

Sabina Jelenc Krašovec¹
University of Ljubljana, Slovenia

Older Adults in Public Open Spaces – Activities and the Role of Learning

Abstract: The paper deals with public open spaces as arenas, open for all inhabitants to share experiences beyond the sphere of their friends and family; they are not bound by age or any other characteristics. Public space is understood as a forum for social and personal change, where a system of relations is created, arising from acting, speaking and learning. The author analyses the differences between public and private spaces and evaluates the meaning of communicative action and learning in these spaces. These questions are analysed from the point of view of older people, who are strongly attached to the space and who are most likely to be interested in belonging to and bringing about proactive change in their living environment. The author offers a fresh reconsideration of the importance of learning in public space for older people and the role of the public adult educator in these processes.

Key words: community spaces, communication, bottom-up approach, older people, learning.

Introduction

In this paper, I consider public spaces as open, everyday arenas where (older) people share experiences beyond their immediate circle of friends, family and age group. To understand the importance of bottom-up possibilities for the active societal involvement of older people in community spaces, it is vital to recognise public and private spaces, ways of performing, acting and communication in these spaces and processes of exchange and learning between people. I argue that learning in a public space is even more important for older than for younger age groups, mostly due to the stronger attachment of older people to spaces and their different needs connected to their living environment. An interdisciplinary

¹ Sabina Jelenc Krašovec, PhD is Associate Professor at the Department of Educational Sciences, Faculty of Arts, University of Ljubljana, Slovenia.

approach to the research of learning in a public space is needed; findings from public sociology², public pedagogy³, critical educational theory and gerontology, phenomenology, public geography, sociology of space⁴, to name a few, are intertwined.

Space, time and place

Regarding the interrelation of space, time and place, a single explanation cannot be offered. There are multitudes of different terms connected with space and place, such as public sphere (Habermas), public domain (Marquant), public space (Arendt, Kohn), public place (Biesta), interspace (Arendt), social space (Lefebvre, Kohn), third space (Oldenburg), shared space, quasi-public space, micro-space (Mean and Tims), hook-up spot, creative non-governmental self-initiated scene, etc. In his rethinking of space, time and place, based on Marxist spatial theory, David Harvey (2011, p. 169) ascertains that the term 'space' includes numerous meanings and could be defined by:

1. 1) An understanding of space and time in a sense of absolute, relative and relational space;
2. 2) definitions of 'material space', 'representation of space' and 'spaces of representations'.

Ad 1) Absolute space is defined as unchangeable and static, as a frame in which objects, events and processes can be precisely identified by measurements. In a social sense, absolute spaces are exclusive spaces of private property; space and time are separate (Harvey, 2011, p. 173). Relative space is defined as the space of processes and movement and is measured by distances in this space; space cannot be understood separately from time (concept of space-time). In the third kind of space, relational space, processes form their own space and time. Space is not distinguishable from time; they are connected in spacetime, which includes the idea of internal relations (Harvey, 2011, p. 174). Harvey ascertains that relational space is a 'nobody's land', created by everybody included. In relational spacetime, identity has a different meaning as in absolute space or relative space-time; it

² Public sociology, advocated by Burawoy (2013; 2005), is understood as a dialogue between sociology and the public, a dialogue which deepens understanding of public issues on both sides. As opposed to mainstream sociology, public sociology tries not to be self-referential and dismissive of public engagement, but rather to use critical communicative methodology, to give voice to marginalised groups and to be close to social movements and discussions on power relations and activism.

³ Public pedagogy is defined by Biesta (2012) as a "pedagogy of the public", which influences the quality of human togetherness.

⁴ Sociology of space examines the social practices and material complexity of how humans and spaces interact.

becomes open, changeable, multiple and indefinite, it becomes 'non-material'. Harvey believes that space is neither absolute nor relative or relational, but it can become each or all; it is defined by human practice relating to space. Conflicts among different groups arise in absolute space and time, but relations among them become real in non-material relational spacetime, where they meet.

Ad 2) Lefebvre (2013) sees the societal production of space as a dialectical interaction between three factors: 'material space' (which is perceived by senses and is reproduced in everyday life), 'representation of space' (space as we imagine, as developed cognitively) and 'spaces of representation' (space as we experience) (Lefebvre, 2013, p. 54-55; p. 60-69). What Lefebvre calls 'spaces of representation', is connected to the way people live in spaces (Lefebvre, 2013, p. 61; Harvey, 2011, p. 181). For the matter of learning, Lefebvre's spaces of representation are the most important.

