

# EXTENDED MOBILITY FOR THE CITY AS A COMMON

Furthering the Right to the City in  
Global Perspective

Edited by  
**Lucia Capanema-Alvares and  
Romulo Orrico**

First published 2026

ISBN: 9781032990521 (hbk)

ISBN: 9781032978758 (pbk)

ISBN: 9781003602033 (ebk)

4

## BUILDING KNOWLEDGE ABOUT EXTENDED MOBILITY

*Lucia Capanema-Alvares, Francesca Cognetti,  
and Flavia da Silva Martins*

(CC BY-NC-ND 4.0)

DOI: 10.4324/9781003602033-7

# 4

## BUILDING KNOWLEDGE ABOUT EXTENDED MOBILITY

*Lucia Capanema-Alvares, Francesca Cognetti,  
and Flavia da Silva Martins*

### **Introduction**

In this chapter, we – three middle-age “white” (in our contexts) women professors, two of them from the global South – develop a methodological approach to analyze and interpret Extended Mobility. To do so, we unpack how to operationalize the study of motility, accessibility, and porosity in different settings through a multi-scalar, mixed methods framework that is sensitive to sociospatial and historical differences. By mixing methods under a participatory-action frame we are specifically concerned and responding to the need to emancipate citizens toward the power of action (Spinoza, 2017) and of performance (Stavrvides, 2024), thus fully exercising their right to the city and instituting commoning processes in the use and management of it (see Chapter 1). As such, it is paramount that any approach to building knowledge with marginalized urban inhabitants be representative of, and meaningful to, those communities. Our approach is therefore concerned with both ethical research practice and empirical steps that can be deployed in the field in response to Santos’ space phenomenology, Soja’s spatial geography, Fraser’s identity recognition, Young’s inclusiveness, and Hardt and Negri’s ontological and social constituent processes, as we detailed in Chapter 1.

### **Inquiring with and from peripheral territories: an ontological shift through learning**

Haraway (1988) views learning and knowledge as fundamentally situated in time and space. Such “situated knowledges” privilege “partial perspectives” that are entangled within the time and lives of people, places, and things. This

assertion demands careful attention to issues of positionality that recognize the inherent power relations at play, highlights lived experiences and often-excluded voices, and observes, listens to, and works with others to understand situations together and from within. In order to produce shared knowledge through fluid encounters and connecting “situated stories” (Doucet & Frichot, 2018), we must be aware of our own subjectivity, voice, and presence, while at the same time remaining attentive to those of others. Emphasis is placed on context, local desires, partnerships, and processes as they are grounded in a feminist ethics of care that requires connectedness, commitment, respect, mutual involvement, and responsibility.

Decentralizing the vantage point of the researcher implies epistemological redistributions in the sense of knowledge production, validation, and the construction of different frames and critical literacy. This is an essential step to overcome typical interpretations that have accepted the invisibility of and scarcity in marginalized territories. It is also about decolonizing the researcher’s consciousness, abandoning eurocentrism and cultural racism (Bugliari Goggia, 2022) and understanding the challenge that the global South presents to authoritative knowledge abstracted from the provincial experiences of the global North (De Satgè & Watson, 2018). This process of knowledge construction involves a radical change in the position of researchers as protagonists of the act of knowing and their relation to their so-called “objects of study.” It is a matter of practicing ontological change by overcoming obdurate hierarchies marked by superiority and inferiority in the subject-object relationship. To counter the regular but subtle violence linked to power imbalances in academic research, we argue for the full recognition of the actors’ knowledge of their broad sociocultural and embodied differences (Cognetti et al., 2023; Foucault, 2005). By accepting social differences and valuing them in the act of enquiry, the outcome is the emergence of a potential for thought and action, in which the inhabitants are recognized as the authors of the common acts of inventing knowledge and practices (Barbosa, 2012). The observation and interpretation of everyday life become embodied in the relational actions of the “object of research,” who is first of all recognized as a subject endowed with a voice, desires, and will and who has a critical approach to practices that seldom emerge within mainstream urban discourses, either academic or popular. There are diverse forms of working, inhabiting, and consuming that make up a marginalized but lively community and are translated into local codes, rules, and social practices that must be recognized, supported, and stimulated by those practicing them. Together they shape unique meanings and reveal sociocultural affiliations that constitute their lived geographies (as we explore in Chapters 5 and 6). Moreover, inhabitants constantly intervene with everyday transformative micro-practices that change the meaning of the city through space use and solidary forms of support (Cellamare, 2019).

