Metadata of the chapter that will be visualized online

Chapter Title	'Generationing' Development: An Introduction	
Copyright Year	2017	
Copyright Holder	The Author(s)	
Corresponding Author	Family Name	**Huijsmans**
	Particle	
	Given Name	**Roy**
	Suffix	
	Division	
	Organization/University	Editorial Board
	Address	Rotterdam, The Netherlands
	Email	r.b.huijsmans@gmail.com

Abstract	This introduction chapter sets out the overall framework informing the volume and surveys the relevant literature. It lays out a relational approach to studying children, youth and development with age and generation as key concepts. This chapter introduces and develops these central ideas, and their various interpretations, and links them to the contributing chapters.

CHAPTER 1

'Generationing' Development: An Introduction

Roy Huijsmans

PRESENTING THE CASE

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

The story about youth is different.[1] Their agency was never in question, albeit seldom studied in relation to young women, and mostly seen as a problem or a particularity. Unlike childhood studies, qualitative research

R. Huijsmans (✉)
Editorial Board, Rotterdam, The Netherlands

is a respected tradition within youth studies (Willis 1981; Mead 2001 [1928]). Research conducted in rich countries still dominates the field, with numerous articles and books on the various 'crises' attributed to (male) youth and particular sub-cultural formations. This epistemological frame has also influenced emerging youth research in the Global South (Amit-Talai and Wulff 1995; Honwana and De Boeck 2005). It is only in recent years that youth studies have started paying serious attention to more-or-less ordinary youth and the potential of studying their every-day lives for rethinking development (Jeffrey et al. 2008; Jeffrey 2010; Woronov 2016).

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

At its core, development studies and practice have remained adult-centric. This influences the questions that drive most research about young people within the field. This adult-centrism is seldom, however,

sufficiently marked, and it can be easily missed because of the vast volume of (evaluation) research on the incorporation of children into development interventions, frequent rhetorical references to 'young people as the future', and sub-debates on the fringes of the discipline about specific 'child', 'adolescent' or 'youth'-related themes such as 'child poverty', 'adolescent sexuality', and 'youth employment'. Children may thus have 'become prominent "clients" of international development discourse and intervention' (Boyden and Zharkevich forthcoming), and the idea of the 'youth bulge' continues to ignite debates on youth as either a danger or potential for development (e.g. World Bank 2006). Yet, the conceptual and theoretical innovations that have come out of the qualitative research on childhood and youth have hardly impacted the terms of thinking about development.

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

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

Analytically, the volume coheres around a relational approach. Relational thinking can take many forms, but in essence it is about tying

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

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

Relational Thinking

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

Thelen et al.'s (2014) relational anthropology of studying the state is driven by a problematique that maps well onto childhood and youth

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

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

The concept of boundary work draws attention to the fuzzy and fluid boundaries of age-based categories, and the constant work that gives these artificial boundaries the gloss of fixity and puts them beyond question. It is precisely these boundaries that are poorly covered in childhood and youth studies. The work of Sally McNamee and Julie Seymour (2013) suggests that research on age-based categories gravitates to the centre. On the basis of a review of 320 articles published between 1993 and 2010 in three leading childhood journals, they conclude that the scholarly attention is

175 unevenly distributed across the age range the journals claim to cover: the
176 articles most commonly report about 10–12 year olds, there is very little
177 coverage of the 'under 5s' and also relatively little attention to young peo-
178 ple aged 17 years and older. If, however, the objective is to understand
179 how age-based categories affect the lived experiences of being young, it
180 is of methodological importance to work across age boundaries. This is
181 of particular importance in relation to phenomena such as migration and
182 sex work that typically straddle (inter)national boundaries between age of
183 minority and majority (O'Connell Davidson 2005; Huijsmans 2015a: 18).

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

202   The third axis of analysis in Thelen et al's scheme (2014) is the embed-
203 dedness of actors. As Karuna Morarji's contribution illustrates, even
204 within one locality various actors are situated in very different webs of
205 social relations. The teachers who work in the remote mountainous areas
206 of Northern India position themselves firmly as agents of the modernising
207 project of mass education. This allows them to mobilise starkly different
208 relational modalities then the rural students and their parents. Through
209 mass schooling and (rural-to-urban) migration, young rural folk become
210 embedded in relational fields other than the place-based community and
211 kinship relations they have been raised into. Young people experience first-
212 hand the conflicts and contradictions between the different ways they are
213 embedded in these respective social fields. They respond to this with a

search for 'balance'. The precise shape such balancing takes would depend however on the extent to which they are able to mobilise some of the social relations they are embedded in. Here, Morarji's chapter underscores the importance of viewing the embeddedness of actors not only through a generational lens but also through a gender lens. She shows that modern schooling is perceived to have a very different effect on, and offering possibilities for, young men as opposed to their female peers. Although the importance of the intersection between gender and generation transpires from virtually all contributions, this is perhaps most powerfully illustrated by Sharada Srinivasan on the basis of her research in a southern Indian study context characterised by 'daughter aversion'. She demonstrates that in their 'bargaining with patriarchy' young women have little other option than to mobilise another set of exploitative relations: the capitalist forces underpinning the Sumangali scheme. Submitting to capital to exploit their youthful, feminine labour power allows them to delay marriage, attain additional schooling, and save for a dowry (compare with Mills 1999; Utrata 2011).

Beyond Categorisation: Age and Generation as Relational Concepts

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

Responding to Hopkins and Pains' critique comes with methodological implications. Childhood and youth researchers have long argued for child and youth friendly, or -centred methods (Punch 2002a; Alderson and Morrow 2004). The chapters in this volume, however, are rather characterised by research that *decentres* adults. Adults, in their various capacities like teachers, parents, employers, social workers, researchers, are deliberately included in the research, while simultaneously creating the space for children and young people's own experiences and perspectives on matters (see also Hoang and Yeoh 2015; Punch 2016: 188). Where

possible, research was conducted in so-called 'natural settings' in order to capture how generational relations work in practice, be it on the streets of Addis Ababa, secondary schools in Northern Vietnam, health clinics in Ecuador, or a Sufi centre in Kall, Germany.

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

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

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

Understanding Age

Despite the centrality of the idea of age in childhood and youth studies, and in development practice too, it is seldom subject to much conceptual scrutiny (Laz 1998: 85; Thorne 2004: 404). Cheryl Laz (1998: 86) argues that age 'involves much more than the number of years since one's birth' leading her to argue that 'age is not natural or fixed'.

