CHILD MOBILITY, TIME USE AND SOCIAL EXCLUSION: REFRAMING THE DISCOURSES AND DEBATES

SHARMLA RAMA

BA (University of Natal), BA Hons (University of Natal), MA (University of Natal)

Submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor or Philosophy, in the Graduate Programme in Sociology, School of Social Sciences, University of KwaZulu-Natal, Pietermaritzburg, South Africa

Supervisor: Professor Simon I R Burton

Disclaimer

Declaration

I, **Sharmla Rama**, declare that

1. The research reported in this thesis, except where otherwise indicated, is my original research.

2. This thesis has not been submitted for any degree or examination at any other university.

3. This thesis does not contain other persons' data, pictures, graphs or other information, unless specifically acknowledged as being sourced from other persons.

4. This thesis does not contain other persons' writing, unless specifically acknowledged as being sourced from other researchers. Where other written sources have been quoted, then:

    a. Their words have been re-written but the general information attributed to them has been referenced

    b. Where their exact words have been used, then their writing has been placed in italics and inside quotation marks, and referenced.

5. This thesis does not contain text, graphics or tables copied and pasted from the Internet, unless specifically acknowledged, and the source being detailed in the thesis and in the References sections.

Student: **Ms. Sharmla Rama**   Date:

Supervisor: **Professor Simon I. R. Burton**   Date:

Dedication

For:

My parents Victor and Angie Rama

I am eternally indebted to you for the unconditional support, care and encouragement. Thank you for motivating me to work hard, and never give up in the face of adversity.

And,

My brother, Reuben Rama RIP

And our grandparents,
Mr and Mrs Savari Anthony RIP, and
Mr and Mrs Govindasami Rama RIP

Acknowledgements

I wish to thank the following persons and institutions for supporting me…

My supervisor, Professor Simon Burton for his time and patience

The Eastern Centre of Transport Development's (ECOTD) postgraduate scholarship programme for financial support

The School of Social Sciences at the University of KwaZulu-Natal, Pietermaritzburg for supporting my application for teaching relief in the second semester of 2012

Colleagues and staff at the School of Social Sciences for their support

Ms May Bingham for proofreading this document and for her encouragement - Any editorial errors and mishaps in this final publication are my own

Professor Linda Richter for encouraging me to pursue a PhD through her support of my application for the South Africa Netherlands Research Programme (SANPAD) on Alternatives in Development Research Capacitation Initiatives

Staff and guest lecturers of the SANPAD programme during the 2005/6 period

My parents, Angie and Victor; and my brother Trevor and his family, Kamini, Simone and Tristan; and to my aunts, uncles and many cousins and relatives for their support and prayers

Father Mario Ceruti for his counsel and friendship

The Augustinian Sisters at Jacob's Well, Botha's Hill for their prayers, kindness and encouragement

Mrs Nthabeleng (Agnes) Sekele and Arlease for their care and help

My cats for tolerating my invasion of their space and for the pleasant disruptions they provided during the long nights and early mornings

God Almighty and Jesus my Lord and Saviour for giving me the strength and patience to pursue and complete this study

"He is my rock and salvation: he is my defence; I shall not be moved"

(Psalm 62, verse 6)

Abstract

This study asserts that the everyday life, daily activities and mobility interaction remains peripheral within the Sociology of Childhood and Mobilities in particular and sociology in general. This is not to say that there are no sociological studies on child mobility. Instead, existing studies usually focus on the impact of child mobility on adult mobility, their daily lives and schedules with children's voices, experiences and needs remaining obscure. This generates a passive, univocal, skewed and constrained portrayal and (re)presentation of the child. These unreflected habituations have particular implications for children's inclusion, participation, and well-being in society; and are in conflict with contemporary and global shifts in childhood and mobility studies.

This dissertation, then examines the conceptualisation and problematisation of child mobility in current studies, statistics, policies and interventions, with a particular focus on South Africa. This encompasses questions about the epistemological worldview and evidence-base supporting the various policies and practices. In terms of the reification and privileging of some paradigms, Max Weber's analysis of 'social action', 'social closure' 'domination' and 'monopolization' is appropriated and redirected. Closure (exclusion) rests on the process of subordination, whereby dominant groups close opportunities to groups it categorises as inferior, or ineligible. Children's subordinate roles in hierarchical structures in societies are derived based on, amongst other factors, culture, age, gender and generation. These codes are used to exclude or include individuals or groups. The utility of closure theory is in the theorising of adult roles; rationalisation of adult dominance; and the limiting of children's agency and autonomy in institutions in societies. This includes adult roles in research and policy-making communities.

