

YOUNG PEOPLE AND STUDENTS¹

FRANÇOIS DUBET

Université de Bordeaux II

In a survey carried out in Marseilles, R. Establet observed that, although 64% of students interviewed defined themselves above all as students, 84% considered themselves first of all to be young people.² Evidently the two identities are not exclusive, given that one can be both young and a student, they should not be confused. To say that students must be considered as young people is not absolutely true, while it also means that their way of life is not, in any sense, solely governed by their studies, but also by the much more extensive problems of youth as a stage of life and as the touchstone of their entry into adulthood. Neither must we forget that some students, to a greater or lesser extent, distance themselves from their families in some cases acquiring a certain economic autonomy, while others begin to live with a partner and, in the end, “grow up” during the period of their studies. The different stages of this process play a major role in the student way of life, though this varies according to a series of factors that are not solely related to the type of studies undertaken, but are also influenced by student accommodation, the location of the study centre, the resources that they dispose of, etc. Thus, students are also young people, but in a different sense: they participate fully in a young way of life, replete with their own chosen relationships and the kind of mass entertainment that is not always specific to, or sufficiently characteristic of, an exclusively student environment.

BETWEEN AUTONOMY AND DEPENDENCE

Alone or with the family

At Rennes, 41% of first level students live with their families.³ This is the case for 44% of the men and 38% of the women, 43% of whom are between 18 and

1. This text has been taken from F. DUBET, X. MERRIEN, A. SAUVAGE, A. VINCE, *Université et ville*, Paris, l'Harmattan, 1994.

2. R. ESTABLET *et al.*, *L'université et la ville : la faculté des Sciences de St Jérôme dans les quartiers Nord de Marseille*, Aix en Provence, Université de Provence, Département de Sociologie, 1993.

3. J. PIHAN *et al.*, *Aires de recrutement des universités et modes de vie des étudiants. Le cas des universités bretonnes*, Rennes 2, AURAU, 1993. The national rate of students living with their families is 36%. For the more urban upper classes, or those that live closer to the universities, this reaches 43%. A. Dufour, J.L. Volatier, *Le budget des étudiants d'universités et d'UT en 1992*, CREDOC, October 1992.

19 years old, and 38% of whom are between 20 and 21 years old. Social background does not appear to have a significant influence on this situation and, in both Rennes and the university's annexes, above all it is the distance between the family residence and the university that determines the type of accommodation chosen. When this distance is less than 15 kilometres, 90% of students live at their parents' home. This is reduced to 45% with distances of between 20 and 30 kilometres and falls to only 3% when the distance is greater than 50 kilometres. The option of studying in a faculty or the central university depends, above all, on proximity to the parents' house. In 70% of the cases this is the main determining factor.⁴ It appears that the mass growth of the universities has accentuated this phenomenon of living with the family, given that 39% of the students at Le Havre, for example, live with their families.⁵ The incidence of students living with their family varies significantly according to the location of the centre. O. Galland observes that although 35% of students live with their families, this percentage increases to 72% in the case of students at Nantes, while it is as low as 21% for the universities of Rennes and Besançon. If we add to these figures data relating to students who live in accommodation paid for by their parents, the percentage increases to 84% for Nantes, 58% for Rennes and 53% for Besançon.⁶ From the age of 24 onwards half of students occupy lodgings paid for by their parents. According to J.P. Molinari, one third of the students at Nantes live with their parents. At Le Mans, where local enrolment is more important, this figure is 47%.⁷ Generally speaking, it would appear that living with their own families is more dependent on geographic circumstances than on any educational choice, insofar as it is far more common at small universities, which depend on a regional enrolment area.

This preponderance of students who live with their family is not merely the result of financial pressures, 65% of the students that do so state that they are in no hurry to leave home.⁸ The issue of family democracy is not, therefore, an invention, insofar as young students, do not wish to leave home on a large scale, even in those cases where they enjoy a considerable level of financial resources. Undoubtedly the image of the independent student escaping the family is no longer the norm. The proximity of the study centre to the family residence is shown to be the first factor in the university option chosen by 44.5% of students, well

4. J. PIHAN, *op. cit.*

5. AURH (Agence d'Urbanisme de la Région du Havre), *Le Havre: une ville accueillante pour les étudiants : modes de vie des étudiants et relations à l'espace universitaire et urbain*. Le Havre, October 1993.

6. O. GALLAND *et al.*, *Les modes de vie étudiants*, Paris, FNSP, OSC, 1994.

7. J. P. MOLINARI, *Modes de vie d'étudiants de l'université de Nantes*, Nantes, LERSCO, 1993; J. CHEVALIER *et al.*, *Le Mans: nouvelles dynamiques et revitalisation d'un campus*, Université du Maine, Groupe de Recherche en Géographie Sociale. 1993.

8. J. PIHAN, *op. cit.*

above the specific course, or the prestige of the university itself. It is evident that this factor has much less influence on Parisian students, who dispose of a much wider range of opportunities, yet who increasingly remain at home. In this sense, as observed by O. Galland and his team, things have not changed much since the time of the "Héritiers"⁹. Most surveys show that this sectorisation is not perceived as an obstacle, to the extent that even cases of "descobabitation" tend to arise from a "logic of territorial continuity".

Despite the difficulties that sharing family secrets may involve, it appears that the students are satisfied with their family relationships, they also enjoy numerous advantages, above all in the case of middle class families in which a certain "family democracy" is practised.¹⁰ O. Galland observed that 85% of students are of the opinion that their relationships with their respective families are good, and that this provides them with both a certain autonomy and a sense of security. Likewise, they also feel a sense of gratitude for the sacrifices being made. These relationships appear to be rather less satisfactory among the working classes, where the family model may be more authoritarian, and in which the family's sacrifice may result in feelings that range from gratitude to guilt. It is true that in 40% of cases students share the "ideas" of their parents, although this percentage is lower among students from classes that are more distanced from the "middle classes"; in these cases the students undergo a process of adopting a higher cultural level which gradually distances them from their families. In this sense, J.P. Molinari speaks of a true cultural tension, above all in rural areas, where parents do not understand their children's way of life or work "always with their heads stuck in a book!"

In time students leave home, this is a progressive process that often lacks any actual break-away point. The percentage of students who live with their family decreases between the first and the fourth year of the course. In Le Havre, for example, it reduced from 45% to 23%.¹¹ Nevertheless, D. Pinson notes that this separation is experienced more as a loss than as the gaining of independence and freedom.¹² Even when the student lives alone, either as part of a couple or with friends, weekly visits to the family continue to be frequent, the weekends are extended and family support persists, although there is no longer so much control.

