Children's Urban Geographies and Child-Centered Approach: Review and Reflections

Jin-Kyu Jung*

아동의 도시 지리학과 아동 중심 접근: 고찰 및 성찰

정진규*

Abstract : Children's Urban Geographies is a relatively young field in the discipline of geography that has had a particular attention on children, and how their experiences and opportunities of urban space are spatially and socially constructed. This paper is intended to review the importance of the theory and practice of children's urban geographies, and to highlight a child-centered philosophy and its embodied practice. The child-centered approach recognizes children as knowledgeable and responsible 'agents' who can freely construct their own understandings of their everyday space in which they live, play, and learn. It transforms our conceptualization of children by illuminating the need to research 'with' rather than 'on' children. This paper is especially drawn from the reflections on my earlier encounters with this new scholarship in geography and 3 years working experience with participating children who lived in a multi-cultural Hispanic Lower-Westside neighborhood in Buffalo, New York. I first examine the evolution of children's urban geographies, with a particular emphasis on three key themes: the geography of children, the social construction of children and childhood, and children's agency. Then, I, cautiously but optimistically, prospect its far-reaching implications on planning and policy. Child-centered approach provides a new perspective to explore the evolving process of children's situated and grounded experiential and interpretive spatial knowledge production.

Key Words : Children's urban geographies, Child-centered approach, Experiential knowledge, Everyday space, Representation of space

요약 : 아동의 도시 지리학은 지리학 분야에서 상대적으로 최근의 연구 주제로서, 특히 아동과, 그들의 도시 공간에 대한 경험과 기회들이 어떻게 공간적 또는 사회적 영향을 받는지에 주목한다. 본 연구는 아동의 도시 지리학의 이론과 실천의 중요성을 고찰하고, 아동 중심의 이념과 구현을 강조하는데 목적을 두고 있다. 아동 중심 접근은 아동을 지성과 책임감을 가진 '주체'로 인식함으로써, 그들이 생활하고, 놀이하고, 학습하는 일상 공간에 대한 이해를 자유롭게 구성할 수 있음을 인식한다. 이는 아동을 단순한 연구 대상이라기 보다는 그들과 함께 연구를 해야하는 필요성을 조명함으로서 아동에 대한 인식을 전환한다. 특히, 이 논문은 아동의 도시 지리학에 대한 성찰과 함께, 뉴욕주 버펄로시 남서부에 위치한 다문화 히스페닉 지역에 거주하는 있는 아동과 함께했던 3년 동안의 경험을 바탕으로 한다. 먼저, 아동의 도시 지리학의 발전과정을 아동 지리학, 아동과 유년시절에 대한 사회 구조, 그리고 아동의 주체성을 중심으로 검토한 후, 조심스럽지만 낙관적 관점에서, 도시 계획과 정책에 미치는 영향에 관해서도 전망하고자 한다. 아동 중심 접근은 아동이 위치해있는 상황에 기반을 둔 경험과 해석을 바탕으로 그들의 계속 변화하는 공간 지식 형성 과정을 알아볼 수 있는 새로운 관점을 제시한다.

주요어 : 아동의 도시 지리학, 아동 중심 접근, 경험적 지식, 일상생활 공간, 공간 표현

*워싱턴대학교 바셀캠퍼스 인터디서프리너리 문리대 조교수(Assistant Professor, Interdisciplinary Arts & Sciences, University of Washington-Bothell, jkjung5@uw.edu)

I. Introduction

The 4th International Conference on the Geographies of Children, Youth and Families will be held at San Diego, California State, in January 2015[1]. This meeting will epitomize a reflective understanding of how the disciplinary approach of Geography has been engaging with children and young people, with a particular emphasis on their perception of urban space and their engagement with it. Urban geographers have long studied complex intersections of life in the urban arena, and the urban space has been a context for competing intellectual claims and traditions that at times converge on consensus but more often than not garner dissent (Aitken *et al.*, 2003; Kaplan *et al.*, 2009; Levy, 2012). The discipline of geography, in the form of attention to the meaning of landscape, place, and space to society in general, has taken center-stage in many other areas such as philosophies, histories, and recently humanities and arts (Bodenhamer *et al.*, 2010; Burdick *et al.*, 2012; Dear *et al.*, 2011; Hulme, 2013; Sui, 2010). However, the research trends in urban geography have paid little attention on children, and how they interact in different geographic locations, scale, and context. In this regard, the children's urban geographies are relatively young field in the discipline of geography that focuses on how children's experiences and opportunities are socially and spatially situated and constructed (Aitken, 1994). It covers a range of themes about children's sense of space, their concepts of cities, and their geographies and the politics of identity in cities, and examines the reproduction of culture and social life through children (Christenson and O'Brien, 2003; Skelton, 2013; Skelton and Valentine, 1998). It also starts to advocate and place 'children's right at the center of academic as well as political activity, and transforms our understanding of children by recognizing the need to work 'with' rather than 'on' children (James *et al.*, 1998).

My earlier encounters with this new perspective in geography was rooted in a multi-year research collaboration called the Children's Urban Geography Project (ChUG)[2] that I participated as a student, research assistant, and a researcher from Summer 2003 to Fall 2006. The project provided a special opportunity for me to conduct a research, and to have a hands-on community work experience with children. I gained greater understanding of how children themselves are important social actors in the construction of social landscapes, and could directly access into the lives of children in general. At that time, I developed my own research agenda, and the primary goal of the research was (quite broadly) studying various and diverse meanings of community held by children. I was particularly interested in developing a GIS-based methodological platform[3] for integrating various (often qualitative) forms of children's experiential and interpretive knowledge of space, and how it allows and also affects ways children perceive and ascribe the meanings to community through the research process. The notion that caught up my attention was 'community,' and I believe there is a relevance of this concept to the children's urban geographies that I hope to reflect in this paper.

