Relationship between the two sets of research questions

In focussing on the project at Half Moon and particularly during the artists' and researchers' intensive two-day event in April 2012, we decided to create a subset of questions for this project that would support the overarching Challenging Place main research questions. The two points below explain both the rationale for the choice of questions and how these relate to the main research questions.

1. The artistic and research team wanted to focus on specific aspects of place with the young people because, after lengthy discussion, we believed:

➤ Particular interpretations of 'place' to be most relevant to young people;
➤ The time for development was going to be limited and we needed to focus quite tightly to achieve outcomes. Half Moon complete a series of workshops with a showing at the end of each period. With only 10 weeks of development and devising time, this was necessarily going to limit the potential for the work and we chose to be more specific therefore;
➤ The broad topic of 'place' is conceptually complex; breaking it down made it more accessible for the youngsters;
➤ We recognised that simply 'place' may even be dull for young people.

2. The subset of questions for Half Moon offers a fruitful range of 'questions' appropriate for contributing material for the first two main research questions of the overall project, Challenging Place. (Activities undertaken would, by their nature, contribute to the third main research question of course.) We wished to break down 'abstract concepts such as place, community, dislocation and belonging' into material that would have the most chance of reaping useful responses as 'practical intervention'. We did this after lengthy discussions and academic input in the 2 day intensive training sessions with Half Moon artists and researchers (April, 2012) by selecting to work on fear of places, the 'performance' of the everyday and extraordinary or 'special' places.

➤ Experimenting through performance with <u>fear</u> of place was obviously linked to the second main research question.
➤ How urban youth think about their <u>everyday</u> places, how they may rethink those places, what 'performing' – or altering or reviewing or enhancing – such places might look like: all this contributes to an understanding of how 'abstract concepts such as place, community, dislocation and belonging … map onto "real life" experiences' of young people.
➤ Whilst not immediately represented in the Challenging Place project, '<u>special</u> place' was related to previous research into place (Mackey, 2002). This asked how we create particular places perhaps interpreting them as substitutes for a comparative longevity of place, now usurped by a vaunted mobility. We were interested in what counted as 'special places' to these urban youth and, again, this might well contribute to how 'abstract concepts such as place, community, dislocation and belonging … map onto "real life" experiences' of young people.

Accompanying each of the three research questions was an increasing interest in virtual places for young people. With education consultant Mark Prensky's famous 'digital natives' (i.e. those born after 1993) in mind, and with an awareness that public spaces have become increasingly policed for young people (e.g. Cahill, 2000; Pickering et al, 2012) and building on a recent project undertaken by Half Moon on young people and digital technology, we expected each of the three 'Half Moon' research questions to wrestle with place as virtual.