2017 has been a busy year for ACYIG. In the spring, we hosted an interdisciplinary conference in partnership with the University of California, Los Angeles’ Center for the Study of International Migration and the Council on Anthropology and Education. With 150 attendees, the interactive conference included a community tour of Los Angeles’ immigrant communities, banquet, art exhibit, workshops, roundtables, 60 paper presentations, and an open forum on political action in the wake of the U.S. presidential election. Keynote Lynn Stephen (U Oregon) presented her recent ethnographic film *Sad Happiness: Cinthya’s Transborder Journey*, and CalArts Center presented their award-winning theatrical performance, *Shelter*, about young people crossing the U.S. border and passing through the U.S. detention system. ACYIG is especially grateful to the board members—Jaymelee Kim (U of Findlay) and Christine El-Ouardani (CSU, Long Beach)—who led this exciting green endeavor, which welcomed attendees from Canada, the U.K., Japan, Israel, Turkey, and Uganda. Additionally, thank you to the ACYIG and CAE volunteers who supported our efforts.

We invite you to get involved at the AAA’s Annual Meeting in Washington, D.C. this November. There are over 20 panels that explore global issues of infancy, childhood, and youth. ACYIG is delighted to sponsor “Futures in Crisis: Contested Childhoods in Global Discourses and Local Articulations” (Thursday, 3-1340) which considers local mediations of global crises through the lens of childhood. Panelists focus on discourses about children’s rights and contestations about children’s futures in order to analyze how global processes are mediated by institutions, organizations, parents, communities, and children themselves. Please visit our conference webpage for a preview of all childhood and youth related panels.

All are welcome to participate in ACYIG’s business meeting at 12:15pm on Friday, December 1st at the Marriott (Delaware Suite A) to learn about new developments and network with your colleagues. We will share details about our next joint-conference with Rutgers University-Camden from March 7th to 9th, 2019. There is swag for business meeting attendees!

Since its inception, ACYIG has benefited from the intellectual labor and sweat equity of many volunteers. A special thank you to outgoing board member Patrick Alexander (Oxford Brookes U), who has long-served ACYIG in various capacities including social media coordinator and most recently the board’s Communications Coordinator. We are grateful for Patrick’s technological savvy and his interest in expanding ACYIG’s global reach. We are also indebted to Dori Beeler (Johns Hopkins U) who has enthusiastically and ably served as our webmaster. ACYIG is only as strong as our active membership and leadership; we invite you to strengthen our efforts by applying for one of our three open board and committee positions.

As part of the board’s planned rotation schedule, we have two Advisory Board positions currently open for self-nomination. Board members play an essential role in representing the interest...
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In my final months as Convener of ACYIG, I reflect on our efforts over the past several years ranging from global conferences, collaborative research networks, vibrant listserv, thriving blog series, the inclusion of a student representative on the board, and our flagship publication Neos. Along with my fellow board members and volunteers past and present, I’m honored to be a part of an organization that promotes the social and political importance of research with children and youth. I look forward to seeing you in D.C.!

MEMBERSHIP UPDATE

Amy Paugh (James Madison U; ACYIG Membership Coordinator)

ACYIG currently has over 500 members from a range of disciplines in the social sciences, including anthropology, human development, psychology, education, history, health, area studies programs, and more. In anthropology, ACYIG has four-field representation with scholars in cultural, linguistic, archaeological, and biological anthropology. While ACYIG’s membership is based primarily in the United States, our international members represent another 33 countries. Over 150 of the members are graduate and undergraduate students. In addition to our core membership, there are more than 1600 subscribers to the ACYIG listserv. Participation in ACYIG thus offers opportunities for rich international and interdisciplinary conversation and collaboration, particularly through our conferences, listserv, Collaborative Research Networks, blogs, and our newsletter, Neos.
Membership in ACYIG is free to members of the American Anthropological Association (AAA). To join ACYIG, go to http://www.americananthro.org and log in to your AAA account. Select “Add interest group” from the menu on the left side of the page. Check the box for “Anthropology of Children and Youth Interest Group” and proceed through the checkout process (there will not be any charge). The same box should be checked each time that you renew your AAA membership.

Thank you for helping to make ACYIG such a vibrant interest group!

Maria Barbero (Florida International U)

The ACYIG social media presence continues to grow, gaining at least a dozen followers every month. Our content has the ability to reach thousands of students, scholars, and practitioners from across the field. We also continue our links with other special interest groups, research centers, university programs, and others—always with the aim of celebrating and promoting research related to children and youth, as well as disseminating teaching resources, opportunities, and news that are of interest to our members and stakeholders.

Earlier this year we were able to circulate a number of calls for papers related to issues of children and youth for the 2017 AAA Annual Meeting. As the meeting approaches, we will use social media to further connect with those interested in the anthropology of children and youth. In addition, we look forward to keeping you updated about relevant sessions and events. #AmAnth17 #ACYIG.

