2019

Tensions Between Children's and Adults' Practices and Understandings of Consent in the Home and School

Mackenzie Mountford

Citation of this paper:

Mountford, Mackenzie, "Tensions Between Children's and Adults' Practices and Understandings of Consent in the Home and School" (2019). 2019 Undergraduate Awards.

Tensions Between Children's and Adults' Practices and Understandings of Consent in the Home

and School

Mackenzie Mountford

King's University College

Introduction: The Importance of Exploring the Intersections Between Geography,

Childhood, and Consent

Sexual violence is disturbingly common, especially for young people (Krug, Dahlberg,

Merci, Zwi & Lozano, 2002). While marginalized groups, such as women, Indigenous peoples,

and members of the LGBTQ+[1] community experience this violence disproportionately compared

to their privileged counterparts, all adolescents between the ages of 15 and 24 confront greater

risk of victimization than older adults (Conroy & Cotter, 2017). Further, 11.8% of the world's

children suffer child sexual abuse (Stoltenborgh, van Ijzendoorn, Euser & Bakermans-

Kranenburg, 2011). Although sexual assault and child sexual abuse differ, consent is

conceptually central to both transgressions. Sexual activity becomes assault when a party fails to

communicate, or revokes, a consciously-made, free choice to engage in a specific act (Brady,

Lowe, Brown, Osmond & Newman, 2018). Contrarily, child sexual abuse is non-consensual by

definition, as unequal age-based power relations between victims and their perpetrators inhibit

children's ability to form and express unrestrained decisions (Stolenborgh et al., 2011).

Consent's relevance to these prevalent crimes renders exploring children's experiences and

understandings of this agreement imperative to determine how to properly inform young people,

and respond meaningfully to their trauma. Because most children in the minority world spend

significant portions of their childhoods in homes and schools, considering consent in these

contexts is valuable. Existing literature on this topic reveals a tension between young people's

ability to comprehend consent and communicate permission through spatial practices, and adults'

failure to teach and practice this agreement due to dominant romantic, socialization, and

developmental conceptions of childhood, and concern with risk. First, children communicate

---

[1] "LGBTQ" stands for lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and queer, while the "+" represents all other identities that
diverge from the dominant heterosexual, cis-gendered label.

consent through their negotiation of place, a physically existent location (Rasmussen, 2004). In the home, young people delineate boundaries by shutting doors and constructing barriers. While some parents respect children's expressed limits, most justify ignoring such wishes by reference to developmentalist generational relations that position children as incompetent and adults as knowing best. Often, children respond to this disregard with resistance. Such opposition is less necessary for children with disabilities, whose parents counteract barriers to privacy by facilitating young people's control of place. In contrast to parents, teachers refrain from any action that could be construed as a violation of children's boundaries. Teachers discipline themselves according to dominant notions of risk by opening doors, sharing rooms with other educators, and maintaining spatial boundaries between themselves and students. Students dispute this aversion to touch, and exhibit thorough understandings of consent. Both homes and schools are viewed as spaces for learning, in which the concept 'space' refers to the subjective meaning society attributes to a place (Rasmussen, 2004). Homes are commonly regarded as environments for informal guidance by family members, while schools are known as formal educational institutions. Research on learning in the home demonstrates that parents rarely discuss consent with their children. Instead, they initiate explicit or vague discussions on bodily boundaries that contradict notions of consent. Similarly, educators fail to teach students about this permission exchange. Further, through a focus on abstinence and a perpetuation of gender stereotypes, sex education advances knowledge that conflicts with consent. Children themselves characterize such teachings as problematic, reinforcing the disparity between young people's and adults' views.

Practices in Places

Home: The Tension Between Agency and Developmentalism

Children strategically utilize place to assert bodily autonomy. For example, young people close bathroom doors to communicate that they want privacy. When children are young, they often share their bathroom time with family members (Lewis, 2010). Eventually, most young people begin to feel uncomfortable occupying this room alongside others (Lewis, 2010). A young girl in Lewis' (2010) study articulated this change clearly: "I used to not mind [my mom] coming into the bathroom when I was having a shower and stuff, but now I like, I don't feel that comfy doing that and stuff" (p. 75). As a response to this uneasiness, children start shutting the bathroom door (Lewis, 2010). Both adults and children recognize that this behaviour represents a desire for privacy. When asked how he knew his child did not want to be seen naked anymore, one father replied, "it's kind of a subconscious thing isn't it, you just read the signals, like the shut door or whatever" (Lewis, 2010, p. 72). A young person affirmed this interpretation, explaining, "I lock the bathroom door 'cos I really don't want somebody to walk in when I'm in the shower" (Lewis, 2010, p. 75). Evidently, children express agency, intentional action, by employing a mutually understood sign of privacy to communicate bodily boundaries.

