

Introduction

This issue stems from the international conference *Metropolização, Trajetórias Residenciais e Modos de Vida: Tendências nas Metrôpoles da Europa do Sul* (Metropolization, Residential Trajectories and Ways of Life: Trends in Southern European Metropolises), which took place in May 2013 at ISCTE-IUL. This conference was the culmination of the research project Residential Trajectories and Metropolization: continuities and changes in Lisbon Metropolitan Area (LMA) ¹, carried out at Instituto Universitário de Lisboa (ISCTE-IUL), DINÂMIA'CET.

It is clear from the project's title that it was focused on the goal to articulate two subjects which are often handled separately. Thereby, its purpose was to study residential trajectories among contemporary inhabitants in LMA so as to broaden knowledge of the metropolization process in this territory. While the latter issue has been frequently approached in our country, in several works and disciplines, from geography to sociology, this is not the case of the former issue – highly regarded in international perspectives. Also uncommon is the articulated approach we set to establish. However, an exception must be mentioned, that of Lucinda Fonseca's work, whose date of publication (1990) and title (*População e território: do país à área metropolitana/ Population and Territory: from the country to the metropolitan area*) are telling of the timing of this research, centred on an evolutionary stage of LMA that was still greatly influenced by the rural exodus process.

This project, whose results are discussed in two articles integrating the issue (Sandra Marques Pereira and Ana Cristina Ferreira', on the one hand, and, on the other, Teresa Costa Pinto, Isabel Guerra and Ana Cristina Ferreira's article), is akin to another one: 'Biographies et Entourages', presented on the article by Catherine Bonvalet, Arnaud Bringé and Christophe Imbert, researchers at the Institut National d'Études Démographiques (INED) and consultants to the Portuguese project. Both projects proposed a mixed methodology, bringing together quantitative and qualitative approaches².

¹ PTDC/CS-SOC/102032/2008

² Constituted by: i) a survey, whose questionnaire and data analysis followed a longitudinal approach – the French survey was applied in Île de France (N=2830), from 2000-2001, focusing on 'baby-boomers', born between 1930-50; the Portuguese survey was applied in LMA (N=1500), in the second semester of 2011, portraying the population born between 1945 and 1975, sectioned into three cohorts (1945-1954; 1955-1964; 1965-1975); ii) In-depth interviews to shed further light on survey results, around 100 in the French case and 70 in the Portuguese one.

The articles by Pereira and Ferreira, on the one hand, and Bonvalet, Bringé and Imbert, on the other hand, present a typology of respondents' residential trajectories that show substantive differences between metropolitan dynamics in Lisbon and Paris, whether we speak of intensity, diversity or complexity.

These differences result from multiple factors, among which only three will be highlighted: i) the metropolises' totally diverse spatial shape – while Greater Paris (île de France) is a continuous radiocentric territory, where the city is at the centre, LMA is divided by the Tagus river, with the city on the north shore, causing a much more intensive growth in its immediate surroundings (Northern LMA); ii) dimension and international status are quite different: (great) Paris is a 'global city', with around 11 million inhabitants, while Lisbon Metropolitan Area is incomparably smaller and less relevant by international standards, with around 2.8 million inhabitants; iii) finally, regional planning policies and the balance of power between actors involved in the construction of the metropolitan space (State, private developers, etc.) – it seems clear that there was a much earlier and systematic approach in Paris (e.g.: the case of the New Towns), as opposed to the first LMA plan, which wasn't approved before the beginning of the 21st Century.

Both articles depart from a similar analysis, centred on the classification of residential trajectories based on location, one of three key-variables in the residential behaviour of individuals, along with the tenure status and housing model (single versus multi-family housing). Later on, however, these articles follow different paths: in Paris, authors take on an analysis of the social recomposition of metropolitan territories, scrutinizing the growing social polarization; in Lisbon, authors further develop two of the most relevant trajectories in the constitution of this area – 'province', directly referring to the rural exodus process particularly noteworthy until the 1970s, and 'centrifugal', the sort of path that is closely linked to suburbanization.

The article by Marco Bottai and Frederico Bennassi has a wider territorial scope, departing from a trial of the several methodological pathways enabling the study of mobility (not only residential mobility but commuting patterns), shows us above all a very unique reality: an Italy with a more balanced urban system in demographic terms, compared to France, Spain or Portugal, in spite of its greater social polarization – this is shown by a strong contrast between the industrialized North (especially the North-western region), wealthier and more receptive to migratory paths, and the economically fragile South. This singularity has meant that dominant migratory pathways, especially those underlying the Italian urbanization process, have been characterized by a South-North/Centre trajectory, rather than a strictly rural exodus rationale.

Alike the article by Pinto, Guerra and Ferreira, Bottai and Bennassi analyse the motivations and variables sustaining the diversity of residential trajectories. In both cases, the focus is on the need to understand the low levels of residential mobility featured in these two settings: this phenomenon has a considerable magnitude in Italy marked by a singular trait, absent from other Southern European countries – the high proportion of newly-established families that occupy dwellings in the same building where their mother, or their parents, already live.

The weight of family networks, and in the case of Pinto, Guerra and Ferreira, also the weight of social class, are variables under analysis. In this sense, the latter work aims to explore the following dimensions: the intensity of residential mobility of households in the Lisbon Metropolitan Area and the profiles associated with more and less mobility; the typology of trajectories in relation to tenure status as well as an analysis of the profiles associated with each type of trajectory and the different reasons for moving house during the residential trajectory. The article emphasizes the limited residential mobility due to the historical dynamics of the housing market in Portugal and the social and cultural options of the families who tend to favour home ownership.

Finally, Isabel Pujadas, Cristina Lopez Villanueva and Jordi Bayona-i-Carrasco target another subject, one that was touched upon but never singled out in the other articles: the crisis' impact in residential mobility, in this case in Barcelona. Unlike Portugal, where real estate slowdown began in 2003 and the crisis' impacts were heightened with the *Programa de Assistência Económica e Financeira* (Bailout Programme) of 2011, in Spain, this resulted in a more clear fashion from the so-called housing bubble' which burst in 2008. Two fundamental discussions result from this article, ones that are still open to many possibilities, nonetheless: i) decreasing mobility that obscures the increase of emigration, undetectable in resident population surveys; ii) and decrease of homeownership compared to tenancy, brought about by credit crunch, paradoxically showing signs of recovery in Portugal, however lightly.

Isabel Guerra

Sandra Marques Pereira