

A Participatory Process: Defining Urban Public Space for Children in a Squatter Settlement

Deniz Hasırcı, Nerkiş Kural, Serpil Ozaloglu, Sezin Tanrıover, Sibel Ertez Ural

Urban culture proliferates in urban public spaces and this is no different for children. This research dwells on the process of offering children a space that they can territorialize. Appropriation of space by children is not possible when the city is regulated based on a city plan that leaves no choice for informal spaces that they can shape for their needs. Considering this, this study focuses on urban space as an indicator of social inequality; based on research conducted in a low-income neighborhood in Ankara, Turkey. Presented to the Development Innovations Market Place 2005, a World Bank Project for social development, it consists of a community program targeting children of lower income group neighborhoods in urban areas.

The research questions dwelled on are; How is community existence in squatter areas for children in terms of participating in urban life? Are there urban spaces where they can get in touch with urban culture as the agents of mobility, resistance, creativity, and interaction? If not, is it possible to represent children in the city with a center in the neighborhood created by a participatory process?

The city is a social product, and thus, it is crucial to address a problem of creating any designed environment by means of a thorough understanding of the life that takes place within it. As part of social development, children become agents of change, interaction, innovation, and democracy; and have a catalytic role in their community. This involves bringing together the community, reaching out to other parts of the city, have their voices heard, and enrich their lives with visions from all over the city. This study therefore aims to design a “Child Attraction Center” (CAC) as an urban space that children can adopt. Thus CAC will be an in between urban place which will help children identify themselves with urban culture as part of their everyday life.

As part of the participatory process, several workshops were organized with the children on site, in school, and in the junkyard. The activities to take place, materials to be used, and the design of the site were decided by the children on site plan drawings and model. Interviews were made with children and families in order to get information about the daily life and family structures in the neighborhood, for the realization of the project. A frequently mentioned problem was the lack of a play area for children and a gathering space for adults. Other problems were related to traffic and security and bad smells from the garbage and sewage. The use of recycled material aims to motivate the children to be creative in terms of attributing new meanings to it and use it in another context. This will also develop the self-esteem of the child while contributing to the design of the physical environment. This study aims to fulfill several needs, and become a model for upcoming projects of similar nature.

Keywords: *space as a social product, representation of child, participatory design, recycled material, squatter settlements, urban spaces.*

1.0. A theoretical approach on the position of children in everyday environments

As part of social development, it has been expected that children become the agents of change, interaction, innovation and democracy; and have a catalytic role in their community; bringing together members of their community (parents, neighbors, civic groups) as well as reaching out to other parts of the city; and have their voices heard; and enrich their lives with colors and visions from all over their city.

In today's world of dichotomies it would be possible to present a discourse on everyday environments of children epitomizing on one hand the need for a children's politics by children; and the abstraction, fragmentation, and alienation of children in everyday lives and environments on the other hand. It may be expected that a discussion of the latter may lead to possibilities and actions in the former, whereby a children's cultural and political environment will be a more appropriate way of representing children in the 21st Century. As part of social development, if children are expected to be agents of change, interaction, innovation, democracy, and have a catalytic role in their communities, reductionist and repressive approaches toward children have to be abandoned/ replaced by emancipatory and just offerings (Hart, 1997). This is believed to aid the diminishing of crime, delinquency, unhappiness, and inequality among children.

1.1. What the urban scene is revealing/evolving/promoting?

Problematization and conceptualization of children's everyday lives can be presented as two main concordant issues for further discussion. In terms of the former, we can posit that children's representation in everyday urbanism is quite weak, though some variations may exist due to variations in urban locations and varying socio-economic and cultural conditions.

In today's urban environments, whether in developing or developed countries, children are eliminated from urban life and urban spaces; especially evident in changes taking place in the spatial and formal characteristics of their play and recreation activities. It must be noted that social scientists tend to look at the issue of urban space and children from a very narrow perspective involving only a "play" concept. Social scientists proclaim that changes in urban environments have led to less use of streets, parks and

playgrounds by children; children spending free time in private and closed spaces which are increasingly commercialized and commodified, even leading to a commodification of the child (Wridt, 2003).

Today, social inequality in the city produces two different environments for children, leaving the low income groups on the street, while the other have special facilities and centers for play and recreation. While the traditional street was able to stimulate the child as a learning environment, supporting his/her experiential and cognitive development, today's street is no more a public space for human interaction and production; it does not even exist in many areas due to housing arrangements where the only spatiality is in the form of the housing block and parking area with sporadic parks or playgrounds.