Community is quite an ambiguous concept, and no consensus or no unqualified definitions are made. What particularly makes urban geographers interested in this concept is that it often implies both geographical and socio-psychological aspects of urban environment. The notion of community as a subject of study have been received a great attention across various disciplines including geography. The conceptualization of community has mainly focused social interaction and social formation, the association with a spatial dimension, and the community as a symbolic and even as an imagined entity. These analytic frameworks also stress the following specific themes: communities as entities based on social interaction, territoriality, proximity and propinquity, locality, consciousness of kind, people, socialization, and shared values and institutions (Anderson, 1991; Bell and Newby, 1978; Bunge, 1977; Cohen, 1985; Keller, 2003; Martin, 2003; Nisbet, 1970; Putnam, 2000; Young, 1990). Among the multitude of definition, I particularly aimed to discuss the specific way in which children perceive and construct

the meanings of community in response to specific socio-spatial environments they experience in their every-day lives. Even though there has been increasing number of researchers who devoted their attention to understanding how community, often referring to neighborhood, has an impact on people's lives, I found relatively fewer studies that have focused on 'children' in particular, how they conceptualize or give meanings to community, and how they may re-define and re-shape their un-derstandings of community as active agents (Amit, 2002; Kraftl *et al.*, 2012; Morrow, 2003). In this sense, the main questions about community have been shifted on the *process* of defining children's community rather than defining 'what community is.' In other words, I learned that the question of 'what *makes* children's community' is more important and useful than 'what *is* children's community.' By witnessing emerging innovative inter-disciplinary projects and global participants representing more than 30 countries at upcoming conference on the geographies of children and youth, I attempt to review and reflect how the children's urban geographies have been moving forward as 'a place for children in geography' (James, 1989: 278), especially in urban and cultural geography. I re-visit my earlier work with children in Buffalo, New York, with a particular attention not only to the *re-presentation* of children's every day space, but also to their *representational* space and the spatial meaning-making process with children.

This paper is intended to shed a light on the value of the children's urban geographies, and it highlights the child-centered philosophy and its embodied approach. In the following section, I first examine the evolution of 'children's urban geographies' distinguished from 'the geography of children' tradition, and how various agendas are set for defining this new field. I primarily focus on three key themes: the geography of children, the social construction of children and childhood, and the emergence of children's agency. Then, in section three, I discuss about the child-centered philosophy and approach that I believe the heart of children's urban geographies scholarship. As we will see more in details, the child-

centered approach allows us to see and recognize children as knowledgeable 'social actors' in their own rights who have interesting insights for research practice (Brannen and O'Brien 1996). I point out the intertwined relationship between the creation of child-centered research envi-ronment and research methods to maximize children's freedom and involvement in research process. I also take a careful consideration on the innovative research methods drawn from the child-oriented philosophy. The section four will introduce several examples from the work with children in Buffalo, NY. The emphasis is upon the practice of child-centered philosophy and the agency of children who can experience, perceive, and represent the diverse, often complex and fluid, meanings of their everyday space in creative ways. Lastly, in concluding section, Lefebvre's (1991) theory of the pro-duction of space is discussed as a useful conceptual framework for analyzing and theorizing the social, cultural, and political significance of children's grounded experiential and interpretive knowledge and their own imagination and representation of space. Then, I prospect the future of children's urban geographies scholarship, and its far-reaching implications on planning and policy.

II. Theorizing Children's (Urban) Geographies from the Geography of Children

Urban geographers have continuously paid attention to such aspects of difference as race, gender, ethnicity, sexuality, and segregation, and have unfolded these hegemonic values that underpin these differences (Aitken *et al.*, 2003; Amin and Thrift, 2002; Jacobs, 1993; Valentine, 2008). The study of difference in urban space has often taken form as representations of difference and the role of geography in creating differences (Harvey 1989; Knox and Pinch, 2000). This clearly shows the linkages between the political-economic structure and the formation of social identities in people's everyday lives and spaces, where different social groups occupy unequal position

of power and autonomy (Matthews and Limb, 1999; Myers *et al.*, 2003). However, the study of children as subject of research has been surprisingly underrepresented (James, 1989; Sibley, 1991; Winchester, 1991). According to James (1989: 278), children in geography "have been hidden from geography for too long." Sibley (1991) also supports James's (1989) argument, and suggests that geographers may adopt and learn from other disciplines of social research. However, efforts are also made to make children visible in geography.

1. The Geography of children

Many of the earlier works on 'the geography of children' were located at the borders between geography and environmental psychology and planning (Matthews and Limb, 1999). Much attention has been given to children's environmental and spatial cognition. It itself has been a revolutionary development within the context that relatively fewer studies have even given focused on children and their perception and conceptualization of urban space. The original projects of asking these spatial ability and spatial cognition of children were traced back in the early 1970s. It was an important epoch in the development of geographies of children. Bunge's (1973a; 1973b) research in Detroit as well as Toronto revealed how children are oppressed by the built-environment. Bunge (1973a) critically reviews the history of geography, and argues that there has been a distinctive division within geography, especially between human and physical geography. The inclusion of children in the Detroit Geographic Expedition is a particular interest. He mentioned the 'children watching' (similar to 'bird watching') and it was one aspect of the Expedition where the micro-mapping of children in the preliminary work that could reveal the dangers that children might have to often face on crowded downtown streets in Detroit (Bunge, 1973b: 336).

Bunge's (1977) continuous 'geographic expedition' projects, Blaut and Stea's (1971) 'place perception,' and Lynch's (1960) 'the Image of City' and his following work of 'the spatial world of the child' (Lynch, 1979) are all good examples of the work on the geography of children. These works pay particular attentions on children as the subject of research, and carefully examined the spatial world of the child by asking and documenting their experiences and memories of space. We can observe several recurring themes from these projects, such as the spatial cognition as the basis for action (e.g. good place to play), children's different use of 'unprogrammed spaces' (e.g. children's use of streets as playgrounds) (Lynch, 1979: 104), a sense of journeying and the idea of control over their own space.

However, as Matthews (2011) points out, there is a limitation because it mainly focuses on the spatial cognition of children based on environmental psychology tradition. As a result, it often undermines the fact that social, cultural, environmental and spatial cognitive aspects of space are intricately related each other. In addition, the concept of 'children,' 'childhood,' and furthermore, the filed of geography of children, were not fully 'theorized' yet in this period. Realizing the importance of theorizing various aspects of children and children's perspectives on space became a turning point that made the geography of children be transitioned away from its environmental and developmental psychology roots, and stepped forward toward a more theorized social, cultural and urban geography of children. It is the shift, what Hart (1979) called, 'children's geographies' different from 'the geography of children.' The new perspective particularly acknowledges the social and cultural construction of children and childhood, the processes of socio-spatial marginalization of children, and the boundary politics with adults. It also links with the children's rights and participation in a research process as follows.

2. The Social construction of childhood

The social construction of 'childhood' (and 'youth' more broadly) tells how childhood, as distinct from biological immaturity, is neither a natural nor universal feature of human groups (Kraftl *et al.*, 2012). In this

sense, children and childhood appears as a specific structural, social and cultural component of many societies (James, 1989; James and Prout, 1990; James *et al.*, 1998).

