UC Santa Cruz
UC Santa Cruz Previously Published Works

Title
“Adults talk too much”: Intergenerational dialogue and power in the Peruvian movement of working children

Permalink
https://escholarship.org/uc/item/7838q51t

Journal
Childhood, 22(4)

ISSN
0907-5682

Author
Taft, Jessica K

Publication Date
2015-11-01

DOI
10.1177/0907568214555148

Copyright Information
This work is made available under the terms of a Creative Commons Attribution License, availalbe at https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

Peer reviewed

eScholarship.org Powered by the California Digital Library
University of California

Taft, Jessica K. "“Adults talk too much”: Intergenerational dialogue and power in the Peruvian movement of working children." *Childhood* 22, no. 4 (2015): 460-473.
FINAL AUTHOR VERSION

Recent calls to advance the scholarship on children’s participation by “taking a dialogic approach” (Graham and Fitzgerald, 2010), “going relational” (Mannion, 2007), and “bringing adults back in” (Wyness, 2013) all suggest the need for deeper, more textured analyses of the ways that adults and children co-construct spaces for kids’ participation in democratic social life. However, in the context of children and adults’ unequal social and political power, pursuing the ideals of collaboration, dialogue, and partnership is a highly complex and difficult endeavor. In this article, I analyze a social movement with over 35 years of experience theorizing and practicing intergenerational collaboration in order to illuminate some of the specific tensions and challenges embedded in this approach to children’s participation. Drawing on ethnographic fieldwork with the Peruvian movement of working children, I’ll show how a discourse of intergenerational partnership and dialogue can be interpreted in multiple ways, some of which may potentially conflict with and undermine the movement’s commitment to centering children’s voices and children’s leadership. Spaces for children’s participation are embedded within a larger social context of age-based inequality in which the intergenerational habitus is one in which adults speak and children listen. Therefore, a discursive emphasis on kids’ voices is not enough to actually create an egalitarian dialogic relationship between children and adults and the framework of intergenerational dialogue can instead provide a narrative justification for an implicit and often unacknowledged continuation of adult dominance.

Theorizing children’s participatory voices:

Children's rights have become a significant field of study and debate in the twenty-five years since the adoption of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (Earls, 2011; Ruck and Horn, 2008). Within this broader field, article 12 has been of particular interest to political scientists and sociologists (Reynaert et al., 2009; Tisdall et al., 2006). This article of the UNCRC declares that "states parties shall assure to the child who is capable of forming his or her own views the right to express those views freely in all matters affecting the child, the views of the child being given due weight in accordance with the age and maturity of the child." Taking guidance from this article, policy-makers and children's rights advocates have substantially increased the opportunities for children's participation in a variety of organizations, institutions, and governments. Indeed, participation rights have become "the new norm in child rights practice and policy" (Reynaert et al., 2009: 529). However, scholars have raised many important questions about the efficacy of current participatory approaches, noting a substantial gap between policy and practice (Veerman and Levine, 2000). Drawing on case studies of participation in numerous contexts including schools (Lodge, 2005; Smith, 2007), child welfare agencies and family law practice (Cashmore, 2011; Neale, 2002), and local governments (Guerra, 2002; Merkle, 2003; Wyness, 2009), researchers have concluded that participatory programs for children are often "tokenistic, unrepresentative in membership, adult-led in process, and ineffective in acting upon what children want" (Davis and Hill, 2006: 9). In addition to the practical challenges of implementation, children's participation remains conceptually ambiguous and difficult to define (Lücker-Babel, 1995; Stoecklin, 2013; Wyness et al., 2004).

There are numerous policy and research documents that offer frameworks for evaluating the depth of children's participation (Hart, 1992; Shier, 2001) and others that suggest guidelines for incorporating children's voices into organizational and public policy and practice (Hill, 2006;

Inter-Agency Working Group on Children's Participation, 2007; Jones, 2010). Perpetua Kirby and Sara Bryson (2002: 6), in their review of the evaluation research on young people's participation in public decision making, suggest that "to develop participatory work, organizations benefit from having committed senior and front line staff, fewer institutional demands, formal systems for feeding in young people's views, good multi-agency and team working, dedicated participation workers, adequate staffing and resources, and high quality staff." They also find "facilitating young people's participation in decision making is a challenging and demanding undertaking for adults, yet few receive specific training."

