Youth nightlife at home: towards a feminist conceptualisation of home

Katharina Pelzelmayer, Sara Landolt, Jasmine Truong, Florian Labhart, Darshan Santani, Emmanuel Kuntsche & Daniel Gatica-Perez

To cite this article: Katharina Pelzelmayer, Sara Landolt, Jasmine Truong, Florian Labhart, Darshan Santani, Emmanuel Kuntsche & Daniel Gatica-Perez (2020): Youth nightlife at home: towards a feminist conceptualisation of home, Children's Geographies, DOI: 10.1080/14733285.2020.1718607

To link to this article: https://doi.org/10.1080/14733285.2020.1718607

Published online: 29 Jan 2020.
Youth nightlife at home: towards a feminist conceptualisation of home

Katharina Pelzelmayer\textsuperscript{a}, Sara Landolt\textsuperscript{a}, Jasmine Truong\textsuperscript{a}, Florian Labhart\textsuperscript{b}, Darshan Santani\textsuperscript{b}, Emmanuel Kuntsche\textsuperscript{c} and Daniel Gatica-Perez\textsuperscript{b}

\textsuperscript{a}Institute of Geography, University of Zurich, Zurich, Switzerland; \textsuperscript{b}IDIAP Research Institute, Lausanne, Switzerland; \textsuperscript{c}Centre for Alcohol Policy Research, La Trobe University, Melbourne, Australia

\textbf{ABSTRACT}
This paper explores home as a space of youth nightlife and drinking through a feminist lens. It draws on feminist geographical scholarship on home and 40 semi-structured interviews with young people aged 16–25 in Switzerland in the context of a larger interdisciplinary study. We find that the home figures as a central space of nightlife for young people beyond pre-drinking or home parties. At the same time, privacy and intimacy are important to young people when drinking alcohol outside of the home. We suggest that this preference of privacy when going out indicates an interweaving of private and public spheres in young people’s nightlives. The paper argues that the home is both a central concrete space and an important symbolic notion in young people’s nightlives. In so doing, it empirically complicates the public/private dualism and contributes to feminist geographical conceptualisations of home in the context of youth nightlife.

\textbf{Introduction}

Going out at weekend nights is widely recognised as an important practice for young people to socialise, spend time with friends, negotiate identities and to escape from structured everyday life (Demant 2007). Alcohol consumption can play a major role at nights out, and for some, including women, getting drunk can be ‘the whole point’ of going out (for a discussion, c.f. Nicholls 2019, 125, 3). Recent studies showed that ‘going out’ is not only related to clubs and pubs but can also be strongly related to drinking at home, including at house parties, drinking at home before and after going out (pre-drinking and sequel drinking) or domestic drinking with family and friends (Garvey 2005; Jayne, Valentine, and Gould 2012; Østergaard and Andrade 2014; Wilkinson 2015; Labhart and Kuntsche 2017). These studies show that considerable proportions of alcohol consumption take place at home quietly, on an everyday basis rather than spectacularly on nights out (Valentine, Jayne, and Gould 2012; Valentine et al. 2007, 52). Many young people experience pre-drinking or the ‘home part’ of their nightlife as the best part because the home represents a safe and relaxing environment where one can drink cheaply, safely and ideally without parental supervision (Demant and Østergaard 2007; Barton and Husk 2014). This experience has raised questions about the quantity and circumstances of young people’s alcohol consumption in the home, which, as Wilkinson (2017, 740) observes, has led to ‘a tendency in popular and policy realms to consider that “drinking at home” is bad’. Given that the home appears to be an increasingly important space for nightlife, including the day after nightlife (Lincoln 2012b), this tendency to dismiss drinking at home as
'bad' overgeneralises the variety of factors involved in and the diversity of alcohol consumption in the home, and deserves further investigation.

Since the home has only recently emerged as a central space for alcohol consumption and nightlife, there are two points which merit further exploration. First, we still know little about how young people characterise the home space in which they spend considerable parts of their nights (Demant 2007). Second, there is a paucity of conceptual engagement with and critical reflection on the notion of home in different strands of nightlife and alcohol research.