There is a contrasting image of the children. Children are either depicted as innocents, at risk from a corrupting society, or as monsters, capable of undermining the moral fabric of places. Rousseau's (1962) idealistic assumptions and enlightened concern focuses on the idea that everything from God is good but degenerates once it gets into the hands of man. On the other hand, Jenks (1996) see children as unruly and unsocialized. It is what Valentine (1996: 63) conceptualizes as 'angels' and 'devils,' and has a topical relevance for the geography of children. She argues that contemporary parents perceive their own children to be innocent and vulnerable ('angels') whilst simultaneously representing other people's children as out of control in public space and a threat to the moral order of society ('devils') (Valentine 1996: 581-582). In particular, James and Prout (1990) take issues with the social conceptualization of childhood. They argue that childhood is subject to different interpretative frames between and within cultures (and societies), and it can 'never' be independent of other social dimensions such as class, ethnicity, and gender. It is a critique to the assumption that 'childhood' is universally experienced and understood.

In particular, Caputo (1995) draws attentions on the 'now' of childhood. It provides an important perspective in theorizing children's geographies. Caputo argues that we often portray children as incomplete, and therefore, promulgate a view that children are mostly *passive* in creating their futures, that their lives only gain meanings through adult's values, and they are viewed as only 'partially cultural'(Caputo, 1995: 29). We tend to think children are not intelligent enough to make their own words, and as a result, often believe that we have to and can accurately speak 'for' children with our (not children's) understandings and words. Because we may often treat children as little more than 'adults in waiting' or 'becoming adults', we hardly realize children's own

formulations of diverse and intrinsic value and perspectives, which are not often visible to adults. More importantly, Caputo's emphasis on the 'now' of childhood makes the attention back on the 'present' lives and perspectives of children before the 'future' of children.

3. Children's affordance of space

Children have a very sense of their everyday space, which is often in sharp contrast to that designed and shared by adults. A number of studies have examined children's own experience and use of space, how these afford different opportunities for them (Aitken, 2001a; Cosco and Moore, 2002; Hart, 1979; Kruger and Chawla, 2002; Percy-Smith, 2002; Ward, 1978). These studies reveal that the spatial configuration are not necessarily forcefully deterministic; however, children's engagement and encounters with space are intricately bound up with their own imagination and abilities for the use of space: the affordance of space for children. In addition, children's perception was often ignored in the discussion of spatial as well as social environments, such as neighborhood condition, streets, race, class, gender, or ethnicity, that are intermingled with what influence upon people's conceptualization of urban space. In relation to the social and cultural construction of childhood, it is important to acknowledge that children's perception and conceptualization of space is also defined as the social, cultural and physical arena in which their daily lives take place (Christensen and Levinson, 2003).

However, we also need to acknowledge that the socio-spatial relationships of children, their reliance on adult caregivers, and the unequal power relationships often circumscribe children's lives. Children's daily lives are influenced by their urban form (e.g. residential segregation), and the implications of their fragmented and excluded parts of the city into their home, school, and neighborhoods, and the combined impacts of these forces and patterns on social reproduction of space have been often examined (Matthews *et al.*, 1999; Winchester, 1991). The boundaries we establish with children appear

to depend not only on their age, gender, and competence, but also on the social and physical dimensions of the space based on adults' perception of those spaces (Hart, 1979; Valentine, 1997). Also, the transformation of public space into private space and the closing off of those spaces into the children and young people has structurally marginalized them (White, 1993). Many public and private places are often designed to reflect only on adults' values and usages. For instance, the visions of environmental planners and architects commonly present the dominant perceptions of a society, such that groups already at the edge become further marginalized by policy-making (Matthews, 1995). The conventional planning strategies usually respond towards building space for children, such as a playground; however, it often results in creating a sterile setting for children's activities (Hart, 1997). This might be due to the planners' misunderstanding of children's preferences, or, maybe, due to the neglect of children's own perspective on space. Spaces, including spaces for children, may be designed or built *for* children (from the adults', including, planners', perspectives), but not necessarily *with* them (Dargen and Zitlin, 1990; Gagen, 2000; Punch, 2000). In this case, the voices of children are silent on the space, and children's rich, diverse and multi-faceted views and experiences of their everyday life are not imprinted on space. Planning and building spaces for children without recourse to the views of children may alienate children from their spaces, and it may limit or even deny children's affordance of space that they can explore, learn, play, and engage with it otherwise. Child-centered philosophy and approach helps us to learn about children's views, to hear their own voices, and eventually to empower them throughout the research process. I believe child-center approach is a kernel of the theory as well as practice of children's urban geographies, and it is what I about to discuss now.

III. Child- centered approach

Child-centered ideology and its embodied approach

are designed to give greater power to children to produce their knowledge and express their ideas as 'agent' and full 'participants' in the research process (Brannen and O' Brien, 1996; Chawla, 2002; Chawla and Malone, 2003; Cope, 2008; Holloway and Valentine, 2000; Qvortrup *et al.*, 1994; Skelton and Valentine, 1998; Thorne, 1993). It helps us learn about children's perspective from their point of views, to work with them, and to hear from their own words and voices. The foundation of child-centered approach is an idea as well as a belief that children can provide a new vantage point to study social relations of production and reproduction. The blurring line between play and work (space) is one example (Katz, 2004). One of the biggest problems we have is that we do not often consider and accept children as 'agents' who can fully express and construct their own worlds with their own will and ways. When we study children, we often assume that our view of the world will be similar to theirs, although we may believe that we are more knowledgeable and sophisticated than they are (Fine and Sandstorm, 1988). We may agree with the child-centered ideology, but including it in the research process is another question.

Let's imagine someone ask us about our own childhood experience of home, neighborhood, and community that we all have experienced to live. All of us can think back to our childhood and answer this question because we all had a childhood. However, this also shows the central irony of 'doing' work with children because we often forget that each child's life experience and thought is unique and different. Our own experience of childhood may give a mere starting point how we can begin asking the meanings associated with everyday space to children. Therefore, it can be both an opportunity and a danger that causes the crisis of representation (Aitken and Herman, 1997). We need to realize that, in reality, it is almost impossible to represent children without their own inputs. We had our own childhood; however, we may not be able to recapture even our own childhood experience because we are already used to living as adults. Tuan (1977) explains this by indicating that the

adult's schemata are different from those of children because adults are geared primarily toward life's practical demands.

