The Potential of Youth Participation in Planning

Kathryn I. Frank

The field of planning is increasingly recognizing youth as an important stakeholder group, and there are calls to directly involve youth in planning processes. Because youth are in many respects different from adults, the practice of youth participation needs special consideration. This article summarizes the findings from empirical studies of youth participation in terms of the impacts on the young participants and their communities, the capacity of youth to participate, and five lessons for effective practice. The literature review will help planners create meaningful opportunities for youth to have a voice in community and environmental affairs.

Keywords: *youth; young people; participation; planning*

A quarter of persons in Western nations, and 30 percent worldwide, are under the age of eighteen years old, yet this significant stakeholder group is one of the least considered in community and environmental planning. In interviews about the subject, planners in the United States and Australia reported that they have little professional knowledge about youth and do not systematically address their needs in planning processes (Knowles-Yánez 2002; White 2001). Not surprisingly, Simpson (1997) found that comprehensive plans made few references to youth beyond descriptions of child-oriented projects such as schools, day care centers, and playgrounds, and thus do not reflect the many other ways in which youth interact with their communities.

We cannot assume that the adult-oriented approach to planning serves youth by default, because in many respects the needs and preferences of youth are different (Talen and Coffindaffer 1999; Terrible 2000). There are signs, in fact, that traditional planning is failing youth. Several authors make the case that current planning practice, by focusing on the needs and preferences of adults, segregates youth from public places and limits their mobility (Lennard and Lennard 2000; Meucci and Redmon 1997; Tonucci and Rissotto 2001; White 2001). An international study of youth "growing up in cities" supports these assertions, finding that youth in Western nations felt alienated from their communities (Chawla 2002b, chap. 10). Similarly, British youth reported feeling ignored (Spencer, Woolley, and Dunn 2000), and youth in Oakland, California, described how the city "turns its back on teens" (Ashley, Samaniego, and Cheun 1997).

The size of the youth population and their feelings of social isolation are two of several compelling reasons for planners and the field of planning to pay greater attention to youth. Because youth are rapidly developing—physically, psychologically, and socially— public decisions about city design, economic development, social services, and environmental quality affect youth to a large degree, and the effects carry over into adulthood (Lennard and Lennard 2000; Chawla 2002a). Planning has far-reaching implications for youth

KATHRYN I. FRANK is a doctoral candidate in the City and Regional Planning Program at the Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta.

because they are the generation that will experience the results of the decisions the longest. And, Tonucci and Rissotto (2001, 413) believe that because the child is a "sensitive environmental indicator," if planning were to focus on meeting the needs of the child, the "needs of all will be heard and taken into consideration."

Fortunately, the field of planning has begun to acknowledge the importance of serving the youngest generation (Francis and Lorenzo 2002). Kevin Lynch (1977) was a pioneer with the Growing Up In Cities international research into how youth perceive and are impacted by their surroundings. Colin Ward (1978; 1988), Roger Hart (1979), and Robin Moore (1986) advanced this topic of investigation in the years that followed. More generally, two global movements, the rights of the child and sustainable development, are encouraging planners to recognize the needs and capabilities of youth. The children's rights movement began as early as 1923 with statements made by the International Save the Children Alliance, which the League of Nations adopted the following year. Known as the Geneva Declaration, the statement of children's rights was the antecedent to today's most significant international treaty in support of people younger than 18 years old, the Convention on the Rights of the Child adopted by the United Nations in 1989 (United Nations 1989). The sustainable development movement of the past two decades, with its future orientation, has focused attention on youth as the direct heirs to the consequences of current environmental and social decisions (World Commission on Environment and Development 1987). Both the children's rights and sustainable development movements have recognized that a strong tool for serving youth is to empower them to influence civic affairs, including in the realm of community and environmental planning.

YOUTH PARTICIPATION IN PLANNING

The Convention on the Rights of the Child is notable for its comprehensive view of children's rights, including the right of young people to participate in decision-making processes that affect their lives, in accordance with their capabilities. Following the lead of the Convention, Agenda 21 (UNCED 1992), the sustainable development initiative originating with the 1992 Earth Summit in Rio de Janeiro, contained a chapter that directs participating nations to involve youth in environmental and development decision making and implementation. Recently, the United Nations Children's Fund devoted their annual report, *The State of the World's Children* (UNICEF 2002), to the theme of youth participation.

The field of planning has indirectly and directly promoted the practice of involving youth in community decision-making processes. According to the AICP Code of Ethics and Professional Conduct (2005), "[Planners] shall give people the opportunity to have a meaningful impact on the development of plans and programs that may affect them. Participation should be broad enough to include those who lack formal organization or influence." The ethics statement entitles youth to participate in planning, even though they have less political power than adults. The explicit recognition of youth as stakeholders arose in the 1970s, particularly in Britain, with planning innovators espousing the benefits of youth participation (Ward and Fyson 1973; Hart 1976; Baldassari, Hart, and Lockett 1980) and introducing the practice through ad hoc projects (Spivak 1969; Baldassari et al. 1981) and its institutionalization within the education unit of Britain's Town and Country Planning Association. More recently, Barry Checkoway (Checkoway, Pothukuchi, and Finn 1995) and the American Planning Association (APA) (Mullahey, Susskind, and Checkoway 1999) have provided leadership on the domestic front, and Roger Hart (1997) and Louise Chawla (2002a; 2002b) have advanced the practice internationally.

Beyond youth having a right to participate in planning and other decision-making processes that affect their lives, the growing numbers of youth participation advocates have hypothesized other benefits that would further encourage the practice. The potential benefits apply to the individual youth participants, their communities, and larger society, with some benefits being immediately apparent and others accumulating or surfacing over time (Checkoway, Pothukuchi, and Finn 1995; Hart 1997; Chawla 2002a; Sinclair 2004). Many of the benefits are similar to those achieved through adult participation (i.e., public participation in general), but the benefits to youth are amplified because youth are undergoing rapid psychosocial development and have had few opportunities for participation in the past. The potential benefits are as follows: Youth participants directly benefit as a result of the educational, entertainment, or networking aspects of planning processes; youth appreciate having a voice in public affairs and feel more connected to their community and the environment, thus countering the epidemic of community disenfranchisement discovered by Chawla (2002b, ch. 10); communities, composed of both youth and adults, benefit directly from the project and policy outcomes of youth participation, because youth act as resources and support common values; and, larger society benefits indirectly from the social learning that occurs. Participation enhances civic capacity, adults gain a better

understanding of youth (and vice versa), and society as a whole advances the standing of young people.

The fact that youth participation in planning has been promoted for three decades yet remains uncommon and unsupported in comparison to adult participation suggests that there are significant barriers to the practice (Checkoway, Pothukuchi, and Finn 1995; Adams and Ingham 1998, 32–34). Knowles-Yánez (2002) found that land use planning had little room for incorporating youth concerns, because the processes were legalistic, reactionary, and dominated by economic interests. As a result of the marginalization of youth concerns, planners had limited knowledge of young people or experience working with them. The presence of adult-oriented institutions and powerful competing interests and adults' lack of understanding of youth combine with other political, economic, and cultural barriers to restrict the occurrence and impacts of youth participation.

In addition to the structural barriers above, when planning innovators attempt to make room for youth participation, their efforts are resisted, because four interrelated societal views of youth cast doubt within others over whether the practice is beneficial or practicable. The societal views of youth elaborated herein are: developmental, vulnerable, legal, and romantic (Baldassari, Hart, and Lockett 1980; Checkoway, Pothukuchi, and Finn 1995; Simpson 1997; Matthews, Limb, and Taylor 1999; Francis and Lorenzo 2002; Hill et al. 2004). The *developmental view* of youth emphasizes their being in a period of early psychosocial growth and thus lacking the level of knowledge, skills, attitudes, behaviors, and social connections of adults. The developmental view leaves society wondering whether youth possess the capacity to participate in the demanding task of planning and fosters the belief that adults are more competent to make decisions on behalf of youth and the community. The *vulnerable view* of youth sees young people as less powerful than adults and therefore subject to abuse by adults or in need of adult protection. The vulnerable view questions the ability of youth participation to create meaningful community change, because youth are perceived as not having the political muscle to assert their ideas and would instead, at best, be co-opted by adults. The vulnerable view raises concerns about the impacts of participation on youth since they could become disenchanted with the process when their recommendations are not heeded or when participation exposes youth to the rough-and-tumble world of politics. In addition, youth could be harmed when adults orchestrate youth participation opportunities to achieve adult ends that are not in the interest of youth. Hart (1997) has labeled such disingenuous youth participation as manipulation and tokenism. The *legal view* of youth assigns youth partial citizen status, because youth do not legally hold the full rights and responsibilities of adults, or treats youth as citizens-in-training. The legal view questions the appropriate level of community decision-making influence that should be afforded to youth, supports the role of adults in providing accountability to the process, and focuses on the educational benefits to youth while discounting the opportunity for direct community influence. Last, the *romantic view* of youth treats youth as having values and capabilities that are distinct from, even superior to, those of adults. Youth, for instance, are thought to exhibit more creativity, curiosity, enthusiasm, and concern for community and environmental well-being than adults. The romantic view privileges youth voices over those of adults and insufficiently integrates the two in practice, thus leading to ineffectual youth participation. Or, perceived differences in perspectives, work styles, and languages leave both adults and youth unsure of how to interact with each other. The four societal views predict negative impacts of youth participation on young people and their communities, thus squarely contradicting the potential benefits described by proponents of the practice. Questions about impacts and proper practice must be addressed before challenges can or should be made to the political, economic, and cultural barriers.

