An investigation into children’s geographies and their value to geography education in schools

Lauren Elise Hammond

University College London
PhD
I, Lauren Elise Hammond, confirm that the work presented in this thesis is my own. Where information has been derived from other sources, I confirm that this has been indicated in the thesis.

**Word Count:** 88117 (excluding references and appendices)

**Signed:** Lauren Elise Hammond
Abstract

This thesis examines the relationships and ‘borders’ (see Castree et al., 2007) that exist between children’s geographies in the space of everyday life, and formal spaces of geographical thought (geography as an academic discipline and geography as a school subject).

The research is based on the construction of a Storytelling and Geography Group which was convened by the researcher six times between September and November 2014. The group consisted of five participants, with the young people being encouraged to be active agents in the research. In the group, the participants shared their geographies and imaginations of London and their world(s). The young people’s narratives were then interpreted using the work of Henri Lefebvre (1991) and David Harvey (1990) on the ‘production of space’. Analysis examined how children are both shaped by, and shape, social space.

The research has three major findings; firstly, the young people in this study navigate multiple, sometimes contradictory, social spaces when constructing and representing themselves, and their identities, in London; secondly, the young people imagine London as a jigsaw of territories with distinct social rules existing in different spaces and places within the city; thirdly, London is perceived by the young people participating in the research as a place of opportunity and hope, but also as a place of inequality and injustice.

This thesis provides an original analysis of children’s geographies using the production of space, an idea that is also hitherto under-considered in education (Middleton, 2017). The research also presents an original argument as to the value of border crossings between the different spaces of geographical thought. Positing that the value of such a crossing for school geography lies in enabling geography teachers to be more informed in their ‘curriculum making’ (Lambert and Morgan, 2010), and arguing further that providing children with opportunities to examine (their own) geographies using ‘powerful knowledge’ (see Young and Muller, 2010) can support their development as informed, and empowered, social actors.
Impact statement

This thesis shows how children’s geographies, as both an area of academic thought, and as shared by children themselves, can be enabling to geography teachers in their ‘curriculum making’ (see Lambert and Morgan, 2010) and children in their lives and futures. Through drawing on ideas from the discipline of geography (specifically children’s geographies and the ‘production of space’ (see Harvey, 1990; Lefebvre, 1991)) the research demonstrates why, and how, it is of value to consider the child, beyond their given identity of student, in school geography. In this way, the research contributes to academic debate about the place of the child in geography education and the significance of geography education to the child.

In addition to contributing to academic debate, the thesis also has the potential to have impact beyond the academy and for the findings of the research, and arguments put forward, to be used by geography teachers in schools. Through drawing on Maude’s (2016) typology of powerful knowledge, the thesis has shown the value of children’s geographies to school geography. For example, it demonstrates that providing children with opportunities to study (their own) everyday life using what Young (2008) terms ‘powerful knowledge’ has the potential to give them power over their own, everyday knowledge.

To bring about impact, the research has been disseminated at both academic, and professional, conferences nationally and internationally, with papers including:

- Mind the Gap! Geography as a discipline, pre-university subject and as part of everyday life (NOFA, 2019, Stockholm)
- Children’s Geographies and the Geography Classroom (Geographical Association annual conference, 2019, Manchester)
- Why Explore the Production of Space in Geography Classrooms? (Royal Geographical Society annual conference, 2018, Cardiff)
- Young People’s Geographies: An Opportunity to Critically Consider the Relationship between “Everyday” and “Powerful Knowledge” (International Geographical Union conference, 2017, Lisbon)
Furthermore, the research has thus far resulted in two publications:


Hammond, L. (2019) ‘Utilising the ‘production of space’ to enhance young people’s understanding of place’ in Geography 104(1) pp28-37
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1. Chapter one: Introduction

This thesis is about children and their geographies; their rich and varied experiences and imaginations of the world. Today in England, as in much of the world, formal education forms a large part of a child’s life (Aitken, 1994; Freeman and Tranter, 2011). Yet the relationships between the child’s everyday life and their formal education is much debated. The focus of these debates include philosophical considerations as to the purpose of schooling and its potential for emancipation (see Freire, 1970) and human flourishing (see Reiss and White, 2013), as well as the relationships between different forms of knowledge (see Young and Muller, 2016) and how these might be considered by teachers in their ‘curriculum making’ (see Lambert and Morgan, 2010; Young et al, 2014). Considering geography’s position in relation to these debates is of value, as whilst everyday life and children’s geographies are significant areas of research in the academic discipline, their place in compulsory education and schooling has yet to be fully explored (Biddulph, 2011; Tani, 2011; Catling, 2014; Roberts, 2017).

With children’s geographies as the focus, this chapter argues that to enhance the quality of school geography there needs to be a much greater understanding of different spaces of geographical thought and their relationships with one another. The chapter begins by introducing, and problematizing, what Tani (2011) terms ‘gaps’ that exist between spaces of geographical thought in section 1.1. Following this, it sets out the need for the research in section 1.2. This section is divided into two distinct, but interrelated, sub sections. The first, section 1.2.1, examines my journey to recognising the need for this research, drawing on my experiences as a geography teacher. Following this, the need for this research is contextualised in academic debate in section 1.2.2. The research questions are then introduced in section 1.3, with the significance of the research being outlined in section 1.4. The chapter then concludes with an overview of the structure of thesis and research undertaken in section 1.5.
1.1 The research problem

Since the 1970s, research in the academy has led to the emergence and growth of the sub discipline children’s geographies. Research in children’s geographies, and associated fields, has developed and changed understandings of children and childhood (see section 2.2). It has also critically examined and developed methodologies that can be used to work with, and research, children (Aitken, 1994; 2001; 2018; van Blerk and Kesby, 2009; Hörschelmann and van Blerk, 2012; Freeman and Tranter, 2015; see sections 2.2 and 3.2). Despite these developments in the discipline of geography, there remains much debate as to if, and how, children’s geographies should be considered in geography education in schools (see for example, Firth and Biddulph, 2009; Catling, 2011; 2014; Tani, 2011; Biddulph, 2012; Roberts, 2017).

In the context of Finnish geography education, Tani (2011) has conceptualised these debates as both emerging from, and being reflected in, two ‘major gaps’ presently affecting school geography:

- Firstly, the gap between geography as an academic discipline and geography as school subject;
- Secondly, the gap between children’s ‘everyday knowledge’ and geographies, and the geography they study in school.

This research seeks to explore what Tani deems ‘major gaps’ and the impacts they have, and have had, on the place of children’s geographies in school geography in England. To do this it examines the relationships between the three spaces of geographical thought that Tani highlights (everyday life, the academic discipline and the school subject). This thesis is an investigation into children’s geographies and their value to geography education in schools.
1.2 The need for this research

Central to the research problem is the idea that whilst geography and geographical thinking, are recognised as existing in different spaces (everyday life, as well as being formalised in the academic discipline and school subject), ‘borders’ (see Castree et al., 2007) exist between these spaces meaning that the relationships between them are complex and multifaceted (Bonnett, 2003; Castree et al., 2007; Tani, 2011; Butt and Collins, 2018; Butt, 2019). The identification of the need for the research (notably these borders), and my desire to undertake this doctorate, was born from my experiences as a geography teacher. In section 1.2.1, I introduce my personal journey to situate myself in the research, as who I am is deeply imbued in every stage of this thesis; from its conception to my navigation of the research process (examined in depth in section 3.1). It is a personal reflection on my experiences and ideas about the place of children, and their geographies, in school geography during my time as a teacher between 2006 and 2014. It focuses specifically on education in England, as this is where I spent the majority of my teaching career. Where academic references are used in this section, this is to evidence where, and how, research and theory have informed, and/or substantiated, my perspectives.

I then move on to situate the need for the research in academic literature in section 1.2.2. It focusses specifically on considering ‘borders’ that can limit, and block, ideas and methods from the sub discipline of children’s geographies being considered in school geography. This section highlights that the need for this research goes beyond the confines of my classroom and experiences, and relates to systemic, and/or recognised, issues in compulsory schooling in England. The use of the term ‘borders’ in this section, and the thesis more broadly, is drawn from Castree et al. (2007), who use the term to consider divisions within geography. Significantly for this research, they highlight a divide between geography as an academic discipline and school subject in England, which they conceptualise as being like two distant relations. Castree et al. argue that although there is no person that prohibits relationships between the discipline and subject, systematic, institutional and personal constraints such as accountability pressures, often prevent the two spaces of thought having sustained and significant relationships with one another.
I now move on to introduce the personal journey which led me to undertake this research in section 1.2.1.

1.2.1 The need for this research: a personal journey

When I began this PhD, I was working full time as geography teacher, and head of department, in a secondary school in London. Over the course of eight years, I had spent time teaching abroad (in Singapore) and in different places across the United Kingdom (UK). Geography fascinated me on both a personal and professional level. I had, and continue to have, a deep sense of intrigue and wonder about people(s) and places, always querying how they varied, and why. Although my perception of others understanding of my professional role (including school leaders) was to teach children geography, and I understood this to be an important part of my job, I also had intrinsic interest in the children I taught. Children would tell me about their geographies, imaginations and experiences of the world, both in geography lessons, but also as their tutor and/or when we engaged in informal conversation outside of the classroom.

Through interactions with children, and also through discussions with colleagues and my experiences of the education system in England more broadly, I began to question the relationships between children’s everyday lives, and geographies, and their formal education. The main focus of these questions related to children’s geographies; in considering if, how and why, I drew on them in the classroom, and also in considering whether they were recognised and valued in the same way in the academic discipline and school subject. In addition, I began to question whether not considering children’s geographies in school geography, affected conceptualisations of children and childhood in schooling. These questions emerged from several inter-related experiences that I now outline:

- Firstly, I noticed that children’s geographies was often absent as a distinct area of study in the curricula in the schools in which I taught. In questioning why children’s geographies were often omitted, I was reminded of Massey’s (2008) question ‘whose geography?’ This led me to consider whether both myself as a teacher, and others involved in curriculum design, from the state
to my colleagues, were sometimes privileging the geographies of some people(s) and social groups in the curricula we made and enacted.

Further to this, I started to question if the under-representation, and/or consideration, of children geographies in schools, might influence both children’s sense of belonging and their conceptualisations of the world. I perceived this to be a pertinent concern, as children and their perspectives are sometimes regarded as less important than adults in mainstream social and political debates (see Skelton and Valentine, 1998; Porter et al., 2012; section 2.1). This led me to question the potential for school geography to support children in examining their own geographies, and the geographies of others.

Secondly, in a context of accountability and performativity pressures in schools (see for example, Jones and Lambert, 2018), I began to feel that there was limited time for me to explore children’s geographies in the classroom through pedagogical choices. For example, on one occasion when discussing political geography and border disputes with a Key Stage 3 class, a child related political borders to a place they called ‘front line’. Front line represented a row of shops, which the majority of the children in the class seemed to conceptualise as territorial line between two schools where children would sometimes meet and/or fight. This resulted in staff from both schools patrolling the row of shops, and surrounding area, after school to try mitigate any issues that might arise. I was both personally intrigued by the child’s comment, and also felt there was value in connecting this personal narrative, which was imbued with ideas of territory, to the political geography we were studying to support students in meaning making (see also Roberts, 2013b; 2017). However, I also felt compelled to move on with the lesson, and on this occasion I failed to explore the connections between this child’s ideas of territory and those that are prevalent in political geography. My reasoning for this ultimately lay in my perception that there was pressure to teach students a large volume of curriculum ‘content’ to
enable them to access an upcoming exam, which was a compulsory part of the schools assessment policy across all subjects.

- Thirdly, I began to query why there seemed to be limited discussion about either subject knowledge, or children and childhood, in continual professional development (CPD) sessions for teachers that the schools led. These sessions were often focussed on developing, or rolling out, strategies to support staff in working towards targets related to exam grades for the school, the (geography) department and/or individual classes and children. Apart from discussions about learning needs (such as dyslexia), I felt that there was limited attention paid to considering questions which I believed were important to both my development as a teacher, and to my students education, such as; what is a child? Who are the children we teach? How do we support them in making progress in geography? And how, and why, are their everyday lives and geographies valued in, or of value to, school geography and education more broadly?

- Finally, I began to query whether the education system, and my lessons, were supporting and empowering the children in their everyday lives. I increasingly questioned the relationships between children’s lives and the formal (geographical) education they engaged with in their schooling. For example, throughout my teaching career I had often made decisions to teach in schools in what may be constructed, and perceived, as being located in areas that face socio-economic challenges. One of my motivations for this was to try in my own small way to challenge inequality and social injustice through education. However, the longer I taught, the more I questioned the best way to do this through education both at a systemic level and also in my individual classroom and interactions. I began to feel that the child’s everyday life, and identity, was often forcibly separated from their school life and identity as a student, through choices in curricula and pedagogy. This seemed at odds with my belief that there are reciprocal relationships between a child’s everyday life and education (see also Freire, 1970). For example, children connect new knowledge and ideas with their prior
knowledge as they make meaning (see Roberts, 2013b; 2017). In addition, children may draw on their formal education in making sense of their everyday lives and in informing decisions they make both inside, and outside, of the classroom.

These experiences, and the questions they led to, connected to a long-standing interest I had developed in children’s geographies through my own education. This interest had informed module choice in my undergraduate degree, and led me to focus on children’s geographies (in different ways) in both my undergraduate and Masters dissertations. This interest also informed my motivation to train to teach and to work with children, and ultimately my decision to leave the classroom, as I was increasingly frustrated with the education system I was a part of, for the reasons outlined above.

When I left the classroom, and began working as a Lecturer in Geography Education at UCL Institute of Education (IOE), I found the issues I had perceived to exist in schools being polarised in debates within the geography education community. With some colleagues extolling the benefits of children’s geographies (see section 2.2.4b), and others questioning whether they should even be explored in (initial) teacher education.

During my last years working in schools, the concerns I outlined above, began to form the basis of my perception of a need for this research, and my desire to contribute to knowledge and debate in the discipline of geography, or as Johnston and Sidaway (2016) state ‘to make geography’. As a first step on my journey to contributing to the discipline, I examined if, and how, my own experiences and perceptions of children’s geographies being under-considered in school geography, were representative of wider academic debate. I introduce these debates in section 1.2.2, highlighting the need for this research as reflected in academic literature.

During this section, and throughout the thesis, the terms ‘school geography’, ‘geography education in schools’ or ‘geography as a school subject’ are used. However, it is recognised that not all children attend school and compulsory education occurs in a variety of settings. The choice of terminology aims to reflect widely used language in both academic literature and everyday life.
1.2.2 The need for this research: as reflected in the literature

So far in this chapter, I have focussed on problematizing the relationships between the child’s everyday life and their formal education, and introducing differences in conceptualisations of children and childhood in academic and school geography (examined further in section 2.2). However, it is of value to recognise that children are central to education. Not only are children who teachers teach, they are, at least in part, why many people choose to teach and why a society educates (see also section 2.2.5). The centrality of children to schooling means that the relationships between the child and their education are areas of research and debate in the academy. Examining these relationships often requires a mix of philosophical and practical considerations. For example, if a person and/or system has a philosophy that school education is about the transmission of knowledge (see for example Hirsch, 2007; 2016; sections 1.2.2, 2.2.4a, 2.2.5), this can, and does, affect the curriculum that is designed, and enacted, and choices in pedagogy. It can also affect children’s experiences of education and their relationships with, and to, specialised knowledge, their teachers and schooling more broadly.

In setting out the need for this research, this section examines how the child has been constructed, and represented, in academic literature about school geography. It posits that although the child is often constructed, and represented, as being central to teaching geography, there is limited research or theory as to how, or why, children’s geographies are of value to geography education in schools.

Children are recognised, and represented, in many models and theories about geography education. Many of these models relate the student (a term which is regularly used to represent the child’s given identity when they are in school), to their teacher and their teaching, and to geography as a school subject. These areas (the child/student, curriculum and pedagogy), and the relationships between them, are also often then related to, or situated within, the academic discipline of geography. These models and theories include; Bennetts’ (2005) ‘Roots of Understanding’ model; Lambert and Morgan’s (2010) ‘Curriculum Making’ model (see also section 2.2.4a); the GeoCapabilities approach; and the Didaktik Tradition, which is widely
referred to in German, Nordic and South American literature on education (see for example, Hudson, 2016; Bladh et al., 2018).

The GeoCapabilities approach is of particular interest to this research, as it suggests that it is of value for geography educators to consider ‘who are the children we teach?’ before anything else when curriculum making (examined in depth in section 2.2.4a). Through this question, the approach appears to both recognise children as existing beyond their identity as students in schools, and suggests that getting to know the children they teach, is a primary concern for all teachers. However, there has been no clear examination in academic literature as to what this means (see section 2.2.4a). For example, the question could be interpreted as encouraging geography educators to consider children’s geographies (both as shared by the children themselves and as an area of thought and sub discipline of geography), yet it might also be interpreted as encouraging teachers to consider the child’s age, and/or their individual and collective learning needs, and notions of progression in geography and education more broadly.

Despite these models and theories recognising the centrality of children to education, there has been limited consideration of, or research into, the relationships between children’s geographies and school geography. Further to this Catling (2011) provides a stark warning that in the United Kingdom (UK), teachers often have a limited knowledge of children’s geographies. He argues this is because the geographies of the children they teach often go unnoticed and under considered, and is also due to state conceptions and constructions of geography education (see for example, DfE, 2013; 2014; section 2.2.4). Catling (2011) asserts that national policy and curricula affect teacher autonomy, omit opportunities for active citizenship and contributions by children, and fail to consider how, and why, it is of value for children to share and deconstruct (their own) geographies as part of their formal geographical education.

This puts school geography at odds with academic debate about children’s geographies, in which literature regularly expounds the benefits of active citizenship (see for example, McKendrick, 2009), and research seeks to examine children’s experiences and imaginations of the world to better understand children, childhood
and society (Aitken, 2001; 2018; Fass, 2013). Although the value of engaging with children’s geographies, both as an academic discipline and as shared by children themselves, has been argued by many in the geography education community (see for example, Young People’s Geographies project; Catling, 2014; Biddulph, 2012; Roberts, 2017; see section 2.2), gaps still exist in geography education’s, and (often) educators, knowledge of children’s geographies.

In situating the need for this research in academic thought, I now introduce ‘borders’ (see section 1.2) that have been highlighted as impeding active consideration of children’s geographies in school geography:

- Firstly, children’s geographies has been represented as anti-intellectual by some academics interested in geography education in schools (see for example Standish, 2006 in Biddulph, 2011; Wheelan, 2007 in Firth and Biddulph, 2009);

- Secondly, as highlighted in my own personal reflections on education (see section 1.2.1), children’s geographies have been omitted from national curricula documentation across compulsory geography education (Key Stages 1-3) in England (see Catling, 2011; DfE, 2007; 2013). The impact of the omission of children’s geographies from the national curricula can also be seen as being exacerbated by the well-documented accountability pressures on (geography) teachers (Lambert and Mitchell, 2015; Jones and Lambert, 2018) and nationally recognised concerns about teacher workload (DfE, 2018). With limited time, increased monitoring and a focus on student results potentially leading to geography teachers feeling they do not have the time or space to either explore children’s geographies in the classroom, or to develop their own knowledge of children and childhood;

- Thirdly, children’s geographies have also been omitted from some (initial) teacher education programmes (Catling, 2011). This problem has also been exacerbated, as it is situated in a context in which there are recruitment and retention issues of geography teachers in England (Geographical Association, 2015; Foster, 2019). This has resulted in an increase of applicants, and trainee teachers, without a first degree in geography. This, in turn, is situated in
landscape in which there is also a lessening of university subject specialist input into initial teacher education (ITE) due to a diversification of routes into teaching (see also Butt, 2019). This means geography teachers may never have had an opportunity to actively consider and/or study children’s geographies in either their Bachelor’s degree or post-graduate teacher education programme;

- Fourthly, sub disciplines, often inadvertently, sometimes behave as ‘gated communities’ meaning that knowledge and research is not always shared with other fields or communities (examined further in sections 2.2.4a and 2.2.4b);

- Finally, the socio-political construction of the child (see section 2.2.5) and ‘knowledge turn’ in school level education in England, have often under-considered the relationships between the child’s everyday knowledge and the specialist knowledge they engage with in their formal education (examined further in sections 2.2.4a and 2.2.4b).

Section 1.2 has identified a need for this research, highlighting reasons why children’s geographies is often not considered in school geography. To do this it has drawn on my own experiences as a geography teacher, which has also introduced my relationship to the research, a theme that will be returned to throughout the thesis. Section 1.2 has also situated the need for this research in academic thought and literature, highlighting that although children are often recognised as being central to geography education in schools, issues with teacher education, and a lack of reference to children’s geographies in curricula, as well as accountability pressures on teachers, often leads to them being under-considered in schools.

Having identified the need for the research, I now move on to introduce the research enquiry and questions in section 1.3. Following this, I argue the significance of this thesis in section 1.4 and outline its structure in section 1.5.
1.3 The research questions

As introduced in section 1.1, this thesis is an investigation into children’s geographies and their value to geography education in schools. The enquiry is structured around three research questions (RQs), which are introduced below:

RQ1 What do young people’s narratives reveal about their geographies and imaginations of London?

RQ2 How can the ‘production of space’ contribute to knowledge of children’s geographies and imaginations of the world?

RQ3 How can geography education use ideas and methodologies from children’s geographies to enhance school geography?

As will be examined further in chapter three, and addressed in chapter seven, research question one aims to enable the young people in the study to share their geographies and imaginations of London. The value of this lies in collecting a case study of data which enables young people to share their experiences and imaginations of London and their world(s). As will be examined in detail in section 3.2, beginning with the child is an underpinning philosophy when conducting research in children’s geographies, with Matthews and Limb’s (1999) stating that the first thing children’s geographers should do, is listen. This philosophy aims to encourage, and enable, young people to share experiences and geographies that matter to them, and not be constrained by adult and/or research agendas.

Research question two focuses on examining the value of using the ‘production of space’ (see Harvey, 1990; Lefebvre, 1991; section 2.3.5) to analyse the narratives of the young people involved in this research. In the thesis, I argue that using the production of space enables a more nuanced understanding of children’s lives and geographies, and also enables connections to be made between children’s everyday lives, the discipline of geography and geography in schools.

In research question three, I critically consider how geography education in schools might draw upon the methodologies, and ideas, of children’s geographies (including those drawn upon, and used, in addressing RQ1 and RQ2) to enhance the quality of school geography. This research question contributes to knowledge, and debates,
about how the research problem, and need for this research, might be addressed in geography education.

I now move on to outline the significance of this research in section 1.4.

1.4 The significance of this research

This research investigates the value of children’s geographies to geography education in schools. Previous research has sought to consider the place of, and promote active consideration of, children’s geographies in geography education. In the case of the ‘Young People’s Geographies Project’ attempts have been made to link the three spaces of geographical thought introduced earlier in this chapter (see section 1.1; Hopwood, 2007; 2008; Firth and Biddulph, 2009; Young People’s Geographies Project). However, this research makes a distinct contribution to knowledge through original methodological choices in geography education (e.g. beginning with the child), and offering an original analysis of how the production of space can be used to provide new insights into children’s experiences and imaginations of the world.

The value of this lies in ‘crossing borders’ (see Castree et al., 2007) between different spaces of geographical thought (see sections 1.1 and 1.2). As whilst the importance of starting with the child has been an influential idea in children’s geographies (see for example, Matthews and Limb, 1999; Horton et al., 2008), and the production of space has offered valuable ways of critically examining everyday life in the academic discipline (Middleton, 2017; Hammond, 2019; see sections 2.3.5 and 3.6), they have received little attention in school (geography) education.

Drawing on a review of the literature on children’s geographies, and narratives of young people (analysed using the production of space as a conceptual framework), this thesis provides a case study of how research into, and methodologies drawn from, children’s geographies can be used to support geography educators to make informed decisions in their ‘curriculum making’ (see Lambert and Morgan, 2010), specifically in considering ‘student experiences’. Arguing further that using hitherto underexplored knowledge about children’s geographies can support geography
educators, and education, in enacting a GeoCapabilities approach through having a richer knowledge of how, and why, we should attend to the question ‘who are the children we teach?’ (see GeoCapabilities; Lambert and Morgan, 2010; sections 1.2.2, 2.2.4a, 4.6, chapter seven). The thesis also posits that enabling children to use disciplinary knowledge to study (their own) everyday lives, can support them in being more informed social actors.

Furthermore, as the research is contextualised and situated within place and time-space (specifically London in the 2010s), the research also contributes to knowledge about children’s geographies in London in this period. With findings highlighting that the young people in this research are navigating multiple, and sometimes contradictory social spaces, when constructing and representing themselves, and their identities, in London; that they imagine London as a jigsaw of territories with distinct social rules existing in different spaces and places within the city; and finally that the young people participating in the research view London as a place of opportunity and hope, but also as a place of inequality and injustice.

Whilst this thesis focuses on critically considering the value of these findings to geography education in schools, they are also of interest to the sub discipline children’s geographies and to wider society, in better understanding children and childhood in this time-space. I now move on to share the structure of this thesis in section 1.5.

1.5 Thesis structure

To outline the steps undertaken to complete this doctorate, and to demonstrate the rigour of this research and the claims it makes, the thesis follows the following structure:

Chapter two begins with a critical examination of the spaces of geographical thought introduced in chapter one in section 2.1. It introduces geography as an academic discipline, geography as a school subject and geography as part of everyday life, examining the relationships, and borders, between these different spaces. Following this, chapter two reviews the literature published to date on two areas:
The first focus is children’s geographies (section 2.2), and how it has been understood, and represented, in the different spaces of geographical thought identified in section 1.1;

The second focus is on the geographical concepts of place, space and time (section 2.3). These concepts are central to the thesis, both in situating the research in place and time-space, and also in introducing the ‘production of space’ as the conceptual framework used in the analysis of this research.

Chapter three provides an outline of the research design and methods undertaken to conduct this research. As the research was conducted with, and for, children, this section also examines the methodological and ethical considerations of research with children. It then draws upon the production of space (introduced in section 2.3.5) in outlining how the empirical data was analysed.

Chapter four is the first of three discussion chapters which share the findings of the research. It focuses on sharing the narratives of the young people analysed as relating to identity.

Chapter five is the second of three discussion chapters which share the findings of the research. This chapter examines the young people’s narratives related to territory and turf, a theme identified during analysis.

Chapter six is the third of three discussion chapters which share the findings of the research. It examines the young people’s conceptualisations of London as a place of opportunity and hope, but also a place of inequality and injustice.

Chapter seven concludes the thesis, addressing the research questions and demonstrating the contributions to knowledge the thesis has made. The chapter also makes suggestions for future research in the field.
Chapter two: Literature review

This chapter provides a systematic review of the literature published to date on research, and debates, that are central to this thesis (Bourner and Greener, 2016). The chapter is divided into two sections, which are focussed on examining areas of debate introduced in chapter one:

- Section 2.2 focusses on children’s geographies. This section is outlined in section 2.2.1 and introduces research, and debates, about children and their geographies that exist in different spaces of geographical thought. It posits that the existence of borders between the different spaces, have resulted in research about children’s geographies often being omitted from, or under-considered in, school geography. Arguing further that this has resulted in children sometimes being constructed and perceived as merely recipients of knowledge in education. This raises concerns about if, and how, children are actively engaged in meaning making and reciprocal dialogue with their teachers, as well as whether they are provided with opportunities to use ‘powerful knowledge’ (see Young and Muller, 2010; section 2.2.4) to critically examine (their own) everyday geographies and lives.

- Section 2.3 examines the concepts of place, space and time (or time-space (see Hägerstrand, 1975; section 2.3.4)), considering how they have been conceptualised and represented in the different spaces of geographical thought. This is worthy of examination not just because everything, including this research, happens in a place, which in turn exists within time-space, but also in introducing the ‘production of space’ (see Lefebvre, 1991; Harvey, 1990) which provides the conceptual framework for analysis used in this research (see section 1.3 and chapter 7). The section argues that further exploration of the production of space in school geography can support greater understanding of how people shape, and are shaped by, social space. Arguing further that this is of value in developing knowledge of power relations and inequality, and how they are produced and sustained in different places and time-spaces. The value of this ultimately lies in the
potential for geography to be more emancipatory, as knowledge of inequality can support people(s) in using disciplinary thought to challenge it.

Prior to this, the literature review begins by introducing the conceptual backdrop to the thesis in section 2.1, examining the different spaces of geographical thought highlighted by Tani (2011) and introduced in section 1.1.

2.1 Spaces of geographical thought
This section aims to provide a critical examination of the spaces of geographical thought introduced in section 1.1. It is situated here as it is drawn upon throughout the two major components of the literature review (see sections 2.2 and 2.3) in discussions about the relationships and borders between the different spaces. The section begins by sharing a visual representation of the three spaces of geographical thought as a conceptual triad in figure one:

![Figure 1: Spaces of geographical thought](image-url)
Lefebvre (1991) who used a conceptual triad to represent the production of space (see section 2.3.5), argues the value of using a triad lies in its representation of connectedness and enabling ideas to move easily between different dimensions. Figure one is used here to represent that each of the spaces of geographical thought have relationships with one another and are situated in place and time-space. This is something alluded to, but not explicitly examined, by Tani (2011). The inclusion of place and time-space in the diagram is representative of spaces of geographical thought being shaped by, and shaping, the place and time-space they exist within. The circle is used to represent totality, as everything exists in both a place and in time-space.

The remainder of this section is dedicated to introducing the spaces of geographical thought and examining the connections and borders between them. It begins by considering geography as part of everyday life in section 2.1.1. This is because it is the space in which all people(s), including geography’s students, and researchers, exist within and contribute to (Gregory et al., 2009; Johnston and Sidaway, 2016). Everyday life is also the space in which geography as a discipline and school subject began. Following this, the formal spaces of geographical thought are introduced in section 2.1.2.

2.1.1 Geography as part of everyday life
Long before geography was studied or researched in a formal manner it was part of everyday life (Bonnett, 2008; Murphy, 2018). Geography is everywhere (Matthews and Herbert, 2008; Cresswell, 2013) and people(s) have always used, and continued to use, geographical thought in order to survive. Survival, including the need to source water, food and shelter has determined the nature of geographical thought for much of human history (Bonnett, 2008). However, as humanity has evolved, and people have created more complex societies, geographical consciousness has become increasingly elaborate (Ibid.).

Although the geographical knowledge people need in order to survive and thrive today varies between people(s) and places (Tuan, 1976), geography remains of
critical importance to, and a fundamental part of, all people's lives (Tuan, 1993; Massey, 2005; Bonnett, 2008; Murphy, 2018). Whether conscious of it or not, people ask geographical questions all the time; from union leaders deciding where would be the best location to hold a demonstration; to parents/carers considering when, and where, it's safe for their children to play out of ear and eye shot; to a refugee making decisions about where they should go to seek safety and/or opportunities. These questions are ones we ask of ourselves, and of those around us (for example to our families, friends, communities and colleagues). The questions, and people’s interpretations and representations of them, are also a significant area of research and debate in the academic discipline of geography (Bonnett, 2008; Gregory et al., 2009; Johnston and Sidaway, 2016).

In this way, geography as part of everyday life has distinct relationships with spaces of formal geographical thinking. Indeed, Cresswell (2013: 2) argues that for geographers 'the questions we ask are profound because of, not in spite of, the everydayness of geographical concerns’, and that a person cannot ‘get through an hour, let alone a day, without confronting potentially geographical questions’ (Ibid.). Cresswell’s argument highlights that research in geography can both explore and represent everyday lives and geographies, and also has the potential to impact upon them and affect change.

This philosophy, and socio-political changes which saw society(s) becoming increasingly aware of inequalities between people(s) and places in the 1960s, informed motivations for the radical turn in geography (see Cresswell, 2013; Peet, 2015; section 2.2.3). This led to geography beginning to question ‘whose geography?’ (See Massey, 2008) was researched, studied, represented, valued and shared. One of the groups which were recognised as being under-considered in geography at this time, were children and young people (see for example, Aitken, 2001; 2018; Freeman and Tranter, 2011). The emergence and growth of geography’s academic interest in children is examined in detail in section 2.2.

This section has introduced geography as a part of everyday life, and begun to examine its relationships with the discipline of geography. It has highlighted that everyday life is an area of research in the academic discipline, and the desire to
research everyday life and inequality, is often born from the desire to affect socio-
political change. I now move on to further examine geography as a space of formal
study and thought in section 2.1.2. This section introduces both geography as an
academic discipline and a school subject.

2.1.2 Formal spaces of geographical thought

In this section, I begin by considering what is meant by an academic discipline. I then
examine the relationships between the discipline of geography and everyday life,
considering geography’s history as part of these discussions to situate the research
in academic debate. This is done both to formally recognise that geography has not
always researched or represented all people(s) with respect, and to position my
motivations for this research as part of a wider movement in geography to attend to
this inequality. Building on the borders between different spaces of thought set out
in chapter one, I then introduce geography as a school subject, examining its
relationships to both everyday life and geography as an academic discipline.

An academic discipline is a field of knowledge. As highlighted in discussions in chapter
one, which refer to two sub disciplines of geography (namely children’s geographies
and geography education), disciplines are made-up of sub disciplines and
communities. However disciplines are not isolated from everyday life and they ‘need
the support of wider society in order to exist’ (Johnston and Sidaway, 2016: 26).
Academics and researchers exist within, and contribute to, society and require
employment and/or funding to research and teach. In addition, research priorities
are sometimes implicitly, or explicitly, driven by external economic or socio-political
factors (Ibid.). Other relationships can be highlighted between geographical thought
in the academy and everyday life in both children’s geographies and geography
education. For example, they both involve research into everyday life. In addition,
academics in both sub disciplines often have a desire to affect societal, professional
and/or policy change through their research and teaching (see for example, Morgan,
2019). In light of this, and as reflected in the conceptual triad in figure one, it is
impossible to separate an academic discipline from the external worlds (including the
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place and time-space) they exist within and contribute to (Gregory et al., 2009; Butt, 2019).

Geography’s interests in, and relationships to, the world around it (indeed, the word geography itself means ‘Earth Writing’ (Gregory et al., 2009; Cresswell, 2013)), also mean that dating when it became an academic discipline is much debated (Matthews and Herbert, 2008; Heffernan, 2009; Johnston and Sidaway, 2016). For example, in the United Kingdom (UK), geography had been investigated, and taught, by ‘amateurs or scientists trained in other academic fields’ (Johnston and Sidaway, 2016: 38) for several centuries before it gained a separate disciplinary and departmental identity in universities (Ibid.). According to Johnston and Sidaway (2016), geography departments, and the discipline, were first established in German universities in around 1874. They argue that traders and commercial interests funded expeditions aiming to benefit from the knowledge, and at times, the land and people(s) the expeditions provided access to. With geographical thought being central to this growth, geographical societies and academic departments began to develop in a number of major trading posts and capital cities (ibid.). The development of geographical societies (such as the Royal Geographical Society (RGS), The Geographical Association (GA) in the UK), led to promotion of geography as both an academic discipline and school subject (Bonnett, 2008; Johnston and Sidaway, 2016).

Geography as a school subject in England expanded alongside the British Empire and the evolution of mass schooling in the late 19th Century (Bonnett, 2008; see also section 2.2.5). Like the academic discipline, geography as school subject has relationships with everyday life. For example, its students and teachers exist within, and contribute to, the social world. In addition, expectations about what is taught, and how it is taught, as well as debates about the purpose of schooling and education, vary between people(s) and places and across time-space (Walford, 2001; Lambert and Morgan, 2010; Morgan, 2018). Bonnett (2008) exemplifies this when discussing the first school students of geography during the age of empire in Britain, noting that students were expected to ‘recall the resources, communications, topographic features and ethnic groups of Britain’s overseas possessions’ in an age dominated by a pedagogy of ‘read and remember’” (p104).
School geography’s relationship with the academic discipline is complex and multifaceted. Although the discipline has at times played a ‘large role in shaping the geography curriculum at a school level’ (Walford and Haggett, 1995: 5), this has varied between places and across time-space. Over the past decade in both England, and in other countries (see for example Tani (2011) with reference to Finland), many academics interested in geography education in schools have issued warnings about an increasing disconnect between the academic discipline and school subject (see for example, Castree et al., 2007; Lambert and Morgan, 2010; Butt and Collins, 2018; Butt, 2019; see sections 1.1, 1.2.1, 1.2.2; 2.2.4a). Recognising, and examining, this disconnect is significant to this thesis in considering questions about which knowledge is taught, and how, in geography. Furthermore, it is of value in considering ‘whose geography?’ (Massey, 2008) is explored in the classroom (examined in detail in sections 2.2.4a and 2.2.4b).

In addition to the changing relationships between the different spaces of formal geographical thought, it’s also significant to recognise that academic disciplines and school subjects have distinct functions when it comes to knowledge. Examining these ideas is of value both in considering borders between these two spaces, and the relationships between the academic discipline and school subject we would most like to construct and why (this is examined in detail in section 2.2.4a).

Academic disciplines continuously evolve as new knowledge is created and tested (Bonnett, 2003; Castree et al., 2007; Lambert, 2014) and according to Johnston and Sidaway (2016) have three fundamental pillars of knowledge; its propagation, preservation and advancement. Whereas school geography education focusses on the communication of knowledge to students, with how knowledge is communicated varying significantly (Lambert, 2014). An example of this is highlighted above by Bonnett (2008) who discusses the relationships between curriculum and pedagogy in the age of empire. This example from Bonnett is pertinent to this research as it highlights that school geography is influenced by, and can influence, social imaginations of the world and the people(s) who call it home. Furthermore, it can also be seen to highlight that what is taught, and how, in schools, is influenced by
both its social and spatial context, and (to varying degrees) disciplinary thought (see Castree et al., 2007; Butt and Collins, 2018; section 2.2.4a)

Before concluding this section, it is also worthy of note that the two spaces also teach different social groups, with geography being a compulsory part of England’s national curriculum between Key Stage’s 1 and 3 (DfE, 2013). It then becomes optional, and accessible to only some, for academic, political, and in the case of university geography in England, socio-economic reasons, after this point. This means that geography as part of compulsory schooling is potentially the only time when a person is taught to ‘think geographically’ (Jackson, 2006; Geographical Association, 2009; 2012) in a formal space of geographical thought. Therefore if we consider geography as being of value to a person’s education, and the formation of an educated person, then the significance and opportunity of this time should not be under-estimated by geography educators or education (see Lambert et al., 2015; Bustin, 2019; GeoCapabilities website, section 2.2.4a).

In this section I have outlined the distinctions between different spaces of formal geographical thinking, and introduced their relationships with one another and with geographical thought in everyday life. The purpose of this has been to begin to contextualise the relationships and borders that presently exist between the different spaces. These ideas will be drawn upon, and further developed, throughout the literature review. I now move on to review literature about the sub discipline of children’s geographies in section 2.2.

2.2 Children’s and young people’s geographies

2.2.1 Introducing children’s and young people’s geographies
As introduced in chapter one, children are both the focus of, and active agents in, this research. This section begins by engaging in a theoretical discussion as to ‘what is a child?’ in section 2.2.2, considering how, and why, conceptions of childhood and children vary. Arguing that conceptualising children as a homogenous group, or as a purely biological construct, is deeply problematic for both school (geography) education and society more broadly. Following this, it builds on the debates
introduced in chapter one about the emergence and growth of children’s geographies as an area of academic interest in section 2.2.3. Drawing on wider debates in (geography) education about ‘powerful knowledge’, the section then examines the relationships and borders between the conceptualisation and study of children’s geographies in the academic discipline, and school subject, in sections 2.2.4a and 2.2.4b.

The chapter then moves on to consider the construction, and representation, of the child in formal education and schooling more broadly in section 2.2.5. This is worthy of examination as geography as a school subject is taught within, and exists as a part of, a wider educational system influenced by both socio-political and economic factors. Finally in section 2.2.6, I examine the relationships between the child and the city, specifically considering London as the context of this research and the home of the children who participated in this study. Sections 2.2.5 and 2.2.6 help to situate the study in place and time-space as per figure one. The chapter is concluded in section 2.2.7, with a note being offered on the terminology used to represent the young people in this research.

2.2.2 What is a child?

This section begins by asking ‘what is a child?’ Through the examination of this question, it also considers another related question ‘what is childhood?’ The decision to begin with what may seem like obvious questions is a conscious one, for although children and childhood are constructs that are familiar to most people, the word construct is highly significant in developing our understanding of both. In his book ‘A Critique of Everyday Life’, Lefebvre (1992: 14) argues that ‘we need to think about what is happening around us, within us, each and every day’. Lefebvre goes on to argue that whilst we live on familiar terms with many people(s) (for example, our family or those in our own milieu), that impression of familiarity does not mean that we know or understand a person, that they are defined for us, or that they see themselves in the same way (ibid.).

If we apply Lefebvre’s argument to the ideas of children and childhood, then the reason for asking ‘what is a child?’ becomes clearer. It is of value in examining
childhood as a social construct, that is often so ingrained in shared social imaginations that it seems ‘natural’ to us (Valentine, 1996; Shapiro; 1991; Aitken, 2001; Skelton, 2008; Hörschelmann and van Blerk, 2012; Freeman and Tranter, 2015). This section aims to critically examine these perceptions of familiarity, and consider how different people, and ideas, have shaped and influenced imaginations of children and childhood. Furthermore, the section examines debates about power relationships in the construction of social identity, which can impact upon children’s experiences and imaginations of the world, and how they view themselves and are viewed by others (Aitken, 2001; Skelton, 2008; Kellet, 2014).

In the academy, both ‘the child’ and childhood are now widely recognised to be more than biologically defined, and as being socially constructed and historically situated (see for example, Hendrick, 1997; Valentine et al, 1998; Aitken, 2001; Freeman and Tranter, 2011; Hörschelmann and van Blerk, 2012; Fass, 2013; Holloway, 2014). Indeed, ‘the child’ can be seen as a social identity (Holloway and Valentine, 2000) that is, in part, constructed by the child and children themselves (Aitken, 1994; Skelton, 2008). However as introduced in chapter one, although these debates are exceedingly prevalent in the academy, their place in school geography is contested.

Despite arguments calling for geography teachers to engage with these debates (see for example, Yarwood and Tyrell, 2012; Biddulph, 2012; Catling, 2014; Roberts, 2017), and the recognition of students experiences, and/or everyday knowledge, on many models and approaches about teaching geography (see section 1.2.2), they have been largely omitted from geography education in schools. Reviewing these debates is of value to this thesis for two reasons:

- Firstly, unless school geography considers these debates, children risk being conceptualised as a homogenous group by those who teach them, especially given the landscape of educational accountability and performativity, which presently exists in schools in England (see section 1.2.1 and 1.2.2; Mitchell and Lambert, 2015; Jones and Lambert, 2018). This could lead to children feeling misunderstood and not represented, with their voices and geographies being under-considered by their teachers. The potential impacts of this are both educational and social. Social impacts include the potential
for children feeling excluded, and educational impacts include teaching not engaging with, or building on, what children already know and the creation of what Freire (1970) terms ‘a banking model’ of education.

- Secondly, the omission of children’s geographies from the curriculum at national, and often classroom, levels may mean that children are not provided with opportunities to examine who they are, and what it means to be a child or young person in the place, and time-space, they exist within. This could lead to children feeling, or being, disempowered as social agents in their own lives through lack of access to what Young (2008) terms ‘powerful knowledge’ about children’s geographies (see sections 2.2.4a and 2.2.4b). Furthermore, this has the potential to result in teachers having a limited knowledge of children and childhood, which could impact on the decisions they make when ‘curriculum making’ (Lambert and Morgan, 2010).

Whilst these ideas are examined in greater depth in section 2.2.4a and 2.2.4b, they are highlighted here to argue the importance of questioning what Lefebvre (1992) describes as ‘familiarity’ in social constructs, labels and imaginations. I now move on to consider the question of who defines the child.

As previous conceptions of childhood and children (such as childhood being defined in solely biological terms) have become destabilised (Holt, 2011; Freeman and Tranter, 2015), the idea that conceptualisations have been mostly constructed and dominated by adult perspectives, has been raised as being particularly problematic (Aitken, 1994; Valentine, 1996; Hendrick, 1997; Jeffrey, 2010; Skelton, 2008; Freeman and Tranter, 2011; Hörschelmann and van Blerk, 2012). This concern is pertinent given that adult perspectives ‘dominate representations in the media, in political discourses and in theoretical debates’ (Hörschelmann and van Blerk, 2012: 11), and these spaces have the power to affect children’s everyday lives (and futures), and how they are perceived, represented and treated (ibid.). However it is now recognised that children, like all people, contribute to, and are affected by, the social space they exist within and its production (see section 2.3.5). In this way, children are not passive recipients of their social identity, they (in part) construct it themselves (Aitken, 1994; Skelton, 2008).
Recognising, and examining, children’s role in the construction of both childhood and their own social identities, is a central aspect of developing knowledge of children, childhood and society more broadly (Fass, 2013). It can also enhance our understanding of the nature of ‘Being’ or ‘Dasein’ (see Heidegger, 1962; Mulhal, 2013), which Heidegger (1962) posits is peculiar to being human, and represents the notion of being aware, or (self) conscious, as we exist within the world. This is because these debates reflect an understanding that children exist as ‘Being’, and yet school geography, and schooling more broadly, doesn’t always reflect this conception of child (see also section 1.2.2).

Despite the benefits of considering children’s construction of their own social identities outlined above, it is worthy of note that it can also be an uncomfortable process for some adults. Accepting that children, in part, construct their own identities and childhoods means that it makes it difficult, if not impossible, for adults to fully understand children’s experiences and imaginations of the world (Skelton, 2008). In the context of formal (geographical) education, recognising, and valuing, children’s perspectives would involve critical consideration of the traditional power relationships between adult and child (for example, between teacher and student) that often exist, and can subordinate children, in schools (see for example; Freire, 1970; Foucault, 1978; Giddens, 2016; examined in detail 2.2.5).

In addition to the child’s role in constructing their own social identity(s), adult conceptualisations of children have also influenced social imaginations of children and childhood. Examining adult perspectives is of value, as they can, and often do, have varying degrees of social, spatial, economic and political power over children. In the next part of this section, I examine adult constructions of the child in two ways. Firstly, I consider ‘grand narratives’ (see Goodson, 2013) which affect social imaginations of children, before examining policy discourse.

For Goodson (2013), grand narratives are widespread popular imaginations that also affect policy and practice. Critically considering grand narratives enables examination of how shared social imaginations of children have, and continue to, affect children’s everyday lives and adult views on, and actions towards, children. Further to this, Hendrick (1997) argues that popular imaginations and grand narratives about
children are sometimes constructed and sustained by adults as they can be used to ‘mould’ children into a singular, conceptual, construction to make them easier to be socially and politically ‘managed’. For example, teacher-student relationships (Aitken, 1994; Freire, 1970).

A widely recognised, and debated, popular social imagination of children in Britain is that of innocent angels (who need protecting) and wild devils (who need controlling) (Valentine, 1998; Holloway and Valentine, 2000; Aitken, 2001; Freeman and Tranter, 2011). These imaginations feed into debates about children and their lives in spaces such as the media and can also impact upon how they are treated in society (Freeman and Tranter, 2011). For example, children are increasingly absent from cityscapes, and encouraged to play in specific places where they are easily managed and even commercialised (see for example, Massey, 1998; McKendrick, 2009; Freeman and Tranter, 2011; Harvey, 2013; see section 2.2.6).

Social imaginations and grand narratives related to children also affect the language used to describe them in the space of everyday life. Children are often described using different social labels (e.g. child, youth, adolescent, teenager, young person etc.), with the use of these labels regularly varying with the social purpose of the narrative and reflecting (implicit or explicit) cultural imaginations (Valentine et al., 1998; Aitken, 2001; Holt, 2011). Valentine et al. (1998) exemplify this when they suggest that the use of the term ‘youth’ often relates to young people being constructed as troublesome in, and to, society. They also note that even within a specific place, and group of people, terms such as youth are hard to define. This is because they have often been used and constructed over a long period of time, with different people(s) using and understanding the term differently (ibid.) The use of these social labels also impacts on how children view and represent themselves, and how they are viewed and represented by others (Valentine et al., 1998; Aitken, 2001; Hörschelmann and van Blerk, 2012).

Thus far in this section, I have examined the value of asking ‘what is a child?’ both for this research and for society more broadly. Following this, I examined why it is significant to recognise that children (in part) construct their own social identities, before beginning to explore adult constructions and social imaginations of children.
In the final part of this section, I examine political constructions of childhood, as they can impact upon a child’s life and the opportunities they have available to them. Indeed, Shapiro (1999: 717) urges us to consider the impact of defining childhood in quasi-legal terms by asking ‘what, exactly are we are attributing to a person when we accord her the status of a child?’ suggesting that there needs to be careful consideration of legally constructing childhood. Shapiro’s warning is especially pertinent, when considering laws and ideas when transcend national boundaries and/or socio-spatial contexts, and Hörschelmann and van Blerk (2012) assert that relational perspectives are needed to avoid doing harm to children.

One particularly powerful example of the legal construction of childhood is the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (UNCRC). The UNCRC has been ratified by all countries in the world apart from the United States of America (USA) meaning it has an almost global political reach. Matthews and Limb (1999: 63) assert it to be ‘the first universal law of humankind’ and extol that it placed children ‘firmly on the political agenda’. It has also influenced the space of UK policy (for example the Children Act, 2004), which is significant to this study as it provides the political context of the research. In addition, it has also been widely debated in the epistemic context to this study; the sub-discipline of children’s geographies, (see for example, Hörschelmann and van Blerk, 2012; Evans and Holt, 2014; Freeman and Tranter, 2015; Aitken, 2018).

In the preamble to the UNCRC, the United Nations (UN) state their ideological vision for the convention, proclaiming ‘that childhood is entitled to special care and assistance’ (1990: 3) and argue for international co-operation to improve the ‘living conditions of children in every country’. The document sets out both an international philosophy for the support and growth of children, and outlines how this might be achieved through specific articles (see UNCRC, 1990). The UNCRC attempts to provide both a vision for the rights of child, and articulates how the enactment of this vision might be supported. However, there are always differences between the planned and enacted. In the case of the UNCRC, these differences are further exacerbated by the diverse nature of all of the countries that have ratified the convention (Freeman and Tranter, 2011; Hörschelmann and van Blerk, 2012). For,
example, whilst the UNCRC asks governments to protect children from child labour (see UNCRC, article 31), this might be essential to some children’s survival. Thus strictly enforcing the universal declaration of rights may result in ‘children being denied the very support they need the most’ (Hörschelmann and van Blerk, 2012: 11).