The idea of "voice" is central to many conceptualizations of children's participation (Campbell, 2008; Hill, 2006; Lodge, 2005), but has also been subject to critique for its epistemological mystification of children's "authentic" voices (James, 2007), for insufficiently addressing how children's voices actually impact programs and policies (Graham and Fitzgerald, 2010) and for not taking into account the relational and contextual conditions of children's self-expressions (Mannion, 2007). Malcolm Hill (2006: 71) notes that an interest in young people's voices should be accompanied by a commitment to responding to those voices: "young people are primarily outcome oriented. When asked their views, they expect a response." Addressing the limitations of a narrow focus on voice, Graham and Fitzgerald (2010) call for greater attention to the relationships between children and adults, emphasizing the potential of a dialogic approach to children's participation. Participation, in their view, involves not only being able to speak, but also having one's identity, status, and opinion recognized as worthy of respect and serious consideration. This dialogic approach to children's participation intersects with Mannion's (2007) argument that children's participation needs to be analyzed as a set of adult-child relations and Michael Wyness's recent call for scholars to bring adults back into the

discussion and to take a "more relational approach to children's participation, recognizing the respective roles and positions of children and adults" (2013: 435). In contrast to earlier models that focused on "giving children more autonomy from adults within which they can participate," Wyness encourages practitioners to consider "creating an environment within which children feel more comfortable participating alongside adults" (2013: 434). Collectively, these three largely theoretical pieces call on scholars to not only think about how children and adults co-create participatory spaces and interactions, but also to engage with the dynamics of power at play within such interactions. Graham and Fitzgerald (2010: 350) ask that we "focus on the workings of power and the ways in which this facilitates, limits, and/or mediates the meanings produced through dialogue between children and those who govern their lives and actions." Without such an accounting of power, the return of scholarly attention to adults could easily replicate previous approaches that marginalized children and their perspectives or lead into a falsely optimistic understanding of the ease of intergenerational partnerships.

There is not yet a substantial body of critical research on the relationships between adults and children within participatory spaces. Instead, as outlined above, the literature is largely split between theoretical explorations of the relational dimensions of participation and highly practical assessments and evaluations of various participatory projects. Two notable exceptions that try to bridge the empirical and theoretical by way of a critical analysis of adult-child relationships include Hava Gordon's (2007) work on the role of adult allies within youth activist organizations and Natasha Blanchet-Cohen and Brian Rabinow's (2006) intergenerational collaboration on the meaning of partnership for kids and adults in the context of an international conference. Building on these works and responding to the theoretical concerns above, this article aims to contribute to the development of a richer, more textured understanding of the complex dynamics

of power, privilege, and voice by exploring how such dynamics operate on the ground within a social movement that is deeply committed to both children's leadership and to intergenerational dialogue.

Collaboration in the Peruvian movement of working children:

Founded in 1976, the Peruvian movement of working children has many decades of experience theorizing about and building organizational practices that support children's political engagement. The movement takes a liberationist approach to children's rights (Hanson, 2012), viewing children as social actors, protagonists, and fully capable members of communities rather than objects of protection (Liebel, 2003). The movement has a deep commitment to centering children's voices in addressing the conditions of child labor (Liebel et al., 2001; van den Berge, 2007) and valorizes children's participation in work, but only in conditions of dignity and respect (Liebel, 2004). Working children, between the ages of 8 and 17, are the heart of the movement and are described as being the primary decision-makers. They are supported in their organizing by volunteer adult "colaboradores." In addition to the goal of improving working children's lives, the movement also aims to create more horizontal relationships between children and adults. In order to facilitate such relationships, the movement organizes extensive trainings and has produced numerous texts on children's "protagonismo" and on the role and function of adults in a kid-led movement (Cussianovich, 2006, 2010; Quiroz, 2008).

The paradigm of childhood and the model of collaboration used in the Peruvian movement of working children are both quite unusual and are not necessarily representative of widespread trends within institutions for children's participation. However, it is this distinctiveness that makes the movement a theoretically compelling case for analysis. Given that

this movement has over 35 years of experience practicing both "children's participation" and intergenerational dialogue, operates outside of the institutional constraints experienced by many formal state-based participatory mechanisms, and articulates a deep commitment to challenging adultist social relations, it is a vital site for exploring how habituated intergenerational relationships and age-based power dynamics can be simultaneously challenged and replicated within spaces for children's participation.