Chronological Age

When the term 'age' is used, this often refers to its chronological conceptualisation; the figure identifying the number of (Gregorian) calendar years that have passed since birth. Taking issue with an understanding of age as 'a chronological fact and as something every individual simply *is*', Laz (1998: 85, original emphasis) calls for a sociology of age:

> …in which we theorize and study empirically how age as a concept and insti-
> tution is created, maintained, challenged, and transformed; how assump-
> tions and beliefs about age in general and about particular age categories
> inform and are reinforced by social statuses, norms, roles, institutions, and
> social structures; and how age patterns individual lives and experiences even
> as individuals accomplish age. (Laz 1998: 90)

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

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

323 so (Huijsmans 2015b), while simultaneously providing chronological age
324 with new meanings, possibilities (Boellstorff 2008: 122; Alexander 2014),
325 and risks (Kierkegaard 2008).

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

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

341   Next, students explain to one another why they were struggling with
342 some answers and had no problems with others (which usually is the case).
343   Should there be any Korean students or other East Asian students who
344 are aware of traditional age systems, the first question already challenges
345 the singularity of chronological age.[4] The second and third question shed
346 light on what in some places are very important biographical data (e.g.
347 used in name-giving or in astrology to calculate auspicious dates or iden-
348 tify suitable marriage partners) yet virtually unknown by lots of people in
349 other contexts. The fourth question turns the spotlight onto 'relative age'
350 (Huijsmans 2014a). In many parts of the world, it is in everyday interac-
351 tions often more important to be aware of differences in relative age (i.e.
352 whether one is older or younger) than the precise chronological age. This
353 is evident from the use of different personal pronouns depending on rela-
354 tive positions in relations of seniority between individuals (Enfield 2007;
355 Szymańska-Matusiewicz 2014).[5] The fifth question refers to the concept
356 of 'social age'. Christina Clark-Kazak (2009: 1310) has defined social age
357 as 'the socially constructed meanings applied to physical development and
358 roles attributed to infants, children, young people, adults and elders, as

well as their intra- and inter-generational relationships' (for a concrete   359
application see Huijsmans 2010: Chap. 5). Although (inter)national defi-   360
nitions of childhood and youth define these life phases firmly in chrono-   361
logical terms (Herrera 2006), in everyday contexts however social age has   362
a strong performative dimension and is always contextual, embodied, and   363
gendered (Laz 1998; Huijsmans and Baker 2012: 935; Huijsmans 2013).[6]   364

Interpreting Generation   365

Unlike the concept of age, generation in its various interpretations *has*   366
received its share of attention in the relevant recent literature (e.g. Koning   367
1997; Alanen 2001; Edmunds and Turner 2005; Cole and Durham 2007;   368
Herrera and Bayat 2010; Jeffrey 2010; Naafs and White 2012; Punch   369
2016). Although age and generation are sometimes used interchangeably,   370
they are conceptually distinct even though some interpretations of gen-   371
eration presuppose a concept of age. The preceding discussion has illus-   372
trated that age is foremost a principle of social differentiation (La Fontaine   373
1978). In its various conceptualisations, age is helpful in understanding   374
some of the relations of power shaping everyday interactions between   375
individuals. In addition, at a macro-level age is a key variable employed   376
in policies and social analysis. Generation, on the other hand, is useful   377
for understanding how societies are structured on the basis of age-based   378
groupings and how this may relate to larger processes of change and con-   379
tinuity (Thorne 2004: 404).   380

Kinship Descent   381

In the kinship descent interpretation of generation, generation refers   382
mostly to parent–child relations. This interpretation of generation has   383
proven useful for conceptualising the generational dimension of intra-   384
household relations (Xu 2015). For example, it can be recognised in   385
Samantha Punch's work (2002b, 2015) on the idea of 'negotiated and   386
constrained interdependencies'; a critique to conventional youth transi-   387
tion models which view young people as moving in a fairly unconstrained   388
and linear manner from a condition of dependence to one of indepen-   389
dence. The idea of generation as kinship descent also transpires through   390
the notion of the 'inter-generational contract' (Hoddinott 1992; Kabeer   391
2000; Whitehead et al. 2007; Evans 2015).   392

The idea of interdependence and the inter-generational contract may   393
be understood in relation to the nuclear family residing in the same   394

395 locality. Yet, it can also be employed in the context of differently com-
396 posed and dispersed family formations (e.g. Sayibu, this volume Carsten
397 2004; Mazzucato and Schans 2011) and possibly to fictive kinship forma-
398 tions entirely outside of any conventional understanding of the household
399 as Sarada Balagopalan's (2014: 142–145) work on street children suggests
400 (see also Belay, this volume Heinonen 2013). In modalities of kinship
401 descent the generational positions, such as child and parent, are perma-
402 nent locations regardless of people's chronological age. However, as both
403 children and their parents age their rights and obligations to one another
404 shift within the loose frame of the inter-generational contract (Huijsmans
405 2010: 129–130). It is at this point that we see how generation in its inter-
406 pretation of kinship descent overlaps with generation as a life phase situ-
407 ated in a generational order. It is further important to note that the loose
408 set of generational relations comprising the intergenerational contract and
409 negotiated interdependence is always gendered and subject to reinterpre-
410 tation as circumstances change—something which is especially evident in
411 the context of migration (Mazzucato et al. 2006; Punch 2007; Huijsmans
412 2013, 2014a; Hoang and Yeoh 2015; Punch 2015).

413 *Life Phase*
414 In contrast to generation as kinship descent, generation as a life phase
415 directs the analytical gaze towards the interplay between institutional
416 dimensions and individual biographies.[7] Närvänen and Näsman (2004:
417 84) explain that 'age-related life phases, such as childhood, come into
418 being through complex processes and are institutionalized but can also
419 change over time'. Although the phrase institutionalisation often refers
420 to forces of the state Anoop Nayak and Mary Jane Kehily (2013: 12)
421 note that 'contemporary Western childhood cannot be read outside of
422 market forces but is constituted in and through relations of capital'. Poor
423 people in poor countries have long been recognised as an important con-
424 sumer base and recently been 'rediscovered' in terms of 'the bottom of
425 the pyramid' (Kolk et al. 2013). Nayak and Kehily's claim, thus, is unlikely
426 to be limited to the West (for an early hint into this direction see White
427 1996: 830). However, the little research that critically investigates the role
428 of consumption and the market in the constitution of young lives tends
429 to be limited to the life phase of youth (e.g. Lukose 2005; Beazley and
430 Chakraborty 2008).
431   Närvänen and Näsman (2004: 85) stress that life phases are relational
432 because they define each other within 'the framework of their relative

positions in the life course as a whole'. Such a life course perspective sits uncomfortably in both childhood and youth studies because it is seen as inviting a reductionist view on children and youth as 'becomings'. Yet, especially in relation to development, a hesitant engagement with the becoming part of being young must be reconsidered. It delimits the analytical scope as it means losing sight of how the temporal dimension of development interacts with the embodied and gendered experience of being young and growing up (Cole and Durham 2008).