This paper has three aims: (a) to provide a rich account of how young people talk about drinking and their weekend nights at home (b) to examine how private and public interweave in youth nightlife, and (c) to contribute to a conceptualisation of home in the context of youth nightlife from a feminist geographical perspective. The paper starts with a discussion of relevant bodies of literature on young people’s nightlife and the concept of home. It then discusses the ways in which young people between 16 and 25 years of age in Switzerland talk about nightlife and drinking with particular reference to home spaces. Our findings suggest that the home emerges as a key site, which figures both as a central concrete space and a significant symbolic notion in young people’s nightlife.

**Gendered geographies of young people’s nightlives**

This section discusses the relationship of space, gender and drinking during young people’s nightlives. It focuses on the importance of where alcohol is consumed, the interweaving of public and private and its gendered associations, as well as performances of gender in nightlife at home.

Geographical research has explored young people’s experiences of alcohol consumption during the so-called evening or night-time economy (Hubbard 2005; Valentine, Holloway, and Jayne 2010). Recent studies have focused on ‘drinking places’ and investigated they ways in which young people use and appropriate spaces for and when drinking alcohol (Landolt 2011; Trell, van Hoven, and Huigen 2014). Examining youth nightlife in Zurich, Switzerland, Landolt and Backhaus (2009, 190) observe how ‘alcohol consumption [takes place] in dependence on place’: where young people drink influences their alcohol consumption. A focus on place-dependent drinking allows us to see how spaces are signified and attain meaning. Some forms of place-dependent drinking, such as drinking in residential areas, challenge moral and spatial boundaries and thus create new spaces for agency and appropriation. At the same time, other forms of drinking, such as drinking in a bar, correspond to and reproduce existing forms of nightlife (Landolt and Backhaus 2009, 190). In both cases, public (rules) and private (norms regarding appropriate drinking/social behaviour) are negotiated (Landolt and Backhaus 2009, 189). As Landolt and Backhaus (2009, 189) explain, ‘the choice of drinking place and the concomitant discussion of what is possible and what is not renders “private” drinking [in public spaces] an either consciously provoked or subconsciously accepted negotiation of public rules’. What we see here is how actions attributed to the private become central in the context of young people’s alcohol consumption in public spaces. Landolt and Backhaus (2009, 189) discuss this in terms of an ‘intertwining of public and private’.

Feminist geography investigates how the public/private dichotomy plays out in many contexts, including nightlife and drinking alcohol (Holloway, Valentine, and Jayne 2009; Gorman-Murray 2012; Jayne, Valentine, and Gould 2012). Given the gendered associations of the public/private dichotomy, feminist scholarship has examined the ways in which femininities and masculinities are negotiated in nightlife, and how understandings and practices of drinking emerge as gendered (Østergaard 2007; Landolt 2009; Nicholls 2019). In their study of women drinking in Northern England, Holloway, Valentine, and Jayne (2009, 829) observe a range of ‘complex gendered moral code [s] around drinking and drunkenness’ regarding the appropriateness of place, behaviour and the amount of drink. So even though older and younger women’s drinking morale and behaviour might appear as radically different, both the older and younger women interviewed had very clear and similar reservations regarding day drinking, women drinking on their own in public, casual
sexual encounters when drunk, and pregnant women’s drinking (Holloway, Valentine, and Jayne 2009, 827–829). The study shows that gendered norms and geographies of drinking are negotiated in subtle and complex but nonetheless powerful ways. A study of youth nightlife in Zurich, Switzerland, illustrates this point in reporting that both the young men and women interviewed accepted drunkenness as a valid excuse for expressions of young women’s sexuality on a night out – behaviour they would deem inappropriate when sober (Landolt 2009, 252–253).

