commentary not only described the game and the fortunes of the respective teams, but it also name-checked the diversity apparent in this version of English nationhood.

These young people are the millennium generation. They will be the first Europeans to come of age in the twenty-first century. What was striking on this warm afternoon was how the identities of these young people combined diverse social elements in a complimentary way. Here, at this moment, it was

possible to be English and Somali or German and Turkish, representing a version of European national identities that are inclusive and culturally heterogeneous. These prosaic events pointed to the ways in which national belongings can be re-worked and reconstructed in everyday life. It also warned against classifying the identities of these young people in a fixed and atavistic fashion, reducing their experience and their present realities to their origins. It was precisely such nuances that we wanted to capture through our research in order to provide a picture of how diversity, belonging and entitlement feature in the lives of young people. Equally, we wanted to try and understand how these changes might co-exist with racism and xenophobia.

These events are an invitation to look at ethnicities or national belongings as something that is reworked and reconstructed in everyday life and can mean different things for the same individual at different moments. They also warn us that, when classifying our research subjects according to their origin, 'race,' or ethnicity (or whatever we may call it), we are constantly in danger of imposing categories on them, which they use in loose, shifting ways. We present these events here also as a warning to the reader about our own way of writing. Whenever we speak about young people in terms of their ethnic origin we do not speak of something that determines them totally or even more than other conditions of their lives.[2] Our intention is to challenge the image of a homogeneous group of young people which can be defined through their socio-spatial origin. Neither can individuals be reduced to their 'ethnic' or 'racial' belonging or to their social position in the host society as migrants or ethnic minorities. In trying to make this point using our empirical material, we arrive at a (well-known) theoretical contradiction: If we want to look at the different ways in which young people with and without a migrant

---

2 For some concepts it is exceedingly difficult to travel. In our case this is especially true for the concept of race. Because against the background of German history it connotes the recent genocide under German fascism we cannot use it in the German part of the study as it is used in the English part. A note on the usage of words in the first part is therefore in order. First, in talking about the young people whose parents were not born in Germany, we should use the phrase 'of migrant background,' since most of the young people are born in Germany and are not migrants themselves. For easier reading we shall nevertheless use 'migrant' as shorthand. Second, in scholarly literature, young people whose parents have not migrated are usually called Germans. We shall not do this because it implies that the young people of migrant origin are not Germans, which in my terms (N.R.) they are, even if some do not have German citizenship. Therefore, we name the young people who do not have a migrant background 'natives,' deliberately turning the tables as 'native' is originally a term signifying the 'uncivilized.' Third, when we present what the young people are saying, we use their vocabulary ('foreigners' for migrants, 'Germans' for natives) without always using quotation marks.

background act in different contexts, we need to use those same categories we want to deconstruct. Using terms like migrant, black, or native youth, we are in danger of constructing homogeneous, essentializing images of young people. But if we want to know if young people positioned as migrants act differently or in the same way as those defined as legitimately belonging to the majority of society, we have to refer to them in the way in which they are positioned. Additionally, as in our societies people are socially positioned, defined and treated by institutions as well as in their everyday life according to their socio-geographical origins (or what is perceived as such) it would be naïve to think that this has no influence on the way in which they (can) act. To analyze the effects of racism one has to refer to those groups who are the targets of racism (and to those who are in the position to be the perpetrators, because this position affects them as well).

The only way out of the quandary is to show through our analysis that possible differences in terms of actions and opinions between those young people with and those without an experience of migration are not a result of different (essential) traits, but the result of different social positionings, that is of their experiences and the concepts and images which they have at their disposal for making sense of their experiences.

The Question

Hamburg[3]

Research on young people in general and young people of migrant origin in particular largely reflects the dominant political situation in the respective country. This accounts for the different questions both parts of the project emphasized, while using the same methodology and looking at comparable neighbourhoods in our two cities. When we started our research in Germany, young people of migrant origin were either not accounted for at all in youth research or, if they were the focus of research, they were seen as producing problems (criminalization) or as having problems.

An emerging body of research looks at young people's lives from the perspective of their abilities and resources, the ways in which they create new spaces for themselves, the ways in which the everyday lives of young people change as a result of long and sustained processes of migration. There is also some research on racism as a practice in everyday life, in 'normal' situations, as opposed to violent acts committed by right-wing extremists – something which the bulk of the literature is still focusing on.