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

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

472 perceived as out of sync with the gendered opportunity structures girls
473 growing up in poverty have become aware of.

474 Generation in its interpretation of life phase is also associated with the
475 idea of transitions (i.e. school-to-work transitions). Transition thinking
476 has been especially influential in questions concerning youth in devel-
477 opment (Camfield 2011). This is illustrated by the World Bank's 2007
478 World Development Report framed around the idea of 'youth transitions'
479 (World Bank 2006) and the International Labour Office's school-to-
480 work transition survey (e.g. Elder 2014). The linearity and directional-
481 ity of many youth transitions models has been a subject to substantial
482 critique. Scholars like Johanna Wyn and Rob White (1997: 97–8), for
483 example, argue the importance of adding a 'vertical perspective' to the
484 idea of youth transition in order to capture generational continuities in
485 terms of class, ethnicity, religion and gender (see also Mills, this volume).
486 They further note that the metaphor of 'transitions' suggests a landscape
487 of 'pathways' leading to a certain destination (adulthood). Even if these
488 institutional 'pathways' are well trodden by many, they are often invisible
489 or inaccessible to others (ibid1997: 99; Punch 2015). A more relational
490 and non-teleological understanding of how young people develop their
491 lives is found in the idea of 'vital conjunctures' (Johnson-Hanks 2002),
492 emphasising the importance of understanding key life course events as
493 indeterminant and multi-directional. Similarly, the concept of 'social navi-
494 gation' (Vigh 2009) sheds light on how in conditions of extreme volatil-
495 ity people make decisions in relation to potential possibilities and risks
496 (instead of established 'pathways'). These conceptual contributions are all
497 critical of the linearity and determinacy of conventional transition models
498 without, however, throwing out the idea of life phases and the life course.

499 When life phases are attributed particular properties and set within the
500 inflexible frame of chronological age this produces something that we may
501 call 'age-normativity: certain rights, responsibilities, and places, as well as
502 the evaluation of the appropriateness of particular activities carried out by
503 young people, become normatively (dis)associated to life phases demar-
504 cated by the universal measure of chronological age' (Huijsmans 2015a:
505 10). Development policies often breathe age-normativity (i.e. World Bank
506 2006). This is not necessarily bad news. In fact, it has led to an increase
507 in social services targeted at specific age-based populations (the young,
508 but also the old) such as the *Education for All* campaign (Gerber and
509 Huijsmans 2016) and programmes aimed at protecting the development
510 and survival of the very young (Myers and Bourdillon 2012: 438). At the

same time though, age-normativity pathologises young lives that do not conform with such globalised middle-class ideas of age-appropriate behaviour, often with adverse effects as critical research on children's work, young people's migration and teenage motherhood has shown (Liebel 2004; Wilson and Huntington 2006; Howard 2014; Maconachie and Hilson 2016). Importantly, the voices of young people living their lives in contradiction to normative ideas about childhood and youth remain mostly excluded from policy making and programmatic interventions, not in the least because institutional contexts and other dimensions of positionality often have a normalising effect on such voices (Montgomery 2007: 421; Spyrou 2011: 155).

Mannheim

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

Given development studies' concern with social transformation, the Mannheimian interpretation of generation has much immediate intuitive

appeal—and indeed, the generationally marked use of social media and digital technologies only adds to this (Barendregt 2008; Shah and Abraham 2009; Mesch and Talmud 2010; Ezbawy 2012; Meek 2012; Buckingham et al. 2014; Huijsmans and Trần Thị Hà Lan 2015).[8] While the Mannheimian interpretation of generation also echoes through the widely used development slogan of 'youth as agents of change', there are also questions and concerns.

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

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

As all tables, Table 1.1 is not more than a heuristic device. The various interpretations of generation flow into one another (Vanderbeck and Worth 2015: 2) and are here separated for analytical purposes only. For example, the life phase understanding of generation overlaps with the

Table 1.1   Concepts of generation and age in relational approaches to childhood and youth

Interpretation of 'generation'	Pre-supposing concepts of age	Relationality	Clustering 'age' conceptually with	Examples	
Kinship descent	Relative age, social age	Relations between household members (possibly spatially dispersed and fictive kin)	Kinship, gender, generational reciprocity, negotiation, socialisation, parenting, childing, the home	Parent-child and sibling relations, intra-household bargaining	t1.1 t1.2 t1.3 t1.4 t1.5 t1.6 t1.7 t1.8 t1.9 t1.10 t1.11 t1.12
Life phase	Chronological age, social age	Relation between social institutions and individual biographies	Social institutions and norms, consumption and market forces, gender, age-based identities, place, life course, transitions, performativity	Youth transitions, schooling, children's work	t1.13 t1.14 t1.15 t1.16 t1.17 t1.18 t1.19 t1.20 t1.21
Mannheimian understanding of generation	Social age, chronological age	Relation between the coming of age of a cohort, and the possible formation of generationally distinct political subjectivities, with events in historical time	Historical events, media and communication technologies, collective generational identities, sub-cultures, movements, resistance	Youth sub-cultures, post-Apartheid generation in South Africa, Đổi Mới generation (economic reform in Vietnam)	t1.22 t1.23 t1.24 t1.25 t1.26 t1.27 t1.28 t1.29 t1.30 t1.31 t1.32

idea of social age. What sets the two apart is less empirical than analytical and thus defined by the questions we ask and the conceptual frames we employ. Furthermore, conceptual innovation is often achieved by working across different interpretations. For example, Samantha Punch's (2015) notion of 'negotiated and constrained interdependencies' for understanding youth transitions combines the idea of generation as a life phase and generation in terms of kinship descent.