The reservations over youth participation outlined above originate with deep-seated societal views of youth rather than through reflexive practice. Given the need to scientifically address the questions of impacts and process approaches, researchers have taken indirect routes. To predict the impacts on young planning participants, researchers have applied the findings from empirical studies of education-oriented participation in general community and volunteer work (i.e., service learning; see Waterman 1997) (Checkoway, Pothukuchi, and Finn 1995). Studies concerning the environmental preferences of youth can be applied to predict the design outcomes of youth participation and hence impacts on the community (Talen and Coffindaffer 1999; Terrible 2000). Researchers have adapted what is known from developmental psychology to predict youth capacity for participation and to suggest effective techniques of engagement (Baldassari, Hart, and Lockett 1980; Hart 1997; Hart et al. 1997; Bartlett et al. 1999). Additionally, researchers have conducted experiments of the ability of youth to perform specific planning tasks such as neighborhood design (Nagy and Baird 1978), aerial photography interpretation (Plester et al. 2002), and cognitive mapping (Halseth and Doddridge 2000).

A complementary approach to understanding the impacts and process of youth participation is empirical

study *of the practice*. The direct observation of youth participation in planning reported in the literature primarily consists of isolated case studies intended to address multiple, broadly defined research questions. The closest that the literature has come to reaching conclusions based upon a wide range of experiences are guides to the processes of youth participation that draw lessons from collections of short case studies conducted by the authors (Baldassari, Hart, and Lockett 1980; Baldassari et al. 1981; Hart and Moore 1982–1983; Hart 1997; Adams and Ingham 1998; Mullahey, Susskind, and Checkoway 1999; Race and Torma 1999; Driskell 2002). This initial experience with youth participation is leading to an alternative view of youth as *resources* for community development (Finn and Checkoway 1998).

The guides and their short case studies are informative, but they lack the scientific formality of a systematic analysis of the peer-reviewed, research-based literature that represents the observations of multiple authors. Fischler (2000) explained the special value of literature reviews of empirical studies of planning practice, especially when the practice is innovative such as is the situation with youth participation. Knowles-Yánez (2005) applied this method to catalog the ways in which the field of planning interacts with youth. She found that scholars study youths' views of their communities and capacity for expressing them, educators teach youth about planning practice, and process organizers engage youth in community development, often because the organizers recognize the right of youth to have their voices heard. Knowles-Yánez called for more effort to integrate these activities with each other and with local government planning processes. In the field of social services development, Cavet and Sloper (2004) reviewed the "grey literature" concerning youth participation in decision-making regarding health care and services for the disabled in the United Kingdom to draw conclusions about the extent of participation, barriers and facilitating factors, and impacts on services.

The purpose of this article is to assemble the published studies of youth participation, both indirect and direct observations, and related literature, in order to ascertain its impacts on the young participants and their communities, to address questions of youth capacity to engage in planning activities, and to compile lessons for effective practice. The lessons are designed to achieve benefits for both youth and communities and thus respond to Knowles-Yánez's (2005) call to integrate the scholarly, educational, and directly participatory ways of considering youth in planning. After three decades of practice and research, the literature is ripe for this type of review. The following section describes the methodology used to select and analyze the direct

observation studies, presents the ensuing list of eighteen empirical references, and discusses limitations of the review. The article then reports the results of the literature review in terms of the impacts and process considerations of interest above. Each results section combines the findings from the indirect and direct observation studies in order to encapsulate the current state of knowledge in the field. The article's conclusion discusses the implications of the literature review for planning practice, education, and research. In particular, the compiled impact and process information will assist planners in deciding whether and how to involve youth in planning, and in knowing what consequences to reasonably expect in the short term.

METHODOLOGY

This literature review sought direct-observation studies of youth participation in community and environmental planning, where the majority of youth involved were 18 years old or younger (the ages typically enrolled in elementary, middle, and high school grades). Checkoway et al. (1995, 135) described community planning as "including steps to assess local conditions, formulate action plans, and build support for implementation." For cases to meet the definition of planning, the youth must have collectively attempted each of the three steps, regardless of the results and with or without the assistance of adults. The last step, for instance, may be as simple as the youth presenting their recommendations to community members. This definition of planning corresponds to Hart's (1997, chapters 5 and 6) descriptions of children's participation in "action research" and "environmental planning, design, and construction." The three-step model does not typically apply to youth input into community decision making via policy boards or councils, opinion forums, or consultative fact-finding missions conducted by adult researchers or planners (e.g., the Growing Up In Cities project). The three-step model is also distinct from other forms of citizen involvement in community development, such as social action, public advocacy, community education, and local services delivery (Checkoway, Pothukuchi, and Finn 1995), although these approaches may be used by youth as they build support for implementation of their plans (the third planning step). The use of other approaches within the planning model indicates the difficulty in providing mutually exclusive definitions of types of civic engagement. A final criterion for the selection of planning cases was that they occurred in countries with predominantly Western European culture, because the sociopolitical context likely influences the results.

The literature review considered detailed studies of real-life youth participation in planning published in peer-reviewed journals from diverse social science disciplines over a time frame spanning the history of the practice (the past three decades). Relevant literature was identified through electronically searching English-language abstract databases and referencing the bibliographies of collected literature. Table 1 lists the eighteen references selected for review and includes pertinent features of the cases studied in order to indicate the kinds of planning processes for which conclusions from this article will apply. The earliest reference dates to 1987, and most references were published in the late 1990s and early 2000s. The cases occurred within seven countries, with the majority in the United States, Italy, and the United Kingdom. Most cases conducted planning at the neighborhood level, in both inner-city and suburban settings. The references are equally representative of cases involving youth in middle childhood (elementary school ages) and adolescence (middle and high school ages), with only one case involving children in early childhood. The participating youth came from neighborhoods representing various ethnicities and economic levels. All the cases are classified as "adult-initiated, shared decisions" with youth (Hart 1997, chapter 3)—that is, none was initiated by youth. Organizers typically drew participants from a cross section of youth in the neighborhood through wide recruitment in school, youth club, and other group settings. The duration of the planning processes ranged from several weeks to two years. No references were found that described failure of the youth to attempt each of the three steps in the definition of planning. In many of the cases, youth had wide latitude in identifying issues. About half the references contained cases for which youth participation proceeded to a fourth step, implementation of the recommendations.

The research method chosen by all the direct observation references was the case study strategy, and more than half the references reported results for multiple cases. Several references presented conclusions drawn from across their cases rather than presenting each case in detail, especially in Italy, where researchers assessed national programs (Alparone and Rissotto 2001; Corsi 2002). Over half the references were written by those who organized or otherwise participated in the cases. All references except Lorenzo (1997) stated research questions, usually in broad terms (see Table 1). Each reference's research questions covered at least one of the topics of interest in this article: impacts on the young participants (nine references), impacts on their communities (thirteen references), and process considerations (fifteen references).

Analysis of the selected literature set consisted of coding the youth participation case study findings from each reference according to the main categories of interest above. Within each of the main categories, the text was further coded in terms of subcategories, or findings statements, identified through patterns in the text and themes from the broader literature. The results sections of this article construct narratives from the coded text and contain tables listing the references that supported each of the findings statements. A high number of references supporting a statement suggests its generalizability, yet the opposite does not hold true since a statement can have fewer supporting references because researchers did not consider the statement. For references that included cases of other forms of youth engagement (particularly youth councils), every attempt was made to use findings that pertained only to the planning cases.

This article's methodology and selected literature set have several limitations. The methodology uses a literal replication approach that combines the case study results (Yin 1994). That is, the methodology provides findings for youth participation in general and does not relate differences between the cases, such as variations in participants' ages or activities conducted, to variations in findings. The article identifies only the impacts of youth participation and does not suggest that similar impacts would or would not be achieved for other forms of youth interaction with their communities. And, because all the cases involve youth, there is no comparison to adult-only participation.

The literature set has limitations because the cases studied are not representative of the universe of youth participation initiatives. The literature did not contain cases of youth-initiated planning. The cases were often led by adult academics or advocates and took place largely outside standard local government planning processes. The academics and advocates devoted more expertise and resources to the planning processes than would be available to a typical planner, and it remains to be seen whether the results would be the same for processes spearheaded by planners. The literature set is also limited by the type and quality of the research and reporting methods used in each study. All studies were case studies driven by multiple, broad research questions, with most results based upon researcher impressions of correlations. The studies therefore lacked the rigor of other methods such as experimental designs investigating narrowly defined questions. Since many of the researchers led the planning initiatives or are advocates of the practice, there is a natural bias to look for and report positive experiences.

The following three sections present the results of the literature review in terms of the impacts on the young

TABLE 1.   Selected Literature

Reference	Description of Cases	Stated Research Focus	Number of Cases	Participant Ages (years)	Total Number of Participants
Alparone and Rissotto 2001; Tonucci and Rissotto 2001	Children's City: The university-based project promoted children's participation in children's councils and planning of urban spaces in forty Italian cities over ten years. The planning cases arose out of city administrators' requests to groups of children to develop proposals for improvement.	Participation methods. Effects on child's personal and social development. Contribution children can make to changing the urban environment. Factors relevant to success.	Many	Adolescents	Unknown
Baldassari, Lehman, and Wolfe 1987	Children Creating Alternative Futures: The project led by academic researchers resulted from a one-year grant to develop, implement, and evaluate youth participation in three schools in New York City. Youth imagined alternative futures for their neighborhoods and requested improvements through final presentations at their schools.	Process issues. Impacts on youth participants. Impacts on participating schools.	2	9–16	About 60
Breitbart 1995	Banners for the Street: University researchers teamed with a summer arts program to involve youth in creating street banners for a low-income neighborhood in Holyoke, Massachusetts.	Participation methods. Obstacles to participation.	1	11–15	30
Checkoway and Richards-Schuster 2003; Checkoway et al. 2003	Lifting New Voices: The Center for Community Change recruited six community-based organizations in low-income areas in the United States to conduct community research to solve social problems. An example project was the Southwest Organizing Project's (Albuquerque, New Mexico) effort to end racial discrimination at a local mall.	Impacts on participants. Impacts for social action. Facilitating factors. Obstacles to participation.	6	15–21	Unknown
Corbishley 1995	Child in the Neighborhood Program: The Children's Society partnered with a local parish in London to help children explore their sense of place through a series of summer drama projects. The experience led to a redraft of the local development plan.	Process characteristics. Impact on parish to counter loss of play space.	1	8–13	Unknown
Corsi 2002	Child Friendly Cities: The Italian Ministry for the Environment created an annual award that encouraged municipalities to involve youth in councils and planning projects. An example project in Fano conducted workshops each year to improve an aspect of the city such as green space.	Children's assessment of their participation experience. Impacts on communities.	Many	9–14	Unknown