In the 37 years since it was founded, the movement of working children has continued to grow and develop, creating a complex landscape of organizations and institutions. MANTHOC (the Movimiento de Adolescentes y Niños Trabajadores Hijos de Obreros Cristianos or Movement of Working Kids and Adolescents, Children of Christian Workers) is the oldest organization and remains at the heart of the Peruvian movement. Nearly 2000 kids from 12 regions participate in weekly or monthly base group meetings. Each base elects delegates who participate in regional meetings, and each regional coordinating group elects delegates to the national coordinating committee. In addition to regular meetings of the members of the regional and national committees, there are annual regional and national assemblies for all of the kids. At each of these levels of organization, one or two adults serve as supporting colaboradores. In these groups, participating kids develop their skills of organization and their knowledge about children's rights and child labor politics. They launch educational and awareness-building campaigns, engage in advocacy work at the local, national, and international levels, plan and implement cultural events and group activities, raise funds for their projects, and participate in wider networks of children's organizations. They also receive and give support on schoolwork, family issues, and problems in their workplaces.

In 1996, MANTHOC members, along with several smaller working children's organizations, launched MNNATSOP as a more inclusive and expansive national movement for working children's rights (Swift, 2000). MNNATSOP, the Movimiento Nacional de Niños, Niñas y Adolescentes Trabajadores Organizados del Peru (the Peruvian National Movement of Organized Working Children and Adolescents) incorporates closer to 10,000 working children from around the country and has its own organizational structures. MNNATSOP is also one of the organizational members of MOLACNATs, the Latin American and Caribbean movement of working children, which currently includes working children's organizations from Argentina, Bolivia, Colombia, Ecuador, Mexico, Paraguay, and Venezuela. Members of MANTHOC, MNNATSOP, and other smaller working children's organizations in Lima also serve as delegates and active leaders in the RedNNA (Network of Children and Adolescents), a network that includes working and non-working children's organizations to address issues of children's rights more broadly.

A few adult-led institutions support these kid-led organizations. INFANT (Instituto de Formación de Adolescentes y Niños Trabajadores) provides training for the kids involved in the movement of working children. They publish materials, facilitate research, and lead many workshops for kids. IFEJANT (Instituto de Formación para Educadores de Jovenes Adolescentes y Niños Trabajadores) does many of the same activities as INFANT, but with a focus on the education and training of adult colaboradores. IFEJANT also offers academic courses on childhood studies, children's rights and critical pedagogy. Finally, the adult colaboradores who support the movement of working children also have their own movement organization: MOVICOLNATs. In this space, colaboradores provide each other with feedback and consider how they, as adults, can further the goals of the working children's organizations.

In addition to extensive ethnographic observation at workshops, meetings, assemblies, gatherings, panel discussions, strategy sessions, meals, celebrations, and field trips with all of the above organizations, conducted in Lima in 2012 and 2013, my argument draws upon semi-structured in-depth interviews with nine adults and thirteen children, as well as the analysis of websites, publications, flyers, pamphlets, training manuals, and other relevant movement materials. The adults and children who were interviewed were all active participants in the movement and were purposively sampled for range (of age, years of experience, base group, leadership role, and gender). All individual names have been changed, with the exception of Alejandro Cussianovich, who agreed to use his real name because of his distinctive role as the author of numerous books articulating the movement's positions and theories. The gathered data was imported into Atlas.ti, a qualitative data analysis program. Taking a Foucauldian, discourse-oriented, approach to coding that also draws heavily on inductive grounded theory, my analytic strategy placed significant attention on the relationship between multiple or conflicting discourses and social practice. The coding process included "in vivo coding," which uses participants' terms as code names in order to identify narrative patterns, as well as extensive open and focused coding of practices and interactions at movement meetings and events. In this article I use this analytic strategy to probe the connections and disjunctions between discourses and practices on voice and dialogue. In doing so, I seek to trace the micro-relations of power embedded in these relationships, exploring how adult/child power is navigated and constructed. This approach does not aim to catalogue voice and power in terms of their quantity (who has more or less voice, who has more or less power), but instead looks at how the dynamics of "encouraging children's voices" and "promoting intergenerational dialogue" articulate with, challenge, and/or (re)produce a set of patterned relationships of power between children and

adults. Although much could be said about age hierarchies and power amongst children, and about other lines of difference and inequality, including gender, class, and education, due to space limitations this article only addresses the adult/child divide.

Voice and dialogue in movement discourse and practice

Organizations and individuals involved in the movement of working children regularly proclaim that the movement is "kid-led" and that kids' voices and opinions direct the movement's actions. Kids talk about how they are encouraged to speak up, how they learn to express themselves, and how they feel more confidence. Adults talk about how important it is for kids to give their opinions, emphasize that the movement belongs to the kids, and encourage quiet kids to share their thoughts in meetings and workshops. In the words of Elena, an adult colaborador, "when addressing the issues of childhood, it is childhood that should speak." Anabella, a twelve-year-old girl, said the movement encourages kids to "feel capable… participate, give your opinion, express yourself without fear, without anyone telling you anything, to know you can have confidence in yourself." There is a widely held, and regularly reiterated, belief that kids have important things to say and that their voices are the voices that most matter, especially on the subject of their own lives.