What we need, therefore, is an effort to 'deconstruct' our belief that we can understand and represent children. We also need to deconstruct another preconception of children that they are only passively receiving and accepting adults' institutional, and often, instructional knowledge of urban space. Central to this perspective is, again, the recognition of children and their competence, that children are responsible social actors in their own rights who can adept and manage their own space and time (Alanen, 1990; Qvorturp, 1994). They are "agents of their own life." (Alanen, 1990: 20). Child-centered approach is a direct critique to the assumption that 'childhood' is universally experienced and understood. It also foregrounds children's as well as young people's own experiences, concerns, perspectives, practices, and feelings of their everyday spaces, and values children as agents and experts in those contexts. It is basically an approach to recognize children's own agency, and explore the process of their situated and grounded experiential and interpretive spatial knowledge production.

Creating child-centered research is also intricately related to the research methods, which are designed to maximize children's freedom and involvement in research. Many child-centered research projects embrace innovative research methods to encourage children's participation in a research process (Aitken, 2014; Driskell, 2002; Fine and Sandstrom, 1988; Hart, 1997). Considering better mediums to reflect on children's ideas is crucial, which is an effective way to re-direct our research to be more child-centered. Driskell (2002) shows a good example of redirecting his project to child-led action research. Many new methods have been applied to encourage children's involvement, such as a child-directing mapping, photographing and designing. Various new methods, such as visual techniques like photographs and videos, dances, games, participatory mapping, counter mapping and arts and crafts, are all emerging and attentative efforts for making a more child-oriented research

process that are not restricted only to children's limited verbal and writing skills (Alim, 2007; Cope, 2009; Elwood and Mitchell, 2013; Hart, 1997; Mitchell and Elwood, 2013; Ross, 2007; Tinkler, 2013). There is also a growing interest in the integration of new technology, particularly on the value of Geographic Information Systems (GIS) and geographic web in capturing, sharing and representing information about children's community and neighborhood (Islam, 2012; Loebach and Gilliland, 2010; Lundine and Poggiali, 2012). Providing a better workspace to capture and represent children's perspective is a powerful way to re-position our research to be more child-oriented. However, regardless of methods we apply though, we need to keep in mind that the most important component in a child-centered approach is to be 'with' children until we build a good rapport. It requires playing and 'doing' things together with children not just observing and treating them as research subjects. Spending more time with children is the indispensable way to reduce the gaps between researchers and children, and to 'enter children's world'. The child-centered ideology and approach guides us to dismantle the 'authoritative' role we all might have occupied as an adult throughout the research process.

IV. Spatial meaning- making with children

1. Practicing child-centered philosophy

During my participation in the Children's Urban Geography Project (ChUG) between 2003 and 2006, I have worked with children who were of ages 6-13, and most of them lived in the Lower-Westside neighborhood in Buffalo, NY. This area is relatively poor, but quite viable community. The conditions of life in Buffalo and its clear evidence of decline may be familiar to many other Rust Belt cities (e.g. Detroit, Cleveland) in the U.S. in the latter 20th Century. Contemporary Buffalo has been marked by the loss of industry, jobs, and

populations that remain, and it is often considered as one of the most segregated city in the U.S. (Goldman, 1990). For instance, Buffalo's population has been in decline since the 1950s. In 2010, Buffalo's population was 261,310, a 10.71% decline from the year 2000, and its unemployment rate hit a new high of 12.1%, in July of 2012 (U.S. Census Bureau, 2010). The racial and ethnic composition clearly differs dramatically in different areas. The emerging multi-cultural Hispanic Lower-Westside where most participating children live is quite distinctively contrasting to the Eastside counterpart where predominantly African-Americans reside. What I will discuss in the following is my own response to the emerging discussion of children's urban geographies, and some snapshots of my three years of working experience with children and a process of building a child-centered rapport that has grounded in my research.

Methodologically, following child-led philosophy, the study primarily depended on qualitative research methods such as participant observation and informal conversation over children's drawings and writing about their everyday space. I spent a lot of time to familiarizing myself with children in the club[4] and their environments with playing, helping homework, and most of time, just being their places[5]. That was the first step moving towards children's space hoping that I would be accepted. Various forms of techniques/methodologies and efforts are made in order to engage with children. I played up with multiple forms of engagement that children could play around with and express their ideas. For example, in order to build rapport, I often did exactly same things kids at the club often did: playing games and sports, cleaning, serving, and even cooking for the meals. The conversations over the familiar subjects for children (e.g. hip-hop artists and songs, Buffalo Bills) helped an initial interaction, and I often wore non-professional-looking clothes that are more familiar to children's favor (e.g. baggy jeans). These were my efforts to let them know that I am an adult; however, I am not an 'authoritative' adult. Also, I respected their ideas and different ways of expressing their opinions (e.g. casual talking, writing,

drawing sketches and painting, role playing, video or audio recording etc.). In this child-led 'participatory' environment, children could decide what they wanted to do, and I tried not to give them any pressure to participate or continue on project. At the same time, I conducted a qualitative research, and collected data by mostly writing participant observation notes and by taking photos of children after asking their permission. Even though I wrote a field note[6] whenever I visited club, I was very cautious not trying too much to record children's work, but just be part of the project with them as co-participants.

After I felt that I had built a good relationship and rapport with them, I started to ask questions about their everyday urban spaces such as home, club, school, and mainly their neighborhoods and communities. Although these were all abstract questions, my intention was not to discuss the specifics of each concept until they first expressed their opinions. For example, in our conversation about the meanings of community, the focus was on the process of defining community rather than trying to have an ultimate one definition. In other words, what constitutes community was a more important question than what is community, and the response should be initiated from the children, not that I made children answer my question. It was not an easy process because it was almost like asking questions about 'community,' without specifically using the notion of 'community.' Discussions about children's initial ideas of community should be also recursive conversation. There was no leading question, and we sometimes switched our role, so they can ask me a question. I was also very careful not to heavily rely on children's verbal, writing, even artistic skills, as well as, geographical abilities. I made efforts to look at their insights of their community and neighborhood, and to let them express and show their experiential knowledge of urban spaces.

