

INTERNATIONAL CENTRE FOR



REGIONAL REGENERATION
& DEVELOPMENT STUDIES

INTERNATIONAL CENTRE FOR REGIONAL REGENERATION AND
DEVELOPMENT STUDIES (ICRRDS)

Durham University

INTERGENERATIONAL RELATIONS AND PRACTICE
IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES

Background Paper for the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister

Dr Rachel Pain

September 2005



**International Centre for Regional Regeneration and Development
Studies**

Wolfson Research Institute

Durham University

Queen's Campus

University Boulevard

Thornaby

Stockton-on-Tees

TS17 6BH

Director:

alan.townsend@durham.ac.uk

or

j.m.painter@durham.ac.uk

Note

From 1 September 2005 the *International Centre for Urban Regeneration and Development Studies* (ICRRDS) will be known as *the Centre for the Study of Cities and Regions* (CSCR).

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Tina Golton, Helen Johnson and Sarah Fielder at ODPM, Ray Hudson for commenting on a first draft, Alan Townsend for his support, and all those who helped in supplying details of case studies.

The views expressed in this report are those of the author and may not necessarily reflect the position of ODPM.

PREFACE

Young people and older people are central to sustainable communities and to the development of more inclusive public spaces. They make up higher proportions of those living in the UK's most deprived areas. They are more likely than other groups to lack social capital and access to resources and services, and also to lack political representation and to participate in public life. All tiers of government have recently been encouraged to take on the implications of an ageing society, to tackle age discrimination and actively engage older and young people in planning their communities.

At the same time, despite recent drops in recorded crime rates and in anti-social behaviour (Home Office 2004), conflict between young people and adults in deprived neighbourhoods is increasingly publicised. This is reflected in contests over the use of public space as well as crime and disorder itself. It is also manifest in unequal involvement in community activity, local policy initiatives and consultation, with young people being the least likely to participate. This 'intergenerational gulf' has been viewed as impinging on quality of life and increasing social exclusion. It is a significant barrier to the participation of all members of communities in current and future strategies which aim to reduce neighbourhood inequalities and foster regeneration and renewal.

In response to similar issues, there has been a rapid rise in interest in intergenerational practice (IGP) as a community development approach in many countries. IGP aims to bring older and young people closer together around a range of planned activities, with a range of beneficial effects not only for individuals but also for communities. The UK has been relatively slow to develop IGP, but it is now reaching critical mass. IGP closely matches key government priorities including social inclusion and cohesion, citizenship and community development. It has relevance to a range of social policy areas including regeneration, housing, community safety and health. It has potential as part of the recent policy drive towards 'community cohesion', although age relations have tended to be overshadowed by recent emphasis on race and faith groups. It is also very relevant to moves to make public spaces better peopled and more inclusive.

This report identifies how the work of ODPM may benefit from greater investment in intergenerational practice. It:

- Provides a conceptual framework for understanding intergenerational relations and intergenerational practice.

- Describes what is known about young and older people's priorities, and the nature of intergenerational relations in disadvantaged communities in the UK.
- Provides an overview of intergenerational practice.
- Considers the potential of IGP for social cohesion, neighbourhood renewal and regeneration.
- Identifies some conceptual, practical and political challenges arising from IGP.
- Makes recommendations as to how IGP might be drawn in to further ODPM's achievement of sustainable communities and inclusive public spaces.
- Identifies some principles for good practice.

POLICY SUMMARY

This report explores the potential of intergenerational practice to aid the achievement of sustainable communities, especially through neighbourhood and public space regeneration and renewal programmes.

1. Understanding intergenerational relations

- Intergenerational relations are a part of our social identity. They have material effects on the experiences and quality of life of older and young people in particular settings, and important implications for community cohesion.
- There has been relatively little research on intergenerational relations at the community, neighbourhood or public space level. Trends within the family or wider nation are not necessarily replicated in neighbourhoods.
- Intergenerational differences and relations are not 'natural', but are produced by a complex range of factors at individual, family, community and societal levels. Ageism (stereotypes about young and older people) is one significant factor.
- The nature of intergenerational relations varies widely in different places and cultural settings.
- There is a danger, as intergenerational practice becomes more popular, of reifying intergenerationality (i.e. assuming it is a problem everywhere and takes the same form).

2. The state of intergenerational relations in the UK today: conflict or cohesion?

- Intergenerational relations in deprived neighbourhoods in the UK can not be characterised as involving 'conflict' or 'cohesion', but are a complex mixture of both, which varies from place to place.
- In deprived neighbourhoods, intergenerational conflict is most often reflected in concerns about young people in public space. Such conflicts have significant impacts on the quality of life, especially for more socially marginalised groups of young and older people. They are difficult to resolve.
- However, qualitative research has shown that many older and younger people also have positive relationships and images of each other in deprived neighbourhoods, and there are many examples of cohesion or ambivalence. They are often concerned about similar issues.
- While young and older people's priorities still tend to be less well represented in regeneration programmes, the potential for inclusion and joint working is high.

- The government's respect agenda provides a further imperative and platform for promoting intergenerational practice. However, research points strongly to the need for mutual respect between older and young people.

3. Understanding intergenerational practice

- IGP usually consists of small scale, intensive projects in particular settings, where older and young people are brought together around planned activities. These interventions seek to enrich intergenerational relations and aim to have a range of positive outcomes for individuals and communities.
- The aims, methods and outcomes of IGP vary widely. However it has great potential to further the political representation and social inclusion of older and young people.
- IGP provides a very promising and under-utilised direction for programmes concerned with neighbourhood and public space regeneration and renewal.

4. Challenges for intergenerational practice for sustainable communities

- There has been little critique of the principles or practice of IGP. The key challenges arising from IGP surround:
- The sometimes loose concepts and definition, and lack of clarity in goals,
- The need to widen the inclusion of 'harder to reach' older and young people,
- The need to tackle ageism that may precondition or arise within IGP,
- The need to ensure a participatory ethos to increase inclusion and the sustainability of projects,
- The need for IGP to be sensitive to different contexts and places,
- The difficulty of effectively measuring and monitoring outcomes.
- These challenges are more likely to be overcome if IGP adheres to participatory principles.

5. Conclusions and recommendations

- The report concludes that intergenerational practice (IGP) has a valuable contribution to make to the achievement of sustainable communities.
- It recommends that resources are put into promoting and directly funding IGP for this purpose.
- A series of principles for participatory intergenerational practice for sustainable communities is outlined.

CONTENTS

Preface

Policy summary

Contents

1. Understanding intergenerational relations

- 1.1 Existing research on intergenerational relations
- 1.2 Intergenerationality as an aspect of social identity
- 1.3 How intergenerational relations are produced
- 1.4 The importance of culture and place
- 1.5 Ageism and intergenerational relations
- 1.6 Reifying intergenerational relations?

Key points in Section 1

2. The state of intergenerational relations in the UK today: conflict or cohesion?

- 2.1 Introduction
- 2.2 Intergenerational conflict and public space: a timebomb waiting to go off?
- 2.3 Intergenerational cohesion
- 2.4 What are the key issues for older and young people in their communities?
- 2.5 Involving older and young people in regeneration
- 2.6 The implications of the 'respect' agenda

Key points in Section 2

3. Understanding intergenerational practice

- 3.1 History and scope
- 3.2 Aims
- 3.3 Structure
- 3.4 Methods
- 3.5 Outcomes
- 3.6 Intergenerational practice for regeneration, neighbourhood renewal and public space

Key points in Section 3

4. Challenges for intergenerational practice for sustainable communities

4.1 Concepts and definition

4.2 Goals and inclusion

4.3 Tackling ageism

4.4 Participation and sustainability

4.5 Context

4.6 Monitoring and measuring outcomes

Key points in Section 4

5. Conclusions and recommendations

5.1 Conclusions

5.2 Recommendations

5.3 Principles for participatory intergenerational practice for sustainable communities

Appendix: Definitions for the purposes of this report

Bibliography

1. UNDERSTANDING INTERGENERATIONAL RELATIONS

1.1 Existing research on intergenerational relations

While intergenerationality is an established theme across the social sciences, relatively little research has focused at the community/neighbourhood/public space level which provide the key interest of this report. Instead, research has tended either to focus on intra-family relations, often with weak conceptualisation of 'age' and 'generation', or on macro level processes of welfare and economic exchange without empirical grounding in the everyday lives of older and young people. (See Appendix for the definitions of older and young people used in this report.)