9. The Héritiers were students from the cultured upper classes who, according to Pierre Bourdieu, inherited the cultural capacities proper to their class. Their historic period continued up to the 60's, with the Héritiers forming the majority at the university (editor's note).

10. J. KELLERHALS, "Les types d'interaction dans la famille", *L'Année sociologique*, vol. 37, 1987. (4). J. Pihan, *op. cit.*

11. AURH, *op. cit.*

12. D. PINSON, *et al.*, *Configurations et usages du logement étudiant à Nantes*, Nantes, Ecole d'Architecture, LAVA, 1994.

*Between occasional work and part time employment.*¹³

50% of students believe that, to cover their needs, they need a monthly income of between 3,000 and 5,000 francs, although 27% would make do with less than 3,000 francs. The stated "needs" increase from one level to the next, given that 59% of second level students would like to receive between 3,000 and 5,000 francs, as against 45.5% of those in the first year. The more modest the students' social origins, the higher the percentage that believe they can satisfy their desires with less than 3,000 francs, 40.5% in the case of working class children, as against 19% for the children of executives.¹⁴ It is evident that financial autonomy is the factor that determines entry into adulthood. However a wide range of situations exists between complete financial dependence and independence, and a wide range of levels of contribution on the part of the students themselves to their own maintenance. It appears that between occasional work and part time employment almost all students work, in one way or another¹⁵. In Tours, 85% of students work in the summer and 15% do so occasionally during the year¹⁶. A study carried out in Montpellier indicates that 60% of students work in the summer, that 16% work occasionally during the year and that 34% have a part time job throughout the year.¹⁷ In terms of summer work, 77% work for over thirty hours a week. During term time, 55% of jobs involve over 15 hours a week, and 14% over thirty hours a week. In Lyon, N. Commerçon detects a rate of activity of 68%, with an increase of almost 10 points between the first and second levels.¹⁸ The share of earnings generated by occasional work and more regular employment increases with the student's age and

13. Independently of the technical difficulties involved in precisely evaluating earnings and financial resources, we can consider the results of a study carried out in Tours as being quite representative of the student condition: 56% of students interviewed dispose of between 1,000 and 2,800 francs per month; while 71% have a higher level of parental assistance. (Y. CHEVALIER *et al.*, *Les étudiants et la ville*, Université François Rabelais, Tours, 1993). Likewise we can also take into account the following figures from Montpellier: apart from rent and transport, one in two students spend less than 1,000 francs per month, and one in six spends over 2,000 francs. Students spend less the younger they are, when they live with their parents and when they go home at weekends, which does not mean that they necessarily cost less. (J. P. VOLLE (ed.), *Observatoire de la vie étudiante. 1. Les étudiants*, Montpellier, GREGAU, 1993). In fact, it would seem that students have a relatively homogeneous lifestyle, with far fewer inequalities than in the social hierarchy in general. On the other hand, what continues to be very unequal is the cost of studies for the families and the income structure.

14. F. DUBET, *Les étudiants, le campus et leurs études* (avec B. DELAGE *et al.*), Lapsac, Plan Urbain, 1993.

15. Legal or unofficial work is not specific to university students, given that at the present time this is also a factor for school children, in particular among the working class. R. Ballion estimates that 13.5% of those at school work during the school year, and 40.4% during the holidays. *Le Monde*, 17/3/1994.

16. Y. CHEVALIER *et al.*, *Nouvelles dynamiques et revitalisation d'un campus*. Le Mans, Université du Maine, Groupe de recherche en Géographie Sociale, 1991, 1992, 1993.

17. J. P. VOLLE *et al.*, *Observatoire la vie étudiante*, Montpellier, 1993.

18. N. COMMERÇON *et al.*, *Eude d'impact d'un nouveau site universitaire en centre-ville : la Manufacture des tabac à Lyon*, Maison Rhône-Alpes des Sciences de l'Homme, 1994.

the time that he has been studying: the percentage of fixed employment in the first year is 20%, increasing to 53% by the third year.¹⁹ In total, in Nice, 7% of students work more than 15 hours a week.²⁰ In a study of students at Rennes, Nantes and Besançon, O. Galland and his team observed that only 14% of students declared that they had not worked at any time in the year: 25% had fixed employment, 14% had more or less part time work and 12% worked, at least, half the day.²¹ A wide range of work situations exists, from those who work on an irregular basis to obtain extra money for their expenses, to students who are true wage earners, including those for whom work provides a regular income to complement family support or grants. This same survey indicates that almost two out of three students state that they work out of necessity, while a third only do so to obtain money to cover extras. Only one student in ten works in order to improve his training. The range of occasional jobs is extremely varied: baby sitting, working at fast-food outlets, cleaning companies, cheer leading in leisure establishments, etc. In terms of work, it is possible to outline certain characteristic profiles, although the great complexity of existing situations must also be taken into account.²²

A distinction can be made in the case of the student supported by his family, either living at home or where the family pays his rent, ensuring that his minimum subsistence and daily living expenses are covered, with or without the help of a grant. In this case the different “holiday jobs” in the summer represent a supplement to cover his expenses, but are not seen as a contribution to his education as such. This model is valid for the youngest group and is independent of social origins, although it is particularly applicable to students with accommodation in the university cities.

The second student model is characterised by the search for supplementary earnings that are indispensable for a specific lifestyle and for certain leisure activities. This is the case where the family and/or the grants only cover the cost of lodgings or food, or both. The “supplementary” part, to cover leisure, clothing and books, etc. depends on having a job, which in this case cannot be occasional. In a subjective way, the students described in this case are under the impression that this increases their autonomy, and they often claim that they help their parents to pay for their studies. In the opinion of some of the students interviewed in Bordeaux, the decision to live as a couple is often associated with passing from one category to another, in the same way as when the change is made from student accommodation on campus to an apartment in the city.

19. J. P. VOLLE, *op. cit.*

20. A. CHENU, V. ERLICH *et al.*, *Enquête sur la vie étudiante dans les Alpes-Maritimes*, Université de Nice, SOLIIS, 1993.