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

AU1

597 studies specific substance to Thelen et al.'s (2014) relational framework.
598 More specifically, it provides a conceptual basis for different ways of
599 understanding the idea of generational modalities, a starting point for how
600 'boundary' work might look like in relation to different concepts of age,
601 and together this sheds light on how to understand the embeddedness of
602 actors in generational and age-related terms.

603   APPROACHING DEVELOPMENT

604 Development is a highly contested concept and the study of development
605 has branched out into various intellectual directions (Thomas 2000).
606 Within this scholarly landscape, the approach to development informing
607 this book can best be described as people-centred and empirically rooted
608 in the everyday. This means that local lives, structures, and processes are
609 taken as the starting point for explaining why things work the way they do
610 (Rigg 2007: 7–8).
611   A focus on the everyday is explicitly relation; the messy, fluid, and net-
612 worked characteristics of the everyday amount to unmaking the seemingly
613 fixed and clear-cut categories that inform so much scholarly work on chil-
614 dren and youth (Balagopalan 2014: 183) and development too (Mosse
615 2005). This does not mean that I consider the local scale and the every-
616 day in isolation from larger structures, relations, and histories—quite the
617 contrary. Drawing on the ethnography of development and globalisation,
618 I treat the local and the global as constantly interacting, co-constituting
619 (Appadurai 1996: 32; Katz 2004; Maira and Soep 2005; Mosse 2005),
620 and historically particular (Morrison 2015; Huijsmans 2016; Woronov
621 2016). In this view the everyday, even in out-of-the-way places, is drawing
622 on Charles Piot (1999), 'remotely global'.
623   In line with contemporary approaches to development studies
624 (McMichael 2004) and practice (United Nations 2016), this volume
625 adopts a global approach. Next to the more conventional case studies,
626 this volume, thus, includes three chapters based on research conducted in
627 the Global North and a chapter that concentrates on the global develop-
628 ment framework of the Sustainable Development Goals. The chapter by
629 Sara Vida Coumans concentrates on the Dutch debate about regulating
630 sex work. Since 'sexual and reproductive health and rights' is one of the
631 four central themes of Dutch development cooperation it is worthwhile
632 unravelling the specific ideas underpinning the Dutch debate as these are
633 likely to have an effect on Dutch development cooperation on this theme.

The chapter by Elyse Mills addresses the challenges faced by Canadians aspiring to become 'young farmers'. The generational problem of farming is receiving much attention in research in the global South (e.g. White 2012). Mills' work shows that the dynamics that exclude many young people from farming futures in the Global South, especially the increase in large-scale, capital intensive agriculture, are not very different in the Canadian context. International migration is one of the factors that have reconfigured the geographies of development. This is vividly illustrated by Mahardhika Sjamsoeoed Sadjad, who, as a young, female, Muslim, Indonesian researcher reflects on her research encounters with young Dutch Muslims from migrant backgrounds as part of her MA in Development Studies. She not only makes a strong case for attending to positionality in the relational exercise of doing research, her work also contributes to redrawing the geographical boundaries of development studies.

STRUCTURE OF THE BOOK

Next follow 12 full chapters and a commentary by Nicola Ansell. Part I of the book ('theorising age and generation in young lives') starts off with a chapter by Jason Hart that argues the importance of attending to 'age-position' in studying and working with young refugees. He draws on four different interpretations of the notion of generation and develops and illustrates these with reference to his work with young Palestinian refugees in Jordan. Hart argues that attending to age-position is important for appreciating the historicity of young refugee lives as well as to comprehend the forces that shape and reshape the particular needs and aspirations of young male refugees. Sara Vida Coumans' contribution takes us to the Netherlands. Drawing on recent policy debates about the increase of minimum age of prostitution, she explores two very different dimensions of age that shape sex work and vividly illustrates the idea of 'boundary work' in relation to age (Thelen et al. 2014). Chronological age dominates in policy discussions, yet it is the corporeal dimension of age that matters in sex work as practice. Coumans' chapter also shows that age, in its various, conceptualisations never works in isolation but always intersects with other relations of social differentiation such as gender. Elyse Mills furthers the theme of intersectionality in her chapter on becoming a young farmer in Nova Scotia, Canada, by analysing the interaction between age and social class. This leads her to propose the idea of 'age-class', which shows that

671 Canadian policies meant to support young people in becoming a young
672 farmer are of little use for large groups of (aspiring) young farmers. She
673 also emphasises the importance of the collective agency of young farm-
674 ers' organisations especially for (aspiring) young farmers from middle-class
675 and lower-class backgrounds both in terms of a support structure as well as
676 a lobbying organisation for rethinking agrarian futures. Part I closes with
677 Christina Clark-Kazak's chapter. She employs the concept of social age
678 and the idea of 'age-mainstreaming' as lenses to critically assess the way
679 age has been incorporated in the Sustainable Development Goals.
680   Part II of the book coheres around 'everyday relationalities: school,
681 work and belonging'. On the basis of ethnographic research in two second-
682 ary schools in the Northern Vietnamese city of Haiphong, Paul Horton
683 unravels the generational dimension of school bullying. Countering per-
684 spectives that understand school bullying at the level of individual chil-
685 dren, Horton proposes that school bullying is deeply connected to the
686 ways power works in the generational organisation of the school and that
687 some students learn to utilise bullying in such a context as a means to
688 influence the behaviour of others. In both Degwale Belay's and Wedadu
689 Sayibu's contribution, the street is treated as an important everyday space
690 and a key site of children's work. The street is an important meeting place
691 for different 'relational modalities' (Thelen et al. 2014) as various reg-
692 isters of meaning interact (Gigengack 2014). This renders street-based
693 work deeply relational. The two chapters also show that children's street-
694 based work is intricately connected to the wider, gendered and genera-
695 tionally organised street-based urban economy. The chapters refute quick
696 generalisations about children's street-based work. Shoe-shining, lottery
697 vending, and accompanying blind adult beggars constitute very different
698 relational modalities, subject to different moral registers, set within dif-
699 ferent economic relations and presenting their own set of vulnerabilities
700 and opportunities. Mahardhika Sjamsoeoed Sadjad's chapter closes part
701 II with a discussion of the relationality of the idea of home and belong-
702 ing drawing on research with Dutch Muslim youth with migrant back-
703 grounds. Her auto-ethnographic contribution brings out in vivid detail
704 the important, yet too little acknowledged, relational dimension of doing
705 research. Sadjad's reflection on her positionality also extends Hart's (this
706 volume) discussion of the idea of 'having been' (in addition 'being' and
707 'becoming') in research with children and young people.
708   Part III of the book is themed 'negotiating development'. It shows
709 how development interventions reshape generational landscapes and how