Existing work can be divided into four inter-connected areas. First, much attention has been given to issues of transfer and transmission between generations, for example of wealth, the risk of social exclusion, health, educational attainment, consumption habits, violence, abuse and attitudes to environmental issues (e.g. Litwin 2003; Moore et al 2001; Schulz and Kingson 2003). A second body of literature focuses on personal relationships, the amount and nature and implications of contact between generations, in most cases those who are related (e.g. Brannen 2003; Luescher and Pillemer 1998; Ng 1998; Noller et al 2001). Thirdly, a small number of authors have sought to examine issues of social identity among and between generational groups at micro and macro levels (e.g. Edmunds and Turner 2002a, 2002b; Kerns 2003; Walker 1996). This work tends to be more theoretically sophisticated. And finally, a burgeoning literature is concerned with evaluation of intergenerational policy and practice (e.g. Kaplan et al 2002b).

This report aims to contribute to the third and fourth of these themes. Here, intergenerational relations are conceptualised in terms of *social identity*, as a framework for analysis in later sections.

1.2 Intergenerationality as an aspect of social identity

Any discussion of intergenerational relations (see Appendix for definition) starts from the premise that there are clear and meaningful *identities* which are associated with intergenerationality. It is widely accepted that class, race, faith, gender, sexual orientation, disability and age produce distinct identities and inequalities in UK society, and these aspects of diversity are now addressed explicitly in policy areas such as neighbourhood renewal (ODPM 2005). Our identities are not just made up of these singular building blocks, but have multiple aspects which interact and change over time and vary from place to place.

Viewing intergenerationality as an aspect of social identity suggests that individuals' and groups' sense of themselves and others is partly on the basis of generational difference or sameness. These identities are not fixed but dynamic, affected by the relations between different age groups or generations which may vary (Bytheway 1995; Edmunds and Turner 2002). Identity, then, is relational, shifting and culturally specific (Brah 1999; Probyn 1996; Somers 1994). Interaction, isolation, divergence, conflict, cooperation and so on all have material effects on the experiences and quality of life of older and young people in particular settings.

It is easy to think about such interactions in the context of family life, where their nature and frequency make family life more or less harmonious (Finch 1989). In the context of neighbourhoods and communities, the same is true of contact between the generations. Relations within one space (for example the home) also affect expectations, behaviour and relations within another (for example local public spaces).

Intergenerational relations, then, form part of our identity or social make-up (and are an aspect which has been underplayed until recently). But they also have much wider ramifications: affecting our social interactions, how we use local spaces, our opportunities to take part in public life on an equal basis with others, the degree to which we participate in community life and efforts to improve it.

1.3 How intergenerational relations are produced

Gender and race are now widely understood in the critical policy literature to be socially produced – that is, although there may be certain biological differences between people, the factors driving social inequality and the categories of 'race' and 'gender' themselves are primarily socio-economic. Age and generation can also be understood as socially constituted in a similar way (Biggs, 1993; Bytheway, 1995; Featherstone and Wernick, 1995). For example, the cultural meaning of being a child varies greatly between rural Sudan and New York City, in terms of roles, expectations, work and play (Katz 2004). Equally there are huge differences in the roles and expectations associated with reaching old age (Conrad 1992).

Generational groups are cohorts of people who are usually but not always of different chronological ages. The significant differences in quality of life between generational groups, and differences in the ways they relate, are not natural or given, but produced by particular societies at a point in history (Edmunds and Turner 2002b; Kaplan et al 2002; Walker 1996). Intergenerational relations are produced by a complex range of factors at individual, family, community and societal levels. They are forged through social and bodily practices and

interactions, in relation and sometimes in opposition to each other. So for example, the antagonism between older and young people in some communities - and the ways this is talked about and represented - actively constructs wider social perceptions about what older people and young people are like (good citizens/trouble-makers, timid/aggressive, and so on).

Intergenerational relations and identities are also politically and socially constituted at the macro level. For example, the changing welfare system has shaped how old age and older people are viewed by other generations (Walker 1996). Walker argues that recent shifts in intergenerational relations in the UK are constructed by political ideology rather than demographic change or the attitudes of the young. For German writers Leisering (2002) and Tesch-Romer et al (2002), intergenerational relations are ever more disembedded from primary social relationships, but increasingly politicised. Edmunds and Turner (2002b) argue that generations have been central to social life and social change (though this role has been overlooked); historical cultural shifts arise partly from generational antagonism and attempts at distinctiveness from previous generations.

Intergenerationality, then, involves a set of identities and relations that are not fixed or determined. It involves multiple identities, perceptions and forms of interaction between older and younger people.

1.4 The importance of culture and place

Culture and place have key roles in shaping intergenerational relations. Intergenerationality existed in all cultures long before it reached research or policy agendas, and is diverse between and within different places (Lowe 2002; Lowenstein and Antonucci 2003; Tesch-Romer et al 2002), reflecting variations in family and culture (Kaplan et al 2002a), state and historical context (Walker 1996). Traditional patterns and identities continue to be disrupted and reshaped by local and global social, economic and political change (Campbell and Rew 1999; Nayak 2003). For example, in China, Japan and Palestine there has traditionally been great respect for the old and there are strong values attached to the care of older people by their families, although more disengaged relations are surfacing (Chadha 2005, Fong Meng Soi 2005; Thang 2002, Thang et al 2003). In Hong Kong and Singapore, intergenerational practice tends to focus more on family and grandparenting work, as fewer older people live alone than in the UK or USA (Thang 2001). In the UK, there is a tradition of young people learning from older people (e.g. through apprenticeships) which, though reduced today, is often built upon in intergenerational practice (Granville 2002).

Locally, class, gender, ethnic, age, sexual, national and sectarian identities influence how different generational groups perceive and relate to each other (see Arber and Ginn 1995; Bairner and Shirlow 2003; Conrad 1992; Edmunds and Turner 2002b; Katz and Monk 1995). For example, in Northern Ireland sectarian conflict has sometimes placed older people in a different position in relation to young people, as heroes who they look up to (Shirlow 2003). In Belfast, ex-paramilitaries have been key to the development of youth-based work, aiming to counter sectarianism which young people learn from older people elsewhere. In communities in the UK where there are racial or faith tensions, intergenerational relations cross-cut and mutually mould these. However, relatively little has been documented about these cultural differences to date (Kuehne 2005).

Thus intergenerational practice must engage with certain traditions and contexts in each setting, and these affect which type of practice is likely to be appropriate and successful (see 5.3).

1.5 Ageism and intergenerational relations

Despite this variance, a common structural feature of every society is ageism. Ageism has generally received less attention in policy and planning literatures than racism and sexism (and latterly, ablism and heterosexism). It describes culturally prescribed norms about appropriate behaviour at certain stages in the lifecourse (Pain et al 2001); the assumption that people of the same chronological age have other things in common (Bytheway 1995). Ageism is often viewed as something only older people experience, but it affects people of every age including young people. This point is central to understanding intergenerational community conflict (see Section 2).

Ageist stereotypes of older people vary across culture and place (see above). In the UK these often include mental and physical decline, financial and social burden, and withdrawal from public and social life (Bytheway 1995; Giles et al 2002). Young people, on the other hand, are variously viewed as having great value and potential, and in need of protection, as incompetent, unruly or out of control (Valentine 1996; Worpole 2003). The concept of institutional ageism is relevant here, given that younger and older people tend to be excluded from aspects of society and the structures which govern it. Both older and young people are presented in particular ways in policy making. For example, strong critiques have been made of the way 'youth' has been portrayed only in problematic terms in UK community safety and youth justice policies (Brown 1998; Francis and Padel 2000; Goldson 2000; Muncie 1999). As it is endemic in society, ageism also has an integral role in shaping intergenerational

relations, which has implications for intergenerational practice in the UK as discussed in Section 4.

1.6 Reifying intergenerational relations?

Finally, as with any social identity, there is a danger in reifying intergenerationality – treating it as if it always has concrete or material existence. The starting point of intergenerationality carries the danger of prioritising or essentialising differences of generation. In this report, a critical awareness is promoted of the assumption that intergenerational relations are always problematic, and that intergenerational practice is always worthwhile. Intergenerational issues may not be a significant problem in all deprived neighbourhoods. The implications for practice are outlined in Section 4.

Key points in Section 1

- Intergenerational relations are a part of our social identity. They have material effects on the experiences and quality of life of older and young people in particular settings, and important implications for community cohesion.
- There has been relatively little research on intergenerational relations at the community, neighbourhood or public space level. Trends within the family or wider nation are not necessarily replicated in neighbourhoods.
- Intergenerational differences and relations are not ‘natural’, but are produced by a complex range of factors at individual, family, community and societal levels. Ageism (stereotypes about young and older people) is one significant factor.
- The nature of intergenerational relations varies widely in different places and cultural settings.
- There is a danger, as intergenerational practice becomes more popular, of reifying intergenerationality (i.e. assuming it is a problem everywhere and takes the same form).