More than fostering the emergence of individual voices and practices, comparing points of view facilitates “learning together” because knowledge is not “restricted to the domain of specialist and expertise. [...] We need to repeatedly ask who ‘we’ [...] learn from, with, for what ends and under what conditions of power and inclusion” (McFarlane, 2018, pp. 323–324). Learning can serve as a common ground in the thresholds (Cognetti & De Carli, 2024) of collaborative processes aimed at producing mutual understanding: a collective and embodied critical urban learning, grounded in local practices and relationships, through place-based acts of “territorial implication” and “situatedness” (Lave & Wenger, 1991). Co-learning through spatial knowledge also involves building a collaborative learning community able to weave singular and situated positions. This approach fosters multivocal subjects who value diverse ways of knowing. It further brings together various disciplines, institutions, places, and identities, shifting the focus from purely technical perspectives toward a holistic, shared, and practical understanding of facts, interdependencies, and dynamics (Petrescu et al., 2022).

Building from directly experienced facts, relationships, and situations, actors may reconstruct translocal logics and interdependencies that change both their self-perception and their perception of the Other. This process can lead to a transformation in how individuals recognize subjectivities and their right to express their identities both individually and in relation to others (Barbosa & Pereira, 2018), a shift that builds the foundation for critical engagement with the city and its underlying power structures. Within the framework of Extended Mobility, this would mean actors exercising *their* right to a discourse on *their* spatial practices, gaining the visibility and recognition necessary to facilitate action and performance via the creation of a new social space.

### ***Reinforcing social and critical capital through Urban Living Labs***

Living Labs are relational fields in which trust, cooperation, and collaborative co-learning can be fostered. Functioning as a porous space where diverse actors are invited to negotiate values, roles, and understandings, Living Labs aim to strengthen and enrich the flow of spatial knowledge and social capital in fluid and incremental contexts. In particular, as Padovani (2016) suggests, a mutual learning path can be generated through the recognition of a space where different voices and interests can be negotiated and where debating can be a first step toward true communication (Padovani, 2016). Since all forms of knowledge are legitimate within the platform, they also produce new knowledge regarding the relation between the self and the Other. Yet this takes time. Building trust and collaborative interaction with citizens in Living Labs demands long-term engagements (Franz et al., 2015): co-learning processes and embodied and relational practices require time for multiple temporalities of engagement (Mason, 2021). Neither authenticity nor credibility can be assured if research is limited to the duration of a specific research project.

As Living Labs, “Observatório de Favelas” in Rio and “Off Campus San Siro” in Milan have constructed lasting urban and socially oriented platforms within their neighborhoods, with the establishment of on-site offices situating and positioning their initiatives while also fostering engagement and their recognition among local residents (Ballon et al., 2015; Cognetti, 2023; see Chapters 5 and 6). Work undertaken in and through these spaces has bolstered neighborhood residents’ capacities to live, create, and reinvent their plural existence in the city, whether in terms of knowledge and economic skills, the creation and enjoyment of their cultures, or in supporting their fight for full citizenship – even in the face of exhausting confrontations with the state arbitrariness and violence, and the armed paralegal groups (militias and drug traffickers). These Living Labs promote relational research by emphasizing the democratization of the city. They achieve this through the production and sharing of knowledge, the development of urban interventions, mobilization and training initiatives, innovative methodologies, and the articulation and implementation of political actions. These efforts aim to reposition the traditional periphery and critically qualify public debate within society as a whole.

“Observatório de Favelas” and “Off Campus San Siro” each institute forms of Lefèbvre’s (1974) “interstices” and Stavrides’ (2019) “thresholds” through their roles in mediating different social, institutional, disciplinary, territorial, and policy realms. Their hybrid and dynamic character also fulfills one of the most important characteristics of a common by constantly redefining the “we” (Dellenbaugh et al., 2015) and leaving room for newcomers. By adopting the framework of Extended Mobility, we can see urban inequalities creating interstices that call out for social recognition, representational possibilities, and opportunities to establish bonds of solidarity and caring across diverse subjects and groups. Together they foster the city as a common.

### **A dialogue among overlapping concepts**

As discussed in Chapter 1, Lucas et al.’s (2016) “sufficient accessibility” approach offers a value model in transportation studies for understanding urban mobility. This model encompasses five components: (1) individual’s needs, abilities, and opportunities; (2) land use, including the opportunities’ supply and demand; (3) the transport system itself; (4) the system’s access to available opportunities to different publics at different times of the day; and (5) individual’s ability to use the system. Seen through the lens of Extended Mobility, however, the individual (1), land use (2), and cognitive (5) components align with what Kaufmann (2014) defines and operationalizes as motility. Meanwhile, the transport (3) and temporal (4) components contextualize mobility data and are best understood as pertaining to issues of accessibility. Furthermore, accessibility must also account for specific user groups, considering factors such as geographic location, mode availability, income,

race, travel motives (Martens & Golub, 2012), and budget constraints (van der Veen, 2020).

