



**“We Are Rolling and Vaulting Tonight”: Sport Programs, Urban Regeneration, and the Politics of Parkour in Turin, Italy.**

Journal:	<i>International Journal of Sport Policy and Politics</i>
Manuscript ID	RISP-2015-0084.R3
Manuscript Type:	Special Issue Paper
Keywords:	Sport Policy, Parkour, Turin, Youth, Citizenship, Urban Regeneration

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

Pre-View Only

**Abstract:**

The following paper aims to contribute to an interdisciplinary field of enquiry addressing the ways in which lifestyle and informal sports can inform policy debate and development at various levels. It will do so by considering the ambivalent position that parkour is taking within policies of urban and community re-branding enacted in Turin, Italy. Parkour in Turin is an increasingly structured discipline often endorsed by events celebrating the city's vibrancy, and by local projects that target youth, and promote social participation. However, this discipline implies also a spontaneous and irreverent engagement with urban spaces that often creates frictions and conflicts between *traceurs* (parkour practitioners) and other actors in relation to what constitutes the public, how it should be used, and by whom. Drawing on 14 months of ethnographic research with a group of twenty traceurs predominantly of migrant origins, this study focuses on the participants' ambivalent engagement with one project promoting social participation through sports in Turin's urban spaces. Building on the ethnographic material, this paper addresses the emerging relationship between social projects, informal urban practices and emerging forms of creative urbanism. The discussion focuses on the ambiguities and fault lines of urban agendas incorporating lifestyle and informal sports in their (neoliberal) vocabulary of community and place regeneration. However, this article calls also for the necessity to engage with spontaneous, informal physical practices as a way to acknowledge, and support existing, contested negotiations of citizenship and belonging in urban spaces.

**Keywords:** Youth; Sport Policy; Parkour; Citizenship; Turin; Urban Regeneration

Acknowledging the world-wide diffusion of lifestyle and informal sport practices in the last three decades, several scholars recently started to interrogate the benefits and implications of the inclusion of informal sports in policy practices promoting health, sport and social participation (Gilchrist and Wheaton, 2011; Thorpe and Reinhart, 2012; Thorpe, 2014; Wheaton, 2010, 2013).

1 This paper aims to contribute to this debate and to this special issue, by addressing the ambivalent  
2 role and position that parkour is taking within social projects promoting urban re-generation and  
3 social participation through (in)formal sports in Turin, Italy. The social benefits of parkour will be  
4 addressed in this paper not in relation to the potential contribution that the practice *per se* can offer  
5 to youth sport programs and policies. Rather, the discussion will focus on the contextualised  
6 enactment and uses of parkour in Turin by different actors, and will address parkour as a practice  
7 wrought with contradictions indicative of current trends within urban politics. Parkour represents  
8 thus an *event* (Mould, 2009) both revealing the fault lines of the city's contemporary policies of  
9 urban, and social regeneration, and informing the presence of spontaneous experiences of  
10 (contested) socialization in Turin's public spaces. This study aims to provide, and calls for  
11 contextualised qualitative analysis on the social benefits of lifestyle/informal sports (see also  
12 Gilchrist and Wheaton, 2011), by articulating the practice, diffusion and regulation of parkour in  
13 Turin to the broader urban and social processes in which it emerged and is enacted.  
14 Most of critical studies on sport for development programs (Coakley, 2011; Spaaij, 2009; Coalter,  
15 2010; Hartmann and Kwauk, 2011; Fusco, 2007, 2012; Agergaard et al., 2015) provided insightful  
16 critiques of “naive and unrealistic generalizations about the transformative capacity of sport”  
17 (Spaaij, 2009, p.1266). Some of these critiques addressed the promotion and enactment of sport for  
18 development programs by “sport evangelists” (Coakley, 2011) embodying an “uncritical and one-  
19 dimensional view of sport” as inherently producing positive outcomes in the form of “development”  
20 (Coalter, 2010, p. 17). Others critically discussed sporting programs as favouring the government  
21 and control of minorities and migrant youth leisure (Agergaard et al., 2015), the promotion of a  
22 neoliberal ideology focusing on *personal* development and success, and the discounting of social  
23 issues and needs for progressive change at a collective, or community level (Coakley, 2011).  
24 Aiming to contribute to this critical literature, but also to combine it with an exploration of the  
25 potential benefits of lifestyle sports, this study will focus its analysis and discussion on the  
26 interpretation and use of urban space endorsed by a sport and community project in Turin, and by  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1 groups of disenfranchised youth, mostly of migrant origins, practicing parkour. Elaborating on the  
2 focus that parkour enables by emplacing the body in urban space, this paper identifies the reciprocal  
3 constitution of *body and place* (Silk and Andrews, 2011) as a meaningful site to address the  
4 consequences and negotiations of Turin's policies of urban, and community regeneration.  
5  
6

7  
8  
9  
10 Furthermore, and aiming to address the potential benefits of lifestyle sports, this bodily and spatial  
11 focus will enable me to highlight the relationship between parkour, public spaces and citizenship,  
12 intended here not much as a legal status, but as an “indisputable belonging to a community”  
13 (Marshall 2009 [1950], in Semi, 2015, p. 15) that is often *spatially* achieved, exerted and limited in  
14 the city (Mitchell, 1995, 2003).  
15

16  
17 In elaborating these arguments, I draw upon 14 months of ethnographic participation with young  
18 men practicing parkour in Turin public spaces. In the following sections of this article I will address  
19 parkour, the context of research and the methodology used in this study, in order to introduce and  
20 set up this study's discussion.  
21  
22

### 23 **Parkour in Turin: A contextualised examination**

24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37 As a number of studies already provided meaningful readings of parkour as a discipline and  
38 (sub)cultural phenomena (Fuggle, 2008; Stapleton and Terrio, 2012), this section focuses mainly on  
39 the contextual dynamics related to the diffusion of the *art du déplacement* (art of displacement) in  
40 Turin. Parkour started to be practiced in Turin from the mid 2000s, and as other lifestyle sports, the  
41 discipline is currently engaging in a debated process of structuring and institutionalisation (Ferrero  
42 Camoletto et al., 2015). In the research context, “Parkour Torino”, a not-for-profit charity founded  
43 by some of the elder traceurs in Turin, was recognised by local traceurs as the only official parkour  
44 association in Turin. This organisation is mainly responsible for the provision of periodic parkour  
45 gatherings, for coordinating “official” parkour performances at institutional and corporate events in  
46 Turin and surroundings, and for promoting the discipline to the general public (i.e. media, sporting  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1 and local institutions). Nevertheless, the parkour scene in Turin, as far as I experienced it, was far  
2  
3 from a homogeneous community and included diverse, sometimes contrasting visions about the  
4  
5 discipline. Several crews ambivalently engaged with “Parkour Torino” initiatives and other  
6  
7 sporting, and social, institutions (see also Ferrero Camoletto et al., 2015). For this research, I mainly  
8  
9 interacted with the latter elements of Turin's parkour scene. Therefore, I engaged with traceurs who  
10  
11 joined informal crews predominantly formed by disenfranchised young men of migrant origins<sup>1</sup>,  
12  
13 who trained in the city's public spaces, and only occasionally participated to Parkour Torino's public  
14  
15 initiatives. These traceurs often described their engagement in parkour as a consequence of their  
16  
17 marginal socio-economic status, and lack of affordable leisure opportunities, and not as a conscious,  
18  
19 deliberate choice of a sporting/leisure activity. This aspect showed an interesting continuity with the  
20  
21 motivations and status of the original representatives of the discipline (gathered around the group  
22  
23 *Yamakasi*, or “strong spirit” in Lingala language), who were mostly young men of working class  
24  
25 and/or migrant background (see Marshall, 2010; Stapleton and Terrio, 2012). Although occasionally  
26  
27 mixing themselves in events and daily practice, the diverse parkour groups in Turin nevertheless  
28  
29 addressed the differences running between them. The traceurs who often trained in more structured  
30  
31 environments (i.e. adapted, or purpose made gymnastics halls) with Parkour Torino underlined their  
32  
33 professionalism, technical proficiency, and “authenticity” recognised by international parkour  
34  
35 institutions<sup>2</sup> (see also Ferrero Camoletto et al., 2015). The traceurs who trained in diverse informal  
36  
37 groups in public spaces stressed instead the socializing and inclusive motives and aspects of their  
38  
39 practice, implicitly suggesting that these elements had been “lost” by some parkour groups, at the  
40  
41 expenses of a focus on technique, institutionalisation, and self-promotion.  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47

48 The differences between diverse parkour groups were not framed in terms of status, class, or ethnic  
49  
50 belonging, but rather concerned different engagements with the discipline, its aims and meanings.  
51  
52 These elements of dispute on what parkour is, means, and does for traceurs in Turin highlighted an  
53  
54 underrepresented feature in the literature, where often the discipline is addressed as embodying a  
55  
56 uniform, and normalised ethos (see Mould, in press), despite the recognised lack of coherent  
57  
58  
59  
60

1 definitions defining the practice (Fuggle, 2008). Aiming therefore to provide a so far under-  
2 addressed perspective in the literature on lifestyle sport (see Wheaton, 2013, 2015) this study will  
3  
4  
5  
6 consider the uses, meanings and stakes of parkour amongst a group of disenfranchised young men,  
7  
8  
9 most of whom are of migrant origins, in Turin.