2. THE STATE OF INTERGENERATIONAL RELATIONS IN THE UK TODAY: CONFLICT OR COHESION?

2.1 Introduction

Most recent attention around diversity and community cohesion in the UK has been focused on issues of race and faith, partly owing to recent high profile events such as race riots in Yorkshire and terrorism linked to Muslim extremists. However, the UK is a diverse country, and in many towns and cities intergenerational conflict may be as pressing or a more pressing issue in cohesion and quality of life (this is most likely to be noticed in the north east and parts of Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland where ethnic minority populations are very small; but may apply in many places). Intergenerational conflict should not be viewed as separate from ethnic or sectarian tensions; rather it cross-cuts these (see 1.4). Further, legislation due to take effect in 2006 will for the first time outlaw discrimination on the basis of age (Age Concern 2005). Given that this will apply to every area of public policy, it heightens the imperative for government departments to consider intergenerational issues in policy making. There are sometimes assumptions on the part of researchers and policy-makers about where, whether and in what way intergenerational relations present a problem, especially in disadvantaged communities. This section gives an overview of recent evidence about the nature of intergenerational relations in the UK, young and older people's priorities and their inclusion in regeneration.

2.2 Intergenerational conflict and public space: a timebomb waiting to go off?

The proportion of older people is increasing in most western societies, and the proportion of young people decreasing in comparison. This significant shift accelerated in the later part of the twentieth century, and has wide implications for society which governments are increasingly forced to address. It has led to a number of 'panics' and an overwhelmingly negative view of the consequences of an ageing population (Katz 1992; Raynes 2004; Walker 1996). A range of other factors is also held to have worsened intergenerational relations during the same period:

- Economic changes in the UK which have increased and entrenched poverty in marginalised places.
- The erosion of traditional family structures.
- A weakened sense of community, and young people not being prepared for citizenship.
- Increasing proportions of young men in particular growing up disaffected from society.
- Review of the welfare state and the support it is able to provide.

(Hatton-Yeo and Watkins 2004)

For some commentators, intergenerational conflicts revolving around differences in political power, share of resources and social identity aspiration 'amount to a time bomb awaiting defusion or investigation' Ng (1998, 106). Such conflicts can be especially intense in sites where values, social identities and places have themselves changed rapidly across generations (Ellis 2003; Lowe 2002; Schreck 2000). Shifting demographic profiles, and national issues about pensions and welfare support may feed into general attitudes towards older people (Bytheway 1995), and so relations at the national or discursive scale affect those at the more local scale of the neighbourhood/community.

There is a significant geography to these changes, as the most deprived neighbourhoods (see Appendix for definition) in the UK have greater proportions of both older and young people in their populations because of selective out-migration. In such areas there is more likely to be intergenerational conflict (Granville 2002). This decline of intergenerational relations is sometimes described simply as growing distance, alienation or a breakdown in positive contact between young and older people, rather than negative contact (Hatton-Yeo and Watkins 2004). Elsewhere it is viewed in terms of conflict and even crisis. Young people 'hanging around' is the most common complaint to local government departments, police, councillors, and surveys about local quality of life (Coulthard et al 2002; Lothian and Borders Police 2002), and the notion that their presence in public space is a source of annoyance and fear of crime for older people is widespread and recurrent (Brown 1998; Matthews et al 2000; Pain 1997, 2003a, 2003b; Valentine 1996; Worpole 2003). In recent research on older people living in cities, conflict with young people was a key negative aspect affecting older people's perceptions about the liveability of urban communities (Brook Lyndhurst 2004).

Overall the evidence suggests that such concerns are sometimes based on experience, and sometimes perception, reflecting not just the behaviour of a minority of young people but a deeper unease about an apparent lack of social control over young people in contemporary society (Brown 1995; Loader et al, 1998; Valentine 1996). However it is a trend which significantly affects the quality of life for older and younger people. The stereotype of all older people as fearful of going outside is a myth, as many are less fearful about crime than young people (Ferraro, 1995; McCoy et al 1996; Midwinter, 1990). But for certain groups of older people, especially the very frail, those living in areas with very high levels of crime and disorder, and those dependent on younger carers with whom they have difficult relationships, intergenerational fear is a significant and damaging issue (Biggs, 1996; McCreadie, 1996; Pain 2003a).

The conflict is harmful to young people too. It is well established that, perhaps more than other groups, children have a great need for accessible and safe public spaces for reasons of health and well-being (CABESpace, no date; Woolley 2003; Worpole 2003). For these authors, the existence of child-friendly outdoor spaces is a sign of healthy, sustainable communities. However, much research with young people suggests that they resent the way they are labelled, they feel misunderstood in their use of public space, and they have no faith in older people to support them or help with their problems (Brown 1995; Cahill et al 2004; Fitzpatrick et al 1998; Loader et al 1998; Pain et al 2000; 2001). A recent survey for Playday suggested that 80% of children had been told off for playing outdoors by adults claiming they caused noise or nuisance, which in reality was extremely minor. Further, young people are considerably more at risk in public space than older people, from violence and harassment by other young people as well as abuse by adults (Anderson et al 1998; Brown 1995; Pain forthcoming). Those in black and ethnic minority groups are at most risk of all. Young people are most likely to respond to fear not just through place avoidance, but by going around in groups, which others – old and young - may find threatening. Further, responses to the issue of young people as trouble-makers in public space by individuals, communities and government policy curtails their freedom at a time when their access to public space is diminishing (Brown 1998; CABESpace no date; Muncie 1999; Worpole 2003). This conflict over public space is a key issue for managing public space which is riven with contradictions and often seems irresolvable. Some suggestions are made in Section 5.

2.3 Intergenerational cohesion

Despite the growing prominence of conflict in public debates and policy-making, there is also evidence of positive intergenerational relations and the potential for greater cohesion. Although there may have been a general reduction in contact between old and young, child/grandparent contact is still strong in many families, and this applies especially to deprived neighbourhoods where the distance between extended families tends to be less. As well as being a vital unrewarded and unrecognised contribution to the economy in allowing parents to work by providing childcare (Arber and Ginn 1995), grandparenting is the keystone for positive intergenerational interactions in other settings such as public spaces.

But increasingly, evidence challenges the stereotyping of relations between old and young in deprived neighbourhoods as purely or mainly negative. In-depth qualitative and ethnographic studies have suggested that stereotyping is more readily identified in the media and the policy sphere than in the views of either older or younger people, which generally involve more complex but positive positions (Brown 1995; McKendrick 1997). Older people have nuanced relations with younger people in their communities (Anderson 1998; Brown 1995;

Loader et al 1998). Within family studies, 'ambivalence' has been suggested as a better framework than 'conflict' versus 'cohesion' for conceptualising intergenerational relationships, encompassing the many contradictions and tensions of social relationships between young and old (Bengtson et al 2002; Brannen 2003; Luescher and Pillemer 1998). This may be also be a useful way of thinking about some configurations of relations at the level of the community.

Further, negative attitudes towards either group do not seem difficult to shift. Part of the problem is simply a lack of contact. A recent study suggested that half of all adults in Scotland do not know any young people in their community. Those living in deprived areas with little social contact with young people were more likely to have negative attitudes towards them. However, those with more contact had a much more positive view of young people (Young People Now 2005). While in intergenerational sessions, young and older people raise many common stereotypes and myths about each other, they do not apply these to people they know, and feel much more positive about the people they meet in the sessions. Two-way ageism exists, then, and adds to conflict and exclusion, but the evidence is that there is much potential for strengthening intergenerational cooperation (Ellis 2003), as Section 3 will outline.

It is important to restate the enormous diversity within the categories 'older' and 'young' people. This diversity makes generalisations about intergenerational relations problematic. There are complex patterns of conflict, cohesion and ambivalence within as well as across the two broad groupings.

2.4 What are the key issues for older and young people in their communities?

How far are the neighbourhood issues which concern older and young people shared? As described above, crime and disorder in public space are key concerns for both groups in particular neighbourhoods (more so, evidence suggests, for young people). Often it is the same incidents, individuals and groups which cause them concern.

According to ODPM (2005), the key issues for older people in neighbourhood renewal are fear of crime, access to local services, transport, antisocial behaviour and the need to bridge the intergenerational divide. For young people, the key issues are educational achievement, teenage pregnancy, road accidents and the provision of safe play spaces. Fitzpatrick et al (1998) point out that young people and adult decision-makers may have different priorities about regeneration. For example, in their research, adults prioritised the educational/training needs of young people, while young people were more concerned to change adults'

perceptions of them. Assumptions that young people do not share adults' concerns about and hopes for their communities are often misplaced. This becomes clearer when young people are actually involved in planning (Freeman et al 1999). A key concern for both groups is having safe public spaces to use (Anon, no date; Worpole 2003), though this common hope is sometimes connected to conflict between them (see above). In an intergenerational project on the future of Bournemouth (Hatch 2003), young people were generally more optimistic about prospects for their town than older people. However the two groups had many of the same priorities for improvements, highlighting the need for better transport and more sport and leisure facilities. Such projects often identify a good deal of common ground in the centre, with more minor differences around the margins.