In this section, I have considered some of the complexities in defining ‘the child’, examining a variety of perspectives to support the discussions. Children and childhood remain debated social constructs, which will continue to vary between people(s), places and across time-space. I agree with Fass (2013) that examining these debates is of value in developing our knowledge of children, childhood and society. In this thesis, I argue that considering ‘what is a child?’ is of value to geography education in schools, both in developing teachers’ understanding of children and childhood, and also in supporting children in examining (their own) geographies. In doing so, throughout the thesis, I often refer to the child as ‘being’ to reflect their existence as a person beyond their given identity in school as a student. Drawing on Heidegger (1962) this term aims to represent the child as being aware and self-conscious in the world, and contributing to both the construction of their own identity and social space. The use of a lower case ‘b’ represents that my use of the term ‘being’ also draws on other ideas and theorists when considering the child as being. For example, I also draw upon, and examine, debates about children being shaped by, and shaping, social space (examined in depth in section 2.3.2 and 2.3.5) and debates in children’s geographies as to how the child constructs their own identity (section 2.2).

I now move on to examine the emergence and growth of the sub-discipline of children’s geographies in sections 2.2.3a and 2.2.3b.

2.2.3a Children’s geographies: the emergence of a sub discipline

Children and young people were conspicuously absent for much of the early development of geography as an academic discipline (Matthews and Limb, 1999; Aitken, 2001; Horton et al., 2008; Freeman and Tranter, 2015). With one of the early advocates of the study of children’s geographies, Roger Hart, arguing in his 1982
paper at the Association of American Geographers conference, that despite human geography beginning in childhood, children have been ‘largely ignored’ (p1) apart from in relation to research in geography education. He argued further that this research was largely centred on the study of children in formal school settings, thus ignoring the everyday lives and geographies of children. This argument was part of a movement in the discipline of geography ‘to attend to experiences, issues and geographies of children and young people hitherto overlooked by human geographers’ (Horton et al., 2008: 338). These concerns, and actions towards addressing them, formed a major element of the groundwork of the sub discipline of children’s geographies (ibid.).

This section outlines the emergence and growth of children’s geographies as a sub discipline. It begins in this section (2.2.3a) by considering the philosophical, and socio-political, ideas that stimulated the emergence of the sub discipline, before outlining key events and ideas that supported its growth in 2.2.3b. Throughout these sections, links are drawn to the different spaces of geographical thought (see figure one), positing that there should be increased consideration of everyday life, and disciplinary thought on this space, in school geography. Following this, the section examines children’s geographies today, outlining some of the challenges it faces.

Contemporary geography recognises that people(s) and places vary across time-space, and that even within a ‘group’ of people, social identities may vary and change (see for example, Lefebvre, 1992; Jackson, 1992; Massey, 2005; see section 2.2.2). Part of this recognition is an acknowledgement ‘that different social groups occupy unequal positions of power and autonomy’ (Matthews and Limb, 1999: 62), and that powerful groups attempt to (re)produce their power spatially, socio-politically and economically (see for example, Harvey, 1990; 2013; Lefebvre, 1991; 1992; Massey, 2005; 2008; see section 2.2.1). As a discipline that seeks to understand, represent, and even affect change (see Cresswell, 2013; Bonnett, 2003; see section 2.1), this recognition has resulted in exposing ‘hegemonic values which underpin the differential positionings and to raise consciousness that within Western societies many aspects of life are the outcome of white, ableist, adult, male, middle-class
decision making’ (Matthews and Limb, 1999: 62), becoming a fundamental motivation for some geographers.

As this argument became more established in the discipline, people(s) who had been previously under-researched, and/or under-represented, in geography were sought out as areas of interest and enquiry (Matthews and Limb, 1999). With geographers, such as David Harvey, pushing for a move away from conservative traditions of geography (see also section 2.1.2), and for geography to consider, study, and represent, the geographies of all people(s). This included a focus on women, children, and ‘ethnic minority’ communities, who had traditionally been marginalised by geography and/or society (Peet, 2013). One such group that was identified as being under-researched, was that of children and young people.

Research into children’s geographies began in 1970s America with the work of Bunge and Bordessa (see Bunge, 1973; Bunge and Bordessa, 1975; James, 1990; Holloway and Valentine, 2000; Aitken, 2001; Freeman and Tranner, 2015). Bunge’s work used ‘geographical expeditions’ to explore the everyday lives and spatial repression of children (Aitken, 2001). This research can be seen as representative of emerging debates in geography about the social construction of identity (Holloway and Valentine, 2000), and wider debates in the space of everyday life in which prejudice and inequality, environmental destruction and geopolitical issues (such as the Vietnam War), became increasingly prevalent in ‘The West’ (Peet, 2013).

Early works in children’s geographies also began to critically consider how best to conduct research with, and for, children (Hart, 1984; Moore, 1986; examined in greater depth in chapter three). This related to other debates such as the contestation, and examination, of ingrained social imaginings which considered children as being less than an adult (Holloway and Valentine, 2000b). However, despite increased research and publications in the field, for many years the work was largely ignored in the ‘adultist’ discipline (Holloway and Valentine, 2000b). Leading to James (1990) being compelled to ask ‘is there a ‘place’ for children in geography?’ arguing:

‘The vast majority of geographical bookshelves or any geography course syllabi soon make us realise that geography is / has been dominated by the study of
`man`, an adult man and latterly women. We might be forgiven in thinking that children simply do not exist in the spatial world, since so much geographic research is undertaken in terms of adult experience only’ (James, 1990: 278).

James argued that although the discipline had begun to consider the geographies of ‘the other half’ (ibid.) in woman, as a discipline it was still failing to research and represent the geographies of all people, including those of children. For James, this limited the breadth and depth of knowledge that the discipline geography was producing, propagating and advancing (see Johnston and Sidaway, 2016; section 2.1.2). It also limited geographers understanding of everyday life, and thus how the discipline might engage in socio-political debate, and where appropriate/possible, affect change.

In the next section (2.2.3), I continue to outline the growth of the sub-discipline of children’s geographies. In doing so, I highlight the philosophical, and socio-political, significance of the developments that the study of children’s geographies has led to. I also begin to suggest some borders which may have prevented ideas from children’s geographies being considered in school geography.

2.2.3b Children’s geographies: the growth of a sub discipline
Since its emergence in the 1970s, the sub discipline of children’s geographies has continued to grow and evolve. Aitken (2018: 4) argues that ‘the critical and radical edge of this work, often springing from feminism and the margins of Marxism, involved something that pushed the agency and rights of children and young people’. Aitken suggests that this push was from academic research and debates, to spaces of politics and everyday life and goes on to highlight two events which he argues ‘propelled the concept of children’s geographies onto the world stage’ (ibid.). These events were:

- The signing of the UNCRC, which Aitken asserts forced geographers to critically consider what is meant by ‘the child’ (see section 2.2.2);
- The rise of the New Sociology of Childhood (see also section 3.2), which questioned singular Western ingrained imaginations of childhood, and
explored power relations between age, and other social differences, across time-space (Hörschelmann and van Blerk, 2012). It also encouraged geographers to consider the importance of interdisciplinary and international research on children.

These changes reflected an increased understanding in cultural geography that all people are not the same, and that diversity and difference are important (Matthews and Limb, 1999).

Children’s geographies relationships with political discourse reflected an increasing questioning of ‘whose geography?’ (Massey, 2008) in the academy, and a growing socio-political engagement with children’s, and human, rights in the space of everyday life (Matthews and Limb, 1999; Hörschelmann and van Blerk, 2012; Aiken, 2018; UNCRC). Aitken (2018: 4) considers this to be the second phase in the ‘evolution and involution of children’s geographies’ as a concept, considering the first phase from its emergence in the 1970s-1990s as ‘an impression’, the second phase (1900s-2000s) as being ‘coherently political’, and the present phase (from 2000s to the present day) as being ‘a challenge as to what we think we know about young people and their geographies’.

Another seminal moment in the evolution of the sub discipline was the launch of the international journal ‘Children’s Geographies’ in 2003. Matthews (2003) argues that this was spurred by both increased research, and debate, in the sub discipline, and also the network of excellence funded by the Royal Geographical Society and Institute of British Geographers (RGS-IBG) ‘whose focus was upon children, youth and families’ (p4). Since this date, children’s geographies has continued to grow into a diverse sub discipline of geography with international and interdisciplinary connections both within the academy, and also with non-academic organizations and individuals such as policy-makers, Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) and service providers (Gregory et al., 2009; Holloway and Pilmott-Wilson, 2011; Holt; Holloway, 2014; Robson et al., 2015; Freeman and Tranter, 2015; Aitken, 2018).

However, despite the advances in the sub discipline, there remains debate amongst geographers in the academy as to the scope of children’s geographies, and its relationships with the wider discipline (Evans and Holt, 2014; Horton et al., 2008).
Holt (2011) argues that one of the reasons for the division between the sub discipline, and geography more broadly, is the creation of a ‘gated community’ (see also section 1.2.2), which she posits surrounds children’s geographies. Holt argues that this community has been created, and sustained, by a network of dedicated conferences and journals that academics often stay within. Holt goes on to suggest that the sub discipline needs to be aware of these challenges to ensure that it engages with the wider discipline, arguing that this is necessary both to support its growth and share research, and also to help ensure that it is not side-lined or ghettoized (ibid.). These debates are significant to this thesis, both in examining why there are ‘borders’ (see Castree et al., 2007) between sub disciplines, and also in developing the argument for increased communication between children’s geographies and geography education, for mutual benefit (see also section 2.2.4).

Sections 2.2.3a, and 2.2.3b, have examined how children’s geographies has developed as a sub discipline of geography since its emergence in 1970s America. It is now a mature sub discipline, which is able to reflect upon its own accumulated knowledge base (see for example, McKendrick, 2000; Horton et al., 2008; Aitken, 2018). However as introduced in chapter one, these developments have not always been considered or recognised in geography education in schools. Put another way, school geography has not consistently used disciplinary thought to explore children’s everyday lives and geographies, due to borders existing between the two spaces. The next section (2.2.4) moves on to examine these debates further, by reviewing the literature on the relationships and borders between children’s geographies in the academy and geography as a school subject.

2.2.4a Situating the debate: the relationships and ‘borders’ between geography in the academy and geography as a school subject

As introduced and problematized in chapter one, there are disconnects between knowledge about children’s geographies in the academic discipline of geography and geography as a school subject. These disconnects can be conceptualised as part of a wider contemporary concern in geography education about the existence of ‘borders’ (Castree et al., 2007) between these two spaces of formal geographical
thought. Drawing on research and literature to date, this section examines these ideas further, and is divided into two inter-related, but distinct, subsections:

- This section, 2.2.4a, builds on the debates introduced in section 2.1, which considered the different functions of academic and school geography. The section begins by examining the relationships, and differences, between geography education and school geography. It argues that the conceptualisation of geography education being mainly focussed on school geography is problematic as it neglects the relationships between the academic discipline and school subject. Following this, I examine the idea of ‘powerful knowledge’ (see Young, 2008; Young and Muller, 2010), considering how, and why, this idea is of value to school geography. Building on these ideas, the section then examines how the GeoCapabilities approach has aimed to attend to the question of how powerful geographical knowledge ‘can contribute to the thinking and empowerment of an educated person in the 21st century?’ (Hawley et al., 2017: 18). The inclusion, and critical consideration, of both powerful knowledge and the GeoCapabilities approach in this section, and the thesis more broadly, situates the borders between children’s geographies in different spaces of geographical thought, in wider debates in geography education.

- Section 2.2.4b examines how children’s geographies has been included, and considered, in school geography. Following this, the section examines arguments for greater inclusion of children’s geographies in the school subject, before drawing on the arguments introduced in section 2.2.4a to argue for a border crossing between children’s geographies and geography education.

Different conceptualisations of geography education exist. Gregory et al. (2009: 187) state in the ‘Dictionary of Human Geography’ that the sub discipline’s focus is on ‘the provision and nature of instruction in the discipline in schools and universities’. This perception can be seen to be echoed by the RGSs recently renamed ‘Geography and Education’ research group, whose nexus of geography and education includes
‘pedagogy, teaching and learning in geography’, ‘geographies of education’ and ‘geographical education’, and encompasses both formal and informal spaces of education (see figure two). However, as articulated in the International Geographical Union’s (IGU) (2016) ‘International Charter on Geographical Education’, school geography is often the primary focus of the sub discipline. Indeed, much of the teaching and research done in geography education focuses on (initial) teacher education and school geography, with academics in this field often being situated in education, as opposed to geography, departments in universities (Butt, 2019).

Figure 2: The Geography and Education nexus: as shared by the Royal Geographical Society’s Geography and Education Research Group by email to its members on 12th September 2019

Considering how geography education is conceptualised, and how this is enacted in practice (e.g. via research and teaching), is worthy of examination as it has sometimes led to geography education being socially, and physically, separate from geography departments in Higher Education Institutes (HEIs). This risks it being difficult for geography education, and educators, to ‘keep up’ (Lambert, 2009; Morgan, 2018) with the discipline as new knowledge is created and tested. This issue can also be seen to be exacerbated by the often limited research time given to
geography educators in universities, and/or increasingly other settings (such as Multi Academy Trusts (MATs)), who have often career changed from being a teacher, and require social and economic investment to support them in developing as academics and/or geography teacher educators (see also Butt, 2019). It can also result in limited discussions about the relationships between geography education in the different spaces of geographical thought. For example, both in regards to transitions in formal education, and also in actively considering the relationships between geography as a discipline and school subject that, as geographers, we would most like to construct.

In countering these borders, Lambert (2014: 157) argues the need for geography education to re-engage with disciplinary knowledge to ‘create educational encounters of significance’ for its (school) students. The notion of re-engaging is significant here, as drawing on wider debates about powerful knowledge (see for example, Young and Muller, 2010; Young, 2013; Roberts, 2013; Young et al., 2014; Lambert and Biddulph, 2015; Butt, 2017; Young and Muller, 2016; Maude, 2016; Roberts, 2017; Counsell, 2018), Lambert asserts both the importance of subjects framing the curriculum, and their role in providing students with access to the best possible knowledge available. He argues that this knowledge is disciplinary knowledge, it is knowledge that has been created and tested in the academy. Although this knowledge is not neutral, or free from socio-cultural norms (see also Young et al., 2014; Butt, 2017; Morgan, 2019), it is the closest to truth that humanity has thus far created. The importance of the school subject ‘keeping up’ with this knowledge lies not only in the maintenance and growth of academic disciplines, or providing social impact for academics (for example, in sharing their research beyond the academy), but primarily in providing all school students with access to this ‘powerful knowledge’.

As such, social justice is a pivotal element in debates about powerful knowledge. For example, Butt (2017: 16) asserts:

‘Providing students with access to disciplinary knowledge in schools is essential – it is an issue of social justice, because people need such knowledge to conduct debates, to address problems and to inform decisions within the societies they live.’
When these ideas are contextualised in the wider socio-political, and temporal, contexts in which geography education exists, they can facilitate debate about power, inequality and access to education (see also section 2.2.5). Put another way, these debates enable critical consideration as to whether access to powerful knowledge has been provided to all students, and examination of any barriers which may have prevented this from happening (Young et al., 2014; Morgan, 2019). Examining these landscapes is of value both in developing a clearer picture of geographies of education (see also section 2.2.4b), and also informing decisions as to how inequality in access to quality geographical education might be addressed at a multitude of scales. For example, in government policy, curricula choices and also in developing teachers as ‘curriculum makers’ (see Lambert and Morgan, 2010).

Michael Young, who coined the term powerful knowledge (see Young, 2008), introduces the idea of three futures for education (see also Young and Muller, 2010; Young et al., 2014; Young and Muller, 2016). The three futures conceptualise and represent, the different relationships school education (and its teachers and students) have, and have had, with knowledge. They are summarised by Morgan (2019: 173) as:

- **Future one** ‘knowledge is what is often termed ‘traditional knowledge’, with fixed subject boundaries and a body of content considered worth learning for its own sake’;

- **Future two** ‘knowledge is that which favours the collapsing of subject boundaries, and more generally, suggests that the generic competences associated with being a learner are to be stressed over acquisition of knowledge’;

- **Future three** an ‘orientation to knowledge assumes that where subject boundaries are maintained, knowledge matters, yet content is not fixed and is open to change’.

In England, future one can be linked to early evolution of mass schooling, a period in which students often recalled the knowledge that they were taught (see also section 2.1.2). This ideology impacted upon curriculum, pedagogy and student-teacher
relationships (Morgan, 2019). An example of this was highlighted in section 2.1.2, drawing on Bonnett’s argument that in the age of empire, the primary pedagogy in geography education was often that of ‘read and remember’. Future Two emerged from socio-political discourses which wanted all students to gain access to qualifications, no matter what it did to the social value of said qualifications, and in which ‘learning to learn’ was perceived as being of greater value to a student’s education than subject knowledge (Lambert, 2014; Morgan, 2019; Butt, 2019). Thus, Lambert’s push to re-engage with knowledge, and ultimately, to construct a future three curriculum lies in providing all students with access, through the school subject, to the ever-evolving powerful knowledge that is created in academic disciplines.

Powerful knowledge has been much debated in geography education. For example, in a debate with Young at UCL Institute of Education in 2013, Roberts echoed his concerns about a focus on generic skills in (geography) education (see Young, 2013; Roberts, 2013). However, Roberts also argued that subject knowledge is not powerful without ‘powerful pedagogies’, and questioned Young’s separation of everyday knowledge (which includes children’s geographies) and powerful knowledge, noting that everyday knowledge is a distinct area of research and debate in academic geography (see also section 2.2.4b). Further to this, geography educators have also questioned what powerful knowledge is, and how a future three curriculum might be enacted (see for example, Maude, 2016; 2018; Bustin, 2019; GeoCapabilities website).

Maude (2016: 72) has, in his own words, aimed to ‘add’ to the powerful knowledge debates, by identifying ‘types of geographical knowledge that might be considered powerful’. Drawing on the work of Lambert and Young, Maude argues that powerful knowledge is ‘enabling’, and suggests a typology of knowledge that is powerful to, and for, geography’s students:

- **Type one** – knowledge that provides students with new ways of thinking about the world;
- **Type two** – knowledge that provides students with powerful ways to analyse, explain and understand the world;
- **Type three** – knowledge that gives students some power over their own knowledge;
- **Type four** – knowledge that enables young people to follow and participate in debates on significant local, national and global issues;
- **Type five** – knowledge of the world.

These ideas have been drawn on by others in the geography education community. For example, Bustin (2019) posits that the typology is of value as it offers broad ideas as to how geographical knowledge is powerful, thus also enabling geography teachers to make decisions about what to teach, and how to teach it. Conceptually, this argument empowers the teacher as ‘expert’ in their classroom and practice. However, Bustin also heeds a warning that on its own, Maude’s typology, is not able to ‘enable a meaningful and engaging curriculum’ (p88). For this, he advocates Lambert and Morgan’s (2010) notion of ‘curriculum making’ (see figure three).

*Figure 3: The ‘curriculum making’ model: as published in Lambert and Biddulph (2014) and developed from Lambert and Morgan (2010)*
Through this model, the teacher is empowered as a curriculum maker as they balance ‘student experiences’, ‘teaching/pedagogy’ and ‘geography: the subject’. Bustin asserts that it is in this model that the potential to create a future three curriculum is truly present. This is because it connects ideas of powerful knowledge, and ‘powerful pedagogies’, and also recognises children and their experiences (albeit via their given identity in school as ‘students’). He argues that it is in balancing these three areas, and drawing on geography’s ‘key concept’s, the notion of ‘thinking geographically’, ‘learning activities’ and considering how we ‘take the learner beyond what they already know’, that what Lambert terms ‘educational encounters of significance’ are truly created. Further to this, Bustin explains that in situating the curriculum-making model ‘in the context of the discipline of geography’, the complex processes of recontextualisation (see Bernstein, 2000; Firth, 2018) are highlighted. In this way it can be seen to represent the relationships between geography as an academic discipline and the school subject.

One project that has drawn on these ideas, and aimed to critically examine if, how, and why, a future three curriculum might be constructed and enacted in geography education, as well as considering the barriers to doing so, is the GeoCapabilities project (see GeoCapabilities website; introduced in section 1.2.2). The GeoCapabilities approach has applied the ideas of economist Amarta Sen, and philosopher Martha Nussbaum, on the ‘capabilities approach’ (see Nussbaum and Sen, 1993) to education. The capabilities approach highlights ‘the means that a single human being needs to have in order to pursue his or her wellbeing’ (Uhlenwinkel et al., 2016: 238), with capabilities being ‘concepts which have been used as measures for human development and capacity (GeoCapabilities website). When applied to education, Bustin (2019: 3) posits that it provides a ‘means to consider what a curriculum is able to enable a student ‘to be’ or ‘to think like’ as a result of their education’. Arguing further that it provides a framework for considering the value of a subject based curriculum, to consider how subjects are of value to a ‘good life’, and what people are ‘capable of doing, thinking or achieving and what freedoms this affords them to live life in the way that they choose’ (p99-100).
Lambert has applied the capabilities approach to geography education in particular (Uhlenwinkel et al., 2016; Bustin, 2019), critically considering the contribution geography makes to person’s education and an educated person (Hawley et al., 2017). Lambert et al., (2015) explain one of the theoretical underpinnings of GeoCapabilities, as being the ‘transformative potential’ of a university education through disciplinary knowledge which changes, and broadens, how a person thinks about the world. They argue that it is a matter of social justice that all people, and not just those who are able to access university level education (see also section 2.1.2), have opportunities to engage with disciplinary knowledge and thinking, to enable them to develop their (geo)capabilities through schooling.

Debates about powerful knowledge, and future three, have informed the development of the GeoCapabilities project, which is currently in its third phase (see GeoCapabilities website). The project has aimed to consider geography’s potential to develop a person’s capabilities by; examining if, and how, current educational policy and practice portray geography and its value to young people; and also in considering ‘in what ways is the capabilities approach potentially helpful in shaping approaches to curriculum-making and developing teachers as leaders in schools’ (Uhlenwinkel et al., 2016: 329).

As well as drawing on ideas of curriculum making, the GeoCapabilities project also developed a model for ‘adopting a capabilities approach’ (see figure four; sections 1.2.2 and 4.6), which they shared via an emailed newsletter sent on 8th March 2016. The model expresses that geography educators should consider three questions, starting from the outer concentric circle on the model and moving inwards, in their curriculum making:

- Who are the children we teach?
- Why teach geography in this day and age?
- What shall we teach and how shall we teach it?
Figure 4: Adopting a capabilities approach: as shared in the GeoCapabilities electronic newsletter on 8th March 2016

This model is worthy of examination as part of the conceptual framework for this research, as it asserts that geography educators should consider the children they teach before anything else. In doing so, the model also represents children as children, and not only students, thus appearing to acknowledge and value the child as ‘being’ (see also sections 1.2.1 and 2.2.2). Following this, the model expresses that teachers should critically consider the purpose of geography education in the place and time-space they exist within and contribute to, before making decisions about curriculum (what to teach) and pedagogy (how to teach it). The ordering of the questions is significant, as without considering both the child, and the purposes of a geographical education, the questions of curriculum and pedagogy become under-informed.

However, although shared in 2016, the model has received limited attention in published literature. I have drawn upon it in a chapter on fieldwork in geography education (see Hammond, 2018; 177-178), arguing that it ‘provides a visual
representation of the considerations that teachers need to make as they begin to plan fieldwork into their curriculum’. In addition, Leon (unpublished) has used it in her work with geography teachers in California on ‘curriculum making’. However, Leon is yet to publish this work.

Exploring debates about powerful knowledge, future three and GeoCapabilities, situates my argument that there are borders between knowledge about children’s geographies in geography as an academic discipline and school subject, in wider debates in geography education. Put another way, examining these debates can enable critical questioning as to why whole sub disciplines, such as children’s geographies, have been under-explored in, and by, the school subject. When considered alongside Lambert and Morgan’s (2010) argument that school geography has at times been ‘socially selective’ about what it teaches, the powerful knowledge debate can support the argument that children’s geographies has sometimes been omitted because it is either not valued, or known about, by those who make decisions about what is included in the curriculum at different levels (Catling, 2011).

Its omission can also be argued to be an issue of social justice, as providing children with access to disciplinary knowledge that they can use to consider (their own) geographies in a formal educational space, could support their development as informed social actors and thus develop their GeoCapabilities. For example, by giving students power over their own everyday knowledge and new ways of thinking about their worlds (see Maude, 2016) through powerful knowledge. Further to this, if ‘who are the children we teach?’ is not considered by geography teachers, this could result in their curriculum making being under-informed.

Drawing on these ideas, I now move on to argue for a border crossing between children’s geographies and geography education in section 2.2.4b. The term border crossing is used to represent an argument for increased communication, research (sharing) and knowledge exchange, between the two sub disciplines of geography with the greatest interest in children and young people.
2.2.4b Arguing for a ‘border crossing’ between children’s geographies and geography education

Two major strands of research, and debate, about the relationships between children’s geographies and geography education exist in the academy at present:

- Firstly debates as to if, and how, children’s geographies should be included, studied and represented in school geography (see for example, Firth and Biddulph, 2009; Tani, 2011; Catling, 2011; Biddulph, 2012; Roberts, 2017; Young People’s Geographies Project);

- Secondly, the critical examination of ‘geographies of education’ (see for example, Butler and Hamnett, 2011; Holloway et al., 2010; Holloway and Jons, 2012; Mills and Kraftl, 2016). The primary focus of geographies of education is to examine the role, and relationships, of education and the (re)production of inequalities between individuals, groups and schools. In addition, it considers the role that education plays in the ‘reproduction of cultural and economic capital’ (Holloway et al., 2010: 585) and how this varies between contexts and places and across time-space.

Although the primary focus of this research is the former, as this thesis investigates the value of children’s geographies to geography education in schools, it is of value to note that there are relationships between the two fields. For example, children’s geographies are affected by, and can also affect, geographies of education. In addition, as considered in section 2.2.4a, geographies of education can affect access to powerful knowledge. Furthermore, space and it’s social (re)production, are areas of debate and research in geographies of education, which are in turn central elements of this thesis (see sections 2.3.5 and 3.6). The young people in this research also show awareness of geographies of education and their narratives on this are examined in the findings chapters (see chapter 6).

Beginning with the national layer of the curriculum, this section now examines how children’s geographies has been included and constructed in geography as a school subject. Children’s geographies are omitted from programmes of study for all Key Stages (KSs) in geography (see DfE, 2013; 2014). This means that children’s
geographies is not an explicit area of study directed by the state in England. However, it is worthy of note that although often referred to as a ‘National Curriculum’, not all schools are required to follow it (see DfE, 2014). Instead, it is often left to geography teachers, and their school/departmental context, to choose if, and how, they engage with the sub discipline. They may consider this in relation to the purposes of a geographical education, and/or in curriculum (e.g. by having children’s geographies as an area of study as recommended by Roberts (2017)), and also in relation to pedagogy (e.g. by connecting student’s everyday experiences to the specialised knowledge they are studying, as highlighted by Bennetts (2005) as being a central aspect of his ‘roots of understanding’ model).

In her 2010 editorial in ‘Teaching Geography’ (a professional journal run by the GA for geography teachers), Biddulph (2010: 45) extols the benefits of including children’s geographies in school geography, stating:

‘Acknowledging and valuing what young people bring to the curriculum is one way of ensuring that the geography they learn is both meaningful and connected to their everyday lives; it is also the means by which we can build a bridge between young people and the mandated curriculum to ensure that the subject discipline, the geography that they learn, is a vehicle through which they make sense of their own lives as well as those beyond their immediate horizon.’

Biddulph asserts that the benefits of considering children’s geographies in the school subject include; enhancing teachers knowledge of the children they teach; supporting students in meaning-making by connecting geography to their own experiences and imaginations of the world and prior knowledge (see also Bennetts, 2005; Roberts, 2010; 2013; Lambert, 2014: Biddulph and Lambert, 2014); and also supporting students to better understand both their own lives and the lives of others.

Biddulph’s arguments are echoed and/or shared by many others in the geography education community (see for example, Firth and Biddulph, 2009; Catling, 2011; 2014; Catling and Martin, 2011; Tani, 2011; Roberts, 2013; 2017; Hammond, 2019; forthcoming). However, as problematized in chapter one, this perspective has also been contested, and there are ‘gaps’ (see Tani, 2011) that mean the place of
children’s geographies in geography education is not clear. This has led Hopwood (2011) to heed a warning that if children’s geographies are ignored in school geography, then a deficit model which views young people as passive recipients of knowledge, and disrespects their experiences and prior knowledge, may emerge.

These debates are not new to geography education, and they have been considered in previous research and debate (Butt, 2019). Indeed, a major project aimed to bring together the different spaces of geographical thought (see figure one) in regards to children’s geographies. This project was the ‘Young People’s Geographies Project’, which was led by Mary Biddulph (University of Nottingham) and Roger Firth (Oxford University). The project began in 2006, receiving funding from ‘DfES Action Plan for Geography and also The Academy for Sustainable Communities’ for its first two years (Biddulph and Firth, 2009). The project aimed to:

1. Establish conversations about young people’s geographies between students, geography teachers, academic geographers and teacher educators that will inform a dynamic process of curriculum making;

2. Explore the ways in which students and teachers collaboratively can use the lived experiences of young people to inform the process of curriculum making in school geography;

3. Develop pedagogies through which young people can use their lived experiences to develop their geographical understanding’ (Biddulph, 2012: 156).

Evaluations of the project praise its engagement with young people, schools and geography teachers. They also note the challenges it faced in regards to: engaging academic geographers in the project; analysing if, and how, young people’s participation in the project developed their geographical understanding; and also in regards to the fact that no new schools were ‘recruited’ to the project in its second year thus limiting its ‘reach’ (Hopwood, 2007; 2008).

Since it ended in 2011, there have been no major projects focussed on children’s or young people’s geographies in school geography in England. However, research and debate has continued as to why, and how, young people’s geographies should be explored, and considered, in school geography (see for example, Lambert and
Biddulph, 2014; Roberts, 2017; Hammond, 2019). Indeed, Roberts (2017) draws on the project to argue that ‘everyday knowledge’ is of critical importance to school geography and that it should not be omitted from conceptions of, and debates about, powerful knowledge, stating that:

- Everyday geographies are an area of academic study in geography, and should therefore be considered in school geography;
- Students bring in to school their experiences and imaginations of the world, and school geography both draws upon, and builds on, these;
- Connecting everyday and powerful knowledge enables students to gain a deeper understanding of concepts such as place.

Roberts’ argument is significant to this thesis, as it reflects recognised relationships between different types of knowledge and spaces of geographical thought. It also rationalises how, and why, actively considering these ideas is beneficial to school geography and children’s learning. However, her comments also reiterate that there are presently borders between the different spaces of geographical thought, and that these borders and gaps can affect curriculum and pedagogy.

This section has continued to build an argument for a border crossing between children’s geographies and geography education. In the next section (2.2.5), I consider how the child is constructed in formal education to situate the debates raised so far in this thesis in education and schooling more broadly.

2.2.5 The construction and representation of the child in school education

This section examines how young people have been, and are, conceptualised and represented in formal education and schooling in England. This is of value to the thesis for three reasons:

- Firstly, school geography exists as part of a broader educational system, and therefore it is important that it is considered as part of this system;
Secondly, the children who took part in this research were all attending a secondary school at the time of data collection. Thus, attending school was a central element of their spatial practices and daily lives;

Thirdly, the school that the children attended provided the location in which the empirical data for this study was collected for reasons related to ethics and access to children (this is examined in full in sections 3.5.2 and 3.7).

Compulsory education, which for most children in England involves attending a school, is a major part of children’s daily lives and geographies. It is also a way in which a society inducts their young into the world (Aitken, 1994; Freeman and Tranter, 2011; Morgan, 2019). This section considers the place of the child in education, examining what this means legally, philosophically and in practice.

Children and young people are both subject to, and the object of, education. Legally children are constructed as physiologically, psychologically and ethically distinct from adults (Starratt, 2014; see section 2.2.1). In light of the legal construction of children, in England young people are entitled to a full time education between the school term after their 5th birthday and the last Friday in June in the school year they turn 16 (DfE, 2014; DfE, 2018). Furthermore, formal education is a legal expectation (and not an option), and parents and/or carers can be prosecuted if they do not enable their child/children to access education (DfE, 2018).

Social expectations, and legal obligations, for children to attend school vary between places and across time-space. Mass schooling, and free access to education, began in the UK in the latter part of the 19th Century (Morgan, 2019). Changes in the conceptualisation of childhood led to both pushes to end child labour (see for example, the 1876 Commission on the Factory Act), and to support compulsory schooling for those between the ages of five and ten (see for example, 1880 Education Act). These changes were born out of wider socio-political debates and pressures, with people beginning to expect and demand education as part of a push towards ‘welfare capitalism’ (Morgan, 2019). The children’s rights movement, which objected to children living and working in harsh conditions during the industrial revolution, is one example of this (Freeman and Tranter, 2011).
The introduction, and growth, of universal education led not only to changes in the formal education that children had access to, and could expect, it also changed the physical and social spaces of inhabited areas, children’s spatial practices and geographies, and social imaginations of children to that of ‘adults in training’ (Freeman and Tranter, 2011: 57). It also resulted in changes in geographies of education (see section 2.2.4b). Further to this, the development of mass schooling during the period of industrialisation and economic growth, led to widespread, and optimistic, social discourse in which ‘children are told that if they work hard and study then they will achieve success’ (Hollingsworth et al., 2011: 251). This discourse, which is reflective of the emergence of neoliberal thinking, assumes that an individual is not constrained by factors such as gender, class, ethnicity and religion, whereas in reality at this time, and still today, people(s) often are (ibid.).

The notion of ‘learning the way’ from those who work within the system, and (re)produce it, is also prevalent in these debates. These ideas are important to highlight in this thesis, as they still influence state policy and children’s experiences of education today. For example, in England the state provides money to schools in the form of pupil premium for students from economically poorer backgrounds, to try and limit them from being constrained by their family’s economic circumstances (Lambert, 2014). These ideas also affect how teachers communicate knowledge to students. For example, whether pedagogy reflects ideas of knowledge-transmission (see for example, Hirsch, 2007; 2016; Birbalsingh, 2016) which maintain teacher ‘authority’ and power (see for example, Freire, 1970; Foucault, 1978), or support students in meaning-making (see Lambert and Morgan, 2010; Roberts, 2013b; 2017; Lambert, 2014) and connecting subject knowledge to, and with, their prior knowledge and everyday experiences (Catling, 2014).

The notion of young people as adults in training, and the role of the school in inducting children and young people into society, is reflective of both the power relations between adults and young people in school contexts, and also of debates about the (re)production of social capital and societal values (Holt, 2010; Giddens, 2016). At a state level, this includes the (re)production of societal norms in the
national curriculum. In England, the Department for Education (DfE) articulates the aims of the national curriculum as being:

‘Every state-funded school must offer a curriculum which is balanced and broadly based, and which:

- Promotes the spiritual, moral, cultural, mental and physical development of pupils at the school and of society, and;
- Prepares pupils at the school for the opportunities, responsibilities and experiences of later life’ (DfE, 2014: 4).

Whilst the state in England presently leave a large amount of decision-making about the construction of the curriculum to schools, and (geography) teachers, they provide the structure of education through Key Stage (age-related), and subject-based, guidance (see DfE, 2014). This system means that there is some consistency for children, but that their experiences may vary dependent on the school they attend. This variation has also increased with a lessoning of the state’s role in education in England, including the DfEs promotion of academies and free schools, which are not required to follow the national curriculum (see also 2.2.4b).

Despite the varied nature of the education children in England receive, mass schooling reflects a desire for adults to influence, and to some extent control, children’s spaces and development (Aitken, 2001). The regimented control of time and space within a school is both a product of necessity when educating large numbers of children, but also reflective of assumptions about child development and learning in regards to both curriculum and pedagogy (ibid.). These notions, which have often reflected assumptions of linear development from child to adult, have been criticised and are increasingly less prevalent within education in England (Thomson, 2009).

Today, debates about knowledge in education are exceedingly widespread (see also 2.2.4a and 2.2.4b). Young and Muller (2016) argue that the rise of mass education led to the emergence of a ‘fundamental pedagogic issue’ - the overcoming of discontinuity between powerful knowledge and everyday knowledge (p12). Young and Muller assert that the former is the purpose of schools; to induct students into
the best knowledge available, which has been created and tested in disciplines and frames the curriculum in schools (Young and Muller, 2010; 2016; Young et al., 2014; see section 2.2.4a). This argument proposes that the teacher is an expert in the discipline and is there to induct the child into ‘their’ subject. However, it fails to explore the borders between academic disciplines and school subjects, issues related to teacher education and knowledge, teacher recruitment and retention and also the positioning of teacher education away from geography departments and sometimes Higher Education Institutes (HEIs) (see sections 1.2 and 2.2.4).

In this section, I have considered the relationships between children and education, examining debates about how the child is constructed in schooling. These are significant areas of research and debate as they can, and often do, affect a child’s experiences of education, and their relationships with adults (including teachers) and ‘the system’. Critically examining the wider socio-political landscapes of education, is also of value to this thesis as it highlights that exploring children’s geographies in classrooms often means challenging, sometimes long standing and ingrained, social imaginations of schooling, teacher-student and adult-child relationships. These imaginations often position the child engaging in formal education as receiving knowledge from the teacher and system, as opposed to engaging in reciprocal dialogue and meaning making (Freire, 1970).

As this research was conducted in an urban environment, I now move on to critically consider the relationships between the child and the city in section 2.2.6, before concluding this section 2.2.7.

2.2.6 The child in the city (London)

This section is deliberately titled after Colin Ward’s (1979) book ‘The Child in the City’ and examines research to date on children’s relationships with, and experiences of, urban environments. Ward’s seminal book examined the social and spatial relationships between the child and the city, and considered how, and why, they vary across time-space. He argued that shared cultural imaginations of childhood often relate to an idyllic rural landscapes. For example, skipping and picking daisies with friends and playing in fields where as a child you are safe. These ideas and
imagination often put the child, and childhood, at odds with the city. Ward asserts that they also inform how children are treated, and perceived, in urban environments.

As the world we live in becomes increasingly urban, this section argues the importance of research examining the social and spatial relationships between the child and the city. It reviews debates on children and the city, with London, the place where the research took place, being examined in greater detail when the research is situated in place, and time-space, in section 2.3.2.

July 2007 marked the first time in history that more people lived in an urban area than a rural one (Hall and Barrett, 2012). This event was hailed in both popular, and academic, debate as being a momentous occasion which offered opportunities (such as increased interconnection and communication between people and places), and highlighted enormous challenges (including inequality, poverty, access to energy and services), at local, national and international levels (ibid.). Today, more than half of the world’s children live in cities. The relationships between the child and the city are worthy of research and consideration, not just as the context of children’s lives and existence, but because they shape, and are shaped by, children (Hörschelmann and van Blerk, 2012). At a variety of scales, the physical design of cities can affect whether children feel included or excluded, and whether, and how, they are able to communicate with others and navigate the city. For example, what may seem like a simple decision about how high to make a garden fence, can impact on whether a child can interact with their neighbours and see the outside world (Freeman and Tranter, 2011). Even places which are marketed as being constructed for children, such as playgrounds, can exclude young people and teenagers, with assumptions sometimes being made that it is inappropriate for them to use these spaces (Massey, 1998).

Although children are increasingly recognised as being distinct social actors, and this has been legally acknowledged in the UNCRC (see section 2.2.1), their rights to participation in the city, and/or in the society in which they live, is often contested or disregarded by adults as it may make them feel uncomfortable (Matthews, 2011). When considering children’s rights in the city, Van Vilet and Karsten (2015)
distinguish children’s rights in urban areas as including both rights in the city (their access to ideas and resources), and rights to the city (opportunities for ‘meaningful participation in urban developments’ (p2)). They also highlight the concept of a ‘Child Friendly Cities’ (see UNICEF, 2004) in supporting children in accessing, and enacting, these rights.

Child Friendly Cities are based around the principles of ‘non-discrimination, the right to life and maximum development and respecting children’s views’ (Hörschelmann and van Blerk, 2012: 192). ‘They promote active participation by children and deal with young people’s needs holistically’, and to achieve the UNCRC at a local level, they ‘engage in institutional, legal and budgetary reforms’ (ibid.). In addition to enabling children to access their human rights (as defined in the UNCRC), Freeman and Tranter (2011: 245) argue that Child Friendly Cities are also more robust in the face of challenges, and are ‘healthier, more liveable and more sustainable for all residents’.

However, despite the push for Child Friendly Cities at an international policy level, it is still recognised that the ‘child and the city (are) commonly seen as incompatible entities’ (Bavidge, 2006: 323). Which for Aitken (2001) relates back to the social construction of children as wild devils and/or innocent angels (see section 2.2.2). This ingrained social imagination of children, along with the increased surveillance of people(s) and moral panics about (child) safety in urban areas (Jones, 2000; McKendrick et al., 2000; Freeman and Tranter, 2011), have resulted in Aitken (2001:16) arguing that ‘the freedom to be unsupervised and do nothing is becoming less and less of a possibility for children in the global north’. This is an argument echoed by Harvey (2013), who posits that public spaces, such as the street, which were once occupied by children playing, neighbours talking and people’s demonstrating etc., have become increasingly devoid of this interaction and almost unusable. Harvey problematizes this, and argues that today ‘the street is not a common’ (p74), with ‘cultural commons’ becoming increasingly commodified through neoliberalism.

In addition, shared imaginations of children have led to the rise in perceptions that children don’t behave in line with hegemonic (adult) social norms in public spaces
(see for example, Ward, 1979; Aitken, 2001; Travou et al., 2008). This has resulted in fears developing about children in public spaces (e.g. paedophilia, attacks on children, and concerns for their social and physical safety) (see for example, Skelton and Valentine, 2008; Harvey, 2013) and the commercialisation of child’s play spaces (Mckendrick et al., 2000). When coupled with arguments that children are often monitored, and given very little privacy in any sphere of their lives (e.g. in the home, the school or in play space) (see Valentine, 2008), significant questions such as how does the child view themselves in the city? How does the child perceive that they are viewed in the city? Are children given opportunities to develop their social and spatial independence? arise.

These questions are important areas of consideration both in enabling, and ensuring, the child’s ‘right to the city’ (see Harvey, 2013), and in constructing and (re)producing spaces and places which support children’s growth and development. Additionally for this study, they are significant in considering how, and why, they are explored in geography education. Matthews and Limb’s (1999) argument that the first thing the adult should do is listen when considering children’s lives and perspectives, was used in this research (examined in full in chapter three). Indeed, the research aimed to provide a space for children to share their geographies, and imaginations, of London, before their value to geography education was considered.

This section has examined the significance of exploring the relationships between the child and the city, in the context of an increasingly urban world. It has also highlighted some of the challenges faced by children in cities today (for example, in how they are perceived and treated). Introducing these debates is pertinent to this research for two reasons; firstly, the young people in the study live in London (a city), and it is of value to listen, and respond, to their experiences and imaginations of the city; secondly, in questioning whether school geography has fully engaged with academic research about, and children’s experiences of, urban environments.

I now move on to conclude section 2.2 in section 2.2.7.
2.2.7 Conclusion and a note on terminology

In section 2.2, I have reviewed literature on children’s geographies. Building on the research problem, and need for this research, set out in chapter one, I have examined the relationships, and borders, between children’s geographies in different spaces of geographical thought. This section has shown that children’s geographies is a rich and diverse area of research in the academy, but it’s place in school geography has yet to be fully considered. Further to this, it has situated arguments for a border crossing between children’s geographies and geography education in debates about powerful knowledge. Before I move on to the second section of this chapter in section 2.3, which reviews the literature on place, space and time in the different spaces of geographical thought, I comment on the terminology used to represent children in this thesis.

As has been examined throughout section 2.2, childhood is a contested notion and different terms are often used to represent children. These terms vary with the social purpose of the narrative and the people(s) who are using them. Thus far in the thesis, my use of terminology (e.g. children or young people) has reflected the research and literature I have reviewed. I continue using this approach throughout the thesis to reflect the arguments, and narratives, of those whose work I draw upon. However, when discussing the participants in my research, I have taken the decision to refer to them as young people. This is to reflect both their age (thirteen at the time of data collection), increasing social independence and their role as active agents in the research.

2.3 The geographical frontiers of place and time-space

2.3.1 Introduction

As introduced in section 2.1, this chapter reviews the literature on two areas of research and debate central to this thesis; children’s geographies (see section 2.2), and this section (2.3), which focuses on place, space and time (or time-space). These concepts are pivotal to this thesis, both in situating the research spatially and temporally, and also in introducing the ‘production of space’ (Lefebvre, 1991) which provides the conceptual framework for analysis.
The chapter begins by building on debates introduced in section 2.2.6 about the child in the city (London) to situate the research in place and time-space (section 2.3.2), thus considering these concepts in the space of everyday life. It then moves on to examine how concepts have been theorised, and debated, in formal spaces of geographical thought in section 2.3.3, building an argument as to why they are central elements of geography. The section then focuses on examining how the concepts of place, space and time, have been constructed in spaces of formal geographical thought in section 2.3.4, examining differences and borders between the academic discipline and school subject. The chapter then introduces the production of space in section 2.3.5 and concludes in section 2.3.6.

2.3.2 Situating the research in place and time-space

As introduced in sections 1.3 and 2.2.6, this research was conducted in London, with data being collected between September and November 2014 (see also chapter three). London is not only the spatial context of the research, it is also the place in which the young people in the study, live, play and attend school. In addition, it’s the place that I as the researcher live, work and study. These factors are worthy of note, as both the young people and I are part of the city; we shape, and are shaped by, its physical and socio-cultural spaces (Fortier, 1999; Tuan, 1976; Freeman and Tranter, 2011; Giddens, 2016).

London is the largest urban area in the UK and acts as the UKs capital city, as well as a socio-cultural, political and economic hub. London’s spheres of influence in these areas often extend beyond the UKs national borders, with Hall (2007) describing it as one of the world’s ‘great global cities’. Sitting at 8.8 million people in 2016 and accounting for 13% of the UKs population, London’s population is the largest it has ever been (Trust for London, 2016). It is also a city that is growing, with its population increasing 7.5% between 2011 and 2016, and Trust for London predicting that it will increase to 9.3 million by 2021 (ibid). London’s increase in population is reflective of global patterns of urban growth, with the World Bank noting that urban populations have increased from 33.5% in 1960 to 54.7% in 2017. The UN (2018) has predicted
that this growth will continue, and that by 2050, 68% of the world’s population will live in cities.

London’s growth is reflective of global patterns as well as the time-space it exists within, as urban growth is often representative of the process of people concentrating around sites of production (Lefebvre, 2003; Harvey, 2013). The relationships between people, place and time-space are worthy of examination as places can be conceptualised as collections of stories which exist within the wider geometries of space and time (Massey, 2005). They are the physical and social embodiments of ideas and stories, which travel through and (re)produce social space. In this way, place exists as both a point on the Earth’s surface and also in our (individual and shared) social imaginations (Massey, 2005; Balderstone, 2006).

Although place is a much debated concept (see for example, Massey, 2005; Balderstone, 2006; Jackson, 2006; Cresswell, 2013; Freeman and Morgan, 2014; Lambert, 2017; see sections 2.3.3 and 2.3.4), it is widely acknowledged that a place is a ‘unique combination of location, landscape and meaning’ (Hammond and El Rashidi, 2018: 43). Place is thus constructed of a combination of its location on the Earth’s surface, its history(s) and sense of place (which may be individual and shared) (Cresswell, 2008). Figure five represents these reciprocal relationships between people(s), place and time-space. These relationships are multi-way, as people(s) physically, and socially, shape the place and time-space they exist within, and they are also shaped by them. In addition, place as humanised space is situated in time-space (Massey, 2005; Tuan, 1976; 2012).
If we use these ideas about place to support us in examining London’s population growth, then we see a history of migration (from both within the UK and globally) leading to a socio-culturally, and economically, diverse city. However, the spatial distribution of people is not even within the city, as different demographic groups have settled in communities, giving London the character of a ‘city of villages’ (see Ackroyd, 2000; Massey, 2008; White, 2008; see also chapter five). Thus, London’s history has led to both social and spatial variation in demographics, and also varied imaginations and senses of place amongst its populous.

Today London sits within a neoliberal epoch, which Harvey (2007) argues is socially accepted due to its construction as ‘conceptual apparatus’ which relate it to political ideas of human dignity and individual freedom. Neoliberalism has increased economic inequality within the city (Hamnett, 2005; Harvey, 2013). Indeed, despite London being the sixth richest city in the world (Freeman and Tranter, 2011), it experiences the highest rate of child poverty in the UK, with around 37% of children living in low income families after housing costs are considered (Tyler and McGuinness, 2018). Spatially this inequality is uneven and there is more child poverty in inner, as opposed to outer, London, and rates also vary substantially by borough.

Indeed, Hamnett (2005) and Massey (2008) argue that neoliberalism has led to several large scale geographical trends in London:

- The working classes have been forced from the city centre as it becomes more expensive due to commercial activities and wealthier groups moving in;
- The creation of a two tier society - ‘greed and need’;
- Companies now have more power, and the role of the state has changed and lessened;
- London can be conceptualised as a ‘city of villages’;
- More forums, such as social media, have emerged which provide different opportunities for people to share their stories and perspectives;
- London can be conceptualised as a ‘world city’. This is reflected both in its population, and also in its social, political and economic connections to other places.

These trends are represented on figure six, which shows the reciprocal relationships between people(s), place and time-space in London during the neoliberal epoch it presently exists within and contributes to.
These trends, and the relationships between place and time-space are worthy of consideration as they shape, and are shaped by, people(s). Thus, a child born in Bethnal Green (an area of East London that could be conceptualised as a ‘London village’) today, is likely to live in a very different world to a child born 30 years ago, who in turn lives in a different world to person born 150 years ago. Their life is also likely to be different from a child living in another place in London (for example, Richmond). These ideas are of value to consider, as the place (and time-space) in which a person lives shapes their lives, and they in turn shape the place and time-space they live in (Harvey, 1990; Lefebvre, 1991; Massey, 2005; Harvey, 2013; figures 5 and 6).

This section has introduced London as the social and spatial context of this study. It has examined conceptualisations of London in a neoliberal epoch, suggesting that it can be thought of as a world city, a city of villages and a city which has a high level of social and spatial inequality. These are ideas which are returned to, and drawn upon, in the findings chapters (chapters four, five and six). I now move on to critically examine how, and why, concepts are of value to geography as both an academic
discipline and school subject in section 2.3.3, before introducing the concepts of place, space and time in section 2.2.4.