In the field of alcohol studies, some literature investigates the performance of gendered roles in young people’s night-time drinking. For example, it is reported that at pre-drinking events, young men might favour drinking games, while young women might focus on getting ready for the night out. While different, both activities serve to cultivate friendships (Barton and Husk 2014; Nicholls 2016, 2019). In the context of home parties, Østergaard (2007) observed how certain traditional gender roles were highlighted at home parties in Denmark. For instance, ‘the girls perform a traditional female role of being the good “hostess” who is visible and active in making people comfortable’ (Østergaard 2007, 145). The studies discussed in this section show how drinking alcohol is negotiated in their respective contexts and along a number of gendered codes and performances. Taking into account these context-dependent and gendered aspects of drinking helps us to understand the meanings of alcohol consumptions and the mechanisms of youth nightlife.

Gendered, privatised constructions of home

Social geographies of children and youth and studies in youth culture (Skelton and Valentine 1998; Holloway and Valentine 2004, 2005; Thomson and Philo 2004; Hörschelmann and Colls 2009; Holt 2011; Lincoln 2012a) have stressed the myriad of meanings and possibilities of home (Holloway and Hubbard 2001, 95). A general point of departure is the notion that “home is a socio-historical construction” (Ursin 2011, 222). This is to say that home is not only a discreet, physical space or locus but also ‘a matrix of social relationships with symbolic and ideological significance’ (Ursin 2011, 222). In short, ‘home is [understood as] both a material location and a symbolic site’ (England 2010, 134). It represents a range of personal, social or ideological values including emotional belonging, family, meaningfulness, etc. As a symbolic site, the home is ‘a central space for understanding […] the embodied, everyday socio-spatial relations through which subjectivities are forged’ (Hörschelmann 2017, 236). Through a focus on everyday socio-spatial relations and experiences of home, we gain insight in crucial processes of identity- and meaning-making (Forsberg and Strandell 2007, 395). Conceptualising home as an anthropological space (Pelzelmayer 2016, 3), we can trace how notions and feelings of identity, belonging, memory, connection and shared experience emerge through everyday experiences of home (Milligan 2003, 462). In this sense, home marks a central site and notion within larger negotiations of identity, privacy and locationality.

The socio-spatial relationships that make up home are, however, often imbued in relations of power. As Hörschelmann (2017, 234) puts it, ‘home as a site [is] shaped by gendered, economic, and imperialist power relations.’ Feminists have discussed how the bourgeois home signifies a restricting, work-, labour- and care-intensive space for many women, girls, and mothers (Hochschild 1989; James 1989; McDowell et al. 2005; Lutz 2008; Williams and Crooks 2008; Cox 2013). In this context, feminist geographers have pointed out the ‘gendered constructions of home as a domestic, feminized space’ (England and Lawson 2005, 78), notably through analyses of the home as a key site of social reproduction (Katz 2001). When focusing on power relation, the home has also been investigated as a ‘risky space’ for children and young people, in particular through interpersonal violence and physical, psychological and emotional abuse (McKie 2005; Katz and Barnetz 2014). Doing so gives insight into young people’s heterogeneous experiences of home, including ‘unhomely homes’ (Hörschelmann 2017, 236). In this sense, feminist efforts to include home in scientific inquiry (Blunt 2005; Cox 2006; Duyvendak 2011) have made possible a teasing out of ‘the fluidity of various public and private boundaries associated with the home’ (England 2010, 134).
Geographical research has also explored struggles of control and autonomy at home. Home can be a space in which children and young people have ‘some influence on what to do and how to use space and time’ (Forsberg and Strandell 2007, 404) and where their ‘bedroom is a safe, private space in which experimentation with possible selves can be conducted’ (Steele and Brown in Bovill and Livingstone 2001, 3). In this sense, young people’s control and autonomy over time and space in the home are linked to feelings of emotional belonging and security (Wilson, Houmøller, and Bernays 2012). At the same time, there is potential for conflict regarding personal/self, parental and societal forms of control in the home, in particular between parental control in/over the home and the home as a space for self-expression and self-realisation (Thomson and Philo 2004; Rawlins 2009; Harden et al. 2013; Pimlott-Wilson 2015). This tension is represented in a theoretical conflation of home with family (Forsberg and Strandell 2007, 395) which equates young people’s relationships and experiences of home with those of their parents.