2. Children's experiential and interpretive knowledge of their everyday space

I learned that children's urban spaces are much

structured, and often constrained, by adults' control in terms of time and space, even though children do not seem to recognize it in the beginning. At the club, one day I asked Emile[7] who had a little bit of a serious face, "How often do you come to this place?" She answered without any hesitation, "Humm···Almost every day because I am supposed to." As Aitken (1994) argued, I clearly saw that the built environment around children often determined their lives, which was designed by adults for the most part. It was not also difficult to assume that the way children's think about their urban environment would be closely affected by the spatial configurations which were also designed by adults. Most of time, these predefined settings (e.g. club spaces children are allowed to go vs. not allowed) often constrained their activities. On the contrary, I also saw how they made their own spaces by transgressing the bounded space set up for them. Children have few flexibility in terms of the given urban spaces and time; however, they also seem to find some opportunities within their limited space and time configuration, and they often capitalize on them to make the best for them. According to Jones (2000), also similar to Aitken's (2001a) consideration of space as a container for children's play, children seek for the opportunities to operate their own spatialization rather than remain utterly confined within the pattern of adults' geography. I sometimes observed children were playing at what they call 'adults' space' at the club (e.g. staff's rooms). This was the space they were not supposed to go; however, they often transgressed and crossed the line any way. Children frequently adept and transform space for their own use as well. Ruddick (1998) shows a few extreme cases that children and young people, especially, homeless youth, create space as a way of resisting towards existing fixed modern adult space. Not only the usage of space as a medium of showing resistance, but it also points out that children are political and they are very creative in terms of ways of using and transforming their confined space. Children can live actively in urban space by negotiating with the limited spaces given to them, and eventually by creating

new (children's) space.

Children also see their everyday space from a unique, and often different, vantage point. They seem to have special eyes. One might have an experience to see the classroom standing on top of the desk or sitting on the ground at school. Interestingly enough, the world does not look same from those different perspectives. We may argue that children physically have lower points of view compared to adults in general, so they may observe their physical environment differently. However, there might be another reason besides a difference in the physical point of view. For example, it is not uncommon to meet children who (firmly) believe they can communicate with natural environment like tress and flowers. Often time, I was struck by children's unexpected creativity and different ways of thinking and understanding their environment. One day, I talked with Jonathan who lived at Fillmore-LeRoy neighborhood in the East Side of Buffalo. I was aware of that particular neighborhood because it was closely located to the South Campus of the University at Buffalo that I often visited. However, another (real) reason was the neighborhood's notorious reputation as "The Shooting Capitol of Buffalo." Jonathan told me that his neighborhood is "the brightest and the best place to play." I nodded in front of him; however, I could not erase the negative image of that neighborhood from my mind that I had kept for a long time, such as poor, deteriorated, vancant, and blighted places. My preconception of Buffalo Eastside neighborhood was quite different and almost opposite to the children's own perception of their space.

Participating children also demonstrated a creative way of representing their experiential and interpretive knowledge of urban space. Google started to provide a new web mapping service, Google Maps, in 2005, and it provided a great opportunity for the project as well. One day, I printed out a Google Map of Inner City Buffalo, and asked children to mark and write about places they often go in the Lower-Westside. Children were first so excited to see the clear view of their neighborhood from the Google Maps[8]. Children all had

their maps, and started to mark on the map. However, Abi was placing some round stickers on the map. They were smiling-face stickers with all different colors and types of funny faces, and she was using them as unique representations of her meanings to particular places in the neighborhood. Different smiling-face stickers represent different feelings she attached to, for examples, favorite places or places she avoids. She got plenty of attention for this idea, and everyone just loved it and asked stickers to her. It was completely unexpected; however, it became one of the most popular projects for many of the children. Each smiling-face had a special meaning, and it became children's own map symbol to visually represent their emotions and affects of particular places in the neighborhood.

I also saw another creative way how children represent their experiential knowledge of urban space. One day, we were talking about 'community photos' children took. I asked them where they took the photos, and if they could write who, where, and why they took those pictures. Children describes their community photos in their own ways. For example, Jonas refused to write anything, and he felt that it was just too boring. As soon as I noticed that Jonas was not interested in this project, I let him do other things that he was inclined to do more. On contrast, Yizel actively wrote the descriptions of her community photos with two different color pens: one blue and the other red. I was quite intrigued by that, and asked her why she was using two color pens. She explained that one color represents the ones closer to her meanings of community, and the other has less relationship to her community. More specifically, according to her, the photos with 'red' color were "smoking hot" ones because they were positively related to her meanings of community (e.g. ethnic food restaurants). On the other hand, the ones with 'blue' color were "cold" because they were not so much about community, but still located in her community (e.g. office buildings).

Both Abi's sticker project and Yizel's, what I named, "Community in Color," remind us of children's agency and creativity that they can bring in to the project,

especially when they are immersed to the child-centered research process. It also demonstrates how children can make and change the project as they want when they are fully participate in (or, are included in) the process. A project itself can be something they can enjoy and engage in, not that something they 'have to.' Children's original creativities and full participation/inclusion help us see their new insights, and also give us a new opportunity to re-imagine the project. We can give reflective as well as reflexive attentions to the participating children, and those responses will help the process of research more towards a child-centered.

V. Conclusions

The main purpose of this paper is to re-draw our attention on the children's urban geographies, and especially how children experience, interpret, and represent their everyday spaces. Reviewing earlier and present works of children's urban geographies scholarship clearly shows the importance of a child-centered philosophy and practice. Children should become 'agents' with their own will in terms of constructing their own understanding of urban spaces they live, play and learn, and they should be actively involving in a research process. In this respect, our focus should not be merely to 're-present' what children (already) know, but to make them be part of research and to allow them to experience how the process of making sense of their everyday urban space is evolved. It is the *representation* of children's urban space.

Lefevre's (1991) theory of the production of space, in particular, the trilogy of space in relation to its representation, is quite helpful tool here to conceptualize children's urban space. Lefebvre's (1991: 38-39) theory rests on a tripartite scheme that sees space as being constructed through "representations of space" or "conceptualized space" (e.g. the space of scientists, planners and rationality); "representational spaces" or "lived spaces" (e.g. the spaces of everyday life with its associated

images and symbols, hence the spaces of 'inhabitants' and 'users'); and "spatial practices" (e.g. the practices of 'deciphering' spaces that link and transform space, the practices that are conflicted and negotiated through representations of space and representational space). From children's urban geographic perspectives, Lefevre's 'representations of space' are more closely related to the adults' space, and 'representational space' more towards children's space. What children experience is a constant juxtaposition of two space. I argue that children's experiential and interpretive knowledge of urban space is an outcome of their spatial practice. Aitken (2001b: 169) also contends that the realm within and through which the identities of children, adolescents and adults are contested and continuously constituted like the adultist control of space, spatiality emphasized by child-centered pedagogy and child work. These are all aligned with an emerging recognition of different "power geometry," where different social groups and individuals are placed in very distinct ways (Massey, 1994). What we need to pursue is revealing, exploring, and representing children's urban space from their perspectives. Borrowing Lefevre's term, *representational space* of children and *spatial practice* of deciphering children's urban space should be grounded on child-centered philosophy and its embodied practice.