2.3.3 What is a concept, and why are concepts of value to geography and geography education?

Defining geography is complicated. As considered in chapter one and section 2.1, when examining the different spaces of geographical thought (see figure 1), geography has a long and debated history. In addition, geographers continuously make and remake geography (Bonnett, 2008; Matthews and Herbert, 2008; Clifford et al., 2009; Heffernan, 2009; Cresswell, 2013; Johnston and Sidaway, 2016; Murphy, 2018). Today the discipline spans a variety of methods, philosophies and purposes, and encompasses a variety of sub disciplines (Clifford, 2018), and this can make defining the discipline, and the roles and methods of its scholars, difficult. Considering what is meant by geography is important in developing disciplinary identity, and in considering how geography drives and motivates its researchers, students and teachers (Brooks, 2016). Indeed, Clifford (2018) argues it is necessary in considering what geographers do, and why they would want to do this.

To support us in conceptualising geography, Clifford (2018) draws upon the work of Vernon and her use of Bernstein’s (1999) theory on the structure of knowledge to examine geography as a discipline. Vernon argues that it is helpful to consider geography as a horizontal, as opposed to vertical, discipline. With the vast, and sometimes disparate, nature of geography meaning that it is the concepts, or ‘grammar’, of the discipline (its big ideas and ways of thinking) that hold it together (Vernon, 2016; Clifford, 2018; Geographical Association, 2009; 2012).

Concepts have been recognised as significant to both school geography, as well as to geography in the academy. In the academy, some concepts are highly theorised (such as place), and others may be more assumed (e.g. space in physical geography) (see Clifford et al., 2009). However, they are nearly always contested both as individual concepts and also in debating which concepts are central to geography (Ibid.). In school geography, concepts have been used by policy makers to frame previous
iterations of the geography national curriculum at Key Stage 3 in England (see DfE, 2007), by academics, subject associations (see for example, Geographical Association, 2009), and teachers to support students in developing their understanding of the discipline and in ‘thinking geographically’ (see Jackson, 2006; Taylor, 2008; Lambert and Morgan, 2010; Biddulph et al., 2015; Lambert, 2017; Brooks, 2018). However, views on concepts in school geography vary between places and across time-space.

With the emergence of the most recent edition of the National Curriculum for Key Stage 3\(^1\) geography in England in 2014, concepts which took a foundational role in the previous curriculum, were completely removed (DfE, 2014; Brooks, 2018). Despite this, the centrality of concepts to geography, and their value as ‘curriculum decision-making tools in the face of any curriculum prescription from central government’ (Biddulph et al., 2015: 49) has continued to be argued. This call to arms by Biddulph et al. reflects the importance placed on the teacher in ‘curriculum making’ (see Lambert and Morgan, 2010; Lambert and Biddulph, 2014; see section 2.2.4a; figure two). For Brooks (2017) the role of the teacher in this process is critical, as it is in the classroom in which the subject ‘comes alive’ for students.

The curriculum making model situates ‘three competing zones of influence’ (Lambert and Morgan, 2010: 49-50); school geography, teacher choices, and student experiences, in the ‘context of the discipline of geography’ (see also figure three; section 2.2.4a). In balancing these zones of influence, the model reflects that the curriculum made by the teacher is underpinned by notions of progression, thinking geographically and key geographical concepts. Discussion of the key concepts might be explicit in the curriculum made (for example, in a lesson on changing places or in discussions about sustainability), or implicit (for example, place, space and environment may be deeply embedded in discussions about inequality). However, they are fundamental to understanding geographical processes and ideas and making connections across topics. For example, the concept of development might

---

\(^1\) This Key Stage is considered in particular as it is the educational stage the young people who participated in the research were working in during the time of data collection (see section 3.5.2).
be an underpinning concept in the teaching of geographical topics as varied as urbanisation and tectonic hazards and their impacts on people(s).

The example of development given above shows a concept behaving like the ‘grammar’ of geography, enabling connections to be made across knowledge (or ‘vocabulary’) and areas of geographical thought (Geographical Association, 2009; 2012; Lambert, 2017). This process is of value in supporting, and enabling, students to think geographically. Indeed, if geography teachers do not consider geography’s concepts in their curriculum making, there is a risk that knowledge is perceived merely as lists to be learnt. This could be conceptualised as a ‘future one’ curriculum (see section 2.2.4a), and could affect children’s opportunities for meaning making and may also have an impact on their understanding of geography.

This section has introduced concepts as being a central, but much-debated, element of geography as an academic discipline. It has also highlighted that concepts have been used to frame, and /or, inform the curriculum at all levels (from the national to the classroom) in school geography in England. As the concepts of place, space and time are of value both in situating the research, and space is used in the analysis of data in this thesis, I now move on to introduce these concepts and their relationships with one another in section 2.3.4.

2.3.4 Place and time-space in geography as an academic discipline and school subject

As introduced in section 2.3.3, concepts are an integral part of geography’s ways of thinking and disciplinary identity. This section considers how the concepts of place, space and time, have been theorised, and debated, in the different spaces of geographical thought and examines their relationships with one another. The section begins by considering place, as everything exists or happens in a place.

People(s) lives are situated in places, and in turn, place exists within space and time (see figure five). Place can be conceptualised as humanised space (see Tuan, 1997, in Jackson, 2006); people exist within, experience and imagine place. For Massey (2005: 130) space can be conceptualised as ‘a simultaneity of stories-so-far’ and places as ‘collections of these stories, circulations within the wider power-geometries of
space’. She argues further that people are both affected by, and contribute to, these stories and in doing so they (re)produce the place, space and time they exist within. In short, as Cresswell (1996: 12) articulates ‘society produces space and space reproduces society’.

Discussing place and space in this way, with space being conceptualised as socially (re)produced, and with the social and the spatial having clear relationships, is a fairly recent phenomenon. Lefebvre (1991: 2) highlights this when he states:

‘Not so many years ago, the word ‘space’ had a strictly geometrical meaning: the idea it evoked was simply that of an empty area’.

Lefebvre’s statement is the opening line to his book ‘The Production of Space’ (examined further in section 2.3.5). In the first passages of this book, he argues that space had until then been conceptualised almost entirely as a mathematical concept, which had been detached from philosophy and the social sciences, with there being a lack of academic debate about what he describes as the ‘science of space’ (see Lefebvre, 1991). Lefebvre used Marxist philosophies to underpin his argument that space needed to be reconceptualised, asserting that if space is not fully and critically examined, then we are unable to consider how ruling elites have constructed and maintained their hegemony and power through the (re)production of space; for example, in relation to capitalism (Lefebvre, 1991).

Although I have regularly referred to the concept of time, and time-space, thus far in this thesis, time is sometimes not considered, or explicitly referenced, in school geography. For example, it was omitted from the previous iteration of the Key Stage 3 geography national curriculum in England’s list of key concepts (DfE, 2007; see section 2.3.3). However, research and debate in the academy has shown that time is a valuable concept in geography (see for example, Hägerstrand, 1975; Taylor, 2009b; Tani and Surmo-aho, 2012; Giddens, 2016), with Taylor (2009b: 140) arguing that it has been conceptualised in two ways; firstly as a ‘physical dimension, something that can be precisely measured… the second view of time is as social change, where the emphasis is on the ‘content of time’. This research considers the second view of time, agreeing with Taylor that time ‘cannot be studied independently of space’ (p141),
and thus using the term ‘time-space’. The rationale for this lies in the argument articulated in section 2.3.2 that places and people(s) change over, and through, time-space. Thus, what it means to live in London today, is different from being a Londoner in the 1970s.

Time is also pertinent in considering the production of space, as this idea was developed to consider the relationships between spatial practices and late capitalism (Harvey, 1990; Lefebvre, 1991). Furthermore, people(s) spatial practices also vary across time-space. I now move on to introduce the production of space in section 2.3.5.

2.3.5 The production of space

The ‘production of space’ provides the conceptual framework for analysis used in this thesis, it is also part of the contribution to knowledge it makes (see section 1.4 and chapter seven). This section begins by introducing Henri Lefebvre, as the person who made the idea famous. It critically examines Lefebvre’s radical motivations for the work, before outlining his ideas about the production of space. These ideas are then drawn upon, and returned to, later in the thesis as I outline the research design and methods (see section 3.6).

Lefebvre was born in 1901, and died in 1991 and his life, and work, have been described by Elden (2004: 1) as ‘the adventure of a century’. Lefebvre had many interests, and his works transcended many academic boundaries and disciplines. He published in excess of sixty books, in addition to other publications and notes, on a vast array of subjects including ‘philosophy, political theory, sociology, literature, music, linguistics and urban studies’ (Kipfer et al., 2008: 2). His interest in such a vast array of ideas, and fields of knowledge, links to both his identity and motivation for conducting his work. Considering his motivations before examining the production of space is significant in cogitating its purpose. Elden, who has written extensively on Lefebvre (see for example, Elden, 2004; Elden, 2006; Brenner and Elden, 2009), describes him first and foremost as a philosopher and quotes Lefebvre directly in
noting that his interest in philosophy relates to his ‘critical conscience’ on everyday life (Elden, 2006: 190).

This critical conscience can be seen to reflect Lefebvre’s political and radical motivations for his work, which developed from his interest in Marx and Marxism. For Brenner and Elden (2009), Lefebvre’s work reflects a struggle to affect change, and they argue he desired to ‘grasp how the production of space, patterns of the state spatial organisation, and geographies of socio-political struggle are being reshaped under late capitalism’ (p25). Put another way, Lefebvre was interested in the relationships between the social and the spatial, and how this related to time-space (late capitalism) being motivated to understand systems (e.g. the state) and people(s) everyday lives, ultimately to affect change and challenge inequality.

Although Anglo-American geographers began translating, and considering translated elements of, Lefebvre’s work in the 1970s, not all of Lefebvre’s writings have been translated into English (Elden, 2004). This means that Anglophone academics (including myself) who do not read French fluently may not have read all of Lefebvre’s works, and further work is required in translating his works and considering if, and how, meanings vary across languages.

One of Lefebvre’s most influential ideas, and works, in the discipline of geography is the production of space (Elden, 2006; Goonewardena, 2011; Kipfer et al., 2011). Although this idea is drawn upon in many of Lefebvre’s writings, it is also a book published as ‘La Production de l’Espace’ (1974) in Lefebvre’s mother tongue (French), and first translated into English in 1991. The book can be conceptualised as acting as a ‘theoretical summation’ of Lefebvre’s research on the urban and the rural (Elden, 2006). For Elden (2006: 192), ‘The Production of Space’ is ‘a work of theory and study of the history of spatial configurations’ which ‘also included reflections on different places and situations’, as Lefebvre critically examines everyday life, relating it theory and philosophy in multi-way dialogue between two spaces of thought (everyday life and philosophy).

For Kipfer et al. (2011), the importance of the production of space lies not only in its theoretical consideration everyday life, but also in its addressing of the privileging of
time over space in some academic disciplines (such as history) and by some theorists. The idea that space has not been fully considered, and has at times been misrepresented in both the academy, schooling and in everyday life, is also noted by other academics with an interest in space (see for example, Massey, 2005; Thrift, 2009).

Critical consideration of the concept of space is of value to this thesis, geography and society more broadly, as it allows the examination of the production, and sustenance, of power relations, and of inequalities within, and between, societies. Lefebvre’s contribution to these debates lies in his application of Marxist notions of production to social space, in considering how space is produced, evolves and is sustained. His philosophy of affecting change is clear when he expresses that no matter what social or political forces do to engender, and produce, space that suits their agenda’s, they will never be able to ‘master it completely’ (Lefebvre, 1991: 26). When applied to school geography, this philosophy has the potential to empower young people in considering how power relations in space are (re)produced and how they might be challenged. I posit that this is of value in considering a variety of fields of study in geography, including children’s geographies, particularly as it is now recognised that children’s voices have often gone under-explored in the socio-political spaces of everyday life and in geography as an academic discipline (see section 2.2), and as children have often been subordinated in their formal schooling (see section 2.2.5).

Thus far in this section, I have introduced the idea of the production of space and considered its philosophical underpinnings and potential value for school geography education. I now move to introduce the ‘conceptual triad’ which Lefebvre (1991) used to support his critical examination of space. In the ‘Production of Space’, Lefebvre repeatedly returns to the triad throughout the course of the book, using it to consider how space is produced, sustained, understood and evolves. The three fundamental pillars of this triad are:

‘1. Spatial Practice - which embraces production and reproduction and the particular locations and spatial sets characteristics of each social formation. Spatial practice ensures continuity and to some degree cohesion. In terms of social space, and each member of a given society’s relationship to space, this
cohesion implies a guaranteed level of competence and specific level of performance;

2. **Representations of space** - which are tied to the relations of the production and to the ‘order’ which those relations impose, and hence to knowledge, to signs, to codes, and to ‘frontal’ relations;

3. **Representational spaces** - embodying complex symbolisms, sometimes coded, sometimes not, linked to the clandestine or underground of social life, as also to art (which may come eventually to be defined less as a code of space than a code of representational spaces)’ (Lefebvre, 1991: 33).

For Lefebvre the triad is significant in conveying his ideas, as it enables a person to move between each of these pillars with ease (Lefebvre, 1991; see section 2.1). Thus, facilitating the consideration of the relationships between lived and conceived space. For example, in my everyday spatial practices I may vote in a general election, this is also part of the conceived space of British democracy, which will in turn be represented through both media and art.

Lefebvre’s works, including the production of space, have been widely considered, and appropriated in the academy in disciplines such as geography, philosophy and urban studies (see for example, Harvey 1990; Goonewardena, 2011; Elden, 2004; 2006; Middleton, 2017). One academic to take a large interest in Lefebvre is David Harvey, who Goonewardena (2011: 6) argues ‘has never hidden his admiration for Lefebvre, and acknowledged the Frenchman’s role in politicizing and radicalising him’. Harvey was intrigued by Lefebvre’s work on the urban, and the relations between the social and the spatial, and how this could be used to affect socio-political, and academic, change (ibid.). Indeed, as will be examined in detail in section 3.6, Harvey drew on Lefebvre’s work widely in considering ideas such as the ‘right to the city’ (Charnock, 2014; see also 2.2.6) and in examining the complexities of urban practices (Harvey, 1990; Harvey, 2013; see sections 2.2.6 and 2.3.2).

However, Lefebvre’s work has received little interest in the field of education (Middleton, 2017). Middleton (2017) argues that this should change, and asserts that greater consideration of Lefebvre in the field of education could enable consideration
of how inequality is socially produced through education; the everyday experiences of people(s) who work and study within educational systems; and pedagogies of appropriation. Following Middleton, in an article informed by work to date on this doctorate, I argue the production of space can also be used to enhance understanding of children’s geographies and children’s understanding of space in school geography (Hammond, 2019).

Significantly to this thesis, consideration of geography’s concepts in children’s geographies are an area that McKendrick (2000) argues to be missing from the burgeoning field (see section 1.3). Space is also a concept which is been conceptualised differently in the academic discipline to school subject (Hammond, 2019). It is thus pertinent that studies in children’s geographies further examine how geographical concepts can be used to enhance understanding of children’s experiences and imaginations of the world (see research questions in section 1.3). I return to these ideas in chapter three when I outline how they have been used in this research, focussing specifically on examining how the production of space can enhance knowledge of children’s geographies (see also RQ2). Prior to this, I conclude the literature review in section 2.3.6.

2.3.6 Conclusion

In section 2.3, I have examined conceptualisations and representations of place and time-space in different spaces of geographical thought. This has included situating the research in place and time-space (London in the 2010s) in section 2.3.2, and also critically examining the value of concepts in, and to, geography. Throughout the section I have highlighted relationships, and borders, between concepts in the different spaces of geographical thought.

The section finished with a discussion of Lefebvre’s work on the production of space, in which he draws upon Marxist thought to examine the (re)production of inequality and power relations in social space. Section 2.3 has also shown that to date this idea has received limited attention in school (geography) education. I argue that this is problematic for the school subject and it’s scholars, as failing to draw on the rich body
of knowledge in the discipline has resulted in key ideas and debates about social space (including power relations and inequality) being omitted from the subject. This thesis aims to contribute to debates as to how these borders can be crossed, considering how the production of space can enhance our knowledge of children’s geographies, and ultimately considering how, and why, this is of value to geography education in schools. I now move on to examine the research design in chapter three.
3. Chapter three: research design, methodology and methods

Chapter three critically examines the process of research design that was undertaken as part of this doctorate; it discusses how I conducted the research and why. As the researcher both shapes the research, and is shaped by it, I begin this chapter by building on section 1.2.1, considering my relationships to the research in section 3.1. Following this, in section 3.2, I examine the importance of research design and methodology when conducting research with, and for, children and young people. This section is of value as young people are often conceptualised as being legally and socially different to adults (see section 2.2). These ‘differences’, and my aim of using ideas and methods drawn from children’s geographies (e.g. conducting research with, and for, young people; see sections 2.2.2 and 2.2.3), influenced the decisions I made when designing, and conducting, the research.

Following this, I restate the research enquiry and questions in section 3.3, before introducing my choice of narrative methodology in section 3.4. I argue that the use of narrative methodology enables young people to share their geographies in a way that is concurrent with everyday life, that they are familiar with and also allows relationships between a person and the place, and time-space, they exist within to be examined. In section 3.5, I provide a detailed outline of the research methodology used. This section includes an examination of how I used narrative methodology, an introduction to the participants in the research and an outline of the methods used in data collection.

In section 3.6, I set out the methods of analysis used in this research. This section draws upon ideas about the production of space introduced in section 2.3.5, and critically considers why, and how, this idea can enhance understanding of children’s geographies and is of value to geography education in schools. This section also introduces key themes that were identified in the analysis and which are examined in detail in the findings chapters (four, five and six). I then outline potential ethical issues involved with conducting this research, and the ethical processes undertaken, defending the decisions I made to ensure the research was ethically sound in section
3.7. Finally, I examine questions of validity in section 3.8, also considering the limitations of the research, before concluding the chapter in section 3.9.

### 3.1 The researcher in the research

In this section, I situate myself as the ‘researcher in the research’. To do this, I build on section 1.2.1 in which I set out the professional journey that led me to conduct this research. I begin by introducing the idea of myself, as the researcher, ‘navigating’ the research process. The use of the term navigation is drawn from Brooks’s (2016) notion of a ‘professional compass’, which she developed from her research with geography teachers. Exploring teachers narratives of their subject stories, Brooks examined how, and why, they used geography (their disciplinary background and the subject they taught) to help them navigate their professional, and sometimes personal, lives.

The idea of a professional compass resonates with me; as someone with a deep sense of intrigue about the world and the people(s) who call it home, I feel that studying geography has helped me to both make sense of my own life, and geographies, and of the wider world. Furthermore, my interest in geography has, in part, informed professional decisions that I have made, such as my motivation to teach the subject and to support children in exploring the world through, and using, disciplinary thought.

However, as outlined in section 1.2.1, after teaching for several years my frustrations with the education and school system in England eventually led me to leave my job as a teacher. On reflection, this was because the system I was a part of seemed at odds with my personal philosophies and values about both geography and education. I felt that I was ‘encouraged’ to teach elements of geography in certain ways and prioritise student attainment, and ‘content delivery’, over teaching geography in a way that I believed was powerful to, and for, children and society (see also section 2.2.4a). For example, I believed that it is of value for children to explore their own geographies using disciplinary thought, but in a context of accountability agendas in schools (see also section 1.2.1 and 1.2.2), this was often very challenging as there were pressures to ‘teach to the test’. Indeed, my experiences led me to I perceive
that there was often an over-focus on consistency across teachers and subjects, which led to school leaders encouraging the ‘delivery’ of formulaic lessons.

Despite choosing to leave the classroom, what could be conceptualised as my professional compass led me to want to be a part of the academy and to contribute further to debates in geography and education through doctoral research. On reflection, this was a deeply personal and values-led process, born from my desire to affect change and do something I believed in. These experiences are highlighted here, as who I am, and my relationships to the young people and the research, influenced methodological and ethical decisions I undertook throughout the research process. These include conducting research with young people who I had previously taught (examined in detail in sections 3.5 and 3.7 and chapter 7). Furthermore, as research design is the space in which the researcher links theory and ideas to methodology and method (Bondi, 2005; Delyser, 2010; Clifford et al., 2016), in doing so they situate themselves in an academic field as decisions made are informed by, and feed into, the researcher’s identity and relationships with the discipline. Put another way, this could be conceptualised as the researcher using their professional compass to support them in designing research that they believe is meaningful to both the discipline, and as is often the case in geography, everyday life.

In this section, I have introduced myself as the researcher in the research. I now move on to consider the importance of research design when conducting research with, and for, children and young people in section 3.2. However, the ideas introduced in this section, will be drawn upon throughout chapter three, as I defend the decisions I made when designing, and conducting, this research.

3.2 Conducting research with, and for, children

Building on section 2.2, which examined how understandings of children and childhood have changed since the 1970s, this section considers the significance of research design when researching (with) children and young people. The section begins by considering why research with children is important, before outlining how research with children has changed over time.
Research conducted with, and for, children and young people is valuable for many reasons. These reasons include the development of academic, social and political debate about children, childhood and society, and also representing children, and/or empowering and enabling them, to share their lives and views (Kay et al., 2009). Methodological design and the choice of research method(s) is of critical importance when conducting research with children (van Blerk et al., 2009; Morrow, 2009; Beazley et al., 2009; Alderson, 2012). Not only are there power dynamics, and ethical questions, to consider when working with children and young people, but the choice of methodology and methods also impact on the type data that is yielded, which may ultimately influence conceptions of childhood and children (Hemming, 2008; Gallagher, 2009; Alderson, 2012; see section 2.2). These choices also affect whether the children involved in the research are empowered and/or enabled in, and through, the research process (Kay et al, 2009; Alderson, 2012).

Until fairly recently, most research with children focussed on child development and was based on ‘laboratory experimentation and precise measurement’ (Aitken, 1994: 31). This methodology meant that children were removed from their real world contexts and has been extensively critiqued as it limited opportunities to develop knowledge of how children relate to the world(s) that they both live in and contribute to (Ibid.). With Aitken (1994) noting the challenges, and perhaps, the impossibility of adults fully understanding a child’s world, often having led to research methods reflecting adult centric perspectives and ideas, that may not reflect a child’s, or children’s, way(s) of thinking.

Debates about how research can enable children to share their lives and perspectives have led to the researchers engaging in different ways of researching children. Academics researching in children’s geographies, now recognise that methodological decisions about how one researches children not only facilitate the collection of data for analysis, but can also be a tool which allows children’s voices to be heard (Beazley et al, 2009; van Blerk et al., 2009). These debates have also led to growing ‘cross fertilisation of ideas between researchers in a variety of social science disciplines’ (Holloway and Valentine, 2000: 764) about how to research children and childhood.
The emergence of what James and Prout (2005) described as a ‘new paradigm’ in studying children and childhood (the New Social Studies of Childhood (NSSC)) in around 1996 (McNamee and Seymour, 2012), received significant interest in geography (see for example, Holloway and Valentine, 2000b). The NSSC called for ‘research with, rather than on, children’ (McNamee and Seymour, 2012: 156), and asked researchers to critically consider their choice of methodology and if, and how, it enables children to be recognised, and respected, as social actors in the research process (ibid.). James and Prout summarise the NSSC as having four major principles:

- Firstly, the NSSC views childhood as a social construction, which means that it varies across time and space;
- Secondly, it argues that childhood can never be ‘entirely separated from other variables such as class, gender or ethnicity’ (p3);
- Thirdly, it believes that childhood is a significant area of study in its own right and that children are viewed as social actors who are actively involved in the construction of their own social worlds;
- Finally, it supports engagement in the process of reconstructing childhood in society (James and Prout, 2005).

These principles can be seen to have led to an increased engagement amongst geographers with the methodological and ethical issues of research with, and for, children (Thomson, 2007; van Blerk et al., 2009).

However, debates about the NSSC have raised questions as to whether there has been an over-emphasis on ethics and access to children, which Thomson (2007) argues has been to the detriment of research methodology. Furthermore, concerns have also been raised that participatory advances in research with children have been side-lined to specialist conferences and publications (van Blerk et al., 2009; see also section 2.2.3), and whether abstract ideas (e.g. social justice) have been neglected as young children are often unable to access, and/or speak about, these ideas (Ansell, 2009).
Whilst recognising these concerns, the NSSC is introduced here as a valuable element in the theoretical grounding of my research methodology as it both recognises children and young people as distinct social actors who construct their own worlds, and promotes critical consideration of the relationships between children, and childhood, and the place and time-space they exist within. Furthermore, I argue that the philosophies shared in the NSSC are also helpful ideas for geography education in schools in considering different, and more reciprocal, relationships between teacher and student than presently often exist (see section 2.2.5).

In this section, I have drawn on literature to show the significance of research design when conducting research with, and for, children. I have highlighted that choices of methodology can empower, and enable, children in the research process and reflect the complexities of childhood and society. I now move on to restate the research enquiry and questions in section 3.3, before outlining the choice of methodology, and methods undertaken, as part of this research.

3.3 Restating the research questions

In this section I restate the research questions. These questions were developed through an examination of the need for this research and a review of the literature published in children’s geographies and geography education (see sections 1.2. and 1.3 and chapter two). The research enquiry was stated in full in section 1.3, with the research questions being restated here as part of the research design. This thesis is an investigation into children’s geographies and their value to geography education in schools. The investigation is constructed of three research questions:

RQ1 What do young people’s narratives reveal about their geographies and imaginations of London?

RQ2 How can the production of space contribute to knowledge of children’s geographies and imaginations of the world?

RQ3 How can geography education use ideas and methodologies from children’s geographies to enhance school geography?
These research questions are addressed in chapter seven, following a discussion of the research findings in chapters four, five and six.

As the data collected in this study (see RQ1) was drawn from the use of narrative methodology, I now move on to introduce narrative research in section 3.4.

### 3.4 Narrative methodology

In this research, I used narrative methodology to explore, and examine, young people’s geographies and imaginations of London (see RQ1, sections 1.3 and 3.3). The purpose of this was to collect data that illuminates the richness of children’s everyday lives and geographies, and to empower the young people in the study to share their experiences and imaginations of the world, whilst enabling them to discuss areas and ideas which they raised as being significant to them (see Matthews and Limb, 1999; section 1.3). The data collected was a case study of young people sharing their geographies in a ‘Storytelling and Geography Group’. This section examines what is meant by the ‘narrative’, before considering why narratives are of value to research in the social sciences. Finally, the section outlines why narrative research was chosen for the methodology in this research.

Communication is a fundamental part of being human, and communicating gives humans a unique opportunity to both convey and transform the world (Tuan, 1998; Bruner, 2004). One of the central ways people communicate is through narratives, which people use to connect themselves to other people and/or their environment (Tuan, 2012). The centrality of narratives to everyday life, and how and why people(s) use them to represent, and to transform, have led them to become a significant area of research and debate in geography and the social sciences more broadly.

Narrative is a term that is used in both everyday social dialogue and in academic debate (Andrews et al., 2011). It is a term that has multiple meanings in both research and everyday life (Ibid.), and which vary between cultures and across time-space (Shuman, 1986; Gee, 2008). For Jerome Bruner:
‘Life as led is inseparable from life as told – or more bluntly, a life is not “how it was” but how it is interpreted, reinterpreted, told and retold’ (Bruner, 2004: 708).

Bruner’s statement is profound and it implies links between the nature of being (Heidegger, 1962; Mulhal, 2013; see section 2.2.2) and narrative. In his 2004 paper, ‘Life as Narrative’ he argues ‘culturally shaped cognitive and linguistic processes’ that we use to organise memories and events lead us to ‘become the autobiographical narratives which we “tell about” our lives’ (p694). Indeed, people(s) narrate their experiences of their lives, and the world, on an almost continual basis. For example, people often tell the story of their day to loved ones when they return home from work or school in the evening. They do this both to narrate the experiences they’ve had, but also to support them in organising, and making sense of, these experiences and ultimately their life. Narratives can be seen as so ingrained in the nature of our being that it can be easy to ignore their purpose and centrality to our lives.

For Squire et al. (2014) narratives build up human meanings. Significantly for this thesis, narratives are socially and historically situated, and this can impact on where they are understood and by whom. In their definition of narrative, Squire et al. draw upon the idea of meaning making, which I will return to throughout this section as I examine the value of narratives for research with people:

‘A broad, inclusive definition is that a narrative is first of all a set of signs, which may involve writing, verbal or other sounds, or visual, acted, built or made elements that similarly convey meaning. For a set of such signs to constitute a narrative, there needs to be movement between signs, whether this occurs in sound, or reading, or an image sequence, or via a distinct spatial path, that generates meaning. Because a narrative progresses in this way, it does not only expound, but explains; it is therefore distinct from description’ (Squire et al., 2014: 6).

As well as considering what a narrative is, their definition highlights the multiplicity of ways narratives can be used by people, from the written to the verbal. Echoing the works of Bruner, and Tuan, meaning-making is at the centre of their definition.
Goodson and Gill (2014: 30) argue that studying narratives, and narrative research, provides an opportunity for researchers to gain ‘insights about the world and/or other people’s experiences of it’. This argument is echoed by Brooks (2016b) who argues that it is the meaning, or sense making, process that it is significant to social research. This is because it offers insights into people(s) lives, and decisions, in a way which other methodologies, which may only focus on factual recall, are unable to do (ibid.).

The research community with the greatest interest in narratives is the social sciences, including human geography, due to their concern with human experience (Clandinin and Connelly, 2000; Shacklock and Thorp, 2005; Goodson and Gill, 2011). However, the type of narrative that research in the social sciences studies, and/or uses, has evolved over time as questions such as ‘whose geography?’ (see Massey, 2008; section 2.2) have changed ways of thinking in both the academy and the socio-political spaces of everyday life. This has led to a growing interest in the lives, experiences and geographies of all people(s).

Goodson (2013) considers this change in the study of narratives, when he asserts that we presently live in an ‘age of narratives’, arguing that the focus of these narratives is now on life histories and small scale narratives as opposed to the grand narratives of the 18th and 19th centuries. These grand narratives were often constructed by those in power in an attempt to ‘render fundamental truths and moral guidance’ (p11). For Goodson, focussing on life histories and researching the narratives of individuals, and groups, can provide a voice to some people(s) whose voices have been, or continue to be, obscured by some qualitative, and/or government, data (ibid.).

Both the idea that narratives are part of everyday life, and the philosophy that they can be used provide people with opportunities to share their voices and lives, are fundamental to this research. As examined in chapter two, people occupy ‘unequal positions of power and autonomy’ within a society (Matthews and Limb, 1999: 62), and children and young people are a social group who have often been marginalised (Aries, 1973; Skelton and Valentine, 1998; see sections 2.2.2 and 2.2.3). These
unequal power relationships mean that any research with, and for, children requires careful consideration of the methodology used (see sections 3.2).

However, despite increasing academic interest in the value of narratives to research, it has been argued that both written and oral narratives have been under-explored in both geography (Barnes and Duncan, 1992) and geography education (Rawling, 2010). With narrative research sometimes being depreciated in comparison to other forms of knowledge that are deemed more scholarly (Hymes, 1996). These arguments often reference the scale, scope and validity of narrative research, raising questions of representation and scalability (see also section 3.8). In addition, Cope and Kurtz (2016) argue that with qualitative research (including narratives) the researcher must also consider what is absent from the stories told. This is because research design, or social imaginations of appropriateness, sometimes leave some things unsaid. Considering this argument is pertinent to this research, due to the relationships between the researcher and the participants (see sections 3.5, 3.7 and chapter seven).

Despite the arguments against the use of narrative research, stories and narratives are increasingly recognised in geography as a valuable area of research and methodology (see Cameron, 2012). I now outline the three reasons why I chose narrative methodology for this research:

- Firstly, when researching with children and young people it can be exceedingly difficult to create a space which is separate from the imaginations of childhood and power relationships that exist within society (Jones, 2009; Thomson, 2009; see section 2.2). As narratives are continuous with everyday life, and thus part of children’s experiences of ‘being’ and making sense of the world, narrative research can be used to support the construction of, as far as possible, a non-hierarchical relationship between the researcher and participants in the research (Beazley et al., 2004; Langevang, 2009);

- Secondly, I wanted to develop a rapport with the young people who participated in the research. Oral narratives, and conducting the research in a group context, was used to support the development of a space which
aimed to enable young people to speak openly, and freely, and also to facilitate multi-way conversation (Bushin, 2009);

- Thirdly, the use of narratives in research can enable the participants to have ownership of the ‘control and flow’ of their stories (Langevang, 2009: 48). Thomson (2009) argues that during the industrial and Fordist epoch’s, people(s) were ‘expected to follow a set trajectory’ (p188), however with globalisation, people’s lives have become increasingly ‘fragmented’ and there have been significant changes in social identities and groups. In the case of children and young people, it is now recognised that children should be enabled, and empowered, to share their voices and to contribute to socio-political debates about their lives and the world(s) they inhabit (Fraser, 2004; Porter et al., 2012).

As well as providing a methodology which enables active participation in the research by children, narratives are also a way that social space is (re)produced. This is significant to this thesis, as the production of space provides the conceptual framework for analysis used in the research (see sections 2.3.5 and 3.6). Furthermore, a fundamental aim of the research is to address RQ2 ‘how can the ‘production of space’ contribute to our knowledge of children’s geographies and imaginations of the world?’ (See sections 1.3 and 3.3). The relationships between narratives and the (re)production of space are highlighted by Goodson et al. (2010) when they argue that people(s) live their lives in, and through, stories. These stories fill social space with ‘narrative fragments, enacted stories in time and space’ (Clandinin and Connelly, 2000: 17) which people are then influenced by, and (re)produce, through sharing their own narratives.

In this section, I have examined what is meant by narrative, and considered how it both an integral part of everyday life and fundamental to ‘being’ (see section 2.2). The centrality of narrative to everyday life has resulted in narratives developing into a significant area of study, and research methodology, in the social sciences. I have developed a case for the use of narratives as the primary research method in this study, both as it offers an opportunity for children, and young people, to actively participate in the research and it is also a fundamental way in which space is
(re)produced. In the next section (3.5), I introduce the research methods used, before going on to outline methods of analysis in section 3.6, ethical considerations in section 3.7, and questions of validity and the limitations of the research in section 3.8.

3.5 Research methods

Thus far in chapter three, I have considered research design, situated myself as researcher in the research, examined how, and why, research with children is of value and set out a case for the use of narrative research. Following Delyser (2010), in section 3.5, I draw on theory and ideas examined so far in the thesis, to inform and outline the methods used in the research. I begin by setting out the research methodology developed in section 3.5.1. Following this, I introduce the young people who participated in the study in section 3.5.2. In this section only, young people are referred to as ‘students’ when they are discussed in the context of their formal educational environment. Consideration of the young people who participated in the study as students, is of value as the research was conducted in the school they attended. It also enables critical consideration of the differences and relationships between the young people’s different social identities (e.g. student and young person), and also of the school as a formal educational environment (see section 2.2.5) and the space in which the research took place. Finally, I outline how the data was collected in section 3.5.3.

3.5.1 From research design to research methodology

This section begins by introducing oral narratives, considering both their value and limitations in research. Following this, the section examines how ‘life histories’ (see Goodson, 2013) informed the development of the methodologies used in this thesis, setting out a case for their value. In addition, the section defends the decision not to engage the young people in the research design process, instead encouraging and empowering them to actively engage in the enactment of the research. Finally, the section introduces the context in which data collection was conducted, examining
why a formal educational space was chosen and outlining some of the challenges this brings.

As examined in section 3.4, the term narrative can be representative of many forms of exchange, including both oral and written communication, which may be constructed and shared for many reasons and in many forms (see for example Andrews et al., 2011; Cameron, 2012). This research focussed on oral narratives, as this is a primary form of everyday communication for most people, including children and young people. Although oral narratives are something we share on an almost continual basis, it is recognised that communication, in all its guises, represents a symbolic exchange of power (Bourdieu, 2012; Cameron, 2012). Language is imbued with power, and for Bourdieu (2012: 45) the ultimate example of this is the language of the state, which ‘becomes the theoretical norm against which all other linguistic practices are measured’.

The language of the state is encountered differently by different young people, who may speak different languages or dialects in the home or during play or leisure time, to the language which is spoken in school (Shuman, 1986). However in England, young people spend a significant proportion of their waking hours in formal education when they are of school age (Aitken, 1994; see section 2.2.5). In schools, which are mainly state run or funded, teachers are directed with the task of using this official language, and state controlled examinations also use this language. Children and young people have varying degrees of knowledge and competence in accessing, and using, state language. This can, and does, vary with their age, history (e.g. whether they have migrated from a place with a different state / local language) and social background. In addition, children and young people often construct their own dialects, which can, and often do, deviate from the state norm. The significance of this, is highlighted by Shuman (1986), who when arguing for storytelling rights (which she conceptualises as a way of discussing oral narratives in terms appropriate for young people) argues:

‘From the adolescent perspective, Standard English was the equivalent of adult white communication; from the parents’ perspective, it represented schoolwork’ (Shuman, 1986: 13).
These debates are introduced here to highlight some of the challenges, and nuances, of oral narratives. They are also significant to this research, as it was conducted in a school; a space which is imbued with hierarchies of power which may influence young people’s ideas about how to speak and behave.

The decision was made to use oral narratives in the methodology of this research as they are concurrent with everyday life. Despite the challenges considered above, oral narratives can be conceptualised as offering an opportunity for participatory research with, and active engagement by, young people. In the next part of this section I introduce the methodologies used, which are outlined further in section 3.5.3.

The research was structured around a ‘Storytelling and Geography Group’. The group was constructed using the philosophy that narratives and texts can be ‘read’ by different people(s) in different ways, and that interaction and discussion can support meaning-making (Yap, 2011). Although I acknowledge that a group context may also inhibit people from sharing their personal narratives, or encourage people to ‘show off’, the group context also has advantages in facilitating discussion about shared, and individual, narratives, and in peer support. It also has value in facilitating discussion about shared narratives and the different experience(s) of individuals, and these ideas will be returned to in the findings chapters.

The research design was informed by Goodson’s (2013) work on life histories (see also section 3.5.3). Goodson views life history research as triangulating oral data from research participants with the historical context and other narratives. The relationships between the individual’s story, and wider social narratives, are significant to life histories as private and public narratives interweave (Jackson and Russell, 2010). These relationships, between public and private narratives, are significant as they enable geographers to ‘make connections between the seemingly small and insignificant…and the broader social and cultural processes within which that story was articulated’ (Cameron, 2012: 577). Put another way, they can be used to consider how social-political grand narratives affect the individual and vice versa. This is of value in considering how children both construct their own social worlds, and are shaped by the worlds they exist within (see also section 3.2).
Although my research did not directly follow Goodson’s work, for example I did not ask participant’s to tell the story of their lives, in some sessions I used contextual data sources (e.g. newspaper articles) to both reflect, and stimulate discussion, about the relationships between the narratives of individuals and the group, and wider societal narratives (outlined in detail section 3.5.3 and figure 8). The group context of the study enabled both immediate dialogue about these relationships and also for analysis by myself the researcher at a later date (as detailed in section 3.6). The spatial-temporal context of the study is London in 2014, the place where the young people lived and attended school, and as such the societal narratives considered in the research, reflect London in this time-space.

It is significant to note, that although the young people were encouraged to be active participants in the research and were encouraged to share their experiences, and imaginations, of London (see section 3.5.3), they were not included in the research design process. As examined in section 2.2, children’s geographies and geographers have sought to find ways to diminish power relations (e.g. between adult and child and the researcher and researched), engage children in research processes and encourage them share their experiences and concerns (van Blerk et al., 2009). As this thesis investigates how, and why, children’s geographies are of value to geography education in schools, it is of important to defend my decision not to engage young people in the research design.

This decision was made as I was concerned that engaging young people in a research design process after school had the potential for it to become burdensome to them. This ultimately had the potential implication that they would fail to engage in the research at all. As examined in detail later in this chapter (see section 3.5.3), I wanted the young people to be active agents in enacting the research and to tell their stories, and share their geographies and imaginations of the world, with myself as the researcher and their community(s). As such, I designed research that aimed to facilitate this and empower the young people in the research. However, when reflecting on the research and how it might be built upon in future (see chapter 7), I consider how engaging children and young people in the process of research design might further enable and empower them in telling their stories.
As will be considered further in the next section (3.5.2), the spatial location of the research was to some extent determined by access to young people and child protection (Robinson and Kellett, 2004). The school the students attended was chosen as the location to hold the Storytelling and geography group. Given that a school is a formal educational space, with distinct social rules which young people often have limited/no control over (Aitken, 1994; Barker and Weller, 2003; Freeman and Tranter, 2011; see section 2.2.5), I decided to conduct the research after school to support the construction of a space that was different to that which young people experienced during the school day as students. However, during the research design process, my conducting of the research, and analysis of the data, I recognise and examine power relationships in the research (see also sections 3.5.2, 3.5.3, 3.6 and 3.7).

3.5.2 Introducing the young people who participated in the research

As introduced in section 1.2.1, when I began this doctoral research I was working full time in a secondary school. In light of this, I made the decision to conduct the research with young people who attended the school I was working in, because I had rapport with the student community (Bushin, 2009). Furthermore, as an employee of the school, I had relationships with the leadership team, who also had access to my Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) report, meaning that they were comfortable with me conducting research with students from the school. These considerations are pertinent in a time-space in which gaining access to children and young people can be difficult, due to social concerns about power relationships and a landscape embedded with legal policies aiming to protect children (Porter and Abane, 2009; examined in detail in section 3.7).

To advertise the opportunity to participate in the research, I talked to year seven and eight students (Key Stage 3) in assemblies and during tutor time in the summer term of 2014, stating that anyone could ‘opt in’ to the research. Following the initial advertisement of the research, I provided any young person that expressed an interest in taking part, with a letter which outlined the purpose and structure of the research, and an ‘opt-in’ form for both the student and their parents/carers to
complete. I wanted students to choose to participate in the research and have agency to do so (Lloyd-Smith and Tarr, 2000; Porter et al., 2012; see sections 3.2 and 3.7). However, I also required parental consent for the research as the young people were legally minors. Alderson (2014) highlights that although participation rights are an integral element of research with children and young people (see also UNCRC), the researcher also has a responsibility to protect the child from harm, abuse or discrimination. As I was asking young people to stay after school, and I was unsure what narratives the young people would share, I had an ethical responsibility to converse with participants’ parents / carers about the research (this is examined in full in the ethics section (3.7)).

This initial interaction with the students, through the letter and ‘opt-in’ form, also enabled me to collect some background demographic data on the young people who participated in the research. As I was unaware of the number, and backgrounds, of the young people who would choose to participate, I made the decision to collect this data in case certain demographic variables significantly correlated with the narratives (Lee and Schuele, 2010). For example, if children had been in different school years, their narratives may have varied and having this data would have enabled analysis of this variation. However, I made the decision not to draw on the background demographic data in the analysis, due to the small number of participants in the research. In addition, the young people’s religious and ethnic backgrounds, and the narratives they shared about them, were identified as prominent areas of discussion in the analysis and are examined throughout the findings chapters.

The background data the participants chose to share is shown in figure seven. Initially, eight students signed up for the study, however five participants attended the sessions. The participants’ names have been changed for ethical reasons and pseudonyms for the young people are used throughout this thesis (see section 3.7).
Figure 7: The participants in the research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pseudonym</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jack</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collected or make their own way home:</td>
<td>Own way home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School year:</td>
<td>8 (year 9 when the research was conducted)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age:</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender:</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity:</td>
<td>White Iraqi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion:</td>
<td>Islam/ Muslim</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jessica</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collected or make their own way home:</td>
<td>Own way home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School year:</td>
<td>8 (year 9 when the research was conducted)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age:</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender:</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity:</td>
<td>‘Mixed Irish and Caribbean’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion:</td>
<td>‘Christian/ Catholic’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rachel</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collected or make their own way home:</td>
<td>Own way home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School year:</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age:</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender:</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity:</td>
<td>‘British’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion:</td>
<td>Islam</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alex</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collected or make their own way home:</td>
<td>Own way home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School year:</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It is significant to note that I had taught, and/or tutored, all of the young people previously, meaning that I already had relationships with them. This had both benefits and limitations, with advantages including that the students were able to approach me, and that I had some awareness of their backgrounds (both academic and social). However, it also meant that it was at times difficult to shake off my previous identity as a teacher (see also chapter seven).

In this section I have introduced the young people who participated in the research. This section has also introduced some ethical questions about research with young people, which will be examined in greater depth in the ethics section (3.7). I now move on to outline the process of data collection in section 3.5.3 and modes of analysis in section 3.6.

### 3.5.3 The process of data collection

As informed by the research design and methodology, data was collected in six Storytelling and Geography Group meetings between September and November 2014. The group meetings lasted for 90 minutes, running between 15:30 (fifteen minutes after the end of the school day) and 17:00 on alternate Thursdays.
timings aimed to make the session accessible to the young people, encourage participation and also ensure the young people did not have to go home too late in the evening, so as to still have time for play and to support a safe journey home (see sections 3.5.2 and 3.7).

In figure eight, I outline the planned data collection process on a session by session basis. Although the analysis of the research, through coding, is examined in depth in section 3.6, as Miles et al. (2014: 71) recommend conducting analysis concurrently with data collection to help ‘the fieldworker cycle back and forth between thinking about the existing data and generating strategies for collecting new, often better, data’, I began the process of analysis during my data collection. This involved taking field notes on the Storytelling and Geography Group, which I recorded after each session. My notes include; discussion of my relationships with the participants, key themes that emerged in the session and suggestions for the next session. I transcribed each interview between the sessions, and added any additional notes to my field notes, which are included in appendix one. However, due to the part time nature of my doctorate, I was unable to begin the coding, or any deep analysis, until after the data had been collected.

Figure 8: The process of data collection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage of data collection and description</th>
<th>Date/Timeline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Storytelling and Geography Group – meeting one</td>
<td>Thursday 11&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; September 2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key areas of planning and consideration:**

- Expectations, such as confidentiality, and the purpose of the study are shared at the start of the session to support the construction of a space in which children are empowered to share their geographies (Goodson and Sikes, 2001; Longhurst, 2016; see also section 3.7).
The first interview is semi structured and focussed on the young people(s) life histories. It follows Goodson et al. (2010: 6) strategy of using questions such as ‘can you tell me about your life?’ with the openness of questions aimed at enabling the young people to tell their stories. Questions such as ‘how does this link to London?’ are to be asked to encourage the participants to consider how their narratives related to the city and grand narratives.

To facilitate the change in relationship from teacher-student to researcher and participants, following Goodson and Sikes (2001) argument that a ‘useful way to start life history work is by inviting respondents to construct a timeline of key events in their life with, if appropriate, an emphasis on those experiences which relate to any focus the project may have’ (p30), the session begins with a ‘getting to know you’ task in which the participants construct, and share, a timeline of their life.

The data collected in the meeting will be:

- Timelines from the getting to know you task;
- Recording of the session.

**Storytelling and Geography Group – meeting two**

**Key areas of planning and consideration:**

- Young people are asked to map their geographies with ‘London’ as a starting point. They are able to add photographs or other objects to their maps if they choose.

- The data collected at this meeting will be:
  - Maps of young people’s geographies;
- Recording of the sessions.
  
  o Discuss with participants the idea of a ‘research show’, to enable the young people to share their geographies with, and to perhaps affect change in, their communities. For example, the head teacher (may be) invited, and he could be encouraged to consider how the research might be used by the school.

**Storytelling and Geography Group – meeting three**

**Key areas of planning and consideration:**

- This is a semi-structured interview in which young people are encouraged to share narratives on their life experiences. They will be encouraged to talk about their geographies and places they have indicated on their map. Questions based on the young people’s original stories, using other data sources and representations of young people in London are included in the interviews (triangulation of data, Goodson (2013)).

- The young people are to be given three maps of London (one of its boroughs, one of the tube map, and one from google maps) and will be encouraged to map their geographies and discuss them.

  Note: These maps were chosen as they related to themes which emerged in the previous session (territory and transport), and this supported the triangulation of data (see appendix one).

- The data collected at this meeting will be:
  
  - Maps;
- Recording of the sessions.

**Storytelling and Geography Group – meeting four**

**Key areas of planning and consideration:**

- Young people are encouraged to share their narratives and experiences with one another. They are given some newspaper articles, photos and clips to help them to contextualize where their ideas came from. This is based on Goodson (2013) process of triangulation, where life stories, documentary resources and other testimonies are considered of equal weighting in the creation of a life narrative.

- The data collected at this meeting will be:
  - Recording of the sessions.

**Storytelling and Geography Group – meeting five**

**Key areas of planning and consideration:**

- A semi-structured interview in which young people are asked to reflect upon where their imaginations of the city come from.

- Participants refer back to their timelines and maps of London to support these discussions.

- The data collected at this meeting will be:
  - Maps of young people’s geographies;
  - Recording of the sessions.

**Storytelling and Geography Group – meeting six**

**Key areas of planning and consideration:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thursday 23rd October 2014 – moved to Thursday 6th November due to a school trip (see appendix one)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thursday 20th November 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday 27th</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Engage in a discussion with the young people to gain feedback on the experience of participating in the research. This might include asking questions about if they have learnt about their geographies and imaginations of London, and whether they have found the Storytelling and Geography Group a useful methodology in exploring these ideas.

- The fact that there are several sessions, over a period of time reflects the long-term relationship element of the research (Squire, 2011). This enables the researcher to expand the contexts of the study with the participant, for example in regards to triangulation.

- Draw the study to an end, thanking the participants and discussing next steps in the research (as no research show).

- The data collected at this meeting will be:
  - Maps of young people’s geographies;
  - Recording of the sessions.

### Storytelling and Geography Group – research show

Note: This did not occur following a unanimous decision from the group in session five (see appendix one and section 3.7).

#### Key areas of planning and consideration:

- This session aims to engage the young people(s) communities with the research, and the young people(s) geographies. It also has the potential to affect change. It will be invite only, with the participants leading the process, but suggestions for invitation will include parents/carers, their peers, school colleagues and the local council.
Once the data was collected, and transcribed, I began the process of analysis which is detailed in section 3.6.

### 3.6 Coding the data

This section examines the process of analysing the data. Qualitative research in the social sciences can often result in data which is relatively unstructured (Bryman, 2016). An example of this is a young person’s response to an open ended question asked in my research, such as ‘tell me about your life/ London’ (see section 3.5.1 and figure 8). This type of data requires interpretation to make it meaningful to, and for, the research (Willig, 2013). Coding data is a way that the researcher can draw out areas of interest from the data and is a form of analysis in which the researcher labels the data to ‘assign symbolic meaning to the descriptive of inferential information compiled during a study’ (Miles et al., 2014: 71). It is used for both data condensation, and for heuristic purposes, as reduction and reflection on the ‘core content and meaning of the data’ (p3).

