

# From youth culture to street culture in the Netherlands

Paper prepared for the workshop  
Youth Culture, Identity and the Public Sphere  
December 3, 2011  
Tokyo, Japan

Henk Vinken<sup>1</sup>  
Tilburg, Netherlands

## Introduction

It has been a while since I first wrote about youth culture. In 1992 I published a brief, encyclopedic article called 'Jeugdcultuur' or 'Youth Culture' in the Dutch journal 'Tijdschrift voor Jeugdonderzoek', which simply translates into Journal of Youth Research. The 'Tijdschrift voor Jeugdonderzoek' is long gone now and also, I will argue in this paper, the notion of youth culture seems to have lost some of its significance. In our times, in the Netherlands, group-based belonging, group-based lifestyles, group-based identity formation, have also, at least since the year 2000, moved away from the academic agenda in the Netherlands. Youth culture, I will argue, is still around and might today well be recognized most clearly in what has become known as street culture, a topic that is high on the moral alarm list of politicians, youth workers, school educators, and other guardians of public space and the public sphere. This paper aims to provide some details on this development and to show how the concepts of youth culture and street culture developed in the Netherlands.

Before presenting the results of the review on the concepts I can make a few remarks on how the review was set up or, more precisely, how the search and analysis processes went. As stated I have been writing on the subjects almost 20 years ago and followed up on the topic with interest but without myself investing much in writing on the subjects directly. Indirectly, in the framework of my thesis on youth centrism (made in the years 1992-1997) and the following years of studies on generations, I did manage to keep up with the facts of who was writing what on the subject of youth culture in the Netherlands. In recent thinking on youth the idea emerged that street culture functions as a guiding notion among young people. The people and publications that colleagues in the field and youth communication workers mentioned inspired me to find out more on the subject, also from the perspective of those working with youths. After reading the basic foreign works and following Dutch studies on street culture, it became clear that this notion has gained more status for analyzing today's youth's values, attitudes and behaviors in the Netherlands than the notion of youth culture itself. Below I describe both notions in short. I will speculate on why street culture has taken up so much interest in the concluding parts of this paper.

## Youth culture, a cultural psychological subject in the Netherlands

Youth culture suffers from a high level of conceptual vagueness. In the work of the Dutch youth psychologist Ter Bogt it seems to refer first and most of all to youth's preferences for musical styles, and associated to that styles of hair dress, clothing fads, styles in facial accessories, fashions in all kinds of realms (Ter Bogt, 1997, Ter Bogt & Hibbel, 2000). The famous 1980s youth researcher Simon Frith thinks we should have a more broad view: "Youth cultures are a whole of common convictions,

---

<sup>1</sup> Henk Vinken is a sociologist (PhD 1997), director/owner of Pyrrhula, Social Research Network, Tilburg, Netherlands, and associate professor at Open University, Heerlen, Netherlands. Email: [hvinken@gmail.com](mailto:hvinken@gmail.com), URL: [www.henkinken.nl](http://www.henkinken.nl).

He thanks Otto van der Sanden and Maartje Mens, both working at Attacom (youth communication) in Tilburg, for their helpful suggestions. He is grateful to Isabelle Diepstraten (Fontys University, Tilburg, and Open University, Heerlen) for commenting on a draft version of this paper.