21. O. GALLAND *et al.*, *Le mode de vie des étudiants*, Paris, FNSP, OSC, 1994.

22. Here I have taken my figures from an extremely wide ranging classification by Galland, *ibid.*, without entering into all of the details

And finally we have the independent students, committed to a job that is more or less regular and more or less legal. This category covers a wide range of situations, including: night watchman, paid substitutes, and foreign students who work at night in the markets, or with cleaning or maintenance companies, etc.

If we return to the “*Héritiers*” we can see some of the essential differences, underlined by O. Galland in a comparison of his own data, on today’s arts students, and the contents of the book by P. Bourdieu and J. P. Passeron. Work as a complement to studying has become generalised, and this fact is reflected in all social groups:

	Students who work	
	1962	1992
Workers and employees	53.5%	45.6%
Craftsmen, salesmen	28 %	54%
Middle management	24.5%	49%
Upper management	25.5%	41%

Thus, as the students/workers of the sixties were mainly from the lower classes, at the present time the different percentages are much more similar, which responds more to a return to economic inequalities than to the influence of a youth lifestyle in which part time work occupies, as in the United States, an increasing place in the youth culture model. Nevertheless, the significance of work is not the same for the different social levels, and the nature of what N. Commerçon calls the “educational contract”, agreed between students and their families.²³ Thus, for students from modest families, the work done in summer is a need that is written into this family contract, which at the same time includes passing exams. In the middle class categories, a professional activity forms a part of the student way of life and is different from that which corresponds to the priority objective of professional insertion. In the case of the well-off classes, summer work plays the role of training and has a professional end, which is emphatically written into the implicit educational contract.

Nevertheless, if subjective independence is closely linked to economic autonomy, the sense of having reached adulthood is manifest after certain more subtle changes. Thus, 55% of students feel that they are adults when they control their own budgets with complete autonomy. One does not become an adult by making a break but by a series of small, almost imperceptible, mutations: returns to the family home at the weekend become increasingly less frequent between the first and fourth year; leisure is increasingly more independent, earnings gradually increase, etc. Youthful cohabitation, considered as a decisive criteria for adult status, increases from 3% in the first year to 20% in the second year.²⁴

23. N. COMMERÇON *et al.*, *op. cit.*

24. F. DUBET *et al.*, *op. cit.* J. P. MOLINARI, *op. cit.*

HOW DOES ONE BECOME AN ADULT?

The period of university studies is also one of changes of status, of the progressive acquisition of functions, of adult behaviour and aptitudes. The fact that this process takes place, in part at least, during university studies does not mean that it is strongly structured during the studies themselves. Effectively, if the studies are subject to a succession of levels and years, this reality is far from corresponding to “psychological years” or stages of social maturity. From this point of view the university is not a prolongation of secondary school or technical college given that, although “freshers” (first year students) exist, there are no “veterans” as such who, merely as a result of their position, have achieved more autonomy and social responsibility. Students do not see themselves as people whose personal progress leads them towards the status of being “grown up” or “more grown up”, in comparison with school children passing from childhood to adolescence, or secondary school children passing from adolescence to youth. At no time, during a study carried out in Bordeaux, did students describe their progress in terms of these categories of growing maturity; there was no talk of either “new boys” or “veterans.”²⁵ The university encloses the time of youth, but does not precisely analyse its distinct stages and processes.

It must be said that this relative disassociation between the educational and the personal trajectory is sustained on certain objective grounds. The influence of studies is weak, the progression of the students is so diversified and the personal conditions so multiple, that it is difficult to group them under a common denominator. The situations with regard to the family, earnings and living conditions are highly diversified. In some cases, it might be a case of the student staying at university to prolong his youth, and avoiding becoming a true adult, whereas for others, this prolonged youth is distressing. To put it another way, entering adulthood appears to be both an individual and a subjective process, which is objective to the extent that there is no clear and unequivocal social definition that indelibly fixes the passage from one status to the other.²⁶

Answering the question: “how does one become a grown up?”, students from Bordeaux emphasise three arguments: the end of living with the family, finding more important and more regular work and, finally, living as a couple. Firstly, one leaves the family, which involves doing your own housework and calculating budgets. Later, regular or occasional work increases income. And finally, one sets up house with someone else “to become established”, not necessarily through marriage, but in terms of a life that is emotionally and materially more independent.

25. F. DUBET *et al.*, *ibid.*

26. Concerning the prolongation of youth, cf: A. CAVALLI, O. GALLAND, (ed.). *L'allongement de la jeunesse*, Ed Actes Sud, 1994.

The study in Bordeaux reveals that, if 35.5% of students live at their parents' homes, this percentage is 42 at the first level and falls to 24 at the second level. If we accept, rather arbitrarily, that any student in Bordeaux could live with his family, as is the case with 47.5% of those in the first year, it can be seen that, overall, 62% live alone. 14.5% of students live away from their families when "they could" live with them. In the second year 38.5% of the sample come from la Gironde, but 76% of them live alone, i.e. a difference of 37.5%. Therefore there is a "guideline" by which to establish oneself, which is individual and progressive, in the course of one's student period. Students separate themselves from their families as the result of no other "need" than that of an autonomy that is achieved in this way.

Through an analysis of student lodgings in Nantes, D. Pinson and his team observed that the choice of accommodation formed a part of a process of developing "independence".²⁷ A room in a student residence at the university is midway between the family home and a flat in the city. Sharing a cheap rented apartment is also an intermediate stage, given that this type of youthful cohabitation sets up a kind of local solidarity, with "regions" with stronger links than those of mere studying companions. It is evident that achieving autonomy through accommodation depends on geographic and material factors. Thus, sharing an apartment in a cheap block of flats is the ideal formula, in terms of "value for money", for those who cannot afford the "ideal" of rooms in the city centre. The "dis-cohabitation" process is slow, and passes from provisional to transitory and then from transitory to more permanent. The flat begins to change its character as the first consumer durables are installed. Likewise, the "lack of intimacy" of the halls of residence is replaced by the "negotiated intimacy" of a flat in the city. The number of meals eaten in the apartment increases and people start to be invited round. This distancing does not appear to be related to any worsening of relations with the family, given that 82.5% of the students declare themselves to be satisfied with family relations. At the second level, this figure is higher, 85%, than at the first, 81%.²⁸

The provision of economic support by families decreases from one cycle to the next. In Bordeaux this assistance, the provision of three quarters or more of resources by parents, passes from 73% to 53% between one level and the next. This provision increases in the case of girls, who receive 71%, compared with 58% for boys. There is always more help provided in the case of selective specialities (Medicine/University Institutes of Technology), than in the more popular centres (45.5% as against 38%). Likewise, it varies in terms of different types of training: 60% for Law, Sciences and Economics, and the IPS (Institute of Political Studies), 46% for scien-

27. D. PINSON *et al.*, *op cit.*

28. F. DUBET *et al.*, *op. cit.*

tific units and 32% for Humanities. Financial dependence is also seen as the main obstacle to the student's status by 40% of the sample, and by 48% of the second level. It is possible that students need to be "kept", but this is not something that necessarily satisfies them. "Undoubtedly I'll feel like an adult as soon as I get my first real job. It's a question of money". Students increasingly work while they are studying, despite the fact that family income is not the only determining factor of student employment.