We invite you to reach out via email at mbarb055@fiu.edu, Facebook, or Twitter (@ACYIG_AAA) with any information that might be of interest to our members and broader networks. We look forward to hearing about your research, book announcements, job opportunities, calls for papers, audiovisual material, and much more!

Facebook: https://www.facebook.com/ACYIG/
Twitter: https://twitter.com/acyig_aa
YouTube: search ACYIG AAA
LinkedIn: Anthropology of Children & Youth Interest Group

I think the “Summerhill and Me” piece (featured in Neos’ February 2017 edition) addresses an important issue in American middle class education—how to strike the balance between on the one hand challenging kids to do their best, and on the other, allowing them to enjoy things they’re good at on their own terms. The piece made me think about all the kids who end up getting pushed away from athletics and arts in middle and high school because they have talent and their coaches push them to be top competitors and don’t allow them to just do these activities for fun and enjoy them. I imagine that several ACYIG members are already doing research in this area, and I look forward to hearing more about it!

Kate Feinberg Robins
Why My Son is Learning Cantonese

Jermaine Gordon-Mizusawa
(Chinese U of Hong Kong)

“So, why is your son learning Cantonese?” is a question that I am often asked. I am an American permanent resident of Japan doing a PhD in Anthropology at a university in Hong Kong. My son was born in Japan as I began my studies in Hong Kong in 2012. Three months later, he and my Japanese wife joined me in a rural area of Hong Kong convenient to campus, where most of my neighbors speak only Cantonese.

I decided to take advantage of the situation to do a cognitive experiment on my son, engineering his brain to make him a polyglot and develop his logic skills. The sci-fi geek in me found a way to experiment on my own child that was non-invasive and would probably not put me in front of an ethics board or in jail for child endangerment.

As it can take a year or more to enroll in preschool, we started our search immediately. I wanted him to learn Cantonese so that he could be part of the community, but I was strongly “encouraged” by several schools to find an international school because foreign parents “do not like homework.” I was actually fine with him having homework, knowing that he would need to practice Chinese characters early and knowing that I could decide later if it was too much for him. The problem is that most international schools are expensive and only teach English and Putonghua (Mandarin), not Cantonese—they assume that foreigners want Putonghua because they would find it more useful but also due to pressure from Beijing to make Putonghua the unifying “Chinese” language, despite Hong Kong’s separate system and cultural identity.

After several months of searching, some Japanese friends told us about an international preschool/Kindergarten that had a local track that accepts non-Chinese children, and teaches in Cantonese but also has English and Putonghua lessons. In addition, this school has a Japanese elective class for children of Japanese expats. My son was accepted the same day as his “interview” to start in the fall of 2015, but not without my being asked several times if I was sure that I wanted him in the local Cantonese section. In the meantime, we returned to Japan for my fieldwork from the fall of 2014, where we enrolled him in an international school and chose to put him into the “Japanese track,” which teaches 60/30 Japanese/English as opposed to the “International track,” where the percentages are reversed. The remaining 10% is Putonghua. There is also a Chilean teacher who includes Spanish in her daily lessons. Although having lived in Hong Kong from the age of 3 months to two years, my son had no problems communicating. When we went back to the Japanese school for the summer in 2016, after he had been at the Hong Kong school for a year, they were impressed by his development and language skills, even befriending a new Chinese student there.

In the meantime, we spoke Japanese at home and exposed him to Cantonese and English as well as Japanese outside the home through play groups with other children. I did and still do read books to him in Japanese, English, French, and Spanish and encourage him to watch videos on YouTube in these languages (he found Russian videos on his own). I also developed baby sign language based on JSL and ESL, so I was able to confirm that his cognitive and communicative development was indeed progressing.

Throughout this adventure, I have not been surprised to hear common myths like, “He has to learn one language before learning another,” or “his parents must speak Chinese,” or my all-time favorite and most heard, “Your son is going to be confused!” (LinguaHealth 2012). However, I was surprised to hear these responses from TEFL/TESL professionals, international preschool teachers, and even fellow anthropologists who have learned other languages. I was determined to prove these naysayers wrong and not squander my fortunate circumstances that allow me to provide a global education to my now four-year-old son.

Many studies in psychoanalysis and neuroscience suggest that language alters brain architecture, plasticity, and malleability, which affects brain development (Sasso 2007), and even that psychotherapy, which is language-based, can be just as or more effective than drugs for depression (Collerton 2013). Multilingual people perform better on logic and memorization tests, which may be why fictional detectives like Sherlock Holmes are characterized as polyglots. Language learning in adults can stave off Alzheimer’s disease and early onset dementia (Delistraty 2014). Babies’ flexible brains can hear and pronounce all sounds but monolinguism and enculturation causes the brain to lose abilities for which it has no use and thus people become tone deaf to “foreign languages.” If exposed to sounds and tones early and long enough, the brain can retain the ability to decode these sounds even if the child no longer speaks that language (Pierce et al. 2014), facilitating future language learning or re-learning.