Francis 1988	Playground and schoolyard design projects: Residents and schools requested university assistance for the design of two open space projects in Davis, California. The designer facilitated a negotiation between youth and adults concerning their divergent design preferences.	Process techniques. Differences between children and adult designs.	2	Children	Unknown
Horelli 1998	Neighborhood improvement projects: The local council in Kitee, Finland, invited school children to plan improvements to the schoolyard and neighborhood over a two-year period. The project was a club held by two teachers. The projects in Locarno, Switzerland, and Darnétal, France, followed the methods used in Finland, but the duration of each was half a year.	Children's urban concerns and design preferences. Implications for planning theory. Implications for education.	3	7–12	About 120
Horelli and Kaaja 2002	Internet-assisted planning projects: In Pihlajisto, Finland, city officials involved school children in green space planning. During the process, the school took on another project to improve the near environment. In Joensuu, Finland, the city architect involved youth in planning the market plaza via an Internet café. In Juuka, Finland, the high school headmaster created a course on planning that targeted improvements of the town's old wooden center and used the Learning Ylä-Karjala project Web site.	Internet opportunities for youth voice in environmental issues.	4	10–18	57
Lorenzo 1997	Children's Futures Project: The World Wildlife Fund project in Aspromonte, Italy, teamed with two middle school teachers to conduct a year-long course that addressed local problems.	Process description.	1	13–14	Unknown
Malone 1999	Growing Up In Cities: The UNESCO initiative in Braybrook, Australia, included the Streetspace urban design project presented to local officials.	Relationship of city planners to young people.	1	10–15	60
Salvadori 1997	UNICEF project: As part of a larger UNICEF research initiative in five countries, the project in Milan, Italy, partnered school children with an urban planner and project leader over seven months to recommend neighborhood improvements to the city council.	Participation obstacles faced by youth.	1	11	19

(continued)

TABLE 1. (continued)

Reference	Description of Cases	Stated Research Focus	Number of Cases	Participant Ages (years)	Total Number of Participants
Schwab 1997; Meucci and Redmon 1997	California Wellness Foundation pilot projects: The Foundation recruited minority youth organizations in poor urban neighborhoods in Richmond, Oakland, and East Los Angeles to bring youth together during summer vacation to identify and address local problems.	Role of adults. Types of problems youth select to work on. Types of solutions youth propose. Benefits to children, communities, and environment.	4	10–19	About 45
Speak 2000	Cruddas Park Community Development Trust planning process: The project in Newcastle, Britain, stemmed from a long-standing development initiative for an inner-city estate that eventually sought the input of neighborhood children.	Ability of children to participate.	1	5–11	24
Sutton and Kemp 2002	School and neighborhood design charrettes: Academic researchers, graduate students, and designers conducted design charrettes at the university (in Seattle, Washington) for three elementary schools and neighborhoods and an urban village. The participating youth came from area schools and received preparatory education by the project team.	Process techniques. Benefits to young participants. Barriers to participation.	2	9–11, 14–18	109

TABLE 2.   Impacts on Youth Participants

Characteristic	References
Knowledge and skills	
Learned about the local community and environment	Baldassari, Lehman, and Wolfe 1987; Schwab 1997; Sutton and Kemp 2002
Learned how to create community change	Checkoway and Richards-Schuster 2003; Checkoway et al. 2003; Sutton and Kemp 2002
Developed planning skills	Baldassari, Lehman, and Wolfe 1987; Checkoway and Richards-Schuster 2003; Schwab 1997; Sutton and Kemp 2002
Attitudes and behaviors	
Became more confident and assertive	Baldassari, Lehman, and Wolfe 1987; Salvadori 1997; Schwab 1997
Were frustrated by lack of adult responsiveness	Alparone and Rissotto 2001; Corsi 2002; Horelli and Kaaja 2002
Developed enthusiasm for planning and community participation	Baldassari, Lehman, and Wolfe 1987; Breitbart 1995; Corsi 2002; Lorenzo 1997; Schwab 1997; Sutton and Kemp 2002

participants and their communities and process considerations, namely the capacity of youth to participate and the planning process attributes that contribute to positive impacts. Each section begins with an overview of what is known about the topic from the indirect research and guides followed by an analysis of the eighteen case study references.

IMPACTS ON YOUTH PARTICIPANTS

Hart (1997) believed that the potential for positive impacts on youth participants, such as fostering local knowledge and a sense of environmental responsibility, was the most persuasive reason for involving youth in community development and environmental care, because the impacts would lead society toward the ideals of sustainable development. These themes appear in the theory and research of the educational field of service learning, defined by the Commission on National and Community Service as a method under which students learn through active participation in service experiences that meet community needs and are coordinated in collaboration with the school and community (Waterman 1997, 2). Waterman (1997, 3) summarized the impacts of service learning on the youth participants as: "(a) enhancement in the learning of material that is part of the traditional in-school curriculum; (b) promoting personal development; (c) fostering the development of civic responsibility and other values of citizenship." Checkoway, Pothukuchi, and Finn (1995) summarized the potential benefits of youth participation in planning by reviewing studies of youth involvement in other forms of community service, finding that participation produces positive psychosocial results, such as enhanced sense of efficacy and civic competence,

and experiential education and skills development. There is very little in the service learning literature to suggest possible negative impacts on youth.

As shown in Table 2, the literature analyzed for this article supported the impression from the indirect research and guides that the majority of impacts on the young participants are positive. Most of the findings pertained to the unique aspects of planning processes such as learning about the local community and environment, learning planning skills, and developing enthusiasm for planning. Some studies found that youth extended their participation and recruited others. To a lesser degree, findings concerned broader impacts such as youth becoming more confident and assertive. Three references reported negative impacts in terms of youth being frustrated by the lack of adult responsiveness to their proposals, but the frustration did not translate into harm to the participants. Overall, it appears that youth participation builds capacity for further participation in terms of desire and abilities. The detailed findings are organized below according the impacts on youth (1) knowledge and skills and (2) attitudes and behaviors.

Knowledge and Skills

Learned about the local community and environment. Several studies reported that youth gained a better understanding of their physical and social environments, especially in terms of seeing their communities as dynamic networks (Baldassari, Lehman, and Wolfe 1987; Schwab 1997; Sutton and Kemp 2002).

Learned how to create community change. Checkoway and Richards-Schuster (2003) found that the Lifting New Voices project raised youth consciousness of the role of evaluation and research in planning and orga-

nizing. The Lifting New Voices cases also increased youth awareness of themselves as a group with organizational capacity to create change (Checkoway et al. 2003). Other researchers remarked that participation exposed youth to planning and public service careers (Sutton and Kemp 2002).

Developed planning skills. When researchers asked youth what they learned by participating in planning, they frequently mentioned new skills (Schwab 1997; Checkoway and Richards-Schuster 2003). Children gained competency at design skills (Sutton and Kemp 2002) and the use of communications media and other professional planning tools (Baldassari, Lehman, and Wolfe 1987). Following the Children Creating Alternative Futures project in New York City, youth demonstrated their improved ability to envision the future— that is, their images became more specific, included a role for institutions, and had the potential to be shaped by the leadership of themselves and others (Baldassari, Lehman, and Wolfe 1987). Schwab (1997) described how the ability of the youth to self-reflect became more pronounced over the progression of the projects sponsored by the California Wellness Foundation.

Attitudes and Behaviors

Became more confident and assertive. Researchers observed that youth participants' confidence in their abilities increased during the planning processes and was bolstered by the positive feedback they received at their final presentations (Salvadori 1997; Schwab 1997). Youth became proud of their communities and comfortable expressing their opinions and immigrant cultures (Baldassari, Lehman, and Wolfe 1987; Schwab 1997). In small ways, youth became more assertive such as learning to arrange the classroom furniture to meet their needs (Baldassari, Lehman, and Wolfe 1987). Participation helped youth to understand how their personal development and community awareness affects their capacity for civic action and responsibility (Baldassari, Lehman, and Wolfe 1987; Schwab 1997).

Were frustrated by lack of adult responsiveness. Interviews with youth participants uncovered that they were frustrated when adults did not take the youth's recommendations seriously, but that in spite of this, youth generally viewed their participation as constructive (Alparone and Rissotto 2001; Corsi 2002; Horelli and Kaaja 2002). Corsi (2002) noted in a study of many cases of youth participation in the Child Friendly Cities program across Italy that the youth believed that the project promoters had good intentions despite the limited tangible impacts on their communities.

Developed enthusiasm for planning and community involvement. The most commonly reported impact on youth was an increase in their desire to participate in planning and other forms of civic engagement. Breitbart (1995) described how the youth involved in the Banners for the Street public art project in Massachusetts began their effort in a playful manner, but that they became more focused when documenting neighborhood conditions. Baldassari, Lehman, and Wolfe (1987) observed that the New York City youth were better behaved and more self-assured during their neighborhood tour than they had been at school and that their seriousness increased as their ideas took shape.