Consequently, it may be fruitful to problematize the repositioning of children in urban environments in general, and public spaces in particular, instead of a concern for "play and recreation". The polarity between production of commodified and commercialized private spaces and production of unhealthy, dangerous, hazardous, unproductive and dull everyday spaces needs to be addressed. Otherwise, social injustices and imbalances will accentuate indiscrimination, alienation and fragmented identities ending in crime, terror, enmity and other behavioral problems among children.

So once more, the representation of children in everyday urban spaces is problematic due to their monotony, dullness, fragmentation; prepared and imposed upon them without their participation, and a representation further intensified by issues of poverty, race, age and gender injustices and inequalities.

The second issue in the aftermath of representation is how to conceptualize the everyday life of children. Here it is proposed that *mobility, resistance, creativity, interaction and communication* be used as *indicators of representation*.

1.2. What is expected of children now and towards the future (as agents of change, interaction, innovation, and democracy)?

In this research, the position of children in urban spaces have been evaluated as a reflection of social injustice. Observing the city in terms of different social groups, it is to

be seen that in squatter areas, in relation to children's positive and negative experiences, children are not getting their share of urban culture, that their mobility in the city is very limited, that their voices are not heard so as to show their resistance or creativity, that chances for interaction and communication with the rest of the city is scarce. However, in the face of these negativities, it was also observed that the squatter areas which contained traditional forms of neighborhood life spaces were arranged horizontally, rather than vertically and afforded social interactions that were direct, frequent, and easy; that communication and solidarity among children were high.

The research questions dwelled on are; How is community existence in squatter areas for children in terms of participating in urban life? Are there sufficient urban spaces where they can get in touch with urban culture? If not, is it possible to represent children in the city with a center in the neighborhood created by a participatory process?

2.0. The proposal: CAC

Urban culture is the product of social classes and stakeholders in public spaces in everyday life. The Child Attraction Center (CAC) is a proposal for dissolving the isolation from urban life and culture that children face and integrate them to an active everyday life as members of the society.

2.1. CAC as a Socio-spatial Project

CAC as a socio-spatial project proposed by a team of architects, interior architects, urban designers as a step forward in providing an example to architects losing foothold and responsibility in the making of everyday places. Furthermore, the role of architects as stakeholders in shaping the rapidly transforming and changing urban environments also seems to be weakening. While 60% of urban Ankara consists of "gecekondu" squatter areas, the planned 40% is reduced to a planning of technical dimension by professionals, developers and local governments. Consequently, architecture is imprisoned into a system of lots and blocks, and architectural practice is simplified into stereotype designs with no vision or connection to life styles.

The CAC proposal for Bademlidere is in one of the squatter districts at the threshold of an urban transformation which is currently on the agenda of the municipality. However “transformation” according to the municipality is to develop the area according to the system of lots and blocks, give legal permission to the construction of apartment buildings for increasing the residential building stock in the city. Public spaces such as parks are left over spaces in the urban plan. Places for recreational and cultural activities either for adults or children are usually not considered at local scale. The demographic structure of the district starts to change when apartment block type of residential buildings replace one- story squatter housing.

The subject of CAC is designing an urban space for children in their neighborhood with a participatory process of children, their families, neighbors and friends. Since in squatter areas, inhabitants usually have a general knowledge of construction because they build their own houses, without receiving technical aid from architects or civil engineers, their participation may also be expected in the implementation phase of CAC.

The participatory process started with an interdisciplinary research in collaboration with sociologists and social workers. A questionnaire was applied to a random sample of children in Bademlidere Primary School and their families. The survey results helped the architects to better understand the inhabitants’ life style(s), wishes, their reservations and tolerances in general (Atauz, 2006).

From another point of view, the participatory approach to design in a socio-spatial project takes into account:

1. The collective memory of the inhabitants from the point of view of socio-spatial practices;
2. The individual memories of the inhabitants from the point of view of public spaces and places;
3. The degree of their participation in urban life in their locale.

The project group expects to generate a space in the locality and provide for an interface between urban culture and the squatter neighborhood affording interaction between children, their parents, neighbors, and all voluntary groups-individuals from other parts of

the city to share experiences, skills and information towards an integrated urban cultural life.