values, symbols, and activities that we can observe with a group of young people” (Frith, 1987: 21). In daily interpretations of youth culture it seems to evolve around forms of ‘leisure and pleasure’ that are typical for youths. Especially groups of youths are meant that display a large share of distinctive, hedonistic if not typically masculine attitudes and behaviors. Another famous 1980s-youth sociologist Mike Brake (1980, 1985) deliberately subtitles his groundbreaking work on youth culture and subcultures with ‘Sex, drugs and rock ‘n’ roll’. In his later comparative work (1985: 163) he cites Frith and he too recognizes that the focus is put too much on the concept of youth culture that is synonymous with assertive expressions of masculinity, even hooliganism, violence and delinquency. Also in the German-language area of youth studies we see this phenomenon. In 1987 the founding father of many youth sociological concepts Jürgen Zinnecker published a study on the kaleidoscope of typical behavioral styles of “Halbstarcken, Fussballfans, Rocker, Teenager und Exis... im Bereich von Freizeitkonsum” (Zinnecker, 1987: 13). Dutch analogies of these styles are abundant. Regularly in especially the 1980s we saw studies on ‘Nozems’ (similar to the Halbstarcken in Germany or to Rockers in the UK), ‘Artistiekelingen’ (artistic types, similar to the jazz-loving Mods in the UK), ‘Kakkers’ (perhaps best translated with Posh Youth), ‘Punkers’ (Punks), etc. The conclusion might go that in most scholarly traditions around the globe youth cultures are associated with certain styles of experiencing leisure time. In Dutch youth culture studies this is not that different. Four Dutch researchers stand out: Ruud Abma, Jacques Janssen, Maerten Prins, and Tom ter Bogt. Abma, working at Utrecht University in the Netherlands, wrote about youth culture of the 1960s and 1970s which in his terms served as a counter culture in Dutch society (Abma, 1990). Janssen and Prins, from Nijmegen University in the Netherlands, have studied youth cultures in the late 1980s, more precisely in 1989 (Janssen & Prins, 1991; see also Janssen, 1994). For his PhD-thesis, Prins replicated the 1989-study in 2001 (see Prins, 2006). Ter Bogt has written, as stated, most on music preferences and music styles among youths when he was at Utrecht University in the Netherlands. As part of the backup material of an educational TV-series on youth cultures he and his colleague Hibbel edited a bulky and very insightful book titled ‘Wilde Jaren’ (Wild Years) overlooking one century of youth culture (Ter Bogt and Hibbel, 2000). And then it became all quiet on the youth cultural front. The noise was not that loud to begin with, considering the low number of youth culture studies, but still, it is remarkable that since 2000 studies on youth culture no longer seem to appear. We have the 2000-overview ‘Wilde Jaren’-book reporting several qualitative studies on ‘contemporary’ youth cultures (such as rai, rasta, rap, and other music-based groups). The last larger scale quantitative study is the one from Prins (2006 with data from 1998/2001) meticulously replicating the 1989-study. Strikingly, Abma, Janssen, Prins, and Ter Bogt all share a similar background in cultural psychology as taught at Nijmegen University.<sup>2</sup> In this paper I will shortly present some findings of Prins who has analyzed youth culture across time and whose analyses are not only the most recent we have but also provides some arguments on why youth culture seem to have disappeared from the agenda.

#### Youth culture as an identity phenomenon

In his PhD study, cultural psychologist Prins (2006) argues that the psychological function of youth culture is changing for Dutch young people. He has replicated a 1989-study in the years 1998 and 2001 and finds that youths are less inclined to consider themselves members of a youth subculture. Prins fielded his study among youths who were selected on the basis of their appearance and thus the expectation that they would be a member of a youth culture. Among these youths Prins aims to find out whether or not “youth cultures still play a role in identification and differentiation in our increasingly individualized society” (Prins, 2006: 89). In doing so he also seeks to find the overlap

---

<sup>2</sup> The four authors are also all men. In the 1980s in the Netherlands female youth studies’ authors, such as Mieke de Waal (an anthropologist) or, e.g., Pauline Naber (a social pedagogue) build on the tradition of analyzing gender in youth cultures (e.g., as set by CCCS, Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies, in Birmingham, UK). In her studies on Dutch girls’ lifeworld, De Waal (1989) analyzes intimate relationships of girls in the school context. Naber has also mainly focused on friendship among young women (1990). For a recent Dutch example in this tradition see Linda Duits (2009).

(homology) between ethics (morals, values, principles) and aesthetics (styles, musical preferences, behavior) within each youth culture.

Youth culture in the eyes of Prins has a twofold identity managing function. It provides young people with a personal as well as a social identity. The personal one is the result of distinctiveness aimed at creating and maintaining a sense of distinction, in expressing individuality. It is also important in the expression of group membership or commitment to a social group aimed at bringing social recognition, a shared and collective representation of who we are. This need for inclusion into a larger social whole might be oppositional to the need for individuality. It is all about the balance between uniqueness and relatedness, of optimal distinctiveness, of being the same and being different at the same time, as Prins cites social psychologist Brewer. For youths this twofold identity forming process mainly takes place with peers through social categorization and by making use of stylistic artifacts. The classic youth studies terms of bricolage and homology are put in place at this stage. Bricolage is the DIY-version of identity-building and style-making as the process of symbolically redefining objects and their meaning. Clothes, speak, music, safety pins (the classic reference) are used in new ways to make one personal and group version of identity recognizable for insiders and outsiders alike. The result is not innocent or at random, but fitting in and matching an ideology or broader set of rules. This correspondence or homology refers to the match between ethics and aesthetics. It is exactly the function of youth culture of providing a stable personal and social identity that seems to be fading away, according to Prins (2006: 88), especially in a time in which the balance of inclusiveness and distinctiveness is in need of more frequent reflection and with a more stringer emphasis on distinctiveness.

These warnings are supported by the data Prins uses although they allow for only indirect suggestions on the balance between individual and social identity. In replicating the study of 1989, Prins seeks to find evidence for youth cultural style group categorizations. Young people are eager to categorize others in youth cultural terms more so in 2001 than in 1989. There is some hesitation against easily categorizing others, also more in 2001 than in 1989. The dominance of certain style groups have changed too: punk was in the top list in 1989, alternative is in 2001. The group 'normal' moved from a 20% to a 25% mention. The specific respondent (picked because of their apparent youth cultural group membership appearance) also categorize themselves easily and recognize they will be categorized by others. New in 2001 is the rising number of youths identifying with more than one youth culture, a phenomenon that Prins calls 'style surfing' with about 20% stating they belong to more than one group in 2001 and none in 1989. In his conclusions Prins takes the style surfing of this 20% as the ultimate proof of a state in which identity has become increasingly ambiguous and individualized. Says Prins (2006: 98): "Belonging to multiple cultures and tolerating within-group diversity, is a way of constructing a social identity with at the same time avoiding self stereotyping. It is a modern answer to a general trend of individualization and cultural fragmentation". This is quite something considering this refers to 20% of 205 young people in 2001 who have a strong youth cultural preference to begin with (was the selection criterion; idem in 1989 for the then 272 youths).