48% of students in Rennes have a vehicle, 1/3 of the students in Bordeaux have a car. In Rennes, the habitual use of a car does not vary between the different social classes: 46% of the working classes, 48% of executives and employees, and 50% amongst farmers. It seems that the smaller and more decentralised the university is, the more usual the need for a vehicle of some kind. While 37% of students have a car, the figure is only 29% for first level students and 51.5% at the second level.²⁹ Being "motorised", i.e. owning a vehicle financed by either the family or the student himself, is an aspect of the student lifestyle, which provides a certain degree of independence. N. Commerçon and his team recorded that 40% of the students interviewed in Lyon owned their own car, while 29% only used it to get to the faculty.³⁰ J. Chevalier showed that, in the case of students at Le Mans, the "motorization of mobility" affects all aspects of student life, with regard to both work and leisure: the car is both a means of transport and one of the key elements of their way of life.³¹

Becoming an adult "is to be independent of your parents and to take charge of your own life, through very specific means, such as maintenance or accommodation, and starting to live your own life".³² One of the main differences between the students in their first year in the faculty at Lille is characterised by the specific destination of the money provided by the parents of well-to-do families in monthly allowances and, in the case of more modest families, in the form of occasional payments. Yet by the third year, independently of social origins, the practice of an overall provision "to spend as you please" has become generalised.³³ Students tend to space out the time they spend with the family. As time passes, family encounters are less frequent. "They have to live their own lives, as their parents live theirs". Weekly visits to the family home diminish from 22% at the first level to 13% at the second. And, more than anything else, total dependence is left behind, given that, with the money from partial employment, they no longer owe anything to anybody; above all when such money, as in the majority of cases, is used for leisure and their own personal lives.

29. F. DUBET *et al.*, *ibid.*; cf, equally N. Commençon *et al.*, *op. cit.*

30. N. COMMERÇON *et al.*, *ibid.*

31. Y. CHEVALIER, *op. cit.*

32. F. DUBET *et al.*, *op. cit.*

33. B. CONVERT, M. PINET, *La carrière étudiante. Contribution à une sociologie de l'étudiant*, Ecole centrale de Lille, 1994.

Living as a couple appears to be a decisive step towards adulthood. "I will consider myself to be grown up when I've taken the decision to live with someone and, at that time, I will no longer count on support from my parents, I'll take complete charge of my life". "I'll feel like a real man when I have a woman; if not, the faculty is eternal adolescence". Cohabitation increases as the years pass: the average is 9.5%. At the first level it is 3%, although this increases to 20.5% by the second level. If we take into account the INSEE figures, quoted by O. Galland, the percentage of student cohabitation outside of marriage continues to be particularly low in relation to the national average: 44% among boys and 36% among girls aged between 20 and 24 in towns with between 100,000 and 200,000 inhabitants.³⁴ Living as a couple is a decisive stage, insofar as "one is not only responsible for oneself", and where one ceases to solely belong to one's family.

A mathematics student describes the passage to maturity as a series of "combinations" between economic, family and personal logic systems. That is why there is no general guideline for entering adult life. Youth's uncertainties and ambiguities mature at the university. There, they are developed, all the more so insofar as students have ambivalent feelings about their future. The future often seems far from bright, given that 69% of students state that they are concerned about unemployment, even at the second selective level, where the figure is only 56%. Social origin is not a shield for their anguish, insofar as this is more common among the children of executives than among those of workers. Likewise, 21% of students consider that fear for the future is the main disadvantage of their status as students. Concern about the future affects girls far more than boys, worrying 77% as against 59%, with 24.5% of girls stating that this is the main disadvantage of their status as students, while only 16.5% of boys feel this way, and are inclined to postpone the moment when they take their professional tests. In fact, that is what they do, given that 34% of them believe that free time is the main advantage of their status as students, and this figure does not vary very much from one year to the next.

The data collected reveals a clear difference in the rhythm of reaching maturity between boys and girls. Girls appear to be more closely connected with their families and to receive more support than boys. They have more numerous opportunities for part time or occasional work, but are less often employed in steady jobs and are more concerned about the future. Among girls, it is as if the model of more traditional family dependence was still operative, as if they were already aware of the specific disadvantages in the employment market. In this sense, the variations between the sexes are minimal but constant.³⁵

34. *Ibid.*

35. These observations are in convergence with those of C. BAUDELLOT, R. ESTABLET, *Allez les filles*, Paris, Seuil, 1992.

THE DOUBLE LIFE OF STUDENTS

Emigrant or sedentary

In a great many cases, the student way of life can be seen as a stage that is “split” down the middle between university life and youthful life in the family, or with companions unconnected with the world of the university. The researchers of the “Observatoire” investigating student life in Montpellier, indicate one of the differences between sedentary and emigrant students.³⁶ The emigrant is the student who returns home every weekend and makes an effort to limit his time spent at university to that which is indispensable to follow the essential courses. 73% of students at Dijon spend all of their weekends with their families and another 13% do so every fortnight.³⁷ 44% of the students at Rennes go home every weekend, which is also the case of over half of those whose families reside within a radius of 30 to 200 kilometres of the city.³⁸ These weekly migrations mainly involve the use of public transport and private cars, which have become an essential ingredient of the way of life of provincial students.

All of the studies carried out in the provinces underline this phenomenon of a double life, which sometimes suggests a case of breaking away, when the students in question are “freshers” and come from families that are culturally distanced from university standards and values. Emigrant students include the youngest, who live in the cheapest lodgings, and who tend to live on campus. Sometimes, as in the case of Bordeaux, the campuses empty out on Thursday afternoons, except for their foreign students who suffer a feeling of captivity. The sedentary students are the veterans, who tend to live in the city centre, although it is the emigrant students who really give life to the university. This is so to the point that certain departments and the TRU (Training and Research Unit) avoid giving classes on Monday mornings and Friday afternoons or Saturdays.