Coding is an ‘intrinsically selective’ process (Miles et al., 2014), in which the researcher uses codes to draw attention to areas of commonality and difference in the data set (Harding, 2013). There are at least thirty documented approaches to coding (Saldana, 2011) and the choice the researcher makes in regards to coding depends on the research question, type of data collected, and conceptual framework (ibid.). Coding is usually divided into at least two major stages, with first cycle coding usually being used to assign meaning to parts of the data and then second cycle coding working within these codes (Miles et al., 2014)

The remainder of this section sets out how coding was used in this research, it begins by outlining the process of first cycle coding in section 3.6.1, before examining the second cycle coding in section 3.6.2. The sections ends by outlining the final stage of analysis and identifying key themes which are used to structure the findings chapters (four, five and six) in section 3.6.3.
3.6.1 First cycle coding

As outlined in section 3.5.3, coding began after data had been collected and transcribed. However, some of the ideas which informed this coding, had begun during the data collection and transcription process (see section 3.5.3 and appendix 1). In the first cycle of coding, I aimed to identify themes in the data that could be used to categorise the data into similar chunks for further analysis (Miles et al., 2014). The first cycle of coding was conducted inductively, using Nvivo to create nodes which enabled me to view narratives coded under a theme together (Bryman, 2016).

I made the decision to code the narratives inductively in the first cycle of coding for two reasons:

- Firstly, it allowed me to assign narratives to a number of codes, meaning that the same narratives could be analysed in different ways during the second cycle of coding (Schreier, 2014);
- Secondly, it allowed new ideas, and themes, to emerge from the narratives as I interpreted them (Gibbs, 2014).

These benefits were of value for my research as I wanted to both listen to, and represent the voices of, the young people in the study (see section 2.2.3 and 3.2). I aimed to both identify themes in the young people’s narratives, and to limit the extent my perspectives were imposed on to the narratives (as would have been more prevalent had the data been initially coded deductively in response to hypotheses).

Using inductive coding was also beneficial in analysing group narratives in which multi-faceted conversations were occurring, as I could code and analyse the narratives in different ways.

During the first cycle of coding, fourteen main codes were assigned. Within these codes, I used sub codes to facilitate in-depth analysis of the narratives. These codes, and sub, codes are shown figure nine.
**Figure 9: First cycle codes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Main code</th>
<th>Sub codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Code 1 | Religion | r.jw (Jehovah’s Witness)  
| | | r.islam (Islam)  
| | | r.convert (Converting to Islam)  
| | | r.terror (Terrorism)  
| | | r.chris (Christianity)  
| Code 2 | People | p.parents (parents)  
| | | p.sib (siblings)  
| | | p.cousin (cousin)  
| | | p.headte (head teacher)  
| | | p.fam (family)  
| | | p.gangs (gangs)  
| | | p.ethni (ethnicity)  
| | | p.old (old men)  
| | | p.fri (friends)  
| | | p. responsibility (responsibilities)  
| | | p.auth (authority, police, council, government)  
| Code 3 | Place | Pl.obirth (place of birth)  
| | | Pl.fherit (family heritage)  
| | | Pl.move (moved house)  
| | | Pl.house (house)  
| | | Pl.floca (location of family)  
| | | Pl.hol (Holiday)  
| | | Pl.ldn (London)  
| | | Pl.ldnspec (specific place in London)  
| | | Pl.WL (West London)  
| | | Pl.influ (influence of place)  
| | | Pl.desiretoleave (Desire to leave)  
| | | Pl.food (food)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Identity</td>
<td>i.gende (gender)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>i.sex (sex and sexuality)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>i.voice (voice)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>i.cloth (clothing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>i.futurecareer (future career)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>i.brit (British)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Relationships</td>
<td>Rel.resear (relationships with me)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Re.groupdy (group dynamics)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rel.links (group links)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rel.self (relationship to self)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>s.schx (school x)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>s.arabsch (Arab school)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>s.play (school plays)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>s.trip (school trips)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>s.valu (value of education)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>m.socmed (social media)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>m.media (media)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Language</td>
<td>l.eng (English)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>l.street (Street language)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>l.arab (Arabic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>Pd.free (freedoms)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>development</td>
<td>pd.future (future career)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Hobbies</td>
<td>h.hob (hobbies)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Young people</td>
<td>Yp.provis (provision for young people)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yp.music (Music and the arts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>Saf.drug (drugs)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The first cycle of coding enabled me to cluster and categorize themes in my data. However, I still had a large amount of data and when I began to reduce the data by code again, I found that new themes emerged which often occurred across a range of the first cycle codes. For example, in relation to religion I identified several new cross-code themes. These were:

- Perception of religion
- Religion and worship
- Religion, upbringing and identity
- Religion and culture
- Religion, sexuality and love
- Religion and terrorism

In considering this issue, and how to proceed with the second cycle of coding, I became concerned about losing shared narratives if I continued to code the data inductively. For example during the first Storytelling and Geography Group, Tilly discusses the fact that she was brought up as a Jehovah’s Witness, explaining that she feels this is part of her identity, before noting that she feels people make fun of this religion. The rest of the group then engage in a discussion about this, and this leads to further conversation about the perception of religion overall, and the experiences of other individuals in the group (e.g. Rachel as a convert to Islam). If this narrative was coded by religion (r.jw and r.islam), and then by the secondary code of ‘perception of religion’, then the group narrative would have been lost and so would the structure of the discussion. As such, to enable deeper analysis of the initial codes, and exploration of cross-code themes I developed a second cycle of coding which aimed to mitigate these potential issues, and this is outlined in section 3.6.2.
3.6.2 Second cycle coding

In the second cycle of coding, I worked within the codes assigned in the first cycle (Miles et al., 2014) aiming to examine the geographies and imaginations of individuals within the group, whilst trying to mitigate the loss of the group narratives and ensuring that I was able to explore the nuances within the codes (e.g. in relation to the perception of religion, as explained in section 3.6.1). Ensuring that analysis of both group narratives and discussions, and the narratives of individuals, was possible was significant to this research in enabling examination of the process of group discussion in meaning-making. It was also of value in considering if, and how, narratives were shared and/or varied between the young people and the grand narratives of the place, and time-space, they exist within and contribute to (see section 3.5.2). To facilitate my examination of how the participants in the study experience and imagine London, I used the production of space (Introduced in 3.5.3 and as a RQ in sections 1.3 and 3.3) as part of the conceptual framework for analysis to consider how the young people were both producing social space, and being affected by it.

To do this, I used Harvey’s (1990) ‘grid of spatial practices’ (see figure ten). Harvey used, and developed, Lefebvre’s conceptual triad from the ‘production of space’ (see section 3.5.3) to further explore the subtleties and complexities of spatial practices in urban settings (Watts, 1992). Harvey expresses his radical motivation for doing this, arguing that to transform society, we must critically explore, and seek to understand, the complexities of spatial practices. He contextualises his motivation in the time-space of neoliberalism, which he argues is a ‘permanent arena’ of social conflict and struggle, stating that ‘those who have the power to command and produce space, possess a vital instrumentality for the reproduction and enhancement of their own power’ (p256). Thus, for Harvey, it is significant to examine how inequality is produced, and sustained, in neoliberalism before challenging it. This argument appealed to me in the context of this research, in examining the geographies of children and young people, who have at times been under-represented, and/or subordinated, in both education and society.
On his grid of spatial practices, Harvey adds three dimensions to Lefebvre’s conceptual triad. These dimensions, as seen on the x axis of figure 10, are used by Harvey with the aim of further examining the nuances of spatial practices. He defines these dimensions as:

- **Accessibility and distanciation** – speaks to the role and “friction of distance” in human affairs. Distance is both a barrier and a defence to human interaction. It imposes transaction costs upon any system of...
production and reproduction (particularly those based on any elaborate social division of labour, trade, social differentiation of reproductive functions). Distanciation is simply a measure of the degree to which space has been overcome to accommodate social interaction;

- **The appropriation of space** - examines the way in which space is used and occupied by individuals, classes, or other social groupings. Systematised and institutionalised appropriation may entail the production of territoriality founded forms of social solidarity;

- **The domination of space** - reflects how individuals or powerful groups dominate the organisation and production of space so as to exercise a greater degree of control over the friction of distance or over the manner in which space is appropriated by themselves or others’ (Harvey, 1990:258).

In the second cycle of coding, I mapped themes identified in the first cycle of coding onto Harvey’s grid. An example of this is shown for r.islam (religion and Islam) in figure eleven. The numbers are used to identify different themes which were drawn out of analysis to enable comparison between the different members of the Storytelling and Geography Group (see also figure twelve).
I then compared if, and how, these themes varied between individuals in the group, so as to develop a comparative picture as to whether narratives were individual or shared. An example of religion and Islam is shown below in figure twelve.

**Figure 11: R.islam (Religion and Islam) mapped on to Harvey's 'grid of spatial practices'**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material spatial practices</th>
<th>Accessibility and distanciation</th>
<th>Appropriation and use of space</th>
<th>Domination and control of space</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flows of people – family heritage and religion (Islam) (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Religion and its links to language, culture, political jurisdictions and racial groups (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representation of space</th>
<th>Accessibility and distanciation</th>
<th>Appropriation and use of space</th>
<th>Domination and control of space</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feeling a friction of distance due to religion (Islam) (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Geopolitics and Islam (6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spaces of representation</th>
<th>Accessibility and distanciation</th>
<th>Appropriation and use of space</th>
<th>Domination and control of space</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation of Islam (media and social media) (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Constructed spaces of ritual (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 12: Shared and individual narratives on r.islam (religion and Islam)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Young person</th>
<th>Theme one: Narratives of religion and identity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sub themes:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Flows of people – family heritage (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Experience / perception of a friction of distance against their religion (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Religion and its links to language, culture, political jurisdictions and racial groups (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Conversion (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o The representation of Islam in the media (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Geopolitics and Islam (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack</td>
<td>o Flows of people – family heritage (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Experience / perception of a friction of distance against their religion (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Religion and its links to language, culture, political jurisdictions and racial groups (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o The representation of Islam in the media (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Geopolitics and Islam (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel</td>
<td>o Experience / perception of a friction of distance against their religion (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Religion and its links to language, culture, political jurisdictions and racial groups (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Conversion (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o The representation of Islam in the media (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessica</td>
<td>o Religion and its links to language, culture, political jurisdictions and racial groups (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o The representation of Islam in the media (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tilly</td>
<td>o Religion and its links to language, culture, political jurisdictions and racial groups (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o The representation of Islam in the media (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Geopolitics and Islam (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alex</td>
<td>o No narratives about Islam</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The mapping of the narratives on figure twelve, shows that four out of five young people in the study discuss negative representations of Islam in the media, thus suggesting that this can be conceptualised as a shared narrative in the group. However, some of the narratives are more individual. For example, Rachel is the only person in the group who has converted to Islam.

During this process I continued to recognise that some themes transcended multiple codes. An example of this is ‘identity’, which was identified as a theme during the analysis of several codes. The system of coding also meant that experiences (such as feeling a ‘friction of distance’ (see Harvey, 1990) because of your religion) could not be analysed across different religions. Aiming to address this issue, and to examine themes that transcended codes, I began the final stages of coding which is outlined in section 3.6.3.

3.6.3 The final stages of coding and identifying key themes for discussion

In the final cycle of coding I identified themes that cut across codes, reducing data to three overarching themes which were constructed of inter-related, but distinct, sub themes which connected to the overarching theme. During this process, I removed several of the codes which I had established in the first cycle (relationships, language, safety, transport and money). This was because the narratives assigned to these codes were also identified, and examined, in other codes. This is an issue which emerged from one of the motivations for my first cycle of coding - to enable sections of narrative to be coded several times (see section 3.6.1). Although the motivation for this was to enable narratives to be interpreted in different ways, it resulted in repetition in the data analysis.

The three overarching themes identified in the analysis of the data, and their sub themes, are outlined in figure thirteen. As these themes are used to structure the findings chapters, I have included the chapter the data is examined in, in figure thirteen. There are some relationships between, and ideas that run across, these themes and these are examined throughout the findings chapters and in the conclusion (chapter seven).
In this section, I have examined the analysis (through coding) of the data collected in the research. I now outline the ethical considerations, and processes undertaken, as part of this research in section 3.7.

### 3.7 Ethical considerations

Conducting research in an ethical manner is a principle concern for researchers (Abebe and Bessell, 2014). It is also a prominent part of the current landscape of academia, in which discourse about integrity, and academic malpractice, feature in debates in universities and in everyday life (for example, in the media and political debate) (Robson, 2018). These debates are especially pertinent when researching people who are deemed to be vulnerable or having less of a voice than others (for example, children and young people). The section begins by examining the importance of research ethics with young people, before outlining the ethical processes undertaken as part of this research. It draws on previous chapters of the
thesis, specifically focussing on contextualising the research in wider literature about research with, and for, children.

The principle role of research ethics is to promote high standards (for example, in regards to active participation by children), to draw the researcher’s attention to potential dangers, and problems, and to examine their responsibilities in addressing, and/or mitigating, these dangers (Alderson, 2014). Morrow (2009) echoes this philosophy, positing that the three most important values that underpin research ethics are justice, respect and avoiding doing harm. These principles are used to underpin both research design and methodology, as well as research ethics committees and structures within academic institutions (Morrow, 2009; Clifford et al., 2016).

Research ethics has had a long history both as a field of philosophical debate, as well as a field of political and practical enactment. These debates have continuously evolved across time and space as research ethics responds to new research, and events, requiring attention and action (Alderson and Morrow, 2011; Alderson, 2014.). In research with, and for, children and young people, research ethics have evolved with changing understandings of children, and childhood, and the enactment of key political events and policies such as the UNCRC (see section 2.2.2; Alderson and Morrow, 2011).

Today those who research children and young people, and those who work with children in professional contexts, have different duties of care towards the children depending on their role and where they work and live (Lloyd-Smith and Tarr, 2000; Alderson, 2014; Robson, 2018). These considerations may involve research ethics and children’s rights, and the sometimes complex interplay between them (see Bell, 2008). They also involve considering how the child is constructed, and represented, both within research and during the data collection (Alderson and Morrow, 2011). These debates informed the ethical processes I went through when designing, and conducting, this research.

To conduct research as a student or staff member in a HEI in England, ethical permission through the university must be granted (Morrow, 2009). As a student at
what was then the Institute of Education (IOE), I applied for ethical approval via IOE systems. I used the British Educational Research Association’s (BERA) ethical guidelines (2011) to inform my research design and application. The application was approved by review by my supervisor (Dr Clare Brooks) and (then) Professor and chair of Geography Education at IOE, David Lambert.

Drawing on Morrow’s (2009) principles for research ethics (justice, respect and avoiding doing harm), I now outline ethical considerations, and actions taken, as part of my research:

1. **Access to children who could participate in the research**

As outlined in section 3.5, I made the decision to conduct the research in a school I had worked in. This is because I was legally cleared to work with children in this environment through my DBS check and the school, young people and some of their parents/carers were familiar with me. In addition, I shared my completed ethics form, and approval, with the head teacher and met with him to discuss the research and he granted permission for me to conduct the research with young people in the school. Furthermore, as outlined in section 3.5, I wrote to the parents/carers of young people who had shown an interest in participating in the research, to ask for their permission for the children to take part in the Storytelling and Geography Group.

2. **Child safety (including the risk of disclosure and supporting the young people to get home safely after the research took place)**

Considering, and endeavou ring to ensure, child safety in this research involved practical considerations as to where the research took place. Although there are limitations with conducting research on school grounds (see section 3.5), there are also advantages in regards to ‘avoiding harm’. Conducting the research on school grounds meant that there was access to other educational professionals should an issue with a young person or a disclosure arise. To further support child safety, both the young people who participated in the research, and their parents/carers, were
asked to identify how participants were travelling home. This is because the research involved staying at school beyond the normal school day (until 5pm). The decision to finish relatively early, also meant the young people were travelling home during the working day when London is still busy and also to help prevent the young people from becoming over tired from additional ‘work’.

In addition to practical considerations about child safety, there were also social considerations to attend to. These included, the risk of students expressing prejudice (Longhurst, 2016) or making a disclosure (Alderson, 2014). Further to this, they also involved the researcher considering power relations, and whether the researcher could truly understand the cultural contexts the children lived in and social spaces they contributed to (Longhurst, 2016). Whilst these considerations could not be eliminated, awareness and critical consideration of them, meant that I was able to try and mitigate them. This was done in the following ways:

- I attempted to create a space which the young people felt was different to the formal educational environment the research was conducted in. I asked the young people to call me ‘Lauren’, as opposed to ‘Miss Hammond’, and encouraged them to speak openly, honestly and respectfully, in the Storytelling and geography group;

- The series of sessions was informed by Goodson’s (2013) work on life histories (see section 3.5 and figure 8), this meant that I was able to return to ideas or areas the young people had shared and to ask questions to encourage them to discuss areas and ideas further if it was perceived valuable;

- The group context also meant that young people, and I, were able to query one another in an open and supportive manner. This was discussed, and agreed, with the young people at the start of the first Storytelling and Geography Group, where we shared and agreed principles for the research (see figure 8);

- The school context meant that should a young person make a disclosure, or it was perceived that they at risk, and/or a risk to others, I had access to, and knowledge of, their support systems.
3. Opportunities to participate in the research

As introduced in section 3.5.2, young people were provided with opportunities to ‘opt in’ to the research. The completion of the ‘opt in’ form by participants (who had been given information about the research group through assemblies and a letter) aimed to give the young people choice and agency. However, I also asked for informed consent from their parents/carers via a letter and form (Morrow, 2016). I did this to try and avoid doing harm, and to ensure parents and carers were aware of their children’s activities and movements. The ‘opt in’ process also aimed to avoid young people feeling excluded, as the opportunity to participate in the research was offered to all students in year seven and eight at the school (Alderson and Morrow, 2016).

4. Confidentiality

Both the school, and the young people who participated in the study, have been treated as confidential in all dissemination of this research. Longhurst (2016) conveys the importance of protecting participants’ confidentiality, and highlights the complexity of this in group discussions, suggesting that this is made an explicit area of discussion and participants are asked to treat all discussions as confidential. Following Longhurst’s recommendation, a group discussion was held at the start of the Storytelling and Geography Group, asking participants to respect one another’s viewpoints and to treat one another’s narratives as confidential (see figure 8). In addition, these expectations were shared with both the young people via the letter given to prospective participants as they considered opting-in to the research and the school through the sharing of my ethical approval documents.

However, due to the small scale of the research, and the nature of the research design (young people were encouraged to share stories of their experiences and imaginations of London (see section 3.5)), the participants cannot be made completely confidential. This concern is especially pertinent as I used to work in the school in which the research was undertaken, and my relationships to the research
and participants are examined as part of the thesis. To prevent any of the participants being identified, they have been given pseudonyms and the school is known as school x. The names of any other people mentioned in the research by the young people (e.g. teachers or the young people’s friends and classmates), as well as places / schools, which might result in connections to individuals being made by readers of this thesis, have also been changed. Using my knowledge of the young people, their school and communities (see section 3.1), I have taken care in writing this thesis to share, and honestly and openly represent the narratives of the participants in the research, but also to ensure that no personal detail is shared which is not representative of the communities they exist within.

As part of the methodology (see figure 8 and section 3.5), young people were asked to map their London and draw timelines of their lives. I made the decisions not to share these in the thesis to avoid ‘doing harm’ by making the young people more identifiable. This is because the maps the young people produced included a lot of personal information about them and their families, including school names and where they lived. I have also taken this decision with regards to the transcribed scripts for the same reason.

It is also worthy of note that I had planned a research show (see section 3.5.3, figure 8 and appendix 1) as part of the research design. The show was included to provide the young people with an opportunity to share their geographies with invited members of their community (e.g. parents and carers and teachers). This was included as part of the research design with the aim of empowering young people within their communities and was a key part of the methodology informed by philosophies of participation, and empowerment, which are prevalent in children’s geographies (see sections 2.2 and 3.5). However, a discussion arose in which young people expressed that they did not wish to share their geographies beyond the group.

When I explored the reasons for this decision with the participants, Jessica and Jack stated that they felt that the head teacher disliked them, with Tilly and Rachel suggesting that they thought he was trying to ‘build up the school’. As the discussion continued, the entire group expressed a perspective that no matter what they said
to the head teacher, nothing would change the school or their experiences of it. Indeed, Tilly stated ‘he would have to act as if he cared, but it doesn’t help him in any way’. When I asked the group how they would like to move forward, the participants expressed that they were happy talking to me, with Jack, Tilly and Rachel offering to attend more sessions, but unanimously decided that the show should not go ahead if any of the group were uncomfortable with it. This suggests that the group felt comfortable sharing their narratives with some people and not others. It also demonstrates that creating a safe, and open, space when conducting research with children and young people is of the upmost importance. Although the young people were happy speaking openly with me, they were not comfortable sharing their geographies with (some) other colleagues in the school.

This meant that the young people’s geographies were not formally shared, through a research show with their communities. This is worthy of consideration for several reasons related to ethics:

- Firstly, the young people’s narratives are now less identifiable by members of their communities as they did not share them in the research show;

- Secondly, it raises questions about empowerment as part of my research design. As young people were not encouraged to be part of the research design process (as explained in section 3.5), it results in questions as to whether I had imposed ideas of empowerment on to the participants in the research by including a research show without discussing this with them. However, the young people repeatedly expressed that they enjoyed the Storytelling and Geography Group and were content in talking about their geographies with me. Analysis of the young people’s narratives, suggests the group’s rationale for not having a research show ultimately lay in their concerns about sharing their geographies with (some) others, such as the head teacher (see also section 4.5);

- Thirdly, as this research is about the value of children’s geographies to geography education in schools, it raises significant questions about if, and how, young people are comfortable with sharing their geographies in formal
educational spaces and how teachers are supported in navigating issues which might arise during this process (see also Hammond, 2019; chapter 7).

5. Voice, respect and inclusion

This research aimed to encourage young people to actively participate in the research and to share their geographies and voices. However, the group context sometimes resulted in me having to ‘chair’ discussions and to lead conversations about respect, and communication, with the group. Although I am aware that this altered power dynamics within the group (see appendix 1 and chapter 7), especially as I had been the participants’ teacher in the past, I made the decision to manage these debates to encourage social cohesion.

As is exemplified in the findings chapters, Alex is a lot quieter than other members of the Storytelling and Geography Group. In addition, the group also often questioned Alex about his identity (for example, about his nationality). Having taught Alex, in my experience, this was representative of his personality as a quiet character who often chooses not to engage with debate. Whilst encouraging group discussions and debate, if I felt that the group were ‘pushing’ Alex, or anyone else, too much, I made decisions to manage the situation to avoid doing harm. This is often a challenge of group discussions, in that some people are more eager to speak and/or wish to dominate.

6. Sharing children’s voices and the dissemination of the research

This research is part of a thesis, and thesis will be published and accessible to those who wish to read it. I am, however, aware that this may be a small number of individuals. In addition to concerns raised above (for example, confidentiality (point 4)), this also raises questions as to the extent to which my research has an impact. This is a question of ethics as it is about the representation of people(s). To share my research, I have presented at academic conferences (e.g. IGU, RGS), and also professional conferences (e.g. Geographical Association and Geography Teacher
Education (GTE)), and I have published aspects of it (see Hammond, 2019; forthcoming). I hope I will also build on this work in future, and have begun to do so in exploring geography teacher educators perspectives on children’s geographies (see Hammond and McKendrick, 2019). In addition, I aim to develop a research bid to further examine the value of children’s geographies to geography education (see chapter 7) and I remain dedicated to, and motivated by, exploring children’s geographies and, where appropriate, trying to affect change.

In this section, I have considered the importance of research ethics, and outlined how I have considered both policy, and philosophy, about ethics in informing my research design. I have also raised questions that emerged during the process of conducting the research about the challenges of exploring children’s geographies that are pertinent to geography education. In the next section (3.8) I critically consider questions of validity and rigour in (this) research.

3.8 Validity, rigour and addressing limitations of this research

This section begins by examining what is meant by validity, outlining why it is a pivotal consideration when undertaking research. The section then addresses questions of validity that could be raised in the case of this research, specifically focussing on the relatively small scale of the research that was undertaken (a case study), and considering the potential implications of this on the significance, limitations and rigour of the thesis. The importance of addressing questions of validity and rigour in research lie in designing and conducting research that results in more trustworthy findings (Saumure and Given, 2012). Put another way, it is of the upmost importance in creating powerful knowledge, which is the best knowledge we have thus far created and tested (see section 2.2.4a).

The concept of validity is integral to research design, and the integrity of both the research and researcher. For Ahlqvist (2009: 320), in this strictest sense validity means ‘the degree to which empirical data truthfully measure a construct of interest’. Ahlqvist argues further that the constructs referred to can be very tangible
(for example, the wind speed at a specific point) or far more theoretical (for example, how threatened a person feels by terrorism). The notion of measurement in validity is worthy of consideration, as how a researcher would measure validity varies with the focus and method of the research. To return to the examples given above, a researcher would measure wind speed, and how threatened a person feels, in very different ways.

When considering validity, the researcher has to make decisions about how to analyse data, which depend on the research design and theoretical framework of the research. Harding (2013: 5) argues that these decisions are ‘invariably subjective’ in qualitative research. Miles et al. (2014) echo this argument, noting that validity is often much debated in qualitative research, with some researchers such as Wolcott (1990) even rejecting validity and arguing for ‘deep understanding’ instead. However, both Harding (2013) and Miles et al. (2014) suggest measures which can be taken by researchers to increase the validity of their findings by ensuring that the ‘written account of the findings accurately represents your data’ (Harding, 2013: 171). I now consider these debates with reference to my research, I begin by outlining my decision to use a case study approach, addressing questions of internal, and external, validity. Finally, I outline measures taken to increase the validity of this research.

This research involved engaging a small group of five young people in a Storytelling and Geography Group (see section 3.5). The decision to use a case study was made for two reasons:

1. Firstly, as a researcher that has worked full time, and been self-funded for most of my PhD, practical and resource considerations meant that I had to develop research which was realistically possible whilst still being ethically sound, rigorous, and making a valuable contribution to debates in the field (Harding, 2013);

2. Secondly, the use of a case study was to focus on contributing to the development of theory, and deep understanding, about children’s geographies and geography education, and not to make generalisations (Yin (2003) in Harding, (2013)).
The second reason introduced above, considers the generalisability of research. For Hammersley (2009) this refers to the external validity of research, whereas internal validity focusses on the reliability of the research and methods. I now examine, and defend, the external validity of my research, before moving on to consider its internal validity.

Questions of external validity are often prevalent in Geography Education Research (GER). Lambert (2010) argues that this is because GER is often small scale and self-funded, and this can limit the scope and generalisability of the research. Drawing on Mathematics Education Research (MER), Lambert sets out an ideal situation for GER, which he argues should be never-ending and do three things to enable consequential validity:

1. ‘To make claims (“inferences”) about Mathematics teaching and learning that can be backed up (“warranted”) by some evidence;

2. To be able to justify such claims as being more warranted than others (on the base of the strength of evidence);

3. To show that such claims are ethically – and practically – defensible’ (p84).

Lambert suggests that GER is a long way from achieving the above, but asserts that considering consequential validity is significant to the sub discipline as it means that ‘the researcher cannot absolve themselves from the consequences of the research’ (p84). Elliot et al., (2016) define consequential validity as asking researchers to consider the extent to which society benefits from the research. However, they go on to note that this is a contested idea, not least as it is debated as to whether, and/or how, social consequences should be considered in questions of validity (Ibid.)

These debates are pertinent to this research as, as a researcher, I must consider the social consequences of my research. For example, in decisions I make about research ethics (see section 3.7), how I share the research and also how I build on the research and take it forward (chapter 7). These concerns are particularly significant, as my research is reflective of Lambert’s conceptualisation of GER, in that it is small scale.
It is therefore of value to highlight that the aim of this research was not to construct generalisations about geography education, or children’s geographies, but to contribute to knowledge and debate about the value of children’s geographies to geography education in schools (see chapter 1). I now move on to problematize the concept of generalisability, before examining the value of a case study approach and defending the choices I made when designing, and conducting, this research.

Harding (2013) argues it is commonly quantitative research which aims to generalise. For example, by collecting data from an entire, or representative, population. However, constructing generalisations also has potential issues. Miles et al. (2014) identifies that these issues include; making links between non-representative participants; generalising between non-representative events; and drawing inferences from non-representative processes. For the purposes of this research, which is grounded in the methods, and philosophies, of children’s geographies, creating generalisations was not a primary concern. Instead, I chose a case study approach, agreeing with Clifford et al. (2016) that case studies have many benefits, including enabling in-depth, and thick, description. Thus, the use of intensive research design (such as case studies) is different from extensive research design in which ‘the emphasis is on pattern and regularity in data’ (Clifford et al., 2016: 11).

Although a limitation of an intensive research design is that relationships discovered are unlikely to be generalizable, they enable in-depth examination of social systems and structures (ibid.). Harding (2013) posits that the relationships between society and the people(s) in the research are often examined in greater detail in case studies. These arguments are central to my research enquiry and design, which examines young people’s geographies in London using the narrative methodologies, and analyses them using the production of space as a conceptual framework. Significantly, both narrative methodologies and the production of space, consider a person’s relationships with, and to, the place and time-space they exist within and contribute to. However, in chapter seven, I return to these debates and suggest further research is conducted in this way to help to develop a more nuanced knowledge of children’s geographies. For example, in considering if, how, and why children’s geographies vary between places and across time-space.
Having considered external validity, I now move on to examine questions of internal validity in this research. In considering these questions a researcher must be aware of, and address, concerns and issues which may affect the claims the research makes (Taylor, 2013). The selection of the young people in this research has been defended throughout chapter three, with the research being open to all young people in two year groups to ‘opt in’ to the study (see sections 3.5 and 3.7). However, further questions of internal validity, such as what Taylor (2013) terms ‘person factors’ such as bias are now addressed.

Firstly, the researcher must minimise the danger of their own bias’s distorting the data (Fraser et al., 2014). In the case of this research, young people were encouraged to lead the discussions about their experiences, and imaginations, of London and the world (see section 3.5). Where I, as a researcher, have commented on, or stepped-in to, any discussion, I have been open about this and defended this decision (see sections 3.5 and 3.7; appendix 1 and chapter 7). The majority of these decisions are the result of a blurring of the boundaries between teacher and student, and researcher and participant the research. The blurring of these boundaries was often due to the young people being playful with one another and my stepping in to mediate, or my asking clarifying questions. I argue they are also a result of my own relationships to the research and participants, as someone who previously taught the young people (see sections 3.5 and 3.7; appendix 1).

Secondly, the researcher must endeavour to truthfully replicate the data they have collected (Fraser et al., 2014), which in the case of this research is the narratives of the young people. The process of research design, as informed by Goodson’s (2013) ideas on life histories (see section 3.5 and figure 8) supported this. This is because it enabled ideas and narratives to be returned to, and discussed, if I wished to ask any clarifying questions. It is worthy of note, that I have taken the decision not to share transcripts of the interviews, or the thesis, with the children that took part in the study (see also section 3.7). As Costley (2000) articulates in relation to her own research, due to the time frame taken to conduct the research and write up the thesis, some of the participants may have left school or significantly changed their perspectives and ideas. Although considering how, and why, young people’s ideas
change is of value, this was not the focus of the research. In addition, the age of the young people in the research, will likely have meant that they would have struggled to access the thesis.

Thirdly, as is defended in section 3.6, which outlines the methods of analysis used in this research, coding and correlation methods are always to some extent subjective (see Harding, 2013; Taylor, 2013; Miles et al., 2014). However, I have endeavoured to ensure that the young people’s narratives, and my perception of their meaning, are honestly and openly represented. This has been done through careful transcription and coding. In addition, if I was unsure of what participants meant in their narratives, I asked clarifying questions during the Storytelling and Geography Group.

Before concluding this section, I now outline measures taken to further ensure validity of the research. The measures outlined below are informed by Miles et al. (2014):

1. I have made explicit, and openly examined, my role in the research and my relationship(s) to the research and the young people who participated in it (see sections 1.2.1, 3.1, 3.5 and 3.7). This is of value in examining how I, as the researcher, may influence the research through my own personal assumptions and biases;

2. The methods and procedures used to collect, and analyse, data in this study have been clearly articulated in chapter three. This enables readers to ‘follow the actual sequence of how the data were collected, processed, condensed/transformed, and displayed for specific conclusion drawing’ (Miles et al., 311). Drawing on academic literature, it rationalises decisions made when designing and conducting the research, and this enables the researcher to both justify, and defend, their decisions and to analyse any impacts on the data collected;

3. Areas of uncertainty and changes to the data collection have been made explicit, examined and defended. For example, changes to the research show (see sections 3.5.3 and 3.7);
4. In the thesis, I examine the relationships between the data, data analysis and the drawing of conclusions, ensuring they are visible to readers (see chapter 3).

This section has examined the steps, and measures, I have taken to ensure the internal and external validity of this research. It has also highlighted some of the challenges of undertaking part time, self-funded, doctoral research and related this to challenges faced by the wider geography education community (see also Lambert, 2010; Butt, 2019). The section shows that this research is rigorous in defending the claims it makes, with the research design and my relationships to it, being made as transparent. I am also self-analytical throughout the thesis, aiming to both ensure rigour and also to identify areas for future research in the field. Furthermore, this section shows the value of this research lies not in making large scale generalisations about children’s geographies, but providing a rich case study of how narrative methods, and analysis using the production of space, can be used to enhance knowledge of children’s geographies and considering how, and why, this is of value to geography education in schools. I now move on to conclude this chapter in section 3.9.

3.9 Conclusions

In this chapter, I have examined the different facets of research design. This has involved considering my relationship to the research and those who participated in it; examining debates about conducting research with children and young people; introducing narrative research and outlining the research methodology and processes of data analysis. I have also addressed questions of validity, and considered ethical questions in regards to the research. In section 3.6.3, I identified key themes identified during data analysis, which I now examine further in the three findings chapters.

Chapter four examines the theme of identity, chapter five territory and turf, and chapter six the young people’s imagination of London as a place of opportunity and hope, but also a place of inequality and injustice. As the themes were drawn from
data analysis, each of the findings chapters begins with a brief academic discussion to the field of interest. This is because the young people in the study were encouraged to lead the discussions, and share ideas, experiences and imaginations that are significant to them. As such, I could not predict which topics or areas they would focus on. The chapters then share the narratives of the young people, examining how, and why, the modes of analysis have led to the findings. Each chapter concludes with an examination as to how, and why, the findings are, and the research more broadly is, of value to geography education in schools.
4. Chapter four: identity

The previous chapter (chapter three) set out the research design of this study, introducing three themes in section 3.6.3 around which the findings chapters are structured. This chapter (four) is the first of the three chapters that examine these themes, focusing on identity. It is constructed of four sub themes that were identified during data analysis. These sub themes, which are stated below, are used to structure the chapter through sections:

- Religion and identity (section 4.2)
- Sex, sexuality, gender and identity (section 4.3)
- The state and oneself (section 4.4)
- Voice and identity (section 4.5)

Relationships between the sub themes are highlighted, and examined, throughout the chapter.

As stated in section 3.9, each section begins with an introduction, or academic grounding, to the sub theme. This is because the participants in the study were encouraged to share their geographies and voices, and as a researcher, I could not predict their areas of discussion (see also sections 2.2.5 and 3.2). The introduction to the sub theme aims to situate the young people’s narratives, and the theme, in academic debate. Following this, each section examines the young people’s narratives that analysis identified as relating to the sub theme, enabling critical examination of data relevant to addressing research questions one and two: what do young people’s narratives reveal about their geographies and imaginations of London? (RQ1) and how can the production of space contribute to knowledge of children’s geographies and imaginations of the world? (RQ2).

The young people’s narratives are shared as a discussion, with shared geographies and imaginations examined alongside differences between individuals in the group. The narratives are presented in this way to ensure that group discussion is not lost (see sections 3.5 and 3.6). In addition, critically considering the notion of individual, and shared, narratives allows examination of how individuals are shaped by, and
shape, the places and time-space they exist within. The chapter begins by introducing identity as an area of geographical consideration and research in section 4.1.

4.1 What is identity?

‘Identity is a powerful organizing presence in social life today—a social fact, or so it would, at least, seem. Whether measured by the amount of energy individuals expend claiming, cultivating, expressing, or bemoaning the lack of it or by the amount of attention devoted to it by institutions that profess to address or are said to reflect popular interests and issues, it is clear that being, in the sense of belonging - to ethnic, national, religious, racial, indigenous, sexual, or any of a range of otherwise affectively charged, socially recognizable corporate groups - is among the most compelling of contemporary concerns’ (Leve, 2011: 513).

In the quotation above, Leve reflects on both the variety of ideas, and relationships with others, that people use to construct their identity(s). She also suggests that identity can be perceived, and experienced, as both a positive element of being (see section 2.2), and a challenge. For example, we might perceive that aspects of our identity, that we may be uncomfortable with, are imposed upon us.

Identity is an important part of being, and being human, and on a personal level it can affect our happiness, whether we feel a sense of belonging to world(s) we exist within and how we represent ourselves to others. On a much larger scale, identities may be constructed at a national level, and this can lead to both inclusion and exclusion, and also to socio-political conflict. As Leve articulates, it’s a primary contemporary concern not only for academics in geography, and the social sciences more broadly, but also in the socio-political spaces of everyday life.

Although now widely debated in geography (Gregory et al., 2009), the most radical shift to considering the self, and identity, in the discipline began with humanistic geography (McKinnon, 2011). This shift focussed geographers’ attention to exploring ‘subjective experiences of place’ and ‘giving a central awareness to human awareness, human agency, and the power for human creativity’ (p39). For McKinnon
the value of this lies in the idea that in the modern world, we are identified by others (for example, in legal documents by our ethnicity and age), or by those around us who may judge us. Aitken (2001) exemplifies this using the example of biases in workplaces related to race, gender, age and class, which can constrain notions of self-identity and cultural capital.

In today’s world of neoliberalism, hyper-communication and globalisation, Graves and Rechniewski (2015) argue that considering identity is significant in examining people(s) geographies, and how relationships to place(s) have changed. For example, diaspora from Mexico may live in the USA, but feel that Mexico is their home, and identify as Mexican. Considering these geographies is significant both for individuals, but also for society, in respecting, and recognising, the identity(s) of all people who live in a place or (choose to) leave. These debates are worthy of consideration in this research, both as themes which were identified in the analysis of the young people’s narratives, and also more broadly in considering ‘who are the children we teach?’ (See GeoCapabilities; sections 1.2.2, 2.2.4 and figure 4). For geography teachers, this may involve questioning how they teach topics such as migration, which are imbued with ideas such as identity and home in the discipline, but often much simplified and focus on discussions of push and pull factors in the school subject (see for example, Casinader et al., 2019).

I now move on to introduce the sub theme of religion and identity in section 4.2. All quotes from young people are written in italics to make them more identifiable throughout chapter four, the findings chapters and the thesis as a whole.

4.2 Religion and identity

Religion emerged as an area of discussion in the Storytelling and Geography Group. The young people talked of religion as part of their spatial practices and daily lives. They also spoke of spaces of ritual and places of worship, and about religion as part of who they are, and as an element of their own, and sometimes their families and/or people(s), identity. This section begins by introducing the relationships between religion, identity and geography. It examines how these concepts, and the
relationships between them, have been considered in the academy. It then moves on to examine geographies of religion in the UK and London, before sharing the narratives of the young people in the study analysed as relating to this theme, in section 4.2.1.

For Tuan (1976) ‘the religious person is one who seeks meaning in his world, and a religious culture is one that has a clearly structured world view’ (quoted in Park, 2004: 1). The strength, and nature, of the impact that religion has on a person varies both between people and cultures. Tuan suggests that whilst socio-cultural environments influence an individual’s relationship with religion, how they respond to these environments will depend on the individual. In addition to being an aspect of an individual’s identity, for Park (2004), religion also has close links to our, often shared, imaginations of ‘racial groups, cultures, political systems and lifestyles’ (p2). Indeed, the relationships between religion and identity are sometimes chosen and sometimes enforced.

Over the past decade, increasing globalisation and meta-narratives of religion in geopolitics (e.g. Islamic extremism) have led to an increased focus on religion in the academy, including in the discipline of geography, and by the state (Dwyer, 2016). This is a significant change from previous debates in geography, in which Park (2004: 3) argues religion had often been ‘studiously avoided’, asserting ‘geography rarely appears in books on religion, and religion rarely appears in books on geography (ibid.) However, it is now recognised that religion has played, and continues to play, a significant role in the formations of some people(s) identity. Religion affects people’s everyday lives, their spatial practices, views, identity(s) and beliefs, as well as the social and physical environments they live within and (re)produce (Bergmann, 2014). Religion’s relationships with identity occur at individual, as well as group, and sometimes societal, levels. As Bergmann (2014) articulates, religion is geographical, socio-cultural and historical; it (re)produces spaces and places that are constructed from actions and ideas in space (see Massey, 2005; 2008; 2013; see section. 2.3). The relationships between religion and space have been a significant area of consideration in French philosophy, with Lefebvre, Foucault and de Certeau all considering the role of religion and religious institutions in producing space, and
exploring narratives of power and authority that religious institutions construct and sustain (Knott, 2008). However, these ideas have largely been omitted from modern Anglophone geography (ibid.).

The post-modern, neoliberal, urban environment provides an interesting context to examine religion and identity. Dwyer (2016: 758) argues as ‘processes of globalisation and geopolitics have shifted critical attention to religious narratives and networks, while globalised immigration flows have given religious identifications greater visibility through their materialisation in urban space’. Examining religion in urban contexts can enable consideration of how the city affects the integration of religious practices and identities. This is especially pertinent in a context of globalisation and hyper-connection, in which people’s lives are increasingly moving from being place-based to being characterised by ‘multiplicity, hybridity, malleability, flexibility, continued transformation and even incoherence’ (Ryan, 2014: 448).

In the case of London, the socio-spatial context of this study, a period of rapid change in regards to religion is occurring. Before introducing the narratives of the young people on identity and religion in section 4.2.1, I examine large-scale trends of geographies of religion in the UK and London. This is to contextualise the study, and is of value to this research because, as reflected in the choice of methodology, young people(s) lives feed into, and are affected by, wider grand narratives of a society (see sections 2.3.2, 3.4 and 3.5).

According to the UK census between 2001 and 2011 there was a significant decrease in the proportion of the population who identified as being Christian from 71.7% to 59.3% in England and Wales (Office for National Statistics, 2015). Christianity has (previously) been the religion associated with the monarchy and the state in the UK, so this change represents a significant socio-cultural shift. In addition, the proportion of the population who identity as having no religion increased from 14.8% in 2001 to 25.1% in 2011 (ibid.) Furthermore, the census shows London to be the most religiously diverse region in the UK, with the largest proportion of people identifying as Muslim, Buddhist, Hindu and Jewish. However, it’s worthy of note, that whilst the census asks people ‘what is your religion?’ the Office of National Statistics recognises that ‘religion is a many sided concept and there are other aspects of religion such as
religious belief, religious practice or belonging which are not covered in this analysis’ (2015).

There are geographies of religion within London, as well as across the UK more broadly. These geographies vary both between boroughs (see for example, London Data Store, 2015) and within boroughs (see for example, Hammersmith and Fulham, 2018). In their borough profile for 2019, Hammersmith and City state the ward where school x (the school in which this research was conducted) is located, has the lowest proportion of the population identifying as White British (30.9%), and the highest proportion identifying as Muslim (21.3%). The profile also states that this ward has a large proportion of the population who have migrated into the area.

Following this introduction to the relationships between religion and identity, and an overview of trends in religion in the UK and London, I now move on to share, and examine, the narratives of the participants in the study analysed as relating to this theme. In doing so, where narratives reflect debates introduced in either the academic grounding to this chapter, or the review of the literature, I highlight these to illuminate discussions. This process also enables consideration as to how the young people are shaped by, and shape, the social spaces they exist within.

4.2.1 Narratives of religion and identity

This section presents a discussion of the narratives of the young people in the research that have been analysed as relating to the theme of religion and identity. This research has identified that the young people in the study are navigating multiple, sometimes contradictory, social spaces in London in regards to their identity. Analysis suggests that the young people feel a ‘friction of distance’ (Harvey, 1990) from parts of society due to their religious and/or ethnoreligious identity, with there being a shared perception in the group that ethnoreligious minorities are not accepted by the white Christian majority in the UK. The use of the group discussion shows that young people have their own religious identity(s), but that they share values and ethical perspectives as to how people should be treated if they identify as having a religion.
In examining these findings further, I begin by sharing the young people’s narratives that were coded as ‘religion and identity’ mapped onto Harvey’s (1990) ‘grid of spatial practices’ (introduced in section 3.6.2) in figure fourteen. This representation enables consideration of how the production of space can be used to develop knowledge of children’s geographies (see RQ2). The language used in the grid is drawn from Harvey (1990) and is clarified before the narratives of the young people are shared. This section ends with a discussion about the differences between individual, and shared, narratives.

**Figure 14: Narratives of religion and identity mapped on to Harvey’s grid of spatial practices**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material spatial practices</th>
<th>Accessibility and distanciation</th>
<th>Appropriation and use of space</th>
<th>Domination and control of space</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flows of people – family heritage (1)</td>
<td>Spaces of communication and worship (6)</td>
<td>Exclusive communities of education and religion (7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representation of space</td>
<td>Friction of distance (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>State, community and religion (3) Geopolitics (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spaces of representation</td>
<td>Media (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Constructed spaces of ritual (8)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As expressed in figure fourteen, several themes related to religion and identity were identified during analysis of the young people’s narratives. I introduce these below, but as will be drawn out in discussions throughout the findings chapters, relationships between the different themes also exist:
1. **Flows of people** - represents migration of family members and groups of people(s) to London. This movement can lead to a friction of distance as people(s) navigate, and produce, different and new social spaces;

2. **Friction of distance** - represents the distance that has to be overcome to facilitate social interaction. In the case of religion, this might represent socio-cultural differences, and differences in social or spatial practices, of religious groups and individuals;

3. **State, community and religion** - represents that religion can, and does, have links to other aspects of identity such as ethnicity, culture, nationality and language;

4. **Geopolitics** - represents the relationships between religion and the socio-political domination of space. For example, by nation states and organisations such as Islamic State of Iraq and Syria (ISIS);

5. **Media** - represents how religion has been represented in the space of media, and how this has impacted on people(s) experiencing a friction of distance related to religion;

6. **Spaces of communication and worship** - represents religion’s construction of physical, and social, spaces to convey its ideas and messages (e.g. mosques or preaching);

7. **Exclusive communities of education and religion** – represents the social reproduction of religion through education, and the potential of this to result in inclusion or exclusion;

8. **Constructed spaces of ritual** – refers to the representation of religion through symbols in the physical and social environment (e.g. religious buildings and also wearing religious symbols such as a hijab);

Drawing on the young people’s narratives, I now examine these themes in greater detail. Where links to the above themes are noted in the findings chapters, I use the language defined above, for ease of reference.
As introduced in section 4.2, London’s religious profile has changed and continues to change due to migration. Flows of people, both in to, and out of, London change how space is socially (re)produced at a variety of scales (e.g. locally, nationally and internationally). Analysis shows that the young people in this study feel that these trends have resulted in them feeling a friction of distance due to their religion and/or ethnoreligious identity. Out of the five young people who participated in the research, only one (Jack) is a first generation migrant to London. As such, he is the only young person who is not legally a citizen of the UK (see also section 4.4). I begin by sharing his experiences, before examining how others in the group echo and contest his perceptions.

Almost immediately in the research, Jack identifies as Muslim. In the first session of the Storytelling and Geography Group, Jack was asked to draw a timeline of his life and share this with the other young people (see section 3.5.3 and figure 8). When Jack narrates his timeline, he begins by sharing his birthdate and that he was born in Holland, before stating ‘and I’m a Muslim’. Religion can be seen as a recurring, and pivotal, theme in Jack’s narratives, with Jack regularly expressing the importance of his religion to him. An example of this is shown in the narrative below:

    Jack: Miss you can’t throw this in the bin

    Researcher: I won’t

    Jack: because it’s to do with my religion. On my flag is says ‘Allah Akbar’, and you can’t throw that away

    Researcher: what does that mean?

    Jack: it means ‘God is the greatest’, but if you speak Arabic, and didn’t know about no religion, it would mean ‘God is the biggest’, but it means ‘God is the greatest’, so I need this on there

    Researcher: so is your religion quite important to you?

    Jack: yeah, Islam.
This narrative can be interpreted as Jack expressing the importance of religion to him, and linking religion to state by writing ‘Allah Akbar’ on the Syrian flag. This is a recurring theme in Jack’s narratives, and he speaks not only of his own experiences of Islam, but also his perception of the experiences and representations of other Muslims. The major focus of his narratives on this theme is Arabic people(s) and the Arabic world. In this way, Jack’s narratives can be seen as linking religion to ethnicity, community and state, with ‘being Arab’ represented as an ethnoreligious identity. This can also be seen as representative of debates, and grand narratives, introduced in section 4.2, about people(s) relationships to place changing in today’s neoliberal and globalised world, as people are increasingly mobile and connected (see also Graves and Rechniewski, 2015).

Jack’s narratives about Arabic people(s) often focus on the everyday experiences of Muslims, and they include discussion of racism and geopolitical issues presently occurring in the Arabic world. He also considers the relationships between his own everyday experiences, and geopolitical issues, when discussing the representation of Arabic people(s) in the media. This narrative is personal to Jack, who is of Arabic descent with both his father and mother being born and raised in the Middle East. However, due to geopolitical issues and war in the region, Jack’s father’s family have migrated from Iraq to what Jack terms ‘safe countries’ in Europe and America. Whereas his mother’s family remains in the Middle East, which Jack states ‘is mostly where all the bombs and stuff happens, but none of my family have died yet’.

Jack repeatedly expresses concern for his family living in the Middle East, and how the region is represented in the media, education and society more broadly. In the narrative below, Jack articulates some of his concerns:

*Jack: I have two statements yeah, number one is you see when they say Asia yeah, they always think of the... they don’t think of the Arab side normally, they always think of China and Japan and stuff*

*Tilly: yeah*
Jack: they never think of Arabs and stuff, and then when you say Middle East yeah, they always think of bombs and stuff

Researcher: do you think that everyone does?