Under Extended Mobility, porosity represents the hospitality with which places (including transportation modalities and structures) and their regular users receive other citizens and visitors, allowing encounters in space. This understanding of porosity is highly determined by the hegemonic and vertical representations of space and by the specificities of the particular habitus. These strongly impact an individual's hopes and fears as well as the attitudes of dominant groups. On the other hand, porosity also affects people and causes immediate mental and physical reactions while also triggering long-term emotions and memories that influence citizens' personal motilities.

It is essential to engage with inhabitants – especially the disenfranchised – to understand how the society-space dialectic, informed by Extended mobility, influences daily social relations, cognitions, expectations, as well as the visibility and recognition of urban dwellers. This involves observing emotions, attitudes, and tangible evidence in locations where spatial justice is contested. Social inequality emerges where low motility, limited accessibility, and reduced porosity intersect.

### ***Operationalizing motility, accessibility, and porosity***

Building on the work of Flamm and Kaufmann (2004), we propose four determinant categorical variables that shape urban mobility both in central and peripheral scenarios:

- 1 *access rights*: the right to move, to own vehicles, to have residency status, to work and stay in private or public spaces, the right to social services, health, education, and to maintain one's own culture;
- 2 *abilities and attitudes*: existing knowledge of the local language and of local transportation modalities and networks. This should include issues of linguistic, cartographic, and technological literacy;
- 3 *culture and methods currently used*: including educational level, personal experience with local transportation, social and cultural assumptions regarding different modes available (as shaped by the racialization or gendering of spaces), and other personal reasons that impact an individual's decisions to take or avoid available transportation options; and
- 4 *affect*: how attitudes, places, and artifacts influence the ways in which diverse people plan to move, and how they feel during both their journeys and at their destinations.

In operationalizing the framework of Extended Mobility, we engage these important categories as variables related to our theorization of motility, accessibility, and porosity.

### Motility

Motility refers to the factors that impact individuals' and groups' desire and capacity to move through the city. Kaufmann (2014) examines motility in relation to: (1) inhabitants' *territories of sociability*, where they build their social relations and engage in leisure activities; (2) their *territories of familiarity*, where they undertake their everyday routines and daily chores; (3) the city's *functional and morphological centralities*, where services and resources are concentrated; and (4) *market territories*, where land values are higher and there are more amenities available. We are interested in evaluating if and how city centralities and market territories overlap with the citizens' territories of sociability and familiarity. We hypothesize that, most times, the territories of working class familiarity overlap with functional and morphological centralities (and sometimes with market territories) as they attempt to seize mandatory opportunities (employment, for instance). However, their territories of sociability would likely be restricted to the immediate areas where they live and access eligible opportunities (like cultural activities).

Yet it is important to remember that motility also depends on the actors' personal desires and capacities, which depend on their habitus, their affections, and the "distribution of the sensible." This makes motility both a qualitative and quantitative factor that may be captured by the combination of: (1) qualitative assessments of individuals' and groups' abilities and willingness to move; (2) the distance-time from a certain group place of residence to territories of familiarity; (3) the distance-time from the group's place of residence to sociability territories; and (4) mapping centralities and land markets across an urban territory. Developing a robust methodology to collect and analyze these data, therefore requires eight steps:

- 1 map the areas or residence of the group(s) in question;
- 2 map the functional and morphological centralities of the city, considering key areas where there are concentrations of infrastructure, services, resources, jobs, and facilities of better quality (replicating, e.g., Manfredini and Di Rosa's, 2018, isochrones);
- 3 map market territories, identifying where the wealthier live, where housing is more expensive, and where there are attractive urban amenities, such as parks and recreation facilities. Mapping functional and morphological centralities and market territories requires field observations (to understand porosity) and interviewing (to understand the group(s)' motility);
- 4 use techniques like GPS and mobile phone mapping to trace out individual's actual journeys and their points of origin and destination at different times of the day and during different days of the week (e.g., between their places of residence and where they go most often during weekdays – indicating trips to mandatory opportunities) and where they go most often during

- weekends (indicating trips to eligible opportunities) with time records (see, e.g., Netto et al.'s, 2018, work using O-D data based on metadata and Silm, Järv, and Masso's, 2020, analysis of mobile positioning data);
- 5 conduct surveys and qualitative interviews with the group(s) to understand the reason behind and the meaning of their journeys throughout the city to contextualize them vis-à-vis access rights, capacities and attitudes, culture and methods currently used, and affection;
  - 6 map the territories of familiarity and sociability of the group(s) in question;
  - 7 overlay the territories of familiarity and sociability maps onto functional and morphologic centralities and onto market territories; and
  - 8 analyze and contextualize the superimposed maps to understand group's motility level and quality, undertaking in-depth interviews if needed.