The correspondence between aesthetics and ethics is clear. Youth cultural groups such as disco, metal punk etc. in 1989 and in 2001 relate to a number of religious and political preferences, values, ideals and feelings. Prins presents numerous correspondence analytical graphs to back this up and find optimally distinctive groups both in styles and ethics. Political views have a clear relationship with alternative, new wave and punk on the more left-wing side in both 1989 and 2001. Self-evident is the relationship with musical preferences and there is also a relationship with the odds of acting out deviant behavior. What has changed is the structure of the plots. In 1989 Prins shows clearly defined youth cultures in both aesthetic and ethical terms. In 2001 the plot is less differentiated and more groups are overlapping in three clusters with 1) posh and normal, 2) gabber (a hardcore house music-related tracksuit and baldheaded youth style), 3) skate, metal, alternative, and punk. The group boundaries, Prins concludes, are apparently more permeable with style surfing as a consequence.

Prins' study shows that self-reported group membership might be less popular an option for youths who might increasingly be hesitant to categorize themselves in youth cultural groups. We have seen that group consciousness much like generation consciousness itself is related strongly to generation membership (Diepstraten et al., 1998; Ester et al., 2008). The so-called Lost Generation in the Netherlands (born between 1956 and 1970 and particularly young in the 1980s) are the least likely to think they are or were members of a group in their youth years. In 1996, about 50% of the members of this generation reply positively when asked if they belong to a generation (Diepstraten et al., 1998). Among the Protest or 1968-Generation (born 1941-1955) and among the younger, so-called Pragmatic Generation (born in 1970 or later) this is 75% and 65% respectively. In the first Prins-study, in 1989, the respondents are aged 14 to 27 (Prins, 2006: 89) and are likely to belong mostly to the Lost Generation (then aged 19 or older). When asked if they belong (or did belong) to a specific youth group in their youth years the Lost Generation is even more explicit. Only 9% confirms this against 24% and 20% for the Protest and Pragmatic Generations. In all cases the groups with which one identifies are style groups related to music, clothing, hair dress, etc. In our 2006-study (Ester et al., 2008), the generational demarcations have changed a little. We now use a Baby Boom Generation (1940-1960) and a Choice Generations (1960 and later) which can be broken up in two groups: the older cohorts (1960-1070) and the younger ones (1970 and later). The older cohorts can be more or less compared with the Lost Generation and the younger ones with the Pragmatic Generation. Generational consciousness is 51% in 1996 for the older Choice Generation cohorts. It is 53% in 2006. No change at all and still rather low. For the Baby Boom Generation it is 72% in 1996 and 77% in 2006: also weakly changed. For the youngest cohorts of the Choice Generation it is 65% and 54%: down to the levels of the older cohorts.

What can be learned from the generational perspectives is that youth culture adherence itself is not a linearly developing phenomenon, either going upward or going down in decline over time. Alternatively, specific generations relate to youth cultures in certain times. Perhaps especially in the 1980s cohorts of young people grew into adulthood who cultivated a certain degree of skepticism if not resistance towards youth cultures and generations. In other cohorts, especially the older ones, this skepticism and resistance is not that well established. Among today's younger cohorts we more recently detect a turn away from collective identifications towards the levels of 1980s young people. It might be an interesting case to further study the psychological but especially the (generation) sociological factors that affect youth cultures in today's era. Yet, after the study of Prins and his colleagues no real youth culture study have been conducted in the Netherlands. Another stream of youth studies came to the rise focusing on youths who seem to frighten the mainstreamer: youths in street cultures.