Tilly: I don’t think of bombs, don’t worry

Jack: I know, I know

Tilly: but most people do

Researcher: so why do you think the Middle East is seen like this?

Tilly: was...

Jack: because like the governments are idiots, and there’s like the terrorists. The thing is yeah...

Tilly: when people say Middle East they never say about specific places.

Jack’s narrative can be interpreted as him expressing a perception that the Middle East is often hidden from social and political debates, and the attention afforded to other places, a sentiment which is also echoed in Tilly’s narratives.

Jack’s narratives also express his perception that there is a shared cultural imagination of the Middle East as a homogenous region dominated by war and terrorism. They can be interpreted as him perceiving that this shared imagination is born from poor governance, geopolitical unrest and terrorism in the name of religion (e.g. ISIS). He expresses that this shared cultural imagination has an impact on his everyday life, not only in his concern for the region and his maternal family, but also in how he feels that he is perceived. For example, Jack states on several occasions that he feels that people think he’s a terrorist because he is Arabic. This raises questions as to whether Jack feels excluded and/or a sense of belonging in, and to, the place in which he lives. These are significant areas of consideration, as they can impact both on an individual’s wellbeing and society more broadly. They can also be seen to be representative of Dwyer’s (2016) assertion that geopolitics has increased the focus on religion in geography and the social sciences (see section 4.2).
Others in the group, such as Tilly in the narrative above, express messages of support to Jack, and one another, when they share narratives that express a feeling of a friction of distance due to their religion. All of the group, apart from Alex who does not mention the region, express that they agree with Jack’s perception of the representation of the Middle East and Arabic people(s). The group are regularly supportive towards each other when they express concern or upset about the representation of religion. An example of this is shown in the narrative below:

*Jessica:* To be honest I don’t think it’s fair for people to get bullied because of their religion, because that the end of the day...

*Jack:* you were brought up like that, it’s not your fault

*Jessica:* at the end of the day, they was born to follow that religion unless they converted

*Rachel:* like me (laughing), and I still get it

*Jessica:* at the end of the day, I don’t think it’s fair, because everyone else has their own religion and their own opinion on it, and will find out one day whether it’s true or not

*Rachel:* like me, cos I converted.

Despite the shared sense of injustice towards bullying against religion, all of the young people in the study share that they have experienced people expressing a friction of distance towards them and their religion.

Rachel echoes Jack’s experiences, and states that she has experienced abuse due to her religion (Islam), and the representation and (perceived) cultural imagination of Muslims as terrorists:

*Jack:* the thing is, like I’m Arab yeah, and I feel like people say ‘you’re a terrorist’ and stuff like that yeah

*Researcher:* does anyone say that to you?

*Rachel:* lots of people say it and I’m not even Arab, man.
Rachel also expresses that her experiences of bullying due to her religion are more than day-to-day encounters, and states that she feels that she has been a victim of institutionalised discrimination due to her religion.

Rachel has a passion for sport and she has engaged in one sport since she was four years old. She has excelled in the sport, and states that in one competition earlier in the year she came high in the rankings for her age group in Great Britain (GB). She also notes on two occasions she has been spotted for trials for the national team. Rachel tells the story of going to GB trials with three friends, Misba (who is a Muslim and, like Rachel, wears a hijab) and Alissa and Cathy (who are not Muslim). Rachel expresses that neither her nor Misba were chosen for the team and she has begun to think that this is to do with racism.

Institutionalised discrimination is discussed by the group further when they consider a YouTube video in which an Arabic man is searched to ‘check for bombs’ (Jack) in an American airport. Tilly and Rachel express that they feel that this is racist behaviour, with Jack stating that he feels the man was stopped, just because he was Arabic. The group state that this also happens in London, with Jack’s narratives suggesting that he perceives the police in London to be institutionally discriminatory against Arabic people(s). All three of these young people then express that they feel that they are unable to report this behaviour to those in power.

Analysis of the data shows that the young people in this research share a perception that social imaginations of religion, which result in bullying and discrimination, are generally acknowledged and accepted as a social norm in London. For example, when talking about people making fun of Jehovah’s Witnesses (her religion), Tilly states ‘like it’s a known thing’ and ‘cos that’s what people are like’. Tilly’s religion can be seen as a central aspect of her everyday life, identity and spatial practices. For example, she explains that she worships twice a week and preaches on a Saturday. Tilly also attends large-scale events for Jehovah’s Witnesses such as ‘the international conference for Jehovah’s Witnesses’ in which she meets people from across the world. When the group discuss bullying towards Jehovah’s Witnesses, Jack states that people ‘laugh at how they knock at houses’, a statement that Tilly and Rachel agree with. This can be read as representing a social imagination of a friction of
distance against a space of ritual, and Jehovah’s Witnesses wanting to share, and preach for, their religion.

Jessica also considers the relationships between religion and other aspects of a person’s identity. Jessica identifies as ‘Christian slash Catholic’, stating that she is unsure which one she is and that she is unclear of the relationships, and/or differences, between the two. In her narratives, Jessica regularly considers Christianity and English/British national identity (see section 4.4) in the same sentence. For example:

*Jessica: people that are born in England and who are Christians, I think they can marry whoever they want*

*Rachel: no*

*Jessica: obviously, I’m not full English, I’m not white English, so I won’t know but, in my opinion they can marry whoever they want. In movies, and documentaries, they don’t have to marry a British person.*

In the narrative, Jessica distances herself from her English citizenship due to her ethnicity, expressing a perception that there are relationships between religion, nationality and ethnicity, and that these relationships affect what people are able to do (see also section 4.4). Jessica also expresses in relation to marriage ‘you can marry anyone, but you have to convert’, giving the example of her cousin who converted from Christianity to Islam for this purpose. These narratives suggests that Jessica feels there are distinct social rules and imaginations about what a person can do, which depend on their religion, citizenship and ethnicity, as well as the law. Rachel contests Jessica’s argument, but does not expand further on why.

Alex is the quietest member of the group, who also experiences some criticisms and debate from others. Like Jessica, Alex links religion and nation. He also identifies as being Christian/Catholic, stating he is from Ireland/Northern Ireland. Alex uses the terms Christian and Catholic intermittently throughout the study, and the rest of the group regularly question him about his religion and nationality (see sections 3.7 and 4.4). The group question Alex about his heritage and whether he would have to date someone from an Irish Catholic background. During this discussion, Jessica states that
‘he is not a proper traveller’, although Alex himself never mentions any traveller heritage. Alex firmly identifies as Irish throughout the study (see national identity, section 4.4) and often debates his feelings on this with the group.

Thus far in this section, I have shown that the young people in the study often feel a friction of distance due to their religion. This can be seen as representative of London as a ‘world city’ (see Massey, 2008; section 2.3.2), and the complexities of navigating religion and identity in such a neoliberal urban environment (Dwyer, 2014; section 4.2). Whilst the reasons for, and type of, friction of distance the young people feel varies, this is something all members of the group experience and perceive is embedded in popular social imaginations and behaviour, and argue is morally wrong. I now examine the narratives of religion and worship, before moving on to discuss religion and territory.

Spaces of worship often play a pivotal role in religions, and the lives and spatial practices of those who identify as being religious. As noted earlier in this chapter, as a Jehovah’s Witness, Tilly worships on a twice-weekly basis and preaches every Saturday. Tilly notes that being a Jehovah’s Witness has ‘always been there with me’ and it’s something she feels she would always return to. The first Storytelling and Geography Group happened on her 14th birthday. When Tilly stated she was 14 on that day, noting ‘it’s my birthday!’ the group began to sing ‘happy birthday’, and part way through the song Jessica asked Tilly ‘can I sing it to you?’ with Tilly replying ‘oh, I don’t think so’. Tilly then explains that she is not able to celebrate Christmas, Easter or her birthday, with Jessica showing an understanding of the religion noting ‘it’s because she’s a Jehovah’s Witness’. In the narrative, Tilly chooses to share that it is her birthday, but also expresses that it cannot be celebrated in a way that is socially familiar to others in the group. This group discussion again highlights some of the discussions that can emerge when there is a mixture of different people(s) and religions sharing a place.

Rachel is another member of the group who has to navigate different perceptions of her religion in different spaces. A convert to Islam, Rachel lives with her parents who have not converted. Rachel’s narratives can be read as her navigating the different, sometimes contradictory, social spaces of her religion and her family’s beliefs and
social practices. For example, when discussing her choice to fast for Ramadan, Rachel notes that she does not celebrate Eid, and continues to attend school during the festival, because ‘my family are not brought up to be Muslim’.

Rachel expresses that she feels her parents are very accepting of her decision to convert and that they do not eat pork around her out of respect. However, she also notes that she, in turn, supports their celebrations, sharing ‘like some things I’ll step back on, like New Year’s, when they’re all drinking, I’ll dance and stuff, but I won’t drink’. She explains that because she was brought up with people eating bacon and drinking, both of which are considered to be haram (forbidden) in Islam, she still understands and enjoys that culture. This narrative can be read as Rachel celebrating and supporting her family and heritage. However, the note that she dances may well be a significant social consideration for her, as music and cinema are prohibited in more orthodox forms of Islam (Ryan, 2014).

Rachel conveys that spending time with her aunty and uncle influenced her decision to convert:

Rachel: my aunty and my uncle, they like converted before me, like 30 years before I was born. I used to go over to their house a lot, I used to go to mosque with them, I used to pray in the middle of the street (laughing), because I used to enjoy that type of culture, that type of religion. So when I did convert, I was successful in a way, but after that I didn’t realize that I would still be knocked down for it. Even now, all the time, all the time, like my English side of the family, I haven’t met my Scottish side, but some of them are like EDL, so they don’t really like...

Researcher: EDL?

Rachel: Yeah, English Defence League, so they don’t really like Muslim people in a way. So, erm, when I first said that I was a Muslim, they were like ‘what?’ they were all confused, cos like it takes a while for them to adapt. And even I get it, you get abuse from Muslim people, which is like the most shocking of all, saying like ‘you wear hijab for fashion’, ‘you’re a fake Muslim’, saying all this.
In the narrative above, Rachel expresses that both her extended family and other Muslims have discriminated against her. However, Rachel also shares that she feels that London has offered her a space in which she feels she can convert, noting ‘like if I was brought up in Scotland or something, I don’t think I would have converted’. This narrative can again be read as being representative of London as a ‘world city’, in which exposure to different people(s) provides opportunities for an individual to express, and in this case alter, their identity (see Massey, 2008; see section 2.3.2).

Rachel’s choice to wear a hijab is something she regularly returns to, explaining that it was a big decision for her and it is how she expressed her conversion to her family and friends. Rachel also expresses that she feels it represents discipline and is a symbol of her religion. When Rachel shares that she has received abuse for wearing a hijab, Jessica states ‘I think they say it because she’s white, and because of the country she is from, they probably think she’s taking the piss, taking the mick’. Rachel states that she agrees with Jessica’s perception. These narratives can be interpreted as representing the young people’s perception of there being shared cultural imaginations related to Islam and ethnicity in the UK.

In other discussions about wearing a hijab, Rachel conveys that she feels that it puts men off talking to her due to the fact it represents discipline. For example she states, ‘my friends who don’t wear headscarf and cover up as much, they get more attention off guys than I do, but I want to talk to guys!’ This narrative can be read as Rachel expressing that she is navigating a complex relationship between wanting to wear the hijab, a symbol of modesty and piety in the Islamic faith, and her socio-sexual desires for attention from men (see also section 4.3).

Another theme identified during analysis of the young people’s narratives about religion and identity, is education and religion. All of the group engage in a discussion about a neighbouring school that Alex states is ‘enemies’ with school x. Tilly expresses that she dislikes the neighbouring school because they ‘dress like grannies!’ The neighbouring school is a Catholic school, in which Alex states ‘you have to learn RE, you have no choice, you have to learn RE!’ to which Rachel responds ‘ah yeah, they made my cousin buy a bible!’ with Tilly stating ‘they force them, they just force them to do that!’ The group discusses students who identify as being Muslim, or another
religion, attending this school and express a shared sense that it is morally incorrect for formal education to enforce religion and religious education (RE) on to children. These narratives can be read as the young people questioning the ethics of an education system, which offers parents/carers an opportunity to segregate their children, by their religion.

The final narrative analysed as relating to religion and identity, is one that links religion to territory on a local scale. Jessica shares her experiences of a group dominating space (see also section 5.3), and in the narrative below, she ‘others’ a group of Saudi Arabian Muslims who appropriate a local park:

Jessica: Me and my friends, we was playing on the park and there was like this this big group, this family of Muslims, I’m not being racist or nothing (said to Rachel, who laughs). And like, they’re really, really rude, if you get what I’m trying to say. And they lived in the towers, and we would go to the park and play, but they would think the park is theirs.

Jessica expresses her perception that this group of Muslim people, who she notes only one of whom could speak English, were dominating the local park. She goes on to state this resulted in her feeling that she couldn’t play on the swings, before explaining that this resulted in a big argument, which a gang eventually mediated through encouraging the young people to ‘take turns’ and share the space. Jessica’s story can be read as representing some of the local scale conflicts that emerge from different people(s) with different religions sharing space and claiming and contesting territories (see Massey, 1998). In addition, Jessica’s application of a social identity on to the group (in this case as ‘Saudi’s’) can be seen as being representative of the potential conflict and feelings of exclusion that can emerge from this sharing of space by different people(s) (see sections 4.1 and 4.2).

In this section, I have shared the narratives of the young people in the study analysed as relating to religion and identity. I have drawn links to theoretical discussions about the importance of identity and religion in geography, and also to wider grand narratives about London as the context of this research. In figure fifteen, I provide an overview of the different themes identified in the analysis by person. The numbers
next to the themes, link to the numbers on figure fourteen, where the themes are mapped on to Harvey’s (1990) grid of spatial practices.

*Figure 15: Shared and individual narratives of religion and identity*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Young person</th>
<th>Key themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jack</td>
<td>o Muslim through family heritage (Arabic) and upbringing (1) (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Has experienced a friction of distance against his religion (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o States that bullying due to religion is wrong (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Expresses that there is a friction of distance against Arabic peoples. Stating that Arabic peoples are often represented as terrorists due to geopolitical issues which are represented in the media (2) (3) (4) (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Links community, state and religion (ethnoreligious identity) (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Expresses that there are social ideas outside of religion that affect decisions and identity (e.g. in relation to marriage) (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Expresses that schools should not enforce with religion on its students (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Attends Arabic school, speaks Arabic and attends mosque, celebrating religious festivals (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel</td>
<td>o Converted to Islam, and expresses a friction of distance against her by Muslim people(s) and others (2) (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessica</td>
<td>o Expresses that being bullied due to your religion is wrong (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Expresses that Arabic people are represented as terrorists due to geopolitical issues (2) (3) (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Expresses that there are social ideas outside of religion that affect decisions and identity (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Has worshipped in the street and engages with religious observation through Ramadan. However she lives with non-Muslim parents and so has to navigate differences related to food, culture, worship and religious celebration (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Constructed spaces of ritual (wearing a hijab) (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tilly</td>
<td>o Has experienced a friction of distance due to her religion (Jehovah’s Witness) (2) (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Expresses that being bullied due to your religion is wrong</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure fifteen shows how the young people’s narratives coded as religion and identity, are sometimes shared and sometimes individual. It has identified the following shared themes:

- The young people in this research share a belief that it is wrong for someone to be discriminated against for their religion;
- Young people in this study are navigating different social spaces in regards to their religion and religious identity in London;
- The young people share a perception that Muslim people are often represented as terrorists due to large scale geopolitical issues in the Middle East;
- The young people share a belief that the social reproduction of religion through schooling is ethically problematic.
However, all of the young people have individual life histories and experiences that make their narratives unique. An example of this is Rachel’s internal debates about the benefits and challenges of wearing a hijab.

I now move on to examine the theme of sex, sexuality, gender and identity in section 4.3. However, themes discussed in this section (4.2), are returned to in section 4.6 where their value to geography education in schools is critically considered.

4.3 Sex, sexuality, gender and identity

The second theme identified during analysis of the young people’s narratives is that of sex, sexuality, gender and identity. Before I examine the young people’s narratives, I introduce this field as an area of geographical interest and concern, specifically considering how it has been conceptualised in children’s geographies.

Sex, sexuality and gender are often central to a person’s identity. However, Brown and Browne (2016) assert that despite the fact they have often been present, they have rarely been explicitly addressed in human geography. This argument is echoed by Jackson (1992: 104) who argues that gender and sexuality are rarely considered as part of the central agenda of human geography, and that in cultural geography ‘they are even further from the mainstream regarded as peripheral, private, and personal issues, not suitable for academic debate or public discussion’. Brown and Browne (2016: 1) use the examples of the Demographic Transition Model and population dynamics to exemplify this, noting that whilst they imply human sexuality ‘they tend to prioritise and only attend to aspects of heterosexual coupledom, parenthood and family arrangements’. They go on to highlight that normative ideas of sexuality vary between people(s) and places, and suggest that this is, and should be, an important focus of human and cultural geography.

Children’s experiences, and imaginations, of sex, sexuality and gender are often perceived as an ‘uncomfortable’ topic for many people(s) (ibid.). Anglo-European cultures often socially repress discussions about sex, and sexuality, and children (Foucault, 1978), with puberty itself being a Western conception (Aitken, 2001). Indeed, there has been ‘very little consistent research on questions of sex, sexuality
and gender’ related to young people (Valentine et al., 1998: 24). Valentine et al. go on to note, that the research that has been undertaken, often relates to preventing the spread of Sexually Transmitted Infections (STIs) or stopping teenage pregnancies, as opposed to exploring young people’s perceptions and experiences of sex, sexuality and gender.

Adolescence tends to be perceived as the time when young people become physically and emotionally mature, and that sex and sexuality can be discussed (Aitken, 2001). However, adolescence is a complex, and debated, construct (see section 2.2.2). In navigating the social and physical changes they go through at this stage, young people often engage in ‘protracted struggles concerning a multiplicity of questions about their development as sexual beings... in their attempts to construct such meaning, youth often look to their social contexts for clues about what constitutes acceptable social behaviour’ (Shoveller et al., 2004: 473).

The social spaces that a young person inhabits are therefore significant to their emerging sexual and gender identities. For young people in urban areas, the spaces they inhabit are rarely mono-cultural (Freeman and Tranter, 2011). Culture(s) can be ‘experienced positively, negatively or both in different parts of their (young peoples’) lives. Cultures can differently value children’s needs... and personal character’ (p138). Thus, a young person in London may well be navigating a complex maze of watching open access pornography, a deeply Catholic family background who forbid sex before marriage and who do not discuss masturbation, as well as grappling with their own sexual and gender identity(s).

I now examine the narratives of the young people which were identified during analysis as relating to sex, sexuality and gender in section 4.3.1.

4.3.1 Narratives of sex, sexuality, gender and identity

This research has identified that the young people in the study are navigating multiple, sometimes contradictory, social spaces in London in regards to their identity. In addition, it shows that young people are engaging in discussions about the representation of sex and gender in the media to inform their own identities and
opinions. In examining these findings further, I begin by sharing the young people’s narratives which were coded as sex, sexuality, gender and identity, mapped onto Harvey’s (1990) ‘grid of spatial practices’ in figure sixteen, before sharing the narratives of the young people.

**Figure 16: narratives of sex, sexuality, gender and identity mapped on to Harvey’s grid of spatial practices**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material spatial practices</th>
<th>Accessibility and distanciation</th>
<th>Appropriation and use of space</th>
<th>Domination and control of space</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Social control related to sex and sexuality (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representation of space</td>
<td></td>
<td>Spaces of sex (5)</td>
<td>Forbidden spaces of sexuality (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spaces of representation</td>
<td>Media (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social media (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I now clarify the language used on the grid, which draws heavily on Harvey’s (1990) terminology:

1. **Social control related to sex and sexuality** – represents how dominant individuals and groups exercise control over gender, sex and sexuality in social space;

2. **Forbidden spaces of sex and sexuality** – refers to how some aspects of sex and sexuality are represented and constructed as being forbidden or wrong;

3. **Media** – refers to how the media generates meaning and represents sex, sexuality and gender;

4. **Social media** - refers to how social media generates meaning and represents sex, sexuality and gender;
5. **Spaces of sex** – represents how young people communicate their experiences and ideas about sex, sexuality and gender, and how they are appropriating space through this process.

I now examine these themes, drawing on the young people’s narratives to inform discussions.

A theme identified during analysis of the data was how sex, sexuality and gender are represented in the media, and via social media, and how the young people in the study felt about this. In the first part of this section, I examine narratives related to media and sex, music videos, access to pornography through the Internet, and sex and violence. Music videos were an area of discussion for all of the young people in the study apart from Alex. In the narrative below, the group discuss Nicki Minaj’s video for her song ‘Anaconda’ expressing a perception that Minaj has exposed her body to get views on YouTube and ultimately to become famous. All three of the female participants in the research express a perception that there is a social pressure for women to use their body to achieve fame:

*Jack: it was just a smoking guy, some old guy. Miss, you see when Jessica was talking about the guy, and people rapping about stuff, and people talking about sex, you see that probably got a million views, ‘Anaconda’ the new song, she’s just showing her cleavage and her arse*

*Jessica: her arse!*

*Tilly: she’s famous already*

*Jack: that got, that got, in two hours that got 300, 3 million views, sorry!*

*Jessica: you don’t have to show your arse, and your boobs, and your cleavage and everything, and your belly and your legs!*

*Tilly: I think it’s kind of sexist!*

*Jack: the video is so... the video is so bad!*

*Jessica: You just don’t have to show your legs and stuff, just to get famous and just to get loads of views on it*
Rachel: nowadays the majority of people do

Tilly: yeah, you do kind of have to do that!

These narratives can be read as being reflective of music videos providing a popular form of entertainment for young people. Due to their popularity, and representation of gender norms and sexual relationships, music videos often play a part in the sexual socialisation of young people as they shape social norms (Martino et al., 2006; Zhang et al., 2008; see section 4.3).

Zhang et al. (2008: 638) argue that music videos regularly portray gender roles related to sex in a stereotypical manner, with men being represented as ‘aggressive and dominant’ and women as ‘dependent and passive’. Furthermore, they posit that women are often dressed in a provocative manner so as to attract the attention of the man/men in the video. These ideas can be read as being reflected in the young people’s narratives about Nicki Minaj, where they are both discussing how she behaves in the video and why. Furthermore, the young people are engaging in discussions about the ethics of this behaviour. For example, whether a woman should, or has to, use her body to achieve fame in this day and age.

When I ask the young people if videos like ‘Anaconda’ influence young peoples’ understanding of, and attitudes towards, sex and gender, their responses suggest that they perceive that they encourage young people to access free, online, pornography websites:

Researcher: so do you think that impacts on young men’s, and young women’s, attitudes?

Rachel: yeah

Tilly: yeah, definitely

Jessica: and also… ah can I just say one thing, please? Do you know that Anaconda video? If young boys see it, that might influence them, they might get turned on about it, and then they’re gonna go on porn!

(Jack laughs)
Jessica: no, it’s true

Researcher: do a lot of young people have access to it?

Jessica: yeah, they have phones and stuff!

Tilly: yeah!

Jack: all you do is type in ‘porn’ and then ‘hub’ and then you press enter, then you click the channel and then you watch it

Jessica: no one cares about porn right now. I’m talking about it, no one wants to know how to get on it! Miss, because she shows her arse and stuff, that’s obviously gonna turn boys on. She does sexy moves and all that. That’s gonna turn boys on, and they’re gonna be like ‘oh yeah, I wanna get more of that, get more turned on’ and then they are gonna go on porn

Researcher: and then do you think that effects how they treat young women?

Jessica: yeah!

Tilly: yeah, I’ve got two things...

Jack: they probably think about raping them

Tilly: yeah, firstly is that, they will definitely view young women as objects, as she is acting like she is an object herself, especially because of the lyrics and...

Jessica: they probably think all girls like that

Tilly: yeah and then, it also influences younger girls who go to school, or who are walking about, to act in that way. Especially if she's famous from that and earning lots of money from that

Jessica: they probably think that's what boys like

Tilly: yeah, or that’s how you get around in life. But also, and the thing is, I don’t know if she means to do it, because I don’t know is she thinks that the age range of her viewers, like her audience, are older. But I still think that, she should take
into account that we are in the 21st-century and everyone has access to YouTube and she shouldn't really...

Jack: Ah Miss, do you know what YouTube did because of her video? They did like this policy thing, so if you're not 18 or above, you can't watch these videos, so I faked my age

Tilly: yeah, everyone fakes their age

Jack: everyone has Facebook, at least when they were in year 7.

This narrative can be seen to show that young people today often have easily obtainable access to what is sometimes termed ‘adult’ materials. These materials are often age restricted due to their explicit nature, and can be conceived of as forbidden spaces both due to age restrictions and shared social imaginations of what is morally right for children to engage with (see section 4.3). However, Jack notes he has ‘faked’ his age to gain access to online pornography. Tilly’s comments suggest that she perceives that faking one’s age to access pornographic materials online is something that a lot of young people do. This can be seen as representative of online pornography, which is often unregulated, and can lead to vulnerable people being exploited.

In the research, three of the participants (Tilly, Jessica and Jack) express that they are aware of pornography websites. When I ask whether pornography has affected the treatment of women, Jack responds that it might stimulate violent sexual thoughts and behaviour stating ‘they probably think about raping them’. Jessica articulates that she perceives that it will affect young men’s ideas about what they want, and can expect, in women. These narratives can be read as the young people expressing a sense that pornography affects both the perception, and treatment, of women/people. Further to this, analysis of the young people’s narratives suggests that they feel music videos impact on young people’s experiences and imaginations of sex and gender. One example of this that was identified through analysis, is web 2.0 and social media altering access to sexual materials (i.e. pornography), which can then influence social imaginations of sex and gender. For example, Tilly expresses
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that women feel they can get money by behaving in ways that mimic the women in music videos, who often dance in submissive ways wearing provocative clothing.

These changes in technology have resulted in significant concerns being raised about children engaging in sexual contact with strangers, ‘sexting’ and having easy access to pornography (Livingstone and Smith, 2014; Hammond, forthcoming). They can also be read as being representative of a moral panic fuelled by adult concern about children as innocent angels that need protecting (see section 2.2), and ingrained social imaginations that children and young people do not have, or even think about, sex (see Foucault, 1978; section 4.3).

In addition to music videos, and pornographic websites, the group discuss the role of media and social media in representing news stories that may have links to sexual crime. Alice Cross was a fifteen-year-old girl who went missing in October 2014, and her story was well documented in the English media during the period in which the Storytelling and Geography Group was held. In the narrative below, the group discuss what happened to Alice. Jack raises on three occasions in the discussion that she had been a victim of violent sexual crime (being ‘gangbanged’ and ‘raped’), none of which had been reported in mainstream media accounts of the case.

_Tilly: They saw a guy who was on a bike just the morning before, and he’s got like, her clothes or something_

_Rachel: ahh_

_Jack: they found one person out of the five that gangbanged her or something_

_Tilly: did they?_

_Jack: yeah. First they punched her up, then they raped her_

_Tilly: but then why do they have missing on it?_

_Researcher: I didn’t think they found her yet?_

_Jack: no they didn’t find her, but basically what happened was she went through an alleyway_

_Tilly: an alleyway?_
Jack: then five people... yeah, an alleyway

Tilly: I thought she was lost near the lake

Jack: no, no, no, what happened was, basically, let me draw, I don’t know what happened in her house, but there was an alleyway from her house, and she went down it, five people punched her up. Yeah, apparently they raped her, because the guy told them and everything, they found one person, but they haven’t found the other four, because he doesn’t want to tell who was, because they are in a gang. They raped her and stuff, I added her on Facebook, and then erm...

In the narrative, Tilly questions Jack’s interpretation of the case, but Jack carries on with his story articulating that he had tried to find out more about the story on Facebook. However, Alice Cross’s page had been blocked after she had died preventing him from doing this. The narrative here can be seen as an example of the group questioning one another as they make meaning of the event and its impacts (see sections 3.4 and 3.5). It can also be seen as an example of a social change, in how people interact with news through social media (see section 2.3.2). This change is arguably from information, and news, transmission in the past, to a more reciprocal dialogue via social media today. However, it is acknowledged that this varies between places, and across time-space, as well as between people.

The interactive nature of narratives and the groups’ questioning of one another as they make meaning, is also worthy of note as it is a fundamental element of narratives both in everyday life and research. Later in the discussion, Jack, Rachel and Tilly express that this news story has impacted upon their everyday spatial practices, noting that it has resulted in them feeling unsafe in public spaces and down alleyways. This can be understood as direct relationships between grand narratives and individual, and/or group, experiences and perceptions of the world (see sections 2.3.2, 3.4 and 3.5).

Another narrative coded as media and sex, sexuality and gender considers relationships. During the Storytelling and Geography Group, Alex shared that he has a girlfriend called Georgia. When I ask him how long he has been dating Georgia,
Alex replies that he has been in a relationship with her for a few months. He is the only young person in the study who mentions having a partner. Jessica responds to him by stating that they ‘have been going out for two or three weeks, on and off. She said to him ‘I can’t be with him, I have to wait until my exams are out of the way’’. When Alex contests this with Jessica, she responds:

Jessica: Miss, they have only been going out for two or three weeks because on her status on Facebook its ‘single’, and his is updated ‘in a relationship’, and that’s about two or three weeks ago

Rachel: Facebook is how you learn about people’s lives!

Alex: it’s sad!

Jessica: we’re all sad then, because we all have it!

This narrative reflects the use of Facebook to convey relationships and share one’s life (to different extents) with friends and sometimes more publically. This can be read as being representative of the time-space the young people exist within, and contribute to, as this is a narrative that could not have been shared before the advent, and development, of social media and web 2.0 over the last thirty years. These changes are worthy of consideration as they change conceptualisations of children and childhood, as well as children’s experiences of being in, and contributing to, the world (Hammond, forthcoming).

In addition to discussing sex, sexuality and gender in online spaces, the group share narratives about sexual behaviours and identities in the physical spaces, and places, too. The example of teen fest sparks a rich discussion on this:

Rachel: you know Miss, I really want to go to a rave, but there is no legal one!

Jessica: teen fest?

Rachel: but that’s where everyone is getting daggered

Researcher: daggered?

Jack: you don’t know what daggered is?!
Jessica: (laughs) you don’t know what daggering is!? It’s when a girl dances

Tilly: like spook dancing

Jessica: you know how Nicki Minaj?

Researcher: yep

Jessica: you know how she dances?

Researcher: yep

Jessica: there’s girls that dance worser than her, like proper dancing. It’s good, but it’s really explicit

Jack: yeah, and they do it on boys

Jessica: and they dance, and boys come up behind them and dance behind them

Rachel: it’s stupid

Jessica: it’s like dry sex, basically, the dancing

Researcher: do you think that’s socially acceptable, or not?

Rachel: no

Jessica: no, if you hang around with the people that I hang around with, and that Jack hangs around with, and that Alex hangs around with, then you’d understand it more. You wouldn’t see it or nasty or disgusting

Rachel: I know people like that and it is kind of disgusting

Tilly: it is disgusting

Rachel: I tell them to their face

Jessica: if you hang around with us, you know that it’s not disgusting, and that it doesn’t mean anything. It’s just like dancing.

In the narrative above, the group discuss how dance is used to express, and explore, sexuality. Dance and music often feed into, and represent, cultural geographies of the time (Richard and Kruger, 1998). The example of daggering at teen fest shared in
the group narrative above, involves a woman simulating sex through dancing with a man. Both Jessica and Jack note that videos of ‘daggering’ are widely available online with Jessica imploring me to ‘Google ‘twerk off’ or ‘jump off’’, suggesting that there is a relationship between the young people’s sexual interactions through dance (e.g. at teen fest) and videos online (see Shoveller et al., 2004; section 4.3). However, Jack goes on to note that watching these videos can lead people to ‘go on Google and search disgusting stuff!’ This narrative can be seen as Jack drawing links between different spaces that represent sex and gender.

The group debate as to whether daggering is socially acceptable, with Jessica and Jack stating that they perceive that it is, and Rachel and Tilly noting that they feel that it is ‘disgusting’. Although, in later narratives, Jessica expresses that she doesn’t feel that people should engage in daggering when there are children around. This narrative can be read as Jessica perceiving children as innocent angels who need protecting (see section 2.2), and also as childhood being an asexual period in which it is not socially appropriate to discuss or consider sex (see Foucault, 1978; section 4.3). It can also be interpreted as relating to the social construction of forbidden spaces of sex in which some groups (e.g. children) are socially, and/or legally, forbidden from engaging. This can also be interpreted as an example of social control related to sex and sexuality, when laws are applied about when in a person’s life they can have sex.

In addition to the group dialogue on sex, sexuality, gender and identity, analysis identified that some narratives were very individual. For example, Rachel expresses that she receives a lot of sexual attention from men, stating ‘loads of guys compliment me, and then I’ve got blue eyes and they think I’m Arab and stuff, and they think I’m older’. Analysis of Rachel’s narratives suggests that she has a complex relationship with this attention. She expresses on several occasions that she enjoys and craves this attention, but sometimes questions the relationships between her religious identity and wanting socio-sexual attention from men (see also section 4.2). In considering sex before and outside marriage, Meldrum et al. (2014: 168) argue Islam has the ‘potential to profoundly influence the development of a young women’s sexuality’.
In the narrative below, Rachel expresses that men are using both Arabic, and praising Allah, to express their sexual interest in her:

Rachel: oh yeah, when I walk along the street, like people usually stare at me, like usually men, they usually shout ‘Masha Allah’ and stuff like that.

Researcher: what does ‘Masha Allah’ mean?

Rachel: praise be to Allah

Jack: yeah. Basically it means like, say you got and A*, you say it

Rachel: and then one day, I was walking with Leila along Church Road, and this guy he said ‘ah, nice arse’

Tilly: That guy said that to me at Comicon

Rachel: yeah, I was walking with her and I started complaining, I said ‘men think that they can objectify woman’ and then she would like ‘Rachel, chill out, he said ‘nice eyes’’. And I was like ‘oooooooon’, because when you’re walking past someone that you’re suspicious of, because nowadays you always have to be suspicious because of the media portrays that.

Analysis suggests that Rachel grapples with the relationships between her religious identity (a convert to Islam; see section 4.2.1) and her sexual, and gender, identity(s). One element of these internal debates relates to her wearing a hijab. Whilst hijab’s are legal in the UK, there has been international socio-political debate about the relationships between religion, gender and politics. For example, in France and Quebec there have been heated debates about whether women should wear a hijab in public (Selby, 2014). Rachel’s narratives can be read as reflecting Sutawella’s (2013: 278) argument that ‘British Muslim women’s gendered identity is not fixed or stable and is anchored in localised frames and cultures’. For Rachel, as a convert to Islam, with some Muslim extended family, but a non-Muslim immediate family, and who attends a school with a relatively high proportion of Muslims, wearing a hijab is something that she states she is proud of. In her narratives, Rachel suggests that she wants to appear disciplined through wearing a hijab, which Sutawella (2013: 280)
explains ‘is predicated on ideals of modesty with the desire to exclude the external gaze’, but also expresses that she also desires sexual attention from men.

The final narrative analysed as relating to sexual identity is raised by Jack who questions social norms in dating someone of a different age. In the narrative below, Alex and Jack share that both of their parents have a substantial age gap between them. Jack questions why an age gap in a relationship is problematic in the school context, with Jessica noting age gaps are more accepted when you’re older:

*Jack*: one question, yeah, in school if you date someone that is older or younger than you, people cuss you, and criticize you. But, when you go to university and marry a woman that’s five years younger than you or five years older than you, no one cares

*Jessica*: they are all like ‘congratulations’

*Jack*: no one cares, in school yeah, everyone cares so much!

*Researcher*: but, there is an age of consent, and I think 40 and 45 is different to 15 and 10…

*Rachel and Tilly*: yeah, yeah, yeah

*Jack*: my dad is 50 yeah, and my mum is 35, there is a fifteen-year age gap and it doesn’t matter

*Tilly*: It’s like being in year 8 and going out with someone in year 6

*Alex*: there’s an 8-year age gap with my parents

*Researcher*: and obviously there is the law. An 18 year old is an adult, but a 14 year old isn’t.

In the above narrative, I introduce the idea of a legal age of consent, with Rachel and Tilly seeming to show a belief that there is a reason why it exists (i.e. to protect children from the complex power relationships involved with sexual relationships with someone who is substantially older and legally an adult). Shoveller et al. (2004) argue that learning about and establishing one’s sexual identity is complex, noting that young people often try to situate their sexuality in relation to perceived socially
acceptable norms (see also section 4.3). However, analysis suggests that the young people in this study perceive that acceptable behaviour is different in different social spaces, and that the young people are discussing how they can, and should, navigate this landscape.

In this section, I have examined the narratives identified through analysis as related to sex, sexuality, gender and identity. Although the young people in the study express different narratives, experiences and imaginations of sex, sexuality and gender (which are shown in figure seventeen, with numbers related to those in figure sixteen), several overarching narratives were identified:

- Changing technologies in the media and social media have changed how sex, sexuality and gender are represented and constructed;
- Music and dance provide forums in which sex, sexuality and gender are explored and represented;
- Young people are navigating different, and sometimes contradictory, social spaces in relation to sex, sexuality and gender in London.

These are returned to, and critically considered, in section 4.6 when I examine the value of these narratives and children’s geographies more broadly to geography education in schools.

Figure 17: Shared and individual narratives of sex, sexuality, gender and identity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Young person</th>
<th>Key points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Jack         | o Forbidden spaces of pornography and access to sexual materials, and how access to these spaces has changed via social media (2) (4)
|              | o Forbidden spaces of age differences in relationships with other people (2) |
|              | o How the media represent, and construct, women and sex and the impact that this has on young people (3) (5) |
I now move on to examine the third sub theme in this chapter, ‘the state and oneself’ in section 4.4.

4.4. The state and oneself

The third theme identified during analysis of the young people’s narratives is relationships with, and to, the state. Analysis shows that the young people often discussed national identity and their relationships to ‘being British’. This section begins with an introduction of the theme of national identity, before examining what
analysis reveals about the young people’s shared, and individual, narratives on this theme in section 4.4.1.

National identity links identity to territory as defined by nation states. Lord Wallace of Saltaire (2006) considers it both a process, and a product, of place making and identity linked to place. National identity has relationships with, and to, citizenship, which UNESCO articulate is the ‘binding element of a national community’. UNESCO states that citizenship is both legal (for example, ‘the right to participate in and be represented in politics’), and socio-cultural (‘all those who possess the status are equal with respect to the rights and duties with which the status is endowed’). For UNESCO, the rights associated with citizenship emerged as an area of consideration along with the nation state.

Nations ‘were built in the 19th Century by states that wanted their inhabitants to accept the legitimacy of the state authority, pay taxes for public goods, and if necessary die for it’ (Lord Wallace of Saltaire, 2006: 7). As articulated in Hammond (2019) national identity can be both socio-politically positive (e.g. in challenging social-atomisation in a neoliberal era (see also Miller, 2016)), as well as carrying heavy ideological baggage (for example, in relation to imperialism (see also Parekh, 1995)). British national identity was originally constructed in opposition to France, with differences being highlighted to children who were often taught about ‘us’ and ‘them’ (Lord Wallace of Soltaire, 2006).

Today, British identity is a debated concept in a country much changed since the 19th Century. Significantly for this research, London is now a multi-religious and multi-ethnic city whose inhabitants often have memories, families, and socio-cultural and economic links to other places in the world (see sections 2.3.2; 4.1; 4.2; Massey, 2008). As such, it is of value to examine how this is understood, managed and explored in education and society. Listening to young people’s voices is significant in considering ideas of inclusion and exclusion, both in education and everyday life. This is especially pertinent in today’s time-space in which populism can be conceptualised as a grand narrative.
I now move on to examine the narratives of the young people coded as ‘the state and oneself’ in section 4.4.1.

### 4.4.1 Narratives of the state and oneself

This research has identified that the young people in the study conceptualise citizenship and national identity as being constructed both legally and culturally. It also shows that the young people in the study feel there is a friction of distance in the UK towards people who identify as being a part of an ethnic or religious minority (see also section 4.2). As the young people in the research, come from, and/or identify as, a variety of national, ethnic and religious backgrounds, this leads to them navigating multiple, sometimes contradictory, social spaces in London.

As has been the case with the first two sections on identity, I begin this section by sharing the narratives of the young people mapped on to Harvey’s (1990) ‘grid of spatial practices’ in figure eighteen. The language used on the grid is then explained, before the young people’s narratives are shared and discussed.

*Figure 18: Narratives of the state and oneself mapped on to Harvey’s grid of spatial practices*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Accessibility and distanciation</th>
<th>Appropriation and use of space</th>
<th>Domination and control of space</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Material spatial practices</strong></td>
<td>Flows of people (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Exclusive communities (Citizenship) (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Representations of space</strong></td>
<td>Friction of distance from citizenship due to ethnicity or religion (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Geopolitics (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spaces of representation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. **Flows of people** – the movement of people(s) is considered in two ways in this study - the movement of young people’s families and also groups of people(s);

2. **Exclusive communities (citizenship)** – this refers to young people’s experiences and perceptions of citizenship as an exclusive community (i.e. a community which is not open to all);

3. **Friction of distance from citizenship due to ethnicity or religion** – this refers to young people’s narratives of the distance they feel from citizenship due to their religion and/or ethnicity;

4. **Geopolitics** – refers to the relationships between national identity and geopolitics.

It is worthy of note, that there are multiple links between the young people’s narratives on national identity, and religion and identity (see section 4.2). These links are examined both in the discussions below and in section 4.2.

Analysis shows that the young people in this study are aware, and discussing the impacts, of changing demographics in London due to flows of people and migration (see also section 4.2). A central element of these discussions relates to the young people expressing a friction of distance from ‘Britishness’. This is despite the fact that all of the young people are legally British citizens, apart from Jack who articulates that he does not class himself as British ‘*because I haven’t got my British passport yet*’.

Jack explains that only two people in his family have a British passport; his baby brother who was born in the UK and his father. Jack expresses that this means his father ‘*can come and go anytime he wants*’. He explains that his mother has applied for a British passport and he will have to wait until his Dutch passport expires before applying. These narratives can be read as Jack expressing his perceptions of the advantages of having legal citizenship (e.g. freedom of movement) and also the complexity of having family members with different citizenships. For example, he explains that his baby brother has to have a Dutch passport as well as a British one, despite being born in the UK, in case his family leave or ‘*get kicked out of*’ the county.
As an international migrant, Jack does not (yet) have legal citizenship in Britain. According to his own narratives, and also the UN Criteria, Jack is a first generation migrant. His birth place (Holland) is different to his country of residence (England), and this has changed his usual residence for the period of over a year. In addition, as articulated in section 4.2.1, Jack also expresses that his family wish to develop and maintain links with his ethnoreligious background. An example of this is Jack stating that he feels his parents are encouraging him to marry a girl from the Middle East and who is a Muslim.

As well as exploring the complexities of legal citizenship, Jack also shares narratives that can be interpreted as relating to cultural citizenship (see also section 4.4). An example of this is when he draws the flags of other nations on his map of London (see figure 8). These flags represent countries he has ties to; Iraq and Syria as his homeland, Holland where he was born, and Denmark and Wales where he has family. Flags represent a nation state and are also used in ceremonies and cultural practices to represent the cultural capital of that nation. Jack’s sharing of the flags can be interpreted as representing both his links to other places, and also how other places (nation states) affect and influence his identity.

London has been argued to be a city of migrants (see section 2.3.2). Indeed, all of the young people in this study express connections to nation states outside of England and/or the UK. Jack’s family heritage has been outlined above, and both Rachel and Alex’s family are from the British Isles. Rachel’s mother is English and her father is Scottish, Alex’s dad is from Essex (England) and his mum is from Ireland. Tilly’s father is Ghanaian and her mother is Spanish, though Tilly was born in the UK. Tilly regularly talks about both countries, and expresses that even though she’s never been to Ghana ‘that’s where I come from’ and ‘I have my identity there’. Tilly’s narrative can be interpreted as her feeling a connection to place through her family and heritage.

Finally, Jessica’s mum was born in Manchester (England), but has Irish origins, and her dad is Grenadian. Jessica states that she has never visited either Ireland or

---

3 Note: A decision has been made not to include the young people’s maps as they have a large number of details which make them identifiable. This includes the names of their school and places they regularly visit and/or worship (see ethics section 3.7)
Grenada, and when asked if she would like to do so, she replies ‘no!’ Although Jessica never explains why she does not wish to visit the places where her parents come from. Her narratives differ significantly to Tilly’s in this respect, and this can be seen as connection to place(s) being individual and unique, as well as sometimes shared.

Analysis of the group’s narratives reflect a shared sense that migration has changed London into what can be described as a ‘world city’ (see Massey, 2008; section 2.3.2; figure 6). They can also be read as expressing a shared perspective that migration into London has resulted in divisions within the city, and some people feeling a friction of distance due to their nationality and national identity. In the narrative below, Jack and Rachel discuss these changes:

*Jack: which is okay, because they are usually together, but if you think about it, there is more like Asian people in the UK, than actually English people*

*Rachel: like, I think it’s about, like British people, proper British people, who are white, like white British people, they are like stuck to, like they are stuck in their ways, and they want it to be like proper British ways. Like what it is to be British, they want a pure race of like, proper like white people who are like British, and want to like participate in…*

*(A child walks in to the room, and asks what is happening and then leaves)*

*Rachel: and they want to be like back to their ways, like celebrating Christmas as a family and stuff. But, because, due to so many people coming from other countries, so many people from other countries come here, that we’ve kind of lost that thing of England and what it is to be English or British)*

*Researcher: so do you think it’s a good thing or a bad thing that there are so many different people in London?*

*Rachel: I think that change is always good, but a lot of people don’t like adapting to change.*

In the narrative above, Rachel expresses a perspective that links religion (Christianity) to Britishness (see section 4.2.1), arguing that there is a desire by British Christians, who form the demographic majority in the UK as a whole, to socially reproduce white
British Christian heritage through ethnicity and religion. These narratives can be read a representing her social imagination that cultural citizenship is as much of an exclusive community, as legal citizenship.

Analysis shows that this perception is echoed by Jessica, who begins a discussion with the group as to whether it’s socially accepted that some people are excluded in Britain due to their national identity and/or ethnicity:

Jessica: obviously, I’m not full English, I’m not white English, so I won’t know but, in my opinion they can marry whoever they want. In movies, and documentaries they have to marry a British person

Tilly: not true

Researcher: do you class yourself as British?

Jack: I think it’s the best thing to marry...

Jessica: not really, because like, white people, are mostly British. I don’t think you understand what I’m trying to say. I don’t wanna say it because it sounds a bit racist, because people say that you are only British if you’re white

Tilly: yeah. Even though British means to be a British Citizen, who lives in Britain or the UK, and to have a British passport, then you’re British

Jessica: yeah, because the black people are originated from Africa, and stuff like that, so they aren’t gonna feel like they aren’t British

Jack: basically, if Tilly was here a long time ago, like fifty or a million years ago

Tilly: a million?

Jack: yeah whatever, I’m just saying. 100 generations ago, her grandpa, whatever

Jessica: Victorian times

Jack: yeah, Victorian times, and her family was African, and they came to UK, and over the generations, all of them stayed in the UK, yeah until Tilly came, I would say that she was British
Researcher: so how many generations do you think you need to be here to be British?

Jack: two

Jessica: In a way, I think the government, if you were born here, and if the government gave you an English passport and all that, then you are British, but if you don’t think that you are British, then you aren’t

Jack: if you have a British passport, you should be British

Researcher: so it’s about how you feel?

Jessica: I feel like I’m British, but if I told a white person, that feels really strongly about it, that I’m British, they probably wouldn’t believe me

Researcher: do you think that all white people feel like that?

Jessica: no, not all white people.

Jack: well, most of them

Rachel: I’m British

Jack: you’re British?

Rachel: I’m full British

Researcher: what do you think, Tilly?

Jack: what’s British? Is that like English?

In the discussion, the group show an awareness of the notion of both cultural, and legal, citizenship (see section 4.4). The narratives can be read as expressing that there is a shared social imagination that non-white people are not accepted in London even if they are a legally a British citizen. Much like in the narratives of religion and identity (see section 4.2), the group’s narratives can be read as them expressing a shared ethical concern about social distance due to ethnoreligious and national identity. They can also be interpreted as the group perceiving that there is a shared social imagination in London that different people(s) have different social rules even when
living in the same nation (or set of legal rules). For example, Jessica comments that white people can marry who they want, implying that she perceives that this is different for other ethnic groups (see also section 4.2.1). Jack also expresses that he is unaware of the differences between ‘being English’ and ‘being British’. This can be read as relating to the complexities of living in a nation constructed from four states, which share some laws and cultural norms, but are also distinct.

Rachel also considers the different countries that make up the UK in her narratives. She explains that her father was raised in Glasgow, and expresses that her Glaswegian heritage has influenced her identity and behaviour. Although she identifies as being ‘fully British’, she also states ‘I’m half Scottish’, before going on to express ‘people in Scotland are a bit harder, a bit tougher, than people in London’. These narratives can be read as Rachel expressing her relationships to the different states in the UK, and exploring her perceptions of the cultural differences between the countries and people(s) relationships with place.

Rachel also shares that she has members of her family who associate with the English Defence League (EDL), a far right socio-political pressure group that presents itself as being opposed to migration and Islam. Analysis of Rachel’s narratives show that her conversion to Islam has led her to feeling a friction of distance against some members of her family who are attempting to socially produce a national identity and state which opposes Islam and multiculturalism. Although, it is worthy of note, that as is examined in section 4.2, many of her family are supportive of her conversion.

Much like in the narratives of religion (see section 4.2.1), the group question Alex’s national identity. In one narrative, Alex explains ‘okay, I live in England, I’m from Ireland’ and that his father is from Essex and his mother is from Ireland. When I ask if he classes himself as British, the following discussion ensues:

*Researcher: do you class yourself as British?*

*Alex: Irish, that’s kind of British, but…*

*Researcher: why do you class yourself as Irish, not British?*

*Rachel: but, aren’t you Northern Irish? That’s British*
Alex: yes,

Jack: you’re still British

Alex: I’m white Irish

Rachel: you’re British, because Northern Ireland is part of Britain

Alex: no, there’s no boxes ‘British’ and ‘Irish...’

Tilly: but, you are talking about boxes, boxes

Alex: it’s kind of like...

Researcher: boxes on what?

Rachel: but, you are not Irish. You are Northern Irish

Tilly: and you have also got another part in you

Alex: that’s kind of Irish

Tilly: so you don’t want to be British, basically? You want to be Irish

Rachel: Northern Ireland got conquered by Britain

Tilly: exactly

Jack: you don’t choose where you are from

Tilly: where were you born?