It is important how people understand space and time – are they victims of it or active composers of space? The understanding of space and time is currently mostly connected with the absolute dimension, which enables surveillance and control of 'free' liberal individuals; atomised and individualised citizens exist in the absolute theory of space and time. Some communities build a space in the sense of a bordered absolute space with certain rules of social participation, where the line between progressive communitarian policy and exclusionary and authoritarian practices can sometimes be very thin.

Areas traditionally deemed as public open spaces are high streets, street markets, parks, playgrounds and allotments; those and other public spaces provide the necessary bandwidth for the flow of information between people. They are spaces where people can learn who they live with, what others do and sometimes, if the space is open enough, what they think and dream of. The 'public sphere' is different from the private domain of 'love, friendship and personal connection' and from the market domain of 'buying and selling' (Marquand, 2004 in Biesta & Cowell, 2012, p. 49). In previous decades, private interests became aggressive intruders into public space; the result being that sometimes we cannot clearly divide public from private. There are new forms of governance, reconfiguring the collective life of towns; conventional public spaces, provided and run by the state are being supplemented and squeezed out by a wider mix of spaces with different governance arrangements (business parks, entertainment complexes) (Hall, 2012; Mean & Tims, 2005). Many of these look very much like conventional public spaces, but each carries a different set of expectations and obligations with implicit or explicit limits on who can use it and for what reason; communication is controlled, behaviour is under surveillance, and values are prescribed. Evidence

of the decline of public space is all around: gated communities, free speech zones, business districts etc. Hajer uses the term ‘tourist consumption’, as an explanation for how cities are changing their public spaces to spaces for ‘leisure trips’ (Hajer, 2004, p. 44). Places are integrated into an ‘experience market’, where all types of events are offered to excite people for a short time (festivals, biennales, various cultural events), but all mostly for the sake of social and cultural mobility (ibid, p. 49). In this sense, even culture is used for marketization of public spaces.

Kohn (2004) ‘upgrades’ the dichotomy of public open spaces (streets, plazas) and private, controlled spaces (homes, company offices) by developing the idea of social spaces, which mix aspects of public and private spaces (shopping centres, arts centres, car boot sales, markets etc.). In a social space (still privately owned) people are encouraged to congregate and interact, but this space is open to different limits and regulations. For example, in the USA, these limitations are enforced through many actions, such as with the ‘Occupy’ movement, where protestors ‘occupied’ privately owned public space (POPS) (Zuccotti Park); soon, private interests were explicitly protected⁵ when the New York Supreme Court issued an injunction ruling against allowing protestors to camp or sleep in Zuccotti Park, and many protesters were arrested. This is not an isolated case⁶, therefore the question is: what will happen if more public spaces become private? What happens to space for free speaking and acting?

Public open space – a venue for action and communication

Arendt (1996) speaks about public space as a condition of politics and as a space which enables the political; for her the most important misunderstandings concern the differentiations between private and the public in spaces (Arendt, 1996, p. 30). She defines something as being public by two phenomena:

1. In the sense that anyone can see and hear everything appearing before the public/community; anything that appears not to be important automatically becomes private;
2. The notion of public means the world alone, common to us all, and it is differentiated from the private. Public space as a common world

⁵ The statement of the owner was: “Zuccotti Park is intended for the use and enjoyment of the general public for passive recreation”.

⁶ For New York, Kohn (2004) stressed that “zoning laws gave developers of skyscrapers special incentives in exchange for building plazas and arcades. This has created a situation in which much of New York City’s public space is privately owned”.

gathers human beings together, and at the same time, prevents their mutual fragmentation.

