Social Justice in Child Friendly Cities: An international comparison of plans, priorities and potential

Sally Power
Esther Muddiman
Rhian Powell
Chris Taylor

Findings from the Project *Children and young people's rights: formal and informal constructions of citizenship*

WISERD Civil Society: Changing perspectives on Civic Stratification and Civil Repair

ES/S012435/1

Social Justice in Child Friendly Cities:
An international comparison of plans, priorities and potential

Summary

This article examines the potential of UNICEF's Child Friendly City (CFC) initiative to improve the lives of children and young people. Based on an analysis of the priorities and plans of three CFCs in the USA (Houston), England (London) and France (Lyon), and drawing on Fraser's analytical framework, the article examines their capacity to address injustices. We find that CFCs tend to privilege 'voice' rather than resources or respect and argues that this will limit their potential to address injustices facing children and young people in urban areas. It concludes by discussing how participatory parity might be improved.

Introduction

Cities have become the focus of many interventions designed to remedy the challenges of contemporary society. As Brown *et al.* (2019: 1) note there are 'healthy' cities, 'slow' cities, 'age-friendly' cities, 'resilient' cities, and 'compact' cities. It should come as no surprise therefore that there are initiatives to make our cities 'child friendly' as well. Foremost amongst these is the UNICEF sponsored 'Child Friendly City' (CFC) movement (UNICEF 2004). Launched in 1996, there are now more than 3500 CFCs around the world.

The CFC movement seeks to radically transform the relationship between children and young people and their cities. In earlier decades, most research and policy focused on how the urban environment impacted on child development (e.g., Homel and Burns 1985; Gleeson and Sipe 2006: 37) rather than how children might impact on urban development. CFCs reflect a growing recognition that children and young people should be shapers rather than powerless inhabitants of their environments. Underpinned by the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (UN General Assembly 1989), CFCs are committed to ensuring that 'the voices, needs, priorities and rights of children are an integral part of public policies, programs and decisions' (https://childfriendlycities.org/what-is-a-child-friendly-city/).

Cities which wish to be recognized by UNICEF as 'child friendly' need to demonstrate how they will seek to ensure that every child and young person:

- is valued, respected and treated fairly within their communities and by local authorities.
- has their voice, needs and priorities heard and taken into account in public laws, policies, budgets, programs and decisions that affect them.

- has access to quality essential social services (this includes healthcare, education, nutrition support, early childhood development and education, justice and family support).
- lives in a safe, secure and clean environment (this includes protection from exploitation, violence and abuse, access to clean water, sanitation and hygiene, safe and child-responsive urban design, mobility and freedom from pollution and waste).
- has opportunities to enjoy family life, play and leisure (this includes social and cultural activities, and safe places to meet their friends and play).

Each country must identify a number of country-level requirements for each CFC to meet (informed by UNICEF's global CFC strategy). Once these have been set, each city can identify its own CFC priorities according to its own needs and challenges. And because children and young people are at the heart of the initiative, it is imperative that the identification of these priorities is informed by wishes of the children and young people themselves. In developing CFC proposals, cities must undertake a range of consultations and/or surveys to identify what matters most to the children and young people. Their priorities are then translated into action plans which are then evaluated by UNICEF before awarding the city 'Child Friendly' status – a status which is reviewed and renewed after a number of years.

The exponential growth of CFCs has not been matched by a parallel growth in research-based literature – of which there has been relatively little since this Journal's Special Issue on Child Friendly Cities appeared in 2015. There are many papers and several books on CFCs (e.g., Gill 2021), but these are often 'calls to action' rather than evidence-informed accounts. Most of the empirical research comprises descriptions of the development of initiatives (e.g., Tandogan & Ergun 2013) or accounts of the consultative process (e.g., Ross 2015). There are individual evaluation reports – but these are often self-evaluations (e.g., Aberdeen 2020) and most usually monitor implementation rather than outcomes. And relatively few raise any of the wider social justice implications of CFCs for children and young people.