2.5 Involving older and young people in regeneration

There has been growing recognition in recent years of the importance of including both older and young people in local regeneration initiatives:

- Neighbourhoods are especially important for older people (Scharf et al 2003) and children (Matthews et al 2000).
- Both groups are more likely to live in deprived neighbourhoods than people in other age groups.
- Both groups have less social capital (see Appendix for definition) and poorer access to resources and services.
- The consequences of 'place poverty' (Powell et al 2001) have more impact on the lives of both groups.

More vulnerable groups of older *and* young people – such as those who are homeless - have been identified as amongst the most socially excluded in UK society (Social Exclusion Unit 2001a). And yet both young and older people are less likely to participate in planning their communities than others (Fitzpatrick et al 1998; Freeman et al 1999; Riseborough and Jenkins 2004; Matthews and Limb 1998; National Strategy for Neighbourhood Renewal 2000; Worpole 2003). Considerable effort is now being put into promoting their interests and including their perspectives, across various policy agendas, which will be reinforced by new legislation on age discrimination from 2006 (Age Concern 2005). The Neighbourhood Renewal Unit identifies the inclusion of both groups, and appreciation of the diversity within them, as central to its goals (ODPM 2005). For example, there are 19 Neighbourhood Renewal Advisors who specialise in dealing with children and young people who are available to assist in regeneration projects, and 68% of Local Neighbourhood Renewal

Strategies for LSPs specifically sought to target and benefit children and young people (Neighbourhood Renewal Unit 2005).

There is also wider recognition now that simply 'adding in' their views in a tokenistic way is rarely successful. The reason for this is that mainstream processes of planning and consulting are often implicitly, if not explicitly, ageist (see 1.5). And negative stereotypes surround the two groups with regard to their interests and ability to participate. For meaningful and sustainable inclusion, the perspectives of both older and young people need to be fully understood, and they have particular needs when it comes to speaking and acting in community development. This is not to say that their perspectives are always compatible, as discussed earlier.

A key issue affecting intergenerational issues is that older people now have a stronger voice on the future of their communities in comparison with young people. Riseborough and Jenkins (2004, 42) conclude that over the last decade older people have gone from participating in some regeneration programmes almost as an afterthought, to 'achieving a growing prominence in regeneration and in related policy areas on housing, support, services, care and health', although there are still significant gaps. One report suggests that three-quarters of older people in deprived areas are involved in at least one type of civic activity (ODPM 2005). In some cases older people's groups are leading good practice. In this sort of activity, the older people who get involved tend to be better organised, more confident and more highly skilled, and the voluntary groups which support their interests in this area are more established and focused, in comparison with the position of young people.

There has been a major push to involve older and young people in neighbourhood regeneration, but this effort largely approaches them as separate groups with unrelated interests. Collaboration between older and young people's agencies in the UK is noticeably lacking (Raynes 2004). Yet acknowledgement of an action on intergenerational relations and issues is central to the achievement of community cohesion. Section 3 goes on to outline intergenerational practice, a recent logical extension of these efforts to understand young and older people's perspectives on community life and include them in regeneration and renewal programmes.

2.6 The implications of the 'respect' agenda

In 2005 the government launched its respect agenda, a key plank in tackling anti-social behaviour, particularly in more deprived neighbourhoods. Proposals in the action plan provide support for families and young people, and greater sanctions against those who

engage in anti-social behaviour (Respect Task Force 2006). While not explicitly framed in terms of intergenerational relations, the plan seeks to address and improve them through extending 'acceptable' standards of behaviour to all. Though it states that 'tackling disrespect is not a 'youth issue' any more than anti-social behaviour is' (Respect Task Force, 2005, 7), much of the agenda is geared towards preventing and tackling the behaviour of a minority of young people.

The respect agenda has great relevance to intergenerational policy and practice (see Section 3), as IGP has often been used in contexts where intergenerational respect has broken down. It underlines the value of IGP, and provides another imperative and platform for applying IGP far more widely. While the government's respect agenda is weighted towards tackling the disrespect of authority by young people, however, a key lesson from IGP has been the *mutual* lack of respect which older people and young people hold in certain contexts, and the need to address harmful stereotypes of young people.

Recent research in East London examined the concept of respect from young people's perspectives (Gaskell 2005). As far as policy-making goes, many young people feel that they are not given respect, and addressing this is central to initiatives to develop their citizenship and increase participation in public life. This applies particularly to the more 'hard to reach' or marginalised groups of young people, the involvement of whom, it is argued here, is most likely to be valuable in IGP. Thus one message for IGP is to ensure that young and older people are treated as equals in the process, who may both suffer from a lack of respect from others (see Section 5.3).

Key points in Section 2

- Intergenerational relations in deprived neighbourhoods in the UK can not be characterised as reflecting 'conflict' or 'cohesion', but are a complex mixture of both, which varies from place to place.
- In deprived neighbourhoods, intergenerational conflict is most often reflected in concerns about young people in public space. Such conflicts have significant impacts on the quality of life, especially for more socially marginalised groups of young and older people. They are difficult to resolve.
- However, qualitative research has shown that many older and younger people also have positive relationships and images of each other in deprived neighbourhoods, and there are many examples of cohesion or ambivalence. They are often concerned about similar issues.

- While young and older people's priorities still tend to be less well represented in regeneration programmes, the potential for inclusion and joint working is high.
- The government's respect agenda provides a further imperative and platform for promoting intergenerational practice. However, research points strongly to the need for mutual respect between older and young people.

3. UNDERSTANDING INTERGENERATIONAL PRACTICE

3.1 History and scope

Intergenerational practice (IGP) has been developed over the last few years in the UK. While longer established in the USA (Newman and Brummel 1989) among other countries, it first emerged in the UK in the early 1990s and has seen the greatest expansion since 2000 (Davis 2003; Granville 2002). Promotion at an international level (for example in the United Nations Madrid International Plan of Action on Ageing 2002) has added considerable impetus to development in the UK (Hatton-Yeo and Ohsako 2000). However, it is important to note that the UK lags behind other countries in significant ways – for example, England has no intergenerational government policy, and no collaboration between the agencies focused on older and young people's services (Raynes 2004).

IGP usually consists of small scale, intensive projects in particular settings, where older and young people are brought together around planned activities. These interventions seek to enrich intergenerational relations and to have a range of positive outcomes for individuals and communities. Beyond this generic aim, the specific reason for implementing IGP and anticipated outcomes may vary (see 3.2), and it is now being applied in a wide range of fields. These include:

- The promotion of social inclusion.
- The improvement of health and well-being.
- Education and learning.
- Increasing community safety and reducing the fear of crime.
- Promoting cultural understanding.
- Promoting local identity and solidarity.
- Planning/action on environmental regeneration.
- Planning/action on neighbourhood renewal.

3.2 Aims

The aims of IGP vary (and they are not always well defined – see 4.2.) Most projects have some shared aims, revolving around *promoting well-being*, including:

- Increasing and improving contact between older and young people.
- Increasing understanding and respect.
- Increasing the self-confidence and well-being of both old and young.
- Recognising the mutual dependency of young and old.

- Challenging age-based stereotypes and myths about youth and old age.
- Being mutually beneficial: having benefits for both older and young people.

In addition, most projects have specific aims relating to their subject matter and the interests and priorities of those involved. For example, and of particular interest to this report, it is possible for those involved, and/or policy-makers, to employ IGP to further *political representation and social inclusion* by:

- Increasing levels of volunteering within communities.
- Building social capital within communities - fostering and strengthening collective resources and capacities to effect change.
- Consultation by community groups, policy-makers or other agencies - using the interaction to encourage young and older people to discuss local issues of concern which affect or involve both groups, so that solutions which are acceptable to all may be developed.
- Influencing policy - via older and young people taking forward issues that arise themselves.
- Community participation and action - building well-functioning joined-up groups of young and older people encourages them to become actively involved in neighbourhood planning.

Thus IGP is 'one of the tools that can be used to address the Government's policy priorities...[and] can offer solutions to many of the social issues that concern communities' (Granville 2002, 24).

The intergenerational element of the project may be central to its aims, or may be just one element. Intergenerational dimensions to wider projects or programmes give them added value in terms of fostering community cohesion.

Older and young people's roles may vary within IGP. On some projects young people are positioned in a servicing role to older people, or vice versa. For example, on the Intergen project, older people are recruited to help out in range of educational activities in Trafford schools (Intergen 2005). Sometimes both groups work on projects together to serve the wider community. Some projects are multigenerational, dealing with more than two generational groups. Many leave out the 'middle' group of adults. Further, intergenerational projects are not just about age. They may also explicitly address issues pertaining to single race or faith groups:

- The 'Bridge the Gap' project between the Specialist Health Promotion Service of Nottingham and the Pakistan Centre aimed to generate social capital through intergenerational working.
- Magic Me, in East End of London, develops intergenerational working to identify the needs of young and older people in local Bengali and Somali communities

(Granville 2002)

More rarely, IGP may address issues between race or faith groups. For example a project engaging German pupils and Jewish seniors discussed by Ohsako (2002). The Magic Me project mentioned above also involves joint working with Muslim and Jewish older and younger women, as well as women of other faiths and different nationalities. This task has become more urgent since the London bombings of July 2005 (Langford 2005). IGP sometimes also highlights issues of gender, ability and sexuality (for example Bruno and Deutchman's (2003) intergenerational work with older people with dementia).