#### Street culture instead of youth culture

In the mid-2000s a former youth worker and since then a successful consultant and trainer-coach, Hans Kaldenbach, has written 'Respect', a book that can be read as a guide on how to deal with young people who are at the core of the so-called street culture. 'Respect' (Kaldenbach, 2011) first appeared in 2004 and by 2011 it was revised three times and saw 28 print issues! With some right, Kaldenbach can boast to have changed the focus of many people working with youth (from teachers to judges, from police enforcers to youth workers) and to have coined the term street culture for the Netherlands. After his work at least two other Dutch authors wrote more indepth publications: Ilias El Hadioui (2011), a social scientist from Erasmus University Rotterdam, and Frans van Strijen (2011), a highly profiled youth worker and director/owner of youth work organization 'Jeugd enzo' ('Youth etc.') also in Rotterdam, the Netherlands. El Hadioui, Van Strijen, and Kaldenbach all three wrote highly accessible books that aim to educate people who have to deal with youngsters living out today's street culture. The three have willingly or not written alarmist books that have had a large impact in Dutch thinking on youths. Two other authors who have tried to empirically research street culture are Anne Christine van Veen and Jan Dirk de Jong. Van Veen (2006) authored a bachelor project study into street culture in Utrecht, the Netherlands. Before displaying the key elements of

the arguments of all four authors, a short look at the historiography of the concept of street culture is called for. Jan Dirk de Jong (2008) wrote a dissertation on Moroccan youths in Amsterdam-West, not per se focusing on street culture but in the end coming up with key street culture values.

Street culture is a concept directly copied from the United States of America. The American ethnographer and Yale University urban sociologist Elijah Anderson used the term in his analysis of poor, inner-city, black communities (Anderson, 1990, 1994, 1999). Structural degradation caused by the loss of jobs, flight of the middle class, hampering law enforcement, experience with racial discrimination, and a flourishing informal economy created both alienation and a strong oppositional culture, a street culture, that in turn contribute to violent behavior. Anderson argues that the most powerful force to counteract these negative influences in the community is a strong, loving, 'decent' family committed to middle-class, mainstream values. The difference between 'street' and 'decent' families as the two main orientations in a community (and as labels residents themselves use) is often cited from the work of Anderson. Knowledge of the street code by both types of families is important. "... on the street the distinction between street and decent is often irrelevant: everybody knows that if rules are violated, there are penalties. Knowledge of the code is thus largely defensive: it is literally necessary for operating in public" (Anderson, 1994: [online page 1]). This code refers to a set of rules governing interpersonal public behavior, particularly violence and aggression, aimed at distributing respect and ensuring order. Respect, as will be shown, is a key concept, also in the Dutch street culture studies. "At the heart of the code is the issue of respect – loosely defined as being treated 'right' or granted the deference, or 'props', one deserves" (Anderson, 1994: [online page 2]). Says Anderson (ibid): "In the street culture, especially among young people, respect is viewed as almost an external entity that is hard-won but easily lost, and so must constantly be guarded... The person whose very appearance... deters transgressions feels that he possesses, and may be considered by others to possess, a measure of respect. With the right amount of respect... he can avoid 'being bothered' in public. If he is bothered, not only may he be in physical danger but he has been disgraced or 'dissed' (disrespected)". Here we see that the code has to do with presentation of the self in public. One must be able to send and understand subtle messages (facial or verbal expressions) to or of the next person in public that one is capable of violence or willing to take care of themselves in public. The street code emerges, Anderson adds, where "the influence of the police and the justice system ends and personal responsibility for one's safety is felt to begin" (ibid). A study by Stewart et al. (2006; see also NIJ, 2009) supports the 'code of the street'-theory. Neighborhood characteristics such as a climate of violence and economic disadvantages increase violent behavior and living in a 'decent' family (families supporting mainstream values such as hard work, self-reliance, child monitoring, etc.) does lower this risk. Yet, living in street family does not raise the risk suggesting that families encourage children to represent street values only on the surface (as a protective mechanism). Still, expressing a street code attitude (as opposed to simply being a part of a street code family) is a developmental predictor of violent behavior in later life. There was no support for the idea that adopting the street code reduces victimization. On the contrary, individuals who adopt the street code have higher levels of victimization (even beyond what would be the case from living in a dangerous neighborhood).

Hans Kaldenbach is, as stated, the first author in the Netherlands to use the street culture concept in his youth practice oriented booklet 'Respect!' (2011, originally 2004). Kaldenbach is interested in showing the clashes between street culture and mainstream culture ('burgerlijke cultuur') and while doing so in presenting professionals who need to work with street culture youths ways of dealing with them. Kaldenbach, like his colleague Van Strijen (2011), is not so much interested in providing empirical data proving the very prevalence and/or development of street culture as a phenomenon among today's young people. He simply takes the prevalence and growing importance of street culture among youths for granted and if he is at all in need of providing arguments he refers to his own individual years of experience as the ultimate proof on which we all should rely. This does not prevent Kaldenbach from making bold statements on how street culture and mainstream youths (and adults) are. In sum, youths who are emerged in street culture do not

trust authority figures, do think these figures are working in their best interest, moreover think they are bullied by the police, politicians, judges, teachers, and sometimes even their own parents. Street culture is a mix of anti-authority, anti-mainstream, anti-bourgeois attitudes and behavior. Kaldenbach (2011: 15) hurries to argue that street culture is not related to social class or to ethnicity. He states, however, that youths from lower social layers and from ethnic minority groups are overrepresented in the street culture.