In general, it would be fair to say that the literature on CFCs is normative rather than critical, with the notable exception of Van Vliet and Karsten (2015), who explore some of the broader structural forces that may lie behind the emergence of CFCs and the ways in which children and young people are differentially positioned within these schemes. In addition to exploring the social dynamics and circumstances which shape CFCs, there is a need for further comparative research. The principal large-scale comparative study is Chan *et al.*'s (2016) mapping of cities' CFC plans against the expectations itemized on UNICEF's CFC website, on the basis of which they identify thematic trends and regional biases. Further comparative research is essential if we are to understand more fully not only the significance of context on CFCs, but the extent to which

any shortcomings may be endemic within the initiative itself rather than its operationalization in discrete contexts.

This article, therefore, seeks to contribute to the burgeoning critical and comparative body of research on CFCs through undertaking a forensic examination of the action plans of three cities – one in the US (Houston), one in England (the London Borough of Redbridge) and one in France (Lyon) – to evaluate the extent to which their different priorities and plans have more or less potential to foster greater social justice for children and young people.

Method and analytical framework

In order to compare how, and which, children and young people's rights are being prioritized in CFCs in different national contexts, we purposively selected three countries with different welfare regimes and, within each, a city that faces particular challenges. We chose the USA, the UK and France because they are generally considered to embody different 'worlds of welfare capitalism' (Esping-Anderson 1990). Both the US and the UK are characterized as having 'liberal' regimes where there is a greater reliance on the market than the state – although the similarities between the US and the UK are perhaps overstated, as the liberal tendencies in the US are combined with strong neo-conservative values (see Cochrane *et al.* 2001). France, on the other hand, is typically seen to have a 'conservative' regime where the state is strong, and the private sector much weaker in the provision of welfare. There are also marked differences in the scale and role of civil society within these countries. Schofer & Fourcade-Gourinchas (2001) identify France as a 'statist' country, where the role of civil society organisations in the provision of welfare is minimal and often viewed with suspicion. In the US and the UK, civil society contributions to welfare are actively fostered – and at times seen as superior to state provision.

In addition to contrasting welfare regimes, there are also variations in cultural and legal attitudes towards children's rights. For example, unlike France and the UK, the USA is not a signatory of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child. There are also different levels of governance that provide states and cities with different degrees of freedom to effect significant change at the local level. The USA's federal system of governance provides a very different context from France's centralized system.

Our comparison is based on the written documentation (in paper and online) that sets out the official priorities and programs for the three CFCs. These documents contain accounts of how their proposals were developed, the priorities that were identified, the action plans that are proposed to address the priorities and the partners that will support the plans. While these plans do not determine what happens, they do provide important evidence of what is seen to 'matter' to the children and young people, to the respective city authorities, to their partners, and to UNICEF – which is the arbiter of whether these cities are 'child friendly'.

In undertaking the analysis, we have been influenced by the comparative analysis of policy documents relating to children in Sweden and England undertaken by Moss and Petrie (2005: 81-100). They show how different histories and contexts are productive of particular ways of understanding children's rights and what public provisions should be made for them as 'they swim in different social waters and adapt to local conditions' (83). Like Moss and Petrie, we will consider 'what is said and what is unsaid, what is included and what is excluded' (83).

There are a number of dimensions along which these documents can be analyzed. For example, following Chan *et al.* (2016) we could examine the extent to which they conform to the elements required by UNICEF. Like Van Vliet and Karsten (2015: 8), we could examine the extent to which children and young people appear to be positioned as 'consumers', 'users', 'entrepreneurs' or 'co-producers'. While these are all valid and valuable approaches, we focus instead on the extent to which these CFCs will address the different kinds of social injustices faced by children and young people. Drawing on the analytical framework developed by Nancy Fraser (2008), we distinguish between three dimensions of social injustice – economic, cultural, and political – each of which needs to be addressed if participatory parity is to be achieved (see Table 1).

Table 1: A framework for classifying priorities (after Fraser 2008)

Domain of deficit	***Conditions for participatory parity***	***Forms of social differentiation***	***Form of injustice***	***Remedy***
Material	*Objective condition*	*Socio-economic marginalization*	*Maldistribution*	*Redistribution (Material Repair)*
Cultural	*Intersubjective condition*	*Status (age, race, gender, etc.)*	*Misrecognition*	*Recognition (Respect)*
Political	*Public-political condition*	*Citizenship (voting etc.)*	*Marginalization*	*Representation (Voice)*

The growing emphasis on children's rights reflects increasing recognition that children and young people experience a range of injustices as a social group. In terms of economic injustice, the overwhelming majority of children and young people have little access to, or control over, financial or material resources. Children and young people suffer cultural injustices. Because of their age status, the views and opinions are often discounted. Children and young people also suffer political marginalisation. They are too young to vote and rarely have access to forums in which decisions are made. In short, it can be argued that children and young people are denied participatory parity on the bases of all material, cultural and political injustices.