Young people continue to use features of their homes to convey their desire for privacy when context restricts their control of place. For example, children who share bedrooms with siblings, and consequently cannot simply close the door to secure personal time, construct physical barriers with nearby objects to demarcate their section of the room (Lincoln, 2012). Young people then enforce these boundaries by instructing their siblings to remain in their area, and showing anger and frustration if they refuse to comply (Lincoln, 2012). By implementing and defending creative strategies to achieve privacy, children demonstrate the capacity to exhibit

agency even when circumstances restrict free action (Klocker, 2007). Evidently, approaching childhood studies through a geographical perspective facilitates an understanding of the ways in which children produce meaning through space (Van Ingen & Halas, 2006). By tactically using place to create boundaries, children show that they value, and believe they are entitled to, bodily autonomy. This desire for independence challenges dominant Western understandings of childhood that position children as naturally reliant on adults (McNamee, 2016). Therefore, studying geography also enables researchers to critique unquestioned assumptions through an exploration of children's lifeworlds.

While parental responses to young people's agentic expressions vary, reactions can be characterized as either respecting or ignoring children's consent. Research shows that a minority of parents abide by their children's expressed boundaries. One mother referenced her childhood to explain this decision: "my parents would knock and wait for an answer. I plan to do the same with my kids. If a door was closed, it meant something specific" (McKinney, 1998, p. 85). This parent evidently attributes legitimacy to her children's desires for privacy by recognizing that young people's decisions are informed by valid rationale. In addition to respecting children's wishes themselves, some parents ensure that siblings observe each other's boundaries. For example, another mom shared that "the only thing Kyle can't do with Kevin" is go into the bathroom with him, because "that's his space, his only private thing" (McKinney, 1998, p. 88). This mother began enforcing this rule after she witnessed Kevin slam and lock the door, and shout "no I'm going poop" when Kyle tried to follow him (McKinney, 1998, p. 88). Patently, Kevin's mom attended to his clearly communicated "no" by taking measures to ensure his alone time in the bathroom was respected (McKinney, 1998, p. 88).

Unfortunately, most parents disregard their children's wishes. First, many enforce rules against privacy. In her study on space and bodies, McKinney (1998) found that 25% of parents forbid their children from closing doors at home, which significantly limits young people's privacy, especially when changing and going to the bathroom. More often, children were not permitted to lock doors, meaning parents could enter their rooms at any time (McKinney, 1998). In response to young people's violations of these rules, some parents removed bedroom doors, ensuring easy, constant monitoring of their children (McKinney, 1998). Clearly, these rules eliminate conditions of possibility for consent by guaranteeing some degree of bodily exposure regardless of children's wishes. In addition to incessantly observing their children, parents violate young people's privacy by searching their belongings without permission. Eighty-three percent of the parents surveyed in McKinney's (1998) study admitted to looking through their children's possessions without their knowledge when "the need [arose]" (p. 93). This practice does not only violate children's informational privacy, but also their spatial privacy, as parents enter young people's bedrooms to conduct these searches. Evidently, parents who secretly search their children's items fail to respect their consent by neglecting to seek permission altogether.

Adults' justifications for this behaviour rely on developmental assumptions about childhood. First, adults assert that children lack the competence necessary to make informed decisions about privacy. One parent in McKinney's (1998) study stated, "because they're so young, they don't get the concept of privacy," suggesting that children are consequently incapable of forming boundaries (p. 80). Another parent claimed that her son does not "mean it" when he says no, indicating that, while her child has the capacity to express himself, his views are arbitrary (McKinney, 1998, p. 90). These opinions about privacy further the developmental

notion that children progress linearly through age-bound stages, moving from incompetence to full adult capacity (McNamee, 2016). By positioning young people as unable to determine their own desires, parents characterize their children as incapable of adult reasoning. Adults' conceptions of children's competence evidently differ substantially from young people's capacities, as displayed above through their intentional negotiation of place.