Upon the completion of planning projects, youth demonstrated their continued enthusiasm by asking adults to extend the planning activities, accepting new invitations for participation, recruiting other youth to participate, and creating their own opportunities for participation (Schwab 1997; Corsi 2002; Sutton and Kemp 2002). Youth involved in the World Wildlife Fund (WWF) initiative in Italy convinced their teachers not to abandon the project in the face of coincidental misfortune, because the youth believed that their efforts could improve the crime-ridden region (Lorenzo 1997). The youth involved in the Massachusetts public art project wanted to go beyond identifying neighborhood problems to taking steps to address them (Breitbart 1995). Youth interest in participation was enhanced by their growing concern for the well-being of their local community and environment (Schwab 1997).

Concurring with Hart (1997), analysis of the case studies showed that participation built civic capacity for community decision making and therefore moved society toward sustainable development. As described in the next section, youth participation has the added benefit of creating present-day change in support of community livability.

IMPACTS ON COMMUNITIES

The AICP Code of Ethics and Professional Conduct (2005) states that citizen participation should have "a meaningful impact on the development of plans and programs." It is thus important to the planning profession that participation not only has beneficial consequences for individual participants, but that it also results in real community change.

A body of research can be applied to anticipate the impacts of youth participation on communities in terms of the values youth would express if they had the opportunity to influence community change. The most extensive research in this genre is the recent Growing Up In Cities initiative that asked youth in eight low- to

mixed-income urban areas around the world about their priorities for community improvement (Chawla 2002b). Comparisons across the research sites uncovered youth preferences for social integration, freedom of movement, safety, and a varied environment. Talen and Coffindaffer (1999) confirmed that youth favor interaction, diversity, and accessibility through their literature review and research of rural children's "perfect neighborhood" designs. Terrible's (2000) literature review stressed the affinity that youth have for the natural environment, which was also a finding from the latest Growing Up In Cities project. Chawla (2002b, 19) and others have concluded, "The priorities that children express are conditions for making cities more livable for all ages."

Indirect studies addressing the capabilities of youth speak to the question of whether youth participation recommendations would be of sufficient technical quality to be implementable. Adapting what is known about child psychosocial development, youth participation theorists have argued that youth can meaningfully contribute to community change within properly designed planning processes (Baldassari, Hart, and Lockett 1980; Hart 1997; Hart et al. 1997; Bartlett et al. 1999). This argument is presented in more detail in the section discussing youth capacity for planning. There are no indirect studies to indicate whether the youths' recommendations would in fact be acted upon.

The following case study analysis provides direct evidence of the impacts of youth participation on communities, with key findings listed in Table 3. The case study findings match the predictions from the indirect literature and provide additional insights. Youth participation in planning resulted in new information, recommendations, and implemented projects that addressed both youth-specific and communitywide concerns. The issues that youth tackled and their proposals for improvement were those that are widely recognized as important for community livability. Because youth tend to rely more heavily on public services such as alternative modes of transportation and access to public spaces, improvements in public services resulting from youth participation also had the potential to benefit other served populations such as low-income and elderly individuals.

About half the references described cases of youth participation that went beyond presenting recommendations to implementation. One study that compared impacts over many cases, however, noted that the tangible effects were small relative to other community changes. For youth participation cases that did not proceed to implementation, many researchers remarked that the recommendations were feasible because they were realistic and represented common community

values. This appraisal does not mean that youth proposals would be accepted "as is" by adults, but that the proposals were not entirely incompatible with adults values and could be implemented in modified form through a process of assistance and negotiation with adults. An additional significant observation was that experience with youth participation invariably increased adults' respect for youth capabilities and interests. Overall, the case study analysis supports the view of youth as valuable resources in positive community change. The detailed findings from the case studies are presented below in terms of how youth participation (1) addressed youth and community concerns, (2) generated information, (3) presented feasible recommendations, and (4) implemented recommendations.

Addressed Youth and Community Concerns

Youth concerns. Since traditional planning underserves youth, a desired role of youth participation is that it address youth-specific concerns. For some of the cases, adults who organized the youth participation initiatives specified that they pertain to youth-oriented public services such the design of a neighborhood playground or elementary schoolyard (Francis 1988). In most situations, however, youth had the freedom to choose the focus of their projects and some participants selected youth-specific concerns such as adult discrimination of youth (Checkoway and Richards-Schuster 2003), the availability of teen centers, and youths' fear of violence (Schwab 1997). Youth in the cases examined by Checkoway et al. (2003) most frequently chose to address education and school conditions.

Community concerns. Most youth participation initiatives addressed concerns that are mutually held by youth and adults. Tonucci and Rissotto (2001) made this observation in their comparative study of youth participation projects in Italy. Across the references reviewed for this article, youth chose to research and work toward solutions for diverse community concerns that included housing, graffiti, tenant-landlord problems, vacant lots, natural areas, toxic sites, library services, and drug and alcohol abuse (Baldassari, Lehman, and Wolfe 1987; Lorenzo 1997; Schwab 1997). Two references (Salvadori 1997; Speak 2000) described children in inner-city neighborhoods who wanted to assist dogwalkers in keeping the streets free of pet waste. The youth involved in the project sponsored by the World Wildlife Fund sought to improve the region's national reputation as crime-ridden by attracting visitors to experience the region's assets (Lorenzo 1997).

Youth preferences. Whether young people were addressing youth-specific or community-wide concerns, their predilection for engaging and safe commu-

TABLE 3.   Impacts on Communities

Characteristic	References
Addressed concerns of	
Youth	Checkoway and Richards-Schuster 2003; Checkoway et al. 2003; Francis 1988; Schwab 1997
Larger community	Baldassari, Lehman, and Wolfe 1987; Lorenzo 1997; Malone 1999; Salvadori 1997; Schwab 1997; Speak 2000; Tonucci and Rissotto 2001
Illustrated youth preferences	Breitbart 1995; Checkoway et al. 2003; Francis 1988; Horelli 1998; Meucci and Redmon 1997; Salvadori 1997; Tonucci and Rissotto 2001
Generated information	Alparone and Rissotto 2001; Checkoway and Richards-Schuster 2003; Corbishley 1995; Salvadori 1997
Improved adult perceptions of youth	Baldassari, Lehman, and Wolfe 1987; Corbishley 1995; Schwab 1997
Presented feasible recommendations	Horelli and Kaaja 2002; Malone 1999; Salvadori 1997; Tonucci and Rissotto 2001
Implemented recommendations	Alparone and Rissotto 2001; Baldassari, Lehman, and Wolfe 1987; Breitbart 1997; Checkoway et al. 2003; Francis 1988; Lorenzo 1997; Schwab 1997; Tonucci and Rissotto 2001
Minor tangible impacts	Alparone and Rissotto 2001

nities was apparent. Tonucci and Rissotto's (2001) comparative study across Italy noted that youth expressed desires for greater social exchange, mobility, and autonomy. The youth who participated in four California health projects called for the renewal of public life (Meucci and Redmon 1997). The children involved in neighborhood improvement in three European countries valued communal spaces (Horelli 1998), and, in an Italian neighborhood project, the children designed a pedestrian-oriented street (Salvadori 1997). Youth Working for Positive Change in Des Moines, Iowa, organized a resident patrol to protect children from drug dealers on their way to and from school, and youth of the Southwest Organizing Project in Albuquerque, New Mexico, fought for the right of youth to assemble at a local mall (Checkoway et al. 2003). Youth artwork communicated their wish for more color, spirited forms, and pleasant scenery that was the opposite of their inner-city surroundings (Breitbart 1995; Salvadori 1997). Francis (1988) observed that the youth designing a playground preferred highly interactive and flexible features. The following discussion of the outcomes of youth participation shows how the youths' values were embodied in information, ideas, projects, and policies.

Generated Information

In terms of concrete products resulting from youth participation, the generation of information about the community or environment is a significant resource that shapes community change. Youth participation initiatives often gathered data, and youth communicated their findings to others in order to raise awareness of problems. When children in Italy surveyed their neighborhood, they identified the main problems as excessive automobile traffic and a lack of recreational areas (Salvadori 1997). A school class in Finland along with neighborhood residents presented traffic safety findings that evolved into a citizens' initiative that received public funds (Horelli 1998). Youth involved in the Lifting New Voices projects tracked rates of school suspensions and incidents of racial discrimination at a local mall (Checkoway and Richards-Schuster 2003). During the participation processes, adults also learned about youths' needs and capabilities, prompting adults to initiate improvements (Corbishley 1995; Alparone and Rissotto 2001) and altering adults' conceptions of youth (Baldassari, Lehman, and Wolfe 1987; Corbishley 1995; Schwab 1997). A special type of information produced from the planning processes is the youths' recommendations. As discussed below, the recommendations have merit not only as expressions of the youths' preferences but also as feasible ideas in response to community concerns.

Presented Feasible Recommendations

Each of the youth participation initiatives presented in the literature developed recommendations for community improvement based upon the information gathered during the process. For cases that did not proceed to implementation, evaluation of the feasibility of the youths' recommendations indicates whether the barriers to implementation primarily reside with the capacity of youth or with the planning process and sociopolitical context. By assessing youth participation proposals as practical, insightful, and operable,

researchers have sided with the opinion that youth are capable (Tonucci and Rissotto 2001; Malone 1999). A few references explained why the proposals were not implemented in spite of their feasibility. Horelli and Kaaja (2002) observed that a regional council deemed the youths' proposal as acceptable, but there were no financial resources to support implementation. Salvadori (1997) noted that the children's pedestrian-friendly street design met with positive community feedback, but that some businesses objected to the reduction of automobile accessibility. For these two cases, the barriers to implementation of the projects (perhaps in modified form) could have been overcome through the extension and improvement of the planning processes. Cases that apparently overcame sociopolitical barriers and turned the youths' recommendations into new policies, projects, and programs are presented below.