The need for respect is a key predisposition as Kaldenbach analyzes street culture. Street culture youths know they are not treated with the same self-evident respect of mainstream people with their broadly accepted lifestyles, tastes, jobs, and positions. Deep down they feel disrespected ('dissed' or disrespected; in Dutch 'gedist'), angry even, and this is shown on the streets where they claim the respect they think they deserve in their own confronting ways. In the streets the reputation of having gained respect and not having been treated with disrespect is a key issue. Masculine elements, including physical power, fighting, acting tough (being 'cool'), acting immediately with strong force ('short fuse'-behavior), are valued higher than mainstream treats such as consultation, discussing conflicts, showing empathy.<sup>3</sup> Again, the use of the word 'respect' is remarkable among street culture youths. Kaldenbach (2011: 32) distinguishes between three different meanings of respect: the meaning of obedience, of equality, and of intimidation. In the first (according to Kaldenbach small) group it is regarded normal to obey adults and showing them respect literally means giving way to them. In the (largest) group supporting equality as a concept of respect, young people do not acknowledge the upper-hand of adults just because of their age or position. They want to be treated equally, if not, than they will display street culture behavior (without them per se being members of this culture). Then there is another small group of intimidating youths who think they are the boss in the street and for whom respect is taking space, demanding others to give way to them. They want others (including adults) to comply to their demands, to show submissiveness, and every remark or feedback is an attack on their honor.

Street culture youths also develop a lifestyle that raises eyebrows if not outright disgust among mainstreamers: in clothing, loudness of speech, use of language, in their musical expressions. They are masters of provocation, knowing how far they can go in teasing mainstreamers, in playing with and scaring ordinary citizens. They do act in groups, also provide mutual support and will not easily act against members of their group. Kaldenbach refers to the 2007-PhD-dissertation of Jan Dirk de Jong (2008, revised public print) in summarizing the main street culture values (actually measured among delinquent Moroccan youth groups in Amsterdam-West): defensibility, loyalty, invulnerability, courage, vigilance, displaying success and being perky. In short, a street culture youth must be able to defend himself, not care about anything or others, must not avoid the use of violence and defend fellow street culture youths, must show he is able to withstand pain and be cool, have guts and go into risky confrontations, always on the lookout to not become a victim, yet always relaxed, witty and sharp.

In pointing to the background of street culture, Kaldenbach argues (without any reference to research) that street culture youths are living a life of chaos after having experienced an upbringing in which rules are not internalized, in which they have not learned to obey (instead feel treated with disrespect easily), in which they cannot control their impulses and are not able to make wise decisions as concerns their own life. The reasons for this chaos is multifold and Kaldenbach mentions elements ranging from undergoing hormonal changes and having had emotional neglect, being raised in poverty or in a single-parent family, to being part of a disrespected minority group and a mistrusted religion, etc. It is very tough to deal with street culture youths, says Kaldenbach who gives numerous examples of how attempts to approach these youths and work with them are unsuccessful. Street culture youths are hard to correct, do not give in, are easily feeling

---

<sup>3</sup> It is interesting that Kaldenbach considers these feminine elements as mainstream treats. Whether or not these treats are mainstream of course depends on the society under consideration. The Netherlands does have a strong feminine culture but the USA, e.g., is a society with a strongly masculine culture (Hofstede, 2001). Street culture in that society is more blended in in mainstream culture, one would argue.

discriminated turning violent, threaten adults and are overly brisk in their responses using forceful (body) language. Two-thirds of Kaldenbach's book is turning to the issue of dealing with these youths. To mention just a few remarkable approaches, Kaldenbach argues to use either a karate- or a judo-approach. In mainstream culture there are just two options if one wants to correct others: kindly or urgently requesting to change one's behavior. In the street culture one needs a broader repertoire (Kaldenbach, 2011: 77). On top of the urgent requests one can forcefully set limits and offer no way out (the karate approach), instead of kindly requesting something one can offer a way out, saving honour and be apparently amicably (the judo approach). The latter case uses the street culture logic of giving trust, acting relaxed, and avoiding the loss of face, the former one is more confrontational and uses the masculine elements of street culture.