Parents ostensibly respect their children's privacy better when they accept boundaries that they consider reasonable. For example, Karla and her husband "respect their [children's] requests for privacy, as long as it's in the appropriate context, and they aren't doing things they shouldn't be doing" (McKinney, 1998, p. 81) While Karla's explicit claim to "respect" her children's personal limits seemingly signifies a meaningful acknowledgement of consent, the conditions she attaches to this freedom reveal that she merely enables her children to behave in accordance with her standards (McKinney, 1998, p. 81). This does not afford children free choice, and accordingly, is not consent. Such practices further developmentalist generational relations, under which adults' superior competence legitimizes their control over incapable children. Evidently, geography offers valuable contributions to the social study of childhood, as exploring the ways in which adults and children interact through practices in places facilitates an understanding of inequalities between generations.

Children do not passively accept such unequal relations. Instead, they resist their parents' boundary transgressions because they value privacy. In an interview that focussed on youth culture and private space, a 16-year-old girl expressed that "it's incredibly important to have [time and space] to yourself, because, you know, sometimes the family is overwhelming and we get invaded" (Lincoln, 2012, p. 86). Manifestly, this adolescent exhibited awareness of her emotional limitations, and prioritized personal time accordingly. To further their justified

desires for alone time, children actively oppose parents' privacy violations. For example, after discerning that their parents had snooped through their bedrooms in their absence, teenagers in Lincoln's (2012) study hid objects, such as alcohol and condoms, to preserve their secrets. Evidently, children possess agency, as they actively respond to adults' behaviour according to their values. Lincoln (2012) also interviewed Oliver, who expressed feeling annoyed that his parents listened to his telephone conversations. Although his parents denied eavesdropping, Oliver deduced the falsity of this claim from their tendency to reduce the television volume when he received calls, and ask specific questions following his conversations (Lincoln, 2012). Oliver utilized place to maintain his privacy. Instead of answering the phone closest to the family room, in which his parents frequently sat, Oliver began using the upstairs phone, which was out of his parents' earshot (Lincoln, 2012). Patently, Oliver expressed competence and agency by reflecting on his parents' behaviour, recognizing that they listened to his conversations, and strategically selecting another area in the house to talk on the phone. Children's significant competence and agency regarding privacy and consent clearly conflict with parents' failure to respect permission, and developmental assumptions about children's incapacity. While Lincoln's study minimally addresses children's views of privacy invasions, most research on this topic focusses on parental views of appropriate boundaries (McKinney, 1998; Naftali, 2010; Ema & Fujigaki, 2011). Thus, to ensure a more representative analysis of children's opinions, researchers should consult children to determine how they feel when parents ignore their consent.

Exploring Disability: Constructions of Difference

Disability impacts children's experience of privacy in the home. For example, houses pose greater barriers to young people with mobility issues than able-bodied children. Children

who use wheelchairs confront difficulties navigating narrow hallways and inaccessible structures, such as stairs (Weigel-Garrey, Cook & Brotherson, 1998). Such common features of homes limit children's alone time by potentially restricting their access to private rooms. Often, these barriers inhibit children's ability to use wheelchairs altogether (Weigel-Garrey et al., 1998). Consequently, young people move about their houses by being carried by a parent or carer (Weigel-Garrey et al., 1998). This practice further hinders children's privacy by guaranteeing constant adult knowledge of their whereabouts. While this analysis seems logical based on children's mobility struggles, young people are rarely asked to reflect on disability's impact on privacy. Accordingly, researchers should seek children's views to diminish academics' analytical layer on this area of study.