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

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

Children and young people are central to questions of development.
This argument is mostly made in reference to demographic data show-
ing that especially in poorer parts of the world typically a large share of

Author's Proof

the population falls in the childhood and youth category (Ansell 2005: 3; World Bank 2006: 4). The relational perspective running through the chapters of this book demands adjusting this oft-repeated argument. Although sheer numbers matter, 'generationing' development is ultimately an analytical exercise.[9] Research with and on children and youth constitutes a unique window on processes of social change and continuity for the ways in which the temporal dimension of development interacts with the embodied and gendered experience of being young and growing up (Cole and Durham 2008; MacDonald 2011; Woronov 2016). Similarly, processes of development are key for childhood and youth studies precisely because development plays out in generational landscapes. Thereby, development transforms the opportunities structures shaping young lives, reshuffles the parameters within which young people negotiate their generational position and within which they give new meaning to the very idea of childhood and youth. The chapters in this volume thus stimulate further thinking on how ideas of age and generation help coming to grips with development as a generational process—especially, though not exclusively, in how it pertains to children and young people.

Notes

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

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

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

4. In the Korean age system (co-existing in Korea with a chronological system based on calendar years from birth), a newborn baby is

considered one year of age at birth and turns two on the first day of   786
the New Year (Gregorian calendar).   787

5. Age is an important marker of seniority, but at times this may be   788
   overruled by other markers of rank such as religious status, kin ship   789
   relations, class or nationality.   790

6. Virginia Morrow (2013: 152) refers in this respect to the idea of   791
   'functional age'.   792

7. The idea of generation as life phase has several points of overlap with   793
   the notion of social age discussed above. Yet, what sets the two apart   794
   is that the idea of life phase implies the larger framework of the life   795
   course. Social age, on the other hand, does not necessarily mobilise   796
   such a larger generational order as it foregrounds subjectivities and   797
   performativity.   798

8. Note here also the branding of cohorts into generational identities   799
   for commercial purposes, as is illustrated by the frequent use of   800
   terms like 'generation X', 'generation Y', etc., in the marketing   801
   literature.   802

9. The term 'generationing' has been defined by Mayall (2002: 27) as   803
   'the relational process whereby people come to be known as chil-   804
   dren, and whereby children and childhood acquire certain charac-   805
   teristics'. Clearly, the idea of 'generationing' is by no means limited   806
   to children and youth.   807

REFERENCES   808

Alanen, L. (2001). Explorations in generational analysis. In L. Alanen & B. Mayall   809
(Eds.), *Conceptualizing child-adult relations* (pp. 11–22). London/New York: 810
RoutledgeFalmer.   811

Alderson, P., & Morrow, V. (2004). *Ethics, social research and consulting with chil-*   812
dren and young people. Ilford/Essex: Barnardo's.   813

Alexander, P. (2014). Learning to act your age: 'Age imaginaries' and media con-   814
sumption in an English secondary school. In D. Buckingham, S. Bragg, &   815
M. J. Kehily (Eds.), *Youth cultures in the age of global media* (pp. 136–149).   816
Basingstoke/New York: Palgrave Macmillan.   817

Amit-Talai, V., & Wulff, H. (Eds.) (1995). *Youth cultures: A crosscultural perspec-*   818
tive. London/New York: Routledge.   819

Ansell, N. (2005). *Children, youth and development.* London/New York: 820
Routledge.   821

Ansell, N. (2009). Childhood and the politics of scale: Descaling children's geog-   822
raphies? *Progress in Human Geography, 33*(2), 190–109.   823

Appadurai, A. (1996). *Modernity at large: cultural dimensions of globalization.* Minneapolis/London: University of Minnesota Press.

Ariès, P. (1962). *Centuries of childhood: A social history of family life.* Vintage Books/Random House: New York.

Balagopalan, S. (2014). *Inhabiting 'childhood': Children, labour and schooling in postcolonial India.* Basingstoke/New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Barendregt, B. (2008). Sex, cannibals, and the language of cool: Indonesian tales of the phone and modernity. *The Information Society, 24*(3), 160–170.

Beazley, H., & Chakraborty, K. (2008). Cool consumption: Rasta, punk and Bollywood on the streets of Yogyakarta, Indonesia and Kolkata, India. In U. M. Rodrigues & B. Smaill (Eds.), *Youth, media and culture in the Asia Pacific region* (pp. 195–214). Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Boellstorff, T. (2008). *Coming of age in second life: An anthropologist explores the virtually human.* Princeton/Oxford: Princeton University Press.

Bourdillon, M. F. C., White, B., & Myers, W. E. (2009). Re-assessing minimum age standards for children's work. *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy, 29*(3/4).

Boyden, J., & Zharkevich, I. (forthcoming). The impact of development on children. In H. Callan (Ed.), *International encyclopedia of anthropology: Anthropology beyond text.* New York: Wiley Blackwell.

Boyden, J., Dercon, S., & Singh, A. (2015). Child development in a changing world: Risks and opportunities. *The World Bank Research Observer, 30*(2), 193–219.

Buckingham, D., Bragg, S., & Kehily, M. J. (Eds.) (2014). *Youth cultures in the age of global media.* Basingstoke/New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Camfield, L. (2011). Editorial: Young lives in transition: From school to adulthood? *European Journal of Development Research, 23*(5), 669–678.

Carsten, J. (2004). *After Kinship.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Christensen, P., & James, A. (Eds.) (2000). *Research with children: Perspectives and practices.* London/New York: RoutledgeFalmer.

Christie, R. (2015). Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and indigenous peoples' literacy in Cambodia: Erosion of sovereignty? *Nations and Nationalism, 21*(2), 250–269.

Clark-Kazak, C. R. (2009). Towards a working definition and application of social age in international development studies. *Journal of International Development, 45*(8), 1307–1324.

Cole, J., & Durham, D. (Eds.) (2007). *Generations and globalization: Youth, age, and family in the new world economy.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Cole, J., & Durham, D. (2008). Globalization and the temporality of children and youth. In J. Cole & D. Durham (Eds.), *Figuring the future: Globalization and the temporalities of children and youth* (pp. 3–23). Santa Fe: School for Advanced Research Press.

Corsten, M. (1999). The time of generations. *Time & Society, 8*(2-3), 249–272.

Côté, J. E. (2014). Towards a new political economy of youth. *Journal of Youth Studies, 17*(4), 527–543.