CAC is not a singular example but a prototype for other districts to be implemented with the guidance of professionals adopting a participatory process involving the community. Such guidance has the potential of giving architects an active role in the making of places for social life.

2.1.1. Aims of CAC

CAC aims to provide children –particularly those at a disadvantage - access points to the urban life and culture in their own everyday environment. In this sense, the innovative characteristics of CAC proposal can be summarized as follows:

- The function of CAC is not limited to a “playground”. CAC is a place where children participate in various activities, cooperate with their peers and adults, discover their fields of interest, and represent themselves.
- The active involvement of the children will continue to be provided during programming, implementation and daily use.
- It is possible to implement CAC’s in different regions, cities and countries, as a possible network of CAC’s in hierarchical order. Design decisions are developed as patterns (re-useable design ideas) compiled as a “Recommendations Guide”. As the patterns are adaptable for different conditions and changing needs, flexibility and variation is possible when and where necessary (Cocuk Cekim Merkezi, unpublished report).
- The use of recycled material in the construction of CAC aims to motivate creativity in children in terms of attributing new meanings to materials, increasing their self-esteem.
- CAC promises to be a space of *interaction-memory-territory-creativity-resistance*.

2.1.2. Structure of CAC

The proposal of CAC is structured as a trilogy of professionals, inhabitants, and public institutions (NGO’s and local governments). Architects and designers are expected to supervise development and implementation of the proposal instead of imposing a

stereotyped project upon a “standardized” user group, with the inclusion of other needed disciplines. As the smallest unit in the organization of local governments, the neighborhood chief is important in the organization of CAC as the mediating figure between the inhabitants and other stakeholders.

2.2. Method of Approach in Generating CAC

2.2.1. Phase 1: Design as a Participatory Process

Today, it is common knowledge that environments created by people have a large influence in terms of health, mood, academic achievement, productivity, and the like, on “other” people (Fraser and Wubbels, 1995; Hawkins, 1997; Hebert, 1998; Moore and Lackney, 1994; Taylor, 1993). The few number of persons like governors, architects, landscape designers who are actually “allowed” to have their say in the shaping of environments, are seldom the persons who actually use them.

This issue reaches a climax in environments designed for children, as they are almost never permitted to have an impact on the surroundings in which they quite often spend a great deal of time. However, when children are given this chance, often they can state issues that may not have even occurred to the adults who are designing for them. The aim of the workshops integrated into the project is to see what the children can teach us about their needs and participate in the design of their own settings.

2.2.1.1. Participatory Design Theory

The idea behind participatory design is to systematically combine interdisciplinary theory and application, and involve the people in the planning and design phases of their surroundings. In addition to the benefits of people having the chance to actively take part instead of passively accept what they are given, this process plays the important role of giving people that feeling of having been listened to. Thus, the planning activity itself becomes a learning process for both the designers and the inhabitants (Sanoff, 1990).

Moreover, even if the inhabitants of an environment change within time, the participatory activity will have given important information regarding the common needs and wishes of persons likely to use the space.

2.2.1.2. Method: Planning Children's Environments

Environments for children are usually designed according to previous models and rely heavily on the adult perception of what a child may need and want in his or her surrounding. It is very seldom that any research is done regarding the composition of spaces, use of colors, textures, and materials. In Turkey, there is a lack of participatory design projects for children. This project aims to fulfill a need and provide insight into upcoming projects of similar nature.

Workshop Planning:

The main issue to be considered is how to work with children. It is one thing to get children excited to work on a project as such, one thing to derive the necessary information to be used as building blocks of the design from them, and a whole other important step to check if the derived information is interpreted correctly. Only if all three of these steps are completely fulfilled can a workshop be recognized as an efficient one.

Workshop 1: Questionnaires and Drawings

It was decided on the collection of data from a school (Bademlidere Preliminary School) near the actual area of the structure, which is in Bademlidere (meaning "creek with almonds"). The students of this school were familiar with this area, and could identify their wishes and needs more specifically. They were also believed to become the first group of users who would initialize the usage of the space, and affect the flow of people and activities within this environment. In order to obtain a general understanding, a couple of weeks before the workshop, the children were asked to write a composition and draw a picture of their neighborhood and anything related to their surrounding in the area.