10  
11 The analysis provided complexifies some of the early readings of parkour and urban spaces, that  
12 framed the discipline mainly in terms of “subversive resistance to oppressive city space” (Stapleton  
13 and Terrio, 2012, p. 19). As Stapleton and Terrio (2012) highlighted, in contrast to the narratives  
14 that stress parkour as a subversive activity that is untainted by commercialism, its very existence as  
15 a global phenomenon stems from its appropriation and commodification by corporate marketers and  
16 elite tastemakers (see also Daskalaki and Mould, 2013). Contrarily to common readings that  
17 describe traceurs as (predominantly white, male, middle class) urban *flâneurs* consciously  
18 subverting the rules and boundaries of the capitalist city (Bavinton, 2011; Daskalaki et al., 2008;  
19 Atkinson, 2009), the disenfranchised youth in this study openly admitted their involvement in the  
20 practice as a lack of other leisure opportunities. Nevertheless, their spontaneous, and unrequested  
21 engagement with parkour in public spaces challenged dominant visions about what constitutes the  
22 public, how it should be used and by whom (see De Martini Ugolotti and Moyer, 2016).

23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38 Acknowledging the inherent ambivalence of the discipline, in this work I will therefore draw on  
39 some of the multiple meanings available and produced on parkour in Turin, to explore the role that  
40 the practice took in the simultaneous promotion and negotiation of contemporary policies of urban  
41 and social transformation enacted in Turin. I will not do so by elaborating on any supposedly shared  
42 meaning or system of values embodied by parkour, against which its utility for specific policies and  
43 initiatives can be evaluated (see Coakley, 2011). Rather, I will look at the ambivalent use of parkour  
44 by disenfranchised, mainly (post)migrant youth in Turin to unpack what social benefits parkour  
45 provides as a discipline, according to the different actors and contexts where it is enacted.

46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95  
96  
97  
98  
99  
100  
101  
102  
103  
104  
105  
106  
107  
108  
109  
110  
111  
112  
113  
114  
115  
116  
117  
118  
119  
120  
121  
122  
123  
124  
125  
126  
127  
128  
129  
130  
131  
132  
133  
134  
135  
136  
137  
138  
139  
140  
141  
142  
143  
144  
145  
146  
147  
148  
149  
150  
151  
152  
153  
154  
155  
156  
157  
158  
159  
160  
161  
162  
163  
164  
165  
166  
167  
168  
169  
170  
171  
172  
173  
174  
175  
176  
177  
178  
179  
180  
181  
182  
183  
184  
185  
186  
187  
188  
189  
190  
191  
192  
193  
194  
195  
196  
197  
198  
199  
200  
201  
202  
203  
204  
205  
206  
207  
208  
209  
210  
211  
212  
213  
214  
215  
216  
217  
218  
219  
220  
221  
222  
223  
224  
225  
226  
227  
228  
229  
230  
231  
232  
233  
234  
235  
236  
237  
238  
239  
240  
241  
242  
243  
244  
245  
246  
247  
248  
249  
250  
251  
252  
253  
254  
255  
256  
257  
258  
259  
260  
261  
262  
263  
264  
265  
266  
267  
268  
269  
270  
271  
272  
273  
274  
275  
276  
277  
278  
279  
280  
281  
282  
283  
284  
285  
286  
287  
288  
289  
290  
291  
292  
293  
294  
295  
296  
297  
298  
299  
300  
301  
302  
303  
304  
305  
306  
307  
308  
309  
310  
311  
312  
313  
314  
315  
316  
317  
318  
319  
320  
321  
322  
323  
324  
325  
326  
327  
328  
329  
330  
331  
332  
333  
334  
335  
336  
337  
338  
339  
340  
341  
342  
343  
344  
345  
346  
347  
348  
349  
350  
351  
352  
353  
354  
355  
356  
357  
358  
359  
360  
361  
362  
363  
364  
365  
366  
367  
368  
369  
370  
371  
372  
373  
374  
375  
376  
377  
378  
379  
380  
381  
382  
383  
384  
385  
386  
387  
388  
389  
390  
391  
392  
393  
394  
395  
396  
397  
398  
399  
400  
401  
402  
403  
404  
405  
406  
407  
408  
409  
410  
411  
412  
413  
414  
415  
416  
417  
418  
419  
420  
421  
422  
423  
424  
425  
426  
427  
428  
429  
430  
431  
432  
433  
434  
435  
436  
437  
438  
439  
440  
441  
442  
443  
444  
445  
446  
447  
448  
449  
450  
451  
452  
453  
454  
455  
456  
457  
458  
459  
460  
461  
462  
463  
464  
465  
466  
467  
468  
469  
470  
471  
472  
473  
474  
475  
476  
477  
478  
479  
480  
481  
482  
483  
484  
485  
486  
487  
488  
489  
490  
491  
492  
493  
494  
495  
496  
497  
498  
499  
500  
501  
502  
503  
504  
505  
506  
507  
508  
509  
510  
511  
512  
513  
514  
515  
516  
517  
518  
519  
520  
521  
522  
523  
524  
525  
526  
527  
528  
529  
530  
531  
532  
533  
534  
535  
536  
537  
538  
539  
540  
541  
542  
543  
544  
545  
546  
547  
548  
549  
550  
551  
552  
553  
554  
555  
556  
557  
558  
559  
560  
561  
562  
563  
564  
565  
566  
567  
568  
569  
570  
571  
572  
573  
574  
575  
576  
577  
578  
579  
580  
581  
582  
583  
584  
585  
586  
587  
588  
589  
590  
591  
592  
593  
594  
595  
596  
597  
598  
599  
600  
601  
602  
603  
604  
605  
606  
607  
608  
609  
610  
611  
612  
613  
614  
615  
616  
617  
618  
619  
620  
621  
622  
623  
624  
625  
626  
627  
628  
629  
630  
631  
632  
633  
634  
635  
636  
637  
638  
639  
640  
641  
642  
643  
644  
645  
646  
647  
648  
649  
650  
651  
652  
653  
654  
655  
656  
657  
658  
659  
660  
661  
662  
663  
664  
665  
666  
667  
668  
669  
670  
671  
672  
673  
674  
675  
676  
677  
678  
679  
680  
681  
682  
683  
684  
685  
686  
687  
688  
689  
690  
691  
692  
693  
694  
695  
696  
697  
698  
699  
700  
701  
702  
703  
704  
705  
706  
707  
708  
709  
710  
711  
712  
713  
714  
715  
716  
717  
718  
719  
720  
721  
722  
723  
724  
725  
726  
727  
728  
729  
730  
731  
732  
733  
734  
735  
736  
737  
738  
739  
740  
741  
742  
743  
744  
745  
746  
747  
748  
749  
750  
751  
752  
753  
754  
755  
756  
757  
758  
759  
760  
761  
762  
763  
764  
765  
766  
767  
768  
769  
770  
771  
772  
773  
774  
775  
776  
777  
778  
779  
780  
781  
782  
783  
784  
785  
786  
787  
788  
789  
790  
791  
792  
793  
794  
795  
796  
797  
798  
799  
800  
801  
802  
803  
804  
805  
806  
807  
808  
809  
810  
811  
812  
813  
814  
815  
816  
817  
818  
819  
820  
821  
822  
823  
824  
825  
826  
827  
828  
829  
830  
831  
832  
833  
834  
835  
836  
837  
838  
839  
840  
841  
842  
843  
844  
845  
846  
847  
848  
849  
850  
851  
852  
853  
854  
855  
856  
857  
858  
859  
860  
861  
862  
863  
864  
865  
866  
867  
868  
869  
870  
871  
872  
873  
874  
875  
876  
877  
878  
879  
880  
881  
882  
883  
884  
885  
886  
887  
888  
889  
890  
891  
892  
893  
894  
895  
896  
897  
898  
899  
900  
901  
902  
903  
904  
905  
906  
907  
908  
909  
910  
911  
912  
913  
914  
915  
916  
917  
918  
919  
920  
921  
922  
923  
924  
925  
926  
927  
928  
929  
930  
931  
932  
933  
934  
935  
936  
937  
938  
939  
940  
941  
942  
943  
944  
945  
946  
947  
948  
949  
950  
951  
952  
953  
954  
955  
956  
957  
958  
959  
960  
961  
962  
963  
964  
965  
966  
967  
968  
969  
970  
971  
972  
973  
974  
975  
976  
977  
978  
979  
980  
981  
982  
983  
984  
985  
986  
987  
988  
989  
990  
991  
992  
993  
994  
995  
996  
997  
998  
999  
1000

1 youth (Stagi, 2015). During the research, I seldom encountered young women who were regularly  
2 practising parkour in public spaces. On this issue, Kidder's (2013) has underlined the (unintentional)  
3 exclusionary results of traceurs' performance of masculinity in urban spaces by groups of traceurs in  
4 Chicago. Mould (in press) also cautioned researchers on uncritically adopting a normalised  
5 perspective that recognises traceurs as mainly male (and predominantly white, and middle class),  
6 young, and physically able, thus skewing “the gendering of urban spatiality that is constituted by its  
7 practice” (p. 2).  
8  
9

10 Although for this article I was not able to engage with female perspectives on parkour and its  
11 eventual social benefits, I intend to address the issue of gendered and spatial relationships in  
12 parkour and other informal/lifestyle sports in future contributions. Paying attention to gender  
13 differences, and inequalities, in informal sporting settings is fundamental to address and evaluate  
14 the contribution and limitations of informal/lifestyle sports to inclusive social policies (see also  
15 Thorpe, 2014).  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32

### 33 **Methodology**

34 Data for this study are derived from 14 months of ethnographic fieldwork in Turin, where I engaged  
35 in consistent parkour practice with approximately twenty research participants aged 16–21 and  
36 interviewed four operators working in one project promoting sport and social participation to  
37 disenfranchised youth in Turin. The young men I followed were committed traceurs with various  
38 levels of experience. Most of them were of migrant background, their families originating from  
39 diverse countries from Eastern Europe, Northern and Western Africa and South America. Only two  
40 of the participants could be considered as “ethnically Italian”. Despite a diversity in legal (legal  
41 residents or Italian citizens), and social status (participants with Italian citizenship but with migrant  
42 background were widely addressed as *alien bodies* in Turin social spaces by a wide range of  
43 different actors), it can be argued that participants shared a common condition as young people  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1 living at the margins of Turin's process of social and spatial redevelopment (see De Martini  
2 Ugolotti, 2015), as I will explain further in the following sections.