Within this general agreement on the importance of kids' voices, however, movement participants express divergent perspectives about how adults' voices should be integrated into the movement. More specifically, there is an ongoing and unresolved tension between the idea that the movement belongs entirely to the kids, where their voices are primary, and the idea that the movement is a space of intergenerational dialogue, where the voices of kids and adults are each valued for their different contributions. In the former framework, kids' voices have clear priority

over adults, while the latter allows for a wide range of interpretations regarding the place of adult opinions in a children's movement, some of which continue to give kids a dominant role while others may enable the re-centering of adult opinions. This discursive ambiguity regarding the role of adults is then amplified in the actual practices of both kids and adults. In the discussion that follows, I first trace out the discursive context and then turn to the practices of kids and colaboradores in order to examine how these practices produce and reproduce particular kinds of relations between children and adults.

Listening or guiding: discourses on the role of adults in a children's movement

One discursive thread weaving throughout the movement is that it entirely belongs to the kids and that adults are there to listen and to provide support. This can be seen in Juan's statement that the "primary role of the colaborador is to always listen to them and to transform what we hear into something that will support them, always in a horizontal way." He suggests that colaboradores synthesize kids' voices and help provide a framework for seeing the patterns in kids' opinions, but don't necessarily give their own perspectives as readily. Kids also say that they believe their own voices are especially important in the movement. Graciela, a sixteen-year-old national leader, said "the good thing about the organization is that we are always questioning, always clarifying that the importance of the organization is what is happening amongst the kids, and that the kids are the decision-makers in the daily life of the organization." And Jhasmila told me that "it is our movement, we are the ones in charge." These statements all emphasize kids' leadership, kids' power, and the greater force of kids' voices within the movement, suggesting an intentional prioritization of kids' voices *over* adult voices.

Adult voices are also highly valued, but how that value relates to the prioritization of

kids' voices remains contested. Both kids and adults talk about the movement as a place where both groups "respect the voices of each other." Immediately following Graciela's words above, she went on to say, "but the colaboradores have an important role in the organization as well because while we are the ones who suggest things, and we are the ones who decide, the colaboradores, a lot of the time, with the decisions we make, they help us make them better, more clear, more coherent, more concise." In Graciela's opinion, adult voices are primarily a complement, or an additional resource, to improve the already-formulated position of the kids. Adults add, but their views are not central to the making of decisions. This function of adult voice is slightly distinct from Juan's position on adults as synthesizers, but it too places adult voice in a clearly secondary role.

Others in the movement give adult voices much greater responsibility. Alejandro Cussianovich, a founding colaborador and movement theorist, spoke about how he believes intergenerational dialogue should work:

> What is important is an attitude of continuous dialogue, but beginning from what we have understood, from what the kids have suggested to us…. Dialogue doesn't begin because I tell them what I think but because I listen to what they think about something, and then, from there, I have the responsibility to disagree, to confront, to say that I agree, or whatever. Dialogue doesn't necessarily mean deciding from the very beginning that the kids are correct. But neither does it mean deciding that I am correct.

From Alejandro's perspective, adults have to give their opinions, not merely synthesize what they hear from kids, but they should not necessarily believe that their opinions are right. This version of intergenerational dialogue was not, however, the one that most others articulated. Far more typical was the formulation of Marco, a thirteen-year-old national leader: he used a

common phrase in the movement to explain the distinction between kids and adults' opinions: "Adults only, as we say, have voice but they don't have a vote. On the other hand, we have voice and we have a vote. They are there to orient us to what options we can choose and which we can't. We are the ones who decide." Here, Marco suggests not that adults work with kids' own organic ideas, but that they present options and ideas for kids to choose between. This is clearly a more powerful role for adult voices – adults suggest, provide frameworks for thinking, respond affirmatively or negatively to kids' decisions, but, in the end, the decision still belongs to the kids themselves. In order to reconcile this clearly powerful role for adult voice in a movement that loudly states it is kid-led, movement participants emphasize the formal decision-making power of the kids and the absence of that formal power in the hands of adults. However, this significantly underplays the substantial informal power embedded in the actions of suggesting, orienting, and guiding. By relying on the discursive distinction between voice and vote, movement participants are able to minimize, or to avoid fully confronting, the substantial influence of adult voices in a children's movement.