Jessica: where were you born?

Alex: Northern Ireland

Tilly: he’s Northern Irish

Jessica and Rachel: he’s Northern Irish

Jack: you are Northern Irish! It’s part of Britain. Miss, you know how Scotland is trying to separate? Imagine how Britain will look without Scotland!

In the narrative above, the group show awareness of the differences between different states in the UK and British Isles. They can also be read as exploring geopolitical debates, such as Scotland (potentially) separating from the UK, and historical geographies such as Ireland and Northern Ireland becoming separate states. However, the groups’ narrative and discussion can also be interpreted as
them sharing an overwhelming perspective that a person should identify with where they are from/born.

This perception, in the context of increased migration to London and the UK, could be interpreted as reflecting present educational, and societal, challenges in constructing inclusive places in which people(s) are encouraged, and empowered, to explore their own identities and ideas of ‘home’ as both material and social constructs (see Blunt and Dowling, 2006; see also section 6.2). This is a challenge for society, but also an area of consideration for geography education. This is because geography researches, and teaches about, the world, and people(s) experiences and imaginations it.

Further to this, analysis identifies that the young people’s narratives often reflect a cultural imagination of London as city in which people(s) feel a friction of distance towards multiculturalism and diversity. For example:

Tilly: I think, you know how people say that London, or the UK, is really diverse and everyone is accepting. On one hand, this is true, because people start to live with it. But, after a while you start to realize, that some people don’t accept. They act like they do, but deep down they don’t accept.

Tilly’s narrative can be read as representing her perception that exclusion is a part of everyday life in London, and that it is perceived as a social norm, but is often covered by social pleasantries. This interpretation raises concerns for society, geography and geography education in considering ‘whose geography?’ and ideas of inclusion and exclusion.

This section has examined the young people’s narratives coded as relating to the state and oneself. The narratives of individuals are expressed on figure nineteen below. These are numbered, and relate to the numbers on the grid of spatial practices shared in figure eighteen. The shared themes that were coded as the state and oneself during analysis are:

- The young people in the research perceive that there is a relationship between religion, ethnicity and national identity;
The young people in the research feel they are navigating different, sometimes contradictory, spaces in regards to the state and themselves;

There is a shared perception that ‘exclusive communities’ of both political and cultural citizenship can lead to people(s) being socially excluded.

These ideas are returned to in section 4.6, in considering their value to geography education in schools.

**Figure 19: Shared and individual narratives of the state and oneself**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jack</th>
<th>Is legally a citizen of another European country (1) with his family having mixed citizenship and in the process of applying for British passports (2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Links Britishness to having a British passport and being born in the UK (2) (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parents desire him to socially reproduce his wider ethnoreligious identity through marriage (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel</td>
<td>Describes herself as ‘half English and half Scottish’ and identities as being ‘full British’ (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>States she has a streak of Glaswegian in her (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some family members are EDL (2) (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experiences social distance from Britishness as she experienced racism due to her conversion to Islam (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feels England has lost what is means to be English or British (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Links ethnicity to religion (Christianity) and feels that British people wish to socially reproduce a ‘pure race’ (2) (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessica</td>
<td>Her mother is from Ireland, her father is from Grenada. Jessica is a British citizen who was born in London (1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I now move on to examining the final sub theme of identity (voice and identity) in section 4.5.

4.5. Voice and identity

Enabling young people to share their experiences, and imaginations, of London and the world, was a fundamental motivation for this research. This philosophy, and methodologies designed to empower children, are part of a wider movement in both research and policy aiming to enable children and young people to share their voices (see also section 2.2 and 3.2). Despite this ‘it remains unclear to what extent evidence in the form of children and young people’s perspectives has informed provision of service and resource allocation’ (Johnson, 2017: 106). Freeman and Tranter (2011) echo this argument, and state that despite the UNCRC, children’s participation rights are often not fully appreciated.

The critical consideration of young people’s voices in research is a fairly recent phenomenon, and ‘academic interests in teenagers was born within criminology, fuelled by moral panics concerning the nuisance value of young people on the urban streets of Western societies’ (Valentine et al., 1998: 10). Valentine et al. argue that research into young people has often presented them as ‘condemned’ and ‘powerless’ alongside other groups in society such as the working classes, migrants and criminals. However, strong arguments have been made about the value of
actively engaging young people in debates in both research and the socio-political spaces of everyday life (see McKendrick, 2009; see sections 1.2, 2.2 and 3.2).

As examined in section 2.2.5, voice and participation is something that has often been conceptualised as philosophically, and practically, at odds with formal schooling. Catling (2014: 35) posits that this is because ‘education is a political activity’, noting that both society and schooling have often subordinated children through pedagogy which does not recognise, or value, their everyday lives and knowledge. Catling goes on to argue that this is both philosophically problematic, and can also limit children’s (geographical) learning through not connecting ideas to what they already know (see also section 1.2.1, 1.2.2, 2.2.4a and 2.2.4b).

In the socio-political spaces of everyday life, Freeman and Tranter (2011) argue that it’s important that child participation is conceptualised both in terms of formal involvement (e.g. in local government decision making), as well as ‘informal involvement in the social and cultural life of a community; a sense of connectedness and a sense of place’ (p246). Critical examination of how children and young people are conceptualised and represented in schooling, academia, policy and society are key to supporting, and enabling, child participation.

The use of the production of space as the conceptual framework for analysis in this research has additional value in regards to the notion of voice. Lefebvre (1991) argues that whilst people and/or organisations, such as the state, a religion, a gang, or even a teacher in a school, try to dominate and control space, they will always fail to master it completely. This is because people(s) are constantly shaping and producing space. Using Harvey’s (1990) ‘grid of spatial practices’ enables active consideration of which people(s) are dominating space, how and why. In the case of this thesis, this can then be used to critically examine how domination of space is impacting on the geographies and imaginations of the young people in this study. This is an example of a case study, which might be reproduced with other people(s), and in other places and time-spaces (see chapter 3 and chapter 7), to help gain a richer understanding of young people’s lives, and enable geographers, educators and society more broadly, to consider how we better empower and support our children and young people (see section 4.6).
I now move on to examine the narratives of the young people identified in analysis as relating to the concept of voice in section 4.5.1.

### 4.5.1 Narratives of voice and identity

This research has identified that the young people in the study are often engaging with large-scale geopolitical issues through the media. The young people also express that school is a place where not all teachers want to listen to them, and they feel that there is no point in sharing their voices. This results in them experiencing a friction of distance due to social control by dominant groups in society (in this case teachers). However, the young people feel that they need to engage with schooling to have a voice later in life. They also express a perception that some people(s) in society have more of a voice than others, with Tilly and Rachel both noting that women are often subordinated.

This section begins by sharing the narratives of the young people mapped onto Harvey’s (1990) ‘grid of spatial practices’ in figure twenty, and introducing the language used to represent the narratives.

*Figure 20: Narratives of voice and identity mapped on to Harvey’s grid of spatial practices*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Accessibility and distanciation</th>
<th>Appropriation and use of space</th>
<th>Domination and control of space</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Material spatial practices</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Social spaces of recreation (1)</td>
<td>Social control (school) (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Representations of space</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Geopolitics (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spaces of representation</strong></td>
<td>Social media (4)</td>
<td>Riots (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. **Social spaces of recreation** - refers to spaces young people appropriate for recreation, they may or may not have been designed for this purpose;

2. **Social control (school)** – refers to how social space and discourse is dominated by powerful groups in the school (e.g. teachers and its leaders);

3. **Geopolitics** – refers to young people’s engagement with geopolitical issues;

4. **Social media** – refers to if/how voice is shared via social media;

5. **Riots** – refer to the London 2011 riots in which young people in London appropriated space in riots across London.

One theme that was identified during analysis was the idea of voice within the research process. As examined in sections 3.5.3 and 3.7, the research design originally included a research show (see also figure 8 and appendix 1). This aimed to empower, and support, the young people in the research to share their lives with their communities. However, as the young people unanimously chose not to go ahead with the research show, it raises questions about; young people’s voices; their perceptions of, and relationships to, teachers and the school environment; and where, how and with whom, they choose to share their geographies and experiences.

The questions raised above are of value to geography education in schools, as the nature of the classroom environment is often one imbued with complex adult-child and/or teacher-student power relationships and social rules (see section 2.2.5; Aitken, 1994; Giddens, 2016). This means that children’s geographies may be an uncomfortable topic for both children (as students in the classroom) and adults (as teachers), to explore. This is because it involves a reimagining of the teacher-student relationship, the facilitation of reciprocal dialogue, as well as teachers being aware that young people may express complex, and sometimes socially challenging, experiences and imaginations of the world (see section 3.7). For example, in this research when the young people expressed they did not want a research show, I discussed this with them and let them decide together how we proceeded with the Storytelling and Geography Group. This incident is situated in a different context to a geography lesson, as the research had a different purpose to formal education.
However, the questions the incident raises are significant in considering how, and why, children’s geographies are of value to, and explored in, geography education in schools.

Tilly and Rachel also consider relationships between school and voice in other ways. Both of these young people express a belief that education can enhance opportunities for having a greater voice in society, and affecting socio-political change, in the future (see also section 6.1). Rachel states that she intends to ‘get my education good, get some money, and get a good job and be successful’. As exemplified in the narrative below, Rachel expresses that this belief and attitude has come from her father:

Rachel: Because, they are like... What my dad says is ‘don't like.... These children in Palestine and Israel who were throwing bricks at like, at the army and stuff, don't throw physical bricks, throw mental bricks. Stick your head in the books, learn something, get that rank where you do have a say in it, and if that doesn't work, try again, until you get what you want.

Rachel’s narrative can be read as her expressing a perception that education provides access to knowledge and learning which can enable a person to affect change. This is also an argument echoed by Tilly. However, whilst others in the group consider the value of education (which is examined in full in section 6.1), only Tilly and Rachel link it explicitly to voice, referencing the opportunities it can give a person to access higher socio-economic, and political, positions in later life.

Narratives about young people’s voice in everyday life were also an area of discussion in the group. For example, Jessica expresses young people often use platforms such as YouTube to share their lives, as they may not be welcomed on more mainstream platforms due to negative perceptions of childhood and youth (see also Hammond, forthcoming; sections 2.2 and 4.5). In the narrative below, Jessica considers how some young people choose to share their lives through rapping via social media. However, Jessica also articulates that she feels this form of expression is often negatively perceived in society:
Jessica: oh yeah, before I forget, also because of X-Factor, I'm not being rude or anything, but if I'm being honest, but like you said bars and melodies, but they were rapping about their lives. But like rappers, they might rap about their life on x-factor, then they still won't get through. They might get through to the rounds, but then everybody would just vote them off.

Researcher: why do you think that is?

Jessica: probably because they just think, well what music you making, ah rapping, it’s only for kids and stuff

Researcher: do you think there’s a negative view on rapping in society?

Rachel and Jessica: yeah.

Tilly engages with these discussions about social media and young people rapping about their lives. However, she states that she disagrees with Jessica, arguing that some rappers ‘just talk nonsense’, but noting that other rappers ‘do want to talk about their lives, in that way, they just choose to portray it in the art form’. Following this, Tilly expresses that a person can share their voice and challenge the system, but at the end of the day they have to follow the rules:

*Tilly: I think it is, but, you can complain about the rules, but you are going to have to follow them anyways. Which is a sad thing, but it’s the truth. They are complaining and they are protesting, but the only thing that you can really do, is work hard and get a job, so you can complain from the inside.*

These narratives can be read as young people perceiving, and exploring, problems within society, and considering ways that they can access opportunities to affect change. For Tilly and Rachel, education offers empowerment and an opportunity for voice in the future. Their narratives can also be read as them considering the value, and impacts, of sharing one’s life and views on social media.

Another theme analysed as voice and identity considers if, how and why, a person might challenge authority. For example, the group discuss the London 2011 riots. The joint report ‘Reading the Riots’ by the London School of Economics (LSE) and The Guardian, examines the riots, which occurred in the autumn of 2011. The report
states that they were the worst social unrest in the UK in a generation, and highlights that the main cause of the riots was anger and frustration at the everyday treatment of people by the police, noting that gangs often called a truce to work together during the riots.

In the narrative below, the young people relate the riots to gangs (see section 5.2) and joke about both the riots themselves, and their level of impact. Their narratives can be read as expressing a perception that the rioters were not to be taken too seriously and/or were not much of a threat to the dominant social order:

*Tilly*: *that's what people try and do. But you know when it was the riots?*

*Researcher*: *yeah?*

*Rachel*: *kinda like the Hunger Games*

*Tilly*: *West London didn’t do anything*

*Rachel*: *North West London didn’t either*

*Jessica*: *Hammersmith did, Hammersmith did!*

*Tilly*: *No, they threw pebbles at Westfield!*

Although there is only a short narrative about the riots, the young people regularly discuss how people respond, and/or contribute, to social debate. An example of this is geopolitics and people voice. For example, Jack shares his experiences of his family commenting on issues in Syria as reported on the television. Advances in media and social media have changed how geopolitical issues are communicated and represented. This could be interpreted as a changing of how grand narratives are shared with people, and how people interact with them, in the digital world (see also sections 2.3.2 and 4.3).

*Jack*: *they’re just shouting at the government. Like, basically when you’re Arab yeah, it’s bad for your parents to watch politics because, they just be like shouting at the TV*

*Tilly*: *no that’s like my family too!*

---
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Researcher: what do they say?

Jack: they say things like, they just swear. They just swear, and say bad stuff about the government. Because the government yeah, they choose the wrong government, because they had an election, because the government is actually kind of like a wasteman

(Laughing)

Jack: because there was a selection of government yeah, and we didn’t vote. Basically you had to write your name on it, and your address and everything

Researcher: on your voting slip?

Jack: yeah! And if you don’t vote for him, yeah, you’d get killed. And 350 people got killed, because they never voted for him. That’s why he won again. Yeah, and Iraq, some new guy happened, he was a government, ah a government for 4 years, and last year they changed him, no this year they changed him, so yeah.

This narrative can be interpreted both as Jack sharing a concern about his parents being affected by geopolitics, and him considering how, and why, voice through democracy and voting is important to him and his family. However, despite the changes in the digital world, often represented as being empowering and offering opportunities for reciprocal dialogue between people(s), Jack expresses frustration at not being able to challenge injustice and the geopolitical situations in Syria and the Middle East. Tilly expresses support to Jack, and explains this is something she has seen with her family too.

In addition, Tilly considers why a person might join a terrorist organisation such as Al-Shabaab or ISIS:

Tilly: When you say ‘look for their rights’, I think some people do actually look for their rights and other people just do it for the sake of doing it, and because they think it’s cool

Jack: yeah

Tilly: And, I mean, that’s not exactly cool, it’s just a waste of time really.
Tilly’s narratives can be read as her having a perception that the terrorist organisations attract people who want to have a voice and more rights, but also people that do it because they think it’s ‘cool’. She expresses a sense of concern and futility about this.

The representation of geopolitical issues is discussed further when Tilly raises that in the civil rights movement, there were songs about freedom. Jack, Tilly and Rachel express awareness of this and begin to sing. This links to the narrative above about young people sharing their lives through rapping and YouTube, with music being a form of expression which can be used to challenge to social norms.

The final theme analysed as relating to voice and identity, considered people in society existing in social hierarchies, with some people(s) having more of a voice, and/or power to share it, than others. In their discussions below, Tilly and Rachel discuss this in relation to sexism (and racism – see also sections 4.2 and 5.3), with Rachel expressing that she feels that women don’t complain even when they experience prejudice related to their gender. Tilly contributes to these discussions, sharing a concern that feminists are sometimes represented as ‘man-haters’. Her narratives can be interpreted as her expressing a perception that it’s hard to make a stand, and share your voice, as a woman without experiencing negative representations.

Reseacher: do you think women experience the city differently to men?

Tilly: yes, do you want to go first?

Rachel: the thing is, women don’t kick up a fuss. If it was racism or sexism, sexism would be underneath the carpet because women don’t complain, that much.

Tilly: I agree with Rachel, but I also, not disagree, but I also think, that when there is sexism towards women and stuff, people think that like feminism or being a feminist, it has to be over-the-top. Like you hate men, and you have to be over the top, and want to kill men, that’s called radical feminism.

This discussion can be read as Tilly and Rachel feeling that, as women, they cannot
challenge issues in society as easily as men.

In this section, I have examined the young people’s narratives analysed as relating to voice and identity. Several shared narratives have been identified:

- The young people in the study feel that there are different opportunities for different people(s) to share their voice;

- The young people in the study feel that people(s), including those who are seen to be oppressed, often seek out different mediums and platforms to share their lives and voices;

- The young people in the study perceive the relationships between school and voice is complicated. For example, schooling offers opportunities to for young people to have a voice in the future through accessing grades and careers, but it is repressive to children sharing their voices now.

I outline key themes by young person in the study in figure twenty one. This shows which narratives are shared, and which are individual. The numbers link to the themes on Harvey’s grid of spatial practices, as represented in figure twenty.

*Figure 21: Shared and individual narratives of voice and identity*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Young person</th>
<th>Key points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jack</td>
<td>o Wants to contribute to the development of a local park, but doesn’t feel listened to (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Family shout at the TV in relation to geopolitics being represented in Iraq and Syria, discussing ideas of democracy (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Does not wish to share the research with the school/community in a research show (notion that he has no power and the head teacher doesn’t care) (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel</td>
<td>Discusses the London riots and their value (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Positive about the research show and thinks her parents would support her, but they can’t attend (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feels it’s best to work hard and try and change rules from the inside as an adult (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Women’s voice (3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jessica</th>
<th>Discusses the London riots and their value (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discusses the use of YouTube to give voice to some who traditionally don’t have it (4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tilly</th>
<th>Discusses the London riots and their value (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Family shout at the TV in relation to geopolitics being represented (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asks why the head teacher would care about their lives (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feels it’s best to work hard and try and change rules from the inside as an adult (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Notes that some rappers/ terrorists aren’t positive in regards to voice (4) (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Women’s voice (3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Alex            | Limited discourse on voice though would like the Head of Year to come the research show (2) |

I now move on to critically considering the value of these narratives to geography education in schools in section 4.6, before concluding the chapter in section 4.7.
4.6 The value of these findings to geography education

Chapter four has examined the young people’s narratives coded through analysis as relating to identity. Although each of the three research questions are returned to, and addressed in chapter seven, as the majority of the findings chapters are focussed on RQ1 and RQ2 (see sections 1.3 and 3.3), I return to RQ3 at the end of each of the three chapters (see also sections 5.4 and 6.3). RQ3 asks how can geography education use ideas and methodologies from children’s geographies to enhance school geography? In responding to this question, I draw on the arguments put forward in the literature review, and analysis of data, to show how children’s geographies are of value to geography education in schools. In doing this, I draw upon the shared narratives that were identified during analysis to exemplify discussions.

The differences between the narratives of individual participants in the research, and the (potential) reasons for these differences, have been examined throughout chapter four. As such, the focus on shared narratives in this section enables consideration of shared themes that analysis identified as being significant to the young peoples’ geographies and imaginations of London. The shared narratives that were identified as relating to identity in chapter four are restated on figure twenty two.

Figure 22: Shared narratives on the theme of identity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religion and identity</th>
<th>Sex, sexuality, gender and identity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>o The young people in this research share a belief that it is wrong for someone to be discriminated against for their religion;</td>
<td>o Changing technologies in the media and social media have changed how sex, sexuality and gender are represented and constructed;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o The Young people in this study are navigating different social spaces in regards to their religion and religious identity in London;</td>
<td>o Music and dance provide forums in which sex, sexuality and gender are explored and represented;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The state and oneself</strong></td>
<td><strong>Voice and identity</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o The young people in the research perceive that there is a relationship between religion, ethnicity and national identity;</td>
<td>o The young people in the study feel that there are different opportunities for different people(s) to share their voice;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o The young people in the research feel they are navigating different, sometimes contradictory, spaces in regards to the state and themselves;</td>
<td>o The young people in the study feel that people(s), including those who are seen to be oppressed, often seek out different mediums and platforms to share their lives and voices;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o There is a shared perception that ‘exclusive communities’ of both political and cultural citizenship can lead to people(s) being socially excluded.</td>
<td>o The young people in the study perceive the relationships between school and voice is complicated. For example, schooling offers opportunities to for young people to have a voice in the future through</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
accessing grades and careers, but it is repressive to children sharing their voices now.

These shared narratives are representative of a case study of young people’s geographies, and they show the richness of the geographies, and imaginations, of the young people who participated in this research. I now highlight the key findings of the chapter, before outlining their value to geography education in schools.

Through using the production of space as the conceptual framework for analysis, chapter four has identified that the young people in this study navigate multiple, sometimes contradictory, social spaces when constructing themselves and their identity(s) in London. An example of this is highlighted in their narratives about sex, sexuality and gender. For example, the young people share that they are exposed to, and/or engaging, with a variety of media representations of gender and sex. In doing so, they are also making decisions about what is acceptable in regards to accessing online spaces (including pornography), and how they should behave in physical spaces (e.g. teen fest). In informing their decisions, they are drawing on, and navigating, social norms, religion, parenting and the media in different ways (see section 4.3).

This process is represented on figure twenty three, which shows the reciprocal relationships between people(s), place and time-space (see also section 3.2.3 and figures 5 and 6). Put another way, figure twenty three represents how the young people relate, and contribute, to social space and grand narratives of our time. This is a helpful representation, as through sharing their narratives, the young people are both meaning making and contributing to what Massey terms ‘stories in space’ (see also sections 2.3.2 and 2.3.4). If we conceptualise place as collections of these stories that exist within the wider geometries of space and time (see Massey, 2005), then as these stories are enacted, and/or shared, they are producing and informing the social space that is London (see also Goodson et al. 2010; Clandinin and Connelly, 2000; section 3.4). For example, when the young people discuss their use of, and debates
about, social media to share their own, and learn about others, stories, this can be conceptualised as part of the wider grand narrative of London in this day and age (see also section 2.3.2).

Figure 23: Young people’s narratives of identity and the reciprocal relationships between people(s), place and time-space

Drawing on these shared narratives and the arguments put forward in chapters one, and two, which examined the relationships and borders between children’s geographies in different spaces of thought, I now show how knowledge about children’s geographies (as shared by children themselves, and as is researched in the academy) can be ‘enabling’ (see Maude, 2016; see also section 2.2.4a) to geography education in schools in two ways:

- Firstly, in developing teacher knowledge of the children they teach, to enable them to be more informed in their ‘curriculum making’;
- Secondly, in enabling young people to use ‘powerful knowledge’ to think about their world(s) and geographies in different ways.

Although the power to enable is subjective (Maude, 2016), I now demonstrate how the ideas drawn upon in, and the empirical findings of, this thesis contribute to debates in geography education. I have taken the decision to examine the two ways
in which children’s geographies can be enabling to school geography identified above together, this is because in the classroom, decisions the teacher makes impact upon the curriculum that is made and children’s learning (Lambert and Morgan, 2010). I begin by situating these debates in classroom context and ideas of GeoCapabilities.

As examined in section 2.2.4a, every day teachers make the curriculum; they balance a complex web of student needs, curriculum prescription and choice, and decisions about how to teach (Lambert and Morgan, 2010), all in the context of school, and education, systems and time-space. However, as has been outlined in section 2.2, children have sometimes been sub-ordinated by both society and education. Furthermore, although many models and approaches about geography education recognise the student as central to the curriculum making process, there has been relatively limited examination as to what this actually means, or recognition of the child existing beyond their given identity as a student in schools (see sections 1.2.1, 1.2.2 and 2.2.4a).

The model introduced by the GeoCapabilities project in 2016 entitled ‘adopting a capabilities approach’ (see figure 4), appears to attempt to counter this. By stating that geography teachers should consider ‘who are the children we teach?’ before anything else, it recognises children as integral to geographical teaching and learning. Drawing on this idea, in sections 1.2.2 and 2.2.4a, I posited that geography teachers need to consider the child holistically in their curriculum making. This includes consideration of their identity(s), their age, their geographies, their everyday lives, as well as their learning needs and prior (geographical) education. This is to enable the teacher to make informed decisions about their teaching, countering a banking model of education in which the child is constructed as a passive recipient of, or empty vessel to be filled with, knowledge (Freire, 1970).

The capabilities model then argues that geography teachers should consider the purpose of geographical education by asking ‘why teach geography in this day and age?’ In doing so, the teacher would consider the significance of geography education and how it might be powerful, and enabling, to children in their lives and futures (see also Maude, 2016; 2018; Roberts, 2017). It is only then, that the teacher can make informed decisions as to ‘what to teach and how to teach it’.
However, as examined in section 2.2.4a, there has been very little consideration as to what this model means for, or why it is significant for, and powerful to, geography education in schools. In this section, I draw on this research to show how children’s geographies can inform and support teachers’ in adopting a GeoCapabilities approach, as is represented in this model. In doing so, I do not negate other elements of the ‘child’ that the teacher is likely to consider as part of their curriculum making; such as their learning needs, prior (geographical) learning and discussions of progression. Rather, I posit that these are already significant areas of debate and research in geography education (see for example, Biddulph et al., 2015; Jones, 2017; Lambert and Jones, 2018), whereas discussions about children’s geographies is more limited. I now draw on an example from my research, to show how the approach might be enacted.

In section 4.4, I examined what analysis revealed about young people’s relationships with the state and ‘being British’. I showed that the young people in the study perceive that there is a relationship between religion, ethnicity and national identity. An example of this is the young people expressed that they felt white British people had different social rules, and more freedoms, than others in London. These narratives are pertinent areas of discussion both in considering if, and how, a child feels a sense of belonging to, or excluded in, society. In addition, as London changes and evolves both demographically through migration, and also through its multiplicity of connections to other places as a ‘world city’ (see Massey, 2008; see section 2.3.2), these narratives can be conceptualised as the young people navigating life in the ever-changing London.

These experiences and imaginations of the world, are one’s which children may well share in response to teachers’ questions, or teaching, on a topic such as migration or political geography. Children may also choose to share similar narratives because they are significant to them, and they are narrating their lives and experiences as they make-meaning (see section 3.4). It is therefore of value that geography teachers are aware of children’s geographies as field of thought, and of the children they teach, particularly as children’s geographies as a sub discipline is omitted from the national level of the curriculum and some (initial) teacher education. I now examine
how this knowledge can support teachers in being more informed in their curriculum making.

In (geography) lessons, children often share their ideas about the world (see for example, section 1.2.1 where I share an example of discussions about ‘front line’). As everyday life is an area of geographical debate and research, the child may well draw on their everyday knowledge in making sense of the geography being studied, or apply the geographical knowledge to their imaginations of the world. This is something Roberts (2010; 2013; 2013b; 2017) advocates as being valuable to meaning making. She extols the value of connecting what might be conceptualised as ‘powerful knowledge’ (although Roberts herself contests this idea, see Roberts, 2013; section 2.2.4a) to children’s everyday knowledge and geographies in the classroom. Arguing that children bring to the classroom a multitude of rich experiences and imaginations, and different ways of thinking about the world, which the geography teacher should consider in their teaching. She argues that ‘geographical knowledge cannot simply be ‘delivered’ to students. Students need to be actively involved in making sense of it themselves. This involves connecting new information and ideas with what they already know and understand’ (Roberts 2010: 6).

When considered in relation to the example shared earlier in this section about children’s imaginations of cultural citizenship, if the teacher were to explore children’s imaginations, and/or experiences of, citizenship and national identity, this would inform their knowledge of ‘who are the children I teach?’ The value of this lies in providing them with knowledge that they can use to make informed decisions as to the purpose of the lesson (i.e. why teach geography in this day and age), and ‘what to teach and how to teach it?’ (see figure 4)

For example, if Jessica, a young person with mixed heritage, were to share her view that she does not feel she’s fully British because she’s not white in a lesson, the teacher would have to make decisions as to how to navigate this situation. These decisions are at once philosophical, ethical and practical. A universal ‘law’ cannot be made as to how this should happen, and instead it is context and child dependent. However, using powerful knowledge to explore, and situate, how experiences such
as hers have been researched and considered in geography, can be conceptualised as enabling to young people. In this particular example, geographical knowledge on migration into the UK; inequalities between different social groups in London and beyond; citizenship and identity; geographies of home; and examination of representations of citizenship and inequality; would all be valuable in supporting Jessica in situating her imaginations and experiences in geographical thought.

Furthermore, when considered using Maude’s (2016) typology (see section 2.2.4a) it could provide Jessica with:

- Knowledge that provides her with powerful ways to analyse, explain and understand the world (type two). For example, how, and why, migration has changed London socially and spatially;
- Knowledge that gives her some power over her own knowledge (type three). For example, in knowing that her geographies are situated in place, and time-space, and in knowing what legal and cultural citizenship means and how it has been debated, and explored, in geography.

It is not within the scope of this research to offer specific ways that this might be done in the classroom. This would require extensive research and work with geography teachers, and discussion with a variety of children as to their experiences of, and perspectives on, these ideas. In addition, teachers are curriculum makers, and there is not one curriculum that can be ‘delivered’. However, what this thesis does is show, is the value of crossing borders between the different spaces of thought (see section 2.1 and figure 1), and school geography drawing on both academic thought, and children’s own experiences, to inform their curriculum making.

In this section I have summarised the findings of chapter four. I have shown how this thesis has contributed to knowledge in geography education, through using narrative research and the production of space as a conceptual framework for analysis, to identify that the young people in this study navigate multiple, sometimes contradictory, social spaces when constructing and representing themselves, and their identities, in London. Through a worked example drawn from the young
people’s narratives, I have then examined how children’s geographies can be enabling to both young people and geography teachers. In doing so, I have highlighted how knowledge about children’s geographies can support the geography teacher to be more informed in their curriculum making. I now move on to conclude the chapter in section 4.7.

4.7 Conclusion

In this chapter, I have examined the young people’s narratives analysed as relating to the theme of identity. Through discussion around four sub themes (religion and identity; sex, sexuality, gender and identity; the state and oneself; and voice and identity), chapter four has shown the complex and multifaceted nature of the young peoples’ experiences and imaginations of London and the world. Analysis has highlighted identity as a central aspect of the young people’s geographies, and shown that growing up in London as a ‘world city’ means that children often exist within and navigate multiple, and sometimes contradictory, social spaces that inform the development of their identity. It has also highlighted how using the production of space can provide a more nuanced knowledge of children’s geographies and the complex social relations that exist in space and are enacted in place.

Further to this, I have demonstrated that this knowledge is of value to geography education in supporting teachers in being more informed in their curriculum making (see section 4.6). Arguing further that this knowledge can support the enactment of a GeoCapabilities approach, which can, in turn, be enabling to children in examining, and situating, (their own) geographies. I now move on to examine the theme of territory and turf in the second of the findings chapters (chapter five).
5. Chapter five: Territory and turf

Chapter five is the second of the three findings chapters that were set out in section 3.6.3. It examines the theme of territory and turf, which was identified during analysis of the young people’s narratives. The theme has been divided into two sub themes:

- Gangs and turf (section 5.2)
- Ethnicity and territory (section 5.3)

Although examined in separate sections, links between them are highlighted and examined throughout.

The chapter follows the same structure as chapter four, with each section beginning with an introduction to the sub theme. This is because the young people in the study were encouraged to share their geographies and voices, and as a researcher, I could not predict their areas of discussion. In light of this, a brief academic introduction about relationships between the sub theme (e.g. gangs) and the main theme of the chapter (territory and turf), is given at the start of each section. Following this, I examine what analysis revealed about the young people’s narratives of their geographies and imaginations of London. The chapter begins by introducing territory and turf as an area of geographical consideration in 5.1, providing an introduction to the overarching theme of the chapter.

5.1 What is territory, what is turf?

Gregory et al. (2009: 746) begin their definition of territory by stating that it is ‘a unit of contiguous space that is used, organised and managed by a social group, individual person or institution to restrict and control access to people and places’. For Massey (1998), the continual aim to territorialise is integral to conceptualising space and the social construction of identities. Massey argues that with varied, and sometimes multiple, motivations, individuals and groups continuously try and include some people, whilst excluding others, from spaces and places.
The scale of territorialisation varies enormously from nation states (which are discussed in section 4.4), to a gang claiming a postcode as their territory (see section 5.2). These examples also reflect that some territories are legally and politically recognised, whilst others are not. Indeed, territories may be recognised by some people(s) and not others, they may also be continuously disputed and contested. In this way, territories can inform and affect people’s spatial practices, identities and everyday lives.

‘Turf’ is the term used by Harvey (1990: 257) in his ‘grid of spatial practices’ to represent the process, and product, of territorialisation, or the appropriation and domination of territory. The terms territory and turf are used interchangeably within this thesis, as they are representative of the same concept. Harvey places turf in the space of ‘material spatial practices (experiences)’ and ‘appropriation and use of space’. This can be seen as representative of territory existing in the realm of experience and spatial practices of (re)production, which for Harvey (1990), represents how space is ‘used and occupied by individual’s, classes and other social groupings’ with appropriation sometimes entailing the ‘production of territoriality’ (p259). An example of this might be an ethnic group moving to a specific area of a city. For example, the Bangladeshi population presently centred on Brick Lane in London. This group then (re)produce space, and change place, through spatial and social practices including, but not limited to, religious practices, cultural traditions and language.

For Massey (1998), the control of space and territoriality are pivotal areas of consideration in children’s geographies. As outlined in section 2.2, children’s voices, as well as their spatial practices, are often controlled. Indeed, adults often set out territories for children, for example, playgrounds which often, at least attempt to, exclude teenagers and most adults. In addition, children and young people also claim their own spaces in many ways; from corners of the playground being appropriated by one group of children, to a gang ‘tagging’ areas of the city (ibid.). These territories have the potential to both include and exclude children and others, with territorialisation, and the contests that surround it, being an important aspect of identity formation (see chapter four). Furthermore, territories can affect children’s
and young people’s sense of place, and their relationships with the places they live and visit (Castree, 2009), and as such, they can be seen areas of concern for both geography and geography education.

I now move on to introduce the relationships between gangs and turf in section 5.2, before examining the young people’s narratives analysed as relating to this theme in section 5.2.1.

5.2 Gangs and turf

In this section, I examine how gangs have been conceptualised and represented in different spaces of thought, including the academy and everyday life. I then consider how ideas about gangs have influenced imaginations of young people. This section highlights both that gangs have been defined in different ways by different people(s), and also raises concerns that negative perceptions of territorialisation can affect the representation of young people.

‘Gang’ is not a simple concept or term; it has multiple definitions and meanings both in everyday language and in the academy. The wide and diverse usage of the term, can be seen as representative of how it has been (re)defined and represented by multiple people(s) and groups, and that defining what constitutes a gang has been, and remains to be, problematic (Hallsworth and Young, 2008). Those involved in discussions about, and the construction of, the concept of ‘gangs’ vary from gangs themselves, to the police whose research and reports ‘have been central in defining what a ‘gang’ is’ (Alexander, 2008: 6), to the media and politicians (Klein, 2011).

Within academia, most of the research conducted into gangs has been done in an American context and by American criminologists, focussing primarily on ‘traditional U.S. gangs’, and not other sorts of gangs, such as street gangs (Klein, 2011). Densley (2012: 43) argues that the label gang ‘is so dangerously leveraged by American ideology and policy prescription that it can neither be translated or meaningfully used in the British context’. Klein (2011) echoes this argument, commenting that it is not just intellectually inappropriate, but also politically dangerous.
However, it is of value to note, that gang is also a term and concept that is present in British society; including in the media, politics and policing. For example, the Government’s (2011) report ‘Ending Gang and Youth Violence’, which was commissioned after the London riots (see also section 4.5), highlights that ‘one in five of those arrested in connection with the riots were known gang members’, and that ‘gang members carry out half of the shootings in the capital (London) and 22% of all serious violence’ (p3). Further to this, the British government often link gangs to crime. For example, on their webpage entitled ‘Knife, Gun and Gang Crime’, they share policy and financial updates, reports and advice (e.g. to schools and parents and carers) on gangs. However, as Klein (2011) point out, gangs vary from adult criminal gangs to ‘youth subcultures with little commitment to criminal or delinquent pursuits’ (p203). Due to the government holding social and political power, their representation of gangs is worthy of consideration as it may inform (shared) social imaginations of gangs. Yet, if different types of gangs are not considered, then there is a risk that some groups will be represented, and treated, as more socially problematic than they actually are. This in turn could result in feelings, and experiences, of social exclusion by both gang members, and other social groups, within a society.

The multifaceted definitions, and uses of, the term gang can be problematic in regards to how young people are imagined and represented within society. As introduced in section 5.1, for Massey (1998: 128) an important part of growing up is hanging out in particular places (both private and public) ‘as a construction of spatiality can be an important element in building a social identity’. The combination of the grand narratives outlined above about gangs, and young people ‘hanging out’ in public places as an important part of growing up, can potentially lead to them being seen as a problem for just occupying space (see also section 2.2.6). Further to this, Freeman and Tranter (2011: 12) assert that this has led to the evolution of ‘geographies of fear’ with the presence of young people leading to some members of the public feeling ‘unsafe’ (see also section 2.2.1).

In examining these debates further, it is of value to consider that public spaces, as well as the concepts of childhood and children, are social constructions. Aitken (2001:
156) argues that ‘by the end of the late twentieth century, the street was transformed by bourgeois notions of consumption from a multipurpose space for all groups and classes into a space which required stricter control and regulation’. Young people who occupy the street are now often seen as either vulnerable, or a danger, as they pose a potential threat to adult hegemony (Valentine, 1996 in Aitken, 2001; Harvey, 2013; section 2.2.6).

Young people are affected by, and feed into, the imagination of the public spaces they occupy. The social construction of young people in relation to ‘difference and deviancy is linked to stereotyping and the moral construction of place’ (Lucas, 1998: 147). However, differences in young people, for example, in relation to age, ethnicity and class, also affect how they are perceived in public places (Lucas, 1998; Densley, 2012). For example, very young children are often not represented as a social threat, but as vulnerable social actors who need protecting (see also section 2.2). Examining young peoples’ experiences of gangs is of value to better understanding gangs, and also young people’s spatial practices and imaginations of the place, and time-space, they exist within and contribute to.

I now move on to share, and discuss, the narratives of the participants in this research analysed as relating to gangs and turf in section 5.2.1.

5.2.1 Narratives of gangs and turf

Analysis of the young people’s narratives has identified several sub themes related to gangs and turf, which are mapped onto Harvey’s (1990) grid of spatial practices in figure twenty four. Analysis shows that all of the young people in the research are aware of gangs in London and of ‘postcode wars’. In addition, the young people often feel that gangs protect areas and keep them safe, although acknowledge that some gangs can be violent and negatively affect people(s) lives. Furthermore, the young people expressed that gangs use social media to share their lives and voices in London.
I now define the terms used on the grid of spatial practices, before moving on to share the narratives of the young people on the theme of gangs and turf:

1. **Turf – territoriality and gangs** represents how gangs appropriate a space or area, and claim it as their territory;

2. **Social space** represents spaces of recreation and socialising;

3. **Social control and parents** refers to discussions about how parents and carers mediate, and/or control, their children’s experiences due to gangs;

4. **Friction of distance (fear)** refers to narratives of fear related to gangs occupying a space or place;

5. **Social media** represents how gangs represent their lives and activities via social media;


All of the young people in the research discuss gangs. Three of the young people (Jack, Rachel and Jessica) express that they have a gang in their local area, with Tilly and Alex sharing that they have an awareness of gangs around London. This section begins by examining their discussions about whether gangs keep an area safe. Following this, narratives about gangs representing places and areas, and their lives, via social media are examined.
One of the primary debates that was identified during analysis of the young peoples’ narratives on gangs is whether they keep an area safe. Three of the young people (Jack, Jessica and Alex) all express a feeling that they do. However, Jack’s narratives vary from expressing that he feels that the gang where he lives protects his local area, to stating that gangs in other areas make him feel unsafe. Jack’s narratives can be read as him feeling a friction of distance, and fear, when stepping into unfamiliar areas which are dominated by gangs. In the narrative below, he articulates that the presence of gangs sometimes leads him to change his behaviour, to ensure he is aware of those around him and to protect himself:

*Jack*: ah yeah, East London is not safe

*Researcher*: what about West London?

*Jack*: West London is in a way safe, yeah. But yeah...

*Researcher*: why is East London less safe?

*Jack*: because there’s lots of gangs there

*Researcher*: ok

*Jack*: yeah, so I live there, but, when someone is walking behind me, I still look, yeah, just in case, yeah. I go to a park called The Green, it’s like the main place where me and my friends go.

Jack raises the existence of gangs in other areas of London several times. For example, when I shared that I lived in Hackney at the time of data collection, Jack responds ‘its biggest enemies are Hayes and West London’. Intrigued by Jack’s statement and knowledge, and his concern about the gangs in this area, I asked him why he felt that I had never been affected by these gangs. Both he and Rachel responded that it’s because they don’t know me and I am not a member of a gang. This narrative can be interpreted as the young people sharing a perception, that whilst gangs appropriate a territory, not all people(s) are aware of gangs, or are a threat to and/or at risk from, them. It also suggests a perception that if you are not a gang member yourself, you are safe and free to enter their turf. These debates are an example of how, and why, it can be hard for some groups to fully understand the
geographies of others. For example, as an adult who is not involved with gangs, I am able to enter gang territory. However, I may not be able to fully understand the geographies of a gang members or young people who cannot cross these territorial lines (see also section 2.2.1).

These narratives can also be read as being representative of wider grand narratives (see sections 3.4 and 3.5), including London’s ‘postcode wars’ (Alexander, 2008; Densley, 2012). For example, Rachel describes London as being like the film series ‘The Hunger Games’, stating ‘cos it's kind of like The Hunger Games, because they're all from different districts, and they come in different districts and try and kill each other, and people get angry’. The young people in this research, also joke about this when they discuss the London riots, representing them as being fairly futile (see also section 4.5). However, research into gangs suggests they are complex and multifaceted. With Hallsworth and Young (2008) arguing that several gangs often operate in one area. This often includes small gangs gathering around bigger, and more developed, gangs whom they might be dependent on for contacts, drugs or weapons, and whom they join together with if a gang from another area invades their territory (Densley, 2012). These patterns can be read as being reflected in the young people’s narratives, as they express that they feel that some gangs are scary, and others are just (young) people hanging out (see Massey, 1998; section 5.2).

An example of what might be considered smaller, and non-criminal, gang can be inferred from Jack’s narratives about a gang that exist near his house and have claimed a local park as their turf. Jack expresses that he feels the gang help to look after young people and their local area:

*Jack: I think that East Acton, is actually a good place to live, yeah. Even though there’s lots of gang people, they don’t hurt you, they usually just sort out the place. So, if they see a fight, yeah? They will just break it up. They won’t just take out their phone like in most places, they won’t just try and record it, and they’ll actually try and sort it out, and stuff like that. And if you don’t like a park, like I do, like I don’t live near a park, but I go to this park. You see near...*

*Jessica: Scrubs?*
Rachel: the prison?

Jack: basically, behind the Scrubs prison, there’s a park, we go there, yeah? And there’s a gang, that’s there... and stuff like that.

Researcher: is that that picture there?

Tilly: this one (holds a picture of Wormwood Scrubs Park)

Jack: yeah, behind it there is like a, there’s a park behind it

Rachel: oh yeah

Jack: yeah, but if they see you every day, they actually start saying hi and stuff like that

Researcher: and they've never caused you any problems?

Jack: oh no, no, no!

Jessica: and some of them like help you and stuff, if you get what I’m trying to say.

Jessica and Alex echo Jack’s sentiments. Indeed, Alex states ‘they keep our area safe, and they don’t cause no problems for it’ and ‘I think they want people to respect them so can all live together nicely’.

Jessica argues that gangs have helped her by setting out social rules for a park she goes to after school. She explains that after a fight she was involved in broke out there (see also section 4.2), the gang helped to set social rules, including ‘we all have to take turns on the swings, and of the park, and share it, because it’s for all of us, and not just for one person’. Jessica expresses that ‘there’s loads of kids my age, and not much trouble in the area’. This narrative indicates that Jessica feels that gangs protect areas, but in doing so they also exert a degree of social control over the people who use the park. This can be read as being representative of the social control that Jack implies with regards to the threat of issues being shared on social media via phone filming, if you do not follow rules set out by the gang.

However, not all of the interactions the young people in this research have had with gangs are positive. For example, Jack also tells a story of him and his friend Robert,
who got into a fight with a person from a local gang whom he calls ‘the guy with the circle face’. Jack states that ‘the guy with the circle face’ is someone who has been excluded from a local school for a violent act, before going on to share that on one occasion he thought that Jack and Robert were looking at him so he started a fight, explaining:

Jack: Robert was about to punch him, and I stopped his hand, yeah and then erm, I threw him into the bushes, where there was all needles and stuff so he couldn’t chase us. So I threw him in there, yeah

Rachel: laughs

Researcher: there are needles in bushes?

Jack: yeah. No it was in someone’s garden. So I grabbed him yeah, and I threw him in there quick, and by the time Robert got up and everything, we ran away...

This interaction reflects that the young people are navigating challenging social environments, as well as difficult physical ones, which Jack uses to his advantage in the fight. It can also be read as Jack experiencing a friction of distance from, and fearing, some gangs.

Alex is the only young person who doesn’t express any concerns about gangs. In the narrative below, Jessica explains that she is aware that some gangs are dangerous (see section 5.2). She also states that it is the function of a gang to ‘look after an area’ and articulates that you have to let gangs know what you are doing in their turf. This echoes her previous narrative about gangs having social control in their territory, and also what she perceives as their social responsibility, to look after it:

Jessica: obviously some gangs aint nice, some gangs can hurt children, and some gangs can be rude and not look after the area, if you get one trying to say. But I’m not saying that it’s all gangs are nice, but mostly the gangs around my area, and Jack's area, and Alex's area is nice, if you get what I’m trying to say. If you get to know them, if you let them do what you’re doing, and not interfere with them.
The young person in the group who expresses the most concern about gangs is Rachel. Rachel shares the most violent stories about gangs, noting that she has seen a person who had recently been shot by a gang in Brent, where she lives. Rachel also discusses problems such as drugs, violence (including stabbings and shootings), sexism and intimidation that she associates with gangs. For example, when discussing a gang near her house, she states:

*Rachel: I was going to say, that I live in an area that is not particularly very nice, and there is a massive gang of about 100 people. They sit outside the houses, like a big long thing, and unlike in your area (to Jessica), in our area the gang is bad. And, well not bad, but it intimidates you to walk past them, so you have to divert yourself. If you’re like an old lady, and it seemed like a big pack of people, how would you feel? It's like you wouldn't want your grandma walking past people blaring their music, saying things like ‘oh, I'm going to slap her about’, and this, that and the other. Like with music like that. And then people smoking weed, next to you, it's not good. And in our area, a couple of people got shot, and a couple of people got stabbed, so in our area, gangs are not good.*

Rachel’s narrative can be read as a gang appropriating a space by sitting outside houses, using aggressive and sexist language, and having weapons they begin dominating that space both socially and physically. Rachel expresses that she has to physically ‘*divert herself*’ to avoid the gang. This can be read as Rachel experiencing a friction of distance, or fear, of gangs, and a sense of concern about members of her community (e.g. old ladies).

Rachel shares further stories of gangs in other places. She explains that her father was raised in Glasgow on an estate in the 1970s. In the narrative below she expresses both how this experience affected her father and how it has influenced her. She states that her father has both taught her to fight to protect herself, and also encouraged her to use education to get out of the situation she is in (see also section 4.5).

*Rachel: I think that, living in an area like this, can kind of, a little bit alter your character. For example, my dad was brought up in Glasgow in the 70s and that was rough, all the estates were, and obviously he has to be streetwise. There,
they have to be prepared to fight anybody, because like he’s got all stab scars from where he’s been stabbed. And he’s like not been shot before, but it was like an air rifle. He was shot in the back with an air rifle.

Researcher: was he okay?

Rachel: yeah he was, but he said, erm you have to learn to toughen up, even the girls. If anyone from down here, went up to the estates up there, they’d be ripped to shreds!

Researcher: So is Glasgow more...

Rachel: yeah, they are hard-core! I’ve got a streak of Glaswegian in me!

Laughing

Tilly: see the streak!

Rachel: but like my dad’s told me about, like what to do if I ever got into a fight situation. I’ve been shocked about what he’s told me, like deck somebody, which means like head-butt somebody first thing. And like somebody attacks you, don’t let them get off the floor, just keep punching until...

Researcher: do you think you have to learn how to fight?

Rachel: well, erm in Glasgow, how it was then, then yeah.

Rachel’s narrative can be read as representing how her father’s Glaswegian heritage, and experiences and imaginations of Glasgow, have influenced and developed her own identity (see chapter four), imaginations of Glasgow and how she navigates London. It is an example of people(s) relationships with place, and how this has influenced how a parent socially controls their child through their parenting. As is examined later in the thesis in section 6.1, Rachel’s father appears to parent in very different ways at different times; from teaching her to fight and defend herself, to encouraging her to engage with her education to challenge ‘the system’ from within.

Another theme identified through analysis of the young people’s narratives is gangs and drugs. Tilly, Rachel, Jessica and Jack all show awareness of drugs in their local area. However, only Rachel shows concern about the impacts of drugs, with the other young people’s narratives representing a sense of drugs being part of the social
landscape in West London. For example, Jessica shares that she witnesses drug dealing all the time, joking about the police not seeing it:

Jessica: miss, do you know what I saw the other day? It’s actually to do with geographies. Basically, I was coming back from this party, my camp party, and basically we was in Fulham, and on the street, there was these teenage boys, yeah, say there was one here, and one here, they was a distance apart, yeah. And they was walking up to them, and he gave them weed in his hand, and the other one gave him a roll of money, a big roll of money! Imagine if we was a CID car!

Researcher: were you scared?

Jessica: no, cuz I see it all the time!

Researcher: you see drugs all the time? Did you report it?

Jessica: no.

When I ask Jessica about what she feels about cannabis, she states that she doesn’t think weed is ‘that bad’, as it can be helpful to ‘disabled people’, before noting that she feels that ‘it’s just illegal as it makes some people go crazy, but someone said, it’s illegal as the government can’t make money off it’. This narrative can be read as Jessica showing some recognition of the potential benefits and dangers of cannabis use, and her feeling a friction of distance towards law makers and authorities (e.g. the government and the police). In this discussion, Jack also shares that he doesn’t tell his parents about the drugs in his local area, as he feels that they would just worry, and stop him from going to local parks. This can be read as an example of social control and parents, but with Jack pre-empting their actions and so limiting how much of his life he shares with them.