3  
4  
5  
6 My engagement with participants in the field resonated with Moyer's (2005) street ethnography  
7 perspective, as a methodological approach that takes place 'down below,' on the sidewalks, street  
8 corners and the back lots of the cityscape. This entailed regular and extensive 'deep hanging out'  
9 with the research participants in their cultural milieu, including long hours in Turin's public spaces.  
10 This approach enabled me to gain valuable insight into young people's practices, stakes, and daily  
11 navigation of public spaces and the power relations affecting their lives. A (street) ethnographic  
12 approach enabled my co-presence with respondents in the field as a "passionate participant" (Guba  
13 and Lincoln, 1994, p. 115) and my participation in respondents' practices facilitated a theoretically  
14 driven, "visceral" analysis (Sweet and Escalante, 2015) of the observed practices in the context of  
15 research by including my own "sensations, moods, and physical state of being" during parkour  
16 practice (p. 1827). Wacquant (2004) and Stoller's (1997) focus on apprenticeship as a means to  
17 access the field, contributed to inspire and inform this project. However, I contend that an engaged  
18 inquiry about physical culture(s) requires more than a sensuous and carnal commitment to the  
19 subject of study. In daily compiling my field-notes, generally at home, after departing from the  
20 traceurs' group, I reflected on my embodied participation and my political, gendered, racialized  
21 bodily presence in the field, following the recognition that my body *did* class, gender, race, and  
22 unwittingly influenced talk, attitudes, gestures amongst the participants and other social actors in  
23 the context of research (see also Carrington, 2008; Giardina and Newman, 2011; Francombe et al.,  
24 2014). As such, I used my embodied self-reflexivity to recognize my voice and make it an analytical  
25 tool to dialogue and create knowledge *with* participants.

26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51 Finally, I integrated the ethnographic material with eighteen semi-structured interviews with  
52 traceurs in public spaces, and in some cases at their homes or in a community centre. Interviews  
53 with operators of the sporting/social project took place in their work offices. All the interviews  
54 lasted a minimum of one hour and as long as two hours. Permission for the youth to be interviewed  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1 was requested from a tutor (if underage) of each participant as well as the participant themselves –  
2  
3 none refused. All interviews were audiotaped with permission and transcribed with relevant texts  
4  
5 samples translated into English. Participants' names in this paper are fictional to protect  
6  
7 respondents' privacy. For the same reason also the name of the social project specifically addressed  
8  
9 in this paper has been modified.  
10  
11

## 12 13 14 15 16 **Rebranding the city “That looked like a factory”:** Turin's Creative Urban Regeneration and 17 18 **Sport Policies** 19

20  
21  
22  
23  
24 “Turin is a city of sport [...], an Olympic city; being awarded as 2015-2018 European  
25  
26 Sport Capital acknowledges our meaningful history and future [...] we plan to host  
27  
28 several international sporting events, and to make sport and physical activity central  
29  
30 elements of community cohesion, elements of social promotion and participation for  
31  
32 Turin's residents” (Piero Fassino, former Turin Mayor, 14<sup>th</sup> May 2015)  
33  
34  
35  
36

37 In the last two decades the municipality of Turin, together with its main cultural-economic  
38  
39 lobbies, responded to the decay of the “Italian Detroit” (Pizzolato, 2008) by trying to rebrand the  
40  
41 city image, and transform it from a “city that looked like a factory” (Bagnasco 1986), to an  
42  
43 European and international capital of culture, tourism and leisure (see also Semi, 2004, 2015;  
44  
45 Vanolo, 2015). The domain of sport has represented one of the key elements of Turin's radical  
46  
47 social, and spatial transformations, as undoubtedly such radical transformations were enabled,  
48  
49 justified and deeply influenced by the hosting of 2006 Winter Olympic Games, and their  
50  
51 controversial, and still debated legacy (Dansero and Puttilli, 2010; Bondonio and Guala, 2011  
52  
53 Bottero et al., 2012; Vanolo, 2015, Bondonio et al., 2016).  
54  
55

56  
57 As the former Mayor of Turin's words at the beginning of the section suggested, the city's award as  
58  
59 European Sport Capital both acknowledged the city's sporting history, and outlined its future as an  
60

1 international hub for sports activities and events, with all the expected positive outcomes  
2 represented by “flows of sport followers and tourists, occasions for [multi]cultural relations, and for  
3 economic activities” (Fassino, 2015). Furthermore, sport was not just described as promoting  
4 Turin's public image and economic development, but as benefiting Turin residents' welfare  
5 (Bondonio et al., 2016), through its capacity to promote community life and social inclusion of  
6 individuals and groups at the margins.  
7

8 It can be argued then that the sporting domain constituted an important element in Turin's process of  
9 regeneration as a both “creative”<sup>3</sup> and inclusive city. Drawing on a progressive “sport for all” policy  
10 approach (Bondonio et al., 2016, pp. 18-20), in the last years Turin's municipality has actively  
11 integrated sport programs in urban policies aiming to redevelop and rebrand urban spaces through  
12 the “empowerment”, participation, and responsabilization of local communities. Since 2008, Turin  
13 Municipality's Urban Policy Division enacts a program co-funded by Compagnia di Sanpaolo Bank  
14 Foundation targeting the city's “residual areas”<sup>4</sup>. According to Turin Municipality's Urban Policy  
15 Division, “residual areas” are urban spaces lacking public services and facilities, but that  
16 nevertheless represent meeting points for youth and local communities in Turin's peripheries (Città  
17 di Torino, 2014). The program aims to “recover and redevelop local residual areas through the  
18 participation of citizens and local communities (Città di Torino, 2014)”, and as part of the program,  
19 the “*Cambia Gioco!*” (Change Game!) project started in 2014 aimed to promote “the dissemination  
20 of good practices and care of public space through new recreational uses of public spaces” (Città di  
21 Torino, 2014). Following the aims of the project, local youth and communities had the chance to  
22 learn and play a range of (in)formal sports and physical activities (namely frisbee, netball,  
23 tchoukball, hitball, flag, and cross-fit) in urban parks and “residual areas”, as means to facilitate  
24 “socialisation and collective participation” (Comune di Torino, 2014). Similarly, in 2014  
25 Compagnia di Sanpaolo Foundation started a social program in collaboration with Turin  
26 Municipality's Youth Policy Division. The program, called YEPP (Youth Empowerment Partnership  
27 Program), aims to promote “youth and community empowerment and lasting positive change”  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2 (YEPP, 2015) and focuses its action on the rebranding of two “problem” neighbourhoods' public  
3 spaces by engaging with local (disenfranchised) youth. Within the YEPP program, the project  
4 “CAMBIamenti: Riprenditi il tuo Spazio” (Changes [but also Change of Minds in Italian]: Claim  
5 Back your Space) aimed to “claim back” public spaces from physical, and social/moral decay, by  
6 engaging youth and local communities in sporting activities. Although disciplines like parkour were  
7 not explicitly mentioned in these projects, both “Cambia Gioco!”, and “CAMBIamenti” activities  
8 included in their aims the valorisation of spontaneous and “positive” practices enacted by young  
9 people in local urban spaces (YEPP, 2015).

10  
11 The examples above are emblematic of a wider range of public-private programs that use sport as a  
12 tool to spatially, and socially rebrand Turin's public spaces by promoting local communities and  
13 youth's “positive” engagement with the territory. As the examples showed, the realm of sport thus  
14 increasingly represents a “cross-cutting approach to social policy” (Coalter 2007, p. 116, in  
15 Gilchrist and Wheaton, 2011, p. 110) in Turin's context. Moreover, these public-private sport and  
16 social programs promote a model of community participation and responsibility in addressing local  
17 spatial/social issues that meaningfully aligns with the Municipality's rationale for drastic cuts to  
18 welfare provision in a context of deep economic recession. As happened in similar cases, Turin's  
19 “creative” urban rebranding absorbed large local budgets by integrating private and public sectors to  
20 attract tourism and capital investment<sup>5</sup> (Bondonio and Guala, 2011, p. 316; Bottero, et al., 2012, p.  
21 204), but implied also severe cuts to social spendings like welfare and public services. Despite the  
22 optimistic, and selective narratives of successful urban *renaissance* (Vanolo, 2015), in recent studies  
23 Turin's municipality figured as the most indebted council in Italy<sup>6</sup> (CGIA, 2014), and the poorest  
24 city in the industrial north of the country (Presa Diretta, 2013). In 2014, Turin had a 49%  
25 unemployment rate in the 15-29 age range (Cassi, 2014), and in 2015 the city counted the highest  
26 number of evictions in a year in Italy (almost 5000) (Fama, 2016).