After attending school for a year and a summer in Japan and almost a year and a half in Hong Kong, my son seems very happy learning new things every day. His
homework is not difficult and because he attends school from 8:30am to 4:30pm, most of the time he finishes there. We practice vocabulary with the flashcards they send home, so we are learning Cantonese together. His grades are above average (international section students are not graded) and his teachers say that his Chinese writing is better than most of the local students. He has no trouble distinguishing between Japanese, English, Cantonese, and Putonghua and loves to teach Mama and Tou-chan Cantonese and Putonghua. He even still remembers a bit of French and Spanish. We have to remember that learning languages as an adult is much different than the immersive experiences of a child and as anthropologists we can learn how to learn from them. I believe that the vast variety of sounds, tones, and vocabulary he is being exposed to will prepare him cognitively, culturally, and linguistically wherever he may live in the future.
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In October 2014, I set off for Buenos Aires, Argentina to carry out fifteen months of fieldwork in public primary schools in the city. Being that it was my first time undertaking such a large ethnographic project on my own, I was acutely aware—and slightly terrified—of the importance of thoroughly examining the ethics involved in every step I took that included child and youth participants. To make matters even more complicated, I decided to carry out not only interviews but also photo projects in which ten- and eleven-year-old students, the majority of whom were from Bolivian immigrant families, were given cameras to take photos related to their cultural heritage. Collecting images, especially such intimate ones taken by the students themselves, would certainly provide the rich data we strive for as anthropologists hoping to portray our participants’ lives and identities in the most accurate way possible.

After reading text after text about the ethics of ethnographic research involving children and youth (i.e., Kirk 2007; Morrow 2008), I did all the things I thought I was supposed to do to protect the students, including collecting the necessary approvals, making sure students knew their rights as participants, and assuring them that they would decide which photos to share with classmates. However, upon starting the photo projects, I began to realize that it wasn’t the other students but rather the adults in the lives of the participants who presented an obstacle to their protection; students’ parents and teachers felt entitled to see their photos, and the authority of parents and teachers quickly trumped any boundaries I had attempted to set up for students to maintain control over their photos. Finding literature to help me navigate this situation proved more difficult than I had imagined, and ultimately I had to consult with students directly on a case-by-case basis about photos I suspected they might have preferred to keep private. Luckily these instances were rare, but they still brought to my attention just how personal the photos were and how exposed my participants could have been to their parents and teachers.

When doing work involving identity, researchers sometimes catch a peek at elements of participants’ lives that they haven’t yet shared with many other people. Child and youth participants are no exception. They actively construct their identities and move fluidly between the multiple social roles they occupy, developing their own worldviews and often challenging the beliefs of their parents, teachers, and other influential adults with whom they have contact. Research is increasingly demonstrating that this engagement with identity begins much earlier than we had previously believed, with middle childhood (roughly ages six to eleven) being an especially dynamic stage in conceptualizations of identity (see Akiba et al. 2004; Marks et al. 2007; and Rogers et al. 2012 for examples related to ethnic identity). My participants fell into this age range, and even in the relatively short time I was with them, I saw their behaviors, friend groups, and interests changing rapidly. Taking this into consideration, I couldn’t help but wonder, “Am I unintentionally putting my participants in danger? What if their photos reveal something they never intended their parents or teachers to see? Will their teachers treat them differently? Will their parents be upset? What will the consequences be for my participants once I am gone?”

The questions that grew out of my fieldwork still loom in my mind. These concerns, however, are not unique to my participants. As researchers working with child and youth participants, we take certain precautions when we collect, store, and present data related to child and youth participants to protect them from people they don’t know, but what about the people they do know? Do children and youth not have a right to a private space to explore their identities? Do
we not have an obligation to respect the trust that our participants so graciously grant us when partaking in our research, regardless of their age? While the answers to these questions may seem straightforward, the complexities of ethnographic fieldwork and the dependency we have on social relationships for carrying out our research means we often have to play by the rules of the environment in which we collect our data. In my case, that environment did not grant children the privacy I believed they deserved, and while I found a way of addressing this without compromising my relationships with parents and teachers, I have yet to come across a systematic way of ensuring that the privacy of child and youth participants is protected from the adults around them. While certain steps like informed consent from parents and teachers are, of course, a necessary part of conducting research with children and youth to hold researchers accountable for any directly impacts their work may have on participants, it is the indirect consequences that we must now begin to examine more thoroughly—especially as we explore methods that give us more personal glimpses into the lives of our child and youth participants.
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The study of children would seem an opportune site for interdisciplinary research since a child’s problem (or a problem child) cannot be said to be psychologically any more than it could be said to be social or cultural (or political, economic, chemical, biological, or even philosophical). Anthropology also appears an opportune site for work across disciplines since anthropology is, after all, the study of humankind. Yet even at this interdisciplinarily fecund intersection, research that truly combines disciplinary perspectives is both difficult and rare. Disciplinary boundaries are real and substantial, often appearing more difficult to cross than any wall imagined in Donald Trump’s wildest dreams.