3.3 Structure

IGP projects are usually set up by public bodies, by voluntary sector agencies or by the community groups involved. The project begins with agreement between a group of older people (for example from residential homes or day centres) and a group of young people (for example from schools or youth groups) to join up. Some projects have deliberately sought to include 'hard to reach' or disaffected young people – arguably those who benefit IGP and who IGP might benefit most - with successful results (e.g. Fish 2005). Projects work best when participants, or their representatives, are involved from the outset in planning exactly what they want to do (Age Concern West Sussex 2003). Participants are prepared before the contact with discussion sessions. Issues of consent, supervision, insurance, codes of conduct and allaying any potential concerns also need to be dealt with. Contact between older and young people then goes ahead, initially using icebreakers, and eventually developing some or all of the activities below. Finally, project management including clear objectives, target setting, monitoring and evaluation of both process and impact are essential (Hatton-Yeo and Watkins 2004). IGP may or may not feed into wider policy and practice, depending on its aims and outcomes, as well as available processes and resources to do so.

3.4 Methods

IGP usually involves planned activities which involve the interaction of young and older people. In most cases, the actual nature of the activity is of secondary importance to the benefits which are perceived to arise from the interaction itself. Commonly used activities include:

- Creative activities, for example arts projects which focus on some shared interest
- Performative activities, for example dance or theatre
- Skills transfer, for example computing, bicycle repair or homework, where some individuals (old or young) help to 'teach' or support others
- Mentoring
- History projects
- Video
- Photography
- Community mapping
- Diagramming techniques, for example as a tool to enable joint discussion on listing, sorting, evaluating and prioritising issues

3.5 Outcomes

There are a range of outcomes of IGP, some limited to the individual involved, and some wider reaching. Some of the benefits to those involved are *social/identity* outcomes, such as:

- Enjoyment among older and young people – 'they sparkle in each other's company. It seems to give them all so much joy' (volunteer in Age Concern West Sussex 2003).
- Replacing lost intergenerational contact, for example where grandparents are not closely involved in children's lives.
- Enhancing well-being – 'it made them a lot younger in their outlook on life' (day care centre manager in Age Concern West Sussex 2003).
- Learning about each other's lives, interests, needs, concerns and potential.

Wider benefits are often of a *political* nature and include:

- Raising the community profile of those involved.
- Joining up different community groups.
- Producing outputs such as reports, films, exhibitions or plays which can be used beyond the initial context to powerful effect. They can aid groups and communities in representing their views and making joint statements.

One of the challenges in setting up IGP is to find an agreed set of outcomes (Granville 2002). This usually takes time to develop, and thus the most successful projects are often allowed to evolve rather than being pre-determined. Outcomes can not always be predicted, and while there are various sourcebooks now available for evaluators of IGP (eg Age Concern West Sussex 2003; Bernard and Ellis 2004), evaluation of outcomes remains a difficult task

(Hatton-Yeo and Watkins 2004). Both 'hard' and 'soft' outcomes are not always easy to quantify, owing to the long term and diffuse nature of benefits (see 4.6).

3.6 Intergenerational practice for regeneration, neighbourhood renewal and public space

A strong focus of regeneration policies continues to be involving communities (National Audit Office 2004). Investing in people and increasing social capital is key to enabling them to participate in policy-making and wider public life. The Neighbourhood Renewal Unit (ODPM 2005) has identified the need to bridge intergenerational divides in disadvantaged communities. Intergenerational work provides a very promising direction for such work, the potential of which is seriously under-utilised.

For example, Granville (2002) has identified the potential of intergenerational practice to deliver aspects of the Neighbourhood Renewal Strategy, suggesting that it could make a significant contribution to strengthening community cohesion. She gives a number of examples of projects, including:

- Getting On in Camden: enabling meaningful contact between generations to help in formulating Community Plans.
- Teenagers, War and Museums in Manchester: a project which addresses conflict between older and young people by bringing them together.
- Generation X on the Ely estate in South Wales: confronted prejudices between older and young people in area of high crime and intergenerational tension.
- LifeLink in North Tyneside: addressed regeneration issues through tackling fear of crime among older people by improving contact with young people.

(Granville 2002)

Further, IGP has great potential for exploring solutions to conflicts over public space:

- A Citizen's Forum in Bournemouth made up of older and young people explored how generations felt about the past and future of the town and its public spaces, and their perceptions of each other (Hatch 2003).
- Edinburgh Youth Social Inclusion Project brought older and young people together to develop a space where young people felt they had a right to be and could spend informal social time. It also sought solutions to conflict beyond the police asking young people to move on (Young 2003).

Key points in Section 3

- IGP usually consists of small scale, intensive projects in particular settings, where older and young people are brought together around planned activities. These interventions seek to enrich intergenerational relations and aim to have a range of positive outcomes for individuals and communities.
- The aims, methods and outcomes of IGP can vary widely. However it has great potential to further the political representation and social inclusion of older and young people.
- IGP provides a very promising and under-utilised direction for programmes concerned with neighbourhood and public space regeneration and renewal.

4. CHALLENGES FOR INTERGENERATIONAL PRACTICE FOR SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES

While academic and practical literatures on IGP are growing, there has been very little critique of its principles or practice. On the whole IGP is an extremely promising approach for use in the development of sustainable communities (see Appendix for definition). However, as a relatively new approach, there are certain challenges associated with IGP, which are identified in this section. Some principles for good practice following on from these are suggested at the end of Section 5.

4.1 Concepts and definition

There has been little conceptual development of IGP, or commonality in terms of theoretical framework where one is applied (Kuehne 2005). 'Intergenerational approach' is a loosely applied term (Granville 2002), and there is diversity in what practitioners mean by it. Ageism tends to be poorly conceptualised in IGP, with a tendency to operationalise projects in ways where older people, rather than young people, are positioned as the main victims of ageism. IGP could also take more explicit account of difference - the intersections of class, age, generation, race, faith, nationality, ability, sexuality, and so on – as age is not the only nor the primary identity structuring experiences of community life. Most IGP still involves white older and young people: 'there is still a deeply entrenched tendency for policy makers and service providers to lump all older people together' (Riseborough and Jenkins 2004), and likewise young people.

4.2 Goals and inclusion

There is sometimes limited clarity about the aims of getting older and young people together. While this may not be a problem for long-term projects which seek to enhance quality of life, it can make it difficult to evaluate more focused outcomes. Where IGP is part of local regeneration strategies, accountability and repeat funding then become an issue. The numbers of older and young people involved are often small, so that benefits may accrue to those involved but not necessarily filter out to others in the wider community where problems may be more likely to lie. Sometimes those who participate are 'the usual suspects' – older and young people who are more articulate, more confident, more used to volunteering for community work, and therefore arguably less likely to be those at the sharp end of intergenerational conflict. Increasingly, and relatedly, schools are focus for this type of regeneration work, but this can present problems around how younger people are selected and how they participate. The type and nature of settings affects successful participation, relating to the sets of power relations governing the space involved (see Kesby 2005).

4.3 Tackling ageism

One of the aims of IGP is often to tackle ageism (see 4.1), which is seen as holding back positive community relations and development. In light of institutional ageism (see 1.5), however, there is potential for IGP itself to work in ageist ways and reinforce ageist attitudes. 'Bringing young and old together does not automatically result in positive and beneficial exchange. If not properly facilitated and planned, activities may confirm or exacerbate prejudice' (Granville 2002, 4).

A key issue at present is that IGP tends to be dominated by older people's agencies. While stated aims are to benefit both young and old, in practice this means that IGP is more often arranged in response to older people's concerns about local issues. One of the principles behind IGP in western countries is that of equality between age groups (Giles et al 2002). Yet young people are more likely to be identified as 'the problem', and older people as being in a position to teach or otherwise benefit them (for example see Granville 2002). The unspoken drive in some IGP is to educate young people about the old and alter their views – one assumption being that these need to be altered and young people are not themselves unjustly labelled. This can be seen most sharply in educational practice and 'service learning' where intergenerational practice is used to promote 'attitude change' amongst young people (Dorfman et al 2004; Karasik 2002). Evaluations are more likely to concentrate on the benefits to older people.