27  
28 As highlighted by some of the critical readers of the creative city model (see Mould, 2015), Turin's  
29 spatial and social rebranding possibly exacerbated many of the problems it ostensibly aspired to  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32

resolve (i.e. economic stagnation, unemployment, socio-spatial polarization and uneven development). In this context, which sees (in)formal sports as both key promoters of Turin's vibrancy and rebranding, and as crucial tools of youth and community responsabilization, the role of public-private sport and community programs is thus not neutral in the development of specific trends in urban and social policies.

In particular, parkour is currently taking an interesting role within this process, through a mix of promotional urban events, and a progressive structuring and involvement with local institutions<sup>7</sup> (see Ferrero Camoletto et al., 2015). By addressing the ambivalent relationship that disenfranchised traceurs engaged with one of Turin's public/private projects of community (re)development, this article will thus unpack some of the consequences of Turin's "creative" urban regeneration. The critical analysis of different uses and interpretations of parkour by various actors and stakeholders will offer some insights about the practice's contested and ambivalent role for social policies, urban governing bodies and disenfranchised youth.

### 33 **Rolling and vaulting in Turin**

34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

"I came to train with Salim, Hamza and Emilio in a relatively affluent suburban area in the far south of Turin [...] As expected, our presence is noticed right away, some people stop to watch fascinated and curious, others, more numerous, concerned and vigilant. Almost two hours into training, a car stops by and a man comes out shouting that we are scaring his old mother: apparently she thought we were thieves of some sort trying to break in her place (sic!). He adds we should have some respect as we are *not even from here* (I am not sure whether he implied with "here" the neighbourhood or whether it was a reference to the participants, and mine with them, "exotic" phenotypes, or both). We apologise to the man for inadvertently scaring his mother, explain we were training parkour, and move to a couple of meters to train on another wall (which is not a

1 building perimeter). A group of about ten youngsters follow the scene and get closer to  
2 us. The discussion just broke the training mood, but on the other hand we all feel that by  
3 going away we would admit we were doing something illegitimate or dodgy (something  
4 the man was clearly implying). The group of youngsters who stopped by when the man  
5 yelled at us stay to 'watch us' when he leaves. They do nothing, but stay very close to us,  
6 basically on our feet, checking and commenting (not nicely) every move we do. The  
7 man in the car also patrols the area by driving slowly around the place where we are  
8 now training” (Fieldwork diary, 18th April 2015)  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22

23 The above excerpt from research field-notes depicts a vignette of the typical interactions  
24 participants faced when practicing parkour in Turin's public spaces. Conflicts and tensions  
25 with other members of the public sphere (i.e. residents, security forces, business owners) are  
26 not unfamiliar to traceurs (Mould, 2009, in press; Lebreton et al., 2010; Ameel and Tani,  
27 2012) and practitioners of other informal urban sports (Borden, 2001). However, in the above  
28 excerpt the aggressive reactions of various members of the public to the traceurs' use of public  
29 space was clearly related also to their (and mine with them) perceived “otherness” that  
30 contributed to define all of us as alien, unwelcome bodies in the cityscape.  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39

40 Participants often reported the symbolic and concrete acts daily reminding them to their  
41 embodied, and often undesired *difference* in Turin's urban environments. These acts involved  
42 ‘judging looks’, threats and acts of discrimination on the streets and public areas, including,  
43 but not limited to, during their training sessions in public spaces:  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52

53 “On the bus, people won't sit by me, or if they have, they hold tight their stuff. To them I  
54 am a Moroccan who's on that bus to steal their purses or bags” (Hassan, 20 years old)  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1 “If I ever had issues with police?! A couple of weeks ago I was running in the park, it  
2 was dark, late afternoon [in winter], all of a sudden two cops come out from a car right  
3 in front of me shouting “Show me your ID! What are you doing?”. “What am I doing?!”  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8 “I am running, man!” ... Of course I didn't tell them that, I shut my mouth and gave  
9 them my ID...” (Emilio, 20 years old)  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15

16 This excerpts show how, in a context of economic disarray and social tensions, a constellation  
17 of anxieties on crime, economic crisis, and illegal migration contributed to construct  
18 disenfranchised (and mostly post-migrant) males' bodies as crucial *objects* of social control in  
19 Turin's public spaces (see De Martini Ugolotti and Moyer, 2016). Despite, or perhaps because  
20 of their marginalisation in Turin's urban and social spaces, most of participants described  
21 finding parkour as a chance to socialize that they did not have in other environments.  
22 Interestingly, they also described how their engagement with the discipline was more the  
23 consequence of a lack of other opportunities, rather than a conscious choice of an amusing  
24 past-time:  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38

39 “At the beginning I wasn't at all interested in it. It was my friend Hamza who got me  
40 into it, so I said, ok, let's do this, kong, vaults, all that stuff... but when I realized how  
41 useful it could be for my life, then I thought, “ok, I have to make myself up here”, and  
42 now parkour is part of me” (Ruan, 21 years old)  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

51 “I didn't know what it was at first, I just saw a video on youtube, and then some kids  
52 jumping... I had nothing to do, and that was free and looked like fun, that's how I  
53 started.” (Abdelrazak, 20 years old)  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

Several respondents acknowledged that they started training ‘just for joke’, ‘because it was free, and I wasn't doing anything anyway’ (Ricardo, 18 years old) or even because ‘I was already doing it (parkour) back at home, but I just had no name to call it!’ (Samba, 20 years old). Nevertheless, as they engaged more in such practices, the participants recalled starting to realize how their daily trainings responded to some of the issues they lived and faced daily:

“Most of the people you see training here, they do it because they feel isolated, you know, socially, but also within their own families” (Karim, 20 years old)

“For me parkour isn't just about learning how to move, it's mainly about making friends, in places where a lot of people hang out, there's the possibility to meet people who might become your friends. You see some people training and jumping, you join them, it's that easy, and that's how I met most of the people I call friends now” (Ruan, 21 years old)

The above excerpts showed how, together with the attraction of being able to perform daring leaps and spectacular moves, what involved the participants in parkour was also the discipline's free accessibility, and the opportunities it provided for socialization, while traditional social institutions, family, school, but also organised leisure activities, seemed to have difficulties to reach, or include the participants (see De Martini Ugolotti, 2015).

As such, the participants' presence and trainings in public spaces did not only incur in harassment by actors of the public, but obtained also a great deal of attention by groups of other youth and occasional by-standers, who usually gathered to assist their training sessions in some of their usual training spots<sup>8</sup>. Amongst those impressed by the participants' abilities, and by their creative engagement with urban spaces, were also the operators of LLT (Living

1 and Learning Together) project. LLT is one of the several public/private community projects  
2 enacting in Turin that aims to re-qualify and re-brand peripheral, blighted urban areas in  
3 collaboration with local youth and communities (more information about the project will  
4 follow in the next section). The research participants friendly welcomed the presence of LLT's  
5 operators' in one of their favourite training spots, a relatively forgotten and hidden peripheral  
6 park that gained the authorities' attention for petty criminal activity involving youth,  
7 homelessness, and drug addicts' presence. The LLT's operators on their side thoroughly  
8 supported the participants' public trainings, and also acknowledged and “capitalized” on the  
9 possibilities that participants provided them to contact and involve local youth in the project's  
10 activities, through the undeniable attention and interest that the traceurs instigated in peers  
11 and younger users of that space. This ongoing informal relationship between the social  
12 program and the participants evolved throughout the research process with insightful turns for  
13 the issues addressed in this paper.

### 33 **Boyz in the Hood sporting centre: or, the sanitization of parkour, and public space**

34  
35  
36  
37  
38 “The project's objectives *provide to the area positive models of occupation of public*  
39 *spaces through cultural and sporting animation, in order to foster the re-appropriation*  
40 *of places* by those who live in the neighbourhood, *with particular attention to boys and*  
41 *girls [...] to identify positive leaderships and empower young people willing to be*  
42 *actively involved and made responsible of the use of public space [...] all the actions*  
43 *aim to valorise neighbourhood youth's human capital and competences”* (LLT Project  
44 Operative Plan, 2014, pp. 2-5 emphasis added)

45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56 The LLT project is one of many examples of the ongoing collaboration between Turin  
57 Municipality's Youth Division and private funding actors. The project targets specifically  
58  
59  
60



1 youth in specific “problem” neighbourhoods with the aim to involve them in the “positive re-  
2  
3  
4 appropriation” of blighted urban spaces, or “residual areas” in the terms of Turin's  
5  
6 Municipality. LLT started to operate in the spring of 2014 in the neighbourhood of Porta  
7  
8 Palazzo, a strategic area within Turin's regeneration process. The neighbourhood is adjacent to  
9  
10 the touristic and glamorous city centre, it hosts numerous migrant communities and has often  
11  
12 been the site of heated tensions regarding the presence of migrants and significant gentrifying  
13  
14 initiatives (See also Semi, 2004, 2015).

