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CHAPTER 1

‘Generationing’ Development: 
An Introduction

Roy Huijsmans

PRESENTING THE CASE

A growing body of research on childhood and youth in the context of development has brought lots, yet still too little. The ‘new sociology of childhood’ that gained shape in the 1990s transformed the field (Tisdall and Punch 2012). Its key premises, appreciating childhood as a social construct and children as social actors, countered the socialisation approaches and development psychology perspectives that long dominated knowledge production about children (Ansell 2009: 190). In this new wave of research, qualitative, participatory, ethnographic, and especially so-called child-centred methods were typically favoured over standardised questionnaires (Christensen and James 2000). This generated a wealth of knowledge about children in their current condition as children, privileging their own perspectives and experiences, and challenging any singular understanding of childhood leading some to speak about ‘multiple’ childhoods (Balagopalan 2014: 11–14).

The story about youth is different.¹ Their agency was never in question, albeit seldom studied in relation to young women, and mostly seen as a problem or a particularity. Unlike childhood studies, qualitative research
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1. The story about youth is different.¹ Their agency was never in question, albeit seldom studied in relation to young women, and mostly seen as a problem or a particularity. Unlike childhood studies, qualitative research
is a respected tradition within youth studies (Willis 1981; Mead 2001 [1928]). Research conducted in rich countries still dominates the field, with numerous articles and books on the various ‘crises’ attributed to (male) youth and particular sub-cultural formations. This epistemological frame has also influenced emerging youth research in the Global South (Amit-Talai and Wulff 1995; Honwana and De Boeck 2005). It is only in recent years that youth studies have started paying serious attention to more-or-less ordinary youth and the potential of studying their everyday lives for rethinking development (Jeffrey et al. 2008; Jeffrey 2010; Woronov 2016).

Nonetheless, a key motivation driving this book is that both childhood and youth studies have informed debates in development studies only marginally. Or more precisely, it is particularly these more recent perspectives and approaches in the respective fields that have failed to impact development thinking despite their potential. For it must be recognised that research coming out of economics, medical science, and development psychology, on children especially, has made more than just a dent in development thinking and practice. This is evident from the global uptake of conditional cash transfer programmes (see Palacio this volume) as well as renewed interest in early childhood programmes (Young, 2007). Driven by the interaction between neuroscience, development psychology, and neoclassical economics, such interventions are considered highly efficient approaches to simultaneously alleviating poverty and building human capital for facilitating economic growth. Such child research, thus, speaks directly to dominant global development agendas while also offering the robust ‘large-n’ causal analyses demanded by inter-governmental donors and national governments alike. However, this research treats childhood as a site of intervention ignoring children’s active engagement with and appropriation of programmes, important contextual variations in how interventions play out, the constantly evolving relational and generational fabric within which children and young people live their lives and in which programmes intervene, as well as the temporal dimension that would show that at least some children may ‘do well’ later in life despite initial hardships and deprivations (Boyden et al. 2015).

At its core, development studies and practice have remained adult-centric. This influences the questions that drive most research about young people within the field. This adult-centrism is seldom, however,
sufficiently marked, and it can be easily missed because of the vast volume of (evaluation) research on the incorporation of children into development interventions, frequent rhetorical references to ‘young people as the future’, and sub-debates on the fringes of the discipline about specific ‘child’, ‘adolescent’ or ‘youth’-related themes such as ‘child poverty’, ‘adolescent sexuality’, and ‘youth employment’. Children may thus have ‘become prominent “clients” of international development discourse and intervention’ (Boyden and Zharkевич forthcoming), and the idea of the ‘youth bulge’ continues to ignite debates on youth as either a danger or potential for development (e.g. World Bank 2006). Yet, the conceptual and theoretical innovations that have come out of the qualitative research on childhood and youth have hardly impacted the terms of thinking about development.

Perhaps, this state of affairs is partly the prize of success. Much of the qualitative research in childhood and youth studies, including work on young people in the context of development, is published in the specialised childhood and youth studies journals and book series launched in recent decades (Tisdall and Punch 2012: 252). In contrast to the early days (e.g. Goddard and White 1982; Nieuwenhuys 1994), only a fraction of this work appears in, or seems to inform in any substantial way, debates in development studies circles (Huijsmans et al. 2014: fn1). Others have pointed at the failure of much childhood and youth research to employ a political economy perspective (see Mills this volume), and thereby speak more directly to larger global processes (Hart 2008; Côté 2014; Woronov 2016).

This volume is a modest contribution to bridging gaps in order to facilitate conceptual dialogue between these strands of research. That is, between childhood and youth studies, and between those two fields and development studies (other major works include Young Lives; Katz 2004; Ansell 2005; Jeffrey et al. 2008; Wells 2009). To this end, the volume brings together a total of 14 chapters. The three parts of the book, ‘theorising age and generation in young lives’, ‘everyday relationalities: school, work and belonging’, and ‘negotiating development’ consist of four chapters each and are complemented with an introductory chapter setting out the conceptual and theoretical parameters and a commentary by Nicola Ansell that closes the volume.