One of the recurring issues was the need for a park. The children seemed to have a great appreciation for nature, and frequently mentioned that they wanted to see flowers, and trees of all kinds (especially almond, sour cherry, apple, and plum trees) in their neighborhood. Another frequently mentioned issue was the neighbors and the relationships with them. In a tightly knit neighborhood as such, relationships with neighbors and relatives are of prime significance. Therefore, socialization areas for neighbors to come together, celebrate important days, play the very popular backgammon game or cards were pointed out repeatedly.

Some children were hopeful, others were quite pessimistic about the realization of this project. A child in sixth grade mentioned that she did not believe that this structure would be built, as there were several people who had lied to them before. This is another reason why it is crucial that children participate in the planning and the actual building of this project. The workshop itself is important to signify the importance of the children's contribution and that they would actually be listened to. The same girl stated, "I feel like an adult because I am happy that you gave me this chance and asked about my opinions. Hopefully, you will realize our wishes". Another sixth grader stated, "You, the architects, have pushed our dreams one step further and given us hope".

Workshop Application:

With the help of the teachers, a random sample of 4 students from grades 1 to 8 were selected and asked to participate. The number of students who continued from beginning to end was 30. The names, ages, and addresses of these students were recorded in order to specify which families would be contacted for the social research part of the study. This would enable a comparison of information from different sources. The addresses were marked on a map of the settlement with the students and hung to the wall of the classroom in which the initial workshop took place. The activity was prepared in the format of a three-hour workshop composed of 4 questionnaires and a drawing.

The workshop consisted of 3 questionnaires, and a drawing that were finished in 3 hours. The "importance list" was not only filled out by students, but also the teachers. The teachers were also asked to fill out an "activity matrix" regarding how they could use an attraction center for children.

The workshop was conducted on a school day at Bademlidere Elementary School, and food and drinks were provided for a more comfortable and enjoyable atmosphere. While these were consumed, small chats were made with the children about their work, and all were reminded that the child attraction center would take shape with their efforts. After the questionnaires and drawings were collected, the wishes and needs of the children were found out and differences between grades were analyzed.

“My Dreams and Wishes List”

The workshop began with the preparation of a wish list regarding the neighborhood, play areas, and activities. This questionnaire enabled the students to think creatively and freely about the child attraction center concept that had been described to them earlier. The information that was collected could be reflected to the attraction center both directly and indirectly.

The children were asked to dream about their *neighborhoods* and state their wishes. They mostly mentioned that they wanted a safe place with flowers, trees, and nearby educational programs that they could participate in. A quiet place away from traffic was a wish that was encountered frequently. The children also mentioned that they wished the poor would have warm homes, houses and the environment would be kept clean, and that no trash would be thrown around.

What the children wished for regarding their *play areas*, were that these spaces would be in a calm green area with almond trees, with well-defined and protected borders, away from traffic (the fact that there were too many accidents was repeated) and danger. The children wanted a natural, clean environment in which the children could plant trees and be happy and comfortable without adults telling them what to do.

“Things I Love/ Hate in My Neighborhood”

After the “My Dreams and Wishes List”, the children filled out the questionnaire on the three things they love and hate the most in their neighborhood. It was asked of the children to think about how their ideas could be represented in the center as they answered the questions.

The things that the children loved in their neighborhoods were the greenery, park, flowers, and trees -especially almonds. Moreover, the children mentioned having many people around, the houses being one story, night walks, and the closeness of people to one another.

Among the features that were hated in the neighborhood, were trash (and that they were thrown around), “people with dirty faces”, the potholes in the streets, dry weeds, sand and

dirt, noises from cars, theft, swearing, the houses in bad condition, and the trees being cut down.

“Picture Drawing”

After the questionnaires, the children were expected to have thought about the space quite a bit, and were asked to imagine and reflect on paper what type of space they imagined. While doing this, they were also asked to show themselves taking part in the activity they love doing the most.

In the children’s drawings, the topics that were frequently dwelled upon were a need for libraries they needed especially to find sources for their homework, a place to carry out scientific activities, where they could use computers, and dance. Other activities that were mentioned were, interviews, talks about different professions, film screenings, small theater plays, and various competitions. As mentioned before, the children are very sensitive about the cleanliness of the environment. Issues such as, garbage being collected on time, and littering were reflected on almost all drawings.

Most of the children depicted their friends along with themselves in their drawings, and showed that the center would primarily be used as a place for socialization. The girls mostly showed themselves jumping rope or picking flowers, and the boys generally represented themselves while playing ball or flying a kite. The boys also showed themselves somehow in relation to the traffic, either playing in the middle of traffic or very close to it. Moreover, since the children frequently mentioned accidents taking place, the significance of a place for children became even more important.