15  
16  
17 In this context, the project aims to “engage local youth in through actions aiming to valorise  
18  
19 their human capital and competences through [...] a re-appropriation of public spaces that  
20  
21 aims to facilitate processes of positive place identity and local urban rebranding” (LTT  
22  
23 Operative Plan, 2014, p. 3).

24  
25  
26 Following these objectives, during the research the project's operators were promoting various  
27  
28 activities<sup>9</sup>, including the provision of sports in the neighbourhoods's public spaces, and  
29  
30 specifically targeting youth between 15 and 30 years old. As mentioned above, the area's  
31  
32 public spaces represented a specific focus of the program's initiatives as commented by one of  
33  
34 the operators:

35  
36  
37  
38  
39 “One of the main aims of the project is to promote a positive use of public space [...], I  
40  
41 am convinced that an embellished place initiates more smiles, happiness, motivation,  
42  
43 we aim to do this by involving youth in positive engagement with local spaces in the  
44  
45 neighbourhood, mainly through sports and other initiatives...” (Franco, project co-  
46  
47 ordinator and operator)  
48  
49

50  
51  
52  
53 The above excerpts illustrated how youth behaviours and use of space have been of great  
54  
55 concern not just to urban residents, but to wider regeneration policies and community  
56  
57 redevelopment programs in Turin. On this issue, Fusco (2012) highlighted how sport and  
58  
59  
60

1 physical activity have often been depicted as solutions to the “problem” of youth and public  
2 spaces (p. 145).  
3

4  
5  
6 As emerged from the quote at the beginning of the section, space was thus symbolically  
7 linked to youth health, participation and an optimistic future by providing “positive models of  
8 occupation of public spaces”, and fostering “the re-appropriation of places” by “boys and  
9 girls”. These highly desirable outcomes were to be obtained mainly by identifying and  
10 empowering youth “willing to be made responsible of the use of public space”. Although  
11 practices like parkour were not included in the original project activities, LTT's Operative  
12 Plan included in its aims the identification and fostering of “youth practices and talents that  
13 contribute to the attractiveness and positive identity of Porta Palazzo”.  
14  
15

16  
17  
18 In this sense, participants' training sessions seemed to meaningfully reflect the project's  
19 rationale and vision of fostering youth's talent, health and place-promotion, and represented  
20 an attractive means to engage with, and attract disenfranchised youth. The operators  
21 evidently regarded the participants as actors possibly aligning with the subjects the program  
22 aimed to empower, in order to promote (disenfranchised) youth “human capital”:  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36

37 “I think these guys [the traceurs] have the potential to make an amazing job to inspire  
38 young people in the area. They are youngsters with initiative, taking care of themselves,  
39 and constantly aiming to improve themselves with what they have in their life. They see  
40 urban spaces in a different, creative, way, as a place of opportunities, not of obstacles.  
41 This is the kind of mindset we value in the project” (Franco, Project operator)  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49

50 “Franco and Sara arrived at the training spot, and immediately came by to greet us,  
51 sweating under the sun. As usual, Franco approached Emilio, who is an experienced,  
52 dedicated traceur, and an informal leading figure in the group. We all engage in a brief  
53 conversation on the delights of training on concrete in Turin's August boiling heat...  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1 Franco comments on how this can be a proof of a traceur's dedication, but Emilio chips  
2 in straight away to clarify: 'It's not just for the sake of it, it's a means to get to know  
3 what you want to become and achieve, how hard do you want what you want, you  
4 know, to keep you in check... as for me, I am pretty sure if it was not for parkour, I'd  
5 probably be wasting myself away around with a bottle of something with my cousins...'.  
6 Franco's eyes are wide open, visibly amazed by Emilio's words...' (Fieldnotes 28<sup>th</sup>  
7 August, 2014)

19 The participants' appreciated the fact that representatives of an official institution positively  
20 acknowledged their public enactment of parkour, and addressed it as an example of "positive  
21 youth leadership", while usually their trainings in public spaces were interrupted by  
22 "concerned" citizens and police forces. In many occasions the traceurs' reported how such  
23 positive acknowledgement made them feel as if they were doing something good not just for  
24 themselves, but for the community, by being represented as "positive examples" for others.  
25 Less than a year from the project's start, Emilio was offered a one-day-per-week job as a peer  
26 trainer in parkour and other physical activities. LTT's operators made clear to Emilio that this  
27 opportunity would not become, or substitute, a "proper" full-time job. Rather the operators'  
28 described it as a "middle-passage", as an incentive for him to keep on developing his  
29 motivation, social and work-skills that would help him to pursue his life goals. Emilio would  
30 be accompanied by a project operator and granted absolute freedom in choosing where and  
31 how to conduct his trainings in the area. This was generally interpreted by the participants as a  
32 further, collective recognition of their worth, and a further motivation to keep training.  
33 However, a couple of months later the situation had changed and all the projects' activities had  
34 been moved to a city council managed open-air sporting centre very close to the traceurs'  
35 usual training spot. When I interviewed the project's operator working with Emilio and asked  
36 her about the change, she said:

1  
2  
3  
4 “It was a decision of the project's coordinators to group all the activities and the youth at  
5  
6 the polyvalent centre. It is easier to offer a productive involvement in our activities here,  
7  
8 in the previous [public] spaces doing that was more difficult, it was more dispersive,  
9  
10 you couldn't engage enough with the youth as they were constantly around... We think  
11  
12 this site can provide *a good idea of public space* [...] those who came along understood  
13  
14 the project's aims” (Sara, Project operator, April, 2015, emphasis added)  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19

20 However, despite the operator's assumptions, Emilio's opinion about the change was definitely  
21  
22 less enthusiastic:  
23  
24  
25

26 “Well, it does seem a bit weird, we have been put in this small piece of green with two  
27  
28 benches between two futsal/tennis fields, we can't really do much here. Plus, who comes  
29  
30 here mainly do it to play football, and while they wait for their turn they play table  
31  
32 tennis, *I think they are completely missing all the others... I don't think though this*  
33  
34 *project is up to what they described to us* when we met them, you know, *valorising the*  
35  
36 *positive stuff young people are spontaneously doing in this city, I really hoped this*  
37  
38 *project aimed to change people's perspective on what we can do, and not just us doing*  
39  
40 parkour, you know? and *you can't do it if you close yourself here...*” (Emilio, emphasis  
41  
42 added)  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48

49 Providing an interesting contrast, Sara's and Emilio's accounts showed the distance between  
50  
51 the project's and participants' aims and realities. As the accounts explained, the project's  
52  
53 decision to move all its activities in an open-air sporting centre operated a crucial shift on  
54  
55 what it is understood as constituting “public space” and the desired moral bodies attending it  
56  
57 (Rose, 1995). Sara's account highlighted how the projects' idea(l) of “positive” public space  
58  
59  
60

1 thus conceived it as open, freely accessible, but also as facilitating control and  
2  
3 (self)regulation, by avoiding “dispersion” and inciting youth to become engaged participants  
4  
5 in the project's health, and community re-branding initiatives (see Fusco, 2012, p. 146).  
6  
7

8 Conversely, Emilio's disappointment seemed to be related to the projects' inability to live up to the  
9  
10 expectations created not only in regard to the legitimation of parkour practice in Turin public  
11  
12 spaces. He meaningfully voiced his interpretation of the projects' claim to encourage youth's re-  
13  
14 appropriation of public spaces as an intention to tackle the geographies of power that  
15  
16 disenfranchised and (post)migrant youth daily experienced in Turin's public spaces.  
17  
18

19 Contrarily to Emilio's expectations, the project's invitation to engage youth in “productive  
20  
21 activities” within the gates of the sporting centre, configured instead youth concurrent  
22  
23 practices and uses of space as inherently unhealthy, a(t) risk, or ambiguous at best (see also  
24  
25 Fusco, 2012).  
26  
27

28 As a consequence of this shift, a number of crucial socio-spatial issues influencing local youth  
29  
30 lives and practices (i.e. unemployment, gender inequalities, social exclusion, but also lack of  
31  
32 social housing and failing public education), were effectively eclipsed by the project's  
33  
34 proclamations of innovative, participatory initiatives of health and social promotion focused  
35  
36 on youth responsibility, and re-imagining of public spaces (see Fusco, 2007, p. 58).  
37  
38

39 The project's tentative “containment” of youth and of traceurs in a sporting centre apparently  
40  
41 resonated with the cases described by Gilchrist and Wheaton (2011) and Ameal and Tani  
42  
43 (2012), and seemed to represent an example of emerging attempts to frame parkour within a  
44  
45 landscape of social, and spatial, control (Vivoni, 2009, p. 130).  
46  
47

48 However, the evolving relationship between the project and the traceurs highlighted more  
49  
50 than a manipulative, mono-directional landscape of (soft)control over disenfranchised youth.  
51  
52

53 It rather showed the complexity, and diversity of the stakes related to the visions and uses of  
54  
55 the city and urban spaces by participants', and by the local, public-private actors embodying  
56  
57 Turin's regeneration process.  
58  
59  
60

### Contested (public) spaces, citizenship, and the unexpected social benefits of parkour

“We appreciate the productive discussion we had with the traceurs after the relocation of the trainings in the sporting centre, and we provided for a venue that suited better their training philosophy... I understand there had been a misunderstanding about our decision to include them in the sporting centre activities. Our initiative was motivated by the idea of legitimising and supporting the important role that these young men are having in building a healthy, cohesive community in such a difficult neighbourhood.”  
(Pietro, project coordinator)

“It all comes to that, and it's very simple: You can give us as many places you want, but we'll keep looking for more...” (Alessandro, 20 years old)

As a consequence of the events described in the previous section, the participants did not stop collaborating with LLT project, but they rather negotiated with the operators the possibility to use a school hall where they could train acrobatics with mattresses once a week. In this way, the traceurs managed to keep some advantages that the project undoubtedly provided them (including a small financial return for some of them, and the social and community recognition deriving from their role as “youth leaders”). They also contributed to the projects' aims of community responsibility and participation, by offering an open and informal physical activity to local youth in the school's sports hall. However, as Alessandro's quote highlighted, participants' engagement with the project did not keep them from a continuous search of new (public) spaces to train, socialize, meet other peers and improve themselves.