Implemented Recommendations

The youth participation initiatives that went beyond passively generating information or recommendations to actively implementing the ideas achieved youth-friendly public policies and services and improvements in neighborhood livability. Alparone and Rissotto (2001) found that many of the Italian projects were implemented, resulting in tangible changes such as a new policy allowing youth to play in public spaces, improvements in pedestrian and bicycle mobility, the creation of new public spaces, and the formation of a neighborhood watch program (Tonucci and Rissotto 2001). The California health projects were particularly successful, with voter approval of a citywide resolution allocating funds for youth programs, passage of a petition to extend library hours, and invitations for youth to serve on city task forces (Schwab 1997). Likewise, youth in the Checkoway et al. (2003) cases had a wide range of accomplishments including removing the police presence at their school, defeating a proposal for a military charter school, and revoking a school policy that punished tardiness with suspension. Other youth participation outcomes were the creation of an outdoor nature laboratory (Lorenzo 1997), improvements to a vacant lot (Baldassari, Lehman, and Wolfe 1987), and the construction of innovative playground equipment (Francis 1988). One study (Breitbart 1995) found that the public art project implementation was more successful because youth had been involved in its planning. Apparently, other youth in the community had greater respect for the effort and therefore did not vandalize the street banners. Despite the successes, Alparone and Rissotto (2001) considered the cumulative impacts and found them to be modest in relation to the changes brought forth by the forces of economic development.

The impacts on youth and communities as described in the past two sections are functions of the approaches used in the planning processes. The case studies were rich with process descriptions, and researchers often expressed opinions about how well youth were able to perform specific activities and what process approaches were particularly beneficial (or not). The results are presented in the following two sections.

YOUTH CAPACITY FOR PARTICIPATION

By and large, the planning initiatives described in the literature benefited young people and their communities, thus youth demonstrated the capacity for meaningful participation. Further understanding of youth capacity, namely the interest that youth have in participating and the planning skills with which young people can competently engage, speaks to whether youth participation is practicable, provides process design options, and contributes general lessons for effective practice as presented in the next section.

Past approaches to understanding the capacity of youth to participate in planning involved arguments based on findings from psychology, particularly descriptions of the psychosocial development of youth. Bartlett et al. (1999) described the capabilities of youth at different developmental stages in order to define the appropriate relationship between local agencies and youth, including the potential for youth participation in community affairs. Based upon their analysis of diverse competencies, such as the ability to understand the perspectives of others, complex systems, and logical principles, Bartlett et al. suggested that middle childhood (ages 7–12 years old) is the time to begin offering opportunities for youth to participate in community action and identified process designs that would fit the interests and capabilities of children and adolescents. Bartlett et al. recommended that children be allowed to test their abilities, explore their surroundings, and interact with adults, and that adolescents be encouraged to plan and manage their own projects and become involved in local decision making with the assistance of adults. Other theorists examined young people's development in the areas of perspective taking, communication, social identity, social cooperation, and peer relations and agreed that children and adolescents are capable of participating in planning, with process recommendations in line with those of Bartlett et al. (Baldassari, Hart, and Lockett 1980; Hart 1997; Hart et al. 1997). Furthermore, there is the growing number of guides to youth participation based on collections of short case studies and personal experience that suggest specific process techniques (Baldassari et al. 1981; Hart and Moore 1982–83; Adams and Ingham 1998; Mullahey,

Susskind, and Checkoway 1999; Race and Torma 1999; Urban Places Project 2000; Driskell 2002).

In addition to the application of developmental psychology, another source that provides an indirect understanding of the capacity of youth to participate is the handful of experiments that have assessed the spatial skills of children. Nagy and Baird (1978) found that children as young as nine years old were able to accurately represent the spatial arrangement of a familiar environment (a playground), but that the children's maps of their ideal spaces did not reflect their preferences. Halseth and Doddridge (2000) examined young children's cognitive mapping abilities, noting that the children worked diligently to represent places that were important to them. Plester et al. (2002) investigated four- and five-year-old children's ability to interpret aerial photographs and determined that they could competently use them. These three studies concluded that the planning techniques showed promise for planners working with young people.

Last, the indirect literature includes interview-based research pertaining to youth interest in planning. The question of youth interest is important because public participation in planning is usually a voluntary activity and motivation to participate would likely affect performance. The studies revealed that youth were enthusiastic about participating in planning (Percy-Smith 2002), but they were skeptical that their opinions mattered to adults (Woolley et al. 1999; Chawla 2002b, chap. 10).

The case study literature reviewed for this article sheds more light on the capacity of youth to participate. In terms of youth interest in participating, no cases had difficulty recruiting participants. Several school-based projects noted that even the "problem kids" were eager to participate. The studies also found that young people believed that they should be regularly consulted on community matters. In terms of youth abilities, the studies provided evidence that youth were able to engage in a wide range of planning activities. Adams (1998) and Adams and Ingham (1998) elaborated on the skills that planning requires, summarized as technical, communicative, and sociopolitical. The sociopolitical skills include incorporating other perspectives, making collective decisions, and sociopolitical mobilization. The case studies found that young people's technical skills included research, analysis, and design, although one case encountered adult professionals who were dissatisfied with the quality of children's designs. Researchers were most impressed by the communicative skills of youth, finding young people to be articulate and expressive, and it was these skills that had the greatest effect on improving adult attitudes toward youth. In terms of sociopolitical skills, youth were observed to incorporate the perspectives of others in the

community and to work collectively to make decisions and function as a team. The youth were less successful, however, in navigating the sociopolitical context to implement their ideas. Children, especially, had limited conceptions of how the sociopolitical context functioned, and youth generally lacked the sociopolitical resources to create change. Older adolescents were more successful in guiding their projects to implementation and became adept at social mobilization as they accumulated participation experience. The remainder of this section presents the detailed results of the capacity of youth to participate, with the findings summarized in Table 4.

Interest in Participating

The planning initiatives were able to attract youth across the board, regardless of their age, location (suburbs or inner-city neighborhoods), ethnicity, or economic status. Several researchers noted that the initiatives' real-world, service aspects and hands-on activities held special appeal for youth who did not respond well to traditional education (Baldassari, Lehman, and Wolfe 1987; Lorenzo 1997). And, as discussed in the section on impacts on participants, the youths' interest in participation usually grew as a result of involvement. Only Sutton and Kemp (2002) reported difficulty retaining the young participants, mostly teenage girls, citing problems with scheduling and transportation.

The literature also uncovered youth receptivity to participation in general, outside of specific invitations for involvement. In the Australian Growing Up in Cities project, youth expressed an interest in being provided with regular opportunities to voice their concerns to local officials (Malone 1999). British children involved in a neighborhood planning project stated that all people, including themselves, had a right to be consulted on neighborhood matters and suggested a school forum as an avenue for participation (Speak 2000). Youths' performance of the technical, communicative, and sociopolitical skills used in planning processes follows.

Technical Skills

Youth demonstrated competence with the standard planning techniques of research (conducting observations, interviews, and surveys, and reviewing documents), analysis (reasoning, mapping, and graphing), and design (drawing and modeling) (Baldassari, Lehman, and Wolfe 1987; Breitbart 1995; Schwab 1997; Horelli and Kaaja 2002; Sutton and Kemp 2002; Checkoway and Richards-Schuster 2003). Baldassari, Lehman, and Wolfe (1987) observed that youth engaged in critical thinking, actively questioning the

TABLE 4.   Youth Capacity for Participation

Characteristic	References
Youth were interested in participating	Baldassari, Lehman, and Wolfe 1987; Lorenzo 1997; Malone 1999; Speak 2000
Youth demonstrated planning skills	
Technical skills	Baldassari, Lehman, and Wolfe 1987; Breitbart 1997; Checkoway and Richards-Schuster 2003; Horelli and Kaaja 2002; Lorenzo 1997; Schwab 1997; Sutton and Kemp 2002
Communicative skills	Alparone and Rissotto 2001; Baldassari, Lehman, and Wolfe 1987; Breitbart 1997; Checkoway et al. 2003; Corsi 2002; Salvadori 1997; Schwab 1997; Speak 2000; Sutton and Kemp 2002
Perspective-taking skills	Alparone and Rissotto 2001: Baldassari, Lehman, and Wolfe 1987; Checkoway et al. 2003; Salvadori 1997
Collective decision-making skills	Baldassari, Lehman, and Wolfe 1987; Breitbart 1997; Checkoway and Richards-Schuster 2003; Francis 1988; Lorenzo 1997; Salvadori 1997; Schwab 1997; Speak 2000
Difficulty understanding or engaging sociopolitical system	Salvadori 1997; Schwab 1997; Speak 2000; Sutton and Kemp 2002
Engaged sociopolitical strategies	Alparone and Rissotto 2001; Baldassari, Lehman, and Wolfe 1987; Checkoway et al. 2003; Lorenzo 1997; Schwab 1997; Speak 2000; Sutton and Kemp 2002

ideas presented to them. Lorenzo (1997) noted that when the youth participating in the World Wildlife Fund project presented their proposal to the local mayor, it was clear that they had already addressed his concerns. Sutton and Kemp (2002), however, reported that the professional charrette leaders demanded higher quality designs than the children could produce.

Communicative Skills

Across the case studies, researchers were impressed by the articulate, passionate, honest, independent, and competent expressions of the young participants (Baldassori 1987; Corsi 2002; Sutton and Kemp 2002). In fact, Speak (2000) observed that the children were more confident in communicating to planners than their parents had been during a parallel planning process. In some cases, children spoke with candor, depicting depressing environments in which they felt alienated (Breitbart 1995; Salvadori 1997) and sharing their cultural identities as minorities (Schwab 1997). Youth were adept at public speaking, including fielding questions, and they encouraged the attendance of parents, community members, and city officials (Baldassari, Lehman, and Wolfe 1987; Alparone and Rissotto 2001; Sutton and Kemp 2002). The high level of communicative skills of youth was most apparent in the cases studied by Checkoway et al. (2003), in which youth held multilingual mass meetings to protest school conditions, organized meetings with school officials, and testified at public hearings.