Because of their marginalization as a social group, the inequalities and deficits experienced by the most marginalised members of the group are likely to be exacerbated. Many children and

young people experience poverty and hunger and are subject to particular kinds of exploitation over which they have little control. For many, their marginal status is, compounded by those forms of cultural injustice associated with 'race', gender, or sexuality. In terms of representation, the most disadvantaged children and young people are the least likely to be heard.

Distinguishing different kinds of injustice is not only important analytically, it has practical significance as different injustices require different remedies. For economic injustices to be tackled, strategies need to be put in place that redistribute resources towards children and young people, and especially those who are the most economically marginalized. Cultural injustices need to be tackled through a politics of recognition, where children and young people are respected rather than dismissed or maligned. Political injustices need to be addressed through increasing representation – through giving children 'voice'.

In the next section, we present a brief outline of the priorities and action plans of our selected CFCs and then consider the extent to which they focus on different domains of deficit and put in place those remedies of redistribution, recognition and representation which will give children and young people some form of participatory parity.

THREE CITIES' PRIORITIES AND PLANS

In this section, we provide a brief outline of each of the three cities, their demographic profile, their distinctive CFC priorities and a selection of their action plans and partners, before examining their potential for improving the participatory parity of children and young people.

Houston

Houston is a large city in Texas, with a population of 2.3M. It is a young city, with one quarter of its population being 18 years old or younger. Over 40% of its residents are Hispanic/Latino and over 20% are African American. Save the Children (2021) reports that Houston (along with the rest of Texas) ranks amongst the worst places in the US for child poverty. While there are variations between the counties of Houston, overall levels of recorded child hunger are high and the childhood equity gap is large.

Houston is a pilot city for the CFC initiative, being one of the first in the US to apply to UNICEF (see https://www.houstontx.gov/education/child-friendly-cities.html). Houston's Child Equity Profile, that sets the context for the action plan, highlights that one third of the city's children live below the poverty line, nearly one half (43%) live in single parent households, 11% of children are migrants, and over half (53%) speak a non-English language at home. Seven percent have disabilities which require special education provision.

In developing its action plan, Houston completed a situational analysis in order to identify the distinctive priority issues for the city that it would concentrate on (in addition to the standard UNICEF requirements relating to governance and communication etc.). This entailed running a series of workshops and surveys with young people as well as other stakeholders. The three priorities identified relate to: a) community decision-making; b) awareness of mental health care; and c) disaster preparedness. The latter is likely to have been triggered by the damage caused by Hurricane Harvey (which killed 36 people in Harris County alone) and Winter Storm Uri (which damaged over 150,000 homes). The priorities and the actions designed to address them are outlined in Table 2.

Table 2: Houston CFC priorities and actions

Priority	***Actions include:***
Increase opportunities for civic involvement	Create a youth council Create children's advocate position within city Launch Social Media Child Rights Campaign Develop a Houston Child Rights website/hub
Increase awareness of how to access mental health support	Mental health first aid training Youth led panel to improve support and access Partnership to address mental health prevention and stigmatization
Increase resource accessibility during emergencies and emergency preparedness	Develop children's emergency plan Engage children and young people in emergency response Outreach webinars to increase awareness.

The CFC proposals are supported by a wide range of over 30 partners. In addition to municipal partners (e.g., Mayor's Offices, Parks Department, Children and Youth Committee), there are twelve third sector partners, such as Arts Connect, Houston Infant Toddler Coalition, Rupani Foundation, Girls, Inc., Choose to do Inc. The website also lists a range of business partners.

London (Redbridge)

Redbridge is one of two London boroughs which has embarked on the process of CFC recognition (see https://www.redbridge.gov.uk/childfriendly/). Far smaller than Houston, the population of Redbridge is just over 300,000. However, like Houston, Redbridge is a young borough (just over 20% are 0-15 years old) and has a significant minority ethnic population. Just under half (47%) of residents are Asian (mainly from India, Pakistan and Bangladesh), with other minorities making up 53% of the population. The largest religious group in Redbridge is Muslims who account for 31% of the population. English is spoken by the majority (74%) of the population, and spoken

‘well’ or ‘very well’ by 31%. Redbridge’s unemployment rate is nearly three times higher than that of England as a whole.