Biesta (2012) talks about public places as those where things can be done without the need for anyone to give permission. It is the domain 'where strangers encounter each other as equal partners in the common life of the society' and where, by sharing experiences with people beyond their immediate circle of friends, family and work colleagues on a daily basis, they collectively define what the public interest is to be (Mean & Tims, 2005, p. 16). Findings from phenomenological and ethnomethodological research help in understanding learning processes through communication in public (open) spaces. In ethnomethodology, social structures, cultural meanings and values are understood as products of social interaction and conversation. Arendt (1996) defines it as un-institutionalised freedom and a kind of communicative action, happening through speaking. Quality of speaking and acting is present only where people speak and act together and not for or against one another. Also, Habermas set the question of communication as the core of the theoretical model of society, which is based on the theory of communicative action; he connects the individual observer, actor and speaker, with other observers, actors and speakers in the field of intersubjectivity. This offers understanding of the role of social context for communication processes and the position of individuals in this interaction (Škerlep, 1997, p. 156). The linguistic turn that Habermas gave to critical theory offers an understanding of the nature of intersubjectivity, with which participants' interaction with one another explains their mutual interpretations of social situations (Habermas, 1984, 2001, xi). The individual is actually not isolated, but initially involved in interpersonal relations, in which he/she is defined as a personality and actively participates as a subject. Public space is an inner space where people follow their interests ('inter-est') and disappears no earlier than when the people who establish it disappear, and the activities which define the space stop (Arendt, 1996, p. 189, 210-211). Public open spaces, filled with diverse people and uncontrolled events, therefore provide communicative and learning experiences, forcing us to move beyond the self and consider the plight of the other. Defence of public space in the name of the social good it provides through fostering mutual cooperation and learning, exchange of ideas and knowledge, is crucial; public open space is a forum for social and personal change, a 'transitional space' (Bourgeois, 2002; Wildemersch, 2012). It is a system of relations, arising from acting, speaking and learning; Arendt (1996, 190) called this the web of human matters. As Torres (2013, p. 62) ascertains, through public space, people fight for recognition, social justice, the spirit of solidarity, and individual and collective well-being; they de-

find the principle of citizenship education and learning instead of the principle of consumerism.

But in his analyses, Habermas (1989, p. 181) shows that with the development of commercial mass media in the 20th century, the publicum shifted from being an active subject to being a passive object. Societal discussions are withdrawing and giving way to non-binding group activities, a form of non-formal common dwelling without a specific power in public communication, without the need for continuation of discussions (Habermas, 1989, p. 182). This is a substitute for action, initiated by people themselves, which lost its public function and is in this sense a top-down approach (Habermas, 1989, p. 183).

However, the transformative power of progressive social movements, arising in public space, their educational practices, oriented against the neoliberal globalization, hegemony of economy and privatisation, or just struggling 'for a better world', brings hope for social justice and social change in our society. Learning is intrinsically connected to social movements as a two-way process that demands action, critical reflection on social action and public discourses on policy, economic, cultural and education issues. It is connected to ideas of radical education, strongly advocated by Gramsci and Freire, who connect knowledge, culture and power (Kump, 2012; Borg et al., 2002; McLaren, 2000). There are different approaches and learning contexts in social movements, but dialogue in a public space is a central element. For example, in the 'Occupy' movement, when creating new physical, political and intellectual spaces, learning, collective thinking and active listening were central (Hall, 2012); similarly, at the University of Ljubljana at the time of the 'occupation' of the Faculty of Arts in December 2012, teachers and students organised lectures and debates in public spaces through 'events' titled 'Knowledge on the Streets'. Common to different movements is the struggle for more solidarity and an attempt to emphasise the importance of active, open and democratic communication in space in which freedom is provided. Participants are teachers and learners at the same time.

Older people and social interaction in public spaces

One of the findings in social gerontology is the decrease in social interaction in old age (Baltes & Carstensen, 1999). Early studies suggest that this decrease in social interaction was societally induced (mandatory retirement, ageism) or was a consequence of psychological withdrawal between the older person and society (Dalley et al., 2012; Merriam & Kee, 2014; Harris, 2007; Estes et al., 2003). More recent studies reject the disengagement theory and put to the forefront the

activity theory, continuity theory and a concept of productive ageing (Merriam & Kee, 2014), which are very much connected with the concept of 'ageing in place'. Bauman (2002) stresses that if other age groups are expected to 'run away' or 'avoid' their immediate space, for older people the opposite is true; they are most often bound to the space in which they live. Environmental gerontologists, who deal with the interdisciplinary understanding of the person-environment interchange processes in ageing (Wahl & Oswald 2013, 112), assert that as people age, they become increasingly attached to the place where they live, spend most of their time (about three-quarters of their daytime) in the home and immediate home environment, and concurrently also become more sensitive to their social and physical environment (Wahl & Oswald, 2013, p. 112; Iecovich, 2014, p. 24; Phillipson, 2013, p. 600). They expose the term 'physical-social' environment to acknowledge "there is no 'objective' environment 'out there' without social interpretation, cultural meaning, ongoing historical reassessment and Zeitgeist influences" (Wahl & Oswald, 2013, p. 112).