Sociopolitical Skills

Perspective-taking. Youth were able to learn about other perspectives and to design community solutions that took them into account. Youth identified other perspectives by interviewing neighborhood residents and conducting role-playing exercises (Salvadori 1997; Alparone and Rissotto 2001). The New York City youth discovered how the different neighborhood groups' visions of the area were in opposition, a fact that explained why the community was unable to make progress in the past (Baldassari, Lehman, and Wolfe 1987). Youth involved with People United for a Better Oakland represented African American, Asian American, Latino, and Latina populations and identified issues that cut across the diverse constituencies (Checkoway et al. 2003).

Collective decision making. The case study initiatives involved youth in collective decision making throughout the processes. Youth participants jointly selected their planning topics or sites of interest within the broad constraints given by adults (Baldassari, Lehman, and Wolfe 1987; Salvadori 1997; Schwab 1997), organized their activities such as information gathering (Breitbart 1995; Checkoway and Richards-Schuster 2003), and designed their own formal decision-making processes and elected representatives (Baldassari, Lehman, and Wolfe 1987; Breitbart 1995; Speak 2000). Youth worked together to generate ideas and analyze results (Breitbart 1995; Lorenzo 1997), and the World Wildlife Fund project youth expressed interest in hearing about how

other youth groups had resolved similar problems (Lorenzo 1997). Francis (1988) included a description of how children successfully negotiated with adults to reconcile their conflicting design preferences. Only Baldassari, Lehman, and Wolfe (1987) reported difficulties with youth working together because of cliques that did not get along with each other.

Sociopolitical mobilization. As the planning initiatives approached the transition from making recommendations to implementing them, youth encountered greater demands for working within the sociopolitical context, and the demands challenged the capacity of youth for a variety of reasons. Researchers found that children had a limited understanding of the sociopolitical context and did not know how to move forward with their recommendations (Speak 2000; Sutton and Kemp 2002). Salvadori (1997) noted that youth lacked the resources for sociopolitical mobilization, such as experience, clout, and social connections. And, there were ingrained power differentials between youth and adults, and between citizens and public officials, of which the youth were aware (Schwab 1997). Schwab (1997) found that older youth became more adept at advocating their ideas with participation experience.

Despite the challenges of sociopolitical mobilization, half of references described cases in which youth achieved some degree of implementation. Youth maintained interest and effort when provided with opportunities to implement their ideas (Alparone and Rissotto 2001). In the case of the World Wildlife Fund project, the youth took the initiative to begin site modifications on their own (Lorenzo 1997). Typical strategies of sociopolitical mobilization employed by youth included contacting property owners, appealing to local officials, enlisting the assistance of adults and organizations, and communicating to the public (Baldassari, Lehman, and Wolfe 1987; Lorenzo 1997; Schwab 1997; Speak 2000; Sutton and Kemp 2002). The Lifting New Voices case was particularly strong in the area of sociopolitical mobilization, with youth collecting petitions, packing public meetings, chanting outside buildings, and organizing students to come late to school in protest of policy (Checkoway et al. 2003).

The overall picture of youth capacity above shows that young people enthusiastically participated in planning and contributed via technical, communicative, and sociopolitical skills. The youth were more adept at some planning tasks than others, and in all cases, adults assisted the youth in leveraging their abilities. Additionally, some cases noted missed opportunities for providing youth with needed support. There are thus important lessons for effective practice directed at adults and youth leaders interested in helping youth create positive community change and personally benefit from participation. The next section assembles five lessons that figured prominently in the case study literature.

LESSONS FOR EFFECTIVE PRACTICE

Researchers often attributed achieving the positive impacts discussed earlier to process characteristics, or they suggested improvements to address the difficulties encountered. This section distills the process wisdom of the literature into five lessons for approaching youth participation that are aimed at adults and youth leaders: (1) give youth responsibility and voice; (2) build youth capacity; (3) encourage youthful styles of working; (4) involve adults throughout the process; and (5) adapt the sociopolitical context. Together, the five lessons recognize that youth participation has the potential to benefit the participants and their communities and that this potential is more fully realized when adults and society reach out to them. The lessons embody multiple alternative views of youth: as resources for civic action, as learners who develop their competencies as a result of experience, and as collaborators who welcome assistance from adults who possess needed resources. The five lessons and supporting references are listed in Table 5.

The five lessons compare favorably to advice given by those who have written guides to the practice of youth participation in planning. Most authors wrote with the goals of making participation tenable and effective at creating community change. Less attention has been paid to increasing the satisfaction of the youth participants. Beginning with Baldassari, Hart, and Lockett (1980), the guides typically touched upon the first four lessons outlined above. In terms of giving youth responsibility and voice, authors pushed for adults to allow youth to engage in activities that are usually the domain of adults. Hart (1997, chap. 3) sought to avoid manipulation and tokenism and advocated that youth be involved all aspects of planning processes, from conceptual to technical. Race and Torma (1999) instructed planners working with youth to act as facilitators and assistants rather than consulting experts. In terms of building youth capacity, Adams and Ingham (1998, 31) stated, "Children cannot suddenly be involved in ways which demand high levels of skill, without having had other opportunities to gain experience and develop some measure of confidence and competence." Authors commonly emphasized the usefulness of the research step to ignite the planning process. In terms of encouraging youthful styles of working, the guides focused on youth-friendly techni-

TABLE 5.　Lessons for Effective Youth Participation

Lesson	References
Give youth responsibility and voice	Alparone and Rissotto 2001; Baldassari, Lehman, and Wolfe 1987; Breitbart 1995; Checkoway and Richards-Schuster 2003; Checkoway et al. 2003; Corsi 2002; Horelli and Kaaja 2002; Lorenzo 1997; Schwab 1997; Sutton and Kemp 2002
Build youth capacity	Alparone and Rissotto 2001; Baldassari, Lehman, and Wolfe 1987; Breitbart 1997; Checkoway et al. 2003; Lorenzo 1997; Malone 1999; Salvadori 1997
Encourage youthful styles of working	Alparone and Rissotto 2001; Baldassari, Lehman, and Wolfe 1987; Breitbart 1997; Corbishley 1995; Horelli and Kaaja 2002; Malone 1999; Schwab 1997; Sutton and Kemp 2002
Involve adults throughout the process	Alparone and Rissotto 2001; Baldassari, Lehman, and Wolfe 1987; Breitbart 1997; Checkoway and Richards-Schuster 2003; Corsi 2002; Lorenzo 1997; Schwab 1997
Adapt the sociopolitical context	Alparone and Rissotto 2001; Baldassari, Lehman, and Wolfe 1987; Breitbart 1997; Checkoway et al. 2003; Salvadori 1997; Schwab 1997

cal and communicative activities: drawing, mapping, interviewing, surveying, publishing, video recording, radio reporting, and the performance arts (Hart and Moore 1982–83; Hart 1997, Part 3; Adams and Ingham 1998; Mullahey, Susskind, and Checkoway 1999; Driskell 2002). Urban Places Project (2000) included sociopolitical activities such as team building, outreach to others, brainstorming, choosing the best ideas, and celebrations. In terms of involving adults throughout the process, Hart (1997, chap. 3) valued "adult-initiated, shared decisions with youth" processes as truly participatory and recognized "child-initiated, shared decisions with adults" processes as having the greatest community impact because youth can accomplish more when tapping into adult power. Adams and Ingham (1998, chap. 12) wrote a chapter about how professionals and young people can work together. The fifth lesson, adapt the sociopolitical context, was less frequently mentioned. Authors paid more attention to creating opportunities for youth participation than to removing barriers faced by established initiatives. Along the lines of the fifth lesson, Adams and Ingham (1998, chap. 14) suggested that professionals and local authorities improve access to community information and take individual responsibility for supporting youth participation. The case study evidence that led to the five lessons is presented below.

Give Youth Responsibility and Voice

The first condition for effective youth participation was to address the power imbalance between young people and adults at the process level. The literature recommended that adults relinquish some of their control and give youth responsibility and voice in the planning processes. Researchers found that when adult coordinators allowed youth greater autonomy and purpose, they were highly motivated to do good work (Schwab 1997; Horelli and Kaaja 2002). Conversely, the youth involved with the public art initiative in Massachusetts lost some of their confidence when faced with the seriousness of the project, but they regained it through experience with the tasks (Breitbart 1995). Several case studies reported that youth felt satisfaction that their voices were heard and that they contributed to the well-being of their communities (Schwab 1997; Corsi 2002; Sutton and Kemp 2002). Corsi (2002) observed that youth sensed when adults, even those acting as project facilitators, did not recognize their capabilities. Checkoway et al. (2003) noted the facilitative benefit of young people serving as leaders within their organizations.

Build Youth Capacity

Second, effective youth participation processes addressed the gap between the demands of planning processes and young people's capabilities by building youth knowledge, skills, and confidence. Building capacity was necessary because youth often had a limited understanding of their neighborhoods as a result of their lack of independent mobility (Baldassori 1987; Breitbart 1995; Salvadori 1997; Malone 1999). Conducting neighborhood tours proved to be a valuable method of eliciting thoughts and generating enthusiasm (Baldassori et al. 1987; Lorenzo 1997). Alparone and Rissotto (2001) described exercises that showed the young participants how to be creative yet realistic. The intergenerational groups of the Lifting New Voices cases provided participants with demonstrably effective training in community organizing (Checkoway et al. 2003).