In developing its priorities for the CFC, Redbridge Council undertook a series of engagement events with children and young people in schools, leading to a vote in order to identify the top three issues: a) safety and security; b) health; and, c) place. These priorities and associated actions are outlined in Table 3.

The CFC is supported by a partnership of at least 25 organizations. The vast majority are public sector (health, schools, transport, policy etc.), but it also includes third sector organizations such as Barnardo’s, Citizens Advice Bureau, Youth Clubs, as well as one commercial partner.

Table 3: Redbridge CFC priorities and actions

Priority	***Actions include:***
Safety and security	Develop a Safe Routes to School scheme Street safety awareness campaigns Crime Commission to include young people Women and girls listening exercises
Health	Workshops on living a healthy lifestyle and tackling obesity Sport and physical activity after-school clubs Young people co-design school nurse support Develop a resilience approach for children’s wellbeing
Place	Engage young people in Climate Action Plan Creation of smoke free zones Community Art program Create Vision Young Influencers to provide feedback on provision

Lyon

The city of Lyon has a population of 495K, situated in a larger metropolitan area with a population in excess of 2.22M, of whom 18% are 0-17 years old. Because France does not permit the collection of data on ethnicity, there are no data on the ethnic composition of the city. However, it is known that 13% of inhabitants are ‘foreign born’, many of whom will have come from former French colonies in North and Sub-Saharan Africa. Lyon is relatively affluent compared to some French cities, but there are significant areas of poverty within the city, not only in ‘migrant’ neighborhoods but in the ‘white’ suburbs (Open Society Foundation 2014).

Unlike Houston and Redbridge, whose embarkation on the road to CFC status is relatively new, Lyon has been recognized as a CFC since 2004 (https://www.lyon.fr/actualite/enfance/lyon-ville-

amie-des-enfants). The city has well-established mechanisms for consultation with children and young people and on the basis of these has identified the following five priorities in its latest Action Plan (REF 2021): a) air pollution; b) nutrition; c) gender equality; d) spaces for involvement in the city; and e) a share vision of the place of children in the city. These priorities and their associated actions are outlined in Table 4.

Table 4: Lyon CFC priorities and actions

Priority	***Actions include:***
Air pollution	Reduce air pollution around educational and sporting places frequented by children and young people Pedestrianize streets
Nutrition	Ensure nutrition emphasized as a determining factor in child and adolescent development.
Gender equality	Work to ensure that girls have the same access to leisure activities as boys.
Create formal and informal spaces for involvement in city projects	Create district councils for children (equal parts of girls and boys). Train the youngest in citizenship, debate and decision-making.
A common and shared vision of the place of children in the city	Allow children to circulate without danger. Securing the surroundings of the school, setting up meeting areas limited to 20 km/h Teach children and young people to ride a bicycle and scooter Take into account the difficulties of access to school for children in extreme poverty

This CFC is supported almost entirely by the state through the offices of the Mairie de Lyon. There is no visible presence of any third sector partners, other than the local branch of UNICEF.

POTENTIAL FOR DELIVERING SOCIAL JUSTICE FOR CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE

The translation of the aspirations of the CFC initiative into the three cities' priorities and plans reveals significant slippage in terms of the scale of intervention envisaged. It is also the case that there is significant unevenness in the attention given to the five dimensions of CFCs outlined by UNICEF (listed in the Introduction). Using Fraser's three-fold categorization of injustices, we show how the slippage in scale, the unevenness of focus, and, in some cases, the mismatch between need and plan, are likely to limit the potential of CFCs to deliver greater social justice for children and young people.

Tackling political marginalization
Threaded through all the action plans is an emphasis on increasing the representation of children. Indeed, as discussed earlier, the CFC priorities of these three cities were informed by children and young people. The resulting CFC action plans promise significant amounts of awareness-raising of the rights of the child through training, social media, and websites, as well as putting in place mechanisms to give children and young people 'voice'. Each of the three cities is proposing to set up or expand formal structures of representation, such as youth councils, to increase skills in debate and decision-making. Houston is proposing to appoint a permanent Children's Advocate (subject to bidding for funds). There are also plans to engage children and young people in a wide range of consultations.