Student social life is influenced by this duality. All of the surveys indicate the differences that the students establish between their *colleagues* from the university itself and their *friends* from older relationships, such as those from school, from their hometown, and from sports clubs, etc. When it comes to taking part in sports, they are more inclined to do so with friends than with university colleagues: students more frequently choose the team from their hometown than that of the university. According to students in Bordeaux, they even tend to fall in love more frequently outside the university environment than they do as the result of encounters in the lecture halls of the faculty. Evidently this duality is much greater in the popular universities than

36. J. P. VOLLE, *op. cit.*

37. F. BOURDON, C. PEYRON, *Le cas de la délocalisation du premier cycle de Droit à Nevers*, Dijon, Université de Bourgogne, LATEC, 1993.

38. J. PIHAN *et al.*, *op. cit.*

in the more select and integrated sectors, which tend to favour a certain team and corporate spirit. Of late, this duality has proved more dominant in educational terms, as is the case in high schools or University Institutes of Technology. Nevertheless, B. Convert and M. Pinet observed the same migratory mechanism, and the same double life, among Parisian students of middle class origins, at university in Lille; insofar as possible, they return to life in their home town.³⁹ O. Galland indicates that this double life is satisfactory for most students, as it shapes a personal space in which they combine their autonomy with a certain security and instrumental relationships with emotional relationships. This double life gently compensates the transition to the status of adulthood and allows them to establish the distance that they want to maintain from their family. The distance grows gradually, with greater lengths of time between family visits, where they manage to establish their own secret life, without cutting off family ties. Thursday nights out, filling certain of the city's cafes and bars, are like ceremonies that mark the borderlines between one life and the other, the end of the university week and the return to "civilian" life. These get-togethers are common place in the majority of provincial universities, above all at Bordeaux, Montpellier, Rennes, etc. and are the most palpable, and at the same time the most spectacular, collective expression of student life.⁴⁰ On Thursday nights, certain cafes and bars are obligatory points of reference for student life, where they "have a good time", often drinking too much, and where young students feel that they are entering the real student world. Some high school students also go along, looking for a taste of what is to come and mixing with "real students". Perhaps this is the only time, apart from demonstrations, when students act as such in a collective way. They can thereby affirm that they form part of the student world, at a time when they still return home to their families every weekend, to their "other life". The more experienced students tend to avoid such get-togethers, judging them to be "infantile", and look to acquire a rather more sophisticated relationship with the city. Their concepts of citizenship and urban trajectory penetrate beyond these cafes and bars that symbolise the world of students.⁴¹

Sometimes, it so happens that the worlds of friends and colleagues come together, through the "brotherhoods" formed by countries. This is particularly the case of uprooted minorities. Foreign students who live on campus do not identify or organise themselves on the basis of what they study, but rather on the basis of their

39. B. CONVERT, M. PINET, *op. cit.*, cf also F. PERON *et al.*, *Brest ville universitaire: pratiques et perceptions du campus, de l'agglomération brestoise et de la région par les étudiants brestois*, Brest UBO. AUCUBE. 1993.

40. R. ALLAIN *et al.*, *Rennes, ville universitaire : relations sociales, économiques, culturelles, de loisirs entre université et ville ou quartier*, Université de Rennes II, AURAU, 1993; M. L. FELONNEAU, *Territorialités étudiantes et symbolique urbaine*, Université de Bordeaux III. CRIAM, 1994; J. P. VOLLE, *op. cit.*

41. M. L. FELONNEAU, *ibid.* It seems that at these university annexes and in small and medium sized towns, such get-togethers are less evident due to the fact that the students leave during the week.

origins, which constitutes a much stronger tie. On the campus at the University of Bordeaux, students from the Antilles, the Maghreb, and Africa, etc. structure their relationships around associations and festivals that link them to their country. In this way they create the emotional security that they lack, as well as a network of support and information that is indispensable for adapting to university life. In fact, this social structure responds to a “minority’s logic”. A double life is created on the basis of the conflict between studies and the community, which occupies part of the environment set aside for the family and “real friends”. African students at the University of Nice define themselves, at the same time, as students and intellectuals, as well as immigrant workers, given that this is what they are taken for as soon as they leave the strictly university territory.⁴² These students “avoid going into town” for fear of encountering racist attitudes that can even include aggression. In particular, travelling by bus can involve bothersome incidents, such as avoiding sitting next to a black, etc. Likewise, there is the fear of being taken for an illegal immigrant, while African students generally avoid going to certain places, such as the beach or the old town centre of Nice. On the other hand, the university city is over invested and on campus extensive networks of collaboration are set up: to search for lodgings, jobs, thesis supervisors, etc., with the network acquiring, in this way, a truly national dimension. Veterans look after recent arrivals, through a system of “tutoring” and, through parties and dinner invitations. A community world, organised on the basis of nationalities, is formed. Durkheim’s description of the cosmopolitan student world of the Medieval universities evokes the role of such brotherhoods, which structured the relationships between students from the same origins.⁴³

The campus and the city

Student life is not solely governed by weekly migrations and the juxtaposition between friends and colleagues. In many university cities there is a certain antagonism between the campus and the city itself, and between work and “life”, that profoundly structures the student way of life. In this sense, we must bear in mind that, since the 1950s, campuses in France have been built on the outskirts of the city and are in no way comparable with the typical Anglo-Saxon campus. They were designed as places of work and to meet the basic needs of the students, but are not places with their own life, with cafeterias, auditoriums, shops, etc. Despite recent efforts on the part of the rectors of universities and the municipalities, when the last class finishes the campus empties out, in the same way as factories or offices.

42. J. STREIFF-FENARD, P. POUTIGNAT *et. al.*, *Etre un étudiant africain dans l’université française. Le cas de Nice*, Nice, IDERIC, 1993.

43. E. DURKHEIM, *L’évolution pédagogique en France*, Paris, PUF.

In Bordeaux, Rennes, Nantes or Brest, as well as in many other cities in which different surveys have been carried out, the same opposition can be seen between the campus, seen as a functional space or a “teaching machine”, and the city that takes in the essential aspects of a youthful world.⁴⁴ 16% of the students at Angers stay on the campus after classes have finished. “The students have accommodation in the city, but do not live there”, states J.P. Volle.⁴⁵ In order to escape from the “nocturnal desertion” of the campus, most students prefer to live in the city centre; the more advanced they are in their studies, the more likely they are to abandon the campus, which is shown to be a way of entering student life. On the other hand, for foreign students, it offers them a protective environment, even though it isolates them even more. Likewise, students believe that living together on campus soon becomes a loaded and monotonous way of life; which is when they take an interest in the city, with greater diversification and more freedom of choice.