Despite these barriers, children with disabilities experience more privacy than their able-bodied counterparts because their parents prioritize their alone time. In Weigel-Garrey et al.'s (1998) study, 100% of respondents agreed that affording their disabled children private time was important, with 64% of parents believing that young people should control when they spend time alone. Often, parents helped their children overcome barriers to privacy by physically modifying their homes (Weigel-Garrey et al., 1998). Parents widened doorways, installed grab bars in bedrooms and bathrooms, and constructed ramps to facilitate independence (Weigel-Garrey et al., 1998). Evidently, contrary to parents of able-bodied children, who actively restrict their children's privacy, disabled children's caregivers endeavour to afford them personal space. A consideration of romanticism, a dominant discourse that regards children as innocent and in need of protection, reveals that this difference is ironic in the context of Western society (McNamee, 2016). Romanticism would attribute greater vulnerability to children with disabilities due to their condition's enhancement of their dependence, and accordingly encourage parents to watch

their children more closely. Therefore, considering reasons for these disparate approaches to privacy is necessary to fully understand this phenomenon.

Parents' desire to compensate for their children's difference accounts for this variance. Parents recognize that children's disabilities inhibit their freedom. Often, parents wish to remedy this, and enable their children to experience a "normal"[2] childhood. For example, a mother interviewed by Weigel-Garrey et al. (1998) expressed feeling concerned that her need to constantly supervise her disabled child negatively impacted her childhood experience. Upon reflection, this mom decided to make a conscious effort to "let her [daughter] have the freedom to talk and giggle about whatever goofy things" she wanted by physically distancing herself from her daughter's friend group (Weigel-Garrey et al., 1998, p. 55). Clearly, parents justify enabling their children's privacy as a means of affording them an experience of childhood equal to that of their able-bodied peers.

Manifestly, exploring children's geographies reveals diversity within childhood. In this case, children's and adults' spatial practices showcase difference between disabled and able-bodied children's experiences. Additionally, approaching childhood studies with a geographical perspective facilitates an understanding of social constructions' impacts on children's lifeworlds. While a conception of children as developing becomings engenders restrictive parenting, dominant constructions of disability, under which disabled children are othered, prompt more relaxed approaches (Tregaskis, 2004). These findings reinforce the importance of an intersectional analysis, according to which researchers explore the impact of children's identities on their experiences, and recognize that findings cannot be generalized to all groups (Hill Collins & Blige, 2016).

---

[2] Here, "normal" refers to experiences that fulfill dominant Western standards of childhood, which are informed by romanticism, socialization theory, and developmentalism.

School: The Tension Between Risk Aversion and Children's Understandings

In contrast to parents of able-bodied children, who regularly transcend young people's communicated boundaries, educational professionals avoid any action that could be construed as an invasion of children's bodily autonomy. Public hysteria regarding child sexual abuse and harassment has induced fear in professionals who work with children (Jones, 2004; Fletcher, 2013). To preclude allegations of inappropriate touch, professionals employ several strategies to refrain from physical contact altogether. From a Foucauldian perspective, these practices exemplify discipline. This power fosters individuals' reflexivity, which enables them to take themselves as objects of the public anxiety surrounding intergenerational touch, and regulate themselves accordingly (Ryan, 2017).

In practice, teachers act as objects of this fear by opening up school places. First, teachers open classroom doors, permitting other students and teachers to monitor them (Fletcher, 2013). In Fletcher's (2013) study on moral panics, Gary, a male teacher explained that:

> You've got to be so careful because you run the risk of someone saying he hugged me inappropriately, you know. I mean, the obvious things like never find yourself, certainly as a male teacher, in a classroom on your own with a kid, leave the doors open, you know. I think people have had their fingers burnt in the past with those allegations. (p. 702)

By keeping his door open, Gary creates his own terms of hierarchical observation, a specific kind of discipline under which the perpetual potential to be seen compels individuals to act according to a set of expectations (Ryan, 2011; Ryan, 2017). In this case, Gary seeks to regulate himself based on socially sanctioned intergenerational relations that define appropriate touch between children and adults.

Teachers also open up school places by sharing rooms with their colleagues. This practice is especially common in physical education classes, in which touch is inevitably more prevalent due to this activity's physical nature (Fletcher, 2013). One gym teacher expressed feeling "lucky" that she was able to share the gymnasium with other professionals (Fletcher, 2013, p. 704). She admitted feeling more comfortable that "we're all sort of able to see each other in action all the time, and so are other staff who walk by" (Fletcher, 2013, p. 704). Manifestly, teachers also enforce hierarchical observation through this practice by guaranteeing other staff members can observe them at all times. By relying on discipline, teachers do not only create conditions under which they are forced to govern themselves, but also ensure that other adults are aware of their personal regulation, and consequent commitment to behaving appropriately.