The extent to which these strategies will lead to an increase in children and young people's representation in practice remains to be seen and will require situated and extensive qualitative research. Nevertheless, it is clear that each of the CFCs has strategies in place to address the political marginalization of young people.

Tackling cultural misrecognition
The importance of ensuring that every child and young person is 'valued' and 'respected' is at the top of the list of UNICEF's CFC requirements, and will require CFCs to address some of the cultural injustices that children and young people experience. The valorization of children and young people as a social group worthy of respect runs through most of the plans, but there are also plans to address specific forms of cultural misrecognition. For example, Lyon's prioritization of ensuring girls have the same access to leisure activities as boys can be seen as an attempt to reduce the literal marginalization of girls in sports and play facilities. Redbridge's plan to run women and girls listening exercises can be seen as an attempt to ensure that female experiences of harassment and exploitation are heard. On another front, Houston's plan to reduce the stigmatization around mental illness can be seen as an attempt to increase cultural recognition of children and young people with mental health challenges.

But, while there are actions in place to tackle cultural misrecognition, these are perhaps fewer than one might expect given the demographic profile of the cities. There are some startling omissions. For example, racism does not get mentioned once in the documentation. While this is inevitable in France, where ethnicity remains officially unrecognized, it is surprising in the American and English contexts, especially for cities with a significant proportion of Black, Hispanic, and other minority ethnic residents. For example, in 2022, racist and anti-Semitic leaflets were scattered throughout a number of Houston neighborhoods. Similarly, there is little doubt that many children and young people in Redbridge will experience Islamophobia, and yet

the cultural injustices and disrespect that will be almost certainly experienced by the sizeable community of Muslim youth are not mentioned.

Tackling economic injustices
Despite UNICEF's aspiration that CFCs will have equal access to quality essential services, such as health, education, and nutrition, very few of the CFC action plans analyzed here include significant measures to improve the access to, or quality of, these services.

With the exception of Lyon, which focuses on nutrition as a key factor in youth development and prioritizes improving access to school for those in extreme poverty, the proposals tend to focus on raising awareness of existing services or consulting on children and young people as to how they might be more easily accessed. Although these proposals are worthy, they do not indicate any significant investment into improving the material circumstances of children and young people or creating new services. There is virtually no mention of addressing the large economic inequalities which are present in each of these cities, and which will have significant impacts on the health and wellbeing of many children and young people.

Moreover, some of the strategies to improve health and wellbeing are not about providing better services, but about awareness-raising or health promotion campaigns. Both Houston and Redbridge make mental health a priority – but their plans are about offering training, or increasing resilience, or making young people more aware of where they can access support. There appears to be little less focus on the provision resources to expand services. In addition, given that mental health issues are often *caused* by the social stresses, stigma and trauma of poverty (Knifton & Inglis 2020), a more effective strategy may have involved trying to reduce the number of children living in poverty. Redbridge's plans to improve the health of children and young people in the borough include plans to teach children and young people about 'living a healthy lifestyle' and 'tackling obesity'. It is possible to argue that these activities will do little to improve the situation of poor children experiencing hunger – indeed, it might be argued that they may even serve to further stigmatize the poor. As Evans *et al.* (2008) argue, discourses around obesity follow an instructional and regulative narrative which is not based on evidence and unlikely to be effective. Moreover, such an approach implies that young people (and their families) are to blame for their health problems.

There are other measures within the CFCs that are less contentious and, if implemented at scale, should improve the material environment in which children live and reduce danger and risk – pedestrianizing streets and reducing air pollution (Lyon), ensuring children can get to school more safely (Redbridge), increasing emergency preparedness (Houston). Whether these benefits are experienced by *all* children and young people in the city remains to be seen.

The relative role of the state and civil society in CFCs
As discussed earlier, we are interested to compare the CFCs in three different national contexts to explore whether there is significant variation that may be related to the form of welfare regime and the priority given to civil society organizations.