This essay considers the nature of these disciplinary boundaries and considers a small but productive instance of disciplinary boundary crossing by the authors. We describe our challenges, delineate two kinds of interdisciplinary research (juxtapositional and dialectical), and describe one productive outcome of the collaboration.

Although our offices are located in adjacent buildings mere steps away from each other, our route to interdisciplinary collaboration wound through Colorado and California. While at a conference in Colorado, Bryant met a colleague, Shirin Vossoughi, who knew me from University of California, San Diego. At Shirin’s suggestion, we made contact, met up, and agreed to work together on an internal interdisciplinary grant, proposing research examining the language usage in home and school contexts of Latino second graders (cf. Phillips 1992).

We soon encountered the challenges of interdisciplinary work. Bryant is a psychologist not afraid to use words like “psychometric,” and I am an anthropologist not afraid to use words like “metapragmatic.” The former refers to measuring psychological functioning, something anthropologists are loathe to do. The latter refers to the meaningfulness associated with talk-in-context, something that is both senseless and useless to most psychologists. In order to collaborate, we would have to figure out how to translate these terms for each other.

Methodologically, although we both had previously employed extensive video recordings in our research, we approached these data very differently. Bryant typically quantified the phenomena so as to characterize traits of individual participants in the classroom (e.g., Jensen, Perez-Martinez, and Escobar 2016). In contrast, I insisted on qualitative analyses, considering how language builds pedagogical contexts in human interactions (e.g., Thompson 2014).

Yet, there were also more significant challenges. Undergirding these terminological and methodological differences was a difference in ontological commitments (i.e., commitments to what exists and can be studied). Psychologists take for granted an individual, interior, and essential subject (psyche) that exists outside of culture. Anthropologists, on the other hand, see subjects as processual and relational accomplishment always (and necessarily) situated within culture (e.g., Shweder 1991). Thus, whereas psychologists’ methods assess the character of essentialized psychological subjects, anthropologists seek to understand processes and relations, such as how subject-making happens in context.

Because our grant was interdisciplinary, we did not have to reconcile these deeper issues. We were awarded the grant even though in our proposal we had simply placed each of our discipline’s language and methods alongside the other. We call this juxtapositional interdisciplinarity, a term we use to refer to projects that juxtapose the language and methods of different disciplines but whose parts remain disciplinary. Like a chimera, the project-as-a-whole is interdisciplinary but the parts are not.

In addition to characterizing the grant writing, this juxtapositional interdisciplinarity also characterized the data collection process of our project. My students and I conducted the ethnography, and Bryant conducted the language assessments. Yet, unless we wanted to write up separately, juxtapositional interdisciplinarity would not be sufficient for data analysis and write-up. Producing a shared product would require a dialectical engagement with each other’s disciplines such that each might be changed by the encounter with the other. We call this dialectical interdisciplinarity (cf. Shweder 1991). Like a hybrid, the project-as-a-whole is interdisciplinary but so are the parts.

Although dialectical interdisciplinarity is much more difficult to achieve, both forms present challenges. There were a number of resources and complementarities that helped us through these challenges. The grant provided a tangible resource that incentivized us to work...
together in proposal writing, project design and execution, and writing up. A number of personal complementari-
ties helped too. Whereas I was new to the field of Latino education in the U.S. and did not speak Spanish, Bryant was fluent in Spanish and had been studying and publishing on these issues for over ten years. Whereas I had connections in the neighborhood around the schools where we would conduct research, Bryant had connections with the school district and was able to secure the necessary approvals. Whereas Bryant knew the language assessment and survey tools that we would use, I knew ethnographic and discourse methods and had highly trained Spanish-speaking undergraduate researchers to conduct the classroom and home ethnographies. It was also important that we developed a strong friendship—what I have elsewhere termed the spirit of collaboration (Thompson 2015)—and which made it much easier for each of us to commit to the collaboration and work through disciplinary disagreements.

The benefits of this hard-fought interdisciplinarity came in the form of a panel we organized for the 2015 AERA annual meeting that included a co-authored paper (Thompson and Jensen 2016), and which featured a panel of psychologists and anthropologists who would otherwise never have spoken directly to one another. The result was a vigorous, respectful, and highly productive conversation about “academic language” and equitable education for Latinos. We are currently developing this panel as a special issue for a language and education journal.