“The Importance List”

The reason that “The Importance List” was the last questionnaire of the workshop was to avoid leading the children in a certain direction, and to unleash their creativity until this last moment. The research group wanted to give a list of predetermined activities for the children to reorder in order to determine which activity is less and which is more important in the attraction center, only after all the information had been collected from the children. This questionnaire has been filled out not only by children, but also the teachers, and the responses were in keeping.

To the questions, “Would you contribute to the construction of a center like this? What would you do?”, all of the children stated that they would do anything they can, such as, help the workers, state their opinions, plant flowers, do research and act as moral support. The teachers on the other hand, stated that they could take an active role in the establishing of a center as such, talk to people from different occupations, and bring books and scrap material to the center for common use. The teachers’ positive attitude towards the use of the center during class hour (both for class and for social activities), is something that will be beneficial for the use of the space. As the role-models of the children, teachers’ frequent use of the space for beneficial activities will be effective on the children’s feeling of belonging and space utilization.

The activities mostly preferred by the teachers for the center were, “Workshops with chefs, musicians, writers”, “Meeting up with friends and playing games”, and “Dancing and exercising”, while the activities that were close to last on the list were, and “Eating”, “Resting”, and “Making toys like model planes, dolls, or other games”. The teachers’ responses were in keeping with the students’. Since the Bademlidere Elementary School was quite a small one, the teachers had no difficulty in guessing the children’s needs. It is for the advantage of the center’s utilization that their own needs were parallel to children’s.

“Activity Matrix”

In this matrix that only the teachers filled out, they were asked to answer questions on what they wanted the children to learn in a center as such, how they wanted the children to learn them, and what they could recommend regarding the reflection of all this to the physical space. The matrix that had been prepared under the headings, “Goals”, “Methods”, and “Spatial Characteristics” showed creative and interesting suggestions in a compact format.

Among the goals, a repeated suggestion was about the children’s artistic talents, visualization skills, hand skills being developed, and enable socialization. As a method, they suggested making ceramics, temporary and permanent wall and panel painting, making hand puppets and organizing shows, drama, various art and painting exhibitions, and group-work of all kinds. For the spatial characteristics, the teachers stated that they

needed a ceramics oven and clay, simple counters, baskets, large tables and child-size chairs, and large panels and laundry lines for the works to be exhibited.

Teachers repeated the significance of providing children with self-esteem, and the notion of sharing and participation. As a method, they thought of drama, experiential learning, and as a space they thought of a space that was plain, natural and warm where children could interact with nature closely and where they could make and listen to music. The teachers also suggested that the space could be one in which the children could learn to cook simple foods in a relaxed environment, and thus to provide the necessary oven, stove, pots and pans, and other equipment accordingly. The final topic that was mentioned was, the children contributing to their family's earnings. As methods, they could sell items that were not used at home for second-hand utilization, or small handcrafts, foods prepared at home, according to the teachers. For the exhibition of these items, counters, baskets, boxes, and laundry lines were suggested.

The teachers believed that the children in this neighborhood suffered enough during their daily lives, and that the important thing regarding this attraction center was that it should be a place that they could have fun, have a good time, and learn a few things. The teachers' opinions are crucial as they spend a significant amount of time with the children, with their parents, and in the neighborhood.

Workshop 2: A Day on the Field of CAC

The day spent on the site was very useful in terms of getting the students used to create the sense of belonging in the children and to begin utilizing the area. A pinwheel theme was chosen for the day and several small and large pinwheels were prepared beforehand to hand out to the students as well as to be used as markers on the site. Materials such as small white pebbles, ropes of different color and thickness, a large map of the site, 9 small paper squares depicting the activities that were chosen by the students in the previous workshop were prepared for each student.

After a colorful descent from the hill the school is on to the site, the children placed their pinwheels somewhere that they liked on the site. The first thing that was done was to pick up the garbage on the site. The children ran around in groups to clean up the site. Then, in

order to mark the exact borders of the site, all children were given a handful of pebbles, and were guided while they marked the boundaries.

Following this step, the children were handed their activity squares and were asked to walk around the site trying to imagine which place was appropriate for which activity. The children were then called to gather around the map that was placed in the middle of the site. With the help of the research group, the children placed their squares to the areas on the map that coincided with their earlier decisions, and according to the count at the end, the activity areas were determined. After this step, signposts depicting each activity were placed in the areas picked, and the children defined the borders between each activity by holding the ropes between the activities. The workshop ended with small snacks and conversations about the activity.