Teachers also utilize place to protect themselves from allegations of misconduct on a much smaller scale. Specifically, professionals maintain spatial boundaries between themselves and their students. Sometimes, teachers enforce special rules about touch, such as high-fives only and no hugs from the front (Jones, 2004). Most often though, teachers avoid touch altogether, not because they are personally uncomfortable with physical contact, but because they are concerned with the consequences that follow acting outside socially sanctioned relations between teachers and students. In an interview with Jones (2004) on social anxiety, sex, and surveillance, a female teacher stated, "in the playground, I have a rule—no holding hands, sorry. I am not your mother or your auntie; I am your teacher" (p. 60). By directly correlating "no holding hands" with her role as a teacher, this woman furthered the notion that specific expectations about touch are implicated in educational positions (Jones, 2004, p. 60). A male teacher in Öhman and Quennerstedt's (2017) study agreed that, as an educator in Western

society, he should not touch his students, but made his opposition to this standard clear: "if we touched each other, without coercion, more spontaneously, everyone would feel better" (p. 316). Evidently, educators regulate touch because they fear others' perceptions, not because they view this as beneficial for themselves or their students. Therefore, teachers also discipline themselves through micro-boundaries by creating rules that ensure their actions conform to society's expectations of touch. This anxiety about, and subsequent employment of strategies to avoid, touch is problematic because it renders consent irrelevant. When teachers enable society to determine appropriate conduct by regulating themselves in accordance with these expectations, they fail to afford children the opportunity to form and express their own bodily boundaries. Clearly, approaching childhood studies through a geographical approach is effective in exposing and exploring relations of power and control. In this case, an adult-constructed discourse of fear, and adult action to employ this set of ideas, overpowers children's ability to practice consent in their lifeworlds.

Exploring students' attitudes towards touch reveals a distinct tension between adults' fear of contact and children's understandings of interaction. In their study on intergenerational touch in schools, Caldeborg, Maivorsdotter, and Öhman (2017) asked young people when they thought it was acceptable for teachers to touch their students. Remarkably, albeit unsurprisingly, children stated that personal preference should determine the ways in which boundaries are managed (Caldeborg et al., 2017). Specifically, students asserted that rules about touch are illogical, as human contact should be guided by an agreement between individuals on a mutual comfort level (Caldeborg et al., 2017). Elin, a female student, communicated this message clearly:

It feels as if it is very individual, from person to person, and that you can't really say like,

yeah in this situation it's ok for the teacher to touch a student, but not in this, it's more

like, that you have to have a communication with the teacher so that you can say: this is

ok by me, and this is not ok. (Caldeborg et al., 2017, p. 9)

Similarly, Jesper explained that "what one person thinks is uncomfortable, maybe another

doesn't think is uncomfortable" (Caldeborg et al., 2017, p. 9). Clearly, these students understand

both that unique individuals have diverse preferences, and that humans have the right to be

treated in accordance with their boundaries. This finding is significant, as it showcases

children's capacity to understand and reflect on consent, not only without adult guidance, but

contrary to adults' views and practices.

Spaces for Learning

Home: Socialization Theory, Romanticism, and the Absence of Children's Views

Parents and teachers do not only fail to practice consent with young people, but also

neglect to inform children about this important concept, despite conceptualizations of the home

and school as spaces for learning. Current literature on childhood and geography does not

address discussions about consent between parents and children. This dearth of evidence could

signal that such conversations are rare. Alternatively, this absence could indicate a general lack

of research on consent in childhood studies. While the perceived irreconcilability between

children and sex likely explains this deficiency, consent is arguably imperative to other everyday

encounters. Practicing consent entails respect for bodily autonomy, to which all humans are

entitled based on their right to security of the person under the International Covenant on Civil

and Political Rights, a treaty signed by all minority world countries (Office of the High

Commissioner of Human Rights, 1976). Because age and sexual maturity do not justify

discounting consent, researchers should conduct studies that explore this issue in the context of childhood.