The concept of 'ageing in place' speaks to the ability of older people to maintain independence and activity in their living environment, which influences their quality of life and perception of it (Iecovich, 2014). The result of the study (Wiles et al., 2011 in Iecovich, 2014) which examined how older people perceive ageing-in-place, shows that they understand it as having choices about their living arrangements, good access to amenities, maintaining social connections and interaction among locals, feeling safe and having a sense of security and autonomy at home and in the community. When older people live in their homes for many decades, it leads to place identity, and it directly influences improvement in quality of life in old age. In this sense attachment to a place with older people is related to three dimensions: a) physical insideness (living somewhere for long periods of time develops a sense of environmental control); b) social insideness (social relationships with others, being known and knowing others); c) autobiographical insideness (self-identity, based on older people's attachment to a place due to memories) (Rowles, 1978; 1983 in Iecovich, 2014, p. 24). Phillipson (2013, p. 600) ascertains that intensification of feelings about spaces is, for older people, one of the most important factors of maintaining a sense of identity within a changing environment. From this point of view, the retaining of public spaces on one side, and the active involvement of older people in communication with other age, cultural, ethnic etc. groups in those spaces in community on the other, is vital for quality of life.

Quality of life as a dynamic, multifaceted and complex concept reflects the interaction of objective and subjective, macro and micro, positive and negative influences; it involves a combination of life-course factors and immediate

situational ones (Walker, 2013, p. 575). As Wiggins' research shows (in Walker, 2013, p. 575), the influence of network relationships may be greater than life-course ones. Some research (Kump & Jelenc Krašovec, 2014; Montross et al., 2006; Walker, 2013; etc.) has shown that some objective factors, amongst them possibilities for social participation, can influence the self-assessed well-being of older people. Compared to younger generations, older people have more time, they place greater value on social contacts and need them for a sense of self-realization; they may need help or are ready to offer help to others and may be more interested in proactive use and creation of a physical-social environment due to strong attachment to the space. A model, presented by Wahl and Oswald (2013, p. 114), is based on the complexity of person-environment dynamics, referring to two key processes of person-environment interchange: belonging⁷ and agency⁸. The model simultaneously considers "autonomy, identity and well-being as major endpoints of a person-environment interchange as people age", which differs from traditional approaches in environmental gerontology, focusing only on one of those three dimensions at a time (Wahl & Oswald, 2013, p. 114). It seems the most important are processes of 'agency', because they assume that older adults may strive proactively to change living conditions according to their own wishes and needs and to gain from environmental opportunities (ibid., 116). However, if exclusion happens, it is most likely a multidimensional phenomenon composed of neighbourhood exclusion and exclusion from material resources, social relations, civic activities and basic services (Wahl & Oswald, 2013, p. 118).

It is often presumed that most older people are frail and dependent (Merriam & Kee, 2014; Formosa, 2012), but there are large variances among older people in terms of their inclinations to engage with public spaces. Many older people congregate in different public spaces on a daily basis, and for many, especially widowed or solitary older people, this could indeed be the only social activity during a given day or week. But in Western societies, many older people tend to travel extensively or even move in their later years. Those older people have a different set of expectations and way of life, which may be more similar to the lifestyle of younger generations⁹.

Another factor concerns poverty; although some data show that older people (in 2012) faced a lower risk of poverty than the overall population at EU-28 level (19.3 % as opposed to 24.8 %) (Eurostat, 2014), more and more old people,

⁷ Belonging entails mainly cognitive and emotional evaluation and representation of physical environments, also attachment to places accounts for a full range of experiences.

⁸ It emphasises the full range of goal-directed cognitions, behaviours and social practices.

⁹ Modern cities are otherwise characterised by contradictions between the demands of a 'hyper-mobile' (younger) professional minority and groups of older people (those ageing in place) (Phillipson, 2013, p. 598).

particularly in some countries, live in poverty (especially older women and the very elderly). Nevertheless for some older people, cafés and tearooms are of the greatest importance, even though only a minority of older people can afford to spend money in cafés; this reflects the important role of public spaces (like markets) in providing a socially inclusive space for people on lower incomes (Watson & Studdert, 2006, p. 18). Many older people sit for long periods of time on circular benches around flower beds or in other formal seating areas, but informal seating areas also appear to be significant sites of social interaction for older people. Older people use public spaces in interconnection with the opportunity to use other amenities, in particular all-purpose shops, health centres, public libraries, post offices and community facilities; many cannot walk long distances, so they gather (and talk) near facilities they must use on a daily basis.