### *Accessibility*

A number of techniques are available for researchers interested in assessing the transport (3) and the temporal (4) components of a “sufficient accessibility” (see Lucas et al., 2016). Much current research on urban mobility combines classic forms of origin-destination data collection with now ubiquitous personal mobile data to map how groups move at different times of the day (see Büscher et al., 2020; Netto et al., 2018; Prelipcean et al., 2018). Van Ham and Tammaru (2016), Xu et al. (2018), and Silm et al. (2020) have devised and used techniques that identify socioeconomic territorial divisions, as well as functionality and centrality within urban areas, which are comparable to Kaufmann's (2014) approach to territorial mapping. Other researchers have recently taken a corporeal turn (Turner, 2012) and produced geographic/time diaries (Henriksson & Berg, 2020), embodied ethnographies (Sheets-Johnstone, 2015), and rhythm-analytical accounts (see Jensen et al., 2020) to bring the individual needs, opportunities, and abilities into the picture. On the whole, these approaches provide a sound foundation to measure “sufficient accessibility” (Lucas et al., 2016). Their incorporation into the Extended Mobility frame, together with the qualitative-quantitative appraisal of motility and porosity, is a methodological choice.

However, there has been very little research on how quantitative transport data produced by local governments and other service companies (e.g., travel behavior, origin and destination surveys, traffic counts, and flowscan) can be combined with qualitative situated knowledge so that they, together, can enrich our understanding of the whole experience of urban mobility. Moreover, mobility methods remain highly Eurocentric, even when looking at under-represented majorities and global South cities. It is crucial to evaluate the differential availability of microdata across different contexts, particularly in comparative research projects. Data availability can vary significantly across countries and between cities. Therefore, which data collection methods and which variables to consider

necessitate careful analysis. This is not an unexpected challenge, considering the amount and importance given to hard data production in the global South and North, where the North is traditionally more quantitative and the South has put more emphasis on qualitative approaches (Capanema Alvares, 1999). Yet these differences do not negate the comparability of urban mobility studies, as each city can be assessed on its own terms (as demonstrated by Xu et al., 2018). Rather, they stress the value of mixed methods approaches and robust methodological triangulation.

### *Porosity*

For Secchi (2013), porosity is: (1) the proportion and distribution of open spaces qualified in environmental terms available and accessible in the city (including by public transport) to the various flows of people, activities, and events of different origins and (2) the “potential of welcoming urban territories to the projects of the actors, [...] the hospitality they encounter in space” (p. 76).

Adapting the proposal developed by Canıçali and Capanema Alvares (2017), such porosity can be observed in the field through: (1) urban planning directives (plans and legislation); (2) urban elements (e.g., the barriers in roads, paths, and areas of collective public use); (3) architectural elements (such as building units and the physical interface between public space and private realms of habitation); (4) technological elements (gatekeeping and surveilling devices in facilities and equipment); and (5) sociocultural, symbolic, and economic elements (representing power and social hierarchies and intended to, e.g., safeguard “real estate values” or differentiate between group’s sociocultural backgrounds and behaviors). These directives, elements, and artifacts can be observed and recorded through techniques such as hand sketches, photographs, notes as diaries of flows, and time-lapse photography (Moreaux, 2020). It is also possible to record percentage counts of visitors and marginalized groups as well as the reactions of individuals and groups to unfamiliar Others. Interviews and focus groups present further opportunities to understand how diverse citizens feel in urban space and understand their access rights, abilities and attitudes, culture and methods used, and affection.

### **Rhythmanalysis: seeing and listening to the Other in space-time**

Weaving together, and building upon, the above strategies, we see particular conceptual and methodological value in work utilizing the practice of rhythmanalysis, as outlined in Lefèbvre’s (1981) posthumously published work, to analyze the potentialities of Extended Mobility. *Rhythmanalysis* elevates the body to the domain of knowledge production, placing it at the center of the investigation of everyday life and situating it at the heart of the dialectical

movement of the need-desire-joy triad (Lefèbvre, 1981). Positioning rhythm-analysis in the critique of everyday life involves activating it as a form of critical praxis that deconstructs the apparent and spectacular unicity that seems to organize things in space and to define a linear and constant time. As such, rhythm-analysis embodies the exercise of transfiguring the present into diverse, complex, and coexistent presences.

According to Lefèbvre (2021, p. 68), “the visible mechanisms hide the machinery” that animates modern society. In this context, rhythm-analysis considers forms situated in their constituting time-space, critically apprehending their durability and recognizing their perishability. Thus, while urban morphologies, such as centralities and peripheries, buildings and avenues, are experienced as constants by users, spatial practices promote interactions that engender difference as an “insurrection of use” (Seabra, 1996). The experiences of mobility in cities and metropolises articulate both conformation and insurrection in everyday life, sometimes in a single day. As a corporeal and sensitive approach, the intention of rhythm-analysis is to synchronize rhythms (of the rhythm-analyst and those around him/her) and to experience them in their compatibilities and disagreements.