Through this example of interdisciplinary border crossing, we hope to have identified some of the more substantial challenges to interdisciplinarity and offered some suggestions for supporting interdisciplinary collaborations, both juxtapositional and dialectical. We might add that if we hope to avoid wall-building at these disciplinary boundaries, we need to do the hard and difficult work of immersive and dialectical exchange across these boundaries (the same could, of course, be said for Trump’s wall).
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CHILDHOOD AND YOUTH INTEREST GROUP

Childhood, Food, and Health: Self-Expressions of Transition and Identity

Preety Gadhoke and Barrett P. Brenton (St. John’s U)

On a sunny afternoon in late September, Kamran, a first-generation ethnic minority American and graduate assistant, was getting ready to lead his weekly after-school workshop on food, resiliency, and health with nine ten- to fifteen-year-old African American girls and boys in the library of a transitional residence for homeless families in New York City. The three-story red-brick building, reminiscent of an old elementary school and sitting at the confluence of three congested thoroughfares, is marked by wrought-iron window bars and three small steps leading to large front metal doors. It is a temporary residence to nearly a hundred homeless families living in independent housing units.

The kids started spilling in, coming directly from the school bus, laden with heavy backpacks, hungry and tired, but also excited, as this is one of the only after-school programs at the residence that they look forward to each week (as stated directly to us during our programs). As part of a St. John’s University IRB-approved study, Kamran and the first author have worked together to design weekly workshops to teach children about using visual methods as powerful tools to express their counter-narratives of vulnerability, resiliency, and hope in relationship with food and health.

The aims of our project are to learn about childhood health and nutrition from a strengths-based approach. This strategy is centered on defining the communities in which we work by identifying their multiple gifts, hopes, assets, and resiliency exhibited through the marshaling of their strengths (Maton et al. 2004). Our approach is guided through the use of visual anthropology methods and reflective workshops, including photography, videography, maps, and drawings. Workshops are designed to elicit narratives from the children and youth participants as active participants and co-creators of knowledge and analysis. Previously, our first Neos publication focused on visual methods (Gadhoke and Brenton 2015). Through the children’s eyes, we have learned so much about the nuances of American food culture and identity, which offers insight into the value of embracing an anthropology of children and youth.

Like he has done every Monday from 3pm to 5pm, Kamran set the table up with fixings for “build-your-own” healthy sandwiches with a loaf of fresh whole wheat bread, crisp iceberg lettuce, juicy red tomatoes, mayonnaise, mustard, and thinly sliced deli ham. He had learned from previous workshops that the children also loved potato chips and fruit, so he brought baked chips and fresh strawberries.

Kamran greeted them effusively, with high-fives, hugs, and a warm smile as they arrived, putting them at ease with his charismatic presence. He recapped last week’s workshop, and then initiated a conversation by posing the first of seven open-ended questions he had prepared for the day to delve deeper into the children’s conceptualization of food security, hunger, and health. “Okay,” he said, “what comes to mind when someone says, ‘healthy?’” In response, the children described what they were eating, which elicited a larger conversation about healthy foods, race, class, weight, and activity.

Alicia, a twelve-year-old girl, spoke of the preferences of her eleven-year old broth-
er (also present), saying: “He eats meats, but he doesn’t eat these meats [ham].” John, a thirteen-year-old boy, said, “We like olives. They’re good, and have to try them.” Then, Dalia, a fourteen-year-old girl, said: “Black people like fried chicken.”

Kamran knew that the last comment was a profoundly insightful self-expression of food and identity. He decided to follow up on this delicately the next week by quoting the children and posing follow-up questions. His first question was: “What do you mean by ‘fried chicken’? Last week I heard someone saying this?” The second was: “I don’t gain weight when I eat because I move around a lot.” “Okay, but I move around a lot too, but I’m still, like, 200 [pounds].” “For both these statements, what do you mean or think about that? Who thinks that?”

This opened a revealing conversation about food, identity, and health. Dalia and Shaniqua started volleying comments back and forth, with Dalia asserting, “If you have a phone and expensive sneakers on your feet, why can’t you have food? That is just stupid to me.” To that, Shaniqua, a ten-year old girl, responded, “I don’t mean to call poor people stupid, but it is stupid to get tattoos and get your hair done, but not get your kids food.” Robert, a fourteen-year-old boy, chimed in, “Poor people shouldn’t be called stupid.” Returning to Kamran’s opening questions, Dalia stated, “White people don’t like the same thing we eat. Like for example, we eat coll’ greens and you guys eat whatever you want!” In a candid way, they articulated a spectrum of the social messages they have internalized early on in life.