We can agree with Phillipson (2013, p. 602), that a solid future for the older aged will strongly depend on the extent to which living in the community is a tolerable and enjoyable experience for different age and social groups; interaction is crucial for empathy and solidarity between them.

The role of learning in public spaces

Research on the topic shows there is little emphasis on older people's learning in public spaces. Some studies stress the importance of learning for the independence of older adults, their healthy living style, active participation in a civil society and fostering personal growth in the later years (Dye, Willoughby & Battisto, 2011; Plath, 2009). The learning process in public spaces is an opportunity for self-reflection, perspective transformation and a chance to address community problems by using the public space as a free environment for the struggle against all forms of regulation and control. Educational environments in educational institutions emphasise the notion of power, prescribed goals and authoritarian relations (Torres, 2013, p. 26), but learning in public spaces is the opposite: emancipatory, democratic, civic and bottom-up. Public spaces, as compared to traditional (structured, regulated) learning environments, are changeable, open and created through discussion and formed by people involved in public spaces, which suits many older people. Learning is unpredictable, multi-layered, and in a sense, more demanding, because the course and its results are dependent on a participant's skills to perform it; but it is natural, experiential and based on the problems of the participant, so it is far less stressful than education in organised forms, which is subject to evaluation and measurable results. Therefore such learning: a) can have a therapeutic role (in the sense of encouraging mental

and physical activity); b) can have an extremely important emancipatory role; c) can encourage older adults to retain control over their own lives and possibilities (Glendenning & Battersby, 1990); d) can be empowering, transformative, liberating and transitional (Torres, 2013; McLaren, 2000; etc.); e) has the potential to be an activity for development of critical consciousness (Freire, 1970; 1994), contributing to empowerment of community members; f) and, finally, offers a new chance to avoid the isolation and despair which is typical for many older people. We can agree with the arguments of Mezirow (1997) and Illeris (2009) that learning has cognitive, emotional and social dimensions, important in learning processes in public spaces. To be a part of the speaking and acting process in public spaces, one has to have will, desire and certain skills, which can be learned only through the democratic process itself. Learning experiences in a public space are not always comfortable or joyful; they can be defined by hesitation, disjunction, discontinuity and conflict between participants (Wildemersch, 2012).

There are arguments (Biesta, 2014; Biesta & Cowell, 2012) that learning in a public sphere (space) could be defined as civic learning; this refers to processes and practices of learning that happen in the public sphere and can be understood “in a way that strives for a single-voice consensus and in a way in which such learning processes remain tied to a democratic commitment to plurality and difference” (Biesta & Cowell, 2012, p. 48). Skills of interaction with others are most needed for negotiations and conducting dialogue; they enable the translation of private issues/interests into public/common concerns. In the neighbourhood we mix and we learn from and through this diversity.

Learning in a public space could also be defined by theories of transformative learning. Transformative learning is a very demanding type of learning which involves personality changes, changes in the organisation of the self and restructuring of learning and living patterns (Illeris, 2009, p. 14). Mezirow (1997) stresses that transformative learning can take several forms involving either objective or subjective reframing. It is rooted in the way human beings communicate and is a common learning experience, which involves learning to make “our own interpretations rather than act on the purposes, beliefs, judgments, and feelings of others” (Mezirow, 1997, p. 5). In the opinion of Mezirow, this is one of the most important goals of adult education. As mentioned, a trusting social context, which enables dialogue and reflective discourse, is needed (Mezirow, 2000); if circumstances are favourable, these goals could be realised by learning in public open spaces. Such learning gives us a voice, an ability to name the world, and consequently, construct the meaning of the world for ourselves (Dirkx, 1998). This could be, by definition, at the core of learning in public spaces, which is open, unstructured, free space.

The idea is basically congruent with ideas of critical pedagogy, advocating dialogical and dialectical process between involved participants, or even revolutionary pedagogy, creating a narrative space, where subjectivity is constantly dissolved and reconstructed (McLaren, 2000). Bauman (2005, p. 23) believes that such learning is a lifelong learning process of “rebuilding of the now increasingly deserted public space, where men and women may engage in a continuous translation between individual and common, private and communal interests, rights and duties”..