The book of Van Strijen comes closest to the one of Kaldenbach. It also aims at helping professionals and residents to make sense of street culture youths and to successfully work with them as a policeperson, a teacher, a youth worker, a co-resident, etc. His aim is provide insights in how street culture affects the average youths, the youths who do not make the headlines with remarkable and/or scary behaviors, but who are affected by street culture, youths also who have low self-esteem and a negative self-image and for whom working on these issues can entail a constructive change of behavior. Street culture, Strijen (2011: 17) argues, is the main overarching canopy of a range of youth cultures in Netherlands. Key is the refusal to conform with the general lines of society: resisting and mistrusting the 'burgercultuur', the mainstream culture, especially representatives of authority within this culture.<sup>4</sup> They have the feeling that society is against them and thus, in turn, they reject and do no longer care about society. They feel as if nothing matters, they have nothing to lose with the result that repression does not bring much on the long run. Strijen argues that the blunt, negative and aggressive provocations are nothing less than calls to be helped, to belong and to be taken seriously. The difference with criminal or deviant youths is that here we are dealing with youths representing a separate culture, not even a subculture within Dutch society, but a culture other than the Dutch culture for which we need to bridge a cultural gap in order to understand it. Strijen distinguishes youths who support a cosmetic street culture in adopting visual elements of the street culture only and who change direction in their behavior as soon as their street culture behavior becomes an obstacle for further social advancement (and who thus become part of the 'burgercultuur'). The other group contains youths with an intrinsic street culture for whom street culture is almost like a religion and who will not change their behavior regardless of the consequences. Strijen uses a psychological explanation for the intrinsic adherence to street culture: for them street culture is an alternative for a personality void. For the cosmetic street culture adepts it is a way to resist parents and others in the puberty phase of life. Like Kaldenbach, Strijen has difficulty in maintaining the idea that street culture is embraced by youths of all social layers and ethnicities. He also admits that the largest group of supporters derives from lower classes, difficult neighborhoods, and ethnic groups. It is has a recruiting power beyond these (social, ethnic and even age) groups is what the authors probably want to argue. The popular versions of gang culture (and of Arabic, Caribbean, African culture) that provide youths with an apparently much desired we-feeling, the commercialized and omni-present rap music that goes with it (and that is now adopted by cute boys such as Justin Timberlake and Justin Bieber), the street language that is presented as a mix of many ethnic languages and that is now used as an amusement in advertisements and even in public appearances of among politicians who like to be regarded streetwise, all of these phenomena indicate that street culture is popularized (if not commodified) for broad groups of youths. It is the proof for Strijen (2011; 33) that street culture is now the mainstream culture among youths.

Illias El Hadioui (2011) is less absolute and he argues that what he calls secondary street culture is the version that is popularized, commercialized, and normalized and in the end cultivated in a so-called urban lifestyle. This street culture appeals to suburban kids for whom street culture is a

---

<sup>4</sup> Like other authors Strijen uses the term 'burgercultuur' which opposes street culture. It is a hard to translate term that both refers to mainstream and petty-bourgeois culture and also to the culture of the average citizen.

game, a fashion, a temporary fad. Secondary street culture youths can easily switch between alternative lifestyles. Youths who have been raised and socialized in the streets and for whom street culture is primary are behind all intentions, goals and behaviors of the culture. El Hadioui does argue that street culture in whatever shape, primary or secondary (also called latent or manifest), is culturally inclusive (culture and race do not matter), but socially exclusive (the one who is unfamiliar with the street codes is excluded) and this latter exclusive phenomenon is related to the masculinity of the street culture. El Hadioui (2011) presents a thoughtful study on the confrontation between a feminine school culture, a masculine street culture and a 'volkse' home culture. 'Volks' in Dutch can translate into both 'traditional/pre-modern' as 'lower class'. The three cultures El Hadioui discerns all send out contradictory socialization messages, codes, ambitions, goals and languages and this complicated pedagogical and sociological situation underpins all kinds of deviant behavior of youths in the school domain leading to problematic interactions between teachers and youths with a street culture repertoire (2011: 7). Macho-masculine socialization in the street culture with harsh street language, rebellious attitudes, extreme materialism, celebration of violence and offensiveness, the stress on display and looking at women solely as an object of desire, contradicts the feminine school culture socialization in which self-control on studying, self-management, self-expression and self-reflection are central key words. Yet, the street culture and the school culture can also contradict with traditional home culture. In this culture the separation of the sexes in public life can be stressed (opposing collaboration of boys and girls in school) and aggression, use of stimulants, promiscuity of the street contradicts standards and rules of the home. El Hadioui sketches the problematic career of youths socialized in working class or low opportunity families and who have gained their pedagogical, cultural, and linguistic lessons on the streets: they are playing an unfamiliar game at school where they are evaluated on exactly the capacities, codes and languages they have not learned automatically. It is not unlikely that these youths seek refuge in the streets to get their share of recognition, appreciation, security and identity.

Christine van Veen (2006) in her bachelor research report seeks to find who the young people are who identify with street culture (among 75 young people in 4 low education secondary schools in the city of Utrecht) and what factors contribute to this identification process. Van Veen's study stands out in dwelling somewhat more on the exact meaning of the street in street culture. For her the street is the ultimate public place to construct identity and locate self-management. The street is the place with little social, adult and parental control, with little to no financial costs, where things happen and where one is seen and can see others. In some neighborhoods the street and street culture are highly valued, more than the home and mainstream culture. The street is the place where people with little perspective in broader society can focus on the here-and-now, the immediate social setting, and can find perspective, respect, and a feeling of authority. Interestingly, the street becomes semi-public because of the street culture: a stranger unknown with the code of the street will feel uninvited and will regard the street no longer as public but as belonging to specific others only. It is a pity that Van Veen does not focus on the qualitative follow-up on her search for what it means to be in the streets and on the relationships between concepts such as the street, authority, and respect in street culture and, instead, continues with a quantitative model for explaining identification with street culture with standard variables SES, ethnicity, sex, neighborhood, etc.