Children's expression of their every day space proved that my prior prejudice and assumption of children were not correct. Before I started the work with children, I thought they might have somewhat similar ideas of their neighborhood and community because they live in a similar physical, social and cultural environment. Children who I met in Buffalo Lower-Westside proved otherwise, and showed how their experience and thoughts are not homogeneous, but how their meanings of those spaces are all unique and personal. They were all original and particular, which were the clear outcomes of their experiential and interpretive spatial-knowledge production. What children also bring up is that their own experience and learning process of their everyday space is often mutually influenced by both socially constructed adult's

view of the world and their own experiential and interpretive knowledge production. There are quite noticeable gaps between two, and those are 'tensions' (Aitken, 1994) between the dominant side of adult politics and children's free expression of self. The child-centered philosophy is intended to 'empower' children, to foster children's expression, and to allow blossoming the diverse meanings of their everyday space they have.

I also would like to re-iterate the importance of 'recursivity' to create a child-centered research. Knigge and Cope's (2006) case study of Lower Westside of Buffalo shows how a thoughtful research method, in their case, 'Grounded Visualization,' can be part of iterative and inductive qualitative research process, and, more importantly demands a critical inquiry to represent multiple interpretation of the world and diverse views of reality. My experience with children also teaches the importance of 'recursivity' in the research process, and how it can help us to create a better child-centered research process. For example, if children want to spend more time to type their notes in front of computer, I let them do so. They sit longer and work with a computer, and it allows them to think and talk more about their everyday space through typing. It also allows me to listen and let them do what they want to do. 'Typing' seems too tedious and boring work to me; however, it turns out to one of the most interesting aspects of project that made children want to be part of it. This is one example clearly illustrating how critical the 'recursivity' is in the child-centered philosophy and approach, and what unexpected outcomes, as we saw from Abi's sticker project, it may produce. In the final stage of a project, I let children use a digital audio recorder, so that they could record their own voices about their everyday spaces as well as their experiences in the project. Participating children were interviewing each other, and seemed to happily record their opinions about the project. However, all of a sudden, Jonas turned back and pushed a recorder to my mouth, and asked me questions about my everyday space in

Buffalo, and my own experience of it. I was surprised, but I also thought that this was the moment that I felt that children were fully 'empowered,' and they became a leading part of the research process. Participating children showed me an equivalent power that they could freely express their ideas in their own will.

Lastly, I like to close this paper by indicating a recent and growing emphasis on the 'politics' of children and children's rights, and its implication of child-centered approach to planning and policy. The Convention on the Rights of the Child by the United Nations (UN)[9] and The Child Friendly City Initiative[10] by the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) present the importance of children's political and humanitarian rights. The U.N. Convention of the Rights of the Child is now ratified by most of countries of the world, and it well on the way to becoming the universal law at the global-level. The convention is rooted in concerns that children have not been well represented as fully human and have therefore not been afforded the same rights as adults (Matthews and Limb, 1999).[11] A child friendly city is the embodiment of the Convention on the Rights of the Child at the local level, which means that children's rights are reflected in policies, laws and planning. These new developments have re-positioned children on to the international political agenda. What I consider more significant implication of the U.N. Convention and a child-friendly city movement is that it (re-)confirms the relevance of child-led approach and children's urban geographies since (urban) space is presented as the essential part of the children's rights and access, and their inclusions in decision-making and city building process. Children's urban geographies and the discussion of child-centered approach not only provides a new perspective of learning children and their urban space, but it also suggests an innovative way of planning an urban space 'with' them.

註

1) More information about the conference will be available at http://icgcsandiego.wix.com/ypbw

2) For more information about this project, see Cope (2009) and Cope and Latcham (2009).

3) For more detailed discussions of the structure and functions of the system, see Jung (2009). Since the focus of this paper is not about the qualitative aspects of GIS, I will not describe the structure of qualitative GIS in details.

4) We call it 'club,' and it was one of the organizations located in Buffalo Westside, which an After-school programs for children who live nearby.

5) I was often considered as a "big kid" to participating children.

6) Writing field notes as early as possible after coming back from the field, and keeping tracks of them was one of the most challenging tasks.

7) To protect children's identities, all participating children's names are pseudonyms.

8) This was the time prior to the era of popular geographic web services similar to Google Maps, and mass ownership by children of digital devices such as smartphones and tablets. So, I don't think children nowadays would be excited to see the printed version of Google Map image.

9) Full text of the Convention is provided in the following: http://childfriendlycities.org/overview/what-is-a-child-friendly-city/full-text-of-the-convention/

10) For more information about this initiative will be available at http://childfriendlycities.org

11) Especially, significant are Articles 12 and 31, which assert children's right to be consulted, heard, listened to and taken seriously, in accordance with their age and maturity (Article 12) and children's right to rest, leisure, play, recreation, cultural life and the arts.

References

Aitken, S.C., 1994, *Putting Children in Their Place*, Washington D.C.: AAG.

Aitken, S.C., 2001a, Putting young people in their place, in Aitken, S. C. ed., *Geographies of Young People: The Morally Contested Spaces of Identity*, London and New York: Routledge, 1-26.

Aitken, S.C., 2001b, *Geographies of Young People: the Morally Contested Spaces of Identity*, London and New York: Routledge.

Aitken, S.C., 2014, *The Ethnopoetics of Space and Transformation: Young People's Engagement, Activism and Aesthetics*, Burlington, VT: Ashgate.

Aitken, S.C. and Herman, T., 1997, Gender, power and crib geography: traditional spaces and potential places, *Gender, Place and Culture*, 4, 63-88.

Aitken, S.C., Mitchell, D., and Staeheli, L., 2003, Urban geography, in Gaile, G. L. and Willmott, C. J. eds., *Geography in America at the Dawn of the 21st Century*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 237-265.

Alanen, L., 1990, Rethinking socialization, the family and childhood, *Sociological Studies of Child Development*, 3, 13-28.

Alim, H.S., 2007, Critical hip-hop language pedagoeis: combat, consciousness, and the cultural politics of communication, *Journal of Language Identity, and Education*, 6(2), 161-176.

Amin, A., and Thrift, N., 2002, *Cities: Reimagining The Urban*, Cambridge, U.K.: Polity.

Amit, V., 2002, *Realizing Community: Concepts, social relationships and sentiments*, London and New York: Routledge.

Anderson, B., 1991, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, London: Verso.