All of the CFCs have a shared focus on increasing the 'voice' of children and young people living in the city, but rather less on increasing 'respect' and very little on material injustices. Lyon is the one city where there is a stronger emphasis on what might be seen as redistributive measures – with an explicit focus on improving nutrition and increasing physical mobility for the most disadvantaged. It is also the only CFC which is not based around an extended partnership with civil society organizations or commercial partners. Clearly, we can only speculate on the basis of the small sample of documents we have examined here, but it may be that economic injustices are more easily addressed through the top-down intervention from the state, rather than from civil society. Not only does the state have a larger economic resource at its disposal, but it is probable that civil society organisations are more likely to champion representational and cultural injustices rather than economic inequalities.

This is not to say that Lyon's interventions entail a significant level of redistribution. France as a nation may privilege the state over market intervention in welfare, but it veers towards conservative and authoritarian values (Esping-Anderson 1996) and any redistributive policies will be modest. And while Lyon's CFC may have greater potential for tackling economic injustices than the other CFCs considered here, it may be less effective in addressing the representational and cultural injustices experienced by marginalized minorities.

DISCUSSION
In this concluding discussion, we will consider the extent to which the potential deficits within these three CFC proposals can be attributed to contextual differences or are endemic within the UNICEF CFC initiative as a whole.

In terms of contextual specificity, it is clear that each of the CFCs is responding to the particular needs of their city – whether by emergency preparedness in Houston or air pollution in Lyon. It is also possible to conjecture that the development and governance of the CFCs reflects national differences in welfare regime and the strength of civil society. Both Houston CFC and Redbridge CFC were developed in partnership with a wide range of civil society organisations. Lyon, on the other hand, is principally a municipal intervention. Perhaps because of this, their CFC plans

appear to focus marginally more on the material challenges facing children and young people. In Houston and Redbridge, the emphasis is much more on voice and, to a lesser extent, respect.

But, while there some important differences between the three CFCs, there are some important similarities. In *all* of them the elements which are designed to tackle cultural and economic injustices are relatively weak and seem to fall some way short of UNICEF's aspiration that CFCs will provide an environment in which *all* children and young people will be respected, and *all* will have access to high quality health, education, and nutrition.

While it is important to bear in mind the constraints that CFCs face in terms of limited funding and time, it is possible to argue that CFCs' emphasis on representation rather than recognition or redistribution comprises a significant weakness in the implementation of the initiative. Following Nancy Fraser, we think it difficult to imagine that any form a participatory parity is likely to be achieved where significant economic injustices prevail. Evidence of this is clear from Monaghan's (2019: 37) investigation of the child-friendly places program in Belfast. She found that in the more deprived areas children were skeptical about the value of sharing their views and the influence they would have. Poverty framed their experience of representation and their sense of powerlessness.

It may be that some of the limits of the initiative arise from UNICEF's requirement that the CFC priorities are developed in consultation with the children and young people themselves. Some commentators ascribe the weaknesses of CFCs to the lack of genuine consultation with children and young people in the development of plans. For example, Chan *et al*s' (2016: 38) comparative analysis led them to conclude that the limits arose from a reluctance 'to genuinely embrace the concept of CFCs and to fully accept its implications, especially insofar these might challenge a status quo in which adults hold power'. However, it might also be argued that it is the incorporation of the voice of children and young people that leads to a diminution of the more radical and structural potential of the initiative.

It is difficult to be sure from the documentation just how significant the input from children and young people in identifying the priorities was – given that adults framed the consultation process. Nevertheless, the evidence from the consultations behind the CFCs considered here would suggest that children and young people prioritize cultural and representational injustices over economic injustices. There may be a number of reasons for this. Economic injustices are unevenly experienced and are less likely to be acute for those who are politically active. Indeed, there may even be class-based conflicts of interest between groups of children and young people. Radical redistributive strategies will have losers as well as winners. It is also quite possible that the focus

on representation and respect may prove more palatable (and feasible) to authorities faced with fiscal austerity than more redistributive measures.

The prominence of voice in the plans that we have examined raises questions about whether, and if so, how, children should shape policy. Initiatives to help develop children and young people's discussion, debate and decision-making skills are laudable, but it is often unclear how children and young people can be supported to make fully informed decisions about the dimensions of CFCs envisaged by UNICEF, and how such decisions can be made in a way that recognizes and champions the voice and perspective of each child in a given city.