Rhythm consists of an interaction between space, time, and energy through which we recognize repetitions, interferences between cyclical and linear processes, and the birth, growth, apogee, and decline of forms, structures, and processes (Lefèbvre, 2021, p. 68). We can also think about rhythm as layers, from the most secret to the most public, from the least to the most eloquent or frequent. When Lefèbvre (2021) states “there is always something new and unforeseen that introduces itself into the repetitive: difference” (p. 56), he foregrounds a central contradiction that can guide us in the practice of rhythm-analysis; putting into motion and changing what appears as a given, preventing us from taking his work in a closed sense. A second of Lefèbvre’s significant insights regards the relations between *cyclical* and *linear* time, which underpin the complexity of the rhythmic arrangements that surround and include us (our body also being a rhythmical arrangement). The former come from cosmic and natural forces (such as seasons and tides) while the latter emerge from increasingly abstract and quantifiable social practices, regulations, and norms. Other oppositions develop across Lefèbvre’s treatise – such as *mechanical* and *organic*, *discovery* and *creation*, *continuous* and *discontinuous*, *quantitative* and *qualitative* – which offer fertile ground to further our understanding of urban rhythms, especially when they are brought into dialogue as oscillating relationships of force and alliance in movement.

The rhythm-analysts don’t need to move in and out of the Other; instead, they use their own body as a metronome, recognizing alignments and frictions, to apprehend a rhythmic arrangement (Lefèbvre, 2021). “Thinking” their own bodies in the face of the Other, in lived temporality and recognizing conditioning processes, provides important rhythm-analytic pathways. Gestures

and acts that seem to be natural in the Other behavior belong to the rational domain and may re-establish “the sensible” as a fundamental dimension of apprehension, because the more trained the bodies are, the more constrained they become by rounds of modernization. Consequently, more than just testifying, the rhythm analyst “modifies that which he [sic.] observes [setting] it in motion, [recognizing] its power” (Lefèbvre, 2021, p. 80). Rhythms preserve within their structure the capacity to order and to flow, for their composition encompasses metamorphosis, creation, and transformation (Paris, 2017). Our methodological challenge, as such, consists of recognizing the repetition of our daily journeys *and within these* the constant and subtle creation of difference. Repetition is vital to situate a multiplicity of rhythms in polyrhythmia – even if these rhythms are hierarchized and situated in broader ordinances – because in everyday life, *repetition engenders difference*.

Rhythm analysts promote an understanding of body-space-time arrangements through sounds. More than seeing, listening appears as a force of de-re-territorialization (Deleuze & Guattari, 2017). In “Seen from the Window,” Lefèbvre (2021) identifies sounds and discerns their differences. This act is as important as observation, transforming vague and confusing sound combinations into a recognition of the interactions’ plurality. Smells, breaths, heartbeats, speech, and speeding: all should be perceived as components of rhythms, parameters of interaction, and rhythm analytical foci. The rhythm analysts’ chosen position at the window places them inside and outside the ambience that they are trying to discern. Immersed in their research environments and, at the same time, standing outside when necessary, this ambiguous positionality is taken as a vital research dimension, not a flaw (Amaral, 2022; Messias, 2024; Moreaux, 2020). Moreover, a variety of improvised tools can be used to capture heartbeats in different environments, to record and analyze different soundscapes. These include the use of apps and photographic recording techniques like time-lapse. The possibility to record and categorize these methodological experiences can be effectively supported by drifting exercises (*dérives*) and the elaboration of influential cartographies, as well as collective diaries and the sharing of photographic and sound recordings.

New digital experiences colonize our everyday life and methodologies under what would constitute an “attention economics” (Citton *apud* Antonioli et al., 2021, p. 45). From the rhythm analytical project (Lefèbvre, 2021) to the politics of rhythm (Antonioli et al., 2021), we seek to update the recognition of constraints and saturations, reinforcing the need to appropriate our rhythms and their conjunction with Others’. More than recognizing the penetration of working time into domestic and intimate spheres, it becomes necessary to locate the disconnection experienced between the space-time we inhabit and the one in which we are supposed to be situated (Dardot & Laval, 2016). Beyond our economic exploitation, this mismatch goes deep into our bodies, into our sleep, into constant feelings of displacement and alienation.

Other dimensions also need to be incorporated into rhythmanalysis, as our rhythms are now delineated by new climatological realities which both suspend normality and completely alter our everyday lives. New rounds of modernization in global South cities find and take over “infrastructures and uses of historically produced territory” (Tozi et al., 2021). Experiences of time acceleration and the digitalization of life coexist with the entrenched constraints of long and time-consuming daily commutes, and with territorial restrictions and closures. Viewed through the framework of Extended Mobility, disconnection, displacements, and climate insecurity are all negative affections that saturate citizens, constraining both their motility and porosity while perpetual, lengthy commutes and closures limit their accessibility.