While there are projects which avoid these traps, they can precondition an inequitable meeting. They relate to the socially, economically and politically marginal position of young people in wider society. So while young people may seem to dominate in the public spaces of deprived neighbourhoods, the opposite is often true in community development. Indeed, one significant barrier to young people's inclusion in local planning is adults' negative perceptions of them (Anon, no date). A significant challenge here as elsewhere, then, is forefronting the issues that matter to young people and working harder to release their potential to contribute to communities. This is especially important if IGP is to be used in response to the government's respect agenda (see section 2.6), which largely identifies young people as the generational group lacking respect. Otherwise the process and outcomes of IGP and related initiatives may reinforce their marginal position.

4.4 Participation and sustainability

IGP should not be viewed as another programme which is done to communities by agencies, but rather as something they do for themselves. This latter ethos is espoused in written

commentaries, and can be found in UK practice. For example, good practice exists such as groups deciding what they want to do, rather than volunteering for pre-set projects. Most IGP is participatory to different degrees, but not all of it. Though ideally young and older people should set the agenda in IGP, in reality it is still often set by the agencies involved in relation to their existing wider agendas. Moreover, young people in particular are often understandably wary of anything that looks like tokenistic consultation (Anon, no date), and both older and young people are very keen that some kind of action follows when their views and/or involvement are sought.

Hence the more bottom-up practice is, the more successful, long term and sustainable the benefits are likely to be (Hatton-Yeo and Watkins 2004). This means thinking about who identifies the community and intergenerational issues or problems that IGP is set up to address, and that participants have input into design, methods, activities, outcomes and so on. Where a group of people are brought together on a short-lived project, this may well have some benefits, but for really significant outcomes the contact needs to be long term, ideally with participants themselves in the driving seat.

This also relates closely to the next point about setting.

4.5 Context

IGP is a wide field which 'fits' many different social contexts and different policy areas (Granville 2002; Hatton-Yeo and Watkins 2004). However, there is a growing understanding that it is not possible simply to reproduce projects identically in different countries, regions, neighbourhoods or social groupings. As above, projects should respond to issues identified by young and older people in their neighbourhoods, and therefore be place-specific. Their design and make-up should reflect the diversity of the community and the specific configuration of intergenerational relations which exists there. Thus while there are some helpful sourcebooks now available to guide the setting up of IGP (e.g. Age Concern West Sussex 2003), the flexibility (so that they can adapt to new places and communities) and reflexivity (so that they can respond to what people suggest) of programmes are very important.

4.6 Monitoring and measuring outcomes

The issue of exactly how to measure the benefits and outcomes of IGP is a thorny one. Monitoring and evaluation is crucial to knowing exactly what works where, developing further effective practice, gaining funding, and so on. However, the aims and outcomes of IGP are not always very focused or clearly specified (see 4.1). To some extent this may be desirable,

as it can be unrealistic to focus too narrowly on outcomes, which may be multiple and should anyway arise from participants on projects. Nonetheless, robust ways of measuring outcomes must be applied.

For example, little is currently known about how to measure improvements to experiences of public space, how wide these improvements are (beyond those originally consulted), or how to view them in comparative terms. There is also a significant question of who changes are most useful to and well received by, especially where the initial problems identified involve conflict between generational groups.

Like all of the challenges in this section, this issue is more likely to be overcome if IGP is implemented using participatory principles. Section 5 outlines these principles and suggests how these challenges might be met.

Key points in Section 4

- There has been little critique of the principles of practice of IGP. The key challenges arising from IGP surround:
- The sometimes loose concepts and definition, and lack of clarity in goals,
- The need to widen the inclusion of 'harder to reach' older and young people,
- The need to tackle ageism that may arise within IGP,
- The need to ensure a participatory ethos to increase inclusion and the sustainability of projects,
- The need for IGP to be sensitive to different contexts and places,
- The difficulty of effectively measuring and monitoring outcomes.
- These challenges are more likely to be overcome if IGP adheres to participatory principles.

5. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

'The policy issues surrounding sustainable communities in England are fruitful ground in which to ensure the growth of intergenerational programmes and organisations to benefit both older and younger members of these communities' (Raynes 2004, 194).

5.1 Conclusions

This report has suggested that intergenerational practice (IGP) has a valuable contribution to make to the achievement of sustainable communities and inclusive public spaces.

A conceptual basis has been outlined in which intergeneration relations are viewed as one aspect of social identity, which takes different forms in specific cultures and places. The forms intergenerational relations take are not 'natural' but are rooted in these cultures and places. Young and older people are extremely diverse groups, and age and intergenerationality should always be considered in close relation to issues of class, race, faith, gender, sexual orientation and disability.

Intergenerational relations do not always provide cause for concern. There is much evidence for cohesion as well as conflict existing in the UK. In many deprived neighbourhoods young and older people tend to be concerned about the same issues. However, in some communities competing interests and conflict between young and older people, especially in public spaces, is a major concern.

There has been a tendency to exclude both older and young people from regeneration/renewal agendas. New legislation on age discrimination taking effect from 2006 will accelerate moves to include all age groups. Given all these points, the potential for joint inclusion and working is high.

Intergenerational practice (IGP) consists of small scale, intensive projects in particular settings where older and young people are brought together around planned activities. It has a range of positive outcomes for individuals and communities. It provides a very promising, if under-utilised, direction for programmes concerned with neighbourhood and public space regeneration and renewal.

Nonetheless, the approach is still maturing, and there are a number of challenges associated with it, including issues of concepts and definition, widening inclusion, tackling ageism,

increasing participation and sustainability, tailoring to specific contexts and measuring and monitoring outcomes effectively. These are more likely to be overcome if IGP is implemented using participatory principles.

5.2 Recommendations

On the basis of the evidence presented in this report, recommendations for policy are as follows:

- There is a need for greater awareness of the benefits and potential of IGP among and within government departments (Centre for Intergenerational Practice 2003; Granville 2002). ODPM could use its oversight of areas such as neighbourhood renewal and regeneration to promote and disseminate understanding of the role that IGP could play in addressing social exclusion and furthering the goals of sustainable communities and inclusive public spaces.
- This should be accompanied by continued emphasis on the importance of the participation of young and older people in regeneration, and on the importance of intergenerational relations to community cohesion.
- The goal to work towards is that IGP becomes an established and accepted part of regeneration and renewal programmes.
- More direct funding is needed for IGP, firstly to encourage more projects to get off the ground, and secondly so that initiatives are longer term and more sustainable.
- There is a need for more nationally based research in England and Wales, as knowledge from other countries may not apply to the particular social and policy contexts here (Raynes 2004).
- The most effective use of IGP, in terms of inclusion and sustainability, involves taking a participatory approach and adhering to participatory principles (outlined below). These principles should be adopted in promoting the approach.

5.3 Principles for good intergenerational practice for sustainable communities

Principles: concepts and definition

- Intergenerational relations can be defined as the interactions between generational groups.
- IGP can be defined as targeted strategies which seek to enrich intergenerational relations with a range of positive outcomes for individuals and communities.
- Ageism can be understood as culturally prescribed norms about appropriate behaviour at certain stages in the lifecycle. It affects people of every age, including young people.

- IGP should be based on the principle that generations are socially and economically constructed, question how intergenerational boundaries are drawn, and highlight their internal differentiation.
- Difference and diversity among older and young people should be explicitly recognised in IGP.
- The basis of introducing IGP should be critically questioned – is it an appropriate approach in a particular setting?
- Strategies need to be tailored to identified problems in local areas, based on accurate evidence-based understanding of local neighbourhood make-up, issues and problems.

Principles: goals and inclusion

- IGP should have clearly defined and agreed aims, developed with participant groups as far as possible.
- IGP should have clearly defined and agreed outcomes.
- IGP should be ‘scaled up’ to become an established and accepted part of regeneration programmes.
- Including so-called ‘hard to reach’ groups in IGP is likely to result in more meaningful and effective outcomes. This can be achieved by sampling from pupil referral units, charitable projects for young and older people, youth offending services, and so on (for examples see Ellis (2004), Fish (2005), and Pain et al (2001) who outline a participatory methodology for engaging ‘hard to reach’ young people).
- The setting of IGP should be one which both older and young people prefer and feel most comfortable in.

Principles: tackling ageism

- Young and older people should enter IGP involvement on an equal footing, and have equal status in the process.
- Projects should be careful to forefront young people’s concerns as well as those of older people, and where there is conflict they should seek compromises that are genuinely shared.
- Projects should focus upon reaching and engaging young people as well as old, for example meeting young people on their own ground, involving them at every stage including design and aims of programmes, using innovative methods such as community arts techniques and peer research (see DETR 1997; Pain et al 2001). These principles should continue to be promoted.

- It requires a greater level of support to secure and sustain youth involvement than for adults (Fitzpatrick 1998), so an increase in resources is needed.
- The principle of respect *for* young people (see Gaskell 2005) *and* older people should underpin IGP.