In conclusion, this small-scale comparative analysis of the priorities and plans of three contrasting CFCs has sought to examine their potential for tackling the social injustices – economic, cultural and political – that children and young people experience not only as a social group but as members of other social groups that are materially deprived, culturally stigmatized and/or politically marginalized. It has shown that there are contextual differences between CFCs that may relate to the overarching welfare regime, the strength of civil society and the particular needs of the city. However, there are some shared characteristics – in particular, a focus on 'voice' and, to a lesser extent, 'respect' – that might be explained through the way in which these CFCs are developed. We would suggest that the lack of a focus on economic injustices and the relative absence of any significant redistributive strategies is likely to prevent CFCs from realizing the radical ambitions envisaged by UNICEF.

REFERENCES

Aberdeen City Council (2020). *Child Friendly Cities CPP Evaluation Report.* Aberdeen: Community Planning. Available at https://communityplanningaberdeen.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2020/09/CFC-Evaluation-Report-June-2020.pdf

Brown, C., de Lannoy, A., McCracken, D., Gill, T., Grant, M., Wright, H., & Williams, S. (2019). Child-Friendly Cities. *Cities & Health*, *3*(1-2), 1-7.

Chan, L., Erlings, E., Mizunoya, S., & Zaw, H. T. (2016). A city fit for children: mapping and analysis of child friendly cities initiatives. *The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Centre for Rights and Justice Occasional Paper Series, Paper No.5.*

Cochrane, A., Clarke, J., & Gewirtz, S. (Eds.). (2001). *Comparing Welfare States (Vol. 5*). London: Sage.

Evans, J., Davies, B., & Rich, E. (2008). The class and cultural functions of obesity discourse: Our latter day child saving movement. International studies in Sociology of Education, 18(2), 117-132.

Fraser, N. (2008). Reframing Justice in a Globalizing World, in K. Olson (Ed) *Adding Insult to Injury: Nancy Fraser debates her critics.* London: Verso.

Schofer, E., & Fourcade-Gourinchas, M. (2001). The structural contexts of civic engagement: Voluntary association membership in comparative perspective. *American Sociological Review*, 66, 806-828.

Gill, T. (2021). *Urban playground: How child-friendly planning and design can save cities*. London: RIBA Publishing.

Gleeson, B., & Sipe, N. (2006). Reinstating kids in the city. In B. Gleeson, & N. Sipe (Eds) *Creating child friendly cities*. London: Routledge. 1-10.

Homel, R., & Burns, A. (1985). Through a child's eyes: quality of neighbourhood and quality of life. In I. Burnley, & J. Forrest. *Living in Cities*. Sydney: Allen & Unwin. 103-115.

Knifton, L., & Inglis, G. (2020). Poverty and mental health: policy, practice and research implications. *British Journal of Psychology Bulletin*, *44*(5), 193-196.

Monaghan, J. (2019). Engagement of children in developing healthy and child-friendly places in Belfast. *Cities & Health*, *3*(1-2), 29-39.

Moss, P., & Petrie, P. (2005). *From Children's Services to Children's Spaces: Public Policy, Children and Childhood*. London: Routledge.

Open Society Foundation. (2014). *Europe's White Working Class Communities: Lyon*. Open Society Foundation; [Available at https://www.opensocietyfoundations.org/uploads/1723e91e-486e-4a6b-aff4-5e448830a2f9/white-working-class-communities-lyon-20150605.pdf

Ross, A. (2015). Child-friendly New Westminster. *Children, Youth and Environments*, *25*(2), 245-271.

Tandogan, O., & Ergun, N. (2013). Assessment of the Child-Friendliness of the Küçük Ayasofya Neighborhood in Istanbul, Turkey. Children Youth and Environments, 23(3), 164-183.

UN General Assembly (1989). *Convention on the Rights of the Child,* 20 November 1989, United Nations, Treaty Series, available at: https://www.ohchr.org/en/instruments-mechanisms/instruments/convention-rights-child [accessed 4 April 2022] .

UNICEF (2004). *Building Child Friendly Cities: A Framework for Action*. Florence, Italy: UNICEF, Innocenti Research Center

Van Vliet, W., & Karsten, L. (2015). Child-friendly cities in a globalizing world: Different approaches and a typology of children's roles. Children, Youth and Environments, 25(2), 1-15.