Workshop 3: Field Trip to the Junkyard

The field trip to the junkyard was actually not that well received when it was first announced to the children and teachers, due to the connotations of trash related to it. The children could not understand what they were going to do with “trash”. However, when the research group explained to the children and teachers how they would altogether assign new meanings to the found material, they began to get curious.

Once everyone was at the junkyard, the research group divided into three groups with the children and began walking around the different stores that were contacted previously. The children were asked to choose three items that they thought could be used in the center. Their names, picked items, and proposed activities with the items were listed by the research group and their photographs were taken for documentation purposes. The children were then taken to the city zoo gardens for snacks. This workshop was helpful to identify and begin to categorize the materials that could be used in the center.

Workshop 4: Children’s Design Proposals on the Site Model

A cork model and several large maps of the site were prepared before the workshop day. Colored markers, pencils, glue, scissors, strings, colored paper, cardboard, pins, and play dough were brought to the workshop classroom at the school.

The children were divided in groups around tables that had a large map on them. They then began to design play items, semi-open and open areas, furniture, pools, plants, signposts, and models of themselves. With the help of the research group, three items were chosen from each study model, and carried on to the final model. The final model turned out to be a very colorful, enjoyable area that was creative and intelligent.

Workshop 5: Competition for CAC Logo Design

After being explained by their teachers what a logo was, the children were asked to design one that would identify the site that had already become theirs. This task was carried out in the form of a competition, which resulted in a very creative logo that represented the spirit of the center. The logo was remodeled by a professional graphic designer and prepared to be printed on t-shirts that were distributed to the students with a ceremony. A girl in second grade received art kit for her design of the logo. This was also the day that schools ended, and the children received their report cards. Thus, it became a very important stage for the project, the research group, and the children.

2.2.1.3. Results: A Discussion of Workshops as a Participatory Process

These workshops enabled the surfacing of the students' wishes and needs in a creative and participatory way. The students felt part of the decision-making process, which was quite a new experience for them. One of the most important issues to be pointed out is that the workshops were enjoyable yet educational experiences for both the students and the research team. Significant information was obtained from the students and teachers regarding several aspects of the life in the neighborhood. One child said, "I thought no one would ever notice this place but us", and added, "There are successful people among us. I want their skills to be valued. Thank you for asking my opinion". This approved to the research group the importance of working in this neighborhood.

3.0. Discussion and Conclusion: Looking Ahead

3.1. Phase 2: Implementation as a Participatory Process

Planning the phases of an interdisciplinary research was efficiently handled despite the inherent complications in terms of organization and communication among the groups. However, planning the implementation phase (2) seems to oblige the project group to solve other unanticipated problems on site. Problems can be categorized under four

subtitles: Participatory process with adults of the neighborhood; Construction process of CAC; Financial problems; Management, maintenance, sustainability issues.

The participatory process at Bademlidere has two groups of participants. The first group is the children, and the second one is the adult inhabitants. The former has already been actualized. The adults, on the other hand will be involved by means of workshops at school, site and junkyard. The aim and meaning of CAC, from the point of view of everyday use, became clear to the children. The adults' expectation, on the other hand from CAC is still a playground, municipality park, or a volleyball field. Even the neighborhood chief, with whom the project group conducted sessions on the subject of convincing parents to send their children to CAC activities in the future, proposes a volleyball field for 15-25 years of age group. For women, CAC will be a playground for their children, while they will also have the opportunity to sit and chat in one corner.

The participatory process may consist of two considerations: 1. Skilled or unskilled labor recruitment from the neighborhood for the construction process. 2. Workshops with adults to ingrain a positive attitude towards CAC's activities, to increase the solidarity between the inhabitants for the security, ownership, continuity, maintenance of CAC. The land of CAC is a donation of the county (Cankaya) municipality and it is classified as green area where building construction is not allowed. CAC will mainly be a place of semi- open and open spaces constructed out of recycled material.

While the first phase of participatory design and research process was supported financially by the World Bank, the second phase of implementation needs to be sponsored by other stakeholders. Infrastructure works (electricity, water, landscaping) and site preparation has already been undertaken by the municipality.

Consultations with various technical experts are required for the implementation of the project, voluntary or paid work will be negotiated.