Conclusion

Public spaces play a vital role in the social life of communities. Older people are very much involved and have a right to a place in the public space, but the role of learning is less clear. The idea of public pedagogy¹⁰ (Biesta, 2012; Biesta & Cowell, 2012) would have to be further developed as a public andragogy or public educational gerontology to influence learning by older adults in public spaces. Biesta proposes that the public pedagogue should somehow enter this space, yet not as an instructor, teacher or facilitator of learning, but as somebody who would interrupt and “keep open the possibility of a space where freedom can appear” (Biesta, 2012, p. 693). It is my conviction that top-down interventions in the public space, in the sense of educational interventions, should be as low-key as possible (or limited to certain events, places and part-time interventions); however, the discussion on the importance of the preservation of the public space, critical debates and resistance against the marketisation and privatisation of the space, should be encouraged in the professional and public sphere. Public adult educators should have interdisciplinary knowledge – besides critical educational theory – about urban sociology, critical public sociology, critical educational gerontology, public geography and sociology of space, to mention a few. A public adult educator could be, similar to a public sociologist (defined by Burawoy, 2013), one who speaks and listens, but also learns and writes about the importance of preservation of public space and learning through open communication. He/she should keep their distance from the market and the state, avoid institutionalised ways of thinking about learning and education, and somehow preserve the critical stance towards political and economic influences; he/she has to show moral responsibility and political commitment to create a sphere of public debate, as Torres (2013, p. 79) has also suggested. These ideas are close to the theories on

¹⁰ Biesta defined public pedagogy as “a pedagogy of the public and as the enactment of a concern for the public quality of human togetherness” (Biesta, 2012, p. 683)

the role of public intellectuals in reinforcing learning in social movements, who advocate autonomous learning, self-organisation of learning and open and transgressive learning (Hall, 2012, p. 134).

Research on the importance of learning in public spaces for both older and younger people, should be fostered and supported. This is vital for greater solidarity and a hopeful society for all, especially for those sliding towards despair (Freire, 1994). There are some such examples and initiatives in the field of adult education, which have been analysed and reported on elsewhere (like the Permanent Breakfast (<http://www.permanentbreakfast.org/>), Live Courtyards (<http://www.ziva-dvorisca.si/en>), The Community Walking Project (Biesta & Cowell, 2012), Personal TownTours (Kutin, 2014) and other research on the importance of public space as a space for learning and socialising (Mean & Tims, 2005; Watson & Studdert, 2006; Wildemeersch, 2012; etc.). However, there is a lack of research from the point of critical educational gerontology. More ethnomethodological research on learning in public spaces is needed in order to build stronger arguments for answering questions such as: what does public space offer to older people and what is their connection with other age groups in public space? Is public space, as Bourgeois said (2002), the 'secure space', where an individual can experience new ways of thinking and acting without risk to her/his identity? Does knowledge, achieved through confrontation of beliefs and ideas, offer an individual the possibility to reflect on his/her own world? What is the role of older people in social movements?

More focus is therefore needed on individual and societal changes in the second half of life at the micro and macro levels, but also on changing living conditions and opportunities to find how older people subjectively perceive it and adapt to it (Walker, 2013, p. 581). This is crucial for further rethinking on the importance of making public (open) space alive and available for different age groups, including older people.

References

- ARENDRT, H. (1996). *Vita Activa*. Ljubljana: Krtina.
- BALTES, M. M., & CARSTENSEN, L. L. (1999). Social-psychological theories and their application to aging: From individual to collective. In V. L. Bengtson & K. W. Schaie (Eds.), *Handbook of Theories of Aging* (pp. 209-226). New York: Springer Publishing.
- BAUMAN, Z. (2005). Learning to Walk in Quicksand. In A. Bron, E. Kurantowicz, H. Salling Olesen & L. West (Eds.), *'Old' and 'New' Worlds of Adult Learning* (pp. 17-26). Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Dolnoślaskiej Szkoły Wyższej Edukacji.