In addition to not talking directly about the implicit power in adult "orientation" and "guidance," movement participants are also relatively quiet about the subtle power differentials that emerge based on differences between how adults' and kids' voices are heard. While kids' voices have a great deal of power on the basis of claims to authenticity and direct experience (James, 2007), many kids also note that they listen carefully to the opinions of the adult colaboradores because they "know more." As Andres, a twelve-year-old boy said, "their opinion is important to us -- they support us and they have more experience, they are older already." Movement propaganda and materials are careful not to position adults as "experts," but kids often continue to view adults as more knowledgeable, giving their words more authority. From

this range of examples, we can see that kids and adults talk about the movement as a space of intergenerational dialogue and collaboration, but that the role of adults within this intergenerational dialogue is understood in many different ways.

Despite this discursive ambiguity regarding the place of adult voice, kids very clearly feel like the movement empowers them to speak and helps them to become more confident in their voices. Norma, a colaborador who works with a base group in the housing cooperative where she lives, described what she hears from the kids and young adults who participated in the movement when they were children: "thanks to MANTHOC, I can go speak in public. I am not embarrassed. I can go out and I can speak… and people admire how well we speak and explain ourselves…. I am happy because I learned. I am not afraid to speak anymore. I can speak to adults, I can say what I think." Becoming more empowered public speakers is also one of the outcomes that kids emphasize when talking about the benefits of their participation in the movement. These discursive commitments to children's voices and kids' increased confidence, however, do not necessarily mean that kids regularly speak up when they have ideas to share. Creating an intergenerational dialogue in which kids' voices have substantial power and authority requires the implementation of practices that can break both groups out of their everyday intergenerational habitus in which adults are the experts from whom children learn. The following section explores movement practices that achieve this goal and movement practices that unintentionally thwart it.

Working against instincts: practices for intergenerational dialogue

One nearly universal practice of colaboradores is encouraging kids to speak by asking questions during meetings and assemblies. Adults regularly ask for the overall opinions of the

group on a given subject and also directly request ideas from quiet individuals, trying to draw them out. They'll ask informational questions about what kids remember from previous meetings or about upcoming events ("what did your base group do this past Saturday?" and "where is tomorrow's workshop"?), theoretical questions that encourage the kids to articulate their own interpretations of movement ideas ("what makes a job exploitative?"), analytic questions about the subject of discussion ("what differences do you see in these two different laws about child labor?"), and personal questions about their own lives and experiences ("what things do you like about your work?"). Learning to ask good questions is one part of the process of becoming a more effective adult colaborador.

In addition to encouraging kids' voices via questions, adult colaboradores also sometimes talk about why they want to hear kids' opinions and directly address their desire for the kids to increase their participation. For example, in one meeting in which many of the kids were fairly quiet, Laura said, "I feel like some of you are not really participating. I'd like to see you ask more, push back against what I say, or against what Marco says. We have to discuss." In these interactions colaboradores do more than ask questions – they remind kids that their voices matter to the movement and they explicitly encourage them to speak up more, showing how they value vocal, talkative children.

Some colaboradores are quite intentional in their use of activities that will help all kids express their ideas. For example, after one of Laura's statements encouraging kids to speak up did not yield much response, another colaborador in that meeting suggested that each kid write down a few ideas on a piece of paper, then they would go around in a circle and share. The time to process and think and the very clear expectation of everyone's contribution led to a useful brainstorm and discussion. These kinds of mechanisms are used somewhat infrequently:

colaboradores only turn to them when they feel the kids are not participating fully or when they are concerned that adult voices are overwhelming a conversation. However, they are often quite successful at amplifying kids' voices, including the voices of kids who are quieter in general discussion.

Another strategy for amplifying kids' voices involves separating kids and adults in some meetings and events. This particular practice, however, is fairly contentious within the movement and not universally appreciated. In 2012 I attended one of the last meetings of a group of national delegates for MNNATSOP -- delegates who were very near the end of their two-year term. Then, in 2013, I attended one of the first meetings of the newly elected delegates. At the 2012 meeting, most of the work was done with the adult colaboradores and kid delegates working separately. Yolanda, one of the teenage coordinators of the first meeting, was a strong advocate for giving kids their own space. She told me multiple times that adults sometimes intervene too much and that they forget their role and interrupt kids' decision-making and discussion processes. The solution she and her peers proposed was to have separate working groups, then to bring the adults into the conversation once the kids had already developed some of their own positions. At the second meeting, with the new delegation and new leadership, this previous model was not being used and was explicitly critiqued. In a small group meeting of kids and adults, one colaborador, Selena said that "last year it seemed like when the colaboradores were present, the kids didn't really talk, so they wanted the colaboradores to be separate, in their own space. This year, it seems like you, the kids, are talking more, and we are all welcome to participate." Selena then went on to say that she understands wanting separate space because, "it is still an adult-centric country, and society doesn't give you your space." These comments clearly indicate the persistent tension in the movement about the role of adults.