3.2. Phase 3: A Participatory Process for Everyday Use

In conclusion, the quality of CAC as urban space in children's everyday life is expected to facilitate confrontation with urban life. Bademlidere CAC as a pilot project is a seed in the soil and it can be effective if number of CAC's increase in urban areas which need

cultural resources to aid the development of children into adult urbanites, and mature individuals.

Implementation of programs and management of the center will again require interaction between various stakeholders. Management should include volunteer work from all parts of the city. Senior citizens, professionals (artists, poets, musicians, etc.) housewives, mothers, etc. can contribute to CAC as part of their everyday life. For maintenance, the protection of CAC against vandalism, theft or misuse can be facilitated by solidarity among inhabitants. Financial support for implementation of programs and maintenance can be obtained through donations.

The workshops with children proved that they are skillful in expressing their feelings, wishes, and criticisms by drawing, writing compositions, making models or in other means if an opportunity is provided. The construction of CAC has just passed the land leveling phase, and the boundaries of the site were fixed with a 50 cm high wall. The children of the neighborhood used the site all through summer. They have already made it into a place of their own. During recent visits to the site, the members of the project group observed that there was no garbage on the site. The project group is hopeful that the children's behavior and feelings towards the site will be shared by the adults.

REFERENCES:

- Ahrens, B., 1985, « The impact of woonerven on children's behavior », *Children's environments quarterly*. n° 1.4, pp. 39-45.
- Andel, J., 1985, « Effects on children's behavior of physical changes in a leiden neighborhood », *Children's environments quarterly*. n° 1.4, 46-60.
- Atauz, S., 2006, *Ankara ili bademlidere gecekodu mahallesinde cocuk ve cocukluk – cocuk cekim merkezi*. Hacettepe Universitesi, Iktisadi ve Idari Bilimler Fakultesi Sosyal Hizmet Bolumu. Basilmamis Arastirma Raporu, Ankara.
- A-matter-part of sedus, *The duchi shoe shop*, 18.7.2006, <http://www.a-matter.com/eng/projects/pr087/Shoe-shop-pr087-04-u.asp>.
- Bjorklid, P., 1985, « Environmental diversity in housing estates as a factor in child development », *Children's environments quarterly*. n° 1.4, 7-14.
- Campbell, S., 2005, « Architecture students design and build homeless shelters », MIT Tech Talk on October 5.
- Chase, John, Ed., 1999, *Everyday urbanism*, Monacelli press, New York.
- Chawla, Louise., 1991, *Homes for children in a changing society*. Advances in environment, behavior and design Vol.3. Eds., Zube, E., Moore, G., Plenum Press, NewYork and London, pp. 187-224.
- Cohen, U., v.d., 1979, *Recommendations for child play areas*, Community Design Center, Inc., Milwaukee and Center for Architecture and Urban Planning Research, University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee.
- Fraser, Barry J. and Theo Wubbels., 1995, « Classroom learning environments », *Improving science education*. Eds., Fraser, B. J. and Walberg, H. J., The National Society for the Study of Education, Chicago, Illinois, pp. 117-144.

- Halbwachs, M., 1992, *On collective memory*, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, London.
- Halbwachs, M., 1997, *La mémoire collective*, Albin Michel, Paris.
- Hart, R. A., 1997, *Cocukların katilimi, maskotluktan yurttaşliga*, Unicef Türkiye Milli Komitesi, Ankara.
- Hasirci, D., Kural, N., Ozaloglu. S., Tanriover, S., Ural, S., 2006, *Cocuk Cekim Merkezi, Dunya Bankasi Basilmamis Raporu*, Ankara.
- Hawkins, Harold L., 1997, « Good classroom design improves learning », *School planning and management*. n° 36.4, pp. 10-12.
- Hawley, C., 2005, « A communist block house renaissance », 25.9.2006, *Spiegel Online*.
<http://www.spiegel.de/international/0,1518,367335,00.html>
- Hebert, Elizabeth A., 1998, « Design matters: how school design affects children », *Educational leadership*. n° 56.1, pp. 69-71.
- Isaksen, S. G.; Murdock, M. C.; Firestien, R. L.; and Treffinger, D. J., Eds., 1993, *Nurturing and developing creativity: the emergence of a discipline*, Ablex Publishing Corporation Norwood, NJ, pp. 1-7.
- Jones, L., 1993, « Barriers to creativity and their relationship to individual, group, and organizational behavior », *Nurturing and developing creativity: the emergence of a discipline*. Eds., Isaksen, S. G., Murdock, M. C., Firestien, R. L., and Treffinger, D. J., Ablex Publishing Corporation, Norwood, NJ, pp. 133-154.
- Lefebvre, H., 1991, *Critique of everyday life*, Verso, N.Y., London.
- Lefebvre, 1996, *Writings on cities*, Blackwell Publishers, Oxford.
- Lefebvre, H., 1968, *La Vie quotidienne dans le monde moderne*, Gallimard,