This brief overview shows how home emerges across a set of oppositions, including public/private distinctions. These oppositions work as creative axes of contestation that produce home both as a notion and as a space. In sum, the literature discusses home as both a physical site and a relational space; a space of meaningfulness and loneliness; an everyday space and a space for experimentation; a space of self-expression and a space of parental/social control; an idealised notion and an everyday space of embodied relations and experiences; a safe space and a risky/violent space; a space of belonging and exclusion; a space of care and of work; a space of autonomy and of responsibility; and a central sphere for the negotiation of the private/public dichotomy. These axes of contestation are of particular relevance for the purpose of our study, since they address key issues in young people’s nightlives at home.

Methodology

The paper draws on 40 semi-structured interviews, which were collected as part of a wider interdisciplinary research project on young people’s nightlife practices and alcohol consumption in Switzerland (Santani et al. 2016). Drawing on ubiquitous computing, alcohol epidemiology and human geography, the project sought to provide new methodological approaches to the study of young people’s drinking behaviour and its spatial and social context (Labhart et al. 2020). A mobile phone application was developed for the study, which the participating young people downloaded onto their personal smartphones (Santani et al. 2018; Truong et al. 2019). In autumn 2014, over 200 young people between the ages of 16 and 25 collected material on what, where, when and with whom they drink during their nightlife. We then conducted 40 semi-structured interviews with a subsample in the cities of Zurich and Lausanne, which are the major hubs for nightlife activities in the German-speaking and Francophone regions of Switzerland respectively. While participants for the quantitative part were recruited following the Geographical Proportional-to-size Street-Intercept Sampling method (Labhart et al. 2017), our interview partners were sampled on the basis of their responses in the smartphone study. The sampling is representative of Swiss demographics, distributed equally between both cities, balanced in terms of gender, age and the educational spectrum. It also displays a range in drinking patterns and includes different household types (from living with parents in or around Zurich or Lausanne, to own or shared apartments in town). The interviews were 1.5 h in length on average and addressed young people’s nightlife and drinking practices and the meaning they attach to them, their perception of urban nightlife venues, and their activities in social media as part of their nightlife experience. The interviews were conducted between November 2014 and March 2015 at sites chosen by our interview partners: in coffee shops, restaurants, at participants’ homes or at university. The Lausanne and Zurich Cantonal Ethics Commissions for Research on Human Beings (protocol 145/14) approved the study protocol.

While the study focused on nightlife spaces in general, the home emerged as a central drinking space in both app material (Santani et al. 2016) and interviews. For the purpose of this paper, we
therefore analysed the study’s interview material with a particular focus on drinking and nightlife in relation to home spaces. We now present three central interview narratives about young people’s drinking and night-time activities at home: relaxed nights in with friends, limitations of nightlife at home, and blurred public/private boundaries in youth nightlife. We discuss these narratives in relation to relevant literature in order to make a valuable feminist contribution to the conceptualisation of home in the context of youth nightlife.

**Relaxed nights in with friends**

When asked where and under what circumstances they would drink alcohol, our interview partners observe that context, time and place influence their drinking behaviour. With regard to home spaces, some say they drink more at home while others said they would drink less. For example, Evelyn who has the possibility of autonomous use of their home space does not necessarily drink alcohol on a weekend night in:

Interviewer: So this means that when you spent this Saturday night at home with your partner, the two of you did not necessarily drink alcohol?

Evelyn: No. Then we made some tea or so (laughs). Because that [drinking alcohol] sort of isn’t necessary. Well, for me, alcohol is more like a treat when going out.