There is a strong desire to give kids space, to let them lead, and an acknowledgement that sometimes adults (even colaboradores) can make that more difficult, but also an equally strong desire for adult involvement in all parts of the process. My own observations of these two meetings, however, make very clear that when they split up, kids do indeed speak out more, both in the kids-only spaces and when they are back with the adults. In the latter meeting, kids would speak frequently in their mixed-age small groups, but large group discussions were dominated by the adults. While splitting up kids and adults disrupts the movement's claims that kids and adults in the movement have mastered kid-led intergenerational dialogue, and points to the difficulties in achieving this ideal, it also significantly increases the expression of kids' voices.

I also observed many practices, of both adults and kids, which centered and emphasized adult contributions and expertise, despite the stated desire for kids' leadership. The first and most common of these, adults presenting information, emerges out of the idea that adults are there to "guide" and "orient" the kids. Adults often have information to offer to the kids in the movement and will share this information at the start of the relevant discussion in meetings and assemblies. On the one hand, this is a dynamic that is entirely understandable and nearly inevitable given that colaboradores often have both longer histories in the movement that give them particular insights and institutional positions that make them the recipients of pertinent information from other organizations. Further, as Manfred Liebel notes, "adult collaborators normally play an important role for the continuity of children's organizations because they remain adults, while children eventually stop being children" (2007: 71). These factors give adults important information that kids may not possess. However, some adults will regularly expand on the presentation of *information* by then presenting kids with their *analysis* of the situation, their arguments about what should be done, and/or giving the kids a set of options for

action. In these cases, adults are positioned by both themselves and by many kids as not just sources of information, but also as the primary sources of *knowledge* within the group. It is this practice that leads kids who are newer to the movement to say, "colaboradores orient us, respect our opinions, tell us what is good, and tell us what is bad." Or, "they let us know what we are talking about, why we are talking about it, and what are the important things to focus on. They tell us what we should do." The practice of adults "orienting" kids to a subject may lead kids to see adults' voices and adult knowledge as more important and more relevant than their own ideas. When adults take up the practice of "giving knowledge" to kids, they are also returning the group back to its normal intergenerational habitus, replicating wider patterns of intergenerational interaction.

In addition to providing initial "orientations," some adults, in the estimations of both adults and kids, "talk too much." As Joaquin, a fifteen-year-old national leader put it, "a lot of the time – how can I put this – the adults talk, blah blah blah blah, and they don't stop, and sometimes the kids get bored, or don't feel comfortable, and they know that this is our space." He went on to say, "some colaboradores… go on for a long time without taking into account the fact that there are kids who also want to participate and that they are the ones who really should be participating." I also observed colaboradores who wanted to give their opinions on every discussion point, with some meetings feeling more like a debate between colaboradores than a conversation amongst the kid delegates. For example, in the meeting where Selena praised the group for the fact that adults and kids were sharing space and working together, the large group was discussing a major change to the organizational structure, during which I wrote the following fieldnotes: "A colaborador suggests that they not make a decision right now, but simply discuss the various structural options and proposals. 1 more colaborador adds his

thoughts and another asks a clarifying question about one proposal. A teen answers the question. 4 colaboradores then give their opinions on the proposal and the issues it raises for them." Adults clearly dominated this large-group conversation.

Such conversational domination by adults was not uncommon and can be seen as the result of the intersection of a few distinct factors. Adults, living in a society that generally values them and their ideas, feel far greater confidence in their voices than kids do, and, like other social groups with various kinds of privilege, are relatively quick to speak up when given an opportunity. Adults also care deeply about the movement and want it to succeed, and this commitment encourages them to participate in order to strengthen the movement. Many of these adults were also former child participants, and the transition from powerful, speaking youth leader to listening, synthesizing adult collaborator takes time and practice. Further, because the movement also uses the framework of intergenerational dialogue, adults feel quite empowered to express themselves in these spaces, knowing that their voices are considered an important part of the conversation. Not speaking, then, requires substantial "control over one's instincts," as Elena put it. The dynamic of adults talking too much is also relational - the result of both adult and kid behaviors. Kids, despite the movement's explicit celebration of their voices, are far less confident about their contributions. As Lili stated, "we are afraid that what we say won't be something important, or that someone else will say it is wrong." Therefore, kids often cede the floor to adults, even when asked to give their opinions or encouraged to participate more. Rather than sitting with silence, adults tend to step in, so kids have found that it is often much easier and more comfortable to simply be quiet and wait for the adults to talk. While adult conversational domination is not malicious or even intentional, and adults do indeed have important things to offer to conversation, the phenomenon of "adults talking too much" can get in the way of the

development of kids' voices and kids' confidence in their voices. Indeed, when adults "talk too much," kids never have to figure out what they think about a subject and what they want to say. They can return to the far more socially comfortable habitus of listening and following adult guidance.