Bell, C. and Newby, H., 1978, Community, communion, class and community action: the social sources of the new urban politics, in Herbert, D.T. and Johnson, R.J. eds., *Social Areas in Cities: Processes, Patterns and Problems*, New York: John Wiley and Sons Ltd, 283-301.

Blaut, J. and Stea, D., 1971, Studies of geographic learning, *Annals of Association of American Geographers*, 61, 387-449.

Bodenhamer, D.J., Corrigan, J., and Harris, T.M., 2010, *The Spatial Humanities: GIS and the Future of Humanities Scholarship*, Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Brannen, J. and O'Brien, M., 1996, *Children in Families: Research and Policy*, London: Falmer Press.

Bunge, W., 1973a, The point of reproduction: a second front, *Antipode*, 9, 60-76.

Bunge, W., 1973b, Views and Opinions, *The Professional Geographer*, 25(4), 331-337.

Bunge, W., 1977, The first years of the Detroit geographical expedition: a personal report, in Peet, R. ed., *Radical Geography: Alternative Viewpoints on Contemporary Social Issues*, Chicago: Maaroufa Press, 31-39.

Burdick, A., Drucker, J., Lunenfeld, P., Presner, T., and Schnapp, J., 2012, *Digital_Humanities*, Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Caputo, V., 1995, Anthropology's silent 'others': a consideration of some conceptual and methodological issues for the study of youth and children's cultures, in Amit-Talai, V., and Wulff, H. eds., *Youth Cultures: A Cross-Cultural Perspective*, London: Routledge, 19-42.

Chawla, L., 2002, Cities for human development, in Chawla, L. ed., *Growing Up in an Urbanising World*, London and Stering, VA: UNESCO Publishing, 15-34.

Chawla, L., and Malone, K., 2003, Neighbourhood quality in children's eyes, in Christensen, P. and O'Brien, M. eds., *Children in the City*, London and New York: RoutledgeFalmer, 118-141.

Christensen, K. and Levinson, D., 2003, *Encyclopedia of Community: From Village to the Virtual World*, London: SAGE.

Christensen, P. and O'Brien, M., 2003, *Children in the*

City: Home, Neighborhood and Community, New York: RoutledgeFalmer.

Cohen, A.P., 1985, *The Symbolic Construction of Community*, London: Ellis Horwood Limited.

Cope, M, 2008, Becoming a scholar-advocate: participatory research with children, *Antipode*, 40(3), 428-435.

Cope, M., 2009, Challenging adult perspectives on children's geographies through participatory research methods: insights from a service-learning course, *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, 33(1), 33-50.

Cope, M. and Latcham, F., 2009, Narratives of decline: race, poverty, and youth in the context of post-industrial urban angst, *The Professional Geographer,* 61(2), 150-163.

Cosco, N. and Moore, R., 2002, Our neighborhood is like that!: cultural richness and childhood identity in Boca-Baraccas, Buenos Aires, in Chawla, L. ed., *Growing Up in an Urbanising World*, London and Stering, VA: UNESCO Publishing, 35-56.

Dargen, A. and Zitlin, S., 1990, *City Play*, New Brunswick, NJ and London: Rutgers University Press.

Dear, M., Ketchum, J., Luria, S., and Richardson, D., 2011, *GeoHumanities: Art, History, Text at the Edge of Place*, London and New York: Routledge.

Driskell, D., 2002, *Creating Better Cities with Children and Youth: A Manual For Participation*, London: UNESCO Publishing.

Elwood, S. and Mitchell, K., 2013, Another politics is possible: neogeographies, visual spatial tactics and political formation, *Cartographica*, 48(4), 275-292.

Fine, G.A. and Sandstrom, K.L., 1988, *Knowing Children: Participant Observation with Minors*, Newsbury Park, CA: Sage Publication.

Gagen, E., 2000, Playing the part: performing gender in America's playgrounds, in Holloway, S. L. and Valentine, G. eds., *Children's Geographies: Playing, Living, Learning*, London: Routledge, 230-244.

Goldman, M., 1990, *City on the Lake*, Buffalo: Prometheus Books.

Hart, R.A., 1979, *Children's Experience of Place*, New York: Irvington.

Hart, R.A., 1997, *Children's Participation: The Theory and Practice of Involving Young Citizens in Community Development and Environmental Care*, London: UNICEF.

Harvey, D., 1989, The Urban process under capitalism: a framework for analysis, in Harvey, D. ed., *The Urban Experience*, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 59-89.

Holloway, S.L. and Valentine, G., 2000, *Children's Geographies: Playing, Living, Learning*, London: Routledge.

Hulme, M., 2013, Geography and the humanities, *Progress in Human Geography*, 37(2), 306-310.

Islam, M.Z., 2012, Using Google Earth to study children's neighborhoods: an application in Dhaka, Bangladesh, *Children, Youth and Environment,* 22(2), 93-111.

Jacobs, J.M., 1993, The City unbound: qualitative approaches to the city, *Urban Studies,* 30(4), 827-848.

James, A., Jenks, C., and Prout, A. eds., 1998, *Theorizing Childhood*, Cambridge: Polity Press.

James, A. and Prout, A. eds, 1990, *Constructing and Reconstructing Childhood*, London: Falmer Press.

James, S., 1989, Is There a place for children in geography?, *Area*, 22(3), 278-283.

Jenks, C., 1996, *Childhood*, London: Routledge.

Jones, O., 2000, Melting geography: purity, disorder, childhood and space, in Holloway, S.L. and Valentine, G. eds., *Children's Geographies: Playing, Living, Learning*, New York: Routledge, 29-47.

Jung, J.-K., 2009, Computer-aided qualitative GIS: a software-level integration of qualitative research and GIS, in Cope, M. and Elwood, S. eds., *Qualitative GIS: A Mixed Methods Approach*, London: SAGE, 115-135.

Kaplan, D., Wheeler, J., and Holloway, S., 2009, *Urban Geography*, Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

Katz, C, 2004, *Growing Up Global: Economic Restructuring and Children's Everyday Lives*, Minneapolis, MN:

University of Minnesota.

Keller, S., 2003, *Community: Pursuing the Dream, Living the Reality*, Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press.

Knigge, L. and Cope, M., 2006, Grounded visualization: integrating the analysis of qualitative and quantitative data through grounded theory and visualization, *Environment and Planning A,* 38(11), 2021-2037.

Knox, P. and Pinch, S., 2000, *Urban Social Geography: An Introduction*, London and New York: Prince Hall.

Kraftl, P., Horton, J., and Tucker, F., 2012, *Critical Geographies of Childhood and Youth: Contemporary Policy and Practice*, Great Britain: The Policy Press.