The campus, seen from the functional point of view of the consumer, is a terrain reserved for “useful” studies and alimentation, and the surveys carried out at Rennes and Bordeaux, by means of a system of mental clichés, indicate that for half of the students the campus is no more than a studying environment and has no further interest for them apart from that which is essential, and on which no emblematic monument exists. At Brest, 75% of students stay on campus for five or six days, eating an average of five meals there; 20% never eat there at all.⁴⁶ There is no doubt about it: the campus is no more than a suburban university, with all that this image of emptiness and atomisation implies. Nevertheless, students are relatively uncritical in terms of the reality of the campus, and the majority of them are not nostalgic for the “*intramural universities*” and the “little Latin quarters” of the provinces. The functional campus will suffice for them in terms of their studies and, in most cities, the biggest problem is transport, which is more important to them than the organisation of the campus or the structuring of their social life. The distancing of one world from the other in this “double life” is of greater concern than the “double life” itself. The students do not dream about an ideal campus, the maximum expression of a student community; enclosed in functional and utility-orientated expectations within their concept of the campus, the symbiosis of their youthful life and the world of study is something of relatively little importance.

The historic city centre and certain streets that make up the student district, along with their bars, cinemas and meeting points for the Thursday night get-togethers,

44. Cf the majority of the studies in the “University and Town” programme, in particular those of: G. MOSER, E. RATIOU, *Pratiques de l'espace universitaire et budget-temps des étudiants dans deux universités “intra muros” et deux campus périurbains*, Paris V, Laboratoire de Psychologie de l'Environnement, 1994.

45. J. P. VOLLE, *op. cit.*

46. F. PÉRON, *op. cit.*

represent an alternative to the traditional concept of the campus. The city centre is overvalued because it represents a mixture of genres and activities and because it is both “cultural” and “young” at the same time, allowing students to wander round as they please. Even in the case of Nice, in which the university centres are within the city, they seem as if they were “outside”, creating a poorer and more limited perception than that of the city.⁴⁷ A. Sauvage observes that these perceptions are not too different from those of the city’s inhabitants, whose topics and clichés are shared by students.⁴⁸

The location of universities in working class suburbs has little influence on the rupture between the campus and the city. Studies carried out in Vaulx-en-Velin and in Bron, indicate that the relationship between the population and the students is non-existent; the “city” continues to be the centre of Lyon,⁴⁹ as in the case of the National School of Public Works, which is effectively enclosed within itself. In Marseilles, in the del Merlan quarter, the distancing between the faculty and the quarter confirms the rule. Even for the 44% of students who live there, if they want to have “fun” or to live a little, they go into Marseilles⁵⁰. In Cergy, the situation is the same: as well as indifference, a certain amount of hostility has been registered between students and local youths.⁵¹ Surveys carried out among students in the Saint Martin d’Hères and Belsunce quarters of Marseilles, where the Puget faculty is located, show that these neighbourhoods do not represent a prolongation of the campus. The students trivialise these spaces, conceding to them merely instrumental functions.⁵²

The binomial relationship between the campus and the city serves to reinforce student identity more in the provinces than it does in Paris or its outskirts. As noted by O. Galland, in Nantes there is no student environment as such, while students at Rennes and Besançon identify themselves with certain student neighbourhoods and certain “drinking areas” clubs or shopping zones. Provincial cities have not

47. A. CHENU, V. Erlich, *op. cit.*

48. A. SAUVAGE *et. al.*, *Rennes, Ville universitaire : ville centre, centre-ville et université. Scénario*. Rennes, LARES, SCET, 1993. A study carried out in Bordeaux suggests that the perception of the city and the campus may vary a little according to the course chosen. For the Sciences, with closer links to a relatively enclosed and older campus, the city is simply seen as a decorative backdrop. In terms of the Humanities, the campus is defined as a “teaching machine” and Bordeaux as “their” city, as a space set aside for pleasure. Even so, all such variations are quite tenuous and do not affect the fundamental duality between campus and city. Cf M. L. FÉLONNEAU, *op. cit.*

49. L. ABDELMAK, J. JEANNERET *et. al.*, *Les sites d’enseignement supérieur en périphérie de grande agglomération. Recomposition urbaine et articulation université ville: Le cas de Vaulx en Velin et de Bron*. Université de Lyon II, ECT, ENTPE, ASTER, TEN, 1993.

50. R. ESTABLET *et. al.*, *op. cit.*

51. M. LEROUX, R. CURIE *et. al.*, *Confrontation et accomodation dans la ville : l’implantation de résidences universitaires à la Croix Petit à Cergy : analyse ethno-sociologique d’une turbulence urbaine*. Paris IRESCO. GRASS, 1993.

52. A. TARRIUS, D. FILATRE, M. DI BENEDETTO, *Aménagements universitaires et dynamiques intra-urbaine, Recherche exploratoire*, Marseille, TRANSIT, 1993.

completely lost their student environment while, in the capital, student areas are less recognisable, despite the over-publicised image of the Latin Quarter. Likewise, the fact that provincial students live less frequently and less time at their parents home (22% in Besançon, as against 78% in Nantes) increases the perception of their own territory held by students as a whole. Urban student social life is less intense in Paris than in the provinces. The “student area” only exists in provincial towns and cities. Perhaps this situation can be explained by the relatively important mobilisation of today’s provincial students, as clearly shown by their battle against the “Professional Insertion Contract”, in March 1994. The question of the great university city, particularly Paris, as the founding centre of student identity, has more to do with myth and nostalgia than reality. The systematic comparison sustained by G. Moser and E. Ratiu, between students on two campuses –Nantes and Rennes II, on the one hand– and two intramural universities –Censier, in Paris and François Rabelais, in Tours, on the other— shows that the organisation of time is more varied and flexible in Paris, where there is a wider range of opportunities and the level of expectations is higher.⁵³ Parisian social life is, however, less tied to the framework of the university than in provincial centres. On the other hand, the migratory phenomenon is irrelevant in Paris, where home visits are scaled to a greater degree during the week. In the *intramural* universities, students spend more time at the centre, and university contacts are more restricted. In Paris, although the students are more integrated with the city, they are less so in their role as students.