We see that Evelyn links drinking alcohol to going out. Another interview partner, Carol, agrees with Evelyn that drinking alcohol is not really needed on a night in, as the atmosphere is already very relaxed at home:

Carol: Because when going out it’s like that: for example, when you’re in a bar, it’s like a place for drinking [alcohol], where I can also get something small—which doesn’t have to be, really. But sometimes at home, when it’s just super relaxed and, erm, we order in some pizza, and we eat, it’s super chill and then sometimes I don’t see a reason [to drink alcohol], really.

Evelyn and Carol link alcohol to going out and describe their nightlife at home as not necessarily wild but about being able to enjoy, relax, be carefree, spend time with intimate friends and just see what happens. The pronounced relaxedness of a night spent in with friends or a partner is a key narrative in young people’s accounts, and, as we will show, it can have different meanings and implications, also in relation to alcohol consumption at home.

**Home as a space of connection and meaning, intimacy and care**

Leslie who likes music and dancing elaborates on this feeling of relaxedness at home. In order to describe how evenings in with friends look like, Leslie recounts a particular evening, ‘It was just like that: chill out at home, drink something, exchange some sound’. When asked what is special about these nights in with friends, Leslie explains:

Leslie: Yes, well, it’s a really relaxed evening, where you don’t spend that much money, either, for example, and that also fulfils me much more because I see what kind of people I have around me.

In line with Barton and Husk’s (2014, 64) study on young people and pre-drinking in the UK, our results indicate that drinking at home with friends is much more than a way to save money. Leslie enjoys staying in with friends for several reasons. Indeed, on a more pragmatic level, Leslie addresses the price of alcohol, which can be considerable in bars and clubs in Switzerland and is a noteworthy factor why many of the young interview partners preferred not to drink in clubs or bars. On a more action-oriented level, a night in allows the friendship group to enjoy ‘a very varied, multifaceted evening’ where they talk, share new music, discuss their own music, drink a few beers or a bottle of Jägermeister (type of liquor) or take a friend’s dog for a quick walk. The home is a space open for possibilities: it is where, in Leslie’s words, ‘a little bit of everything’ can happen, but always decided by the young people themselves. It shows that the home can become a space of autonomy for young
people with regard to choice of activities, company, and control over their own actions. We will return to the nexus of relaxedness and the home as a space of autonomy later. On another level, Leslie – like many young people – emphasises the people they spend their night in with. This emphasis foregrounds the social aspect of drinking alcohol (Valentine et al. 2007, 53). Valentine et al. (2007, 53) found that in Britain the majority of their interview partners did not drink alcohol alone at home, and identified family’s and friends’ homes as regular drinking venues. Spending time at home with close people signifies the home as a space of connection and meaning. Our interview partner Leslie put this very clearly above in observing that a relaxed night in with friends is ‘fulfilling’. As Leslie’s group of friends engage in activities that they enjoy doing together, an appreciation of ‘the people I have around me’ manifests in Leslie’s narrative.

The home as a space of connection and friendship at nights in is also evident in the interview with Harryo. Since there is a party room down in the basement of the family house, Harryo explains:

Harryo: … so it happened many times that afterwards, when the evening is drawing to a close or when the club closes or when we feel like going home, we often ask people if they want do an ‘after [party]’ at home.

In this quote, Harryo describes the often spontaneous decision to end the night at the family house where they would conclude an evening with the drinks that are available and friends would have the opportunity to stay the night. For Harryo this is a given because, ‘well, it’s clear that we share that because we know [each other]; after all, we are always the same group of mates.’ While Harryo confirms the importance of and closeness with the friendship group in a similar way as seen above, the crucial point here is how Harryo highlights the practices of sharing, including available drinks and the home as a place to stay overnight. In doing so, the group not only maintain friendships and use the home as a space for group bonding, they also – particular by sharing the home as a place to stay overnight – prevent someone from having to go home drunk. Therefore, the ‘home part’ of nights out includes caring for each other and each other’s safety.

For Kei, nightlife at home is also a matter of safety. Kei explains, ‘… you are more controlled at home, you know. You are at home, there is your bed close by, you can be calmed down, you know the environment’. Based on this perception that home or friends’ houses are safer spaces, Robin is more likely to drink larger amounts of alcohol at house parties:

Robin: … well, when I get drunk then it’s more likely that I am at a friends’ house, [at a] house party. And yeah that’s great fun, playing party games, like.