- BAUMAN, Z. (2002). *Tekoča moderna [Liquid Modernity]*. Ljubljana: Založba / *cf.
- BIESTA, G., & COWELL, G. (2012). How is community done? Understanding civic learning through psychogeographical mapping. *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, 31 (1), 47-61.
- BIESTA, G. (2012). Becoming public: Public pedagogy, citizenship and the public sphere. *Social & Cultural Geography*, 13 (7), 683-697.
- BORG, C., BUTTIGIEG, J., & MAYO, P. (2002). *Gramsci and Education*. Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield.
- BOURGEOIS, E. (2002). A Constructivist Approach to Adult Learning. In A. Bron & M. Schemmann (Eds.), *Social Science Theories in Adult Education Research* (pp. 130-152). Münster: LIT Verlag.
- BURAWOY, M. (2013). Public Sociology: The Task and the Promise. In K. Gould & T. Lewis (Eds.), *Ten Lessons in Introductory Sociology* (pp. 279-298). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- DALLEY, G., K. GILHOOLY, J. BARNETT, F. GOBET, P. HARRIES, S. NIBLOCK, M. P. SULLIVAN, & VICTOR, C. (2012). *Risk, trust and relationships in an ageing society*. Joseph Roundtree Foundation Report. Retrieved from: <http://goo.gl/ZY3UUh>.
- DIRKX, J. M. (1998). Transformative Learning Theory in the Practice of Adult Education: An Overview. *PAACE Journal of Lifelong Learning*, 7, 1-14.
- DYE, C. J., WILLOUGHBY, D. F., & BATTISTO, D. G. (2011). Advice from Rural Elders: What it Takes to Age in Place. *Educational Gerontology*, 37 (1), 74-93.
- ESTES, C., BIGGS, S., & PHILLIPSON, C. (2003). *Social Theory, Social Policy and Ageing: Critical Perspectives*. Berkshire: Open University Press.
- EUROSTAT (2014). *People at risk of poverty or social exclusion*. Retrieved from: http://ep.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/statistics_explained/index.php/People_at_risk_of_poverty_or_social_exclusion.
- FORMOSA, M. (2012). Lifelong education for older adults in Malta: Current trends and future visions. *International Review of Education*, 58, 271-292.
- FREIRE, P. (1994). *Pedagogy of Hope. Reliving Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. New York: Continuum.
- FREIRE, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. New York: Seabury Press.
- GLENDENNING, F., & BATTERSBY D. (1990). Why We Need Educational Gerontology and Education for Older Adults: A statement of first principles. In F. Glendenning & K. Percy (Eds.), *Ageing, Education and Society: Readings in Educational Gerontology* (pp. 219-231). Keele, Staffordshire: Association for Educational Gerontology.
- HARRIS, D. K. (2007). *The Sociology of Ageing*. Maryland: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers.
- HAJER, M., & REIJNDORP, A. (2004). Heritage discourse and public space. In L. Deben, W. Salet, and M.-T. van Thoore (Eds.), *Cultural Heritage and the Future of the Historic Inner City of Amsterdam* (pp. 43-53). Amsterdam: Aksant Academic Publishers.

- HABERMAS, J. (2001). *On the Pragmatics of Social Interaction. Preliminary Studies in the Theory of Communicative Action*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press.
- HABERMAS, J. (1989). *Strukturne spremembe javnosti* [*Strukturwandel der Öffentlichkeit*]. Ljubljana: ŠKUC, Filozofska fakulteta.
- HARVEY, D. (2011). *Kozmopolitstvo in geografije svobode* [*Cosmopolitanism and the Geographies moral cosmopolitan of Freedom*]. Ljubljana: Sofia.
- IECOVICH, E. (2014). Aging in Place: From Theory to Practice. *Anthropological Notebooks*, 20 (1), 21–33.
- ILLERIS, K. (2009). A comprehensive understanding of human learning. In K. Illeris (Ed.), *Contemporary Theories of Learning* (pp. 7-20). London, New York: Routledge.
- KOHN, M. (2004). *Brave New Neighborhood: The Privatization of Public Space*. New York, London: Routledge.
- KUMP, S. (2012). Družbena gibanja - prostori radikalnega izobraževanja odraslih [Social movements - sites of radical adult education]. *Sodobna pedagogika*, 63/129 (3), 18-38.
- KUMP, S., & JELENC KRAŠOVEC, S. (2014). The educational opportunities for older adults in rural and urban municipalities. *Anthropological notebooks*, 20 (1), 51-68.
- LEFEBVRE, H. (2013). *Produkcija prostora* [*La production de l'espace*]. Ljubljana: Studia Humanitatis.
- HALL, B. L. (2012). A Giant Human Hashtag: Learning and the #Occupy Movement.' In B. Hall, D. E. Clover, J. Crowter & E. Scandrett (Eds.), *Learning and Education for a Better World: The Role of Social Movements* (pp. 127-139). Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.
- McLAREN, P. (2000). *Che Guevara, Paulo Freire, and the Pedagogy of Revolution*. Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield.
- MEAN, M., & TIMS, C. (2005). *People make places*. London: Demos.
- MEZIROW, J. (1997). Transformative Learning: Theory to Practice. In P. Cranton (Ed.), *New directions for adult and continuing education*: No. 74. Transformative learning in action: Insights from practice (pp. 5-12). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- MEZIROW, J. (2000). Learning to think like an adult: Core concepts of transformation theory. In J. Mezirow & Associates (Eds.), *Learning as transformation: Critical perspectives on a theory in progress* (pp. 3-34). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- MONTROSS, L. P., DEPP, C., DALY, J., REICHSTADT, J., GOLSHAN, S., MOORE, D. SITZER, D., & JESTE, D. V. (2006). Correlates of Self-rated Successful Aging among Community-dwelling Older Adults. *American Journal of Geriatric Psychiatry* 14 (1), 42–51.
- OLDENBURG, R. (1999). *The Great Good Place*. Cambridge: Da Capo Press.
- PHILLIPSON, C. (2013). Ageing in Urban Society: Growing Old in the 'Century of the City'. In D. Dale & C. Phillipson (Eds.), *Social Gerontology* (pp. 597-606). London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi, Singapore: Sage Publications.
- PLATH, D. (2009). International Policy Perspectives on Independence in Old Age. *Journal of Aging & Social Policy*, 21 (2), 209-223.