Many adults within the movement of working children are highly conscious of the potential problems of adult power and dominance within intergenerational spaces. They also acknowledge the persistent tension in the role of the colaborador: are they supportive listeners, equal participants, or educators? The trainings and meetings organized by IFEJANT and MOVICOLNATs encourage them to reflect on their position and to engage with this question. In these trainings, colaboradores develop a dual discourse of centering kids' voices AND engaging in intergenerational dialogue. However, they do not necessarily learn a methodology or set of practices that will produce and sustain kid-led (rather than adult-driven) intergenerational dialogue. And, as this analysis indicates, a deep organizational commitment to kids' leadership and authority is not necessarily sufficient to interrupt far more common patterns of intergenerational interaction and deeply habituated power relations that can emerge within the framework of dialogue. Without concrete techniques, many adults and kids revert back to the standard intergenerational habitus in which adults speak and children listen, justified in part by the movement's somewhat ambiguous discourse on dialogue.

Conclusion

The Peruvian movement of working children is deeply committed to the dual ideals of prioritizing children's voices and creating collaborative intergenerational relationships. On the one hand, they suggest that kids are in charge, that the movement belongs to the kids, and that

kids' voices "matter more." On the other hand, they emphasize intergenerational dialogue, with its multiple interpretations of the role of adults within a children's movement. While ambiguities can be generative as we attempt to build a critical theory and practice for more egalitarian relations between children and adults, they also need to be read in the context of larger social relations and patterns of interaction. While the movement of working children offers some examples of practices and strategies that can encourage children's leadership and organizational power, I also find that many adults have difficulty creating intergenerational dialogue without reverting to habituated and hegemonic adult/child relationships. Kids within the movement also struggle to make sense of the discursive tension between the movement as "kid-led" and as an intergenerational collaboration, and therefore often return to their own habitus of waiting and listening for the expert advice of adults.

The ideal of egalitarian intergenerational dialogue between children and adults is a persuasive vision for the movement of working children and many scholars of childhood. However, it is also an ideal that is incredibly difficult to implement in the larger social context of age-based inequalities. Given such inequalities, I want to suggest that there are some potential dangers in the invocation of a dialogic approach. The ideal of dialogue, while it *can* allow for an amplification of children's voices, can also provide justification for a re-centering of adult power. Adults and children do not live in a world in which they are equal. Therefore, the dialogic model has to be accompanied by not only a belief in children's capacity to contribute to the conversation but also by a set of structured methodologies and organizational practices that can disrupt habituated behaviors, actively interrupt adult power, and draw out and amplify children's voices and perspectives. We need to acknowledge the profound challenge of

egalitarian adult-child relationships and be attentive to *how* we construct intergenerational dialogic models for children's participation.

References

Blanchet-Cohen N and Rainbow B (2006) Partnership between Children and Adults?: The Experience of the International Children's Conference on the Environment. *Childhood*, 13(1), 113–126.

Campbell DE (2008) Voice in the Classroom: How an Open Classroom Climate Fosters Political Engagement Among Adolescents. *Political Behavior*, 30, 437–454.

Cashmore J (2011) Children's Participation in Family Law Decision-Making: Theoretical Approaches to Understanding Children's Views. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 33(4), 515–520.

Cussianovich A (2006) *Ensayos Sobre Infancia: Sujeto de Derechos y Protagonista*. Lima, Peru: IFEJANT.

Cussianovich A (2010) *Paradigma del Protagonismo*. Lima: INFANT.

Davis J and Hill M (2006) Introduction. In: Tisdall EKM, Davis J, Hill M, et al. (eds), *Children, Young People and Social Inclusion: Participation for What?*, Bristol: The Policy Press, pp. 1–22.

Earls F (2011) Children: From Rights to Citizenship. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 633, 6–16.

Gordon HR (2007) Allies Within and Without: How Adolescent Activists Conceptualize Ageism and Navigate Adult Power in Youth Social Movements. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, 36(6), 631–668.