In contrast to peers like Carol and Evelyn who maintained that they do not feel the need to drink (more) at home, other young people like Robin drink more in home spaces because there they feel safer to drink alcohol and enjoy a carefree night in. This means that young people feel relaxed enough at home to choose whether or not, and how much, they wish to drink.

The home as a space of autonomy and self-expression at nights in

As a relaxed, enabling space for nightlife, the home can become a space of autonomy and self-expression for young people (Wilson, Houmoller, and Bernays 2012). As we have shown, interview partners with unsupervised access to home spaces appreciate the home as a space of autonomy with regard to choice of activities, company, and control over their own actions. They can decide themselves how they wish to enjoy the comfort of (their own) home (c.f. Forsberg and Strandell 2007, 404). Relaxed nights in allow for self-expression and a certain degree of decision-making power over one’s own drinking behaviour. For example, in the more relaxed atmosphere of home spaces, young people feel both free to drink or not to drink, to get drunk or just have a beer or two. Their actions and decisions depend more on mood and atmosphere rather than for example the social pressure of going out on a big night, partying and drinking in a large group. This autonomy and decision-making power are central factors of self-expression for both young people who live with
their parents and those who live on their own. Our finding that the home can be a space of autonomy for young people echoes Wilkinson (2017) who highlights that young people contribute to the atmospheres at nights in with lighting practices, i.a., and that in turn, these co-shaped atmospheres influence their drinking practices.

The young people who took part in our study attribute a particular ‘relaxedness’ to the home when they spend nights in with well-known people. From a feminist perspective, this does two things. First, the linking of relaxedness and home articulates a private understanding of the home: home is where one has autonomy, where it is more relaxed, more intimate, more controlled or controllable even. This articulation is based on a gendered understanding of the home as the pinnacle of the private sphere (England and Lawson 2005, 78). Second, on one level, this narrative of relaxed nights in suggests a clear spatial distinction between home and public drinking spaces such as clubs, bars and pubs, which in turn speaks to gendered distinctions of private (home) and public (club, night out). We will see in the next two sections how young people’s nightlives also complicate this distinction on other levels.

**Limitations of nightlife at home**

While many interview partners describe the home as a comparatively safe space for nightlife where one can express oneself freely and experiment safely with alcohol for example, other interview partners see the home as more controlled than a night out on the town. In particular this is the case for young people who do not have autonomous use of home spaces. In the interview material the limitations of the home in young people’s nightlives mainly emerged in three ways: first, in relation to parental supervision of home space; second, the home’s spatial limitations in contrast to public nightlife venues; and third, the home as a space of loneliness.

Some young people who live with their parents mentioned the restrictions of parental control, which for example manifests in that they are not allowed to or that they do not feel comfortable to drink alcohol in the family home. As Kiran states:

Kiran: I believe that it was all about going out on the town to drink and that the goal was to get drunk because at the same time, well, we couldn’t really do that at home.

Kiran formulates an understanding of nightlife and drinking as going out on the town and getting drunk because it is not possible to get drunk at home with parents around. Kiran’s group of friends go out on the town because parental supervision and control over the home space limit their possibilities to experiment with alcohol and simply enjoy relaxed nights at home.

Other young people address the home’s spatial limitations. For example, Sidney enjoys dancing with their group of friends when out at a club. When asked if it would be the same if the group were to dance at home, Sidney replies that there would simply not be enough space:

Sidney: Well, if my house were the same size as a club then it would be the same experience but like that—cramped and yes, cramped, it [my house] is a much smaller scale of course.

While Sidney speaks of literal spatial limitations, other interview partners address the limitations of the home in terms of loneliness. For example, Toni lives alone and hence likes to go out in order to get out of the house from time to time:

Toni: It’s rather that I don’t want to be at home all the time. I like to get out, I need some air, see. But I don’t want to go out alone. Because, I don’t have pets, either (laughs), so I am on my own most of the time.