---

3   The approach of the London team, as well as a revisiting of their methods, can be found at the beginning of Part 2.

This type of research was pioneered by the group around Josef Held and Rudi Leiprecht (Held/Leiprecht/Marvakis 1991, Leiprecht 1990 and 2001) and others, who started out by challenging the notion that only deprived young people act in racist ways or believe in racist ideas. They showed that racism existed among so-called normal youth of German origin. Another strand within this research is critical of what they call ethnicization. Authors like Wolf-Dietrich Bukow (1996) or Hans Lösch and Clemens Dannenbeck (1999) criticize the way in which young people of migrant origin are defined through ethnicity, their assumed culture. Others, like Ursula Neumann (2002), Ingrid Gogolin (1994), and Frank-Olaf Radtke (Gomolla/Radtke 2002), look at structures of discrimination in state organizations, that is, in schools.

Our study takes the everyday lives of young people as a point of departure. As Henri Lefèbvre expressed it,

> it is in everyday life and starting from everyday life that genuine creations are achieved, those creations which produce the human and which men produce as part of the process of becoming human: works of creativity (…). The human world is not defined simply by the historical, by culture, by totality or society as a whole, or by ideological and political superstructures. It is defined by this intermediate and mediating level: everyday life (Lefèbvre 2002, 44f).

Therefore, if one is interested in the possibilities of change (as we are) it is necessary to study everyday life, since it is only there – despite its repetitiveness – that "genuine changes" take place (Lefèbvre 1992, 137). In order to identify what can be seen as changing or as having the potential for change, however, we must first specify what we already know.

The political background for our investigation in the second half of the nineties was the tension existing in Germany between the fact of immigration and (until the new government was voted in after we had finished our fieldwork) the official notion that Germany was not a country of immigration. This tension led to conflicts and limitations, with a negative effect on the migrant populations. The societal institutions had not (and have not until today) been changed according to the needs of a society of immigration, thus ignoring the needs/rights of people with a migrant background to full citizenship (in the juridical sense, as well as in the sense of their political and social rights, and of being seen as legitimate parts of the population). Until being voted out in 2005, the governing coalition of Social Democrats and Greens had not delivered on their promises to bring about change in this area. An immigration law was developed but did not pass and the aim of developing a law enabling dual citizenship was given up.

The tension between the fact of immigration and the unwillingness or incapacity to transform societal institutions according to this fact also has negative bearings on the native populations: it is partly responsible for their in-

ability to deal with and accept differences; it enables them to construct internal conflicts (such as housing problems or unemployment) as external conflicts, i. e. as conflicts brought into society by immigrants – so-called foreigners – and thus keeps them from finding viable solutions for these conflicts (see Räthzel 2002a). Against this background we ask: How is this tension lived in the everyday lives of young people? More specifically: Do we find with those young people who say that they don't know anything else than growing up with 'foreigners' – or 'as foreigners,' for that matter – new ways of living with differences? Living with differences would also include hybridization, the merging of differences into new commonalities (Hall 2000, see also Back 1996). 'New ways,' against the background of what has been defined as old, can be defined as ways in which difference, the heterogeneity of one's neighbourhoods, schools, institutions, etc. are seen as normal and not as something unusual, undesirable, temporal.

Our aim is to find such new ways and to analyze the conditions under which they become possible. This would enable us to suggest that, insofar as such conditions could be reproduced, there is a fair chance that new ways of living with differences would develop. Generalization, that is producing the conditions for a proliferation of such new ways of living, would not be the business of researchers, but of political practices. By the same token, the analysis of the existing conflicts in living with differences can identify the conditions, which make it more difficult to live them in productive ways.

Before starting the research project in Hamburg, we had been investigating (together with Annita Kalpaka and later with Ülkü Sarica) forms of everyday racism in the workplace, in schools, in administration and within anti-racist groups.[4] We focused on the institutional structures on the one hand and the images of those who are defined as belonging to the German nation-state, that is native Germans, on the other hand.