Analytically, the volume coheres around a relational approach. Relational thinking can take many forms, but in essence it is about tying
together different things, actors, dimensions, dynamics, or forces. It emphasises relationships, networks, friction, interaction, negotiation, the everyday and power. At an ontological level, relational thinking, thus, seeks to overcome static agency–structure binaries (Worth 2014). At a minimum, the relational exercise presented in this volume is about bringing into critical conversation some of the conceptual and theoretical contributions of childhood and youth studies with debates and perspectives in development studies. In addition, the chapters in this volume also retain the important relational exercise of investigating the interactions between constructs of childhood and youth and the lived experience of being young (see for example Alma Gottlieb’s (2004) work on the interplay between the understanding of the personhood attributed to babies and practices of child rearing). However, the specific contribution of the volume lies in its attempt to capture the twofold dynamic of how development, in its various conceptualisations, restructures generational social landscapes, and also how young people themselves, as constrained agents of development, renegotiate their role and position vis-à-vis others and in particular places and spaces of development.

The next section sets out an analytical frame underpinning the relational approach informing this book. This framework is given specific childhood and youth studies content by mobilising age and generation, in their various interpretations, as key concepts. Next, the general approach to development is sketched followed by an outline of the organisation of the book and a brief introduction to the contributing chapters.

**Relational Thinking**

In recent years, there has been somewhat of a revival of relational approaches. This is evident not only in work on ‘space’ (Jones 2009), ‘the state’ (Thelen et al. 2014), ‘poverty’ (Mosse 2010) but also in research with young people (e.g. Punch 2002b; Kraftl 2013; Worth 2014). Thelen et al. (2014: 2) posit that by making relations the entry point of analysis, we gain new insights into how things work. The rationale for foregrounding generational relations is, thus, to gain a deeper understanding of how development, in its diverse conceptualisations, works in a generational manner—and especially, though not exclusively, how this pertains to young people.

Thelen et al.’s (2014) relational anthropology of studying the state is driven by a problematique that maps well onto childhood and youth
studies because of its concern with the interplay between ‘formations’, ‘representations’, and ‘practices’. In the context of childhood and youth studies, formations can be operationalised as ‘generational structures’, representations can be taken to refer to ‘discourses about young people’, and practices can direct attention to the ‘lived experiences of being young’. Thelen et al. (2014: 2) propose studying these interconnected dimensions with an analytical framework comprising of three axes: ‘relational modalities, boundary work, and the embeddedness of actors’.

The idea of modalities captures the different ontologies in which notions of childhood and youth exist and the various understandings of age that come with it. We could, thus, speak of ‘generational modalities’. In Sara Vida Coumans chapter, different modalities are clearly illustrated through policies seeking to regulate sex work. These policies are articulated in terms of chronological age and legitimised on the basis of neuroscience. However, there is also the modality of the embodied dimension of age that shapes sex work as practice. Similarly, in Lidewyde Berckmoes and Ben White’s contribution, young people hopefully articulate the rights and obligations associated with kinship descent. According to this generational modality, parents support their children in setting up an adult life. However, under conditions in which such support is lacking young women and young men must mobilise their youthfulness in other ways in order to ‘find a life’, amongst other things, by resorting to cross-border labour migration, ‘illegal marriages’, and for some urban youth also by becoming involved in ‘political participation’, the latter giving rise to discourses about the destructive and disruptive potential of idle male youth (see also Izzi 2013). Berckmoes and White’s chapter shows that these different modalities are neither mutually exclusive nor discrete and especially in times of rapid change, crises or transformation people draw on various modalities, at times simultaneously, in their efforts to get by (see also Vigh 2006).

The concept of boundary work draws attention to the fuzzy and fluid boundaries of age-based categories, and the constant work that gives these artificial boundaries the gloss of fixity and puts them beyond question. It is precisely these boundaries that are poorly covered in childhood and youth studies. The work of Sally McNamee and Julie Seymour (2013) suggests that research on age-based categories gravitates to the centre. On the basis of a review of 320 articles published between 1993 and 2010 in three leading childhood journals, they conclude that the scholarly attention is
unevenly distributed across the age range the journals claim to cover: the articles most commonly report about 10–12 year olds, there is very little coverage of the ‘under 5s’ and also relatively little attention to young people aged 17 years and older. If, however, the objective is to understand how age-based categories affect the lived experiences of being young, it is of methodological importance to work across age boundaries. This is of particular importance in relation to phenomena such as migration and sex work that typically straddle (inter)national boundaries between age of minority and majority (O’Connell Davidson 2005; Huijsmans 2015a: 18).

The relevance of boundary work for understanding how development policies intervening in generational landscapes play out is vividly illustrated by Mariá Gabriela Palacio in her discussion on teenage mothers (Chap. 11 this volume). Attaining motherhood prior to turning 18 frictions with the social logic underpinning the conditional cash transfer scheme. Social workers are aware that these young mothers are often the most needy, yet conservative Catholicism holds them back from bending the boundaries of the programme out of fear of creating a perverse incentive. Similarly, young mothers do boundary work by opting for practicing motherhood in the margins of their lives as a consequence of choosing employment rather than claiming financial support even once they have reached the age at which they have become admissible to the programme. Attention to boundary work is also demonstrated in the chapters by Wedadu Sayibu and Degwale Belay, respectively. Their work does not only investigate why children enter begging arrangements and street-based work, a question that is commonly addressed in childhood studies, but it also unravels why young people cease to be involved in or aim to exit this work some years later.