This suggests that we need to reflect on, re-evaluate and reframe our approach to listening, talking, thinking and writing on, and about, children. The study asserts the relevancy of the *pragmatic* and *critical constructivist* lens in mediating the paradigmatic and epistemic shifts necessary for sociological (re)engagement and reframing of the discourses and debates on child mobility. The approaches are compatible with current developments in field (s) and are important to producing sociologically relevant knowledge on and about children.

Abbreviations and Acronyms

ACRWC	African Charter on the Rights and Welfare of the Child
ANC	African National Congress
AsgiSA	Accelerated and Shared Growth Initiative for South Africa
AU	African Union
CFC	Child-Friendly Cities
CoGTA	Department of Cooperative Governance and Traditional Affairs
CSS	Critical Social Science(s)
GEAR	Growth, Employment and Redistribution: A Macroeconomic Strategy
HIV/AIDS	Human Immunodeficiency Virus/Acquired Immunodeficiency Syndrome
ILO	International Labour Organisation
IMF	International Monetary Fund
KZN	KwaZulu-Natal, Province in South Africa
LGTAS	Local Government Turnaround Strategy
MDGs	Millennium Development Goals
MIIF	Municipal Infrastructure Investment Framework
n.d	No Date
NEPAD	The New Partnership for African Development
NMTs	Non-motorised Means of Transport
NP	Nationalist Party
NPC	National Planning Commission
RDP	Reconstruction and Development Programme
RDP WP	RDP White Paper
s.l	No Place of Publication (Latin: *sine loco*)
s.n	No Named Publisher (Latin: *sine nomine*)
SADC	The Southern African Development Community
SANHTS	South African National Household Transport Survey
SAYP	Survey of Activities of Young People
SD	Secondary Data
SNA	System of National Accounts
TUS(s)	Time Use Survey(s)
UK	United Kingdom
UKZN	University of KwaZulu-Natal
UNAIDS	Joint United Nations Programme HIV/AIDS
UNCRC	United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
UNP	University of Natal, Pietermaritzburg campus
USA (US)	United States of America
WB	World Bank
WSB	Walking School Bus

TABLE OF CONTENTS

"In order to address the agenda for the future of transport…there is an urgent need to better understand the root causes of travel demand and how these are changing and can be changed over time. To do so will require that established approaches and methodologies employed to furnish decision-makers with the 'facts' are challenged and where necessary replaced, revised or enhanced. In acknowledging the importance of social context, pursuit of better understanding will need to take much greater account of certain social science disciplines such as psychology and sociology. Transport studies must move outwards from its heartlands in engineering, mathematics, computing, IT and economics…What capacity is there within the social sciences to begin addressing transport issues?…However to date, far fewer transport professionals have their origins in politics, sociology or psychology. The transport profession remains male dominated and characterised by the theory, mental models and thought processes of engineers, mathematicians and economists. In order to see the profession equipped to fully address the links between transport and society it would appear that more women must be attracted into transport studies."

(Lyons, 2003:5)

"As transport systems have become more established I would suggest that the disciplinary centre of gravity for transport has moved ever further towards social science - reinforced by greater tacit recognition that transport should support rather than serve society."

(Lyons, 2012:1)

"If children are to become truly incorporated into our public and professional responsibilities, we must consider them in different contexts and on several levels. We must analyse perceptions, articulate language and create conceptual frameworks which can deepen our understanding and help us in our practical work."

(Knutsson, 1997: 6)

CHAPTER 1 : BACKGROUND AND INTRODUCTION

"Some of the major obstacles to the betterment of children are grounded in a misunderstanding of the significance of childhood, the absence of a proper recognition of the obligations placed on children collectively by adult society, deficiencies in the rights of citizenship of children." (Knutsson, 1997:139)

1.1 The study in context

First year sociology students often ask the question 'what is sociology?' and 'what do sociologists study?' The customary response is:

"**Sociology** is the systematic study of the ways in which people are affected by, and affect, the social structures and social processes that are associated with the groups, organizations, cultures, societies, and world in which they exist." (Ritzer, 2012: 3)

Yet, this simplistic response belies the nature, scope and cogency of the discipline. This means that sociology is neither limited nor limiting in terms of insights and issues for investigation. Consequently, contemporary sociology is continuing to (re)define and refine new areas and pathways of interest and inquiry (Burawoy, 2005; Awosan, 2009; Akpan 2010; Burawoy, 2011; Xaba 2011 and Ritzer, 2012). Globally, this diversity enables sociologists to examine, understand and use the knowledge of social inequalities, differentiation and stratification, actions, networks, relationships and social changes across different societies and contexts.