Edmunds, J., & Turner, B. S. (2005). Global generations: Social change in the twentieth century. *The British Journal of Sociology, 56*(4), 559–577.

Elder, S. (2014). *Labour market transitions of young women and men in Asia and the Pacific, Work4Youth publication series no. 19*. Geneva: International Labour Office, Mastercard Foundation.

Enfield, N. J. (2007). Meaning of the unmarked: How 'default' person reference does more than just refer. In N. J. Enfield & T. Stivers (Eds.), *Person reference in interaction: Linguistic, cultural and social perspectives* (pp. 97–120). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Evans, G. (1998). *The politics of ritual and remembrance: Laos since 1975*. Chiang Mai: Silkworm Books.

Evans, R. (2015). Negotiating intergenerational relations and care in diverse African contexts. In R. Vanderbeck & N. Worth (Eds.), *Intergenerational space* (pp. 199–213). London/New York: Routledge.

Ezbawy, Y. A. (2012). The role of youth's new protest movements in the January 25th revolution. *IDS Bulletin, 43*(1), 26–36.

Gerber, N., & Huijsmans, R. (2016). From access to post-access concerns: Rethinking inclusion in education through children's everyday school attendance in rural Malaysia. In C. Hunner-Kreisel & S. Bohne (Eds.), *Childhood, youth and migration: Connecting global and local perspectives*. Dordrecht: Springer.

Gigengack, R. (2014). 'Beyond discourse and competence: Science and subjugated knowledge in street children studies.' *the European Journal of Development Research* 26(2): 264–282.

Goddard, V., & White, B. (1982). Special issue: Child workers and capitalist development. *Development & Change, 13*(4), 465–652.

Gottlieb, A. (2004). *The afterlife is where we come from: The culture of infancy in western Africa*. Chicago/London: University of Chicago Press.

Grieg, B. (1994). Invisible hands: The political economy of child labour in colonial Zimbabwe, 1890-1930. *Journal of Southern African Studies, 20*(1), 27–52.

Hanson, K., & Nieuwenhuys, O. (Eds.) (2013). *Reconceptualizing children's rights in international development: Living rights, social justice, translations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hart, J. (2008). *Business as usual? The global political economy of childhood poverty, Young lives technical note no. 13*. Oxford: Young Lives, Department of International Development, University of Oxford.

Heinonen, P. (2013). *Youth gangs & street children: Culture, nurture and masculinity in Ethiopia*. New York/Oxford: Berghahn.

Herrera, L. (2006). What's new about youth? *Development & Change, 37*(6), 1425–1434.

Herrera, L., & Bayat, A. (Eds.) (2010). *Being young and Muslim: New cultural politics in the global south and north*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.

Hoang, L. A., & Yeoh, B. S. A. (2015). Children's agency and its contradictions in the context of transnational labour migration from Vietnam. *Global Networks, 15*(2), 180–197.

Hoddinott, J. (1992). Rotten kids or manipulative parents: Are children old age security in western Kenya? *Economic Development & Cultural Change, 40*(3), 545–565.

Honwana, A., & De Boeck, F. (Eds.) (2005). *Makers and breakers: Children and youth in postcolonial Africa*. London: James Currey.

Hopkins, P., & Hill, M. (2010). Contested bodies of asylum-seeking children. In K. Hörschelmann & R. Colls (Eds.), *Contested bodies of childhood and youth* (pp. 136–147). Basingstoke/New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Hopkins, P., & Pain, R. (2007). Geographies of age: Thinking relationally. *Area, 39*(3), 287–294.

Howard, N. (2014). Teenage labor migration and antitrafficking policy in West Africa. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 653*(1), 124–140.

Huijsmans, R.B.C. (2010). *Migrating children, households, and the post-socialist state: An ethnographic study of migration and non-migration by children and youth in an ethnic Lao village.' Department of Geography*. Unpublished PhD thesis. Durham, Durham University.

Huijsmans, R. (2011). The theatre of human trafficking: A global discourse on Lao stages. *International Journal of Social Quality, 1*(2), 66–84.

Huijsmans, R. (2013). Doing gendered age': Older mothers and migrant daughters negotiating care work in rural Lao PDR and Thailand. *Third World Quarterly, 34*(10), 1896–1910.

Huijsmans, R. (2014a). Becoming a young migrant or stayer seen through the lens of 'householding': Households 'in flux' and the intersection of relations of gender and seniority. *Geoforum, 51*, 294–304.

Huijsmans, R. (2014b). Gender, masculinity, and safety in the changing Lao-Thai migration landscape. In T.-D. Truong, D. Gasper, J. Handmaker, & S. I. Bergh (Eds.), *Migration, gender and social justice: Perspectives on human security* (pp. 333–349). Heidelberg/New York/Dordrecht/London: Springer.

Huijsmans, R. (2015a). Children and young people in migration: A relational approach. In C. N. Laoire, A. White, & T. Skelton (Eds.), *Movement, mobilities and journeys* (p. 6). Singapore: Springer.

Huijsmans, R. (2015b). Youth, phones and companies: Impressions from Southeast Asia. *8th conference of the European Association for Southeast Asian Studies (EuroSEAS)*. Vienna,11–14 August.

Huijsmans, R. (2016). Critical geopolitics of child and youth migration in (post) socialist laos. In M. C. Benwell & P. Hopkins (Eds.), *Children, young people and critical geopolitics* (pp. 139–154). Farnham: Ashgate.

Huijsmans, R., & Baker, S. (2012). Child trafficking: 'Worst Form' of child labour, or worst approach to young migrants? *Development and Change, 43*(4), 919–946.

Huijsmans, R., & Lan, T. T. H. (2015). Enacting nationalism through youthful mobilities? Youth, mobile phones and digital capitalism in a Lao-Vietnamese borderland. *Nations and Nationalism, 21*(2), 209–229.

Huijsmans, R., George, S., Gigengack, R., & Evers, S. J. T. M. (2014). Introduction. Theorising age and generation in development: A relational approach. *European Journal of Development Research, 26*(2), 163–174.

Izzi, V. (2013). Just keeping them busy? youth employment projects as a peace-building tool. *International Development Planning Review, 35*(2), 103–117.

Jeffrey, C. (2010). *Timepass: Youth, class, and the politics of waiting in India*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Jeffrey, C., Jeffery, P., & Jeffery, R. (2008). *Degrees without freedom: Education, masculinities and unemployment in North India*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Johnson-Hanks, J. (2002). On the limits of life stages in ethnography: Toward a theory of vital conjunctions. *American Anthropologist, 104*(3), 865–880.