The third axis of analysis in Thelen et al’s scheme (2014) is the embeddedness of actors. As Karuna Morarji’s contribution illustrates, even within one locality various actors are situated in very different webs of social relations. The teachers who work in the remote mountainous areas of Northern India position themselves firmly as agents of the modernising project of mass education. This allows them to mobilise starkly different relational modalities then the rural students and their parents. Through mass schooling and (rural-to-urban) migration, young rural folk become embedded in relational fields other than the place-based community and kinship relations they have been raised into. Young people experience first-hand the conflicts and contradictions between the different ways they are embedded in these respective social fields. They respond to this with a
search for ‘balance’. The precise shape such balancing takes would depend however on the extent to which they are able to mobilise some of the social relations they are embedded in. Here, Morarji’s chapter underscores the importance of viewing the embeddedness of actors not only through a generational lens but also through a gender lens. She shows that modern schooling is perceived to have a very different effect on, and offering possibilities for, young men as opposed to their female peers. Although the importance of the intersection between gender and generation transpires from virtually all contributions, this is perhaps most powerfully illustrated by Sharada Srinivasan on the basis of her research in a southern Indian study context characterised by ‘daughter aversion’. She demonstrates that in their ‘bargaining with patriarchy’ young women have little other option than to mobilise another set of exploitative relations: the capitalist forces underpinning the Sumangali scheme. Submitting to capital to exploit their youthful, feminine labour power allows them to delay marriage, attain additional schooling, and save for a dowry (compare with Mills 1999; Utrata 2011).

**Beyond Categorisation: Age and Generation as Relational Concepts**

Relationality in research with children and young people is first and foremost a critique of the categorisation fashion that has come to characterise a good part of both the childhood and youth studies literature. Peter Hopkins and Rachel Pain (2007: 288) even write about a ‘politics of fetishizing the social-chronological margins’. With this, they take issue with the isolationist fashion in which research on children and youth and to a lesser extent older people has developed into vibrant sub-fields, while the adult centre has been left unmarked (see also Vanderbeck and Worth 2015: 3).

Responding to Hopkins and Pains’ critique comes with methodological implications. Childhood and youth researchers have long argued for child and youth friendly, or -centred methods (Punch 2002a; Alderson and Morrow 2004). The chapters in this volume, however, are rather characterised by research that decentres adults. Adults, in their various capacities like teachers, parents, employers, social workers, researchers, are deliberately included in the research, while simultaneously creating the space for children and young people’s own experiences and perspectives on matters (see also Hoang and Yeoh 2015; Punch 2016: 188). Where
possible, research was conducted in so-called ‘natural settings’ in order to
capture how generational relations work in practice, be it on the streets
of Addis Ababa, secondary schools in Northern Vietnam, health clinics in
Ecuador, or a Sufi centre in Kall, Germany.

Hopkins and Pain note further that despite much awareness of the con-
structed nature of categorisations on the basis of age and the variations
in which people experience age, ‘age has been given a fixity’ (ibid 2007:
288). Research that uncritically embraces such age-based categories risks
missing sight of how:

…identities of children and others are produced through interactions with
other age/generational groups and are in a constant state of flux. Therefore,
children and childhood interact with others in family and community set-
tings and so are more than children alone; studying them in context adds
new layers to our understanding. (Hopkins and Pain 2007: 289, original
emphasis)²

Hopkins and Pain’s call for ‘more relational geographies of age’, how-
ever, does not fully delineate how notions of generation and age are
understood precisely (Hopkins and Pain 2007: 291). In fact, the afore-
mentioned quote leaves unclear whether or the extent to which age and
generation are conceptually distinct. Since both terms are widely used in
everyday parlance and subject to many interpretations, I present a brief
overview.

Understanding Age

Despite the centrality of the idea of age in childhood and youth studies,
and in development practice too, it is seldom subject to much concep-
argues that age ‘involves much more than the number of years since one’s
birth’ leading her to argue that ‘age is not natural or fixed’.

Chronological Age

When the term ‘age’ is used, this often refers to its chronological con-
ceptualisation; the figure identifying the number of (Gregorian) calendar
years that have passed since birth. Taking issue with an understanding of
age as ‘a chronological fact and as something every individual simply is’,
Laz (1998: 85, original emphasis) calls for a sociology of age:
…in which we theorize and study empirically how age as a concept and institution is created, maintained, challenged, and transformed; how assumptions and beliefs about age in general and about particular age categories inform and are reinforced by social statuses, norms, roles, institutions, and social structures; and how age patterns individual lives and experiences even as individuals accomplish age. (Laz 1998: 90)

Some questions such a framework raises would include: how one particular conceptualisation of age (chronological age) has become hegemonic, what it mutes, and how it matters? The work of Philippe Ariès (1962) and James Scott (1998) shed light on this from a history of childhood and development studies’ perspective, respectively (see also Grieg 1994: 32). Their work confirms Laz’s assertion (1998: 92, original emphasis) that ‘chronological age is made important in particular social and historical contexts’.

In Scott’s terms, chronological age can be seen as a form of state simplification; characteristic of modernising states’ efforts to make legible its population. State simplifications allow for ‘discriminating interventions’ (Scott 1998: 3) which include (and exclude) segments of the population on the basis of the unidimensional measure of chronological age. Key examples include mass schooling (Horton this volume), mass organisations for the young (Valentin 2007; Semedi 2016), minimum age regulations (Melchiorre 2004; Bourdillon et al. 2009), and the very idea of a separate set of rights specifically for children (Van Bueren 1995; Hanson and Nieuwenhuys 2013; Twum-Danso Imoh and Ansell 2013). In other instances, ‘discriminating interventions’ employ age in combination with additional characteristics such as sex, in case of boy scouts and girl guides (Proctor 2009) income in the case of conditional cash transfer programmes (Palacio this volume), social class (as proposed by Mills, this volume), or migrant status (Sadjad, this volume Hopkins and Hill 2010). These examples illustrate that age, in its chronological conceptualisation, is evidently made important not only by the state but also through work of non-govermental and inter-governmental organisation—amongst other things through development related interventions. However, Scott (1998: 8) cautions that ‘global capitalism is perhaps the most powerful force for homogenization’. Indeed, where states and their non-governmental partners have failed or do not fully succeed in making young people identify with their date of birth, it is increasingly the digital capitalism of companies like Facebook, and mobile services providers that succeed in doing
so (Huijsmans 2015b), while simultaneously providing chronological age with new meanings, possibilities (Boellstorff 2008: 122; Alexander 2014), and risks (Kierkegaard 2008).