Principles: participation and sustainability

- The development of social capital, participation and local action are complex processes, and to foster and support them, IGP projects will ideally be long term, sustainable and involve local people genuinely at every stage.
- IGP works best when it is participant-led, in response to issues raised by both older and young people.
- IGP should therefore adhere to good practice in participatory community development.

Principles: context

- IGP must be sensitive to local conditions and to particular configurations of intergenerational relations and other social identities.
- It should be responsive to place-based issues raised by young and older people.

Principles: monitoring and measuring outcomes

- IGP projects need clear aims and outcomes if they are to be effectively monitored and evaluated. These aims and outcomes may be developed as the project progresses, to avoid setting an inflexible agenda in advance.
- Outcomes should always be measured using a range of quantitative and qualitative evaluation techniques. Because of the likely nature of outcomes, qualitative measurement may often be most appropriate. This should be undertaken in a systematic and rigorous way.
- Participatory monitoring and evaluation (Estrella et al 2000) is likely to be most effective for measuring improvements which arise from IGP in renewal and regeneration programmes. This involves stakeholders and participants in the evaluation process, involving them in designing questions, collecting and analysing data and generating knowledge. As applied to IGP, participatory monitoring and evaluation would therefore involve older and young people in framing questions about the effectiveness of interventions and the best direction for these to take in future.
- Young and older people's views and priorities may still sometimes conflict. IGP provides one very promising and proven route to tackle those conflicts and seek mutually agreeable solutions. It is not successful in every case and every setting.

APPENDIX: DEFINITIONS FOR THE PURPOSES OF THIS REPORT

Community = a group of interacting individuals living in the same geographical area

Deprived neighbourhoods = neighbourhoods which perform poorly on key social and economic indicators

Intergenerational relations = the interactions between generational groups

Intergenerational practice = targeted strategies which seek to enrich intergenerational relations with a range of positive outcomes for individuals and communities

Older people = a diverse group of people over the age of 60

Sustainable communities = communities which are inclusive, cohesive and safe in the long term

Social capital = the resources for action which individuals, groups or communities hold

Young people = a diverse group of people under the age of 25

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Age Concern West Sussex (2003) *Generations as partners: a practical framework for use by anyone interested in bringing young and older people together*. Age Concern West Sussex, Littlehampton.

Age Concern (2005) *How will the new law on age discrimination affect you?* Information Sheet, November 2005. Age Concern, London.

Anderson S (1998) *Older people, crime and crime prevention*. Age Concern Scotland, Edinburgh

Anon (no date) Young Voices in Regeneration.

<http://www.renewal.net/Documents/RNET/Case%20Study/Youngvoicesregeneration.doc>

Arber S and Ginn J (1995) Eds *Connecting Gender and Ageing: a Sociological Approach* (Open University Press, Buckingham)

Bairner P and Shirlow P (in press) When leisure turns to fear: understanding the reproduction of ethno-sectarianism in Belfast. *Leisure Studies* vol 22 203-221

Bengtson V, Giarrusso R, Mabry J B and Silverstein M (2002) Solidarity, conflict, and ambivalence: complementary or competing perspectives on intergenerational relationships? *Journal of Marriage and Family* 64 568-76

Bernard M and Ellis S (2004) *How do you know that intergenerational practice works? A guide to getting started on evaluating intergenerational practice*. Beth Johnson Foundation, Stoke-on-Trent

Biggs S, 1993, *Understanding Ageing: Images, Attitudes and Professional Practice* (Open University Press, Buckingham)

Biggs S (1996) A family concern: elder abuse in British social policy. *Critical Social Policy* 16, 63-88

- Brah A, Mac an Ghaill M and Hickman M (1999) *Thinking identities: ethnicity, racism and culture* Palgrave Macmillan
- Brannen J (2003) Towards a typology of intergenerational relations: continuities and change in families. *Sociological Research Online* 8, 2
<http://www.socresonline.org.uk/8/2/brannen.html>
- Brook Lyndhurst (2004) *Sustainable cities and the ageing society: the role of older people in an urban renaissance* Report to ODPM
- Brown S (1995) Crime and safety in whose 'community'? Age, everyday life, and problems for youth policy. *Youth and Policy* 48, 27-48
- Brown S (1998) *Understanding youth and crime: listening to youth?* Open University Press, Buckingham
- Bruno K and Deutchman D (2003) Intergenerational activities involving persons with dementia. *Gerontologist* 43, 239-40
- Bytheway B, 1995, *Ageism* (Open University Press, Buckingham)
- CABESpace (no date) *The value of public space: how high quality parks and public spaces create economic, social and environmental value* CABESpace, London
- Cahill, C., Arenas, E., Contreras, J., Jiang, N., Rios-Moore, I. and Threatts, T. (2004) Speaking back: voices of young urban womyn of color. In Harris A, editor, *All About the Girl: Power, Culture and Identity* New York: Routledge.
- Campbell J R and Rew A (1999) *Identity and affect: experiences of identity in a globalising world* Pluto, London
- Centre for Intergenerational Practice (2003) *Neighbourhoods for all ages: intergenerational work in the UK. Conference report.* Beth Johnson Foundation, Stoke-on-Trent
- Chadha N K (2005) Indian family and intergenerational program: issues and challenges. International Conference on Intergenerational Practice, Keele University.

- Conrad C (1992) Old age in the modern and postmodern world in *Handbook of the Humanities and Ageing* Eds T Cole, D van Tassel, R Kastenbaum (New York: Springer) pp 62-95
- Coulthard M, Walker A and Morgan A (2002) *People's perceptions of their neighbourhood and community involvement* Stationery Office, London
- Davis M (2003) Intergenerational practice: an idea whose time has come *Gerontologist* 43, 287
- DETR (1997) *Involving communities in urban and rural regeneration: a guide for practitioners* Second edition. DETR, London
- Dorfman L T, Murty S A, Ingram J G, Evans R J and Power J R (2004) Intergenerational service-learning in five cohorts of students: is attitude change robust? *Educational Gerontology* 30, 1, 39-55
- Edmunds J and Turner B S (2002a) *Generational consciousness, narrative, and politics* Rowman and Littlefield, Lanham
- Edmunds J and Turner B S (2002b) *Generations, culture and society*. OUP Buckingham.
- Ellis S W (2003) Is there more intergenerational cooperation or conflict in the United Kingdom? *Journal of Intergenerational Relationships* 1 2 113-115
- Ellis S (2004) *Generations in action: final evaluation report* Beth Johnson Foundation, Stoke-on-Trent
- Estrella M, Blauert J, Campilan D, Gaventa J, Gonsalves J, Guijt I, Johnson D and Ricafort R (eds) (2000) *Learning From Change: Issues and Experiences in Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation* Institute of Development Studies, University of Sussex
- Featherstone M, Wernick A, 1995, Eds *Images of Aging: Cultural Representations of Later Life* Routledge, London

Fong Meng Soi F (2005) Constructing intergenerational relationship and support through community level intergenerational programmes in Hong Kong. Paper presented to ICIP UK July 2005, Keele

Ferraro, K. (1995) *Fear of crime: interpreting victimisation risk*. State University of New York Press, New York.

Finch J (1989) *Family obligations and social change* Cambridge:Polity Press;

Fish A (2005) pers. comm. on *Write-On! Learning through life* project, University of Glamorgan.

Fitzpatrick S, Hasting A and Kintrea K (1998) *Including young people in urban regeneration* Bristol, Polity Press and Joseph Rowntree Foundation

Francis P and Padel U (2000) Editorial: youth justice. *Criminal Justice Matters* 41, 3

Freeman C, Henderson P and Kettle J (1999) *Planning with children for better communities* Policy Press, Bristol

Gaskell C (2005) *Fighting for respect: youth, violence and citizenship in East London* PhD Thesis, Department of Geography, University of London

Giles H, McCann R M, Ota H and Noels K A (2002) Challenging intergenerational stereotypes across Eastern and Western cultures. In Kaplan M, Henkin N and Kusano A (eds) *Linking lifetimes: a global view of intergenerational exchange* University Press of America, New York, 13-28

Goldson B (2000) *The new youth justice* Russell House, Lyme Regis

Granville G (2002) *A review of intergenerational practice in the UK* Beth Johnson Foundation, Stoke-on-Trent

Hatch B (2003) *Whose town is it anyway? A report of a Citizen's Forum with under 25s and over 65s in Bournemouth* Institute for Public Policy Research, London

Hatton-Yeo and Ohsako T (2000) *Intergenerational programmes: public policy and research implications, an international perspective* Beth Johnson Foundation, Stoke-on-Trent

Hatton-Yeo A and Watkins C (2004) *Intergenerational community development: a practice guide* Beth Johnson Foundation, Stoke-on-Trent

Home Office (2004) *Confident communities in a secure Britain* Home Office, London

Intergen (2005) *Annual report 2004-2005* Intergen, Cherry Manor Primary School, Sale

Jackson P (1999) Identity. In McDowell L and Sharp J P (eds) *A feminist glossary of human geography* Arnold, London

Kaplan M, Henkin N and Kusano Atsuko (2002a) A conceptual framework for cross-cultural comparisons of intergenerational initiatives. In Kaplan M, Henkin N and Kusano Atsuko (eds) *Linking lifetimes: a global view of intergenerational exchange* University Press of America, New York, 1-12

Kaplan M, Henkin N and Kusano Atsuko (2002b) *Linking lifetimes: a global view of intergenerational exchange* University Press of America, New York

Karasik R (2002) So that's what it's like to be old! The impact of intergenerational service-learning on undergraduate attitudes towards learning. *Gerontologist* 42, 57

Katz, C. (2004) *Growing up global: economic restructuring and children's everyday lives* University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis

Katz C, Monk J (1993) *Full Circles: Geographies of Women over the Lifecourse* (Routledge, London)

Katz, S. (1992) Alarmist demography: power, knowledge and the elderly population. *Journal of Aging Studies* 6, (3), 203-25.