Jones, M. (2009). Phase space: Geography, relational thinking, and beyond. *Progress in Human Geography, 33*(4), 487–506.

Kabeer, N. (2000). Intergenerational-contracts, demographic transitions, and the 'quantity-quality' tradeoff: Parents, children and investing in the future. *Journal of International Development, 12*(4), 463–482.

Katz, C. (2004). *Growing up global: Economic restructuring and children's every-day lives*. Minneapolis/London: University of Minnesota Press.

Kierkegaard, S. (2008). Cybering, online grooming and ageplay. *Computer Law & Security Review, 24*(1), 41–55.

Kolk, A., Rivera-Santos, M., & Rufín, C. (2013). Reviewing a decade of research on the "Base/Bottom of the Pyramid" (BOP) concept. *Business & Society, 53*, 338–377.

Koning, J. (1997). Generations of change: A Javanese village in the 1990s. *Faculteit der Politieke en Sociaal-Culturele Wetenschappen*. PhD thesis. Amsterdam, University of Amsterdam.

Kraftl, P. (2013). Beyond 'voice', beyond 'agency', beyond 'politics'? Hybrid childhoods and some critical reflections on children's emotional geographies. *Emotion, Space and Society, 9*, 13–23.

La Fontaine, J. S. (Ed.) (1978). *Sex and age as principles of social differentiation*. London/New York/San Francisco: Academic.

Lall, M., & Vickers, E. (Eds.) (2009). *Education as a political tool in Asia*. London/New York: Routledge.

993   Laz, C. (1998). Act your age. *Sociological Forum, 13*(1), 85–113.
994   Liebel, M. (2004). *A will of their own: Cross-cultural perspectives on working chil-*
995   *dren*. London/New York: Zed Books.
996   Lukose, R. (2005). Consuming globalization: Youth and gender in Kerala, India.
997   *Journal of Social History, 38*(4), 915–935.
998   MacDonald, R. (2011). Youth transitions, unemployment and underemployment:
999   Plus ça change, plus c'est la même chose. *Journal of Sociology, 47*(4), 427–444.
1000   Maconachie, R., & Hilson, G. (2016). Rethinking the child labor 'problem' in
1001   rural Sub-Saharan Africa: The case of Sierra Leone's half shovels. *World*
1002   *Development, 78*, 136–147.
1003   Maira, S., & Soep, E. (Eds.) (2005). *Youthscapes: The popular, the national, the*
1004   *global*. University of Pennsylvania Press: Philadelphia.
1005   Mannheim, K. (1952). *Essays on the sociology of knowledge*. London: RKP.
1006   Mayall, B. (2002). *Towards a sociology for childhood: Thinking from children's lives*.
1007   Maidenhead: Open University Press.
1008   Mazzucato, V., & Schans, D. (2011). Transnational families and the well-being of
1009   children: Conceptual and methodological challenges. *Journal of Marriage and*
1010   *Family, 73*(4), 704–712.
1011   Mazzucato, V., Kabki, M., & Smith, L. (2006). Transnational migration and the
1012   economy of funerals: Changing practices in Ghana. *Development and Change,*
1013   *37*(5), 1047–1072.
1014   McMichael, P. (2004). *Development as social change: A global perspective* (3rd ed.).
1015   London: Sage.
1016   McNamee, S., & Seymour, J. (2013). Towards a sociology of 10–12 year olds?
1017   Emerging methodological issues in the 'new' social studies of childhood.
1018   *Childhood, 20*(2), 156–168.
1019   Mead, M. (2001 [1928]). *Coming of age in Samoa: A psychological study of primi-*
1020   *tive youth for western civilisation*. New York: Perennial Classics.
1021   Meek, D. (2012). YouTube and social movements: A phenomenological analysis
1022   of participation, events and cyberspace. *Antipode, 44*(4), 1429–1448.
1023   Melchiorre, A. (2004). *At what age?...are school-children employed, married and*
1024   *taken to court?*. Right to Education Project.
1025   Mesch, G. S., & Talmud, I. (2010). *Wired youth: The social world of adolescence in*
1026   *the information age*. Hove/New York: Routledge.
1027   Mills, M. B. (1999). *Thai women in the global labor force: Consuming desires, con-*
1028   *tested selves*. New Brunswick/London: Rutgers University Press.
1029   Montgomery, H. (2007). Working with child prostitutes in Thailand: Problems of
1030   practice and interpretation. *Childhood, 14*(4), 415–430.
1031   Morrison, H. (2015). *Childhood and colonial modernity in Egypt*. Basingstoke/
1032   New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
1033   Morrow, V. (2013). What's in a number? Unsettling the boundaries of age.
1034   *Childhood, 20*(2), 151–155.

Mosse, D. (2005). *Cultivating development: An ethnography of aid policy and practice*. London/Ann Arbor: Pluto Press.

Mosse, D. (2010). A relational approach to durable poverty, inequality and power. *Journal of Development Studies, 46*(7), 1156–1178.

Myers, W., & Bourdillon, M. (2012). Introduction: Development, children, and protection. *Development in Practice, 22*(4), 437–447.

Naafs, S., & White, B. (2012). Intermediate generations: Reflections on Indonesian youth studies. *The Asia Pacific Journal of Anthropology, 13*(1), 3–20.

Närvänen, A.-L., & Näsman, E. (2004). Childhood as generation or life phase? *Young, 12*(1), 71–91.

Nayak, A., & Kehily, M. J. (2013). *Gender, youth & culture: Global masculinities & femininities* (2nd ed.). Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan.

Nieuwenhuys, O. (1994). *Children's lifeworlds: Gender, welfare and labour in the developing world*. London: Routledge.

O'Connell Davidson, J. (2005). *Children in the global sex trade*. Cambridge/Malden: Polity Press.

Piot, C. (1999). *Remotely global: Village modernity in West Africa*. Chicago/London: The University of Chicago Press.

Proctor, T. M. (2009). *Scouting for girls: A century of girl guides and girl scouts*. Santa Barbara: Greenwood Publishing Group.

Punch, S. (2002a). Research with children: The same or different from research with adults? *Childhood, 9*(3), 321–341.

Punch, S. (2002b). Youth transitions and interdependent adult-child relations in rural Bolivia. *Journal of Rural Studies, 18*(2), 123–133.