The operator's clarification on the attempted inclusion of parkour in the sporting centre's spaces showed clearly how the perceived benefits of parkour assumed two quite different

1 meanings and implications according to the project, and the participants. For the project's  
2 operators, the promotion of parkour was related to the idea of supporting disenfranchised  
3 youth's engagement in a free, engaging physical activity that minimised the risks of possible  
4 involvement in anti-social behaviours (as argued by Emilio when discussing with Franco). As  
5 such, the inclusion of parkour trainings in the sporting centre did not simply represent a  
6 subtle, manipulative attempt to “eliminate traceurs from the streets” (Ameel and Tani, 2012,  
7 p. 21). Rather, it aimed to provide participants with a “safe and legitimised space” (Ferrero  
8 Camoletto et al., 2015, p. 307) to promote, empower and possibly legitimise their practices.  
9 This attempt was thus coherent with the institutionalisation and “sportification” process that  
10 the discipline is currently, and actively, pursuing (Lebreton et al., 2010, p. 303) in several  
11 contexts, including Turin. Furthermore, the attempted inclusion of parkour trainings in the  
12 sporting centre espoused the project's aims to make the local youth responsible for the  
13 regeneration of their community, by engaging with other local disenfranchised youth through  
14 physical activities in a (supposedly) safe, healthy, and regulated space. As discussed above  
15 though, this perspective promoted young people's health, and community re-generation as a  
16 matter of young people's individualised and self- responsible choices, and contributed to  
17 construct normative ideas of “healthy” public spaces, and ways to live in them (Fusco, 2012,  
18 p. 152).

19 The project's vision of participatory urban regeneration also actively enacted an elision of  
20 structural urban inequalities located in urban spaces, through a “common good” ethos of  
21 youth, and community empowerment/responsibility: a cohesive “we” implying a  
22 homogeneous population with a common investment in a unified vision of what is a healthy  
23 city/community, its development and management (see also Fusco, 2007, p. 55),

24 On the contrary, the participants' spontaneous and unrequested practices showed urban spaces  
25 as contested arenas, cleaved by hidden, unequal power relations, and as sites where the  
26 meanings and contours of inclusion and belonging in the city had to be daily negotiated:  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 “Well, that annoys me a bit... we are always been told to move away, “you can't jump  
5  
6 here”, “no, you can't do this here” when the spaces we train are abso-fucking-lutely  
7  
8 public [...] If in a public space one person, or a police man comes to me and tell me  
9  
10 “you can't do that” if I'm not doing anything wrong, that really annoys me!” (Hamza, 21  
11  
12 years old)

13  
14  
15  
16  
17 “It's not even the issue that you [the authorities] have to give me a place, because we  
18  
19 don't play tennis or golf, we don't need apposite places, and I am not a thief or a thug, I  
20  
21 am not doing anything wrong, so I want to choose where to train... (Hugo, 19 years old)  
22  
23

24  
25  
26 According to the operators and participants' perspectives, the meaning and implications of the  
27  
28 supposed social benefits of parkour were thus drastically different. Although participants'  
29  
30 ethos of self-improvement and inner motivation meaningfully aligned with the project's image  
31  
32 of youth leaders of healthy, responsible communities, their engagement with parkour implied  
33  
34 a far more complex relationship with the city than the project's aims of positive urban  
35  
36 rebranding.  
37

38  
39 The participants' spontaneous and unrequested use of the *whole* city as an unfolding  
40  
41 playground actively contradicted, though *not opposed*, the project's idea of urban spaces as  
42  
43 rebranded, freely accessible, but controlled and (self)regulated areas. The participants' use of  
44  
45 public spaces instead engaged the city, from the blighted peripheral parks and “residual areas”  
46  
47 to the city centre, for how it was daily lived by disenfranchised youth in Turin: as a site of  
48  
49 daily tensions and negotiation, where disenfranchised youth's civic membership was  
50  
51 contingent on how embodied markers of *difference*, be it poverty, ethnicity, gender, religion,  
52  
53 or a combination of these factors were perceived in specific spatial/temporal contexts (see  
54  
55 Glick Schiller, 2015; Manley and Silk, 2014; De Martini Ugolotti and Moyer, 2016) .  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

Through their contested engagement with parkour and public spaces, the participants thus illuminated the hidden tensions, power relations and hierarchies of belonging (Back et al., 2012) emerging in Turin's (self)celebrated process of inclusive and participatory urban regeneration. However, as suggested in other studies (see Borden, 2001), the traceurs in the study did not engage in such contested re-appropriations of space to enact an explicit political agenda (see Lefebvre, 1991; Mitchell, 2003).

Rather, the participants' *desire* for socialization and recognition in the Turin's public spaces (see also Daskalaki and Mould, 2013; Mould, 2015) informed the inherent political negotiation of their positioning and relationship with the LTT project, and with the city. As such, for the group of young men in this study, one of the (unimagined) benefits of parkour was their active negotiation of the meaning and contours of belonging in Turin public spaces, as sites where participants came to recognise themselves as contested, marginal, yet rightful members of the city's public life, and polity.

### **Conclusions: The politics of parkour, and of desire**

Drawing on an ethnographic perspective, this paper contributed to the inter-disciplinary discussion on the social benefits of lifestyle sports/informal practices, by unpacking the ambivalent position that parkour acquired within initiatives of urban and community re-branding enacted in Turin. I contend that if we want to address effectively the benefits, and limitations, of lifestyle sports in grass-root, or institutionalised activities, the assumption that informal physical practices like parkour embody inherent homogeneous characteristics or “cultural values” (see Atkinson, 2009; Gilchrist and Wheaton, 2011; Thorpe, 2014; Mould, 2009, in press) risks providing an analysis that is one sided at best. As a discipline that does not provide “any particular clear or finished blueprint for action” (Saville, 2008, p. 892), parkour can represent diverse, even competing cultural values and forms of inhabiting the body and (urban) space: from the anti- authoritarian “anarcho-

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

environmentalism” described by Atkinson (2009) in Toronto, to the courses provided by Parkour Generations in London for security, surveillance and anti-infiltration purposes (Parkour Generations, 2015), to the emerging “sportified” and regulated training landscapes created and/or pursued by several parkour groups (Lebreton et al., 2010, p. 303).

In this sense, parkour represents an empty frame and canvas providing with its lack of definition countless possibilities for practitioners' creative expression, but “whose meaning, use, and impact is dependent on the ways in which it is employed on how and to what ends it is used” (MacAloon, 1995, in Hartmann and Kwauk, 2011, p. 289). In order to establish its social benefits or inclusive capacities (for example in relation to gender) we need to look at its contextualised uses and practice.

*together with the power forces in which it is imbued locally and globally*

This study provided only a partial analysis that could not include in its discussion important intersectional articulations of gender, class, race and disability in relation to parkour. However, it provided an initial, critical discussion of the discipline's ambivalent incorporation in broader contexts of urban policy, and politics, and of the negotiation of this process by a group of disenfranchised, mostly (post)migrant traceurs. Whereas a focus on lifestyle sports' participants who do not fall in the white, (often male), middle-class demographic has been absent in the literature on the subject<sup>10</sup> (see Wheaton 2013, 2015), this paper showed how such a perspective can provide critical insights on the stakes and possibilities of informal sports practice within the context of contemporary cities (see also Daskalaki and Mould, 2013; Mould, 2015).

In particular, the discussion of disenfranchised youth's spontaneous and unrequested engagement with parkour in Turin's urban spaces highlighted the (unexpected) citizenship negotiations enacted by the participants, driven by irreverent *desires* of self-expression, recognition and socialization.

The (re)appropriation of (in)formal sports by marginal social groups can therefore provide insightful perspectives on the daily sites of contestation over the meanings and contours of belonging and citizenship that are created in urban spaces without the assertive foregrounding of an explicit transformative social project (see Soja, 1996). This can thus represent a meaningful lens to ferret out contextual manifestations of inequality in urban spaces (Moyer, 2005). Moreover, this

1 focus can enable researchers, policy-makers, activists and citizens to identify and be inspired by  
2  
3  
4 “yet to come” experiences (Daskalaki and Mould, 2013, p. 2), and by the irreverent meaning-, self-,  
5  
6 and place- (re)inventions that exceed power inequalities and strategies of urban planning, and that  
7  
8 daily take place on the sidewalks, parks, street corners and back lots of our cities.  
9

---

10  
11  
12 <sup>1</sup> Interestingly, this ratio is not common amongst traceurs' crews training in more structured courses in gyms and  
13 sporting associations in Turin.