Despite, the opportunities and challenges this presents, South African sociology seldom pays particular attention to the intersecting issues of mobility, transport, children and childhood. This is not to say there are no studies in sociology on transport (transportation), mobility (mobilities) or childhood. Rather, the country's historical circumstances and current macro-level political, social or economic concerns (see Cilliers, 1984; Webster, 2004; Hendricks, 2006; Jubber, 2007; Burawoy, 2009 and Akpan 2010) sometimes overshadow the experiences and realities of the daily lives of vulnerable groups, particularly children.

Moreover, children and childhood is "usually contextualised within the family, the school, and the relationship between family (home) and school" (Rama and Richter, 2007). In comparison to the more established themes and topics (Jubber, 2007), the South African

sociologists' response to childhood and children's needs and problems is more spasmodic and / or sporadic in nature.

However, in relation to child mobility, existing local and international studies typically focus on the impact of child mobility on adult mobility, their daily lives and schedules with children's voices, experiences and needs remaining obscure. This assertion comes with a caveat. This hierarchizing or prioritising of adultist[1] needs produces a skewed and poor evidence-base for understanding and examining child mobility. Such an approach only fuels the child mobility and transport theory-praxis-policy disjuncture, further fragmenting our understanding of children's mobility or transport problems, constraints, experiences and needs. It certainly impedes the development of child-friendly and child-centred policies and interventions in the transport sector. Such an approach usually generates a passive, univocal and constrained view of the child in society. Children's marginality and invisibility, then, only fuels knowledge gaps (Wells, 2009).

In other words, the social location of children influences knowledge production and dissemination on and about them. Yet, Starr (2010: 2) reminds us that knowledge construction is not linear or absolute, rather it is evolving and reflects an intersection between history and biography (see C Wright Mills, 2000). Ellis, Adams and Bochner (2011, on-line publication) note that:

> "…different kinds of people possess different assumptions about the world - a multitude of ways of speaking, writing, valuing and believing - and that conventional ways of doing and thinking about research were narrow, limiting, and parochial."

Yet, such observations still need to permeate child mobility and transport studies in general. This implies that while some aspects do require further empirical efforts there are several conceptual, theoretical, methodological and epistemological deficits.

In this study, the focus is on children under eighteen years of age. Recent estimates suggest that those under the age of 19 years[2] constitute just under 40 per cent (less than 21 million) of the total population in South Africa (Statistics South Africa, 2013). This cohort represents a

---

[1] Dalrymple and Burke (1995 cited in Watson, 2006: 5) argue that the term 'adultism' describes the "domination by adults of children and young people, which they see as having a significant a power dimension in the lives of young people as do racism and sexism of all ages."

[2] Mid-year estimates are available in five-year intervals, and thus the figure for 0 to 19 years old. The recent mid-year estimates of the total population are about 52.98 million (Statistics South Africa, 2013).

significant social, political, economic, priority and transport user group in democratic South Africa[3].

Himes (cited in Knutsson, 1997: xi) raises the important point that empirical marginalisation implies political, policy and social marginalisation of children and their particular problems and needs.

> "How can we claim…that our conceptual frameworks, our diagnostic tools, our policies for economic and social reform, and our ethical standards are valid in theory and useful in practice when they often exclude 40 per cent of the world's population which consists of children and youth on this precarious planet?"

For example, Sutton, de Toma, Lind, Gunnarsson, and Tibblin (2005) point out that while more than half the total population in developing countries are children; yet the girl child is at greater risk. To what extent are policy, political and welfare initiatives in developing countries responsive to the needs of this segment of their citizenry? In other words, Hime's concerns are valid points for us to reflect on.

This dissertation, then introduces questions about the nature of the conceptualisation and problematisation of child mobility in current studies, statistics, policies and interventions, with a particular focus on South Africa. It extends beyond the need to just (re)produce another social study on and about child mobility. Instead, it aims to reflect on why or how, in the problematisation and conceptualisation of child mobility and transport, there is reification and privileging of some theoretical, metatheoretical, ideological and epistemological positions.