Toni is quite clear that the home can also be a constricting, lonely space, in particular when living on one’s own. Thus it is nice to go out and meet a friend once in a while.

For this discussion of loneliness at home it is worth briefly returning to the notion of the home as a space of connection and meaning, intimacy and care. Toni’s example suggests that the emergence of the home as a space of meaningfulness is not a given but often relational and based on particular
interpersonal relations. Toni lives alone and is thus ‘on my own most of the time’, so they look for con-
nection and intimacy with close friends outside the home. This indicates that emotional attachment and feelings of belonging at home are highly fragile, since they tend to depend to a certain degree on people and interpersonal relationships in the home (Wilson, Houmøller, and Bernays 2012).

We see that while some young people characterise the home as a meaningful space of connection in the nightlife, others are also aware of its limitations. By referring to parental control, spatial limit-
atations and feelings of loneliness at home, they address issues which feminist literature and children’s geographies have discussed in terms of the home as an axis of contestation between parental control and self-control, the struggle for autonomy and self-determination, and the potential of ‘ unhomely homes’ (Hörschelmann 2017, 236) for children and young people. Thus, this discussion shows how the home also has possible meanings of social exclusion and loneliness. From a feminist perspective, this reference to potential limitations of the home as a space of nightlife balances equally romanticis-
ing and gendered portrayals of the home as the pinnacle of the private sphere including its associ-
ations of privacy, autonomy, meaningfulness, interpersonal connection, and emotional belonging.

‘Going out privately’: blurred public/private boundaries in youth nightlife

This section focuses on the emphasis, which young people place on intimacy and privacy in their
nightlives – both at nights in and nights out. We discuss how public/private boundaries intertwine in and are complicated by young people’s so-called practice of ‘private going out’.

Many of the young people we interviewed in our study voiced a preference for intimacy in their
nightlife. Toni for example says:

Toni: Yeah, that [living alone] leads to that I prefer to go out more privately, going for a drink with one per-
son, you know.

Toni makes an interesting point. While going out is something Toni does in order not to feel lonely
at home, it is nevertheless a ‘private’ matter: a quiet drink with a close friend. In a similar vein, our
interview participant Sidney explained to us that they only dance with and as a group of friends when
at a club. This echoes Evelyn’s assertion that, ‘Going out doesn’t serve the purpose of meeting some-
one. Just—it’s simple: you’re having a good time, you go out, you have fun.’ Thus, the goal of going out privately is clear: not to meet new people but to spend time with a person or the people one has arranged to meet. This person is a close friend, or a group of well-known people. The meeting is pre-arranged and takes place in a public night-time location such as a bar. In going out ‘privately’, young people are interested in maintaining some degree of intimacy and privacy in public nightlife settings.

The notion of going out privately is of interest on three levels here. First, it adds complexity to
bodies of literature, which discuss going out in relation to meeting new people. These discussions of nightlife and going out have to date primarily concluded that ‘drinking alcohol in public enhances the possibilities of approaching strangers – among other things because the more disciplined behaviour is left at home (in the private space) … ’ (Østergaard 2007, 132). However, the young people who participated in our study preferred to spend their nightlife with people they already knew quite well, be it on a night out or a night in. We can thus add to studies of youth nightlife that some young people prefer intimacy and privacy when going out.