Punch, S. (2007). Negotiating migrant identities: Young people in Bolivia and Argentina. *Children's Geographies, 5*(1), 95–112.

Punch, S. (2015). Youth transitions and migration: Negotiated and constrained interdependencies within and across generations. *Journal of Youth Studies, 18*(2), 262–276.

Punch, S. (2016). Exploring children's agency across majority and minority world contexts. In F. Esser, M. S. Baader, T. Betz, & B. Hungerland (Eds.), *Reconceptualising agency and childhood: New perspectives in childhood studies* (pp. 183–196). London: Routledge.

Rigg, J. (2007). *An everyday geography of the global South*. Abingdon/New York: Routledge.

Robson, E., Panelli, R., & Punch, S. (Eds.) (2007). *Global perspectives on rural childhood and youth: Young rural lives*. New York: Taylor & Francis Group.

Scott, J. C. (1998). *Seeing like a state: How certain schemes to improve the human condition have failed*. New Haven/London: Yale University Press.

Semedi, P. (2016). Pramuka: Scouting days of fun. In K. Robinson (Ed.), *Youth identities and social transformations in Modern Indonesia* (pp. 113–129). Leiden/Boston: Brill.

Shah, N., & Abraham, S. (2009). *Digital natives with a cause? A knowledge survey and framework*. Hivos Knowledge Programme Report. The Hague, Bangalore, Humanist Institute for Cooperation with Developing Countries (HIVOS), Centre for Internet and Society.

Sinha-Kerkhoff, K. (2011). Seeing the state through youth policy formation: The case of the state of Jharkhand. *Africa Development, XXXVI*(3&4), 67–88.

Smith, S. H. (2013). In the heart, there's nothing': Unruly youth, generational vertigo and territory. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers, 38*(4), 572–585.

Spyrou, S. (2011). The limits of children's voices: From authenticity to critical, reflexive representation. *Childhood, 18*(2), 151–165.

Streuli, N. (2012). *Children's experiences of Juntos, a conditional cash transfer scheme in Peru, Working paper no. 78*. Oxford: Young Lives, Oxford Department of International Development, University of Oxford.

Szymańska-Matusiewicz, G. (2014). The researcher as 'older sister', 'younger sister' and 'niece': Playing the roles defined by the Vietnamese pronominal reference system. *Qualitative Research, 14*(1), 95–111.

Thelen, T., Vetters, L., & Von Benda-Beckmann, K. (2014). Introduction to stategraphy: Toward a relational anthropology of the state. *Social Analysis, 58*(3), 1–19.

Thomas, A. (2000). Meanings and views of development. In T. Allen & A. Thomas (Eds.), *Poverty and development: Into the 21st century* (pp. 23–48). Oxford: Open University Press with Oxford University Press.

Thorne, B. (2004). Editorial: Theorizing age and other differences. *Childhood, 11*(4), 403–408.

Tisdall, E. K. M., & Punch, S. (2012). Not so 'new'? Looking critically at childhood studies. *Children's Geographies, 10*(3), 249–264.

Twum-Danso Imoh, A., & Ansell, N. (Eds.) (2013). *Children's lives in the era of children's rights: The progress of the convention on the rights of the child in Africa*. London: Routledge.

United Nations. (2016). *Sustainabledevelopment knowledge platform*. Retrieved February 21, 2016, from https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/?menu=1300

Uprichard, E. (2008). Children as 'being and becomings': Children, childhood and temporality. *Children & Society, 22*(4), 303–313.

Utrata, J. (2011). Youth privilege: Doing age and gender in Russia's single-mother families. *Gender & Society, 25*(5), 616–641.

Valentin, K. (2007). Mass mobilization and the struggle over the youth: The role of Ho Chi Minh Communist youth Union in urban Vietnam. *Young, 15*(3), 299–315.

Van Bueren, G. (1995). *The international law on the rights of the child*. The Hague/Boston/London: Save the Children & Martinus Nijhoff Publishers.

Vanderbeck, R. M., & Worth, N. (2015). Introduction. In R. M. Vanderbeck & N. Worth (Eds.), *Intergenerational space* (pp. 1–14). London/New York: Routledge.

Vigh, H. (2006). *Navigating terrains of war: Youth and soldiering in Guinea-Bissau*. Oxford: Berghahn Books.

Vigh, H. (2009). Motion squared: A second look at the concept of social navigation. *Anthropological Theory, 9*(4), 419–438.

Wells, K. (2009). *Childhood in a global perspective*. Cambridge/Malden: Polity Press.

White, B. (1996). Globalization and the child labour problem. *Journal of International Development, 8*(6), 829–839.

White, B. (2012). Agriculture and the generation problem: Rural youth, employment and the future of farming. *IDS Bulletin, 43*(6), 9–19.

Whitehead, A., Hashim, I. M., &Iversen, V. (2007). *Child migration, child agency, and inter-generational relations in Africa and South Asia* (Working paper T24). Brighton, Development Research Centre on Migration, Globalisation & Poverty, Sussex University.

Willis, P. E. (1981). *Learning to labour: How working class kids get working class jobs*. Hampshire: Gower Publishing Company Ltd.

Wilson, H., & Huntington, A. (2006). Deviant (M)others: The construction of teenage motherhood in contemporary discourse. *Journal of Social Policy, 35*(01), 59–76.

World Bank. (2006). *World development report 2007. Development and the next generation*. Washington, DC: The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development/The World Bank.

Woronov, T. E. (2016). *Class work: Vocational schools and China's urban youth*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Worth, N. (2014). Youth, relationality, and space: Conceptual resources for youth studies from critical human geography. In J. Wyn & H. Cahill (Eds.), *Handbook of children and youth studies*. Singapore: Springer.

Wyn, J., & White, R. (1997). *Rethinking youth*. London/Thousand Oaks/New Delhi: Sage.

Xu, Q. (2015). One roof, different dreams. In R. M. Vanderbeck & N. Worth (Eds.), *Intergenerational space* (pp. 183–196). London/New York: Routledge.

Young, M. E. (Ed.) (2007). *Child development from measurement to action: A priority for growth and equity*. Washinghton, DC: The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development/The World Bank.

Young Lives. Young lives: An international study of childhood poverty. From http://www.younglives.org.uk/

Author Query

Chapter No.: 1   0002793870

Queries	Details Required	Author's Response
AU1	The superscript number "7" has been deleted after the sentence "What sets the two apart is less empirical…". Please check.	