Consent's absence from the literature necessitates an exploration of other parental teachings to determine how parents frame this agreement. Bodily boundaries are directly relevant to this concept, as they represent the extent, or lack thereof, of children's consent. Some parents explicitly address bodily boundaries with their children. They teach young people to avoid physical contact with genitalia, both their own and others', and that touch by strangers is unacceptable (Lewis, 2010). Such conversations are significantly one-sided, as parents define appropriate boundaries for their children. This denies young people the opportunity to reflect on their bodies and establish limits with which they feel comfortable. Thus, by enforcing their conceptions of privacy, parents suggest that children's views are inferior to adult knowledge. This teaching is founded in socialization theory, under which children are regarded as blank slates on which adults write to create ideal citizens (McNamee, 2016). By establishing fixed boundaries for their children, parents position young people as non-ethical becomings who must be taught morality to acquire the capacity for meaningful decision-making about their privacy in adulthood.

While defining appropriate bodily boundaries negates consent, failing to explicitly discuss children's bodies is also problematic. Instead of engaging in straightforward discussions about personal space with their children, some parents "filter it in," meaning they initiate vague discussions that they hope their children will interpret as demonstrating the importance of bodily autonomy (Lewis, 2010, p. 70). This ambiguity is an issue because children's interpretations could easily differ from parents' intentions. Consequently, children could feel confused or uncertain about boundaries. Such unclear conversations could also discourage children from

clarifying concerns with their parents. In her study on terminally ill children, Bluebond-Langner (1978) found that when children detect adult discomfort with a topic, they advance the perceived social taboo by evading further conversation. Therefore, by avoiding straightforward discussions about bodily autonomy, parents further restrict their children's knowledge by dissuading them from seeking information themselves. This educational strategy is founded in the romantic notion of child innocence (McNamee, 2016). Parents' association between bodily boundaries and sex encourages them to protect their children from these "adult" discussions. Unfortunately, there is a dearth of research that addresses children's reflections on parents' teachings. Accordingly, while one can reasonably theorize that this romantic approach to childhood would inhibit children's agency, more research must be done to uncover children's thoughts and experiences. Furthermore, researchers should investigate what children feel would be the most comfortable, productive way to learn about consent in the home to ensure this education is meaningful for young people.

School: The Tensions Between Socialization Theory, Romanticism, and Children's Views

Formal education also fails to further meaningful understandings of consent. First, teachers avoid discussion on this mutual permission altogether. Tellingly, the term consent is wholly absent from the Ontario elementary curriculum (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2010). Reports from students in other countries confirm that this shortcoming is standard internationally (Powell, 2010). This an issue, as youth could logically interpret this absence of discussion as a sign that consent lacks relevance or importance, which could inhibit their capacity to practice this agreement in their own relationships, or impede the categorization of forced sex as assault.

Schools further preclude discussion on consent by presenting abstinence as the ideal decision for youth. The Ontario curriculum requires that teachers "explain the importance of

abstinence as a positive choice for adolescents" (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2015, p. 42).

Students in other minority world contexts are subject to similar teachings. One Australian

teenager expressed that "in schools they're more deterring you from having sex rather than

telling you 'if you're going to do it, do it safely'" (Powell, 2010, p. 131). Abstinence education

is founded in the romantic notion that children are innocent, and accordingly, non-sexual. While

adults may find comfort in believing that young people do not have sex, statistics clearly

characterize this expectation as misguided (Statistics Canada, 2015). Thus, overlooking consent

by problematizing sex altogether fails to achieve relevance to adolescents' lives, and

consequently affords them less knowledge to reflect upon while navigating sexual experiences.

Gender stereotypes that prevail in sex education also inhibit meaningful discussion on

consent. Dominant heterosexual understandings of sex typically characterize male sexuality as

active and irrepressible, and female sexuality as submissive (Powell, 2010). While teachers

educate students on male erections, ejaculation, and wet dreams, teachings on female health

centre on menstruation (Powell, 2010). Evidently, while males' sexual feelings are

acknowledged, females' desires are not. By failing to position young women as sexual agents,

while simultaneously conceptualizing sex as an act between a man and a woman, teachers

suggest that females are meant to satisfy males' desires. Such gendered teachings further

socialization theory by encouraging young people to conform to socially acceptable gender roles.