14 <sup>2</sup> Parkour Torino endorsed the ADAPT instructor qualification system created by the UK based “Parkour  
15 Generations”. As this qualification is the only acknowledged by parkour's founders, it is thereby (re)presented as  
16 embodying the authentic version of the discipline (see Ferrero Camoleto et al., 2015, p. 314)

17 <sup>3</sup> The creative city model has been described as aiming to cultivate glamorous innovation and cultural vibrancy,  
18 thereby creating a more attractive place for businesses and tourists, and thus stimulating further economic rewards  
19 (Mould, 2015). Through a (neoliberal) logic indissolubly tying market revitalisation with the upscaling of urban  
20 residents' quality of life, the creative city model has also been purported to encourage social inclusion, and  
21 responsibility, cultural participation and poverty alleviation (Semi, 2004; Mould, 2015).

22 <sup>4</sup> Translations from texts in Italian were made by the author.

23 <sup>5</sup> The implementation of new legislation from the regional government, such as Law 18/1999, favoured stimulating  
24 private companies to “enrich and valorise touristic areas” with public funding, (Bottero et al., 2012, p. 208), mainly  
25 by supporting the construction of tourist, or tourism related structures.

26 <sup>6</sup> According to CGIA's study Turin's enormous public debt is a direct consequence of the expenses the municipality  
27 sustained for the 2006 Winter Olympic Games (see also Vanolo, 2015, p. 3).

28 <sup>7</sup> Parkour is featured in the most recent promotional video produced by Turin's Municipality Tourism Office  
29 <http://www.torinoemotion.it/news051115/>

30 <sup>8</sup> A “spot” is a location traceurs choose to use for training.

31 <sup>9</sup> Theatre and participatory video courses and workshops for “active job search”.

32 <sup>1</sup> <sup>0</sup> Though with notable exceptions (Thorpe and Ahmed, 2013; Thorpe, 2014).

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
**REFERENCES**

Agergaard, S., A. Michelsen la Cour & M. Gregersen, 2015. Politicisation of migrant leisure: a public and civil intervention involving organised sports. *Leisure Studies*, 35(2), 200-214.

Ameel, L., & Tani S., 2012. Parkour: A Way to Create Loose Spaces? *Geografiska Annaler B*, 94(1), 17–30.

Atkinson, M., 2009. Parkour, Anarcho-Environmentalism and Poiesis. *Journal of Sport & Social Issues*. 33(2), 169-194.

Back, L., Sinha, S. & Bryan, C., 2012. New Hierarchies of Belonging. *European Journal of Cultural Studies* (15)2, 139-154.

Bagnasco, A., 1986. *Torino un profilo sociologico* [Turin, a sociological profile]. Milano: Einaudi.

Bavinton, N., 2011. Parkour, Leisure and the Reinterpretation of Constraints. *Annals of Leisure Research*. 10(3-4).

Bondonio, P., & Guala, C., 2011. Gran Torino? The 2006 Olympic Winter Games and the tourism revival of an ancient city. *Journal of Sport & Tourism*, 16(4), 303-321.

Bondonio, P., Dansero, E., & Genova, C., 2016. La città e lo sport. Torino 2015 e oltre [*The city and the sport. Torino 2015 and beyond*]. Report. Olympics and Mega Events Research Observatory: University of Turin.

Borden, I., 2001. *Skateboarding, space and the city: Architecture and the body*. Oxford: Berg Publishers.

Bottero M., Levi Sacerdotti S. & Mauro S., 2012. Turin 2006 Olympic Winter Games: impacts and legacies from a tourism perspective. *Journal of Tourism and Cultural Change*. 10(2), 202-217.

Calavita, K., 2005. *Immigrants at the margins: Law, Race and Exclusion in Southern Europe*. Cambridge: University of Cambridge Press.

Carrington, B., 2008. “What's the footballer doin' here?”: Racialized performativity, reflexivity and

1  
2 identity. *Cultural Studies ↔ Critical Methodologies*, 8(4), 423–452.

3  
4 Cassi, M., 2014. Disoccupazione, a Torino il record del Nord. Quasi la metà dei ragazzi con meno  
5 di 24 anni non studia e non lavora. [*Unemployment, in Turin the highest in the North. Almost half*  
6 *young people below 24 years old are neither studying nor in employment*]. *La Stampa*. 13 October.  
7 Available from: [http://www.lastampa.it/2014/10/13/cronaca/disoccupazione-giovanile-a-torino-il-](http://www.lastampa.it/2014/10/13/cronaca/disoccupazione-giovanile-a-torino-il-record-del-nord-QwLSQGdeJriKRyLr9CRUDP/pagina.html)  
8 [record-del-nord-QwLSQGdeJriKRyLr9CRUDP/pagina.html](http://www.lastampa.it/2014/10/13/cronaca/disoccupazione-giovanile-a-torino-il-record-del-nord-QwLSQGdeJriKRyLr9CRUDP/pagina.html). [Accessed 13 September 2016].

9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16 CGIA, 2014. *Analisi finanziaria dei comuni italiani* [Financial appraisal of Italian municipalities],  
17 report (Mestre: CGIA)

18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24 Coakley, J., 2011. Youth Sports: What Counts as “Positive Development?”. *Journal of Sport and*  
*Social Issues*, 35(3), 306-324.

25  
26  
27 Coalter, F., 2007. *A wider social role for sport: who's keeping the score?* London: Routledge.

28  
29  
30  
31  
32 Coalter, F., 2010. The politics of sport-for-development. Limited focus programmes and broad  
gauge problems? *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, 45, 295-314.

33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
Comune di Torino, 2014. Cambia Gioco! Nuovi Sport nei Parchi [*Change Game! New Sports in*  
*Parks*]. Available from:  
<http://www.comune.torino.it/circ7/cm/pages/ServeBLOB.php/L/IT/IDPagina/3025> [Accessed 14  
September 2016].

Dal Lago, A., 1999. *Non Persone: L'esclusione dei Migranti nella Società Globale* [Not Persons:  
the Exclusion of Migrants in Global Society]. Milano: Feltrinelli.

Dansero, E., & M. Puttilli, 2010. Mega events, tourism and local development: the case of Torino  
2006. *Leisure Studies* 29 (3), 321-341.

Daskalaki, M., Stara, A. & Imas, M., 2008. The Parkour Organisation: Inhabitation of Corporate  
Spaces. *Culture and Organization*, 14(1), 49-64.

Daskalaki, M., and Mould, O., 2013. Beyond Urban Subcultures: Urban Subversions as Rhizomatic

1 Social Formations. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 37(1), pp. 1-18.

2  
3  
4 De Martini Ugolotti, N., 2015. Climbing Walls, Making Bridges: Children of Immigrants'  
5 Identity Negotiations through Capoeira and Parkour in Turin. *Leisure Studies*, 34  
6  
7 (1), pp. 19-33.

8  
9  
10  
11 De Martini Ugolotti, N., and Moyer, E., 2016. "If I climb a Wall of Ten  
12 Meters" : Capoeira, parkour and the politics of public space among (post)migrant  
13 youth in Turin, Italy. *Patterns of Prejudice*, 50(2), pp. 188-206.

14  
15 Fama, A., 2016. Senza casa, il dramma degli sfratti in Italia [*Homeless, the tragedy of evictions in*  
16 *Italy*]. *L'Espresso*, 4 January. Available from:  
17 [http://espresso.repubblica.it/inchieste/2015/12/18/news/senza-casa-il-dramma-degli-sfratti-in-italia-](http://espresso.repubblica.it/inchieste/2015/12/18/news/senza-casa-il-dramma-degli-sfratti-in-italia-si-specula-ma-aumenta-chi-non-ha-un-tetto-1.243938)  
18 [si-specula-ma-aumenta-chi-non-ha-un-tetto-1.243938](http://espresso.repubblica.it/inchieste/2015/12/18/news/senza-casa-il-dramma-degli-sfratti-in-italia-si-specula-ma-aumenta-chi-non-ha-un-tetto-1.243938) [Accessed 13 September 2016]

19  
20  
21 Ferrero Camoletto, R., Sterchele, D., and Genova, C., 2015. Managing alternative sports: new  
22 organisational spaces for the diffusion of Italian parkour. *Modern Italy*, 20(3), 307-319.

23  
24  
25 Francombe-Webb, J., Rich E., and De Pian, L., 2014. I Move Like You... But Different: Biopolitics  
26 and Embodied Methodologies. *Cultural Studies ↔ Critical Methodologies*, 14(5), 471-482.

27  
28  
29 Fuggle, S., 2008. Discourses of Subversion: The Ethics and Aesthetics of Capoeira and Parkour.  
30 *Dance Research*, 26(2), pp. 204-222.

31  
32  
33 Fusco, C., 2007. 'Healthification' and the Promises of Urban Space. A Textual Analysis of Place,  
34 Activity, Youth (PLAY-ing) in the City. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, 42(1), 43-  
35  
36 63.

37  
38  
39 Fusco, C., 2012. Governing Play: Moral Geographies, Healthification, and Neoliberal Urban  
40 Imaginaries. In Andrews, D. & Silk, M., eds. *Sport and Neoliberalism: Politics, Consumption and*  
41 *Cultura*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 128-143.

42  
43  
44 Giardina, M., and Newman J.I., 2011. Physical Cultural Studies and Embodied Research Acts,

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

*Cultural Studies ↔ Critical Methodologies*, 11(6), 523-534.