The young people also raise that gangs have a presence in cyber space. The narrative below is a discussion about how a gang represents their area (or turf) in a YouTube rap (see also section 4.5):

Jessica: I’ve got a rap for you about West London! (Starts clapping)

Researcher: go on then...

Researcher: where’s that from Jessica?

Jessica: from the Internet, shall I show you?

Researcher: why don’t you show me at the end, I’ve got no Wi-Fi on my iPad

Jessica: there’s a dance for it as well!

Rachel: (laughing) I don’t know it, I just started dancing

Researcher: and why do you think people make raps like that about West London?

Jessica: because we are the gunman around here

(Laughing)

Rachel: Because they think they’re badmans, but they’re not, they’re just insecure

Tilly: it’s like in London, you’ve got East London, you’ve got South London, you’ve got North London, you’ve got...

In the discussion, Jessica expresses that she feels that the group rap about their area as they want people to know about it, and also ‘about their lives and what they’re doing; basically how they survive around here’. However, this idea is contested by Rachel who argues that the gang are insecure and trying to represent themselves as more powerful than they actually are.

In addition to this rap, the group discuss a song called ‘the hot n*gg*’ by Bobby Schmurda. Tilly explains that this video, and song, are an example of how people in urban areas want to build their reputation. The whole group engage in this discussion, and Jack states that it was a ‘viral video’, and explains that the artist is now in jail. Tilly’s narratives suggest that she feels that there are some good rappers, but others who talk ‘nonsense’, and about ‘drugs, alcohol, guns and knives’. However,
when Jessica and Alex express that they feel this is the only forum that some young people can talk in, Tilly also agrees that it is an art form that some people(s) represent their lives through.

Jessica’s narratives can be interpreted as relating ‘reppin’ for your area’ and the theme of voice and identity (examined in detail in section 4.5), as not all people(s) can share their lives equally, or in the same way. The group discuss the rap for several minutes, and in the narrative that follows, Jessica acknowledges Tilly’s comment that the group may want to be famous, but disagrees with Rachel describing them as ‘insecure’ as opposed to the ‘badmans’ they express themselves to be, firmly reiterating that this is a way they ‘rep’ for their area. Jessica states that the reason they use YouTube and similar forums is because ‘people that aint like us, like the Prime Minister or something, they aren’t going to listen are they’. As such, putting it ‘out there’ (Jessica) on social media may let people, including those who are socially distant and hold a position of authority (e.g. politicians), know about their lives and area. This example can be seen as representative of how social media is changing how ideas, and perspectives, are communicated in London today (see also section 2.3.2). When I last looked at this video on YouTube (26/02/2019) it had had over 390,000 views and over 700 comments, some of which suggest that members of this gang are in prison. This implies that there is significant interest in ‘reppin’ for your area in cyber space, and also that Jessica, and potentially others in this research, are engaging with people who have broken the law and are potentially in jail.

When Tilly discusses gangs, she raises that she regularly leaves the local area to go to public places in central London. In this way, she is unlike Jessica, Jack and, to some extent, Rachel, who spend a lot of time in local parks and public spaces where ‘gangs’ of young people are prevalent. Tilly discusses her reasons for this, stating that ‘my mum, instead of taking me to the park around here, she’d take me to Hyde Park, Battersea Park, she wouldn’t take me around here’. When I ask Tilly to explain this further she responds ‘I think not only because the parks over there are nice, not only are they safer, it’s just a nice experience’. Following this, Tilly goes on state that the parks in central London are ‘higher class’ and ‘better developed’.
Whilst Tilly never articulates that her mother, or wider family, worry about gangs, analysis of her narratives suggest that they have a desire to protect her. In addition, Tilly explains that her mother hopes to introduce her to what she expresses she perceives to be safer, higher class and nicer environments. This is again, an example of parental control. Parenting, and young people’s relationships with their parents, differ between the participants in the study. Even in the few examples shared here, it can be inferred that parents are trying to support their children in navigating the social spaces they exist within, and have awareness of gangs and problems in the area, but choose to deal with them in different ways. For example, Tilly’s mother takes her to parks in central London to avoid gangs and see different places, and Rachel’s father teaches her to fight.

Tilly also shows awareness of gang violence in London. For example, when Rachel was going to a concert in Brixton, Tilly saw on the news that someone had recently been shot in that area. She explains that in response, she got in touch with Rachel and stated ‘I was just like be careful and don’t get hurt. But I think Brixton is one of the most talked about places, like on the news, not for good things’. This narrative suggests that she feels a degree of fear towards gangs related to the safety of her friends. It also suggests she perceives that some places in London are more dangerous than others.

In addition, Tilly questions the nature of gangs regularly and expresses a perception that young people are sometimes viewed, and/or represented, as engaging in anti-social behaviour just because of how they dress and behave:

*Rachel: nowadays when you think of gangs, you think of young teenagers with hoodies and stuff*

*Jack: Miss you see when you go in supermarkets yeah, with your friends and stuff. They are like ‘there’s a group of, a teen gang’*

*Researcher: Do people look at you funny?*

*Jack and Tilly: yeah!*

*Tilly: they think you’re going to start stealing*
Jack: because yesterday, yeah, I came to school yeah, I was wearing black yeah, I was wearing everything black and the shop keeper was bare looking at me, like I was going to steal something

Researcher: Is that because or how you look, or how you dress or?

Jack: it’s because I was wearing a black hoody and stuff

Tilly: he is young, and like he’s wearing like clothes. He’s wearing clothes, so what!?

This narrative can be interpreted as being a product of the shared social imagination of children as ‘wild devils’ who don’t behave in line with social norms (see section 2.2) and social concerns about gangs (see section 5.2). In the narrative, Tilly, Jack and Rachel are discussing how young people are sometimes portrayed as being problematic in public places. The narrative can be read as the young people having an awareness of social imaginations of young people, and can also be seen as the young people trying to challenge these imagination. For example, when Tilly contests ‘he is young, he’s wearing clothes. He’s wearing clothes, so what!?’

When discussing gangs, Tilly also expresses that she feels that the people who are in them, have to take some responsibility for their actions. Rachel tells a story of a gang of boys, who hang out and smoke cannabis near her house. When the group discus the potential reasons for this, Jack’s narrative suggests he perceives that it’s due to territoriality, and that they are ‘waiting for their enemies’. Rachel expresses that it’s because she thinks they think they look cool, and Tilly states that they perhaps don’t have jobs or didn’t take their education seriously. These narratives can be read as Tilly feeling that by working ‘within the system’ (e.g. through education and employment) can change a person’s life and circumstances (see also section 6.1).

Tilly: some people don’t live, some people just survive. So some people, like, they might not have the same morals as others, that’s what I think. And when you grow up in a certain household, you might have different rules about how you react to things. So someone was to say something rude to me down the street, I would just walk on, but some other person might just get a knife out and hurt them.
In addition, Tilly also discusses on several reasons why she perceives that people might join gangs. She notes that gang members ‘they might not have jobs’, ‘they want to get famous’ and ‘they have to live up to their reputation’. These narratives have relationships to the conceptualisation of London as a place of opportunity and hope, and inequality and injustice (see chapter 6).

The final narrative analysed as relating to gangs and turf, involves Jack comparing gangs with organised terrorism. He states ‘yeah with gangs, in every country, there’s a bad gang or something like. Even in Arab countries, it’s not gangs, it’s big like ISIS and Al Shabaab’. Jack’s comparison can be read as him exploring how different groups appropriate and dominate space, and the differences between different groups in different places.

In this section I have shared the young people’s narratives about gangs and turf. The individual narratives are highlighted in figure twenty five. Several shared themes emerged from the analysis:

- The young people perceive that London is divided into gang territories;
- Gangs ‘rep’ for their areas and lives via social media;
- Gangs can be both helpful to an area they appropriate, and also involved in illegal activities (e.g. drugs) and violent crime;
- Parents and carers are aware of gangs, but support their children in navigating gangs in different ways;

These are returned to in section 5.4 when I examine the value of these findings to geography education.
**Figure 25: Shared narratives of gangs and turf**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Young person</th>
<th>Key points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Jack**     |  o Parents worry about gangs and drug use in parks (3)  
               o Areas have enemies (1)  
               o Gangs can affect an areas safety both positively and negatively (2) (4)  
               o Gangs Reppin’ for their area on YouTube (5)  
               o Links gangs and terrorism linked (1) |
| **Rachel**   |  o She does not feel safe in her area because of gangs (24)  
               o Gangs push her to want to achieve (3)  
               o Father raised in Glaswegian estates in 1970s, and has taught her to be streetwise and defend herself (3)  
               o Has witnessed gang violence (1) (4)  
               o Links gangs to territories (1) |
| **Jessica**  |  o Lives in EA – lots of children not much trouble (2)  
               o Has family members in gangs who ‘rep’ for their area (6)  
               o Feels that gangs keep her area safe, though acknowledges that some gangs are problematic (2) (1)  
               o Gangs rep for their area on Youtube (to share their voice) (6)  
               o Has seen drug dealing (2) |
| **Tilly**    |  o Avoids local parks as central London parks are safer and a higher class (2) (3)  
               o Feels that gangs don’t affect her (2)  
               o Doesn’t go into areas that make her feel unsafe as she wouldn’t feel at home there (4)  
               o Questions what a gang is (2) |
States that people make their own decisions, no matter what their lives are like (2)

Alex

Feels that gangs help people in his local area (2) (1)

I now move on to examine the young people’s narratives related to ethnicity and territory in section 5.3.

5.3 Ethnicity and territory

The recognition and study of the relationship(s) between people and place is nothing new, neither is the consideration of how different cultures and ethnic groups relate to place. However, they are both evolving as the world changes, for example through migration and globalisation. Drawing on debates about London as the context of this research (see also section 2.3.2), this section examines the relationships between ethnicity and territory, considering how these ideas have been debated in the academy and represented in everyday life. However, before examining these ideas further, it’s of value to begin by questioning what is meant by the term ‘ethnicity’.

Ethnicity is a contested term, and concept, both historically and today. In addition, the use of the term ethnicity often varies between everyday language and disciplinary use. Eriksen (2010: 5) argues that its use in everyday life may have connotations of ‘minority issues’ and ‘race relations’, but in his discipline (social anthropology) it refers to ‘the aspects of relationships between groups which consider themselves, and are regarded by others, as being culturally distinctive’. However in other disciplines, and in everyday life, ethnicity may be considered in either, or both, biological or cultural terms. Jackson and Penrose (1993: 5) argue that it is now accepted that ‘races’ ‘are socially constructed rather than biologically given’. For example, even if we are studying biological characteristics apparent in some people(s), this is still related to socially constructed ideas. Throughout this thesis, the term ‘ethnicity’ is used as opposed to ‘race’ unless in a direct quotation, as race as a
concept often has connotations of exclusion related to racism, whereas ‘ethnicity’ is perceived as more inclusive (Eriksen, 2010; Bloch and Solomos, 2010).

Britain’s history as ‘a major global power and territorial empire’, has meant that consciousness and cultural awareness of ethnicity has been part of British society for centuries, with it becoming an important element of political policy from the 1960s onwards (Bloch and Solomon, 2010: 2). The relationships between ethnicity and place have often been complex, which has sometimes been underexplored and/or underestimated. Sen and Silverman (2014: 7) posit that there has been a ‘mistaken isomorphism’ between place and culture in traditional scholarship, and that in the past ‘we have tended to see cultures as discrete, object-like phenomena occupying a discrete space’. Sen and Silverman refer here to what Saltman (2002: 3) considers as a formalised part of nation building – linking people to place, which is often done even through the naming of national territories. He gives the examples of Serbians living in Serbia and Scots living in Scotland. Arguably, the link between people and nation has become so natural in our social constructions of human divisions ‘that it is sometimes hard to imagine a world in which these divisions would no longer be salient’ (Jackson and Penrose, 1993: 9).

As London continues to change and evolve (see sections 2.2.6 and 2.3.2), for example, through its hybridity of connections to other places and migration, changes in imaginations of the city, and people(s), also occur. For example, it is now widely understood that not all Scots live in Scotland, and a Scottish person can live in London, but Scottishness may well still be a part of their identity, even if they live in another country.

Part of the relationship between ethnicity and place relates to the idea of territory and territoriality. Territoriality is both human behaviour, and also part of the way people(s) have conceptualised the world. For example, nations were not something that were discovered, but are ‘conceptualisation of the world that we have created’ (Jackson and Penrose, 1993: 28; see also section 4.5). In considering this, Harvey (1990) uses the term turf to express that people(s) appropriate of space, defining appropriation as ‘the ways in which space is used and occupied by individuals, classes and other social grouping’ (1990: 259). Harvey argues that the ‘production of
territoriality’ occurs when space is appropriated in a systematized and institutionalised way (for example, nation building). However, it is also acknowledged that appropriation of space also occurs in a non-systematised way by different people(s). Saltman (2002) uses the example of Orthodox Jews living in a compact community in North London as an example of this, highlighting how an ethnic group, and/or religion, appropriate an area. This is also one way in which London can be seen to have developed its character as a ‘city of villages’ (see also section 2.3.2).

I now move on to examine the narratives of the young people identified through analysis as relating to ethnicity and territory in 5.3.1.

### 5.3.1 Narratives of ethnicity and territory

This section shares the narratives of the young people coded as ‘ethnicity and territory’. It shows that the young people in the research acknowledge, and question, the appropriation of space by different ethnic groups in London. In addition, it highlights that the young people are aware of, and affected by, conflict over place by different ethnic groups through geopolitics. The key themes, which emerged during the analysis, are mapped on to Harvey’s (1990) ‘grid of spatial practices’ in figure twenty six.

*Figure 26: Narratives of ethnicity and territory mapped on to Harvey’s grid of spatial practices*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Accessibility and distanciation</th>
<th>Appropriation and use of space</th>
<th>Domination and control of space</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Material spatial practices</strong></td>
<td>Flows of people: ethnicity (1)</td>
<td>Turf – territoriality ethnicity (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Representations of space</strong></td>
<td>Friction of distance (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Geopolitics (4) Ethnicty and nation (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spaces of representation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Before examining the narratives of the young people, I define the terms used on the grid of spatial practices:

1. **Flows of people: ethnicity** refers to the movement of ethnic groups to different places;
2. **Turf – territoriality and ethnicity** refers to ethnic groups appropriating, or being enclaved, to a specific area;
3. **Friction of distance** refers to individuals, or groups, expressing a feeling of social distance due to their ethnicity;
4. **Geopolitics** refers to geopolitical issues relating to ethnicity;
5. **Ethnicity and nation** refers to relationships between ethnic heritage and a nation state.

All of the young people who participated in the research, apart from Alex, shared narratives related to ethnicity and territory. One way they did this is through the comparison of London, or England, to other places. For example, in the following narrative, Jack shares that he went to Cardiff and notes how demographically different it was to London expressing there’s ‘only one type of people’. He then reflects that London is ‘really multicultural’, noting in the same sentence ‘Cardiff is not’. Jack goes on to express that he perceives that this as an advantage, noting ‘the thing is Miss, about London, yeah, is that London, from every single country there’s one person’. Jack explains that he feels this due to flows of people moving to London through migration and quotes ‘an American’ as saying ‘if I was in London, I wouldn’t really have to go to every country, because a person from every country lives there’.

This perception can be seen to be echoed by Tilly. For example, when sharing a story of visiting her grandparents, Tilly explains that her mother is from Spain and her father is from Ghana, and that her father was the first black man her mother ever saw. When Tilly reflects on visiting the village in which her maternal grandparents live, she states that she feels that it’s the safest place that she has ever been:

*Tilly:* it’s where I went to Spain with my grandparents, it’s really quiet. Where I went before, it’s a small village, and it’s on top of Portugal, and it’s literally just
a village. Everyone knows each other. So when we came there, they were just going up to us, asking us questions, they were just staring at us, it was kind of weird.

Researcher: why were they staring at you?

Tilly: I think it’s because we were new, and it’s because we were the only black people there, and it’s not a lie, we were. And, erm, but everyone looks so friendly. And whenever I was speaking to my mum about police and stuff, she said that when she was small, she’d never heard a report about someone dying or something. But I was like ‘well what if someone was killed in the woods or something?’ because there was a massive forest, but she was like, ‘that would never happen, not here.’

Although in the narrative above Tilly expresses that she felt unique in her ethnicity in Spain, her narratives suggest that she felt safe there and that it was a friendly place.

In contrast, when discussing how multicultural London is, Tilly’s narratives can be interpreted as reflecting her feeling, and/or perceiving, a friction of distance related to ethnicity. The following two quotes from Tilly on this matter, are from different discussions in the Storytelling and Geography Group:

Tilly: Even though people say that ‘London is so multicultural’, yeah maybe they are right. But, deep down no one really accepts you.

Tilly: I think, you know how people say that London, or the UK, is really diverse and everyone is accepting. On one hand, this is true, because people start to live with it. But, after a while you start to realize, that some people don’t accept. They act like they do, but deep down they don’t accept.

Analysis of Tilly’s narratives suggests that she polarises her experiences, and imaginations, of London and Spain. In Spain, Tilly expresses that she is ethnically different from the majority of the population, and feels that she intrigues people, but equally that she is safe. Whereas in London, she recognises that she is in a multicultural city, but expresses she does not feel accepted. Rachel echoes this sentiment. For example, when she talks of Belfast, where her cousin lives, she notes ‘I really like Belfast better than London, I don’t know why, there’s just a different
atmosphere. Like everyone is really accepted.’ Both of these narratives can be read as the young people perceiving that some people(s) are excluded in London.

Analysis shows that the young people in this study feel there is a shared social imagination that ethnic minorities are not always accepted in London and/or the UK. The narrative below can be interpreted as Jessica and Rachel considering the historical reasons for this (see also section 4.4):

Jessica: because Britain used to be a white country, so they don’t want black people or Somalians, or...

Rachel: and it’s a Christian country too

Jessica: or Muslims coming and taking it over.

This narrative can be read as Jessica and Rachel expressing that they feel Britain wants to maintain, and socially reproduce, what they perceive to be its ethnoreligious heritage (see also section 4.2). Following this discussion, Jack raises that he perceives that black people commit more crime in the UK, and that they are the most targeted by the police. Rachel, Jessica and Tilly debate this idea with him, referring to statistics about crime by ethnicity, and questioning the reasons for his views. In this discussion, Tilly’s narratives suggests that she perceives that this representation of black people is born out of ingrained social imaginations that black people commit more crime.

The group then attempt to unpick why black people experience racism in London, and Rachel relates this to the history of slavery, and Jack shows awareness of groups such as the Ku Klux Klan (KKK) who have targeted black communities. These discussions suggest that the young people are aware of, and/or interested in, how history(s) and socio-political organisations across the world have shaped shared social imaginations of ethnicity at a variety of scales.

In addition to discussing London as an entire city, the group also raise the idea of ethnic territories in different parts of London. They express that these vary in scale, from localised gatherings of an ethnic group on the park (see section 4.2), to established ethnic enclaves such as China Town (see also section 2.3.2 and 5.3). Analysis shows that the group express both a sense of intrigue towards these areas,
and also a sense of otherness and exclusion when they enter what can be conceptualised as an ethnic enclave. An example of this is shared by Rachel, who states ‘I walk through Harlesden, and there’s like, loads of like, it’s dominated by mostly, like, Somali people and Arab people’. In the narrative below, the group use the language of territory to describe the gathering of an ethnic group in one particular area:

Jessica: I go Acton Park, it gives me a headache when I go there

Researcher: why does it give you a headache?

Jessica: I don’t know

Jack: there’s so many Saudi’s

Jessica: I go Shepherd’s Bush Park

Jack: I’m not even joking, it’s like you are going Saudi

Researcher: which area of London is this, it’s like Saudi Arabia?

Jack: no, no, no. You see Acton Park, yeah? Have you ever been Acton Park?

Researcher: no

Jack: Basically, Acton park, yeah, there is so many Saudi’s. There’s more Saudi’s there, than you will find in Saudi Arabia

Researcher: Is that a bad thing?

Jack: no, it’s just where all the Saudi’s meet in London!

Researcher: why do you think that happens in London? You know how if you go to some areas, there’s more of one ethnicity?

Rachel: yeah like Wembley

Tilly: I think it’s like their territory sort of, like Southall, when you go there, there’s loads of Indians

Rachel: yeah

Tilly: it’s awkward though, I remember once

Jack: it gets awkward.
These narratives can be interpreted as the young people expressing that ethnic groups and nationalities appropriate, and sometimes dominate, areas of London and that this sometimes results in them feeling a friction of distance. For example, Tilly tells a story of when she went to Southall, an area known colloquially in London as ‘Little Punjab’ (see for example, Guardian, 2018) due to its concentration of Indian people(s). Tilly visited Southall to buy a sari for an Indian themed party at her primary school, and explains ‘and then I went around, and they were trying to rip us off!’ Tilly articulates that she felt that this was because ‘my mum’s not Indian, and it’s so obvious, and I think it’s kind of mean!’

Rachel echoes these sentiments in her discussions about China Town. Although, Rachel expresses intrigue about Chinese food and culture, when I ask Rachel about whether she feels that it is important that there are areas like China Town, Rachel responds with the following narrative:

Rachel: I don’t really like it in a way, because there are lots of Chinese people near where I live. I’m not being racist, but the Chinese people are really like insular in that place. Because they think they like own it, like it is China

Tilly: Like it’s their own place

Rachel: and then I get really dirty looks when I’m walking along there

Tilly: but, I think that China Town, I get what Rachel is saying, but I also think that some people in China Town how they’ve got the restaurants, they want people to know their culture.

These narratives can be interpreted as Tilly and Rachel debating the benefits and challenges of social reproduction of ethnicity in a specific place. For example, in sharing and sustaining cultures, and also places becoming insular and exclusionary to other people(s). It can be read as the young people meaning making about the ‘city of villages’ (see section 2.3.2) they live within. For example, in discussing why London is socially and spatially the way it is, and the impacts this has on its populace.

Finally, Jack raises the idea of ethnicity-based violence. He links this to gangs and turf (see 5.2.1), discussing what happens when someone from West London visits East London, noting ‘if you went East London, yeah, and you got a YouTube rap, yeah,
they’d get curry and beat you up, because they’re all Indians and Bangladeshi’s. I’m not trying to be racist’. In this narrative, Jack is linking ethnicity and territory, articulating a socio-cultural distance from East London. Harvey (1990) argues that low-income populations are often unable to own or command space, often resulting in ‘an intense attachment to place and ‘turf’ (page 260). Further to this, Harvey argues that ‘fine-tuned ethnic, religious, racial and status discriminations are frequently called into play’ (p261) as a process of cultural construction. When challenged on his stereotypical discussion of Indian and Bangladeshi communities, Jack stands firm that there is a division between communities that could lead to you be attacked or killed if you step into another ethnic group’s territory in London.

In this section, I have examined narratives analysed as related to ethnicity and territory. In figure twenty seven, I outline the shared and individual narratives of the young people on this theme. The shared themes identified are:

- London is recognised as being very multicultural and this is both a benefit and a challenge;
- Different ethnic groups appropriate space at different scales, and this can cause a feeling of exclusion to others as well as allowing the sharing of culture;
- Racism can be related to historical geographies.

**Figure 27: Shared narratives of ethnicity and territory**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Young person</th>
<th>Key points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jack</td>
<td>o Links Indians and Bangladeshi populations with East London, and notes this can result in violence to outsiders (2) (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Feels London is multicultural and this is beneficial (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Discusses how the KKK have targeted black communities (3) (4) (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Compares London to Cardiff, noting that London is much more multicultural (1) (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel</td>
<td>Feels London is multicultural but that people aren’t accepted (1) (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feels that Belfast is more accepting of others than London (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relates racism to the history of slavery (3) (4) (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Links Indian people to Southall and Chinese people to China Town – noting that this leads to exclusion of other ethnic groups (2) (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feels that Chinese people try to dominate China Town (2) (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessica</td>
<td>Feels England’s white Christian history means that Britain does not want flows of other ethnic group to change it (1) (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discusses Saudi peoples appropriating a local park and causing a friction of distance (1) (2) (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tilly</td>
<td>Feels London is multicultural but that people aren’t accepted (1) (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Links Indian people to Southall and Chinese people to China Town – noting that this leads to exclusion of other ethnic groups (2) (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Notes that ethnic enclaves such as China Town sometimes share culture (2) (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feels that Spain is more accepting of others than London, despite being more mono-cultural (3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I now move on to examine the value of these narratives to geography education in schools in section 5.4.

5.4 The value of these narratives to geography education

As set out in section 4.6, at the end of each of the findings chapters I return to RQ3 and consider how can geography education use ideas and methodologies from children’s geographies to enhance school geography? The first of the findings chapters (chapter four) focused on narratives coded as relating to identity, whilst chapter five focuses on territory and turf. The shared themes that were identified through analysis of the young peoples’ narratives on territory and turf are shown in figure twenty eight.

**Figure 28: Share narratives on the theme of territory and turf**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gangs and turf</th>
<th>Ethnicity and territory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>o The young people perceive that London is divided into gang territories</td>
<td>o London is recognised as being very multicultural and this is both a benefit and a challenge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Gangs ‘rep’ for their areas and lives via social media</td>
<td>o Different ethnic groups appropriate space at different scales, and this can cause a feeling of exclusion to others as well as allowing the sharing of culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Gangs can be both helpful to an area they appropriate, and also involved in illegal activities (e.g. drugs) and violent crime</td>
<td>o Racism can be related to historical geographies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Parents and carers are aware of gangs, but support their</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In this section, I summarise the findings of this chapter, highlighting contributions to knowledge made. Following this, building on section 4.6, I draw on the shared themes identified in chapter five (see figure 28), to show how children’s geographies are of value to geography education in schools.

The major finding of the research on the theme of territory and turf is that the young people in this study imagine London as a jigsaw of territories with distinct social rules existing in different spaces and places in the city. This is represented on figure twenty nine, which represents the relationships between people(s), place and time-space and how people(s) shape, and are shaped by, the city (see also sections 2.3.2, 2.3.4 and 4.6).

Figure 29: Young People’s narratives of territory and turf and the reciprocal relationships between people(s), place and time-space

Analysis of the young people’s narratives shows that the jigsaw of territories affects their spatial practices and imaginations of London. For example, the young people express the existence of both gangs, and ethnic enclaves, influence decisions as to
where they go within the city at both micro, and macro, scales. Furthermore, it shows that the young people perceive that gangs affect their parents parenting decisions. For example, in considering where they allow their children to play and go. The young people’s narratives can be seen as representative of London in today’s time-space and as both a ‘world city’ (see Massey, 2008; see sections 2.3.2 and 4.6), and ‘city of villages’ (section 2.3.2) which is constructed of different social groups in different places within the city. This imagination of London has resulted in the young people often feeling a friction of distance to (some places in) the city, due to gangs and/or a perceived domination by an ethnic group.

The chapter also highlights that the young people in this study have ideas about how, and why, territories have evolved, and developed, in London. Further to this, it shows that they perceive that different people(s) have different experiences and imaginations of territories. For example, I (who might be represented as a white British woman in her thirties, who is middle class) do not have the same awareness of, and interactions with, gangs as the young people in this research. As examined in section 5.2, at the time of the Storytelling and Geography Group, I was able to regularly walk through gang territory near where I lived without feeling any level of intimidation or threat. These differential experiences of the city, can be seen to highlight the difficulties different people(s) sometimes have in understanding one another’s geographies and lives.

I now set out how these findings are of value to geography education in schools. Following section 4.6, I show that they can be seen as enabling to both geography’s teachers and students, particularly in developing the use of, and knowledge about, the concepts of place and time-space. Knowledge of these concepts is significant in developing young people’s knowledge of how power relations are socially (re)produced and spatially situated (see section 2.3). This knowledge can be seen to be enabling, and powerful (see Maude, 2016; section 2.2.4a), to young people, as it can:

- Provide them with new ways of thinking about the world (Maude, 2016 (type one)). For example, in considering the relationships between social reproduction, time-space and place;
Providing knowledge that gives students powerful ways to analyse, explain and understand the world (Maude, 2016 (type two)). For example, in considering why different people(s) live in certain areas, and how social reproduction through language, religion and culture, gives places distinct characteristics.

Before I share an example of how this can be done, building on section 2.3 I outline the significance of concepts in, and to, geography.

Although school geography often promotes concepts as being central to the subject (see for example, section 2.3; Lambert and Morgan, 2010; DfE, 2007; Geographical Association, 2009; ALCAB, 2016), processes of ‘social selection’ through recontextualisation have resulted in ideas about place, and time-space, which are prevalent in the academy, being under-considered in the school subject (see Hammond, 2019). In addition, Hirschian conceptualisations of knowledge in schools and educational policy in England can be seen as separating knowledge from concepts. When concepts are viewed as the grammar of geography (see also section 2.3.3), their value is highlighted as they can be seen as connecting seemingly disparate areas of the subject and/or discipline (Lambert, 2017). In addition, they are pivotal in considering the relationships between everyday life and academic thought in geography, as the stories people tell, influence and shape, shared imaginations, which in turn shape time-space and place.

Drawing on the work of Young and Muller (2010; 2014), Lambert (2017: 20) argues that schools ‘introduce students to the world as an ‘object of thought’’. For him, this offers children new ways of thinking about the world, which take them beyond, and/or helps them to think about world as a place of experience in different ways. As everyday life is a significant area of research and debate in geography, the school subject can, and often does, examine everyday life (see Roberts, 2017; chapter 1). Considering, and using, the concepts of place, space and time, can be enabling to young people in helping them to situate (their own) lives and geographies, and also in thinking about, and analysing, the world in different ways. For example, if teachers were to use academic thought about place (see for example, Jackson, 2006;
Cresswell, 2008; 2013; Lambert, 2017) in their curriculum making to develop children’s knowledge of London, they would likely consider:

- Its location on the Earth’s surface;
- Its physical, and human, characteristics;
- Its history(s);
- People(s) individual, and shared, imaginations of London.

Analysis of the young people’s narratives in this research clearly shows, that despite concepts being removed from the most recent version of the national curriculum (see DfE, 2014; section 2.3), they are aware of, and have an interest in, London as a place. Put another way, place is part of their everyday life and they seem to be seeking to understand it through discussion and narratives. Although it can be said that they do not always have the academic language or knowledge to examine their ideas further, they are discussing London through ideas about place. For example, they share their imaginations of areas of the city (e.g. Little Punjab and China Town), and consider how London’s history(s) of migration has made it a multi-cultural place, which in turn they compare to other places.

However, analysis also shows that their world of experience is often populated with feelings of a friction of distance to some people(s), and places, due to variations within London. Using ‘powerful knowledge’ about place to think about where London is located, why people have moved there, how it has changed through migration, and how different people(s) experience the city differently, has the potential to enable young people to think about London as an object of thought and to situate their experiences. These ideas can be seen to be helpful in enacting a GeoCapabilities approach (see sections 2.2.4a and 4.6). For example, increased knowledge of the ‘children we teach’ can support teachers in considering ‘why teach geography in this day and age?’ and questions of curriculum and pedagogy.

Furthermore, exploring feelings of exclusion and social distance, are pertinent areas of consideration for school geography. I do not suggest that school geography can solve society’s problems, or that it should be one dimensional, and/or explicitly or implicitly political. However, I argue that knowledge about space, time and place, and
how the production of space can lead to inequality, has the potential to be enabling. This is because to have knowledge about something, enables a person to engage with, and contribute to, debates and ideas about this, that they otherwise may have not been able to do. This can be conceptualised as type four powerful knowledge (see Maude, 2016).

Finally, it’s worthy of note that a place cannot be separated from time-space (see sections 2.1, 2.3 and 4.6). Both time and space are integral to geographical thought about place. Through the use of narratives, and the production of space as the conceptual framework of analysis, this research has shown that in telling their stories about London, the young people are, in part, reproducing the city as they make-meaning. Exploring these ideas with children, through knowledge about the social production of space, can enable them to think about their relationships to the city, and the world, in different ways. As beings, we shape, and are shaped by, the world. This in itself can be seen as philosophically enabling, and it is an idea that has thus far been under-considered in geography education.

I now move on to conclude this chapter in section 5.5.

5.5 Conclusion

In this chapter, I have examined the narratives of the young people analysed as relating to turf and territory. I have shown that the young people in this study conceptualise London as being divided into distinct territories, with distinct social rules existing in different places and spaces within the city. The young people also expressed a perception that these rules affect different people(s) differently. Furthermore, analysis has shown that the young peoples’ imagination of territory within London is mainly linked to ethnic groups occupying specific areas, and gangs appropriating and dominating places. The young people’s narratives also highlight that their (sometimes shared) imagination of London as a city of territories, has affected their spatial practices, their parents parenting and also how they interact with other people(s) in the city.
Building on arguments developed in section 4.6, using Maude’s (2016) typology, I have shown how these findings can be enabling to geography’s teachers and students. In doing so, I have also set out how the geographical concepts of place and time-space could be further considered in school geography. I argue that this can be enabling to children, and support them in thinking about the complex, and multifaceted, social geographies of territory and turf that are a part of their lives and this world. Furthermore, a deeper understanding of the production of space can support children in understanding themselves as beings that are both shaped by, and shape, place and time-space. The value of this lies in empowering young people as social actors who are more able to make informed contributions to debates in their lives and futures.

I now move on to the final findings chapter (chapter six), which examines young people’s narratives coded as London being conceptualised as a place of opportunity and hope, as well as a place of inequality and injustice.
6. Chapter six: London as a place of opportunity of hope, as well as a place of inequality and injustice

Chapter six is the final findings chapter. It examines the theme of experiences and imaginations of London, specifically focussing on the construction and representation of London by the young people in this study as a place of opportunity and hope, but also as a place of inequality and injustice. The theme has been divided into two sub themes, which were identified during analysis:

- Education (section 6.1)
- London as home (section 6.2)

Whilst these themes are examined in different sections, links and relationships between them, and other findings, are highlighted and considered throughout.

The chapter follows the same structure as chapters four and five, with each section beginning with an academic introduction to the sub theme. This is because the participants in the research were encouraged to share their geographies and voices, and as a researcher, I could not predict their areas of discussion. Following this, each section examines the young people’s narratives analysed as relating to the theme. In doing so, I critically consider the relationships, and differences, between individual and shared narratives throughout.

The chapter begins by introducing education as an area of geographical consideration in section 6.1.

6.1 Education

‘Education is still widely seen as a liberating force – not least by children in poorer countries who are denied access to it. But all too often students experience school as a place that constricts and controls rather than inspires’

(Unwin and Yandell, 2016: 13).

This quote from Unwin and Yandell expresses a clash between ideologies, and enacted experiences, of education. As examined at the very start of this thesis (see
chapter 1), and in section 2.2.5, both philosophies and experiences of education vary from being nurturing and enabling, to oppressive and constrictive. Young and Muller (2016) suggest that this is reflective of historical tensions over the purpose of schooling, which can be conceptualised as broadly varying between philosophies of emancipation and domination. Arguing further that major tensions including ‘who gets schooling?’ and ‘what do they get?’ (p108) have also influenced educational policy, research and children’s experiences of education.

In England, the answer to who gets education is answered, at least in part, by governmental policy and law; with a free state education being provided / offered to all children between the ages of five and sixteen (see also section 2.2.5). However, there is disparity in both access to, and the quality of, education. Put another way, there are geographies of education (see section 2.2.4b). For example, a person’s social and economic background, as well as their parents/careers socio-cultural and political beliefs, and the types of school / education available to them locally, can all impact on the type of education a child receives. These cultural geographies can result in exclusion, marginalisation and social differences (Mills and Kraftl, 2016), as well as influencing children as what Finn (2016) terms ‘beings and becomings’.

On his grid of spatial practices, Harvey (1990) uses the term ‘exclusive communities’ to represent that some services, ideas and/or communities, are only accessible to some people(s). When considered in relation to education, the idea of an exclusive community can be seen to represent a group of people who can access education, or who have achieved a certain level of education which enables them to access different services, communities and ideas. In England, access to exclusive communities through education could be conceptualised, and represented, as a (young) person achieving qualifications (for example, GCSEs, A levels or a degree), which allow them to move on to further education and (potentially) access different jobs. These exclusive communities could be seen as being representative of some of the extrinsic aims of education. With ideas such as the GeoCapabilities approach (see section 2.2.4a) focussing more on the intrinsic value of a geographical education, and the value of geography to a person’s education and the development of the educated person.
Before moving on to introduce the narratives of the young people analysed as relating to education, I introduce the school they attended, which is also the place where the data collection took place (see chapter three). The school is an 11-19 mixed comprehensive school in West London. At the time of data collection, it had just over 1000 pupils on role, and was deemed ‘requires improvement’ by Ofsted following a recent inspection. The school had been previously judged as ‘outstanding’ by Ofsted, but changes in the head teacher between the inspections were often considered by the students, at least in this research, as having a detrimental impact on the school.

I now move on to share the narratives of the young people coded as relating to education in section 6.1.1.

6.1.1 Narratives of education

All of the young people in the study shared narratives that were analysed as relating to education. This is unsurprising given the centrality of schooling to children’s everyday lives and spatial practices, and also its socio-cultural roles in society (see section 2.2.5). This research shows that the young people in the study conceptualise education as both an area of opportunity and hope, but also a space of inequality and injustice.

Figure thirty shows the narratives of the young people mapped on to Harvey’s (1990) grid of spatial practices, with the terms used in the grid defined below.
Figure 30: Narratives of education mapped on to Harvey’s grid of spatial practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Accessibility and distanciation</th>
<th>Appropriation and use of space</th>
<th>Domination and control of space</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Material spatial practices</strong></td>
<td>Social hierarchies (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Exclusive communities – education (2) Social control and education (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Representation of space</strong></td>
<td>Personal space (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spaces of representation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. **Social hierarchies** refers to social structures which affect if, and how, a person feels social distance from different groups. These can be formalised within a society, or informally constructed, they also regularly change and evolve as space is contested;

2. **Exclusive communities – education** refers to access to education and also to the communities that education affords access to (for example, GCSEs enable access to the next level of education and certain jobs);

3. **Social control and education** refers to dominant groups constructing education in certain ways to ensure the reproduction of space, and societies, in ways which benefit themselves;

4. **Personal space** reflects the young people’s discussions of ideas and values they hold about education and also considers if/ how these value relate to wider society.

As stated above, all of the young people in the research discuss education. They refer to the opportunities it affords them both now (for example, through school trips), and in the future (for example, access to jobs). In addition, the young people also consider if, and how, the education system impacts upon their lives and futures. In this section, I begin by examining the young people’s responses to a question I asked
as to whether they perceived that they have received a good education. Tilly was the first person to respond to this question, stating:

*Tilly: we get more than any other country in the world. Here, I think, they actually understand that the people who are going to be ruling over the country are children, so they of course want us to succeed. And, I think they've realized now, that it doesn’t matter which background that you’ve come from, it just matters what you have to give.*

Tilly’s narratives can be read as her feeling that she is afforded opportunities and privileges from a free state education, and that she perceives that the government believe in people(s) from different backgrounds being afforded the same chances in England. Her narratives can be interpreted as having a strong social justice foci. For example, Tilly states that she is glad to attend ‘*a really multi-cultural school, everyone is accepted*’, explaining that she feels that in private schools there would be more competition related to a person’s social and material status. This can be read as Tilly believing in the inclusion of all people(s). It also relates to narratives of identity and inclusion (see chapter four), and London as ‘world city’ with different ethnic groups (see sections 2.3.2 and 5.2) and social hierarchies. Furthermore, this narrative could be interpreted as Tilly being aware of geographies of education at an international scale, and expressing that she wishes to be in a multicultural environment in which all people(s) are included.

All members in the group echo the perception that England’s education system is comparatively strong. Jack shares that, along with the English language, the education system was a primary reason why his father moved their family to England. In the narrative below, Jack expresses that he believes the main purpose of education is to gain qualifications such as GCSEs:

*Jack: yeah, without GCSE’s you can’t get a job, that’s the main test! If you fail that, you fail your life!*

*Researcher: Is education about anything else, though?*
Jack: no, it’s not, it’s just your GCSE’s. The reason we come to school, is to pass our GCSEs. If we don’t pass our GCSE’s, then about 11, maybe even 13, years of our lives have been wasted.

Jack’s comments can be read as reflecting a view that GCSEs are both a currency to wider employment and the purpose of schooling. To him, GCSEs can be conceptualised as a currency that show that you are a member of the exclusive community, educated to that level.

In the narrative above, I play ‘devil’s advocate’, questioning Jack about whether education is about other things. In his response, Jack expresses a perception that his entire schooling leads up to these exams. Jack’s narratives can be seen to reflect a focus on the extrinsic aims of education and standards, in which GCSEs can be conceptualised as a key indicator in England (Ball et al, 2012; Finn, 2016). Although GCSEs were introduced with the aim to recognise positive achievement of students (Biddulph et al., 2015), there have been challenges in how they are used. These include, affecting the emotional wellbeing of teachers and students, encouraging a focus on performance over learning and the use of out-of-date assessment practices (Biddulph et al., 2015; Mitchell and Lambert, 2015).

However, Jack’s narratives show that GCSEs are significant to him. He expresses that his father is his inspiration for working hard to gain his GCSEs. Jack shares that his father previously worked as a security guard, but when he tried to get a different job in a factory, he was unable to access the recruitment tests due to his English and education levels. Following this, Jack states that he feels that employers are only going to ‘employ people who did good in their GCSEs’. Further to this, Tilly and Rachel also express a shared perception that pressure to achieve ‘good’ grades in qualifications such as GCSEs affects both the education system and teaching. For example, when discussing setting in schools, Tilly states ‘once it hits year 9, 10 and 11, they only focus on the top sets’. This narrative can be interpreted as Tilly showing some awareness of the accountability and performativity pressures, and agendas, which presently exist in schools in England (see also chapter 1). For Tilly, this agenda has a human, and social, impact on children, and whether they feel supported in their education.
Rachel’s narratives can be read as her echoing Tilly’s concerns about the impact of an accountability culture in education. For example, she states ‘I think the education system has messed us up, and it’s so depressing, it’s true, the education has messed up completely’ before noting ‘we’re only learning now, what we were supposed to learn last year!’ This narrative can be seen as Rachel, to some extent, having a Hirschian (see Hirsch, 2007; 2016) view of knowledge and education, in which students have to learn content to be repeated for an exam. Further to this, Rachel appears to perceive that a banking model (see Freire, 1970; section 2.2.5) will support her in achieving success in her education. Despite their concerns about the system, both Tilly and Rachel state that they love education. In addition, Rachel echoes Tilly in stating that she’d rather attend a state school than a private one, as she feels people(s) are more accepted.

All members of the group show awareness of social hierarchies and geographies of education. This varies from comparing education in England to other nations, to considering geographies of education at a local scale. For example, when considering international variation in education, Rachel states ‘and black people are in like slums and stuff, therefore they can’t get a proper education, so they can’t get where they would like to be’. This view on education, which can conceptualised as education affording opportunities in life and society, is fundamental to many of Rachel’s narratives. It can also be interpreted, as being is reflective of how she constructs, and represents, people(s) and places through social hierarchies. In this case, it leads to an out-dated representation of ethnicity by Rachel, specifically black people(s) being ‘poor’ and a homogenous people.

As introduced above, Rachel’s narratives often express that she believes that education can enable her access to a better life and career. She talks regularly about gangs in her area and the challenges her community faces (see also section 5.2). This seems to motivate her to want to leave the area, and she sees education as a route out. For example, she states ‘instead of being violated and shouting and going against the government… (I’ll) work inside the system, use my mind, get my head into the book, get a good education, get some money and get a good job’. Rachel goes on to express that those who have dreams of success (she gives the example of herself
wanting to become a lawyer), but who hang out on street corners, are ‘just defeatist’.
This narrative can be read as Rachel perceiving that England provides educational opportunities, but that people have to make decisions as individuals as to if, and how, they engage with education. It can be seen as showing a perception that there are personal, as well as societal, responsibilities in regards to education and as representative of neoliberal thinking (see sections 2.2.5 and 2.3.2).

Rachel expresses that she feels success can come from gaining access to an education system, and the jobs and money she feels it will bring. Like Jack, Rachel’s family are very eager for her to do well in school and get a good formal education. Also similarly to Jack, it is her father that pushes this. She notes that her father tells her that she should ‘throw mental bricks, stick your head in the books, learn something, get to that rank where you have a say in it, and if that doesn’t work, try again, until you get what you want’. However, Rachel’s narratives also show that she feels pressure related to accessing exclusive communities through education. For example, when discussing GCSEs, she states ‘there is so much emphasis on GSCEs now!’ This can be interpreted as Rachel perceiving that within school x, and potentially in society more broadly, there is a substantial focus on attainment in national exams as part of the educational system.

These narratives could be seen as relating to accountability, as a grand narrative of our time, in education (see for example, Mitchell and Lambert, 2015; see also chapter 1). These pressures affect the curriculum that is made, as well as student-teacher relationships (see Freire, 1970; Giddens, 2017). Perhaps related to this, Rachel expresses concern that in some subjects she regularly has supply teachers, and states that she feels that this is problematic for her education ‘especially with geography, because we only have it once a week’. This could be seen as representative of societal challenges in recruiting and retaining (geography) teachers in England at present.

Much like Jack and Rachel, Jessica expresses a perception that there is a focus on national examinations in the school system. In the narrative below, Jessica is responding to the question ‘how do you feel about London, Jessica?’
Jessica: it’s good. Like you have a lot of opportunities, more than other countries and stuff. But like, mostly, like your, say like our generation basically, it depends on our grades and stuff. If we don’t get good grades, you can’t be what you wanna be. But like, in America or something, if you get bad grades you have to stay in that year. If you went to America, you would learn, you would still learn, even if you was 21 and you was in year 7

Researcher: do you think that would be better here?

Jessica: yes, because people would know, they’d think ‘oh okay, I better start putting my head down because I don’t wanna stay in year 7, until like I’m 18’. Cuz that’s what Mr Lawrence was telling us, and it’s actually a really good example, because, yeah they should bring it to London.

Jessica’s comments suggest that whilst she feels that London has multiple opportunities, access to them is often through currency related to grades at school. Jessica compares London positively to other places (e.g. it offers opportunities), but also negatively (e.g. in regards to the American system and student engagement in education). Further to this, she shares that she learnt about the American system from a teacher within the school, and her narratives suggest that she feels it would be useful to apply certain educational practices from America in London.

Jessica also shares further narratives related to the importance of education. She uses the example of her cousin, who she states ‘got kicked out of school’ and went to a local Pupil Referral Unit (PRU), noting that ‘some people just don’t give people a chance’. This can again be read as the young people expressing ideas, and experiences, of social hierarchies and geographies of education. In one narrative, Jessica discusses the causes and impacts of not accessing mainstream schooling with Alex:

Jessica: yes schools for bad kids, a referral unit, and most of the kids that go to (referral unit x) won’t get a job, like as a politician or anything like that. Yeah maybe I’m being stereotypical, but no one really wants a child, who has a bad attitude and a temper and stuff, and got kicked out of school, ata 13. Sometimes people have to understand, their backgrounds, what they were
brought up with, and that they will probably going through a hard time. And yet they have no right to bring into school, and to take it out another people, but some people just don't understand, if you get what I’, trying to say?

Alex: this also like, some people struggle to focus in class

Jessica: but some of it is their fault if you get what I’m trying to say

Alex: yes there is probably their fault, but if you can’t focus, then you get bad grades, and then you can’t get a job. But there’s the more people, no offence, like raping girls, and raping young children, then knife crimes.

This narrative shows Jessica and Alex considering the causes of lack of access to formal (mainstream) education, suggesting it’s often the result of a combination of social factors and personal choice. Alex also reflects that not engaging with education, and exclusive communities that it can provide access to, can result in a person living a challenging life. An idea which he expresses through the use of the extreme examples of knife crime and sexual violence. These narratives are echoed in the young people’s discussions of the reasons young people join gangs (see section 5.2).

When discussing GCSEs, Alex compares school x with another local school. He argues that the local school is better as ‘you have more time to do your GCSEs there. They get their GCSE choices in year 8, you have more time to learn, and also they actually care about their GCSEs because they do their homework’. His narratives can be seen to reflect both a perception that the purpose of schooling is to achieve examination results, and also a desire for the curriculum to be structured in a way that enables him to achieve this. This can again be interpreted as the young people expressing a Hirschian view of knowledge. Their desire for this can be seen as emerging from the pressure to gain GCSEs, and ultimately access exclusive communities.

As well as opportunities, the group also share narratives related to education as a form of social control, which often shares and expresses the views of dominant peoples and groups. Rachel considers this in regards to learning History, when she states ‘History is interesting, but it’s written by the people who conquered, rather than the people who were conquered’. Rachel’s narrative can be seen to represent a
perception that the curriculum, and the discipline that is used to inform it, is often constructed by those in positions of power.

However, Tilly suggests that she perceives that the education system itself is a form of social control and an experiment, stating:

*Tilly: ever since that we were born, we were, or I know I am, a social experiment. Because I've got this thing, because, like, you we're born in the 21st-century so they can do surveys on you to see how you're moving on, and that is I that there we're like an experiment. They're are also practising the iGCSE’s on us, and they've been testing out all of the changes in the education system on us. They just want to see if we are getting better or not, but I don't think it's fair. Especially because education is meant to be, like, it's meant to nourish you, and you're meant like enjoy it, but how can you enjoy it, if they just change everything every single second.*

Tilly's narratives can be seen as her contrasting what she feels is the purpose of education, which for her can be conceptualised as enjoyment and nourishment, with what the reality of her experiences of education are. Her narratives suggests she perceives a sense of injustice for her, and her generation, born from continual changes to educational policy and practice.

The group discuss whose responsibility their education is, with Rachel arguing 'the government has messed us up!' and Tilly agreeing, stating it’s not the schools fault as they have to teach within systems. In addition, the group show awareness of the school’s recent poor Ofsted inspection, with Jack expressing that he feels that the school is bad. Alex states that this perception is unjust as the teachers work hard to plan their lessons, but also notes that ‘some teachers just can’t be bothered as some students just get excluded’. These debates can be read as being reflective of the young people acknowledging that Ofsted have labelled the school as being problematic, and them trying to unpick the causes of this judgement.

Thus far in this section, I have examined the young people’s narratives related to education in schools. However, schools offer more than education, and all of the group discuss the social opportunities that their school offers. For example, Tilly
regularly takes part in extra-curricular activities and talks about her engagement with
the arts through school plays (referencing ‘Little Red Riding Hood’, ‘Two Tribes’ and
‘Bugsy Mallone’). Tilly also shares that in primary school a ‘couple of people were
chosen to play the flute and we performed it to loads of people’ (at the Lyric Theatre).
This opportunity provided Tilly with access to a space famous for the arts, which
arguably she may not have had access to it if it wasn’t for her schooling.