Second, this brings us to the complication of public/private boundaries. The notion of going out privately adds a further dimension to how public/private boundaries intertwine in young people’s nightlife. Scholars mainly elaborate on how public/private boundaries intertwine through moral codes of drinking in youth nightlife. Moral codes of drinking in youth nightlife refer to understandings and practices of drinking, including the ways in which they emerge as gendered (Landolt 2009). For example, a woman drinking by herself in public might be considered unseemly (Holloway, Valentine, and Jayne 2009, 827–829) or young women drinking in public are judged as feminine or not feminine in relation to what they drink (Nicholls 2016). The ways in which it emerged
in our data, the notion of ‘going out privately’ complicates public/private entanglements: Young people’s preference to dance within the more private boundaries of a pre-defined group of friends at a club is not only a good example of the preference for privacy and intimacy but marks a particular ‘private’ practice of nightlife beyond gendered drinking practices. Going out privately thus sheds light on how public and private intertwine through and across activities, notions, gendered moral codes and understandings of nightlife. In articulating a privatised understanding of nightlife, the notion of ‘private going out’ complicates oppositional notions of private/public in the context of drinking alcohol (Holloway, Valentine, and Jayne 2009; Jayne, Valentine, and Gould 2012). So while in the case of ‘relaxed nights in’, private/public boundaries emerge in a rather straightforward reproduction of spatial and gendered distinctions – and are challenged in the case of ‘limitations at the night in’ –, we can observe a more complex process in the example of ‘going out privately’.

Third, in complicating the private/public distinction, the notion of ‘going out privately’ also mobilises the home as a symbolic notion in public nightlife settings. As a key site in the public/private distinction, the home here emerges as a central notion in youth nightlife. This is of significance when going back to our definition of the home as a ‘a matrix of social relationships with symbolic and ideological significance’ (Ursin 2011, emphasis added). In terms of a feminist conceptualisation of home in youth nightlife we can thus say that the home figures (a) as a concrete space for relaxed nights in, where one meets and simply enjoys a relaxed time. It is a central space in youth nightlife where activities do not necessarily need to be defined. The home is thus a space for nightlife in its own right. At the same time, (b), the home is a key symbolic notion in youth nightlife, both as a space that symbolises self-expression for young people, autonomy over actions and the use of time and space, and as voiced in the preference for intimacy and privacy on nights out (‘private going out’).

Conclusion

Based on an interdisciplinary study on young people’s nightlife activities in Switzerland, this paper discussed young people’s characterisations of home in their nightlife. Our study shows how the home emerges as a central space in young people’s nightlife. For example, the young people who had unsupervised access to home spaces described that they engage in a range of night-time activities with close friends. For them, nightlife at home is ‘relaxed’, intimate and does not necessarily need to be pre-defined. Regarding home and space, this does two things. First, our findings add to the literature that home is of significance in youth nightlife beyond pre-drinking and home parties. It is a space of nightlife in its own right. Second, the notion of the ‘relaxed’ evening at home confirms understandings of home as the quintessentially private or privatised space. With respect to spatialised notions of ‘private’ and ‘public’, our interview partners voiced a preference for what one young person called ‘a more private going out’ with well-known and pre-defined friends. In other words, meeting new people is not the goal of a night out. Young people prefer privacy and intimacy also when going out. This ‘private going out’ is a primary example of how private and public notions and spheres interweave in contemporary nightlife beyond gendered moral codes of drinking and going out. This finding opens up new insights into how space and identity are co-constitutive, and calls for further research on its implications regarding norms, performances and limitations of nightlife behaviour.

Overall, our findings suggest that the home is both a concrete space in nightlife, which hosts negotiations of autonomy, self-expression, control and meaningfulness, and an important symbolic notion in contemporary interweaving of public/private boundaries in young people’s nightlives. For a conceptualisation of home, this means that home can only be grasped in relation to context, people, the activities people engage in and the meaning they attribute to these activities. There is much potential for further conceptually driven work to explore the complex processes of signifying home in young people’s nightlives.
Notes

1. The legal drinking age for beer and wine is 16 and 18 for harder alcohol including liquors in Switzerland. It is legal to drink alcohol but punishable by law to sell and pass on beer and wine to persons below the age of 16 and liquors below the age of 18. Parents are excluded from this prohibition.

2. All translation by first author.

3. Jasmine Truong conducted the German-speaking interviews, Pauline Ndondo and Anna Katz the French-speaking interviews and the two research assistants Lucie Chambeyron and Valentine Guenin helped with the transcription of the material.
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