However, we had come to see some limitations of our approach. If one analyzes everyday racism outside its specific context, one misses the overdeterminations and overlappings of the different conflicts and contradictions that constitute daily life. We ran the danger of seeing racist behaviour as

---

4 In our first longer publication on the subject we had used and developed the term "everyday racism" ("Alltäglicher Rassismus," Kalpaka/Räthzel 1986, 34ff.) without being aware of its usage by Philomena Essed in our neighbouring country, the Netherlands, see Essed (1984). Meanwhile, Essed has developed this concept more broadly in many of her publications, but mainly in her famous work *Understanding Everyday Racism* (Essed 1991). Our approach draws on different theoretical traditions than Essed's and, as this book is a presentation of our empirical work and to a much lesser degree a discussion of theoretical approaches, we will not be able to discuss her work here. However, we want to refer readers interested in questions of everyday racism to her important contributions.

either an anonymous structure or as a feature of individuals. At the same time, those who were the targets of racism did not come into the picture at all or were referred to merely as victims. It thus becomes difficult to understand strategies of resistance, of suppression, or of circumvention. In this study we have tried to overcome these limitations by looking at different dimensions of the everyday: at the social-spatial conditions under which young people develop their understanding of the world and of themselves, and at the relations between young people of migrant and of non-migrant background. Looking only at young people with a migrant background (as it has been and is the case in the majority of studies dealing with 'ethnicity in one way or another) or only at those without a migrant background (as we had done in our attempt to counter mainstream research) makes it impossible to see the *relational* character of both – forms of daily racism and forms of living productively with differences.

Summarizing our aim with this project we could say that we were interested in how young people with and without a migrant background develop their ways of living with differences. What role did ethnic, gender, and class categories play in this process, how were they used, defined and transformed in everyday relations? Which were the favourable and which the unfavourable conditions for productive relations between these young people? The aim of our research was to find everyday relationships that can be defined as productive or unproductive, and to investigate the conditions under which such relationships could come about.

The Method

Data Collection

The research design attempted to draw together theoretical and methodological approaches in a way that promotes a more dialogic approach to working with young people. Our research has focused on young people between 13 and 14 years of age. The rationale for this choice of age group was that it allowed us to focus on young people on the cusp of the transition into adolescent geographies of risk, and draws on some of our previous work in this field.[5]

The research process is best described in terms of two phases, each taking place within a distinctive social and spatial setting. Firstly, the school-based ethnography was carried out, using a variety of methods that included written, oral and visual forms of expression. In addition, the young people introduced us into their neighbourhoods through walkabouts and other methods. This phase involved young people from two school classes in Deptford and

---

5 See, for example, Cohen 1997b.

the Isle of Dogs and twelve classes of young people in six schools in Altona and Bergedorf in Hamburg. Due to the school system in Hamburg we needed to involve more classes in order to include a set of all three school types in each neighbourhood. The second phase of the research centred on collecting accounts from adult professionals and young people in institutional settings outside of school. During the first phase researchers conducted interviews and worked with the young people (over the period of one year in Britain and two and a half years in Hamburg) using the following devices:

1. Fashion Parade:
In London participants were presented with 50 images of youth styles that were variously gendered and ethnicized, and were asked to pick and comment on three images that they liked and one they disliked. The choices have been subjected to statistical analysis in order to establish connections between the ethnicity and gender of the informant, the types of style model chosen, and differences in the distribution patterns between the two study areas. In Hamburg, 35 images of boys and girls embodying different styles and images of gender and ethnicity picked out of youth magazines were shown. Boys and girls were separately asked to pick and comment on the three images they liked best and the three they disliked most. We wanted to concentrate on forms of identification/rejection that were not influenced by attraction to the other sex. Therefore boys were able to choose from 15 male images and girls from 20 female images. In our statistical analysis of the results we wanted to look at patterns connecting style, ethnicity, and belongings to sub- or counter-cultures (Punk, Techno, green movement) as well as patterns of activities and inclusionary and exclusionary attitudes.[6]

2. Photoscapes:
In London young people were given disposable cameras and asked to photograph places which they thought of as safe or dangerous. These images were mapped and categorized and an analysis of the distribution and type of place-specific coding established. In Hamburg we asked our participants to photograph places, people and things which they liked and disliked. These images were analyzed as to the criteria by which places are described (e.g. safety/danger, clean/dirty, places for certain types of activities, racialization).

3. Photo Storyboards:
In London and Hamburg young people were shown a series of specially constructed photographs depicting young people in ambiguous peer group situa-

---

6   See especially Chapter 7 by Andreas Hieronymus for an analysis of this material.

tions across a range of ethnic and gender relations. Informants were asked to fill in captions and dialogue to explain the scene. The narrativized pictures were then grouped into types of storylines in order to establish how potential patterns of affinity or enmity, suspicion or trust were racialized or gendered. In Hamburg the usage of these storyboards elicited for the first time during our work with young people a large amount of stories about everyday racism.