Nearing the end of workshop, the children were getting antsy. They were more than ready, as usual, to head out and take snapshots on their digital cameras for the day around the residential premises with Kamran. Robert made a remarkable comment, suggestive of the manifold layers of the American culture and food preferences that are heavily influenced by our own local food environments: “I think other races also eat fried chicken.” These “fried chicken” narratives in and of themselves begin to frame the consumption of African American “soul” foods as a performance deeply embedded in historical, socioeconomic, political, and ethnic spaces (Williams-Forson 2013). These spaces disclose even further the complexities of the confluence of African American foodways, diet, health, and identity, particularly for those living in transition.

The workshops also provide the children with a venue for self-empowerment by analyzing their own visual imagery through a para-ethnographic process (Alexander et al. 2016). This has captured even deeper intersections of food, health, and culture. We can see through their photos the landscapes of food and health that represent the waves of New York City immigrants that have shaped pluralistic American food identities. When we look at one of Robert’s favorite photos, it conveys through his eyes this richness (Figure 1). A favorite photo of Dalia’s is a celebration of her mom’s homemade stewed lentils that imbues her Afro-Caribbean and multi-ethnic identity (Figure 2).

They then listened to the following week’s assignment, with reverberations of the day’s dialogues no doubt informing their yet-to-be captured images of their dreams about life after transitional homelessness. Next Monday’s homework: Take photographs of a food prepared at home and bring a written description of the dish to the next workshop.
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Figure 2. “Mommy’s homemade cooking of stewed lentils in our residence” (Dalia, fourteen-year-old girl).
among Homeless Youth.” *Neos: A Publication of the Anthropology of Children and Youth Interest Group* 7(2): 8–9.


Laura Gilliam and Eva Gulløv January, 2017

This original ethnographic study looks at how children are ‘civilized’ within child institutions such as schools, day care centers, and families, under the auspices of the welfare state.

As part of a general discussion on civilizing projects and the role of state institutions, the authors focus on Denmark, a country characterized by the extent of time children use public institutions from an early age. They look at the extraordinary amount of attention and effort put into the process of upbringing by the state, as well as the widespread co-operation in this by parents across the social spectrum.

Taking as its point of departure sociologist Norbert Elias’ concept of civilizing, *Children of the Welfare State* explores the ideals of civilized conduct expressed through institutional upbringing and examine how children of different age, gender, ethnicity, and social backgrounds experience and react to these norms and efforts. The analysis demonstrates that welfare state institutions, though characterized by a strong egalitarian ideal, create distinctions between social groups, teach children about moral hierarchies in society, and prompt them to identify as more or less civilized citizens of the state.

Naomi Glenn-Levin Rodriguez August, 2017

Based on research conducted in the San Diego–Tijuana region between 2008 and 2012, *Fragile Families* tells the stories of children, parents, social workers, and legal actors enmeshed in the child welfare system, and sheds light on the particular challenges faced by the children of detained and deported non-U.S. citizen parents who are simultaneously caught up in the immigration system in this border region.

Many families come into contact with child welfare services because of the precariousness of their lives—unsafe housing, unstable employment, and the conditions of violence, drug use, and domestic violence made visible by the heightened police presence in impoverished communities.

Naomi Glenn-Levin Rodriguez examines the character of child welfare deci-
Considered highly unorthodox—even harmful—by current “informed” parents and professionals. Attention is drawn to areas of greatest contrast between “weird” society and almost everyone else. In the process, the author shows why contemporary parents experience so much uncertainty and doubt about their success. A common thread is that we are, by historical standards, guilty of over-parenting, of doing too much for our children and micro-managing their lives. Children in other cultures have much greater freedom to learn, take risks and develop as confident, self-sufficient members of their culture.

Among the many topics covered include: infant care and attachment; children’s privacy; children’s access to real world scenes and objects from which they can learn independently; the downside of turning each child into a unique individual; free vs adult-managed play; fruitless efforts to insure the child is always happy; why children may be reluctant scholars; and the origins of the “failure to launch.”

In Zambia, due to the rise of tuberculosis and the closely connected HIV epidemic, a large number of children have experienced the illness or death of at least one parent. Children as Caregivers examines how well-intentioned practitioners fail to realize that children take on active caregiving roles when their guardians become seriously ill and demonstrates why understanding children’s care is crucial for global health policy.

Using ethnographic methods, and listening to the voices of the young as well as adults, Jean Hunleth makes the caregiving work of children visible. She shows how children actively seek to “get closer” to ill guardians by providing good care. Both children and ill adults define good care as attentiveness of the young to adults’ physical needs, the ability to carry out treatment and medication programs in the home, and above all, the need to maintain physical closeness and proximity. Children understand that losing their guardians will not only be emotionally devastating, but that such loss is likely to set them adrift in Zambian society, where education and advancement depend on maintaining familial, reciprocal relationships.
rights of girls in a culture where initiation forms the lynchpin of the ritual cycle at the core of defining gender, identity, and social and political status? In Making the Mark, Miroslava Prazak follows the practice of female circumcision through the lives and activities of community members in a rural Kenyan farming society as they decide whether or not to participate in the tradition.