Almost half of the youths interviewed partly supports street culture, and less than 10% strongly identifies with it. Street culture in this case is 1) support for the idea (5 item scale) that the street is an important place of social interaction, 2) that respect (also 5 item scale) is something worth fighting for, and 3) that the authority of the police, teachers, etc. (another 5 item scale) should be rejected. It is found that street culture and alienation (negative expectation on the future) are such intertwined concepts that they can be merged. Clearly the feeling of being alienated from society seems inherent to identification with street culture. The family factor is most important for the identification with street culture: being from a decent family (i.e., exercising more supervision) reduces the identification odds. Much less effect has discrimination: the reported experience of



having been discriminated has a positive effect on street culture identification. Indirectly ethnicity (via family and discrimination) and sex (via family) play a role too: young people with only a Dutch ethnic identification have less chance of having a supervising family (so more street culture identification) and of having been discriminated (leading to less identification), and girls have more chance of coming from a supervising family (so less street culture identification). The lower levels of parental supervising for Dutch youths might relate to group composition: Van Veen's study covers youths in lower educated gremia of schooling who might well be experiencing a typical (low) level of parental supervision.

### Conclusions

In the close of this paper a few conclusions can be drawn. I will present them in a staccato fashion in order to gain a sharp view on what the change from the notion of youth culture to the notion of street culture has brought us.

A first conclusion might go that in the Netherlands social scientific topics closely follow social discourse. Put differently: if it is a social problem, it will be on the topical list of science. After increasing worry and concern and after rising moral panics on what is happening in the streets of the Netherlands, street culture has become increasingly 'en vogue' in the social science study of youths. Although not all Dutch authors on the topic do recognize (some even deny) an ethnic dimension in the notion of street culture, the basic element also found in the original notion is that ethnic groups have a key interest in roaming and claiming the street as a territory of identity. In the Netherlands, worries about these groups, about multicultural society in general and about how the streets are changing face more specifically have surfaced fast since the early 2000s and dominate public discourse. The other side of the coin is that topics that are not a focal concern in public discourse, such as youth culture as a matter of commodified styles, rapidly lose their market share.

There is, secondly, a similarity in the youth cultural and street cultural notions in the fact that they both allow for style surfing, as Prins has called in his analysis of youth cultures. There is always a group of youths who pick and chose from the styles and make their own whole from it, a whole that provides an identity for just a period of time, after which the style (of clothing, talking, liking, etc.) is swapped for another, perhaps from a biographical point of view a less dangerous one. E.g., one might well be in difficulty if one tries to find a decent job while being fully emerged in street culture; so, some will turn away from street culture and comply with mainstream culture for that moment and in that context. This contrasts primary street culture, or primary youth culture one could argue, which refers to deep and early involvement in these cultures and which provides a profound and hard to interchange type of identity. For now, it is unclear how many youths in the Netherlands really have this deep type of involvement in street culture and how many have a more shallow relationship with it and with its commodified, commercial and less dangerous elements.

Third, we can conclude that of the youth and street culture, usually the confrontational and threatening forms developed and supported by male and lower class youth groups are the ones that are most fiercely studied. The less outgoing and more inward-directed types, including the forms developed and supported by girls, are less, if at all studied. This relates to the above speculation of the high social responsiveness of social sciences in the Netherlands. What is regarded a real problem in the streets, the (ethnic) boys acting out their scary lifestyles in the streets, is what is taking up by social scientists and others who seek to understand today's youths.

Finally and perhaps of interest in the context of this workshop set in Japan, we must ask ourselves questions on the international dimensions of youth and street cultures. The notion of street culture is profoundly American, e.g. in its stress on masculinity, confrontation, and tough display by highly distinctive ethnic groups. Where are the Dutch elements in the Dutch street culture if at all? Has the street culture notion globalized beyond the Western world? Is there a Japanese version thinkable on the primary level (on the secondary there probably are given many fashions from street culture that are likely to land among Japanese youths)? Japan is a nation with much less ethnic diversity: is a street culture on the primary level likely to emerge in a nation like that? These

and more questions must be formulated and answered in a few comparative studies which will contribute to defining what contemporary youth culture and street culture entail and what these cultures contribute to the identities of youths and to their place in the public sphere.