Thus, we observe the rather paradoxical effect of the rupture between campus and city. It seems that attachment to the city and the symbolic appropriation thereof is greater among students on the campuses, to the extent that the functional, and “neutral”, character of the campus is opposed to the city as the environment of the student lifestyle in itself, insofar as it could even be said that the city is then “desired” as an expression of this way of life. Students at *intramural* universities prefer to merge with the city, given that this indicates, to a lesser extent, their collective identity. The city/campus pairing is so fundamental that it is often no more than the spatial expression of the student’s own double identity. Students are defined in terms of their studies on campus and seen as young people in the city.

UNIVERSITY STUDENTS AND HIGH SCHOOL PUPILS

Rapid mass growth in the student population and the introduction of new university networks in small cities has resulted in the emergence of new types of students, differentiated from “mass students” by their social and cultural characteristics, as well as their way of life, that tends to be similar to that of high school pupils.

53. G. MOSER, E. RATIU, *op. cit.*

Being able to enrol in the first level at university annexes, located in small cities and towns, directly depends on the resources of the parents. This is also associated with an unsettling idea of student life in the big city. Only a small minority of students in these annexes experience such geographic sectorisation as an imposition (13% as against 8% in central universities).⁵⁴ Conversely, proximity is the determining factor of an option that allows them to live with their families and close to their school friends. As one history lecturer at Bordeaux said: "Students at university annexes have made the choice not to be students".

A survey carried out in the Poitiers region shows that university annexes and University Institutes of Technology in small cities and towns have allowed the enrolment of students who, if this had not been the case and without this proximity, would not have continued to study.⁵⁵ In this sense, students at Angoulême, where the majority come from working class families, lag behind in their studies in comparison with their colleagues at Poitiers. There are more technological degrees, because the "harder" it seems to pass a particular degree –with category C or D or an honorific mention– the higher the level of enrolment in large cities and throughout the territory as a whole. Thus, in Angoulême, 48% of SEA (Social and Economic Administration) students had not applied to Poitiers and, if the faculty of Angoulême had not existed, 15% of them would have started working directly after school. One particularly interesting aspect of these students is that they are "less motivated" and their application for enrolment often arrives after they have been rejected elsewhere. Could it be that these students are less prepared? Whatever the case may be, their exam results are lower than those of their colleagues at the central universities.

A survey carried out among first level Law students at Nevers confirms these observations.⁵⁶ Here too, social enrolment is significantly lower than at Dijon: 13% as against 34% of the children of executives and 48% of the children of workers or employees, as against 28% in Dijon. 45% of the students at Nevers, as against 78% of those at Dijon, state that they "freely" chose where to study. Among these new types of student, the student lifestyle is frankly less consolidated than in the larger cities. The students live with their parents and 74% of them only ever eat at home, they go out less and go to cafeterias and cinemas less often than their colleagues from Dijon. School exam marks are significantly lower in Nevers and the student "environment" is seen as more negative, insofar as students do not feel that they belong to a student community.⁵⁷ As pointed out by J. M. Berthelot, a process of

54. J. PIHAN, *op. cit.*

55. J. L. MARCHAIS, *Influences des délocalisations universitaires sur le recrutement, le profil, les cursus et les débouchés des étudiantes*, Poitiers, Institut d'Economie Régionale, 1991, 1992, 1993.

56. F. BOURDON, C. PEYRON, *Le cas de la délocalisation du premier cycle de droit à Nevers*, LATEC. Dijon.

57. The same conclusions can be drawn from the E. Verschave, S. Bortolino *et. al.*, study. *Les futurs bacheliers du littoral Nord-pas de Calais face à leur orientation. Etudes des premiers vœux OC-API en 1991*, Lille, Université du littoral, 1993.

“secondariness” can be detected in the annexes, which is not solely due to “second class” recruitment, but also to maintaining a “secondary” way of life.⁵⁸

“At the annexes it’s as if you were still at school”. The culture of student “nights out” has not reached the university annexes, given that these students come from a class where such traditions do not exist and they find themselves in towns or small cities where they do not exist either. Definitively, this “high school pupil” attitude is to a lesser extent the result of the reduced facilities of the annexes themselves than the notion of studies. The university, even though it continues to be a source of hope, has lost some of its symbolic meaning for the new candidates, who continue to be tied to their family and their adolescent friendships.

YOUTH CULTURE

Is there a way of life that characterises students? And does an easily recognisable style that would allow them to be identified, actually exist? Except for certain evident factors, such as the organisation of time, which is specific to the pacing of studies that are combined with different kinds of work,, and with the exception of the pace of life prior to examinations, the relationship of students with culture appears to be very different today from what it was at the time of the “*Héritiers*”. With mass higher education, students can no longer be defined on the basis of their particular relationship with culture, but on the basis of the heterogeneous nature of these relationships and their adhesion to a mass youth culture, which is much more than a style pertaining to the students themselves.

Student leisure and entertainment activities are similar and informal. An affinity is established among friends and university colleagues on the basis of opportunities and mutual preferences. In terms of the more informal aspects, students almost always manage to escape from cultural and sports programmes. Thus, student life appears as a “pilgrimage” between old and new friendships, between colleagues and friends, between disparate amusements and specific spheres of sociability.⁵⁹ At the University of Angers, for example, 50% of students go out on the town once a week and go to the cinema in a systematic, almost hegemonic, way. Half of them take part in some kind of sports activity, although half of these do not belong to any specific club; they are more interested in “keeping in shape” than in competing. The majority of those who belong to some kind of sports club choose a “civilian” association. 70% of the students at Angers do not belong to any association and

58. J. M. BERTHELOT, “Les effets pervers de l’expansion des enseignements supérieurs : le cas de la France”, *Les sociétés contemporaines* 1990, 4.

59. AUCUBE, *Les processus d’intégration sociale des étudiants à propos des sites de l’Université de Bretagne Occidentale*, St Brieuc, Atelier d’Etudes et de Recherches, 1993.

only 3% are in a union.⁶⁰ O. Galland collected identical data: 30% of students belong to an association, as against 24% of young people out of the population as a whole, although the difference, it must be said, is hardly significant.⁶¹ The social life of students is not necessarily organised: 59% state that they belong to a group whose aim is to “go out on the town” in 51% of cases, to take part in sports in 18%, and “to eat” in 7%. In terms of the associations to which they belong, in 62% of cases the aim is sporting, in 22% of a cultural type, in 14% religious, and in 9% of cases of a political or union type.