In an ethnography twenty years in the making, Prazak weaves multiple Kuria perspectives—those of girls, boys, family members, circumcisers, political and religious leaders—into a riveting account. Though many books have been published on the topic of genital cutting, this is one of the few ethnographies to give voice to evolving perspectives of practitioners, especially through a period of intense anticutting campaigning on the part of international NGOs, local activists, and donor organizations. Prazak also examines the cultural challenges that complicate the human-rights anti-FGM stance.

Set in the rolling hills of southwestern Kenya, Making the Mark examines the influences that shape and change female genital cutting over time, presenting a rich mosaic of the voices contributing to the debate over this life-altering ritual.

**MEMBER NEWS**

**.calls for submissions**

**Other CallS for Submissions**

Call for Chapters – “Youth, Inequality and Social Change in the Global South” for the Springer series Perspectives on Children and Young People

This edited book addresses a gap in youth studies by focusing on young people’s experiences in the Global South. The book aims to expand our thinking on youth experiences by linking theoretical and empirical perspectives to regions in the Global South and questioning the Global North domination in the social sciences and in youth studies. The contributors to this edited book will highlight different aspects of young people’s experiences in the diverse regions that compose the Global South (e.g., Latin America, the Middle East, Asia, the South Pacific region, and South, Central, and Northern Africa). The book is organized in four broad thematic issues: (1) education, work, and social structure; (2) identity and belonging; (3) place, mobilities, and marginalization; and (4) power, social conflict, and new forms of political participation of youth. Authors are invited to discuss potential chapters with the editors. Interested scholars are encouraged to submit a 200 word abstract to the editors, Dr. Hernán Cuervo hicuervo@unimelb.edu.au and Dr. Ana Miranda amiranda@flacso.org.ar, by October 10th, 2017. The first chapter is due March 1st, 2018 and the final chapter is due May 31st, 2018.

**EVENTS & NEW RESOURCES**

**Publications**

Families, Relationships and Societies: Volume 5, Number 1 Available Online

Don’t forget to take a look at the latest issue of Families, Relationships and Societies (Vol. 5, No. 1). You can follow the journal on Twitter at @FRSjournal and sign up to receive the latest news from the journal team. We offer a free online trial for institutions, during which you can access all online content, as available to subscribers. To sign up, go to: http://www.ingentaconnect.com/content/tpp/hrs. Families, Relationships and Societies is available as part of the Policy Press journals collections.

Jeunesse: Winter Issue Now Available

The Centre for Research in Young People’s Texts and Cultures is pleased to announce the 2017 Winter Issue of Jeunesse: Young People, Texts, Cultures is available. Housed in the Centre for Research in Young People’s Texts and Cultures and produced with funding from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada, Jeunesse: Young People, Texts, Cultures is an interdisciplinary, refereed academic journal whose mandate is to publish research on and provide a forum for discussion about cultural productions for, by, and about young people. More information on how to submit papers and subscribe can be found on our website: http://www.jeunessejournal.ca. To recommend Jeunesse to your institution’s library, download our form.

Journal of Playwork Practice: Volume 3, Number 1 Now Out

The Journal of Playwork Practice (JPP), published in association with Common
Threads, is the first academic journal in the playwork field and provides an international platform for the publication and dissemination of scholarship relevant to playwork practice. The journal is available in print and online. You can follow the journal on Twitter at @jpp_journal. For information about submitting a paper to the Journal of Playwork Practice, please email jpp@commonthreads.org.uk. To keep up-to-date with all Policy Press childhood and family titles, sign up for our alerts.

Report: Experiences of Children Born into LRA Captivity

As an often overlooked category of survivors, the publication of a field note by the Justice and Reconciliation Project (JRP) titled “We Are All the Same: Experiences of Children Born into LRA captivity” offers nuanced findings to the children’s lived experiences and makes key recommendations to ensure their inclusion and redress in transitional justice. This note documents the views, experiences and hopes of 29 children born into the captivity of the Lord’s Resistance Army and now living in the urban center of Gulu. The field note can be downloaded on JRP’s website: http://justiceandreconciliation.com/publications/field-notes/2015/we-are-all-the-same-experiences-of-children-born-into-lra-captivity/. Also, researcher Beth Stewart reflects on the process of documentation and the questions raised by the children who participated in a blog, on JRP’s website: http://justiceandreconciliation.com/blog/2016/i-want-to-ask-why-are-you-writing-this-documenting-the-experiences-of-children-born-into-lra-captivity/. For comments or questions, please email Oryem Nyeko (onyeko@justiceandreconciliation.com) or info@justiceandreconciliation.com.