Encourage Youthful Styles of Working

Although building youth capacity to engage in traditional, adult-oriented planning activities was important, researchers also emphasized the need for processes to reach out to the participants by incorporating youthful styles of working. Youth responded to techniques that were social, dynamic, interactive, expressive, constructive, and challenging (Malone 1999; Alparone and Rissotto 2001; Corsi 2002; Horelli and Kaaja 2002). The California health projects capitalized on the artistic, and occasionally boisterous, ways in which youth express themselves by using video and music recording (Schwab 1997). One case, however, encountered conflict when the youth incorporated rap music, of which the adult teachers did not approve (Baldassari, Lehman, and Wolfe 1987). A key draw to participation for youth was that the processes were fun, and this was achieved through socializing, learning new skills, and exploring outside the classroom (Alparone and Rissotto 2001). Youth appreciated working alongside their peers rather than being in processes dominated by adults (Malone 1999), yet youth relished opportunities to demonstrate their skills to adults (Baldassari, Lehman, and Wolfe 1987). Breitbart (1995) and Corbishley (1995) commented that since youth appreciated learning, experiencing, communicating, and demonstrating skills, the processes did not need to progress to implementation for the youth to value their participation. Checkoway and Richards-Schuster (2003), however, found that youth often began their community evaluation research with social action in mind.

Several references noted practical concerns of importance when working with youth. The initiatives were usually ad hoc and short duration (on the order of months), fitting well with the fact that youth are in a dynamic period in their lives. Thus, planning processes avoided the difficulties associated with the high turnover rates experienced by institutionalized forms of participation such as municipal youth councils (Alparone and Rissotto 2001). The youth involved in the California health projects identified the need for a stable workspace, something that adults often take for granted (Schwab 1997). Sutton and Kemp (2002) noted that youth were not able to maintain participation because of problems with scheduling and transportation.

Involve Adults throughout the Process

With every case, adults served as process conveners and facilitators. Within these roles, adults ensured positive impacts by taking youth seriously, building youth capacity, and levering resources on behalf of youth. Given that youth have less experience with community planning, it was important for adult facilitators to train and assist youth with the process activities (Alparone and Rissotto 2001). Through adult support, youth acquired the confidence to ask decision makers to consider their ideas or to directly pursue change (Baldassari, Lehman, and Wolfe 1987; Lorenzo 1997; Schwab 1997). In other cases, adults' organizational clout was crucial in tipping the political scale in favor of the youths' recommendations (Breitbart 1995; Lorenzo 1997; Checkoway and Richards-Schuster 2003). Youth consistently appreciated adult assistance (Lorenzo 1997; Schwab 1997), and, in one case, participants suggested that older youth also serve as project mentors (Schwab 1997).

Several researchers recommended ways in which the working relationship between adults and youth could be further strengthened. Alparone and Rissotto (2001) stressed that adults should be honest with youth regarding the political and bureaucratic challenges, and that adults should adhere to an explicit code of ethics that includes acting in good faith and not exploiting youth. Corsi (2002) suggested that tokenism could be addressed if adults and youth negotiated the responsibilities of each at the beginning and end of the process.

Adapt the Sociopolitical Context

When reflecting on their participatory experiences, youth were most critical of the lack of responsiveness of government officials (Alparone and Rissotto 2001; Corsi 2002; Horelli and Kaaja 2002). Researchers concurred that the present state of the sociopolitical context posed a significant barrier to the full realization of youth participation and suggested changes in the context to make it more responsive. To improve the commitment of decision makers, Breitbart (1995) and Salvadori (1997) recommended that city officials and community leaders be involved early in the process. Alparone and Rissotto (2001) observed, however, that even government-initiated projects lost enthusiasm when it came time to implement the youths' proposals. Alparone and Rissotto (2001) called for the institution of ethical standards regarding working with youth, and Schwab (1997) recommended that adults be trained how to share power. At the organizational level, Baldassari, Lehman, and Wolfe (1987) noted that the New York City schools were uncomfortable with the sociopolitical controversies connected to their students' participation in planning and suggested that youth participation programs have independence outside the schools. Only one reference reported an incidence of the sociopolitical context adapting in response to the initiatives' needs: Italian city administrators shortened their bureaucratic procedures for the youth (Alparone and

Rissotto 2001). In light of the disconnects between the worlds of youth and adults, Checkoway et al. (2003, 305) noted the usefulness of persons of any age who can serve as "intermediaries, translators and matchmakers between diverse individuals and groups."

CONCLUSIONS

This article began by contrasting the potential benefits of youth participation identified by proponents with the mostly cynical expectations stemming from the societal views of youth. The review of the empirically based literature leans decidedly in the direction of benefits, although there were hints of the possibility for negative impacts. The review found that young people benefited from their participation because it increased their civic capacity, an impact of societal value as well. Youth participation benefited communities by raising awareness of problems, addressing youth concerns, and improving livability for all. The review also showed that young people were enthusiastic about participating and capable of engaging in a wide range of planning activities. Negative findings from the review included minor community change and youths' frustration at the lack of responsiveness of city officials. The negative findings were related to youths' limited ability to work within sociopolitical context. An encouraging finding was, however, that participation was positively reinforcing, building youth and adult, and perhaps institutional and societal, capacity for further engagement. The literature review wrapped up by highlighting the importance of process to maximize benefits and attend to concerns of youth capacity and the ability of the sociopolitical context to respond. The advice to give youth power, build youth capacity, encourage youthful styles of working, provide adult assistance, and adapt the sociopolitical context recognized youth as community resources, learners, and collaborators.

These findings are tentative, however, because the case study literature did not represent important types of youth participation. Notably lacking were cases of youth participation led by traditional local government planners, the type that would inevitably follow if calls for greater youth participation are headed. Given that traditional planning processes are dominated by legal, economic, and other concerns as observed by Knowles-Yánez (2002), it is more likely that the possible negative impacts would surface. Initiatives that originate from planners would also differ from the literature cases by having a more narrow objective, and thus not be as open ended, collective, and research based. Planning-oriented rather than youth-oriented processes would thus theoretically not have as great a potential for benefiting the young participants. Also missing from the literature set were cases of the type "youth initiated, shared decisions with adults," a type that further challenges youth-adult power relations and would thus affect the conclusions. Implications of the literature review for planning practice, education, and research are presented below.

The main implication for practice is to encourage youth participation in planning, because it is practicable and has a wide range of benefits. Actions for planners include making room for youth participation within traditional public involvement processes and responding to the needs and recommendations of independent processes. Both actions entail using the principles of good practice outlined by the five lessons and will prove challenging for planners. Planners would be stretched to allow youth the latitude to define and address their issues of concern, especially given the presence of powerful, competing demands on planning processes (e.g., economic development). Planners have a short supply of the time and resources needed to build participant capacity and provide continuing adult assistance. Planners are also entrenched in bureaucratic procedures and professional standards that would resist incorporating youthful styles of working and adapting the sociopolitical context. To increase the chances that youth participation will be a positive experience and achieve significant community change, planners looking to create processes should select "win-win-win" projects that clearly serve the interests of planners, youth, and the community. Such projects would be of direct concern to youth, likely achieve improved design and implementation with youth involvement (and thus be attractive to planners), and be less controversial within the community. Planners asked to support independent processes should be open minded to the valuable community service that the youth are offering, rather than viewing such activities as strictly educational or as unwelcome demands, and consider the opportunity for building relationships with youth. Youth are capable of understanding planners' constraints, and negotiation with youth is a better strategy than dismissing their concerns and suggestions. To meet the unique requirements of youth participation processes, planners should partner with grade schools, youth organizations, universities, and youth advocates in order to gain access to youth, learn about youth, and leverage resources. Partnerships have the added, necessary effect of ensuring a closer balance of power between the interests of youth, planners, and other community groups.

The implications for practice give direction to the education of planners, whether through universities, professional gatherings, or trade publications. To begin, educators should continue to raise awareness of the

invisibility of youth concerns in planning and pose youth participation as an effectual response. The American Planning Association's *Youth Participation in Community Planning* (Mullahey, Susskind, and Checkoway 1999) is a significant step in this direction. Educators can use research such as this literature review to promote the view of youth as resources, learners, and collaborators, and to specifically suggest the five lessons as a standard for good practice. Educators should contrast this approach with the real possibility for manipulation and tokenism, and present concrete ways in which planners can share power with youth while at the same time giving them the support they need.

Last, this literature review indicates what we do not know about youth participation in planning and therefore has implications for research. The biggest deficiency in the literature was the lack of reporting about cases of youth participation originating within local government planning, where the presence of strong, competing agendas will have a significant effect on impacts and process considerations. Research in the nexus of traditional planning and youth participation should seek to understand planners' incentives (and disincentives) for working with young people, with greater attention paid to the prospect of manipulation and tokenism. Such research would incorporate studies of cases that failed to reach their objectives or that had suspected negative impacts. Planners' incentives can then be matched to the known benefits and risks of youth participation, thus leading to more opportunities for participation as well as avoidance of improper practice. Related research topics include planners' capacity to adopt the five lessons (in terms of planners' attitudes, knowledge, skills, and resources), what happens when planners neglect one or more of the lessons, and strategies for bridging the gaps in capacity. Research of independent youth participation projects—that is, those not originating with local government planning—should focus on the barriers that reduce their community impacts and how these projects can successfully interface with traditional planning. The overall research agenda described above would ensure that the expansion of youth participation into traditional planning would occur responsibly and to the benefit of youth, planners, and their communities.

REFERENCES

Adams, Eileen. 1998. Dealing with change: Issues arising from young people's involvement in educational research and curriculum development. In *Stepping forward: Children and young people's participation in the development process*, edited by Victoria Johnson, Edda Ivan-Smith, Gill Gordon, Pat Pridmore, and Patta Scott, 46–51. London: Intermediate Technology.

Adams, Eileen, and Sue Ingham. 1998. *Changing places: Children's participation in environmental planning*. London: The Children's Society.

AICP (American Institute of Certified Planners). 2005. AICP code of ethics and professional conduct. http://www.planning.org/ethics/conduct.html (accessed October 19, 2005).