Antonoli et al.’s (2021) “manifesto,” which presents a framework of pathologies grouped around the notion of *saturation*, now seems particularly timely. Their identification of four categories according to levels of illness offers a visceral heuristic perspective to inform our methodological approach and disclose the embodied experience of those deprived of their Extended Mobility. They are: (1) *congestion*, generated structurally outside the body, but reverberating within it (e.g., traffic jams) – highly related to accessibility; (2) *asphyxia*, associated with a vital blockage due to an excess of rules (implying a loss of freedom and flexibility to use the city) – rules that hamper city porosity; (3) *numbness*, an excess of requests and interpellations that severely reduce our ability to formulate our own desires – a retrograde motility; which leads to (4) *exhaustion*, a multiplication of objectives that dissipates the feeling of being in control of our own rhythms. This conceptual framing and language powerfully resonate with the “trialectical” reality limiting Extended Mobility discussed in Chapter 1.

### Activating Extended Mobility through rhythms

Extended Mobility and rhythmanalysis are both oriented toward a politics of rhythm. They recognize and strengthen strategies of appropriation, review the modern separation between space and time, and that between society and nature. As we recognize the political dimension of festivities held in bus stations, of gatherings with those who missed the last bus home, or of free-style rap circles so closely tied to the dynamics of youth mobility, rhythmic appropriations acquire an essential political meaning. These are spaces and times of the common and of city enjoyment arising from the fabric of everyday experiences which bring together languages that have been historically separated, such as writing, poetry, dance, and music. Through rhythmanalysis and Extended Mobility, the geography of everyday life reveals itself through partnerships that transcend boundaries. It discovers realms of exploration and action in art, ethnography, and the sounds of the streets, trains, and cities. These elements serve as platforms for the exercise of agency and performance, ultimately contributing to the creation of shared, collective spaces.

To conclude on a technical note, ethnographical and more-than-phenomenological methods in general have the potential to disclose affections exchanged between people and with physical environments, especially when researchers mobilize a Lefebvrian approach to rhythmanalysis. Practically speaking, the best rhythmanalytic exercises result when the researcher: (1) actively works toward “virtual objects as projects of a synthetic reconstitution” (Lefebvre, 1996, p. 142) in order to realize it, as we do in relation to the city as a common; (2) is acquainted with, and able to move through, dominant and subdominant cultures; (3) has shared some personal history or background with the community in question, enabling co-constructions; and (4) follows Participatory Action-Research (PAR) principles (Foote Whyte, 1991), which include utilizing educational and training resources that involve citizens as active researchers and key-informants (thus increasing the trustworthiness of the research and the community’s social capital). We embraced these propositions as animating principles guiding the in-depth comparative case studies of Rio and Milan documented in Chapters 5 and 6.

### Funding statement

The open access publication of this chapter was funded by the Competence Center for AntiFragile Territories (CRAFT) of the Department of Architecture and Urban Studies (DASU) of the Politecnico di Milano as part of the “Departments of Excellence” Initiative 2023–2027 promoted by the Italian Ministry of University and Research (MUR). The Competence Centre works on the development of methodologies and design approaches that help public administrations to make the most of uncertainty, complexity, fragmentation and to build enabling conditions. This Chapter contributes to the objectives and approach of CRAFT.

### References

- Amaral, D. L. F. (2022). *A produção do espaço no bairro do Pinheirinho*. [Master’s thesis. UNIFAL].
- Antonioli, M., Drevon, G., Gwiazdzinski, L., Kaufmann, V., & Pattaroni, L. (2021). *Pour une politique de rythms*. Editions EPFL Presses. <https://doi.org/10.55430/05ADGKP42>
- Barbosa, J. L. & Pereira, I. (2018). Reinventing public spaces: politics of oneself and politics with many others. In L. Capanema Alvares, & J. L. Barbosa. (Eds.), *Urban Public Spaces: from planned policies to everyday politics (illustrated with Brazilian case studies*. Springer (pp. 43–56).
- Ballon, P., Schuurman, D., & Franz, Y. (2015). Designing social living labs in urban research. *Info*, 17(4), 53–66. DOI:10.1108/info-01-2015-0008
- Barbosa, J. L. (2012). Cidade e território: desafios da reinvenção da política do espaço público. In J. S. Silva, J. L. Barbosa, & M. V. Faustini (Eds.), *O Novo Carioca*. Mórula (pp. 69–73).

