Web-mapping the city: social, play, leisure and emotional geographies for youths
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MOTIVATION

Children’s Independent Mobility *in the urban environment*

An increase of urbanization degree leads to a general decrease of children’s independent mobility.


Qualitative research to inform about better practices to tackle this problem, addressing child-environment relationships in a more ecological scope.
THEORETICAL MOSAIC

ENVIRONMENTAL PSYCHOLOGY

MOTOR DEVELOPMENT

SOCIOLOGY OF SPACES

URBAN PLANNING

SOCIOLOGY OF CHILDHOOD

CHILDREN’S GEOGRAPHIES

TRANSACTIONAL APPROACH TO THE PERSON-ENVIRONMENT RELATIONSHIP

(Bonnes & Bonaiuto, 2002)

(Heft, 2013)
Affordances as specific environmental psychological relational properties that emerge through ongoing “active child-in-place” relationships which are functionally, socially and emotionally meaningful.
Analysis of the “Child in the City” exploring the relationship between mobility, affordances and urban space, adopting a participatory and child-friendly methodology.
PARTICIPATORY CHILD-FRIENDLY METHODOLOGY

**SOFTGIS METHODOLOGY**

collection and place mapping of human experiences and everyday behavior in the physical environment using web-map based technology

PARTICIPATORY CHILD-FRIENDLY METHODOLOGY

“Cidade ideal: um jogo de imaginação gráfica!”

(Ideal City: a game of graphic imagination!)

- meaningful places mapping
- place likeability
- daily & ideal mobility to meaningful places
- play and leisure (child vs. adult led)
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PARTICIPATORY CHILD-FRIENDLY METHODOLOGY

“Cidade ideal: um jogo de imaginação gráfica!”

CHILD-FRIENDLY

• relevant content for children’s lives

• digital language & computer game usability

• children as participant-actors

• capture children’s suggestions

• articles 12º and 31º of the Convention on the Rights of the Child (UNICEF)
INDIRECT DATA COLLECTION METHODS

URBAN SPACE TYPOLOGY
(adapted from Brandão, 2008; Francis, 1987; Sandalack & Uribe, 2010)

1. Street.
2. Square.
3. Green space.
4. Exterior play and sports space.
5. Waterfront space.
6. Commercial space.
7. Recreational and leisure space.
8. School.
9. Housing space.
10. Neighbourhood space.
11. Other
PARTICIPANTS AND GEOGRAPHIC CONTEXTS

LH (LISBON HISTORIC)
40 children (11-17 years old)

LM (LISBON MODERN)
53 children (11-15 years old)

LBS (LISBON BY SEA)
52 children (11-14 years old)

L (METROPOLITAN AREA OF LISBON)
145 children (11-17 years old)
6th-9th grade
Active travel and independent travel were more frequently adopted when going to meaningful places. (Sarjala, Broberg, & Hynynen, 2015)

Neighbourhood area as promoter of independent and active mobility. (Fagerholm & Broberg, 2011)
RESULTS ON MEANINGFUL PLACE AFFORDANCES

FREQUENCY OF EXPRESSIONAL CATEGORIES OF AFFORDANCES ACROSS RESEARCH GROUPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nº</th>
<th>SOCIAL</th>
<th>LEISURE</th>
<th>FUNCTIONAL</th>
<th>EMOTIONAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L 1632</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LH 392</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBS 529</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LM 711</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

➢ Social affordances as the most expressive. (Sarjala et al., 2015)
Neighbourhood environment as socially meaningful but not so much functionally, leisurely and emotionally. (Clark & Uzzell, 2002)
RESULTS ON MEANINGFUL PLACE AFFORDANCES

ACTUALIZATION OF SOCIAL AFFORDANCES IN LH, LBS AND LM

- being with friends
- being myself

(Kyttä et al., 2012)
ACTUALIZED VS. IDEALLY PERCEIVED CHILD-LED FUNCTIONAL AND LEISURE AFFORDANCES

➤ Ideally children would like for the majority of play and leisure to be child-led.

(Article 31º, CRC)
Example of actualized affordances in different urban space typologies in LBS group: housing space (red symbols); green space (green symbols); commercial space (purple symbols); school space (yellow symbols)
Example of social affordances expressivity in different urban space typologies in LH group: social affordances (blue symbols); housing space (red symbols); green space (green symbols); school space (yellow symbols)
Privileged urban typologies for transactional place experiences to occur.

(Sarjala et al., 2015)
RESULTS ON URBAN SPACE TYPOLOGIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Urban space typologies</th>
<th>Social affordances</th>
<th>Functional affordances</th>
<th>Leisure affordances</th>
<th>Emotional affordances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Street</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>26.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Square</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green space</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exterior play and sports space</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>54.4</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterfront space</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>53.9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial space</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>70.7</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational and leisure space</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>75.5</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>50.9</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing space</td>
<td>55.8</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood space</td>
<td>54.9</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>47.4</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>27.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Privileged urban typologies for social transactional place experiences to occur

(Broberg, Kyttä, et al., 2013)
Privileged urban typologies for functional and leisure transactional place experiences to occur.
DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

- Increase territorial range, distance travelled autonomously, when going to meaningful places.
DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

• Most expressive affordances “being with friends and being myself” and clusters of affordances in line with developmental needs of participants.

• Social meaningful places as promoters of young people’s independent and active mobility namely in the neighbourhood area.

• Play and leisure affordances are more expressive in specific outdoor and indoor settings, respectively. Thus, in city environments, both naturalized and artificialized geographies are important promoters of youth-led play and leisure interactions.
DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

- Green space as privileged typology for child-in-place experience.
- Multidimensional affordances found in each urban typology.
- Specific urban typologies afford a specific category of place transaction.
“Cidade Ideal” child-friendly survey and a specific methodological design was effective in revealing and idealizing landscapes of children’s transactional behaviour.

Include children and young people in child-friendly urban planning processes.
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