Relative Age and Social Age

Although chronological age has by no means displaced alternative conceptualisations of age, creating the conceptual space for understanding age otherwise requires some efforts—especially in environments where chronological age dominates such as in the classroom and policy arenas (see Horton, this volume; Clark-Kazak, this volume). In my teaching with mostly mature MA-level students from diverse professional, geographical and cultural backgrounds I have, to this end, been using a short exercise. In pairs, students ask each other about:

1. their (chronological) age;
2. the day of the week they were born;
3. the time of the day they were born;
4. whether they can identify fellow students that are older/younger than them; and
5. whether they consider themselves youth, adults, etc.

Next, students explain to one another why they were struggling with some answers and had no problems with others (which usually is the case).

Should there be any Korean students or other East Asian students who are aware of traditional age systems, the first question already challenges the singularity of chronological age. The second and third question shed light on what in some places are very important biographical data (e.g. used in name-giving or in astrology to calculate auspicious dates or identify suitable marriage partners) yet virtually unknown by lots of people in other contexts. The fourth question turns the spotlight onto ‘relative age’ (Huijsmans 2014a). In many parts of the world, it is in everyday interactions often more important to be aware of differences in relative age (i.e. whether one is older or younger) than the precise chronological age. This is evident from the use of different personal pronouns depending on relative positions in relations of seniority between individuals (Enfield 2007; Szymańska-Matusiewicz 2014). The fifth question refers to the concept of ‘social age’. Christina Clark-Kazak (2009: 1310) has defined social age as ‘the socially constructed meanings applied to physical development and roles attributed to infants, children, young people, adults and elders, as
well as their intra- and inter-generational relationships’ (for a concrete application see Huijsmans 2010: Chap. 5). Although (inter)national definitions of childhood and youth define these life phases firmly in chronological terms (Herrera 2006), in everyday contexts however social age has a strong performative dimension and is always contextual, embodied, and gendered (Laz 1998; Huijsmans and Baker 2012: 935; Huijsmans 2013).6

**Interpreting Generation**

Unlike the concept of age, generation in its various interpretations has received its share of attention in the relevant recent literature (e.g. Koning 1997; Alanen 2001; Edmunds and Turner 2005; Cole and Durham 2007; Herrera and Bayat 2010; Jeffrey 2010; Naafs and White 2012; Punch 2016). Although age and generation are sometimes used interchangeably, they are conceptually distinct even though some interpretations of generation presuppose a concept of age. The preceding discussion has illustrated that age is foremost a principle of social differentiation (La Fontaine 1978). In its various conceptualisations, age is helpful in understanding some of the relations of power shaping everyday interactions between individuals. In addition, at a macro-level age is a key variable employed in policies and social analysis. Generation, on the other hand, is useful for understanding how societies are structured on the basis of age-based groupings and how this may relate to larger processes of change and continuity (Thorne 2004: 404).

**Kinship Descent**

In the kinship descent interpretation of generation, generation refers mostly to parent–child relations. This interpretation of generation has proven useful for conceptualising the generational dimension of intra-household relations (Xu 2015). For example, it can be recognised in Samantha Punch’s work (2002b, 2015) on the idea of ‘negotiated and constrained interdependencies’; a critique to conventional youth transition models which view young people as moving in a fairly unconstrained and linear manner from a condition of dependence to one of independence. The idea of generation as kinship descent also transpires through the notion of the ‘inter-generational contract’ (Hoddinott 1992; Kabeer 2000; Whitehead et al. 2007; Evans 2015).

The idea of interdependence and the inter-generational contract may be understood in relation to the nuclear family residing in the same
locality. Yet, it can also be employed in the context of differently composed and dispersed family formations (e.g. Sayibu, this volume Carsten 2004; Mazzucato and Schans 2011) and possibly to fictive kinship formations entirely outside of any conventional understanding of the household as Sarada Balagopalan’s (2014: 142–145) work on street children suggests (see also Belay, this volume Heinonen 2013). In modalities of kinship descent the generational positions, such as child and parent, are permanent locations regardless of people’s chronological age. However, as both children and their parents age their rights and obligations to one another shift within the loose frame of the inter-generational contract (Huijsmans 2010: 129–130). It is at this point that we see how generation in its interpretation of kinship descent overlaps with generation as a life phase situated in a generational order. It is further important to note that the loose set of generational relations comprising the intergenerational contract and negotiated interdependence is always gendered and subject to reinterpretation as circumstances change—something which is especially evident in the context of migration (Mazzucato et al. 2006; Punch 2007; Huijsmans 2013, 2014a; Hoang and Yeoh 2015; Punch 2015).