4. Geneogram:
Young people plotted degrees of contact and levels of intimacy with their friends and relatives and represented them spatially on a piece of paper. In London the geneograms have been analyzed in terms of how family relations are mapped and spatially distributed. In Hamburg we have also used them to look at the relationship between family relations and relations between peers.

5. Guided Fantasy:
Young people were given a trigger scenario and wrote a story, utilizing aspects of their real and imaginary landscapes to complete the story. These stories have been subjected to detailed narrative analysis and show the basic images of fear and anxiety as well as ways of perceiving and controlling danger.[7]

6. Audio Diaries:
In London young people kept a verbal diary over the period of a weekend documenting the walk home from school, the weekend and their journey back to school on Monday morning. These diaries have been treated as oral testimonies and analyzed in terms of their thematic content. In Hamburg young people were given tape recorders during a week and were asked to record in the morning what they expected of the day and in the evening how the day had been. In analyzing these accounts we wanted to get a better understanding of the time structures of young people's lives and also of the events that they see as significant in order to make the day a 'success' or a 'failure.' What we discovered by listening to these audio diaries was the different manners in which young people talked about themselves and presented their personality as opposed to individual or group interviews.

7. Place Mapping:
In London the young people mapped their localities in terms of the places they thought of as 'no-go areas,' places to 'explore,' where they went with their friends, which places they thought of as 'dangerous' and where they went alone. We have firstly looked at the individual context of each map,

---

7   See Chapter 9 by Phil Cohen.

identifying the personal features of each landscape. Additionally, we have used GIS (Geographical Information Systems) to generate composite maps of particular groups of young people and of each of the study areas. In Hamburg we have not used this method.

8. Video Walkabouts:
In London the young people planned and then conducted walks through their neighbourhoods, giving the field workers a 'guided-tour commentary' as they went along. The exercise was recorded on video, plotting itineraries and documenting sites of familiarity, safety and risk. These have been analyzed as forms of visual ethnography which both identify the routes of particular groups and the narratives through which these ethnoscapes are plotted. In Hamburg the researchers identified – according to the photographs the young people had taken and their stories about the places represented therein – a focus group in each of the six schools and asked these groups to shown them the places they had photographed and to tell them what they did at those places and what events they could remember taking place there. This material, which amounted to six hours, was then cut into a film of half an hour, featuring the young people's stories on friendships and enmity, love and friendship, we and them, conversion of places, fights for places, sharing of places, legends of fighting, living in ghettos, living together vs. living separated, staying or leaving.

9. Summer Projects – Art Work and Video Talk Show:
In London the art project took place at George Green School and involved an artist in residence working with selected groups of young people over the summer term. The project involved young people creating an 'adventure story in a box' using mixed media to build a three-dimensional structure exploring real and imaginary geographies of risk. It was not possible for logistical reasons to organize a similar project at Deptford. Instead, the Video Talk Show used the genre of popular television to address the issue of intercultural friendship and relationships via role play. The young people themselves set the agenda for the show and the key characters, which included both young people and adults, some of them experts. The show was then performed and filmed in the television studio of Goldsmiths College. Due to the lack of time and resources we were not able to organize similar events in Hamburg. Young people there were instead asked to make a collage, a triptych on a subject they could choose from the following: their life-story; images of the past, present and future; places they liked, disliked and found adventurous; or something that had happened to them and they had found surprising.

10. Follow-up Interviews or Feedback-Interviews:
These took the form of standard individual semi-structured interviews, which offered a space for each participant to reflect on the materials produced during the project. It also allowed direct questioning concerning some of the key issues that emerged within the research. In Hamburg we presented a summary of our preliminary findings to the young people and asked them what they thought about it. This gave them an insight into what we thought we had detected and allowed them to make a more direct and conscious contribution to the contradictory issues that had come up during the research period.

11. A youth exchange took place wherein young people from the study areas in London visited Hamburg and vice versa. These visits were especially instructive on the ways in which young people formed friendships and enmities, behaved towards unknown topographies, languages and people. In Hamburg we were at pains to select from our group of about 160 participants 22 young people who differed from each other in terms of gender, ethnicity, class background, neighbourhood, school attendance and attitudes towards those seen as different. It was very interesting to see who did and did not get along with each other and how this changed over the week we were in London and during our journey back on the ship.