### References

- Abma, R. (1990). *Jeugd en tegencultuur. Een theoretische verkenning* [Youth and counter culture. A theoretical exploration]. Nijmegen: SUN.
- Anderson, (1990). *Streetwise*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Anderson, E. (1994). The code of the streets. *The Atlantic Monthly*, 273, 5, 80-94. (Online at <http://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/1994/05/the-code-of-the-streets/6601>).
- Anderson, E. (1999). *Code of the street. Decency, violence, and the moral life of the inner city*. New York: W.W. Norton and Company.
- Bogt, T. ter (1997). *One Two Three Four... Popmuziek, jeugdcultuur en stijl* [One Two Three Four... Popmusic, youth culture, and style]. Utrecht: Lemma.
- Bogt, T. ter, B. Hibbel (Eds.) (2000). *Wilde jaren. Een eeuw jeugdcultuur* [Wild years. A century of youth culture]. Utrecht: Lemma.
- Brake, M. (1980). *The sociology of youth culture and youth subcultures: Sex, drugs and rock 'n' roll*. London: Routledge + Kegan Paul.
- Brake, M. (1985). *Comparative youth culture. The sociology of youth culture and youth subcultures in America, Britain and Canada*. London: Routledge + Kegan Paul.
- Diepstraten, I., P. Ester & H. Vinken (1998). *Mijn generatie. Zelfbeelden, jeugdervaringen en lotgevallen van generaties in de twintigste eeuw* [My generation. Self-images, youth experiences, and vicissitudes of generations in the twentieth century]. Tilburg: Syntax Publishers.
- Duits, L. (2009). Between skipping rope and Eid ul-Fitr. Everyday youth culture in 8<sup>th</sup> form. *Quotidian, Dutch Journal for the Study of Everyday Life*, 1, 34-49.
- Ester, P., I. Diepstraten & H. Vinken (2008). *Mijn generatie, tien jaar later. Generatiebesef, jeugdervaringen en levenslopen in Nederland* [My generation, ten years later. Generational consciousness, youth experiences, and life courses in the Netherlands]. Amsterdam: Rozenberg.
- Frith, S. (1987). *Jeugdsociologie* [Youth sociology]. Groningen: Wolters-Noordhoff.
- Hadioui, I. El (2011). *Hoe de straat de school binnendringt. Denken vanuit de pedagogische driehoek van de thuiscultuur, de schoolcultuur en de straatcultuur*. [How the street penetrates the school. Thinking from the pedagogical triangle of the home culture, the school culture, and the street culture]. Amsterdam: Van Gennep.
- Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's consequences. Comparing values, behaviors, institutions, and organizations across nations*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Janssen, J. (1994). *Jeugdcultuur. Een actueel geschiedenis* [Youth culture. A contemporary history]. Utrecht: De Tijdstroom.
- Janssen, J. & M. Prins (1991). Jeugdsubculturen binnenstebuiten. Een onderzoek naar de homologie van jeugdsubculturen [Youth subcultures inside out. A study on the homology of youth subcultures]. *Jeugd en samenleving*, 21, 2/3, 194-213.
- Jong, J.D. de (2007). *Kapot moeilijk* [Broken tough]. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.
- Kaldenbach, H. (2011). *Respect! 99 tips voor het omgaan met jongerne in de straatcultuur* [Respect! 99 tips on how to interact with youths in the street culture]. Amsterdam: Prometheus.
- Naber, P.M. (1990). *Vriendschap onder jonge vrouwen*. Amsterfoort/Leuven: Acco.

- NIJ (2009). *The code of the street and African-American adolescent violence* (Research in Brief Feb 09). Washington: US Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice. (Online at [www.ojp.usdoj.gov/nij](http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/nij)).
- Prins, M. (2006). *The fragmentization of youth*. Nijmegen: Radboud Universiteit Nijmegen. (PhD online at <http://repository.ubn.ru.nl/bitstream/2066/55049/1/55049.pdf>).
- Stewart, E.A., C.J. Schreck & R.L. Simons (2006). "I ain't gonna let no one disrespect me". Does the code of the street reduce or increase violent victimization among African American adolescents? *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 43, 4, 427-458.
- Strijen, F. van (edited by S. Postema) (2011). *Van de straat. De straatcultuur van jongeren ontrafeld* [From the street. The street culture of youths disentangled]. Amsterdam: Uitgeverij SWP.
- Veen, C. van (2006). *Gedist!?* Een onderzoek naar jongeren en straatcultuur in Utrecht: Eindrapportage. [Dist!?: A study on youths and street culture in Utrecht: Final report]. Utrecht: <http://www.uu.nl/university/bachelors/NL/asw/studieprogramma/afstudeer-onderzoek/eindrapportages/Documents/BP-ACvanVeen.pdf>.
- Vinken, H. (1992). Klein jeugdwoordenboek. Jeugdcultuur [Short youth dictionary. Youth culture]. *Tijdschrift voor Jeugdonderzoek*, 5, 2, 20-25.
- Waal, M. de (1989). *Meisjes. Een wereld apart. Een etnografie van meisjes op de middelbare school*. Meppel: Boom.
- Zinnecker, J. (1987). *Jugendkultur 1940-1985* [Youth culture 1940-1985]. Opladen: Leske + Budrich.