- Bugliari Goggia, A. (2022). *Rosso Banlieu: Etnografia della nuova composizione di classe nelle periferie francesi*. Ombre Corte.
- Büscher, M., Freudendal-Pedersen, M., Kesselring, S., & Kristensen, N. G. (Eds.). (2020). *Handbook of research methods and applications for mobilities*. Edward Elgar. <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781788115469>
- Caniçali, D., & Capanema Alvares, L. (2017). *Agregações e segregações na cidade em diferentes tempos socioespaciais*. International Seminar on Urban Form (Proceedings), Porto.
- Capanema Alvares, L. (1999). *A classification of non-governmental organizations according to their strategies to empower local grassroots communities*. [PhD dissertation. University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign].
- Cellamare, C. (2019). *Città fai da te: tra antagonismo e cittadinanza. Storie di autorganizzazione urbana*. Donzelli.
- Cognetti, F. (2023). Beyond a buzzword: Situated participation through socially oriented Urban Living Labs. In N. Aernouts, F. Cognetti, & E. Maranghi (Eds.), *Beyond participation: Urban Living Labs for urban regeneration in social housing estates*. Springer (pp. 19–37). <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-19748-2>
- Cognetti, F., Capanema-Alvares, L., & Barbosa, J. L. (2023). *Formar, mobilizar, intervir: o que podem as trajetórias relacionais em contextos periféricos diversos*. UrbBa[23], Salvador, BA.
- Cognetti, F., & De Carli, B. (2024). Finding common ground on the threshold: An experiment in critical urban learning. *Planning Theory*, 23(4), 400–422. <https://doi.org/10.1177/14730952231214278>
- Dardot, P., & Laval, C. (2016). *A nova razão do mundo: ensaio sobre a sociedade neoliberal*. Boitempo.
- Deleuze, G., & Guattari, F. (2017). Capitalismo e esquizofrenia. *Mil Platôs*, 2(4). Editora 34.
- Dellenbaugh, M., Kip, M., Bieniok, M., Muller, A. K., & Schwegmann, M. (Eds.). (2015). *Urban commons: Moving beyond state and market*. Birkhäuser Verlag GmbH. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783038214953>
- De Satgé, R., & Watson, V. (2018). *Urban planning in the Global South: Conflicting rationalities in contested urban space*. Springer.
- Doucet, I., & Frichot, H. (2018). Resist, reclaim, speculate: Situated perspectives on architecture and the city. *Architectural Theory Review*, 22(1), 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13264826.2018.1418127>
- Flamm, M., & Kaufmann, V. (2004). Operationalizing the concept of motility: A qualitative exploration. *Mobilities*, 1(2), 167–189. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17450100600726563>
- Foote Whyte, W. (1991). *Participatory action research*. Sage Publications.
- Foucault, M. (2005). *Em Defesa da Sociedade*. Martins Fontes.
- Franz, Y., Tausz, K., & Thiel, S. K. (2015). Contextuality and co-creation matter: A qualitative case study comparison of Living Labs concepts in urban research. *Technology Innovation Management Review*, 5(12), 48–55.
- Haraway, D. (1988). Situated knowledges: The science question in feminism and the privilege of partial perspective. *Feminist Studies*, 14(3), 575–599.
- Henriksson, M., & Berg, J. (2020). How to use time-geographic travel diaries in mobility research. In M. Büscher, M. Freudendal-Pedersen, S. Kesselring, & N. G. Kristensen (Eds.), *Handbook of research methods and applications for mobilities*. Edward Elgar, 74–83. <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781788115469.00014>