Graham A and Fitzgerald R (2010) Progressing Children's Participation: Exploring the Potential of a Dialogical Turn. *Childhood*, 17(3), 343–359.

Guerra E (2002) Citizenship Knows No Age: Children's Participation in the Governance and Municipal Budget of Barra Mansa, Brazil. *Environment & Urbanization*, 14(9-15), 71–84.

Hanson K (2012) Schools of Thought in Children's Rights. In: *Children's Rights from Below*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 63–79.

Hart RA (1992) *Children's Participation: From Tokenism to Citizenship*. Innocenti Essays, Florence, Italy: UNICEF.

Hill M (2006) Children's Voices on Ways of Having a Voice. *Childhood*, 13(1), 69–89.

Inter-Agency Working Group on Children's Participation (2007) *Operations Manual on Children's Participation in Consultations*. Bangkok: IAWGCP.

James A (2007) Giving Voice to Children's Voices: Practices and Problems, Pitfalls and Potentials. *American Anthropologist*, 109(2), 261–272.

Jones HL (2010) *Putting Children at the Center: A Practical Guide to Children's Participation*. London: Save the Children UK.

Kirby P and Bryson S (2002) *Measuring the Magic: Evaluating and Researching Young People's Participation in Public Decision Making*. London: Carnegie Young People Initiative.

Liebel M (2003) Working Children as Social Subjects: The Contribution of Working Children's Organizations to Social Transformations. *Childhood*, 10(3), 265–285.

Liebel M (2004) *A Will of Their Own: Cross-Cultural Perspectives on Working Children*. London: Zed Books.

Liebel M (2007) Paternalism, Participation, and Children's Protagonism. *Children, Youth and Environments*, 17(2), 56–73.

Liebel M, Overwien B and Recknagel A (eds) (2001) *Working Children's Protagonism: Social Movements and Empowerment in Latin America, Africa, and India*. Frankfurt: IKO.

Lodge C (2005) From Hearing Voices to Engaging in Dialogue: Problematising Student Participation for School Improvement. *Journal of Educational Change*, 6(2), 125–146.

Lücker-Babel M-F (1995) The Right of the Child to Express Views to be Heard: An Attempt to Interpret Article 12 of the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child. *International Journal of Children's Rights*, 3(3/4), 391–404.

Mannion G (2007) Going Spatial, Going Relational: Why 'listening to children' and children's participation needs reframing. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 28(3), 405–420.

Merkle C (2003) Youth Participation in El Alto, Bolivia. *Environment & Urbanization*, 15(1), 205–214.

Neale B (2002) Dialogues with Children: Children, Divorce and Citizenship. *Childhood*, 9(4), 455–475.

Quiroz LE (2008) Reflexiones Sobre el Protagonismo Infantil. *Revista NATs*, 16, 69–81.

Reynaert D, Bouverne-De Bie M and Vandevelde S (2009) A Review of the Children's Rights Literature Since the Adoption of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child. *Childhood*, 16(4), 518–534.

Ruck MD and Horn SS (2008) Charting the Landscape of Children's Rights. *Journal of Social Issues*, 64(4), 685–699.

Shier H (2001) Pathways to Participation: Openings, Opportunities and Obligations. *Children & Society*, 15, 107–117.

Smith A (2007) Children and Young People's Participation Rights in Education. *International Journal of Children's Rights*, 15(1), 147–164.

Stoecklin D (2013) Theories of action in the field of child participation: In search of explicit frameworks. *Childhood*, 20(4), 443–457.

Swift A (2000) El Movimiento Nacional de Niños, Niñas y Adolescentes Trabajadores de Peru. *Revista NATs*, 5/6, 99–174.

Tisdall EKM, Davis J, Hill M, et al. (eds) (2006) *Children, Young People and Social Inclusion: Participation for What?* Bristol: The Policy Press.

Van den Berge MP (2007) *Working Children's Movements in Peru*. Amsterdam: International Research on Working Children.

Veerman P and Levine H (2000) Implementing Children's Rights on a Local Level: Narrowing the Gap between Geneva and the Grassroots. *International Journal of Children's Rights*, 8(4), 373–384.

Wyness M (2009) Children Representing Children: Participation and the Problem of Diversity in UK Youth Councils. *Childhood*, 16(4), 535–552.

Wyness M (2013) Children's participation and intergenerational dialogue: Bringing adults back into the analysis. *Childhood*, 20(4), 429–442.

Wyness M, Harrison L and Buchanan I (2004) Childhood, Politics and Ambiguity: Towards an Agenda for Children's Political Inclusion. *Sociology*, 38(1), 81–99.