Life Phase

In contrast to generation as kinship descent, generation as a life phase directs the analytical gaze towards the interplay between institutional dimensions and individual biographies. 7 Närvänen and Näsmann (2004: 84) explain that ‘age-related life phases, such as childhood, come into being through complex processes and are institutionalized but can also change over time’. Although the phrase institutionalisation often refers to forces of the state Anoop Nayak and Mary Jane Kehily (2013: 12) note that ‘contemporary Western childhood cannot be read outside of market forces but is constituted in and through relations of capital’. Poor people in poor countries have long been recognised as an important consumer base and recently been ‘rediscovered’ in terms of ‘the bottom of the pyramid’ (Kolk et al. 2013). Nayak and Kehily’s claim, thus, is unlikely to be limited to the West (for an early hint into this direction see White 1996: 830). However, the little research that critically investigates the role of consumption and the market in the constitution of young lives tends to be limited to the life phase of youth (e.g. Lukose 2005; Beazley and Chakraborty 2008).

Närvänen and Näsmann (2004: 85) stress that life phases are relational because they define each other within ‘the framework of their relative
positions in the life course as a whole’. Such a life course perspective sits uncomfortably in both childhood and youth studies because it is seen as inviting a reductionist view on children and youth as ‘becomings’. Yet, especially in relation to development, a hesitant engagement with the becoming part of being young must be reconsidered. It delimits the analytical scope as it means losing sight of how the temporal dimension of development interacts with the embodied and gendered experience of being young and growing up (Cole and Durham 2008).

The interplay between these different rhythms of continuity and change is not only of analytical interest, but also of political relevance. For the adult population, young people constitute a means to access, and also a site to influence the future (Smith 2013). This is partly because the young are seen as more malleable. Making them a key target for projects seeking to bring about politico-economic and socio-cultural change (Evans 1998: 159; Christie 2015: 260–1). The interplay between brain research and human capital theory has added scientific clout to this long-standing popular idea and, more importantly, given rise to an understanding of childhood as the life phase with the highest returns to investment (Young 2007). Next, the interplay between the temporality of development and human maturation also transpires from interventions and practicing seeking to safeguard continuity. It is through young people that one may attempt to secure particular pasts and presents in the future (Lall and Vickers 2009; Huijsmans 2011; Sinha-Kerkhoff 2011).

Attending to futurity neither means viewing children or youth as ‘blank slates’ onto which any future can be written, even if adults represent children as such (see Moraji, this volume), nor going back to visions about children and young people as incomplete and adults-in-making. Indeed, it is fully compatible with viewing young people as social actors because ‘looking forward to what a child “becomes” is arguably an important part of “being” a child’ (Uprichard 2008: 306). Several of the chapters included in this volume illustrate this argument (Berckmoes & White; Hart; Morarji; Palacio; Srinivasan). For example, Palacio’s chapter shows that the way in which the human capital theory and development psychology underpinning conditional cash transfer programmes is mapped onto the life course renders childhood a site of investment. She, then, proceeds to investigate how this particular definition of the life phase of childhood affects how children think of themselves in relation to the future. This brings out important gender differences. The idea of succeeding in the labour market gels well with masculine ideas of adulthood while it is
perceived as out of sync with the gendered opportunity structures girls growing up in poverty have become aware of.

Generation in its interpretation of life phase is also associated with the idea of transitions (i.e. school-to-work transitions). Transition thinking has been especially influential in questions concerning youth in development (Camfield 2011). This is illustrated by the World Bank’s 2007 World Development Report framed around the idea of ‘youth transitions’ (World Bank 2006) and the International Labour Office’s school-to-work transition survey (e.g. Elder 2014). The linearity and directionality of many youth transitions models has been a subject to substantial critique. Scholars like Johanna Wyn and Rob White (1997: 97–8), for example, argue the importance of adding a ‘vertical perspective’ to the idea of youth transition in order to capture generational continuities in terms of class, ethnicity, religion and gender (see also Mills, this volume). They further note that the metaphor of ‘transitions’ suggests a landscape of ‘pathways’ leading to a certain destination (adulthood). Even if these institutional ‘pathways’ are well trodden by many, they are often invisible or inaccessible to others (ibid 1997: 99; Punch 2015). A more relational and non-teleological understanding of how young people develop their lives is found in the idea of ‘vital conjunctures’ (Johnson-Hanks 2002), emphasising the importance of understanding key life course events as indeterminant and multi-directional. Similarly, the concept of ‘social navigation’ (Vigh 2009) sheds light on how in conditions of extreme volatility people make decisions in relation to potential possibilities and risks (instead of established ‘pathways’). These conceptual contributions are all critical of the linearity and determinacy of conventional transition models without, however, throwing out the idea of life phases and the life course.

When life phases are attributed particular properties and set within the inflexible frame of chronological age this produces something that we may call ‘age-normativity: certain rights, responsibilities, and places, as well as the evaluation of the appropriateness of particular activities carried out by young people, become normatively (dis)associated to life phases demarcated by the universal measure of chronological age’ (Huijsmans 2015a: 10). Development policies often breathe age-normativity (i.e. World Bank 2006). This is not necessarily bad news. In fact, it has led to an increase in social services targeted at specific age-based populations (the young, but also the old) such as the Education for All campaign (Gerber and Huijsmans 2016) and programmes aimed at protecting the development and survival of the very young (Myers and Bourdillon 2012: 438). At the
same time though, age-normativity pathologises young lives that do not
conform with such globalised middle-class ideas of age-appropriate behav-

ior, often with adverse effects as critical research on children’s work,
young people’s migration and teenage motherhood has shown (Liebel
2004; Wilson and Huntington 2006; Howard 2014; Maconachie and
Hilson 2016). Importantly, the voices of young people living their lives
in contradiction to normative ideas about childhood and youth remain
mostly excluded from policy making and programmatic interventions,
not in the least because institutional contexts and other dimensions of
positionality often have a normalising effect on such voices (Montgomery