Kerns M (2003) Post-solidarity and postmodern intergenerational relationships *Gerontologist* 43 252

- Kesby, M. (2005) *Spatialising participatory approaches: Geography's contribution to a mature debate*. Available from the author, Department of Geography, St Andrews University.
- Kuehne V (2005) Looking back, looking forward: understanding intergenerational programs through research and evaluation. Paper presented to ICIP UK July 2005, Keele
- Langford S (2005) pers.comm. on *Magic Me* project, 118 Commercial Street, London
- Leisering L (2002) Disembedding and remoralization – old-age security and intergenerational relationships in the age of global welfare capitalism *Zeitschrift fur Gerontologie und Geriatrie* 35 4 343-54
- Litwin H (2004) Intergenerational exchange patterns and their correlates in an aging Israeli cohort *Research on Aging* 26 2 202-23
- Loader I, Girling E and Sparks R (1998) Narratives of decline: youth, dis/order and community in an English 'Middletown'. *British Journal of Criminology* 38, 3, 388-403.
- Lothian and Borders Police (2002) *Partners survey 2001/2* Author, Edinburgh
- Lowe E D (2002) Identity, activity, and the well-being of adolescents and youths: lessons from young people in a Micronesian society *Culture Medicine and Psychiatry* 27 2 187-219
- Lowenstein A and Antonucci T (2003) Intergenerational solidarity, motivations for family help, quality of life and well-being of elders in a comparative cross-national perspective *Gerontologist* 43 480
- Luescher K and Pillemer K (1998) Intergenerational ambivalence: a new approach to the study of parent-child relationships in later life *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 60 413-25
- Matthews H and Limb M (1998) Defining an agenda for the geography of children *Progress in Human Geography*, 23, 1, 59-88.
- Matthews H, Limb M and Taylor M (2000) The 'street as thirdspace' in Holloway S L and Valentine G (eds) *Children's geographies: playing, living, learning* Routledge, London, 63-79

McCoy, H V, Wooldredge, J D, Cullen, F T, Dubeck, P J and Browning, S L 1996: Lifestyles of the old and not so fearful: life situation and older persons' fear of crime. *Journal of Criminal Justice* 24, 3, 191-205.

McCreadie C (1996) *Elder abuse: update on research* Age Concern Institute of Gerontology, Kings College London

McKendrick, J.H. 1997: *Regulating Children's Street Life: A Case Study of Everyday Politics in the Neighbourhood*. SPA Working Paper 39. Manchester: School of Geography, University of Manchester.

Midwinter E (1990) *The old order: crime and older people* Centre for Policy on Ageing, London

Moore E S, Wilkie W L and Alder J A (2001) Lighting the torch: how do intergenerational influences develop? *Advances in Consumer Research* 28 287-93

Muncie J (1999) *Youth and Crime* Sage, London

National Audit Office (2004) *Getting citizens involved: community participation in neighbourhood renewal* The Stationery Office, London

National Strategy for Neighbourhood Renewal (2000) *Report of Policy Action Team 4: Neighbourhood management* Stationery Office, London

Nayak A (2003) Last of the 'Real Geordies?' White masculinities and the subcultural response to deindustrialisation *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 1 7-25

Neighbourhood Renewal Unit (2005) *Children and young people* <http://www.neighbourhood.gov.uk/page.asp?id=1008> accessed 08/09/05.

Newman S and Brummel S (1989) *Intergenerational programs: imperatives, strategies, impacts, trends* Haworth Press, New York

Ng S H (1998) Social psychology in an ageing world: ageism and intergenerational relations *Asian Journal of Social Psychology* 1 99-116

Noller P, Feeney J A and Peterson C (2001) *Personal relationships across the lifespan* Psychology Press, Hove

ODPM (2003) *The national strategy for Neighbourhood Renewal* Factsheet 2, Neighbourhood Renewal Unit, ODPM, London

ODPM (2005) *Diversity and neighbourhood renewal factsheet* ODPM, London

Ohsako T (2002) German pupils and Jewish seniors: intergenerational dialogue as a framework for healing history. In Kaplan M, Henkin N and Kusano Atsuko (eds) *Linking lifetimes: a global view of intergenerational exchange* University Press of America, New York, 209-220

Pain R H (1997) 'Old age' and ageism in urban research: the case of fear of crime. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 21, 1, 117-28

Pain R, Williams S and Hudson B (2000) Auditing fear of crime on North Tyneside: a qualitative approach. In Mair G and Tarling R (eds) *British Criminology Conferences: Selected Proceedings Volume 3* (ISSN 1464-4088)

Pain R, Barke M, Gough J, Fuller D, MacFarlane R, Mowl G (2001) *Introducing Social Geographies* Arnold, London

Pain R (2003a) Old age and victimisation. In Davies P, Francis P and Jupp V (eds) *Victimisation: Theory, Research and Politics* Macmillan, London

Pain (2003b) Youth, age and the representation of fear. *Capital and Class* 60, 151-71

Pain R (2006) Paranoid parenting? Rematerialising risk and fear for children. *Social and Cultural Geography*

Pile S, Thrift N, 1995, *Mapping the Subject: Geographies of Cultural Transformation* (Routledge, London)

Powell M, Boyne G and Ashworth R (2001) Towards a geography of people poverty and place poverty *Policy and Politics* 29 3 243-58

Probyn E (1996) *Outside belongings* Routledge, London

Raynes N (2004) Where we are now with intergenerational developments: an English perspective. *Journal of Intergenerational Relationships* 2, 3-4, 187-95.

Respect Task Force (2006) *Respect action plan*. Home Office, London

Riseborough M and Jenkins C (2004) *Now you see me...now you don't. How are older citizens being included in regeneration?* Age Concern England, London

Scharf T, Phillipson C and Smith A (2003) Older people's perceptions of the neighbourhood: evidence from socially deprived areas. *Sociological Research Online* 8 4

Schreck H C (2000) *Communities and caring: older persons, intergenerational relations and change in an urban community* University Press of America, Lanham Maryland

Schulz J and Kingston E (2003) The economics, culture and biology of intergenerational transfers *Gerontologist* 43 14

Shirlow P (2003) Ethno-sectarianism and the reproduction of fear in Belfast. *Capital and Class* 60 2 77-94

Social Exclusion Unit (2001a) *A new commitment to neighbourhood renewal: national strategy action plan* Social Exclusion Unit, London

Social Exclusion Unit (2001b) *Preventing social exclusion* Social Exclusion Unit, London

Somers M (1994) The narrative constitution of identity: a relational and network approach *Theory and Society* 23 605-49

Tesch-Romer C, Motel-Kingebiel A and von Kondratowitz H J (2002) The relevance of the family network for the quality of life of elderly people: comparing societies and cultures *Zeitschrift fur Gerontologie und Geriatrie* 35 4 335-42

Thang L L (2001) *Generations in touch: linking the old and young in a Tokyo neighbourhood* Cornell University Press, Ithaca

Thang L L (2002) Generational re-engagements: changing demographic patterns and the revival of intergenerational contact in Japan. In Traphagari J and Knight J (eds) *Demographic change and the family in Japan* New York Press, New York

Thang L L, Kaplan M and Henkin N (2003) Intergenerational programming in Asia: converging diversities toward a common goal. *Intergenerational Programming Quarterly* 1, 1, 49-69

Valentine G (1996) Angels and devils: moral landscapes of childhood. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 14, 581-599

Walker A (1996) *The new generational contract: intergenerational relations, old age and welfare* UCL Press, London

Woolley H (2000) *Urban open spaces*. Spon Press, London

Worpole K (2003) *No particular place to go? Children, young people and public space* Groundwork UK, Birmingham

Young T (2003) *Youth Zones, The Inch: Summary report to South Edinburgh Partnership Board meeting 21st January 2003*

Young People Now (2005) Scotland: many adults don't know local teens. *Young People Now* 7 September 2005 <http://www.ypnmagazine.com>