One school visit that Tilly appears especially passionate about, is a trip to Cornwall.
Both Tilly and Rachel went on the trip, and she explains:

  Tilly: I’ve got Cornwall, like. The reason why I like Cornwall so much is because
  it was for free

  Rachel: Oh yeah we went for free! Last minute.com they came up to us in an
  exam

  Tilly: In an exam, in the middle of our history exam

  Rachel: I done so well on my history exam

  Tilly: I did so well too. During our exams, and we were all like ‘ooo I’ve got to do
  our exams’ and half way through Mr Brian just called us out and said ‘you can
go to Cornwall now’ and I was like ‘yay’ (Rachel says ‘yay’ too). So we went
  back, and finished our exams, and like I did really well on my exams so I was
  happy.

Much like Tilly, Rachel and Jessica, Alex appreciates the extra-curricular opportunities
that the school offers. He notes that, along with Rachel, he attends two school clubs.
He has also been in the school play ‘Two Tribes’ with others in the group and has also
been to Wembley Arena for a concert for a teacher’s leaving party with other
students, as well as on a boat from Westminster to Greenwich with the school.

Whilst the young people have individual narratives related to education as a space of
opportunity and hope, as well as inequality and injustice, the following shared
themes were identified during analysis:

  - GCSEs are currency which enable you to access ‘exclusive communities’;
The extracurricular aspects of education are much valued; these narratives are shown in figure thirty one.

**Figure 31: Shared and individual narratives of education**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Young person</th>
<th>Key points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Jack         | o Setting classes and its impact (1) (3)  
                   o Focus on national examinations (2)     
                   o Family influence their attitude to education (4)  
                   o Ofsted and school grading and assessment (4)  
                   o Comparison of education in different places (1)  
                   o Trips and extra-curricular activities (2)  |
| Rachel       | o Focus on national examinations (2)  
                   o Their family and education (4)  
                   o Ofsted and school grading and assessment (1)  
                   o Comparison of education in different places (1)  
                   o Trips and extra-curricular activities (2)  
                   o Social control and education through curricula (3)  |
| Jessica      | o Focus on national examinations (2)  
                   o Their family and education (4)  
                   o Ofsted and school grading and assessment (4)  
                   o Comparison of education in different places (2)  
                   o Trips and extra-curricular activities (2)  |
| Tilly        | o Setting classes and its impact (1)  
                   o Focus on national examinations (2)  
                   o Ofsted and school grading and assessment (2)  
                   o Comparison of education in different places (2)  
                   o Trips and extra-curricular activities (2)  |
I now move on to examine the young people’s narratives analysed as relating to London as home in section 6.2. Prior to exploring the young people’s narratives, I introduce home as an area of academic interest.

### 6.2 London as home

Home is a concept with multiple meanings in both everyday life and in geography. In everyday life, discussion of home can refer to the physical space in which a person lives, the place a person has social ties to and feelings about, or to represent the place where a person was born or has settled. Home is related to identity, memory and social (re)production. Blunt and Varley (2004: 3) define the geographies of home as:

> ‘Both material and symbolic and are located on thresholds between memory and nostalgia for the past, everyday life in the present, and future dreams and fears.’

As spaces we have occupied and we have (re)produced, homes are ‘invested with meaning, emotions, experience and relationships’ (Ibid). The home is a common area of research and discussion in human geography. However, how it has been interpreted and researched has changed vastly from ‘a uniform space of safety and familiarity’ (Brickell, 2012: 225) to a more complex idea. Brickell (2012) draws on Blunt and Dowling (2006) to define the ‘cross-cutting elements of a critical geography of home’.
Home is simultaneously material and imaginative’ – the home as a physical
location, and also ‘an imaginative and metaphorical space of emotion and
belonging’;

The nexus between home, power and identity – ‘ties into debates concerning
the domestic as a locus of personality, belonging and meaning to which
people are differently positioned, and differently experience according to
age, gender, sexuality, ethnicity and class’;

The home as multi-scaler – ‘emphasises the porosity of home as the personal
relations it plays host to transect public and political worlds’ (p225).

Within the context of London in 2014, the home is a significant non-public space in
which social practices are established and reproduced within the city. The role
of private space in the city is important, as neoliberalism has often excluded people(s)
from public spaces such as the street (Harvey, 2013; see also section 2.3.2). Harvey
compares the street today, with the street of his past, stating ‘before the car came
along, however, streets were often a common – a place of popular sociality, a play
space for kids’. These changes in public spaces, have changed spatial practices and
social reproduction, as ‘through their daily activities and struggles, individuals and
social groups create the social world of the city’ (p74).

This section considers the young people’s narratives analysed as relating to London
as home. It builds on the previous section to examine their narratives of London as a
place of opportunity and hope, but also a place of inequality and injustice.

6.2.1 Narratives of London and home

London is the place where the young people live. The narratives coded as relating to
London and home are mapped onto Harvey’s (1990) ‘grid of spatial practices’ in
figure thirty two, with the terms used in the grid being clarified below.
Figure 32: Narratives of London and home mapped on to Harvey’s grid of spatial practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accessible and distanciation</th>
<th>Appropriation and use of space</th>
<th>Domination and control of space</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Material spatial practices</strong></td>
<td>Flows of people (1)</td>
<td>Social space (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Representation of space</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Personal space (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spaces of representation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Geopolitics (5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. **Flows of people** - refers to the movement of people to London through migration;

2. **Social space** – represents recreational and public space;

3. **Crime** – refers to how individuals and groups dominate a space through committing crime;

4. **Personal space** – considers notions of identity and the feelings of belonging to a place;

5. **Geopolitics** – refers to geopolitical issues.

As introduced in section 6.2, notions of home are complex, and whilst London might be the place where a person lives, they may also have multifaceted relationships with other places. Narratives which consider these relationships, are also examined in chapter four, particularly through discussions of religion and identity and the state and oneself (see section 4.2 and 4.4). This section adds to these discussions through considering the notion of belonging. Mee and Wright (2009: 772) argue that ‘belonging is an inherently geographical concept’ and ‘belonging connects matter to place.’

All of the young people in the study express a connection to places other than London through family ties and migration (flows of people). This can be interpreted as London being their physical home (or the place they live), but the young people
having emotional and social connections to other places. In this research, this regularly leads the young people to compare London with other places and also to consider how London has affected, and/or changed, who they are. For example, drawing on her experiences in the narrative below, Rachel considers how place affects a person/people:

Rachel: I think London is really important to me, like, because it’s changed a lot of things about me. For example, erm people here, are different from people in other areas. Like they are different from people in Scotland... But people in London are a bit more like, it’s hard to explain, but they’re like different. But erm, London adapts you to different to situations, and you learn how to live and grow up in a city.

Rachel’s narrative can be read as her considering how growing up, and living in, a multicultural city has affected her identity and who she is. Clearly expressing that she feels she would be different if she lived in another place, noting Scotland as an example (see also section 4.2).

London is a ‘world city’ which has grown through migration and flows of people, and which has a multiplicity of ties to other places in the world (see section 2.3.2; Massey, 2008). As noted in sections 2.3.2 and 6.1, London attracts people to it. Tilly considers this when expressing London is a ‘serious and economical place’ explaining ‘you go there for education, you go there for work, you get your money there, and then you leave’. This narrative suggests that Tilly perceives that London is a transitory place, which people go to gain social and economic benefits. However, her narratives also suggests she does not perceive it as a homely place, or somewhere she wishes to remain and that she perceives this to be a wider social imagination and pattern.

The young people attend school in West London (see also section 6.1), and when the group discuss the area, their narratives show awareness of inequality. They discuss demographics, noting that there is a lot of young people and single mums in the area, as well as socio-economic issues, such as not many people working. Jack describes it as ‘it’s not a poor place, yeah, but it’s not a place to make a private school, because no one will come to it, because loads of people here are on benefits, I’m not trying to be rude’. Tilly and Jessica express that they perceive lot of people who live there have
just moved to England or have lost their jobs. These narratives suggest they perceive it to be a transitory place that experiences both social, and economic, challenges.

However despite these challenges, all of the group express that they like the area. Tilly sheds light on to her perception of the locality when she states ‘they’re all in the same situation’ and ‘no one is rich and no one is poor’. This can be interpreted as Tilly perceiving that when there is economic inequality in an area, and between people(s), it leads to social stigma and judgement. It can be conceptualised as Tilly feeling more comfortable being in, and around, her own milieu, and what is known and experientially understood.

All of the young people in the study highlight crime as a problem in London. Some of the narratives related to this are examined in discussions about gang’s (see section 5.2). However, it is worthy of note that Jessica, Rachel and Alex all express that they have witnessed crime, with Rachel and Alex stating they have witnessed violent crime. In the narrative below, Alex tells the story of a man who died in his stairwell after being stabbed:

Alex: and I used to live on an estate, in Fulham

Researcher: why don't you like Fulham? You have an unhappy face there

Alex: because there's too much crime, and there's loads of arguments

Researcher: what sort of crime?

Alex: fighting, stabbing and yeah

Researcher: if that stuff that you have seen or just heard about on the news?

Alex: nah, I’ve seen it because they do it in my block. Once there was a man dead on the staircase

Researcher: you saw that, or just heard about it?

Alex: as a man dead in my block.
In addition to crime, Jack raises other challenges of staying safe in London, and he discusses large scale geopolitical issues and terrorist groups such as ISIS, stating that he fears the tube:

*Jack: Basically, yeah, you see ISIS yeah, you know what ISIS is?*

*Researcher: yeah*

*Jack: yeah, the group of terrorists, yeah. They let out, the guy yeah, the main guy, he let out a few people to go to Paris, England and America, and now they’re in the tube yeah, trying to bomb themselves and stuff.*

*Researcher: and where did you get that information from?*

*Jack: from TV Miss, from the media. They found already three people that are in the USA*

*Researcher: and why do you think they’ve done that?*

*Jack: and they’ve found one person in the UK, and they’ve found nine in Paris*

*Researcher: do you feel like that effects where you go, and how you use transport?*

*Jack: yeah, definitely if I take the tube, but I hardly take the tube anyway. Do not take the tube unless you wanna get bombed!*

*Researcher: I’ve got to get the tube home....*

*Rachel: hahaha*

*Jack: take the bus*

*Researcher: taking the bus, would take me all day. Right Tilly, carry on*

*Rachel: that is so funny.*

In the narrative, when expressing a fear of using the tube, Jack explains that he is concerned about bombings by terrorist groups. Terrorism is a large-scale geopolitical issue, which has affected everyday geographies in London in the past (for example, in the 7/7 attack in 2007 and the London Bridge attacks in 2017).
These narratives are worthy of examination as Pain (2014: 232) has argued that representations and geographical studies of terrorism have paid ‘relatively little empirical attention to the experiential, emotional and everyday dimensions of global terrorism’. Before going on to note that this is contrary to the fact that global/distant events may have a bearing on every day and emotional geographies. Pain et al. (2010) argue that young people have often been marginal in research on the impacts of geopolitics. They posit, ‘relatively little is known about their views, feelings and political senses in relation to geopolitical events’ (p794). Jack’s narratives suggest that his fear of terrorism is so great, that he does not use the tube and encourages others not to do so. In addition, Jack also talks about America, which he states is more dangerous at night than London. America is an interesting region for Jack, as he feels that it is often (unfairly) represented positively (e.g. in relation to Nagasaki and Hiroshima). These historical representations of a place, may perhaps seem quite distant from his daily geographies and the discussion of terrorism, however, they imply that he has a complex and sometimes negative view of ‘The West’.

In this section, I have examined young people’s narratives of London and home, and considered their perceptions of its opportunities and challenges. Although some of the narratives are individual, several shared themes were identified through analysis:

- The young people have a sense of belonging to places other than London
- White City is recognised as having social and economic challenges
- The young people value London’s entertainment industries and public spaces

Individual and shared narratives are noted on figure thirty three.

Figure 33: Shared and individual narratives of London and home

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Young person</th>
<th>Key points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jack</td>
<td>A sense of belonging to places other than where they live (1) (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identifies with West London (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discusses migration and identities links to other peoples and places (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fear of terrorism in London (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identifies with West London (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White City is recognised as having social and economic challenges (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Values public space and entertainment in London (2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rachel</th>
<th>Has witnessed crime (3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identifies with West London (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A sense of belonging to places other than where they live (1) (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White City is recognised as having social and economic challenges (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Values public space and entertainment in London (2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jessica</th>
<th>Has witnessed crime (3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identifies with West London (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A sense of belonging to places other than where they live (1) (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White City is recognised as having social and economic challenges (2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tilly</th>
<th>Identifies with West London (4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A sense of belonging to places other than where they live (1) (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White City is recognised as having social and economic challenges (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Values public space and entertainment in London (2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alex</th>
<th>Has witnessed crime (3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identifies with West London (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A sense of belonging to places other than where they live (1) (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Values public space and entertainment in London (2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I now move on to examine how, and why, these ideas are of value to geography education in schools in section 6.3.

6.3 The value of these findings to geography education

Building on sections 4.6 and 5.4, this section examines how children’s geographies are of value to geography education in schools (as per RQ3). It does not repeat the findings, and ideas, shared in previous sections, but adds to them, before they are drawn together in chapter seven. The shared themes identified through analysis of the young people’s narratives in chapter six are compiled in figure thirty four and these are drawn upon to illuminate discussions in this section.

Figure 34: Shared narratives on London as a place of opportunity and hope and inequality and injustice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>London as home</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>o GCSEs are currency which enable you to access ‘exclusive communities’;</td>
<td>o The young people have a sense of belonging to places other than London;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o The extracurricular aspects of education are much valued;</td>
<td>o White City is recognised as having social and economic challenges;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o The young people value London’s entertainment industries and public spaces.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Before I examine how these findings are of value to geography education in schools, I outline the contributions to knowledge made about children’s geographies and imaginations of London. After sharing the overall finding, this section focusses primarily on the theme of education to illuminate discussions because many of the
narratives of home have been considered in chapters four and five. For example, in considering children’s imaginations of, and relationships to, other places.

As represented on figure thirty five, this chapter has shown that the young people in this research perceive London to be a place of opportunity and hope, but also a place of inequality and injustice. For example, the young people share narratives about the opportunities that London affords to them (including education), but also the high crime rates and socio-economic injustice in the city. As has been considered in reference to figures 5, 6, 23 and 29, the use of representation of the relationships between people(s), place and time-space provides a visual illustration as to how people(s) shape, and are shaped by, the city. In the case of this chapter, the young people’s narratives about home can be seen to reflect London as a world city, with a multiplicity of connections to other places and people(s), and also a city of ‘greed and need’ with high levels of inequality.

Figure 35: Young people’s narratives of London and the reciprocal relationships between people(s), place and time-space

This chapter has shown that formal education forms a large part of the young people’s discussions about London. Indeed, they often discuss their own, or their families, hopes and aspirations about education, as well as societal challenges and
geographies of education. For example, the young people discuss their imaginations of geographies of education at local, and global, scales. Analysis has shown that inequality in access to, and provision of, education is a concern to them, both in regards to social justice and in considering what they want, and need, from their own education.

This chapter has also shown that the young people in this study feel that there is a social pressure to access ‘exclusive communities’ (Harvey, 1990) of education. Unsurprisingly due to the age group of the young people in this research, this relates to GCSEs, which analysis shows they conceptualise as a social currency enabling them to access jobs, opportunities and social communities. Furthermore, chapter six has illustrated that the young people perceive that an accountability system related to GCSEs affects both teachers and teaching. For example, the young people express that they perceive that it leads teachers to focus more on GCSE groups than lower years. In addition, it suggests that through their experiences of, and perspectives on, GCSEs, young people are often developing a Hirschian view of knowledge and schooling. Their narratives can be seen to reflect a desire to receive a banking model (Freire, 1970) of education to ensure they are able to access their GCSEs and exclusive communities. These perspectives do not consider ideas about powerful knowledge or developing capabilities through (geography) education, which are currently areas of debate in the academy (see section 2.2.4a).

This raises significant questions for geography education and geography teachers. For example, in considering how geography education can be powerful, and enabling, to a young person, teachers need to consider the child’s perspective, and desires, as well as research and literature in geography education. In considering ‘who are the children we teach?’ (Figure 4) there is value in the teacher considering both their children’s experiences of, and hopes about, education, not only to support them in working towards their goals, but also to introduce to them, and explore with them, other ways other ways of viewing both education and the world. This could be conceptualised as providing students with knowledge that gives students some power over their own knowledge (type three from Maude’s (2016) typology). Building on section 4.6, I argue that reciprocal student-teacher dialogue is significant
in this process. For example, if a young person shares that they perceive the only point in schooling is to gain their GCSEs, the teacher might engage with them in a discussion about how education, and geography education, can enable them to think about the world in new ways and contribute to debates in society (type one and four of Maude’s (2016) typology respectively).

In addition to attending school to gain qualifications, this chapter has shown that the young people in the study greatly value the extra-curricular aspects of their schooling. These include being involved in school plays and going on school trips. Although, fieldwork has clear relationships to disciplinary thought in geography (see for example, Geographical Association, 2009; Biddulph et al., 2016; Lambert and Reiss, 2016; Hammond, 2018) and the same can be said about school plays and English and Drama, this raises questions about the functions of schools beyond gaining access to ‘powerful knowledge’. These questions include if, and how, the social functions of schooling should be explored, constructed and (potentially) celebrated in debates on powerful knowledge; and how (geography) education should include, and empower, young people in these debates and discussions. These questions are especially pertinent given that the young people did not connect the extra-curricular elements of schooling to any subject, or their learning, in their narratives.

At present, these debates have largely been omitted from discussions on powerful knowledge. However, schools serve societal functions beyond the teaching and learning of subjects (Aitken, 1994; Giddens, 2016; Morgan, 2019), and although (as outlined in section 5.5) I do not suggest that schools should solve society’s problems, I argue that in considering, and examining, ideas about powerful knowledge, we must also consider what is lost for children if these other functions of education and schooling are omitted from these discussions. This is also a matter of social justice, as children come from diverse socio-cultural, and economic, backgrounds and do not have equal access to opportunities and resources. Indeed, this research has shown, that education and opportunities are a reason why some of the young people’s families choose to live in England and it’s something the children themselves value.
Put another way, it would be of value for the powerful knowledge debates to also consider how, and why, schooling can be powerful to a child.

I now move on to conclude this chapter in section 6.4.

6.4 conclusions

In this chapter, I have examined young people’s narratives analysed as relating to London as a place of opportunity and hope, and also a place of inequality and injustice. In doing so, I have primarily focussed on the themes of education and London as home. Chapter six has shown that young people are aware of, and engaged in, debates about geographies of education, the purpose of schooling and about inequality and injustice in London. I have argued that this knowledge is of value to geography education in considering how we value young people’s perceptions on, and experiences of, the knowledge debates that are occurring in education at present. Building on arguments in section 4.6 and 5.4, I have shown that these findings are of value to geography education as they can be enabling to geography’s students and teachers alike.
7. Chapter seven: conclusions

In the previous three chapters, I presented the research findings through three themes identified during analysis; identity (chapter four), territory and turf (chapter five) and London as a place of opportunity and hope, and also as a place of inequality and injustice (chapter six). In this chapter, I return to, and address, the research questions as set out in sections 1.3 and 3.3, and I outline how this will be done in section 7.1. In addressing the research questions, I highlight the contributions to knowledge the thesis makes. In addition, as a significant concern of this thesis is also to address borders between different spaces of geographical thought (see sections 1.1, 1.2 and 2.1; figure 1), throughout the conclusion I regularly consider how ideas from the discipline, and everyday life, might be drawn upon and/or used in geography as a school subject. Following this, I outline the significance of the research in section 7.2, before suggesting areas of future research in section 7.3. Finally the thesis is concluded in section 7.4.

7.1 Addressing the research questions

As introduced in chapter one (see section 1.1 and 1.3), and examined as part of the research design in chapter three (see section 3.3), this thesis is an investigation into children’s geographies and their value to geography education in schools. The research enquiry is constructed of three research questions to enable both critical consideration of data, and the production of space as a conceptual framework of analysis, as well as addressing the overarching enquiry:

RQ1 what do young people’s narratives reveal about their geographies and imaginations of London?

RQ2 how can the ‘production of space’ contribute to knowledge of children’s geographies and imaginations of the world?

RQ3 how can geography education use ideas and methodologies from children’s geographies to enhance school geography?
In concluding the thesis, I address the research questions in turn, before returning to the overarching enquiry. I begin by addressing RQ1 in section 7.1.1.

7.1.1 Research question one

This section outlines how the research addressed RQ1 - **what do young people’s narratives reveal about their geographies and imaginations of London?** It begins by setting out how the research addressed this question, before examining some of the strengths and challenges of using of narratives to explore young people’s geographies. After this, it outline how the research has contributed to knowledge about young people’s geographies and imaginations of London.

As introduced, and examined, in the methodology sections (see sections 3.4 and 3.5), the research drew upon Goodson’s (2013) work on life histories to inform the development of a ‘Storytelling and Geography Group’. The use of narrative methodology, and the group context, produced rich data that could be used to analyse the differences between individual experiences and shared narratives. The group nature of the research also enabled the young people to comment on, question, or agree with, one another’s narratives (see for example, the group discussion on Alice Cross in section 4.3.1). This process allowed consideration of how the methodology enabled examination as to how the young people used narratives to convey their geographies and imaginations of the world, but also engage in meaning-making through group discussion. The group context also provided access to children in a relatively unmonitored and unmediated way, thus providing them with an opportunity to speak about their lives and worlds in a way that was not pre-determined by a specific research agenda.

The group context did, however, raise the issue of managing group dynamics. Occasionally the young people would antagonise one another during the Storytelling and Geography Group. For example on one occasion, Jack took Alex’s pen and then Tilly shouted ‘no one can really trust you right now, Jack!’ with Rachel noting this was ‘because he was hungry’. Although before the session, I had been told by a teacher in the school that Jack had started a fight earlier in the day. Furthermore, the group
were mean to Alex on several occasions. For example, Jack commented that a teacher ‘said he’d throw it in the bin’ with reference to some of Alex’s school work, which he had handed in and expressed pride in. Although I was aware that Alex was a quieter member of the group (see section 3.7), the group context meant I had to manage dynamics to support the construction of a respectful environment in which all participants were able, comfortable and empowered to speak.

The group context, dynamics between the young people and my relationships to them (see also sections 3.5 and 3.7), resulted in me sometimes assuming a teacher like role. This was done to try and diffuse situations between the members of the group, and to encourage the participants to listen to, and communicate with, one another with respect. Thus, my previous identity a school geography teacher, and the group nature of the research, sometimes changed the areas, and/or type of, discussions that occurred. This can also be seen as relating to the space the research took place in - the school the young people attended and which I had previously worked in. Giddens (2016: 135) describes modern schools as ‘disciplinary organisations’, as they operate within ‘closed boundaries’ that make possible the strict co-ordination of the students who attend them. As examined in section 2.2.5, schools are often spaces in which cultures of conformity and compliance dominate (Aitken 1994; Freeman and Tranter, 2011), and where adults have distinct power relationships over children.

Attempting to change the dynamic between teacher and student, as I aimed to do in this research (see chapter three), can be difficult. In addition to the examples given above about managing the group dynamics, this is further exemplified by the participants in the study repeatedly calling me ‘Miss’, despite the fact I had requested to be called ‘Lauren’. Significantly for this research, which is an investigation into children’s geographies and value to geography education in schools, this raises questions as to how the teacher constructs their relationships with students when teaching and/or exploring children’s geographies. This research has identified, through the removal of the research show from the methodology (see section 3.5, 3.7 and 4.5), that young people (in this study at least) need to feel comfortable to share their geographies. Those who hold positions of power, and authority, over
children (including teachers) must carefully consider if, and how, their position might affect if, and how, a child shares their geographies. Teachers may also need to consider if, and how, exploring children’s geographies may change their relationships with children, and why this is significant and/or of value. For example, in stimulating reciprocal dialogue to support meaning making (see for example, Roberts, 2013b; Freire, 1970; section 4.6).

Thus far in this section, I have outlined the benefits, and challenges, of narrative methodology in the form of the Storytelling and Geography Group. In addressing RQ1, I now outline the research findings as to what young people’s narratives tell us about their geographies and imaginations of London. Their narratives, and subsequent analysis, has resulted in three overarching themes being identified:

- Firstly, the young people in this research navigate multiple, sometimes contradictory, social spaces when constructing and representing themselves and their identities in London;
- Secondly, the young people in this research imagine London as jigsaw of territories, with distinct social rules existing in different spaces and places in the city;
- Thirdly, London is perceived as a place of opportunity and hope, but also as a place of inequality and injustice by the young people in this study.

These findings were examined in detail chapters four, five and six and I consider their value to geography education in schools, in the conclusions to each of these chapters and in section 7.1.3. I now move on to address RQ2 in section 7.1.2.

7.1.2 Research question two

RQ2 asked **how can the ‘production of space’ contribute to knowledge of children’s geographies and imaginations of the world?** As outlined in section 3.5.3, the production of space has been under-considered in both (school) education and children’s geographies. Examining if, and how, the production of space can be used in exploring children’s geographies, and why this is of value to geography education, thus forms a major element of the contribution to knowledge that this thesis makes.
The production of space, as interpreted by Harvey (1990), and represented in his ‘grid of spatial practices’, was used as the conceptual framework for analysis in the second cycle of coding (see section 3.6.2). Harvey developed the grid to ‘help us to unravel some of the complexity that prevails in the field of contemporary spatial practices’ (p259), in the context of what he describes as ‘capitalist social relations and imperatives’ (ibid.). Although he states that it was not his purpose to set about a systematic review of how people(s) operated within the grid, Harvey also expresses that this type of review would be of both academic, and societal, interest (ibid.).

The value of using the grid of spatial practices as expressed by Harvey (1990), and echoed in my own perspectives, lies in examining the relationships between a person’s everyday geographies and imaginations of the world (including their spatial practices), and the place and time-space they exist within. This is an area that Watts (1992) argues has previously been under examined, and is weak, in geography. For this research, the place and time-space was London in 2014, and the people(s) of interest were young people.

London, as a place and as situated in time-space, is introduced in section 2.3.2. Although grand narratives of London in a neoliberal epoch have been conceptualised, debated and researched in the academy (see for example, Hamnet, 2005; Massey, 2008), how these trends affect children’s geographies has yet to be fully examined. The use of the production of space as a conceptual framework for analysis in this research, alongside the narrative methods used, has enabled young people to share their geographies and imaginations of London. It has also enabled consideration of how young people(s) narratives relate to grand narratives of London. The value of this lies in examining how people(s) are both affected by, and socially produce, space and also in considering the value of the grid of spatial practices in examining these processes.

The reciprocal relationships between people(s), place and time-space were introduced in section 2.3.2, and have been returned to in each of the findings chapters (see sections 4.6, 5.4 and 6.3) when, drawing on the young people’s narratives, I have visually illustrated these relationships (see figures 23, 29 and 35). On figure thirty six, I draw together the overall findings about the young people’s
narratives of their geographies and imaginations of London (see section 7.1.1), and relate them to ideas about London in a neoliberal epoch.

*Figure 36: The reciprocal relationships between people(s), place and time-space (the case study of this research)*

Beginning with the grand narratives identified in section (2.3.2), I now outline the relationships between the young people’s narratives of their geographies and imaginations of London and the place, and time-space, they shape and are shaped by:

- London can be conceptualised as a city of ‘greed and need’ with a high level of inequality. The young people’s narratives can be seen to reflect this imagination of London as they consider inequality between people(s) and places in the city. For example, a shared narrative that was identified in discussions about voice and identity (see section 4.5) is that the young people perceive that some people(s) are able to have more of a voice than others in society. Another shared narrative which reflects this imagination was identified through analysis on the theme of London as home (see section 6.2), is the young people perceiving areas of London to have high levels of inequality;
Massey (2008) conceptualises London as a ‘world city’, which is both culturally diverse and has multiplicity of connections to other places. For Massey these connections (including trade routes, political influences and investments) can be seen as ‘power relations of all sorts that run around the globe and that link the fate of other places to what is done in London’ (p14).

Analysis of the young people’s narratives reveal that they regularly reflect on their own family histories of migration (for example Jack), as well as cultural influences (for example, Rachel’s conversion to Islam), as they consider how London has influenced their identity(s). These influences, and the ever-evolving socio-cultural landscapes of London, mean that the young people have to navigate a variety of physical, and social, spaces in their geographies, and in constructing their own identity(s). Navigating these spaces can be challenging (for example, as expressed in section 4.2 about bullying due to religious identity), but also has advantages (for example, that the young people are able to express who they are in new ways (e.g. via social media);

- London as a ‘city of villages’ and ‘world city’ is reflected in the idea of turf and territory (see chapter five). Analysis shows this theme as being pertinent to the young peoples’ experiences and imaginations of London. Indeed, their narratives show a perception that different people(s) (for example Chinese people(s) in China Town, or Indian people(s) in Southall), appropriate and dominate spaces in London, which in turn the young people navigate and question (see section 5.1);

- Finally, analysis shows that social media is a significant area of interest for the young people in the study. For example, the young people in the study question how it has changed, and enabled, more people(s) to share their voices and lives (e.g. gangs), and also how it has altered and changed representations of sex, sexuality and gender (see sections 5.2 and 4.5 respectively).

It is significant to note, that this is not meant as a ‘crude task’. By this I mean that the relationships between people(s), place and time-space, are not easily identified
and represented. Indeed, both Lefebvre (1991) and Harvey (1990) argue that people(s) move between different spaces (e.g. in Lefebvre’s conceptual triad or Harvey’s grid of spatial practices) with ease and that no dimension of space is independent from another. For example, a person may feel a friction of distance due to the domination of space by a different social group (see sections 2.3.5 and 3.6). An example of this identified through this research, is the young people feeling uncomfortable entering, and/or fascinated by, some areas of London that could be conceptualised as an ethnic enclave (see section 5.3).

Although, using the production of space to analyse the young people(s) narratives is of value for the reasons outlined above, these findings reflect a specific group of young people in a specific place and time-space. Indeed, the participants in this research’s narratives, and my analysis of them, may well be different if we conducted the research today. This is because London has changed, and evolved, and time-space has moved forward. Furthermore, as a ‘being’ I have changed, as have the young people who participated in this research. In addition, the sub disciplines of children’s geographies, and geography education, have also evolved. As such, this research represents a case study allowing in depth examination of the geographies of a specific group, in a specific place and time-space (see section 3.8). I return to discussing the potential for using this research design with other children in other places, and time-spaces, when I suggest areas of future research in section 7.3.

The major challenge I have faced using the production of space as my conceptual framework for analysis, is that the language on Harvey’s grid of spatial practices has not always represented the narratives of the young people in the study. As with all analysis, this has meant that my coding has included a degree of subjectivity (see sections 3.6 and 3.8). To mitigate the impacts of this, I have endeavoured to always be transparent when this has occurred in the findings chapters. For example, stating when narratives can be ‘read as meaning…’ , ‘interpreted as…’ or similar, and defining the language I use on the grid of spatial practices in each of the findings chapters. In addition, I have defended the decisions I have made when addressing questions of rigour (see section 3.8), and I have also shared young people’s own narratives, and language, to try and ensure the story told in this thesis is true to them.
I now move on to address the final research question in 7.1.3.

7.1.3 Research question three

RQ3 asks **how can geography education use ideas and methodologies from children’s geographies to enhance school geography?** Although this question is not considered in the empirical research, it is a fundamental part of the research problem and is addressed through the literature review and considered at the end of each of the findings chapters (see sections 4.6, 5.4 and 6.3). It is a pivotal element of this thesis and the contribution to knowledge it makes. This section examines how the findings from the research, can be uses to address the ‘gaps’ (see Tani, 2011) introduced in section 1.1, which presently affect school geography.

In addressing RQ3, the thesis draws on a case study of data and analysis (see RQ1 and RQ2) as well as the review of the literature, which was used in informing the research design. As is addressed in section 7.3, and is noted in sections 2.2.4a and 2.2.4b, further research is needed to enable a border crossing between the two sub disciplines of geography with the greatest interest in children and young people; children’s geographies and geography education. For example, it is not within the scope of this research to examine the potential benefits, and/or challenges, to children’s geographies of increased research, and knowledge exchange, with geography education. Suggestions for further research are examined in detail in section 7.3.

I now move on to outline what this research shows about the value of children’s geographies to geography education in schools:

1. Firstly, as introduced in section 4.6, children’s geographies can be enabling (see also Maude, 2016) to geography education in schools. This research has shown that it can be enabling to both geography teachers and geography students, and I now address these ideas in turn. Although it is worthy of note, that as examined in section 4.6, teachers and students have relationships with one another, as the curriculum made by the teacher effects children’s learning and relationships with geography and education.
When teachers have knowledge of who they teach, derived from both disciplinary knowledge and interactions with the children, it can enable them to make informed decisions in their curriculum making and in enacting a GeoCapabilities approach, particularly in considering ‘who are the children we teach?’ and ‘why teach geography in this day and age?’ (See sections 4.6, 5.5 and 6.3). This is of value to debates in geography education as whilst children and students are recognised on many models of teaching geography (see chapter one and section 2.2.4a), the relationships between their everyday lives and knowledge, and formal education, are yet to be fully explored. Indeed, the child is often only recognised as a student in educational debates, thus neglecting to consider, and represent, the child as being. Furthermore, questions have been raised as to the extent childhood, children’s geographies, and the relationships between the child and their formal education, are considered in (initial) teacher education (see section 1.2.2). This is significant to note, as it has the potential to impact on a teacher’s ability to make informed decisions in their curriculum making.

The findings, and arguments, put forward in this thesis can support geography teachers in considering how they connecting powerful knowledge to students’ prior knowledge and experiences of the world, to support the student in meaning making in geography. Using Maude’s (2016) typology, I have shown that this has the potential to be enabling to young people. If young people are provided with opportunities to examine their own lives and geographies, and those of others, using powerful geographical knowledge in a space of formal geographical thought, it can enable them to have power over their own lives, and the decisions that they make in their lives and futures.

In this way, the findings of this thesis are of value to geography education, to children and to society more broadly. However, for this knowledge to be enabling to children and society, we require confident and strong geography teachers to support children in their geographical studies. Children’s geographies therefore need to be considered in (initial) teacher education (see also Hammond and McKendrick, 2019).
2. Secondly, this thesis has shown that the young people in this study have an interest in, and complex relationships to, the geographical concepts of place and time-space (see section 5.4). Using the production of space as the conceptual framework for analysis (see sections 2.3.5, 3.6 and 7.1.2) has shown how rich, and varied, young people’s geographies are. Situated in a context in which concepts have been omitted from national curriculum documentation in England (see section 2.3.3) and there is an increasing focus on knowledge in education (this also noted in young people’s narratives on education (see sections 5.4 and 6.1)), this thesis has shown that to fully explore children’s geographies, and address Tani’s (2011) major gaps, there needs to be an increased focus on concepts in school geography education. This is because the concepts of place, and time-space, enable children to think about their everyday lives in different ways. The use of concepts can also enable children to consider themselves as being, as their lives, and the stories they tell, shape time-space and place, just as they are shaped by them. This idea can be seen as philosophically empowering.

3. Thirdly, this thesis has shown that the children are aware of, and interested in, geographies of education and question about the purpose of schooling (see sections 6.1 and 6.3). This knowledge is of value to (geography) educators, and society more broadly, in critically considering how decisions we make about formal education and schooling impact on children’s experiences, and imaginations, of both education and the world. In chapter six, I raise concerns that the accountability culture, that presently exists in school education in England, has resulted in the young people who participated in this research, perceiving that the purpose of education is only to achieve exam results. This in turn has impacted upon their views of knowledge and how schooling should be structured. In countering this concern, I have shown how engaging children in, and with, these debates can be enabling to them through giving them new ways of thinking about the world and education and enabling them to participate in debates (see also Maude, 2016; section 6.3).
Although this thesis does not offer explicit answers on how any of the above should be addressed in practice as this would require further research, it provides arguments, and questions, for consideration in school (geography) education and in society more broadly. It also provides a case study of ideas and approaches which can be used in future research (examined in section 7.3), to further support border crossings between children’s geographies and geography education to address the gaps set out in section 1.1.

I now move on to address the overarching research question in 7.1.4.

7.1.4 Addressing the overarching research question

This thesis is an investigation into children’s geographies and their value to geography education in schools. As has been examined in sections 7.1.1, 7.1.2 and 7.1.3, this research has offered a case study of research that encouraged young people to share their geographies and imaginations of London using narrative research. This approach aimed to empower the young people in the research to direct the discussions in the Storytelling and Geography Group and to consider ideas, and matters, which are significant to them. Analysing their narratives using the production of space as a conceptual framework has shown how rich and varied their geographies are, and how much the young people are engaging with grand narratives, and significant issues, of our time.

This approach has contributed to debates as to how, and why, geography education can cross borders between different spaces of geographical thought to enhance school geography. It has used disciplinary thought on both children’s geographies, and geographical concepts, to develop research which enables young people to share their experiences and imaginations of the world.

In concluding this thesis, I am reminded of Bonnett’s (2003: 58) argument that geography should not be ‘regarded simply as a private academic matter but as a form and result of public knowledge’. His argument resonates with me, and I now use it in addressing the overarching enquiry. The value of children’s geographies to geography education in schools ultimately lies in crossing borders between the
different spaces of geographical thought (section 2.1). Geography as a discipline increasingly questions ‘whose geography?’ it represents people(s) and places, and where appropriate, it advocates for change. School geography can, and should, have a role in this to.

Although education is always political (Catling, 2014), and teachers and geography educators should be mindful of who they teach (e.g. children at different ages), if (school) geography education fails to engage with disciplinary thought on children’s geographies, and/or with children’s own experiences and imaginations of the world, then this carries enormous risks. These risks include; misrepresenting the world as white, male, middle/upper class, ableist and adult; constructing the child as only a student, and disrespecting children’s experiences and imaginations of the world; failing to connect powerful knowledge to children’s everyday knowledge, experiences and imaginations; and leaving geography teachers with little knowledge of children or childhood. This has the potential to result in a banking model of education, which misrepresents the world.

Although this argument is a worst case scenario, I have shown that geography education should consider children’s geographies, as we move forward and work to construct a school geography education that enables, and empowers, our children as informed social actors who have an understanding of the world they exist within and contribute to. This is matter of societal, as well as educational, concern and significance. If geography education in schools does not consider what knowledge might give children power over their own knowledge, and/or enables them to think about their world(s) in different ways, and contribute to debates (see Maude, 2016), this could significantly reduce their capabilities (see Lambert et al., 2015; Uhlenwinkel et al, 2016; Bustin, 2019; see section 2.2.4a). Put another way, geography teachers should draw on disciplinary thought, and the children themselves, in considering ‘who are the children we teach?’ to inform, and support them in curriculum making which informs, and enables, children in their lives and futures.

I now move on to outline the significance of this research in section 7.2, before suggesting opportunities for future research in section 7.3.
7.2 The significance of this research

The gaps that are highlighted by Tani (2011), and which form the basis of the research problem of this thesis, continue to exist. However, this thesis makes a contribution to addressing these gaps, and to children’s geographies, geography education and to debates in education more broadly. It does this through offering a case study which uses disciplinary thought, specifically on children’s geographies and production of space, to better understand children’s geographies, before examining why children’s geographies are of value to geography education in schools (see section 1.4). In this way, it crosses borders between the different spaces of geographical thought introduced in sections 1.1 and 2.1 (see figure 1).

I have shown that crossing borders is significant to geography education, as it can be enabling to geography teachers, in supporting them in making informed decisions in their curriculum making. In addition, I have shown it is also enabling to children, in supporting them in accessing, and using, powerful knowledge to better understand their own lives and geographies, and the lives and geographies of others, to support them in developing as informed and empowered social actors.

I now move on to make suggestions for how this research can be further developed in section 7.3, before concluding the thesis in section 7.4.

7.3 Opportunities to develop this research further

In this section I identify, and outline, suggestions for future areas of research that have been identified through this thesis. I make three suggestions for future research, which have relationships with one another. They are set out in a specific order to allow for the development of further knowledge and debate, before examining the application of theory to practice in educational settings, such as schools. This decision was made with the aim of supporting teachers, and others who work in education, who (as introduced and problematized in chapter one) presently may not have the knowledge or confidence to explore children’s geographies. In addition, as examined in sections 3.5.3, 3.7 and 7.1.1 with reference to the research show, exploring children’s geographies requires the creation of a safe and open space
to empower children, and deal with any challenging issues raised. Those who engage in this work, and research, need to be confident and have the skills to do so.

The three future areas for research I suggest are:

1. Examining children’s geographies through narrative research and the production of space in different places and time-spaces;

2. Examining how children’s geographies have been conceptualised and represented in school education, and understood by those who work in the sector (e.g. geography teachers, Ofsted and policy makers);

3. The application of theory about children’s geographies, to policy and practice in educational settings (e.g. schools) and evaluating this process and resulting practice.

I now examine these suggestions in more detail below.

In section 3.8, I considered the validity, and limitations, of the research design. One of the limitations of this research is its scale and focus. This thesis only examines one group of young people’s geographies, in London, at a specific time. However, it has developed a research design that has resulted in young people sharing their geographies, and the production of space being used to examine relationship(s) between children’s narratives and the place and time-space they exist within.

The first stage of extending this work would be to repeat the research in different places. This might include other young people(s) in London, as well as young people in rural communities and/or young people internationally. It may also include researching children and young people of different ages. The rationale for this lies in enabling, and empowering, more young people to share their geographies and imaginations of the world. This process would also facilitate further testing, and possible refinement, of the research design as developed in this thesis. Furthermore, it would likely result in other suggestions as to the value of children’s geographies to school geography. In addition, this research would also enhance knowledge about how children’s geographies vary between places and across time-space.
The second area for further research lies in collecting data about conceptualisations and representations, of children’s geographies in school education. This would involve considering the curriculum as a ‘multi-layered concept’ (Bidduph et al., 2015). For example, analysing national documents, Ofsted inspections and also decisions teachers make as part of their curriculum making (see Lambert and Morgan, 2010). This process could involve interviews, and discourse, with policy-makers and teacher educators (see also Hammond and McKendrick, 2019), to gain a sense of their understanding of, and practice about, children’s geographies. The value of collecting empirical data in this area, lies in understanding the present educational landscape and borders to exploring children’s geographies, before engaging with suggestion three. This enables the development of a tailored process of the application of ideas to educational practice. It will also enable the results of suggestion three to be analysed with greater clarity.

The final area for further research suggested, is the application of theory about children’s geographies, to practice in educational settings (e.g. schools) and evaluating this process and resulting practice. This is the area of research with the greatest potential impact in crossing borders between the different spaces of geographical thought. However, it is also the area of further research that raises the most ethical issues for consideration. These ethical issues include ensuring that children’s geographies are explored in a supportive and empowering way in school education, and that those involved in this process (e.g. geography teachers) are supported in creating safe and open spaces for children to share their geographies.

Finally, it is also worthy of note, that although this research has argued for a border crossing between children’s geographies and geography education, it has focussed primarily on the benefits of this process to school geography. With Horton et al. (2008), I argue that it would also be of value to further research how children’s geographies could use the ideas and research from geography education. A suggestion for this would be researching children’s perceptions of geography education, and how it connects to their lives, and also their experiences and ideas about geography education (see also sections 2.2.4, 6.1 and 7.1). There is also the
potential for children’s geographers to enhance their social impact, through sharing their research, ideas and methodologies in schools.

In short, there is a wealth of possibilities for future research to be conducted, and debates to be had, and I look forward to being a part of these discussions. I now move on to conclude the thesis in section 7.4.

7.4 Conclusions

In the final chapter of this thesis, I have addressed the research questions, outlined the significance of the research, and set out suggested ideas for future research. My motivation for conducting this research lay in addressing the research problem as set out in section 1.1; I wanted to further examine, and begin to address, the borders between different spaces of geographical thought in regards to children’s geographies (see also section 2.1). My rationale for doing this was to contribute to knowledge, and debates, about how to improve the quality of geography education in schools, and ultimately for children, through enhancing knowledge about children and childhood.

The thesis has shown that children are central to (geography) education, and that education is central to children’s lives. It has also highlighted gaps in knowledge about children and childhood that affect how informed ‘curriculum making’ is in the school subject, and how empowered teachers are to explore children’s geographies. Further to this, it has shown that powerful knowledge on children’s geographies could be used to inform, and enable, children in their lives and futures.

This thesis has made a contribution to knowledge about the existence of borders between children’s geographies and geography education and different spaces of geographical thought. It has also developed arguments as to why, and how, these borders should be crossed. In concluding the thesis, I remain committed to, and excited about, the next stages in this journey.
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## Field notes

### Notes from session one: Thursday 11th September 2014

**Data collected**
- Recorded interview
- Timeline of key events in the young person’s life

**Notes on relationships**
- Are student-teacher relationship developing/continuing? I question whether this is related to:
  - The impacts of modelling activities (a teacher behaviour?);
  - How the participants communicate with me. For example, before the session, I told students that they could refer to me as Lauren, but they continued to called me ‘Miss’;
  - At times I had to ‘manage’ the some of the participants being a little silly. This resulted in my acting like a teacher;
  - Group dynamics were positive, and the participants generally responded to each other, discussing ideas raised.

**To consider for the next meeting**
- I reminded the participants to bring photos in about London/their lives for the next session;
- Try to minimize the development of a student-teacher relationship, to ensure that participants feel comfortable in speaking openly.

**Key themes which emerged from the session**
Notes from session two: Thursday 25th September 2014

- The session begins by reflecting on previous narratives – Jack and Rachel immediately mention gangs.

**Data collected**

- Participants maps of London (for analysis);
- Recorded interview (to be transcribed and coded).

**Notes on relationship(s)**

- Jessica was away due to a cancer research event. I have asked if I can meet her for 45 minutes before the next research group to map her geographies;
- No participants brought photographs or any evidence to the group. This impacted on the idea of triangulating narratives (see Goodson, 2013; sections 3.4 and 3.5.1);
- Jack had a fight just before the research group in one of his lessons (I was told by two separate former colleagues) and he appeared both excited and agitated when he came to the session and was stealing pens. This resulted in
me acting in a teacher like manner and speaking to him about why he was stealing pens;
  o I am still continually referred to as ‘Miss’, and feel that modelling ideas and activities is perpetuating the construction of student-teacher relationships, though this may just be a part of working with young people in a school environment.

To consider for the next meeting
  o Meeting Jessica for a separate session

Key themes from the interview
  o Gangs
  o Family
  o Social space
  o Representation of place (e.g. Camden Town, Shoreditch etc.)
  o Provision for young people
  o Central vs. West London
  o Transport
  o Education
  o Migration and past places
  o Influence of London
  o Gangs
  o Safety and fear

Notes from session three Thursday 9th October 2014
  o A teacher walked in and out of the classroom, and this distracted the research session;
  o Alex and Jessica left earlier in group session;
  o The session started with reflections on the previous session;
  o The young people used the tube map most in their mapping activity;
  o Jessica – had a separate interview.
Data collected

- Individual interview with Jessica first, as she missed the last session – recorded interview (to be transcribed and coded);
- Recorded interview (to be transcribed and coded);
- Annotated maps.

Notes of relationships

- The group begins a discussion as to whether they want to share their narratives with the head teacher and others. This will be returned to in a future session, to enable the participants to make a decision as to whether they would like to hold a research show.

To consider for the next meeting

- Bring images to link to the grand narrative

Key themes from the interview

Jessica

- Social space
- Safety
- Education
- Family
- Representation of place (e.g. Rochdale and London)

Group

- Transport (linked to the tube map)
- Family
- Social space
- Religion
- Education
- Media
- Terrorism
- Fear
Notes from session four (missed session): Thursday 23rd October 2014

The young people were on a school trip and nobody told me

Actions:

Students were on a field trip and nobody told me. As such, I spoke to the head teacher and emailed an assistant head teacher who booked a training room from 2pm for future sessions. The change of time is to try and encourage, and support, all participants in attending. The room had to be changed from a geography classroom to the school training room due to the fact that the sessions are now in the day. They Head of Year offered to collect the participants prior to the sessions, this continues to blur the boundaries between teacher and student and researcher and participants.

Notes from session four (when it occurred on Thursday 6th November 2014)

- Discussion on links to grand narratives of London;
- No participants brought in photographs – the reasons for this were not discussed, but it may be related to access or choice. To reduce potential anxiety in regards to this, I will now remove this from the research process, and bring in items based on the participants narratives where needed for triangulation.

Data collected

- Recorded interview (to be transcribed and coded)

Notes on relationships
Concern about the impacts of the assistant head teacher bringing the participants to the session (it makes it feel more ‘forced’ and potentially feeds into the construction of a teacher-student relationship).

To consider for the next meeting

- Further discuss the option of a research show

Key themes from the interview

- Began talking through images of places and events that students had mentioned. There was a big focus on the ‘West London’ rap
- Bombings (‘7/7’ London terrorist attack)
- Gangs
- Social media
- Social space
- Representation of people and place (rap)
- Religion
- Territoriality
- Media
- Sexuality
- Education and opportunity
- Grand narratives
- Family

Notes from session five: Thursday 20th November 2014

Data collected

- Recorded interview (to be transcribed and coded);
- Large maps of ‘their London’ based on everything they have discussed for a research show.

Notes on relationships

- Discussion of whether they want to share their work in a research show. Jack and Jessica don’t want to share with the head teacher;
Jack stated ‘what happens in East Wing, stays in East wing’, expressing that he doesn’t want to share his story as part of the research show;

Following a discussion on the research show, the group unanimously decide this should not go ahead. This raises questions about the participants’ relationship(s) with the school, as they do not want the majority of teachers to attend. It also raises questions about how to create a space for young people to share their geographies (they all stated they were happy to continue to attend the group).

Key themes from the interview

- Authority
- Education
- Territory
- London
- Social space
- Young people
- Class and social support and opportunity
- Migration
- Representation of place
- Family
- Identity
- Media
- Gangs
- Sexuality

Notes from session six Thursday 27th November 2014

Data collected

- Recorded interview (to be transcribed and coded)

Key themes from the interview

- Education
- Social space
| Authority |
| Religion |
| Identity |
| Family |
| Media |
| Middle East |
| Migration |
| Territory |
| Royalty |
| Sexuality |
| Britishness |

**Storytelling and Geography Group – research show Thursday 11th December 2014**

Note: This did not occur following a unanimous decision from the group in session five.