- ŠKERLEP, A. (1997). *Komunikacija v družbi, družba v komunikaciji [Communication in society, society in communication]*. Ljubljana: Fakulteta za družbene vede.
- TORRES, C. A. (2013). *Political Sociology of Adult Education*. Rotterdam/Boston/Taipei: Sense Publishers.
- WAHL, H.-W., & OSWALD, F. (2013). Environmental Perspectives on Ageing. In D. Dale & C. Phillipson (Eds.), *Social Gerontology* (pp. 111-124). London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi, Singapore: Sage Publications.
- WALKER, A. (2013). Ageing and Quality of Life in Europe. In D. Dale & C. Phillipson (Eds.), *Social Gerontology* (pp. 573-586). London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi, Singapore: Sage Publications.
- WATSON, S., & STUDDERT, D. (2006). *Markets as spaces for social interaction: Spaces of diversity*. Bristol: The Policy Press. Report and summary. Accessible at www.jrf.org.uk.
- WILDEMEERSCH, D. (2012). Imagining pedagogy in public space: visions of cultural policies and practices in a city in transformation. *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, 31 (1), 77-95, DOI: 10.1080/02601370.2011.636638.
- PERMANENT BRAKFAST. (2015). Retrieved from: <http://www.permanentbreakfast.org>.
- LIVE COURTYARDS. (2015). Retrieved from: <http://www.ziva-dvorisca.si/en>.

Sabina Jelenc Krašovec¹¹
Univerzitet u Ljubljani, Slovenija

Stariji odrasli u otvorenim javnim prostorima – aktivnosti i uloga učenja

Apstrakt: Rad obrađuje temu javnih prostora kao arena otvorenih za sve građane, gde je moguće razmenjivati iskustva koja nisu nužno vezana za prijatelje i porodicu, bez ograničenja kad je reč o starosnom dobu ili bilo kojim drugim karakteristikama. Javni prostor se smatra forumom za društvene i lične promene, mestom gde se stvara sistem odnosa koji je posledica delanja, govorenja i učenja. Autor analizira razlike između javnih i privatnih prostora i ocenjuje značenje komunikacije i učenja u njima. Pitanja su analizirana sa gledišta starijih ljudi, koji su snažno povezani sa prostorom i koji su najčešće najviše zainteresovani za to da budu deo svog okruženja i da ga menjaju. Autor iznova razmatra koliko je učenje u javnom prostoru značajno za starije ljude i kakvu ulogu u tom procesu imaju nastavnici u obrazovanju odraslih.

Ključne reči: prostori zajednice, komunikacija, bottom-up pristup, stariji ljudi, učenje.

¹¹ Dr Sabina Jelenc Krašovec je vanredni profesor na Odeljenju za pedagogiju i andragogiju Filozofskog Fakulteta, Univerziteta u Ljubljani, Slovenija.