By doing so, sex education neglects consensual sex, in which all parties' perspectives of the

experience are pertinent.

Adopting a geographical approach to childhood is important for understanding the ways

in which discourse impacts children's experience of space. This discussion of consent has

revealed that schools and homes are not spaces for all learning, but instead, for education that

adults deem important for moulding children into ideal citizens and protecting them from the adult world. Evidently, socialization theory and romanticism dominate this conception of space, and accordingly impact children by framing possible action in their lifeworlds.

Young people feel discontent with this lack of meaningful discussion on consent. After learning about consent on their own, adolescents in Powell's (2010) study reflected on their education with disappointment. They stated that schools fail to empower students to control their bodies (Powell, 2010). Youth recommended that educators assure young people "that you don't have to do it if you don't want to," and suggested promoting self-confidence as a means of helping teenagers feel entitled to bodily autonomy (Powell, 2010, p. 136). Young people's views are doubly meaningful. First, these opinions reveal that sex education conflicts with children's values, and accordingly is meaningless for children's lives. Thus, adaptations to curricula should be made to ensure youth benefit from this learning. Additionally, Powell's research reveals that adolescents express clear preferences, which would render consulting them in the development of sex education productive. Moving forward, researchers should continue to ask children about their views on consent education, and encourage policy makers to refer to this research when making changes to curricula.

Conclusion: The Benefits of Conducting Further Research in Geography

Evidently, there is a tension between young people's capacities to understand and practice consent, and adults' failure to discuss and employ this agreement. In the home, children express agency by shutting doors and constructing barriers. Unfortunately, developmentalism prompts most parents to ignore these communicated boundaries. Children further exhibit agency by responding to this disregard with resistance. Children with disabilities experience greater respect from their parents, who attempt to compensate for their children's difference by affording

them privacy. While children ostensibly receive the most bodily autonomy in school because teachers regulate themselves to avoid transcending students' boundaries by opening doors, sharing spaces, and establishing rules about touch, such strict discipline precludes consent. Accordingly, students disapprove of this risk aversion, which reveals their competence on this mutual understanding. Finally, while both homes and schools are conceptualized as spaces for learning, explicit education on consent does not occur in either place. Instead, adults further teachings founded in socialization theory by defining appropriate bodily boundaries and advancing gender stereotypes, and employ romanticism by failing to discuss children's bodies and promoting abstinence. By relying on these dominant discourses, parents and teachers prevent children's knowledge about consent. While available literature fails to ask children about their perspectives on teachings in the home, consulted students clearly do not value sex education, which further reinforces the conflict between adults' and children's ideas about consent. Continuing to conduct geographical research on this topic would not only produce knowledge about discourse, children's lifeworlds, inequality, and power relations, but also empower children to advocate for their bodily autonomy.

References

Bluebond-Langner, M. (1978). *The private worlds of dying children*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton

University Press.

Brady, G., Lowe, P., Brown, G., Osmond, J., & Newman, M. (2018). 'All in all it is just a

judgement call': Issues surrounding sexual consent in young people's heterosexual

encounters. *Journal of Youth Studies, 21*(1), 35-50. doi:10.1080/13676261.2017.1343461

Caldeborg, A., Maivorsdotter, N., & Öhman, M. (2017). Touching the didactic contract—a

student perspective on intergenerational touch in PE. *Sport, Education and Society*, 1-13.

doi:10.1080/13573322.2017.1346600

Conroy, S. & Cotter, A. (2017). Self-reported sexual assault in Canada, 2014. *Statistics

Canada*. Retrieved from https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/pub/85-002-

x/2017001/article/14842-eng.htm

Ema, A., & Fujigaki, Y. (2011). How far can child surveillance go?: Assessing the parental

perceptions of an RFID child monitoring system in japan. *Surveillance & Society, 9*(1/2),

132-148. doi:10.24908/ss.v9i1/2.4105

Fletcher, S. (2013). Touching practice and physical education: Deconstruction of a contemporary

moral panic. *Sport, Education and Society, 18*(5), 694-709.

doi:10.1080/13573322.2013.774272

Hill Collins, P., & Bilge, S. (2016). *Intersectionality*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Jones, A. (2004). Social anxiety, sex, surveillance, and the 'safe' teacher. British Journal of

Sociology of Education, 25(1), 53-66. doi:10.1080/0142569032000155935

Klocker, N. (2007). An example of "thin" agency: Child domestic workers in Tanzania. In

      Panelli, R., Punch, S. & Robson, E. (Eds.), *Global perspectives on rural childhood and*

      youth: young rural lives. New York: Routledge.