There are some wider issues raised by the research design, which we believe are of importance for future work in this field. It is interesting to compare our approach with the methodology used by Kevin Lynch and his UNESCO team in their international comparative study *Growing Up in Cities* twenty years ago (see Lynch 1960). Lynch was one of the pioneers of urban phenomenology and also contributed to the development of spatial semiology. His study, like ours, was concerned with understanding the impact of urban structures on the images of place that shaped young people's experiences of growing up in what was then called the 'inner city.' Like us he wanted to find ways of giving young people more say in the process of urban governance; unlike *Finding the Way Home* his research does not foreground issues of race, gender and class, although they are implicit in much of his material on urban poverty. The most significant difference, however, lies in the methods used to elicit young people's mental maps. Lynch, for all his interest in the urban imaginary, did not have a methodology which would allow this imaginary to speak. He asked his informants to draw pictures of their local neighbourhood environment, a task that defeated all but the most visually gifted, and then used photography, both aerial and locational, only to establish the physical geography of the areas as a kind of 'objective correlate' against which the 'subjective' pictures could be measured. In his research report, the young people's statements elicited through interviews are confined, literally, to the margins of the text where they serve merely as an illustrative supplement to

the main body of the findings rather than as a genuinely dialogic commentary on the research narrative.

Even twenty years later many ethnographic studies of urban youth culture conform to this basic model and underwrite positivistic approaches to mental mapping.[8] To go beyond this model in practice, as well as in theory, we have used techniques for eliciting first-person and peer-group narratives that put the means of representation in young people's own hands; our 'informants' used video- or disposable cameras as a way of mapping the cultural and social geography of the study areas from their own point of view, and these 'image texts' in turn triggered a flow of stories and other commentary that both added to the thickness of the description and also, in some cases, problematized the dominant authorized account.

This approach owes much to a further development within ethnographic studies on youth during the seventies and eighties at the Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies (e.g. Willis 1981, Clarke/Critcher/Johnson 1979). Perhaps the main difference in relation to those studies is our attempt to look at the interrelations of class, gender, and race instead of focusing mainly on one social position, as well as the aim to look at the diversities within those categories in order to avoid simply 'reading off' social positionings from the everyday actions of young people. In short, the aim is to take social conditions into consideration without understanding them as determinant.

The range of instruments used meant that the young people were able to find the techniques of representation with which they were most comfortable. For example we found that some participants who were not verbally responsive in face-to-face interview situations were able to produce interesting reflections through photography, visual mapping, or written stories. The combination of 'public' and 'private' modes of representation allowed young people who were not always vocal in peer groups to contribute insights which otherwise would have been ignored. Additionally, the use of creative writing, art work and role play enabled us to access young people's fantasy constructs in a way that is not normally possible through more conventional ethnographic or mental-mapping techniques.

We have used this material, at a theoretical level, to complicate the relationship between the 'real' and 'the imaginary' within the landscapes of what we refer to as the urban uncanny.[9] Equally, through the medium of storyboard and role-play exercises, we invited young people to use their social knowledge to project themselves into a range of subject positions, such as victim/perpetrator, male/female, or minority/majority, in various scenarios of

---

8 See the discussion, from a position similar to our own, in Holloway/Jefferson 1997.
9 See Phil Cohen's chapter in this book or Cohen 1999.

potential affinity or enmity. By providing these symbolic frames (of which the drama role-play was another notable example) difficult issues such as racist language being used in everyday family discourse were brought to life in ways that would otherwise remain unspeakable.

We used thematic analysis for the initial coding of the material, which in the Hamburg case was done with the help of the MAXQDA software program for qualitative analysis.[10] For the more specified analysis of the Hamburg material we used a version of discourse analysis, looking at the subject position(s) occupied by the speaker and assigned by him/her to his/her object(s) of talk, relating the statements to ideologies and meanings circulating in society at large. One could call this procedure the *explication of the implicit* following a notion developed by the project on theories of ideology (Projekt Ideologie-Theorie 1979). This analysis takes as its point of departure the idea that all utterances contain several layers of meaning. They are made up of the history of the concepts that are used, their meaning at a specific socio-historical moment in society at large, their meaning within the specific locality in which they are expressed, including the specific individual position of the speaker within this locality. Ideally, all these layers implicit in a statement should be explicated in order to make sense of its significance for the speaker, that is for the way in which the speaker positions her/himself within the specific community to which s/he belongs and, more generally, within society at large. This kind of analysis attempts to bridge the gap between an analysis focusing on the individual and its inner world and motives on the one hand and one that sees the individual as an effect of social conditions, or the mouthpiece of general ideologies, on the other hand. We are interested in the ways in which individuals are constituted and constitute themselves and others within the conditions constraining and enabling their actions.[11]