Kruger, J. and Chawla, L., 2002, "We know something someone doesn't know": children speak out on local conditions in Johannesburg, *Environment and Urbanization*, 14(2), 85-96.

Lefebvre, H., 1991, *The Production of Space*, Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Levy, J.M., 2012, *Contemporary Urban Planning*, New York: Pearson.

Loebach, J. and Gilliland, J., 2010, Child-led tours to uncover children's perceptions and use of neighborhood environments, *Children, Youth and Environment,* 20(1), 52-90.

Lundine, J. and Poggiali, L., 2012, Youth and digital mapping in urban informal settlements: lessons learned from participatory mapping processes in Mathare in Nairobi, Kenya, *Children, Youth and Environment,* 22(2), 214-233.

Lynch, K., 1960, *The Image of City*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Lynch, K., 1979, The spatial world of the child, in Michelson, W.M., Levine, S. V. and Michelson, E. eds., *The Child in the City: Today and Tomorrow,* Toronto: University of Toronto, 102-127.

Martin, D.G., 2003, Enacting Neighborhood, *Urban Geography,* 24(5), 361-385.

Massey, D., 1994, *Space, Place and Gender*. Minneapolis:

University of Minnesota Press.

Matthews, H., 1995, Living on the edge: children as outsiders, *Tijdschrift voor Economische en Sociale Geografie,* 86, 456-466.

Matthews, H. and Limb, M., 1999, Defining an agenda for the geography of children: review and prospect, *Progress in Human Geography,* 23(1), 61-90.

Matthews, H., Limb, M., and Taylor, M., 1999, Young people's participation and representation in society, *Geoforum,* 30, 135-144.

Matthews, S.A., 2011, Spatial polygamy and the heterogeneity of place: studying people and place via egocentric methods, in Burton, L.M., Kemp, S.P., Leung, M., Matthews, S.A., and Takeuchi, D.T. eds., *Community, Neighborhoods, and Health*, New York: Springer, 35-56.

Mitchell, K. and Elwood, S., 2013, Intergenerational mapping and the cultural politics of memory, *Space and Polity,* 17(1), 33-52.

Morrow, V., 2003, Improving the neighborhood for children, in Christensen, P. and O'Brien, M. eds., *Children in the City: Home, Neighborhood and Community,* London and New York: RoutledgeFalmer, 162-183.

Myers, G.A., McGreevy, P., Carney, G.O., and Kenny, J., 2003, Cultural Geography, in Gaile, G.L., and Willmott, C.J. eds., *Geography in America at the Dawn of the 21st Century,* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 81-96.

Nisbet, R.A., 1970, *The Quest For Community*, New York: Oxford University Press.

Percy-Smith, B., 2002, Contested worlds, in Chawla, L. ed., *Growing up in an Urbanizing World*, London and Stering, VA: UNESCO Publishing, 57-80.

Punch, S., 2000, Children's strategies for creating playspaces: negotiating independence in rural Bolivia, in Holloway, S.L. and Valentine, G. eds., *Children's Geographies: Playing, Living, Learning*, London: Routledge, 48-61.

Putnam, R.D., 2000, *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community*, New York:

Simon and Schuster.

Qvortrup, J., 1994, Childhood matters: an introduction, in Qvortrup, J., Bardy, M., Sgritta, G., and Wintersberger, H. eds., *Childhood Matters: Social Theory, Practice and Politics*, Aldershot: Avebury Press. 1-24.

Qvortrup, J., Bardy, M., Sgritta, G. and Wintersberger, H.,1994, *Childhood Matters: Social Theory, Practice and Politics*, Aldershot: Avebury.

Ross, N.J., 2007, 'My journey to school...': foregrounding the *meaning* of school journeys and children's engagements and interactions in their everyday localities, *Children's Geographies,* 5(4), 373-391.

Rousseau, J.-J., 1962, *The Emile of Jean-Jacques Rousseau: Selections*, New York: Columbia University.

Ruddick, S., 1998, Modernism and resistance: how 'homeless' youth sub-cultures make a difference, in Skelton, T. and Valentine, G. eds., *Cool Places: Geographies of Youth Cultures*, London, New York: Routledge, 343-360.

Sibley, D., 1991, Children's geographies: some problems of representation, *Area,* 23, 269-270.

Skelton, T., 2013, Young people, children, politics and space: a decade of youthful political geography scholarship 2003-2013, *Space and Polity,* 17(1), 123-136.

Skelton, T. and Valentine, G., 1998, *Cool Places: Geographies of Young Cultures*. New York: Routledge.

Sui, D.Z., 2010, GeoJournal: a new focus on spatially integrated social sciences and humanities, *GeoJournal,* 75(1), 1-2.

Thorne, B., 1993, Learning from Kids, in Emerson, R.M. ed., *Contemporary Field Research: Perspectives and Formulations,* Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press, Inc, 224-238.

Tinkler, P., 2013, *Using Photographs in Social and Historical Research*, London: Sage.

Tuan, Y.-F., 1977, *Space and Place*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

U.S. Census Bureau, 2010, *American Factfinder 2 of Buffalo, NY, http://factfinder2.census.gov/faces/nav/jsf/pages/community_facts.xhtml*.

Valentine, G., 1996, Angels and devils: moral landscapes of childhood, *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space,* 14, 581-599.

Valentine, G., 1997, "Oh Yes I can." "Oh No You Can't": Childen and Parents' Understandings of Kids' Competence to Negotiate Public Space Safely, *Antipode,* 29, 65-89.

Valentine, G., 2008, Living with difference: reflections on geographies of encounter, *Progress in Human Geography,* 32(3), 323-337.

Ward, C., 1978, *The Child in the City*, New York: Pantheon Books.

White, R., 1993, Youth and conflict over urban space, *Children's Environments,* 10, 85-93.

Winchester, H.P.M., 1991, The geography of children, *Area,* 23, 357-360.

Young, I.M., 1990, The Ideal of community and the politics of difference, in Nicholson, L.J. ed., *Feminism/Postmodernism,* New York: Routledge, 299-323.

Correspondence : Jin-Kyu Jung, 18115 Campus Way NE, Bothell, WA 98011, U.S.A., University of Washington-Bothell, School of Interdisciplinary Arts & Sciences (Email: jkjung5@uw.edu)

교신 : 정진규, 18115 Campus Way NE, Bothell, WA 98011, U.S.A., 워싱턴대학교 바셀캠퍼스 인터디서프리너리 문리대 (이메일: jkjung5@uw.edu)