Mannheim

Next to kinship descent and life phase, the term ‘generation’ has also been
used in its meaning of ‘cohort’. This simply refers to people born in the
same year(s). In demographic approaches to development cohorts are
used as ‘a tool to observe, to describe, and sometimes to explain social
change’ (Corsten 1999: 255). However, for childhood and youth studies,
the Mannheimian development of the idea of cohorts is of greater rele-
vance. In his essay on The Problem of Generations, Karl Mannheim presents
a formal sociological analysis of the generation phenomenon with the aim
of better understanding some of the dynamics of historical development
(Mannheim 1952). According to this schema, not all cohorts develop into
a generation (ibid 1952: 310). For this to happen, there must be a ‘stratifi-
cation of experience’ (Mannheim, in Corsten 1999: 256). This means that
sharing the same historical time at which they were born (in Mannheim
terms ‘generational location’) is a necessary, yet not a sufficient condition
for the formation of an actual generation. For people to start identifying
as an ‘actual generation’, they must also belong to a ‘cultural and historical
region’ (Närvänen and Näsman 2004: 78–9). Specifying the generational
dimension of belonging further, Corsten (1999: 258) defines ‘actual gen-
erations’ as cohorts ‘who do not only have something in common, they
have also a (common) sense for (a kind of knowledge about) the fact that
they have something in common’. Mannheim further coined the phrase
‘generational units’. These are different groups of young people within
the same actual generation that have experienced and respond to the same
historical events very differently (Mannheim 1952: 304).

Given development studies’ concern with social transformation, the
Mannheimian interpretation of generation has much immediate intuitive
appeal—and indeed, the generationally marked use of social media
and digital technologies only adds to this (Barendregt 2008; Shah and
Abraham 2009; Mesch and Talmud 2010; Ezawy 2012; Meek 2012;
Buckingham et al. 2014; Huijsmans and Trần Thị Hà Lan 2015). While
the Mannheimian interpretation of generation also echoes through the
widely used development slogan of ‘youth as agents of change’, there are
also questions and concerns.

First, Mannheim placed the formative period of generational identi-
ties in the youth stage of the life course. Leena Alanen (2001: 16) rightly
asks whether it is not in childhood that generations are formed. Second,
at what point in the life course can we truly speak of an actual genera-
tion? ‘Reflective participation in intellectual issues and shared experi-
ences’ (Närvänen and Näsman 2004: 79) is, in part, also produced by the
increased intensity of the institutionalisation of the life phases of childhood
and youth, yet does that render cohorts of young people into actual gen-
erations or can this only be ascertained if at later points in the life course
this is still observable? Third, the Mannheimian interpretation of genera-
tion contributes to reinforcing a common feature in the cultural studies of
youth, in that a disproportionate share of scholarly attention goes out to
so-called ‘spectacular youth’ such a punkers, skinheads, skaters, and those
youth involved in social movements, with relatively little attention paid to
ordinary, and especially, rural youth (Robson et al. 2007). Fourth, atten-
tion to spectacular youth easily equates the idea of youth with young men.
This leads to a gender-blind perspective of youth because it leaves female
youth out of sight while the male dimension too often remains unmarked
(Sadjad, this volume; Huijsmans 2014b).

The aforementioned discussion has not more than scratched the sur-
face of the multiple ways in which ideas of age and generation have been
conceptualised. Even so, I hope to have demonstrated the relevance of
these relational concepts for a firmer analytical anchoring of research on
childhood and youth in the field of development studies. Table 1.1 pulls
together the discussion. It outlines the main concepts of age various inter-
pretations of generation presuppose, the key relations they capture and
also how each of these different interpretations of generation comes with
its own cluster of connecting concepts.

As all tables, Table 1.1 is not more than a heuristic device. The vari-
ous interpretations of generation flow into one another (Vanderbeck and
Worth 2015: 2) and are here separated for analytical purposes only. For
example, the life phase understanding of generation overlaps with the
idea of social age. What sets the two apart is less empirical than analytical and thus defined by the questions we ask and the conceptual frames we employ. Furthermore, conceptual innovation is often achieved by working across different interpretations. For example, Samantha Punch’s (2015) notion of ‘negotiated and constrained interdependencies’ for understanding youth transitions combines the idea of generation as a life phase and generation in terms of kinship descent.

The conceptual journey through different understandings of age and generation that is presented in this section adds childhood and youth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interpretation of 'generation'</th>
<th>Pre-supposing concepts of age</th>
<th>Relationality</th>
<th>Clustering 'age' conceptually with</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kinship descent</td>
<td>Relative age, social age</td>
<td>Relations</td>
<td>Kinship, gender, generational</td>
<td>Parent-child and sibling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>between household members</td>
<td>reciprocity, negotiation, socialisation, parenting, childing, the home</td>
<td>intra-household bargaining</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(possibly spatially dispersed and fictive kin)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life phase</td>
<td>Chronological age, social age</td>
<td>Relations</td>
<td>Social institutions and norms, consumption and market forces, gender, age-based identities, place, life course, transitions, performativity</td>
<td>Youth transitions, schooling, children’s work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>between social institutions and individual biographies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mannheimian understanding of generation</td>
<td>Social age, chronological age</td>
<td>Relations</td>
<td>Historical events, media and communication technologies, collective identity, sub-cultures, movements, resistance</td>
<td>Youth sub-cultures, apartheid generation in South Africa, Đổi Mới generation (economic reform in Vietnam)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>between the coming of age of a cohort, and the possible formation of generationally distinct political subjectivities, with events in historical time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
studies specific substance to Thelen et al.’s (2014) relational framework. More specifically, it provides a conceptual basis for different ways of understanding the idea of generational modalities, a starting point for how ‘boundary’ work might look like in relation to different concepts of age, and together this sheds light on how to understand the embeddedness of actors in generational and age-related terms.