- Jensen, O., Lassen, C., Kaufmann, V., Freudendal-Pedersen, M., & Lange, I. S. G. (Orgs.). (2020). *Handbook of urban mobilities*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781351058759>
- Kaufmann, V. (2014). *Retour sur la ville: motilité et transformations urbaines*. EPFL Press.
- Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge University Press.
- Lefebvre, H. (1974). *La production de l'espace*. Éditions Anthropos.
- Lefebvre, H. (1981). *Critique de la vie quotidienne III, de la modernité au modernisme (pour une métaphilosophie du quotidien)*. L'Arche Editeur.
- Lefebvre, H. (1996). The Right to the City. In E. Kofman & E. Lebas (Eds.), *Writings on Cities*. Blackwell.
- Lefebvre, H. (2021). *Elementos de Ritmanálise e outros ensaios sobre temporalidades. Rio de Janeiro: Consequência*.
- Lucas, K., Maat, K., & van Wee, G. P. (2016). A method to evaluate equitable accessibility: Combining ethical theories and accessibility-based approaches. In *Transportation*, 43(3), 473–490. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11116-015-9585-2>
- Manfredini, F., & Di Rosa, C. (2018). Measuring spatial accessibility for elderly. An application to subway stations in Milan. *T&MA – Journal of Land Use, Mobility and Environment*, 85–94. <https://serena.sharepress.it/index.php/tema/issue/view/447/263>
- Martens, K., & Golub, A. (2012). A justice-theoretic exploration of accessibility. In K. T. Geurs, K. J. Krizek, & A. Reggiani (Eds.), *Accessibility analysis and transport planning: Challenges for Europe and North America (part of the Nectar Series on Transportation and Communications Networks Research)*. Edward Elgar (pp. 195–210). <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781781000113.00020>
- Mason, W. (2021). On staying: Extended temporalities, relationships and practices in community engaged scholarship. *Qualitative Research*, 23(3). <https://doi.org/10.1177/146879412111049318>
- McFarlane, C. (2018). Learning from the city: A politics of urban learning in planning. In M. Gunder, A. Madanipour, & V. Watson (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of planning theory*. Routledge (pp. 323–333).
- Messias, W. A. (2024). *Cidade estilhaçada: fragmentação espacial e vida cotidiana no bairro Jardim São Paulo*. [Master's thesis. FFLCH-USP]. <https://doi.org/10.11606/D.8.2024.tde-20082024-122223>
- Moreaux, M. P. (2020). *Espaço e ritmo: estudo das práticas dos artistas de rua como formas de apropriação do espaço público*. [PhD dissertation. UERJ].
- Netto, V., Meirelles, J. V., Pinheiro, M., & Lorea, H. (2018). A temporal geography of encounters. *Cybergeo: European Journal of Geography*, 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.4000/cybergeo.28985>
- Padovani L. (2016). Partecipazione come forma di apprendimento. *Sentieri Urbani*, 8(21), 39–43.
- Paris, A. A. (2017). Tempo Vibrado e dialética da duração: provocações imagéticas para a composição rítmica. *Revista Cena*, 23, 71–85 <https://doi.org/10.22456/2236-3254.75026>
- Petrescu, D., Cermeño, H., Keller, C., Moujan, C., Belfield, A., Koch, F., Goff, D., Schalk, M., & Bernhardt, F. (2022). Sharing and space-commoning knowledge through urban Living Labs across different European cities. *Urban Planning*, 7(3), 253–273. <https://doi.org/10.17645/up.v7i3.5402>

- Prelicpean, A., Susilo, Y., & Gidófalvi, G. (2018). Collecting travel diaries: Current state of the art, best practices, and future research directions. *Transportation Research Procedia*, 32, 155–166. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trpro.2018.10.029>
- Seabra, O. C. L. (1996). *Insurreição do uso. Henri Lefêbvre e o retorno à dialética*. Hucitec.
- Secchi, B. (2013). *La città dei ricchi e la città dei poveri*. Laterza.
- Sheets-Johnstone, M. (2015). *The corporeal turn: An interdisciplinary reader*. Imprint Academic, Exeter and Charlottesville. <https://doi.org/10.22329/p.v9i2.4287>
- Silm, S., Järv, O., & Masso, A. (2020). Tracing human mobilities through mobile phones. In M. Büscher, M. Freudendal-Pedersen, S. Kesselring, & N. G. Kristensen (Eds.), *Handbook of research methods and applications for mobilities*. Edward Elgar. <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781788115469.00025>
- Spinoza, B. (2017). *Ética*. Autêntica Editora.
- Stavrides, S. (2019). *Common spaces of urban emancipation*. University Press, Manchester.
- Stavrides, S. (2024). *The politics of urban potentiality: Spatial patterns of emancipatory commoning*. Bloomsbury.
- Tozi, F., Duarte, L., & Rocha, G. (2021). *Trabalho precário, espaço precário: As plataformas digitais de transporte e os circuitos da economia urbana no Brasil*. <https://revistes.ub.edu/index.php/araacne/article/view/33968>. <https://doi.org/10.1344/ara2021.252.33968>
- Turner, B. S. (Ed.). (2012). *Routledge handbook of body studies*. Routledge.
- Van der Veen, A. S. (2020). Operationalizing an indicator of sufficient accessibility – A case study for the city of Rotterdam. *Case Studies on Transport Policy*, 8, 1360–1370. [www.elsevier.com/locate/cstp](http://www.elsevier.com/locate/cstp) (<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cstp.2020.09.007>) <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cstp.2020.09.007>
- Van Ham, M., & Tammaru, T. (2016). New perspectives on ethnic segregation over time and space: A domains approach. *Urban Geography*, 37(7), 953–962. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02723638.2016.1142152>
- Xu, Y., Belyi, A., Bojic, I., & Ratti, C. (2018). Human mobility and socioeconomic status: Analysis of Singapore and Boston. *Computers, Environment and Urban Systems*, 72, 51–67. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compenvurbsys.2018.04.001>