Krug, E. G., Mercy, J. A., Dahlberg, L. L., & Zwi, A. B. (2002). The world report on violence

      and health. *The Lancet, 360*(9339), 1083-1088. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(02)11133-0

Lewis, R. (2010). Shutting the bathroom door: parents, young teenagers, and the negotiation of

      bodily boundaries at home. In Holt, L. (Ed.), *Geographies of children, youth, and*

      families: An international perspective (pp. 67-80). Great Britain: Routledge.

Lincoln, S. (2012). *Youth culture and private space*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

McKinney, K. D. (1998). Space, body, and mind: Parental perceptions of children's privacy

      needs. *Journal of Family Issues, 19*(1), 75-100. doi:10.1177/019251398019001006

McNamee, S. (2016). *The social study of childhood: An introduction*. Basingstoke: Palgrave

      Macmillan.

Naftali, O. (2010). Caged golden canaries: Childhood, privacy and subjectivity in contemporary

      urban china. *Childhood, 17*(3), 297-311. doi:10.1177/0907568209345612

Office of the High Commissioner of Human Rights. (1976). International Covenant on Civil

      and Political Rights. *United Nations.* Retrieved from

      https://www.ohchr.org/en/professionalinterest/pages/ccpr.aspx

Öhman, M. & Quennerstedt, A. (2017). Questioning the no-touch discourse in physical

      education from a children's rights perspective. *Sport, Education and Society, 22*(3), 305-

      320. doi:10.1080/13573322.2015.1030384

Ontario Ministry of Education. (2010) Th*e Ontario Curriculum: Health and Physical Education (Interim Edition)*. Ontario: Queen's Printer for Ontario. Retrieved from http://www.edu.gov.on.ca/eng/curriculum/elementary/healthcurr18.pdf

Ontario Ministry of Education. (2015). *The Ontario curriculum grades 9-12: Health and physical education*. Retrieved from http://www.edu.gov.on.ca/eng/curriculum/secondary/health9to12.pdf

Powell, A. (2008). Amor fati?: Gender habitus and young people's negotiation of (hetero)sexual consent. *Journal of Sociology, 44*(2), 167-184. doi:10.1177/1440783308089168

Powell, A. (2010). *Sex, power and consent: Youth culture and the unwritten rules.* New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Rasmussen, K. (2004). Places for children - children's places. *Childhood, 11*(2), 155. doi:10.1177/0907568204043053

Ryan, P. J. (2011). "Young rebels flee psychology": Individual intelligence, race and foster children in Cleveland, Ohio between the world wars. *Paedagogica Historica, 47*(6), 767-783. doi:10.1080/00309230.2011.621200

Ryan, P. J. (2017). The 'government of heroic women': childhood, discipline, and the discourse of poverty. *International Journal for the Historiography of Education 7*(2), 173-190.

Statistics Canada. (2015). Health reports: Trends in teen sexual behaviour and condom use. *Government of Canada*. Retrieved from https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/pub/82-003-x/2008003/article/10664/5202360-eng.htm

Stoltenborgh, M., van IJzendoorn, M. H., Euser, E. M., & Bakermans-Kranenburg, M. J. (2011). A global perspective on child sexual abuse: Meta-analysis of prevalence around the world. *Child Maltreatment, 16*(2), 79-101. doi:10.1177/1077559511403920

Tregaskis, C. (2004). *Constructions of disability: Researching the interface between disabled and non-disabled people*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Van Ingen, C., & Halas, J. (2006). Claiming space: Aboriginal students within school landscapes. *Children's Geographies, 4*(3), 379-398. doi:10.1080/14733280601005856

Weigel-Garrey, C. J., Cook, C. C., & Brotherson, M. J. (1998). Children and privacy: Choice, control, and access in home environments. *Journal of Family Issues, 19*(1), 43-64. doi:10.1177/019251398019001004