OTHER EVENTS AND RESOURCES

New Website – Childhood@UCL: Researching and Teaching the Politics of Children and Childhood at University College London (UCL)

The University College London has a new website: https://childhooducl.wordpress.com/. The site has a rich and growing collection of video resources and blog postings from academic staff and students involved in the study of childhood at UCL. On the site, you will find information about programs of undergraduate and post-graduate study, current research and engagement projects, and upcoming seminars and events.

CALLS FOR APPLICATIONS

PROGRAMS OF STUDY

New MRes in Wellbeing launching at the University of Sussex

The MRes in Wellbeing has been designed for those interested in developing their research skills and knowledge in the field of wellbeing. It is taught by a combination of seminars, lectures, tutorials, and individual supervision. The programme of study also includes the opportunity to carry out fieldwork. The course will give you a strong grounding in theory and methodology, drawing on disciplines such as social work, psychology, economics, anthropology, medicine and sociology. You will have a unique opportunity to learn from leading scholars working in a range of innovative and interdisciplinary projects on wellbeing, and to apply knowledge gained through the programme to projects that are shaping policy and practice. The development of the MRes course reflects particular expertise within the Department of Social Work and Social Care’s interdisciplinary Centre for Innovation and Research in Wellbeing. A first- or upper-second class undergraduate honours degree in a social science is normally required. Exceptionally, other academic backgrounds will be considered, as well as applicants who have significant experience in wellbeing-related programmes. For further information, please consult the online prospectus: http://www.sussex.ac.uk/study/pg/2016/taught/1575/33917.
SOLICITATIONS FOR FEBRUARY 2018

We are soliciting the following articles and features from ACYIG members for the next issue of Neos:

**ARTICLES (1000 WORDS OR LESS, INCLUDING REFERENCES)**

Methods and Ethics in the Anthropology of Childhood, in which members explore the methods and ethics of doing research with children or youth.

Childhood and __________ (you fill in the blank!), in which members discuss a topic of interest to their research.

My Experiences/Intersections with Interdisciplinary Research on Children and Youth, in which members investigate the value, pitfalls, and lessons associated with combining anthropological research with that of other disciplines to study children and youth.

An Ethnography of Children or Youth that has Impacted My Work, in which members discuss their favorite classic or contemporary ethnography of children or youth. Note that this should NOT be written as a book review, but rather as an account of how a particular ethnography has impacted your theoretical or methodological approach, or how it might be used in your teaching.

Children and Youth in Our Lives and Our Work, in which members discuss the challenges and triumphs of balancing their own lives with their research, focusing particularly on the fieldwork stage.

**FEATURES**

Letters to the Editor (250 words or less), in which members comment on Neos and/or its contents.

Obituaries (250 words or less), in which members share memories of an anthropologist of children and youth. Please notify the Editor of your intent to submit an obituary.

Photos from the Field, which should be accompanied by a caption of 30 words or less explaining the context of the photo.

Unsung Heroes of ACYIG (1000 words or less), in which members interview an important contributor to ACYIG. Please notify the Editor of your intent to submit an interview. See the February 2016 issue for an example.

New Book Announcements (250 words or less), which must include the title, author, publisher (and the book series, if applicable), date of publication, and listing price of the book, in addition to a description of the contents. If possible, please send—as a separate attachment—a digital image of the book cover.

Member News (200 words or less), in which members may submit job announcements and research opportunities; grants/prizes available; calls for papers and conference announcements; recent appointments; grants received and/or prizes awarded; publication announcements; and other professional achievements.

Correction Notices may be submitted to the editor if Neos has printed an error in a previous issue.

Please refer to the General Submission Guidelines and Author Agreement for Publication on our website for more detailed information. All material should be sent to ACYIG.Editor@gmail.com.

**NEOS CONTRIBUTORS**

Editor: Véronique Gilbert (Independent Scholar)

Layout Editor: Álvaro Vargas (Rongo Media)

Copy Editor: Nicole Gallicchio (U Chicago)

Assistant Editor for New Book Announcements: Anne Pfister (U of North Florida)

Assistant Editor for Member News: Krista Billingsley (U Tennessee, Knoxville)

Assistant Editor for Updates: Matilda Stubbs (Northwestern U)

ACYIG Newsletter Advisory Board:

- Jaycee Bigham (UC Santa Barbara)
- Caroline Compretta (U Mississippi Medical Center)
- Rebecca Grunzke (Independent Scholar)
- Anne Karabon (U of Nebraska Omaha)
- Jen Tilton (U of Redlands)

**STAY IN TOUCH**

Website and Blog
http://acyig.americananthro.org

Facebook
https://www.facebook.com/ACYIG

Twitter
https://twitter.com/acyig_aaa

Neos Editor
ACYIG.Editor@gmail.com