Gilchrist, P., and Wheaton, B., 2011. Lifestyle Sport, Public Policy and Youth Engagement: Examining the Emergence of Parkour. *International Journal of Sport Policy and Politics*, 3(1), 109-131.

Glick Schiller, N., 2015. Diasporic cosmopolitanism: Migrant Sociabilities and City Making. In: N. Glick Schiller & A. Irving, eds. *Whose Cosmopolitanism? Critical Perspectives, Relationalities and Discontent*. New York: Berghan.

Guba, E.G., and Lincoln, Y.S., 1994. Competing paradigms in qualitative research. In: N.K. Denzin & Y.S. Lincoln, Eds. *Handbook of Qualitative Research*, Thousands Oak, CA: Sage, 105-117.

Hartmann, D., and C. Kwauk, 2011. Sport and Development: An Overview, Critique, and Reconstruction. *Journal of Sport and Social Issues*, 35(3), 284-305.

Il Sindaco Fassino presenta l'iniziativa Torino 2015 – Capitale europea dello sport. Torino, Torino on Campus 2015. Available from: <http://www.torino2015oncampus.it/notizie/item/il-sindaco-fassino-presenta-l-iniziativa-torino-2015-capitale-europea-dello-sport>. [Accessed 24 November 2015]

Kidder, J. L., 2013. Parkour, masculinity and the city. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 30, pp. 1-23.

Lebreton, F., Routier, G., Héas, S., and Bodin, D., 2010. Cultures urbaines et activités physiques et sportives. La "sportification" du parkour et du street golf comme médiation culturelle [*Urban culture and physical and sports activities. The "sportification" of parkour and street golf as cultural mediation*]. *Canadian review of sociology = Revue canadienne de sociologie*, 47(3), 293-317.

Lefebvre, H., 1991. *The production of space*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Living and Learning Together. 2014, Project Operative Plan.

Manley, A., and Silk, M., 2014. Liquid London: Sporting spectacle, britishness and ban-optic surveillance. *Surveillance and Society*, 11(4), 360-376.

- 1  
2 Marshall, B., 2010. Running Across the Rooves of Empire: Parkour and the Post-Colonial City.  
3  
4 *Modern and Contemporary France*, 18(2), 157-173.
- 5  
6 Marshall, T.H., 2009 [1950]. Citizenship and Social Class. In: J. Manza & M. Sauder, Eds.  
7  
8 *Inequality and Society*. New York: Norton & Co, 148-154.
- 9  
10  
11 Merrill, H., 2011. Migration and Surplus Population: Race and Deindustrialization in Northern Italy.  
12  
13 *Antipode*, 43 (5), 1542-1572.
- 14  
15  
16 Mitchell, D., 1995. The End of Public Space? People's Park, Definitions of the Public and  
17  
18 Democracy. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*. 85(1), 108-133.
- 19  
20  
21 Mitchell, D., 2003. *The Right to the City. Social Justice and the Fight for Public Space*. London:  
22  
23 Guilford.
- 24  
25  
26 Mould, O., 2009. Parkour, the City, the Event. *Society and Space*, 27(4), 738-750.
- 27  
28  
29 Mould, O., 2015. *Urban Subversion and the Creative City*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- 30  
31  
32 Mould, O., in press. Parkour, Activism, and Young People, In: K. Nairn et al., Eds. *Geographies of*  
33  
34 *Children and Young People. Space, Place and Environment*. London: Springer.
- 35  
36  
37 Moyer, E., 2005. Street Corner Justice in the Name of Jah: Imperatives for Peace among Dar es  
38  
39 Salaam Street Youth. *Africa Today* 51(3), 32-58.
- 40  
41  
42 Palmas, Q. L., 2009. *Dentro le Gang: Giovani, Migranti e Nuovi Spazi Pubblici* [Inside the  
43  
44 gangs: Youth, migrants and new public spaces]. Verona: Ombre Corte.
- 45  
46  
47 Parkour Generations, 2015. *Parkour: Tactical*. Available from:  
48  
49 <http://parkourgenerations.com/tactical/>. [Last Accessed 20 November 2015]
- 50  
51  
52 *Presa Diretta*, 2013, 'Ricchi e Poveri' [The Rich and the Poor], investigative journalistic report, TV  
53  
54 RAI 3. September 2. Available from: <http://www.presadiretta.rai.it> [Last Accessed 20 November  
55  
56 2015].
- 57  
58  
59 Pizzolato, N., 2008. Challenging global capitalism: Labor migration, radical struggle, and urban  
60



1 change in Detroit and Turin. New York: Palgrave MacMillan.

2  
3  
4 Rose, G., 1995. Making Space for the Female Subject of Feminism: the Spatial Subversions of  
5  
6  
7 Holzer, Kruger and Sherman. In: S. Pile and N. Thrift, eds. *Mapping the Subject: Geographies of*  
8  
9  
10 *Cultural Transformation*,. London: Routledge, 332-354.

11  
12 Saville, J. S., 2008. Playing with Fear: Parkour and the Mobility of Emotion. *Social & Cultural*  
13  
14 *Geography*. 9(8), 891-914.

15  
16 Semi, G., 2004. Un quartiere che (si) distingue: un caso di gentrification a Torino [A neighbourhood  
17  
18 that distinguish (itself): Gentrification in Turin]. *Studi Culturali*. 1(1), pp. 83-106.

19  
20 Semi, G., 2015. Gentrification. Tutte le città come Disneyland? [Gentrification. All cities like  
21  
22  
23 Disneyland?]. Bologna: Il Mulino.

24  
25 Silk, M. & Andrews D., 2011. Towards a Physical Cultural Studies. *Sociology of Sport Journal*,  
26  
27 28(1), 4-35.

28  
29  
30 Soja, E. W., 1996. *Thirdspace: Journey to Los Angeles and Other Real-and- Imagined Places*.  
31  
32 Oxford: Blackwell.

33  
34  
35 Spaaij, R., 2009. Personal and social change in and through sport: Cross-cutting themes. *Sport in*  
36  
37 *Society*, 12, 1265-1268.

38  
39  
40 Sport: Fassino, Torino capitale europea 2015 e' opportunita'. Torino: La Repubblica. Available from:  
41  
42 [http://www.repubblica.it/ultimora/24ore/Sport-Fassino-Torino-capitale-europea-2015-e-](http://www.repubblica.it/ultimora/24ore/Sport-Fassino-Torino-capitale-europea-2015-e-opportunita/news-dettaglio/4241072)  
43  
44 [opportunita/news-dettaglio/4241072](http://www.repubblica.it/ultimora/24ore/Sport-Fassino-Torino-capitale-europea-2015-e-opportunita/news-dettaglio/4241072) [Accessed 24 November 2015]

45  
46  
47 Stagi, L., 2015. Crossing the symbolic boundaries: parkour, gender and urban space. *Modern Italy*.  
48  
49 20(3), 295-305.

50  
51  
52 Stapleton, S., and Terrio, S., 2012. Le Parkour: Urban Street Culture and the Commodization of  
53  
54 Male Youth Expression. *International Migration*, 50(6), 18-27.

55  
56  
57 Stoller, P., 1997. *Sensuous Scholarship*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

- 1  
2 Sweet, E., and Escalante, S.O., 2015. Bringing bodies into planning: Visceral methods, fear and  
3  
4 gender violence, *Urban Studies*, 52(10), 1826-1845.  
5  
6  
7 Thorpe, H., 2014. Action sports for youth development: critical insights for the SDP community.  
8  
9 *International Journal of Sport Policy and Politics*, 8(1), 91-116.  
10  
11 Thorpe, H., and Rinehart, R., 2012. Action Sport NGOs in a Neo-Liberal Context: The Cases of  
12  
13 Skateistan and Surf Aid International. *Journal of Sport and Social Issues*, 37(2), 115-141.  
14  
15  
16 Thorpe, H., and Ahmad N., 2013. Youth, action sports and political agency in the Middle East:  
17  
18 lessons from a grassroots parkour group in Gaza. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*,  
19  
20 50(6), 678-704.  
21  
22  
23 Vanolo, A., 2015. The image of the creative city, eight years later: Turin, urban branding and the  
24  
25 economic crisis taboo. *Cities*, 46, 1-7.  
26  
27  
28 Vivoni, F., 2009. Spots of Spatial Desire: Skateparks, Skateplazas and Urban Politics. *Journal of*  
29  
30 *Sport & Social Issues*, 33(2), 130-149.  
31  
32  
33 Wacquant, L., 2004. *Body and soul*. Oxford: University Press.  
34  
35  
36 Wheaton, B., 2010. Introducing the Consumption and Representation of Lifestyle Sports. *Sport in*  
37  
38 *Society: Cultures, Commerce, Media, Politics*, 13(7-8), 1057-1081.  
39  
40  
41 Wheaton, B., 2013. *The Cultural Politics of Lifestyle Sports*. London: Routledge.  
42  
43  
44 Wheaton, B., 2015. Assessing the Sociology of Sport: On action sports and the politics of identity.  
45  
46 *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, 50(4-5), pp. 634-639.  
47  
48  
49 Youth Empowerment Partnership Program, 2015. *Vision & Mission*. Available from: <http://yepp->  
50  
51 [community.org](http://yepp-community.org) [Accessed 14 September 2016].  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60