As pointed out by B. Convert and M. Pinet: “Today’s students sleep at night and on Saturday nights, just like everyone else, and they go to the cinema”.⁶² 70% of first year students get up before eight o’clock in the morning and 80% of them go to bed before half past eleven”. In Rennes, three quarters of the students go to the cinema once a month, while 80% never go to the theatre.⁶³ In fact, these leisure activities depend, for the most part, on social origins. Becoming a student has no fundamental affect on student tastes; it does not mean that they will become actively involved in a particular student culture: the theatre and classical music concerts continue to be the preserve of the upper classes, “cultural goodwill” appears amongst the middle classes and the cinema predominates in the preferred activities of the working classes. This state of affairs does not prevent students from criticising the cultural sub-infrastructure of the campus and of these provincial cities or towns, in this way showing their “good will” and adhesion to a higher culture, in the same way as many television watchers deplore the “level” of television programmes but continue to watch TF-1 rather than the Art Channel.

A study carried out in Nice clarifies three of the principal relationships between students and culture.⁶⁴ Cultural activities of a *youthful* type, which can be defined as similar to those of all young people, include: discotheques, sports, rock concerts, etc. This is a masculine style, holding sway in the UIT’s (University Institutes of Technology) and the BTS’s (Superior Technical Diploma) among students with social class origins among employees, sales staff and workers. The *traditional* style, in which there is a certain preference for the cinema, jazz and “music hall”, is prevalent among older students and those from higher social classes. Finally, there is a small *cultured* elite, who go to the theatre, to classical music concerts and to the opera; this is particularly characteristic amongst girls and older students from the more cultured

60. D. PENNEAU-FONTBONNE., *Conditions de vie des étudiants et accessibilité à un ensemble de services*. Université d’Angers, 1993.

61. O. GALLAND *et al.*, *op. cit.*

62. B. CONVERT, M. PINET, *op. cit.*

63. R. SECHET POISSON, J. P. PEYRON *et al.*, *Les universités de Nantes et de Rennes et leurs antennes : espace imaginé, espace approprié, espace promotionnel*. Université de Rennes II et de Nantes, URA 915, 1993.

64. A. CHENU, V. ÉRLICH *et al.*, *op. cit.*

social classes. This characterisation reveals, above all, that the pole of “cultural” tastes is well below the youth pole of the “masses”, and that students do not differ much from the rest of society. Their relationship with culture is no more than an extension of that of society as a whole: it is more childish and populist among the youngest and most culturally deprived, and more cultivated and less populist among older students and those from the more privileged classes.

Student preferences are linked to age and social origins: they tend to avoid “extreme” tastes, such as hard-rock, in the same way that they reject extreme political ideas. Students from the more privileged classes have more possibilities, though they are equally “average”. Surveys on students and culture carried out in Grenoble confirm these observations.⁶⁵ There is no true “student culture”; attitudes continue to be correlated with the main variables, depending on social origin, the overall climate of “cultural opinion” and the sex division. These results also generally confirm differences between scientists and artists. Those who are actively engaged in, initiated in, or fans of, refined or avant-garde culture are a small minority, with the majority of students having no particular interest in culture at all. 60% of students have never been to a museum, and 75% have never been to the theatre. The percentages among the French population as a whole are 70% and 85% respectively. “What we could catalogue as a “common student condition” does not actually exist outside the discourse of those who question whether or not it does exist”.

This medium term character is shown by the preference for the cinema and sports as student leisure occupations. Their preferences with respect to films are exactly the same as those of other young people and they also clearly prefer the most fashionable actors. We must, however, point out one significant difference between students and the rest of the population; they are below average consumers of television, watching it for forty-five minutes a day during the week and an hour and fifteen minutes on Sundays. Television is not the chosen form of entertainment in the world of students who prefer activities that involve a more selective sociability.⁶⁶ Nevertheless, a survey carried out at Le Mans shows that this sociability is much more focused on group entertainments, such as meeting up in bars and cafes, than on any kind of institutional cultural consumption. Such cultural infrastructures as the MJC and newspaper reading rooms are frequented more by high school pupils and “non-students” than by university students.⁶⁷

In summary, students are only young people, just like the rest, with the exception of a “cultured” sector, whose origins are related to social and hierarchical enrolment from “cultivated” origins, and who particularly study literature and arts. The student

65. F. & N. BERTHEIR, *Les étudiants grenoblois, les loisirs et la culture*, in A. PESSIN *et. al.*, *Les étudiants et leur culture*, Université de Grenoble II, ARSA, 1994.

66. N. COMMERÇON, *op. cit.*

67. Y. CHEVALIER, *op. cit.*

lifestyle is an “extension” of scholarly activity. With the exception of certain very specific cases, the influence of the university does not transcend a strictly university framework. What has most weight in the characterisation of students is the double life that they lead, the positive aspect of which is that it creates space for their autonomy which allows them to structure their youth.⁶⁸

The condition of being a student which, being so widespread, covers an ample sector of youth, thus appears to be a youthful way of life that is extensively juxtaposed with respect to the studies themselves. This mode of life is contained within an extension of young people’s existence consisting of successive mutations and progressive separations, moving towards a growing independence. It is equally defined by the various social conditions of the student’s origins and depends on where the university is located, the economic and social conditions of the individuals attending it and existing cultural hierarchies. This is particularly the case among young students. These ways of life are contained within a series of dualities that lead us to affirm that the condition of being a student is more of an activity and a progression, than a status or a “way of being” in itself.

* * *

The establishment of mass higher education has diluted and diversified student way of life and their experiences to an extreme extent. This situation is often paradoxical. Most of the time, it is the medium sized cities that have best maintained the aspect and ambience of a student city, in which they have their own neighbourhoods, with their own cultural and social activities that are defined by the students. On the other hand, it is difficult for small cities and towns, where university annexes have been set up, to acquire this character, which seems to have been set aside for high school pupils. In terms of the campus, this graft does not seem to have been very positive, because the city or town continues to conserve its capacity to attraction and offer cultural input, and in France, campuses continue to be considered as shelters for students and not as model types for universities.



68. The priority conceded to culture in the double life of students may, in part, explain the weak impact of the cultural policies conceived by the universities. Cf “Evaluation de l’opération ‘Un tramway nommé culture’” in A. PESSIN, *et. al., op. cit.*