Our methods generated a huge amount of data, which exceeded our available time for analysis. Some of the results could not be used at all in the analyses that follow; others have been used far too sparsely. The Hamburg part mainly uses data obtained through the fashion parade, the photoscapes, the video walkabouts and the feedback-interviews, at times adding insights developed from other activities**.** The London part uses roughly the same data, but includes a specific chapter based on the guided phantasies.

Partly, the selection was guided by our professional training, which for instance made it easier for us to concentrate on texts rather than images. But mainly, the data selection related to our research questions: the issues of

---

10 This is a program which allows coding and searching in a variety of ways that leave the context of the coded and searched quotes intact.

11 See Chapter 2 on theories for a more detailed theorization of this approach.

safety and danger; the construction of ethnicities in everyday life; the overde-terminations of gender, ethnic, and class relations; and the significance of space.

The Sample

Places

In Hamburg we chose two neighbourhoods which we considered very different in terms of migrant and non-migrant populations. The rationale for this was to look at the validity of beliefs which see racism as a result of the mix of populations. In Germany, it is popular to believe in a 'threshold of tolerance,' assuming that racism is caused by those who are its objects, by their numbers. It therefore seemed interesting to look at an area known for its low level of migrant populations (Bergedorf) but portrayed as a centre of neo-Nazi activity and an area known for its high level of migrant populations (Altona), portrayed as 'Turkish,' a centre of youth violence and drugs by some, but also as an enjoyable place of diversity and an alternative lifestyle. The fieldwork for this research has been undertaken between 1996 and 1999. In 2001 and in 2003 I (N.R.) went back to the two neighbourhoods and inter-viewed 18 young people from our former sample, mostly those who had been to London with us.

In London we also chose two very contrasting neighbourhoods. Both have been the object of dense media construction over the last twenty years, albeit through very different repertoires of urban imagery. Deptford is variously represented, as the quintessential 'dirty' inner city region where drug abuse, crime and racial conflict prevail, or as a multicultural place; the Isle of Dogs has been portrayed as a heartland of English racism and proto-fascism.

Young People

In total the school sample consisted of 42 young people in Deptford (23F/19M) and 47 in the Isle of Dogs (27F/20M), so that a total of 89 young people took part, representing the diversity of ethnic groups present within these localities. The ethnic breakdown of the samples was as follows: 35 young people were white English (18F/17M); 17 were black African or Afri-can-Caribbean (8F/9M); 18 were South Asian (10F/8M); 16 were Chi-nese/Vietnamese (12F/4M); two of the young people were of mixed parent-age (1F/1M); and one young woman of South American parentage.

In Hamburg, the whole sample consisted of 179 (104F/75M) young peo-ple, of which around 120 took part in all exercises. 46 of the 179 attended a grammar school (*Gymnasium*) (36F/10M), 89 a comprehensive school (*Real-schule*) (45F/44M) and 44 a secondary school (*Hauptschule*) (23F/21M).

In Altona, 84 of the 124 young people interviewed were not of migrant background. Of those coming from families whose parents had migrated to Germany, 15 had a Turkish background, seven came from former Yugoslavia, five from Greece, and five from bi-national families with one German parent, three from Poland, two from Iran, one from Portugal, one from Thailand, and one lived in a bi-national family where one parent came from Czechoslovakia and the other from India.

In Bergedorf 45 of the 56 young people interviewed had no migrant background, four had parents coming from Turkey, two from Poland, two from Russia, two lived in bi-national families and one had parents originating from Ghana.

Given that we wanted to conduct a qualitative study, the reason for this rather large sample was to have a wide variety of young people. As we were looking for the conditions of new ways of living difference, it was likely that the more those conditions differed, the greater were our chances to find a variety of ways in which differences are lived.

Part I: The Hamburg Case Study