Turkish translation: *Modern dünyada gundelik hayat*, Metis Yayınları, Istanbul, 1998.

Legendre, A., 2003, « Social sustainability and changes in environments designed for young children: the case of the french daycare centers ». *People, places, and sustainability*. Eds., Moser, G., Pol, E., Bernard, Y., Hogrefe and Huber Publishers, Gottingen, Toronto, Bern, Seattle, pp. 243-254.

Mays, P., 1985, *Teaching children through the environment*, Hodder and Stoughton, London.

McQuaid, M., 2003, *Shigeru Ban*, Phaidon Press, London.

Mead, M., 1985, « Neighborhoods and human needs ». *Children's environments quarterly*. n° 1.4, pp. 3-6.

Mestre Cobra, M. and M. Walsh, AIA, *Brazil Studio*, Axis Mundi, Kilombo Tenonde, Capoeira Angola, 2005, <http://www.thelaststraw.org/isnbc/hands/brazil.pdf>.

Minnesota Office of Environmental Assistance, 2000, *Tofte Cabin*, <http://www.moea.state.mn.us/greenbuilding/tofte.pdf>.

Mooney, R. L., 1963, « A conceptual model for integrating four approaches to the identification of creative talent », *Scientific creativity: its recognition and development*. Eds. Taylor, C. W.; Barron, F., Wiley, New York, pp. 331-340.

Moore, Gary T. and Jeffery A. Lackney., 1994, *Educational facilities for the twenty-first century: research analysis and design patterns*. Publications in Architecture and Urban Planning, Center for Architecture and Urban Planning Research, Wisconsin, Milwaukee.

Moore, R. C.; Goltsman, S. M.; and Iacofano, D. S., Eds., 1987, *Play for all*

guidelines: planning, design and management of outdoor play settings for all children, MIG Communications, Berkeley, CA.

Norinder, M., 2003, « Accessibility or obstacles? Children's independent mobility and valuation of the outdoor environment », *People, places, and sustainability*. Eds., Moser, G., Pol, E., Bernard, Y., Hofgreffe and Huber Publishers, Seattle. pp. 161-172.

Sanoff, H., 1990, *Participatory design*, BookMasters, Inc., Mansfield, Ohio.

Sanoff, H., 1995, *creating environments for young children*, BookMasters, Inc. Mansfield, Ohio.

Sanoff, H., 2001, *A visioning process for designing responsive schools*, National Clearinghouse for Educational Facilities, Washington, DC.

Sanoff, H., 2001, *School building assessment methods*, National Clearinghouse for Educational Facilities Washington, DC.

Setela, M., 1985, « Transmission of childhood culture in an urban neighborhood », *Children's environments quarterly*, n° 1.4, pp. 15-18.

Schneekloth, L. H., Shibley, R. G. *Placemaking: the art and practice of building Communities*, John Wiley and Sons Inc., New York.

Schneekloth, L. H., Shibley, R. G., 2000, « Implacing Architecture into the practice of placemaking », *Journal of Architectural Education*, n° 53.3, pp. 130-140.

Taylor, A., 1993, « How schools are redesigning their space », *Educational leadership*, n° 51.1, pp. 36-42.

Taylor, A.; Vlastos, G.; and Marshall, A., 1991, *Architecture and children: teacher's guide*, Architecture and Children Institute Seattle, Washington.

Thurber, C., Malinowski, J., 1999, « Environmental correlates of negative emotions in children », *Environment and behavior*, n° 31.4, pp. 487-513.

Wridt, P. J., 2003, « An historical analysis of young people's use of public space, parks, and playgrounds in new york city », *Quality of urban life-policy versus practice*.
Gulersoy, N. Z., Esin, N., Ozsoy, A., Istanbul Technical University, Urban and Environmental Planning and Research Center, Istanbul, pp. 597-608.