**Approaching Development**

Development is a highly contested concept and the study of development has branched out into various intellectual directions (Thomas 2000). Within this scholarly landscape, the approach to development informing this book can best be described as people-centred and empirically rooted in the everyday. This means that local lives, structures, and processes are taken as the starting point for explaining why things work the way they do (Rigg 2007: 7–8).

A focus on the everyday is explicitly relation; the messy, fluid, and networked characteristics of the everyday amount to unmaking the seemingly fixed and clear-cut categories that inform so much scholarly work on children and youth (Balagopalan 2014: 183) and development too (Mosse 2005). This does not mean that I consider the local scale and the everyday in isolation from larger structures, relations, and histories—quite the contrary. Drawing on the ethnography of development and globalisation, I treat the local and the global as constantly interacting, co-constituting (Appadurai 1996: 32; Katz 2004; Maira and Soep 2005; Mosse 2005), and historically particular (Morrison 2015; Huijsmans 2016; Woronov 2016). In this view the everyday, even in out-of-the-way places, is drawing on Charles Piot (1999), ‘remotely global’.

In line with contemporary approaches to development studies (McMichael 2004) and practice (United Nations 2016), this volume adopts a global approach. Next to the more conventional case studies, this volume, thus, includes three chapters based on research conducted in the Global North and a chapter that concentrates on the global development framework of the Sustainable Development Goals. The chapter by Sara Vida Coumans concentrates on the Dutch debate about regulating sex work. Since ‘sexual and reproductive health and rights’ is one of the four central themes of Dutch development cooperation it is worthwhile unravelling the specific ideas underpinning the Dutch debate as these are likely to have an effect on Dutch development cooperation on this theme.
The chapter by Elyse Mills addresses the challenges faced by Canadians aspiring to become ‘young farmers’. The generational problem of farming is receiving much attention in research in the global South (e.g. White 2012). Mills’ work shows that the dynamics that exclude many young people from farming futures in the Global South, especially the increase in large-scale, capital intensive agriculture, are not very different in the Canadian context. International migration is one of the factors that have reconfigured the geographies of development. This is vividly illustrated by Mahardhika Sjamsoeoed Sadjad, who, as a young, female, Muslim, Indonesian researcher reflects on her research encounters with young Dutch Muslims from migrant backgrounds as part of her MA in Development Studies. She not only makes a strong case for attending to positionality in the relational exercise of doing research, her work also contributes to redrawing the geographical boundaries of development studies.

**Structure of the Book**

Next follow 12 full chapters and a commentary by Nicola Ansell. Part I of the book (‘theorising age and generation in young lives’) starts off with a chapter by Jason Hart that argues the importance of attending to ‘age-position’ in studying and working with young refugees. He draws on four different interpretations of the notion of generation and develops and illustrates these with reference to his work with young Palestinian refugees in Jordan. Hart argues that attending to age-position is important for appreciating the historicity of young refugee lives as well as to comprehend the forces that shape and reshape the particular needs and aspirations of young male refugees. Sara Vida Coumans’ contribution takes us to the Netherlands. Drawing on recent policy debates about the increase of minimum age of prostitution, she explores two very different dimensions of age that shape sex work and vividly illustrates the idea of ‘boundary work’ in relation to age (Thelen et al. 2014). Chronological age dominates in policy discussions, yet it is the corporeal dimension of age that matters in sex work as practice. Coumans’ chapter also shows that age, in its various, conceptualisations never works in isolation but always intersects with other relations of social differentiation such as gender. Elyse Mills furthers the theme of intersectionality in her chapter on becoming a young farmer in Nova Scotia, Canada, by analysing the interaction between age and social class. This leads her to propose the idea of ‘age-class’, which shows that
Canadian policies meant to support young people in becoming a young farmer are of little use for large groups of (aspiring) young farmers. She also emphasises the importance of the collective agency of young farmers’ organisations especially for (aspiring) young farmers from middle-class and lower-class backgrounds both in terms of a support structure as well as a lobbying organisation for rethinking agrarian futures. Part I closes with Christina Clark-Kazak’s chapter. She employs the concept of social age and the idea of ‘age-mainstreaming’ as lenses to critically assess the way age has been incorporated in the Sustainable Development Goals.

Part II of the book coheres around ‘everyday relationalities: school, work and belonging’. On the basis of ethnographic research in two secondary schools in the Northern Vietnamese city of Haiphong, Paul Horton unravels the generational dimension of school bullying. Countering perspectives that understand school bullying at the level of individual children, Horton proposes that school bullying is deeply connected to the ways power works in the generational organisation of the school and that some students learn to utilise bullying in such a context as a means to influence the behaviour of others. In both Degwale Belay’s and Wedadu Sayibu’s contribution, the street is treated as an important everyday space and a key site of children’s work. The street is an important meeting place for different ‘relational modalities’ (Thelen et al. 2014) as various registers of meaning interact (Gigengack 2014). This renders street-based work deeply relational. The two chapters also show that children’s street-based work is intricately connected to the wider, gendered and generationally organised street-based urban economy. The chapters refute quick generalisations about children’s street-based work. Shoe-shining, lottery vending, and accompanying blind adult beggars constitute very different relational modalities, subject to different moral registers, set within different economic relations and presenting their own set of vulnerabilities and opportunities. Mahardhika Sjamsoed Sadjad’s chapter closes part II with a discussion of the relationality of the idea of home and belonging drawing on research with Dutch Muslim youth with migrant backgrounds. Her auto-ethnographic contribution brings out in vivid detail the important, yet too little acknowledged, relational dimension of doing research. Sadjad’s reflection on her positionality also extends Hart’s (this volume) discussion of the idea of ‘having been’ (in addition ‘being’ and ‘becoming’) in research with children and young people.