Alparone, Francesca Romana, and Antonella Rissotto. 2001. Children's citizenship and participation models: Participation in planning urban spaces and children's councils. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology* 11(6): 421–34.

Ashley, Jermaine, Dawn Samaniego, and Lian Cheun. 1997. How Oakland turns its back on teens: A youth perspective. *Social Justice* 24(3): 170–76.

Baldassari, Carol, Pia Bjorklid, Roger Hart, Mike Lockett, and Robin More. 1981. Special issue: Participation 2: A survey of projects, programs and organizations, *Childhood City Newsletter* 23.

Baldassari, Carol, Roger Hart, and Mike Lockett. 1980. Special issue: Participation, *Childhood City Newsletter* 22.

Baldassari, Carol, Sheila Lehman, and Maxine Wolfe. 1987. Imaging and creating alternative environments with children. In *Spaces for children: The built environment and child development*, edited by C. S. Weinstein and T. G. David, 241–68. New York: Plenum.

Bartlett, Sheridan, Roger Hart, David Satterthwaite, Ximena de la Barra, and Alfredo Missair. 1999. *Cities for children: Children's rights, poverty and urban management*, 26–35. London: Earthscan.

Breitbart, Myrna Margulies. 1995. Banners for the street: Reclaiming space and designing change with urban youth. *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 15:35–49.

Cavet, J., and P. Sloper. 2004. The participation of children and young people in decisions about UK service development. *Child: Care, Health & Development* 30(6): 613–21.

Chawla, Louise. 2002a. "Insight, creativity and thoughts on the environment": Integrating youth into human settlement development. *Environment & Urbanization* 14(2): 11–21.

Chawla, Louise, ed. 2002b. *Growing up in an urbanizing world*. London: UNESCO/Earthscan.

Checkoway, Barry, Kameshwari Pothukuchi, and Janet Finn. 1995. Youth participation in community planning: What are the benefits? *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 14(2): 134–39.

Checkoway, Barry, and Katie Richards-Schuster. 2003. Youth participation in community evaluation research. *American Journal of Evaluation* 24(1): 21–33.

Checkoway, Barry, Katie Richards-Schuster, Shakira Abdullah, Margarita Aragon, Evelyn Facio, Lisa Figueroa, Ellen Reddy, Mary Welsh, and Al White. 2003. Young people as competent citizens. *Community Development Journal* 38(4): 298–309.

Corbishley, Peter. 1995. A parish listens to its children. *Children's Environments* 12(4): 414–26.

Corsi, Marco. 2002. The child friendly cities initiative in Italy. *Environment & Urbanization* 14(2): 169–79.

Driskell, David. 2002. *Creating better cities with youth: A manual for participation*. London: UNESCO/Earthscan.

Finn, Janet L., and Barry Checkoway. 1998. Young people as competent community builders: A challenge to social work. *Social Work* 43(4): 335–45.

Fischler, R. 2000. Case studies of planners at work. *Journal of Planning Literature* 15(2): 184–95.

Francis, Mark. 1988. Negotiating between children and adult design values in open space projects. *Design Studies* 9:67–75.

Francis, Mark, and Ray Lorenzo. 2002. Seven realms of children's participation. *Journal of Environmental Psychology* 22:157–69.

Halseth, G., and J. Doddridge. 2000. Children's cognitive mapping: A potential tool for neighborhood planning. *Environment & Planning B: Planning & Design* 27(4): 565–82.

Hart, Roger. 1976. Youth as planners and designers. Proceedings of the Seventh Annual Conference of the Environmental Design Research Association, Vancouver, BC.

Hart, Roger. 1979. *Children's experience of place*. New York: Irvington.

Hart, Roger, and Robin Moore. 1982–1983. Special double issue: Participation 3: Techniques, *Childhood City Quarterly* 9(4)/10(1).

Hart, Roger A. 1997. *Children's participation: The theory and practice of involving young citizens in community development and environmental care*. London: Earthscan.

Hart, Roger, Collette Daiute, Selim Iltus, David Kritt, Michaela Rome, and Kim Sabo. 1997. Developmental theory and children's participation in community organizations. *Social Justice* 24:33–61.

Hill, Malcolm, John Davis, Alan Prout, and Kay Tisdall. 2004. Moving the participation agenda forward. *Children & Society* 18:77–96.

Horelli, Liisa. 1998. Creating child-friendly environments: Case studies on children's participation in three European communities. *Childhood* 5:225–39.

Horelli, Liisa, and Mirkka Kaaja. 2002. Opportunities and constraints of "Internet-assisted urban planning" with youth. *Journal of Environmental Psychology* 22:191–200.

Knowles-Yánez, Kim. 2002. Concerns of children in land use planning processes. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning, Baltimore, MD.

Knowles-Yánez, Kimberley L. 2005. Children's participation in planning processes. *Journal of Planning Literature* 20(1): 3–14.

Lennard, Henry L., and Suzanne H. Crowhurst Lennard. 2000. *The forgotten child: Cities for the well-being of children*. Carmel, CA: International Making Cities Livable Council.

Lorenzo, Ray. 1997. Case study on children designing the future in a disadvantaged rural setting, Aspromonte, Italy. In *Children's participation: The theory and practice of involving young citizens in community development and environmental care*, by Roger A. Hart, 114–18. London: Earthscan.

Lynch, Kevin, ed. 1977. *Growing up in cities*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Malone, Karen. 1999. Growing Up in Cities as a model of participatory planning and "place-making" with youth. *Youth Studies Australia* 18(2): 17–23.

Matthews, Hugh, Melanie Limb, and Mark Taylor. 1999. Young people's participation and representation in society. *Geoforum* 30:135–44.

Meucci, Sandra, and Jim Redmon. 1997. Safe spaces: California children enter a policy debate. *Social Justice* 24(3): 139–51.

Moore, Robin C. 1986. *Childhood's domain: play and place in child development*. London: Croom Helm.

Mullahey, Ramona, Yve Susskind, and Barry Checkoway. 1999. *Youth participation in community planning*. Chicago: American Planning Association.

Nagy, J. N., and J. C. Baird. 1978. Children as environmental planners. In *Children and the environment*, edited by I. Altman and J. F. Wohlwill, 259–93. New York: Plenum.

Percy-Smith, Barry. 2002. Contested worlds: Constraints and opportunities in city and suburban environments in an English midlands city. In *Growing up in an urbanizing world*, edited by Louise Chawla, 57–80. London: UNESCO/Earthscan.

Plester, Beverly, Jenna Richards, Mark Blades, and Christopher Spencer. 2002. Young children's ability to use aerial photographs as maps. *Journal of Environmental Psychology* 22:29–47.

Race, Bruce, and Carolyn Torma. 1999. *Youth planning charrettes: A manual for planners, teachers, and youth advocates*. Chicago: APA Planners Press.

Salvadori, Ilaria. 1997. A dragon in the neighborhood: City planning with children in Milan, Italy. *Social Justice* 24(3): 192—202.

Schwab, Michael. 1997. Sharing power: Participatory public health research with California teens. *Social Justice* 24(3): 11–32.

Simpson, Brian. 1997. Towards the participation of children and young people in urban planning and design. *Urban Studies* 32(5/6): 907–25.

Sinclair, Ruth. 2004. Participation in practice: Making it meaningful, effective and sustainable. *Children & Society* 18:106–18.

Speak, Suzanne. 2000. Children in urban regeneration: Foundations for sustainable participation. *Community Development Journal* 35(1): 31–40.

Spencer, Christopher, Helen Woolley, and Jessica Dunn. 2000. Participating in their towns: Children feel ignored. *Streetwise: The Magazine of Urban Studies* 10(39): 16–18.

Spivak, M. 1969. The political collapse of a playground. *Landscape Architecture* 59:288–92.

Sutton, Sharon Egretta, and Susan P. Kemp. 2002. Children as partners in neighborhood placemaking: Lessons from intergenerational design charettes. *Journal of Environmental Psychology* 22:171–89.

Talen, Emily, and Mary Coffindaffer. 1999. The utopianism of children: An empirical study of children's neighborhood design preferences. *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 18:321–31.

Terrible, Rebecca Sellers. 2000. An annotated bibliography of literature concerning children and their knowledge of the environment. *Journal of Planning Literature* 14(3): 489–98.

Tonucci, Francesco, and Antonella Rissotto. 2001. Why do we need children's participation? The importance of children's participation in changing the city. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology* 11:407–19.

UNCED (United Nations Conference on Environment and Development). 1992. *Agenda 21, Rio declaration, and statement of forest principles*. New York: UNCED.

UNICEF (The United Nations Children's Fund). 2002. *The state of the world's children 2003*. New York: UNICEF.

United Nations. 1989. *Convention on the rights of the child*. Geneva, Switzerland: United Nations Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights.

Urban Places Project. 2000. *The YouthPower guide: How to make your community better*. Amherst, MA: UMass Extention.

Ward, Colin. 1978. *The child in the city*. New York: Pantheon.

Ward, Colin. 1988. *The child in the country*. London: Robert Hale.

Ward, Colin, and Anthony Fyson. 1973. *Streetwork: The exploding school*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Waterman, Alan S. 1997. An overview of service-learning and the role of research and evaluation in service-learning programs. In *Service-learning: Applications from the research*, edited by Alan S. Waterman, 1–12. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

White, Rob. 2001. Youth participation in designing public spaces. *Youth Studies Australia* 20(1): 18–26.

Woolley, Helen, Christopher Spencer, Jessica Dunn, and Gwyn Rowley. 1999. The child as citizen: Experiences of British town and city centres. *Journal of Urban Design* 4(3): 255–82.

World Commission on Environment and Development. 1987. *Our common future*, Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Yin, Robert K. 1994. *Case study research: Design and methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.