Part III of the book is themed ‘negotiating development’. It shows how development interventions reshape generational landscapes and how
young people from their particular position in society negotiate the various contradictions of development and work hard to ‘have a life’ as one of the young people in Lidewyde Berckmoes and Ben White’s chapter put it. Karuna Morarji’s chapter is also written in an ethnographic fashion, but unlike Sadjad’s Dutch setting Morarji’s chapter is set in a remote mountainous area of northern India. She illustrates how young men and women negotiate the contradictions of schooling as a modernising project that is part and parcel of the broader cultural politics of development yet distinctly differentiated by class, gender, and generation. María Gabriela Palacio focuses in her chapter on another widespread development intervention that targets the young: conditional cash transfers (CCTs). Despite the wealth of literature on CCTs and the centrality of children in the theory of change underpinning these schemes, relatively little has been written about how these affect the lived experience of being young and growing up (a notable exception includes: Streuli 2012). Drawing on research in Loja, Ecuador Palacio’s chapter investigates how children’s recipient status affects their relational position within the family, between children and vis-à-vis the state. Sharada Srinivasan’s chapter explicitly addresses the theme of gender, another long-standing concern in development studies and practice. Srinivasan asks what it means for girls to grow up in contexts characterised by poverty and daughter aversion. This brings to the surface the particular ways in which gender discrimination manifests and is negotiated by these girls over the first two decades of their lives. Part III closes with a contribution from Lidewyde Berckmoes and Ben White based on research in rural eastern Burundi. The chapter illuminates young people’s highly gendered and ‘fleeting responses’ to the challenges of building a livelihood and successful generational transitions in the aftermath of conflict and under conditions of extreme poverty. In contrast to various other studies, Berckmoes and White argue that young people’s apparent turn-away from farming has less to do with an aversion to farming futures but is rather attributable to structural limitations over which young people have little influence.

The volume closes with a commentary by Nicola Ansell. She points out that age and generation are produced and deployed in the exercise of power in societies, and thus fundamental concepts for understanding contexts in which development interventions play out.

Children and young people are central to questions of development. This argument is mostly made in reference to demographic data showing that especially in poorer parts of the world typically a large share of
the population falls in the childhood and youth category (Ansell 2005: 3; World Bank 2006: 4). The relational perspective running through the chapters of this book demands adjusting this oft-repeated argument. Although sheer numbers matter, ‘generationing’ development is ultimately an analytical exercise. Research with and on children and youth constitutes a unique window on processes of social change and continuity for the ways in which the temporal dimension of development interacts with the embodied and gendered experience of being young and growing up (Cole and Durham 2008; MacDonald 2011; Woronov 2016). Similarly, processes of development are key for childhood and youth studies precisely because development plays out in generational landscapes. Thereby, development transforms the opportunities structures shaping young lives, reshuffles the parameters within which young people negotiate their generational position and within which they give new meaning to the very idea of childhood and youth. The chapters in this volume thus stimulate further thinking on how ideas of age and generation help coming to grips with development as a generational process—especially, though not exclusively, in how it pertains to children and young people.

NOTES

1. Note though that there is much ambiguity about the use of the term ‘children’ or ‘youth’, especially in relation to 15–18 years old where according to international age-based definitions both labels apply. Yet, the choice of term matters. A study framed in terms of gang youth suggests a very different research problem than a study on street children even though the subjects may well be the same young people.

2. Note here too a recently launched Collaborative Research Network on ‘life course’ between the Association for Anthropology and Gerontology, the Anthropology of Aging and the Life Course Interest Group (AALCIG) and the Anthropology of Children and Youth Interest Group, see: https://lists.capalon.com/lists/list-info/acyig_lifecourse

3. Note that Facebook requires one to enter a date of birth when setting up an account and uses 13 as the minimum age for opening an account.

4. In the Korean age system (co-existing in Korea with a chronological system based on calendar years from birth), a newborn baby is
considered one year of age at birth and turns two on the first day of
the New Year (Gregorian calendar).

5. Age is an important marker of seniority, but at times this may be
overruled by other markers of rank such as religious status, kin ship
relations, class or nationality.

6. Virginia Morrow (2013: 152) refers in this respect to the idea of
‘functional age’.

7. The idea of generation as life phase has several points of overlap
with the notion of social age discussed above. Yet, what sets the two
apart is that the idea of life phase implies the larger framework of the life
course. Social age, on the other hand, does not necessarily mobilise
such a larger generational order as it foregrounds subjectivities and
performativity.

8. Note here also the branding of cohorts into generational identities
for commercial purposes, as is illustrated by the frequent use of
terms like ‘generation X’, ‘generation Y’, etc., in the marketing
literature.

9. The term ‘generationing’ has been defined by Mayall (2002: 27) as
‘the relational process whereby people come to be known as chil-
dren, and whereby children and childhood acquire certain charac-
teristics’. Clearly, the idea of ‘generationing’ is by no means limited
to children and youth.
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