This also relates to children's social positioning within research and by researchers. How is child mobility and transport concerns conceptualised and internalised? How are 'children' and 'childhood' theorised and conceptualised? To what extent does a (re)production of the knowledge in which children are (re)presented in a passive and univocal manner really contribute to the body of knowledge on and about child mobility in particular, and children and childhood in general? In what way can sociological theories (including the Sociology of Childhood or Mobility) account for the social problems and phenomena in child mobility?

---

[3] The social and contextual information and circumstances on children in South Africa are integrated into the discussions across chapters one, four and five, rather than as a stand alone section in the introductory chapter.

This introductory section highlights *some* of the crucial aspects framing the study's research aims and questions. Some of these questions are examined in subsequent chapters. The argument here is that philosophical, theoretical, ontological, epistemological, ethical and methodological orientations are inseparable from our everyday beliefs, values and worldviews. Research or policy-making is not a separate activity or value-free. Instead, the onus is on the academic or specialist to confront biases and nested epistemologies, and to 'defamiliarise the familiar' (Bauman cited in Macionis and Plummer, 2008: 5) when examining children, childhood and child mobility. Thus, the adopted approach for this study facilitates the contesting, disembedding and reframing of mainstream and parochial representations and discourses, in particular the conceptions that render children and their childhoods marginal, invisible and / homogenous (or equal). This is important if the outcome is to produce a 'balanced, representative and informed' picture of children's social realities.

1.1.1 Structure and aim of the chapter

This chapter is organised to highlight some of the overarching conceptual, theoretical, methodological and epistemological deficits evident in the existing literature. This chapter begins with a brief examination of *some* of the themes, debates, discourses and ideologies (and structures) shaping knowledge production, or gaps in child mobility in the current literature. This discussion illuminates significant patterns that have emerged and provides an overview of the concerns that frame this study and future or further studies. This is followed by a discussion of the research objectives and questions, key concepts and theoretical approach.

1.2 Study rationale and research problems

Historically, much of the accessible or peer-reviewed research on child mobility remains located within the economic, mathematics, engineering, psychology, geography, anthropology and health disciplines (Barker, Kraft, Horton and Tucker, 2009). Overall, a minority of social scientists and specialists from mostly developed (Northern)[4] countries generate much of the child mobility research, and the general themes, debates and discourses. These include studies on child mobility and transport in sub-Saharan Africa. Regardless of the origins of the knowledge production and producers, this is an indication that the set of

---

[4] Where relevant and appropriate literature from the South is identified by drawing attention to where (geo-politcal location) the study was undertaken.

problems and issues raised remain relevant and critical to contemporary society, particularly the experiences and social problems faced by children.

Hendricks's (2006: 96-97) general comments are congruent with the views asserted in this study. The author argues that the role of the sociologist extends beyond the critic, commentator and researcher. It compels us to think about addressing the major social issues and crises affecting South African. While, the argument conveys the sentiments underpinning the critical social sciences, the author also implies that the sociologist is not restricted in what issues to engage with and analyse and whom to focus on or prioritise in social research. In other words, the author encourages the ideas of exploring 'new' avenues and domains within sociology in general, and in South Africa in particular.

Yet, there are some aspects that remain embedded, uncontested and in some quarters impervious to emergent developments in mobility and childhood studies. The motivation for this research revolves around two issues. The first relates to deconstructing or taking apart the traditional or normative ideas and structures framing contemporary understandings and explanations of child mobility. It is not an outright rejection of all the traditional and normative assumptions and approaches. The second raises the importance of (re)constructing understandings and explanations of child mobility reflecting children's social realities across different social, cultural, political and economic contexts. In relation to the concerns raised in this dissertation, seven emerging and intersecting themes dominate:

1.2.1 Thematic and empirical straitjackets

Thematically, research on children's educational trip-making dominates child mobility studies, including studies from South Africa (for example, Mngaza, Dhlamini, and van Zyl, 2001; Behrens, 2002, 2004a and 2004b; Mbatha, 2005; Rogan, 2007; and Department of Transport South Africa, 2005). Usually, the focus is on the impact of children's educational trip making on, amongst others, adult travel times and patterns, the urban built-environment, and transport planning and networks (Hillman, Adams, and Whitelegg, 1990; Hillman, 1993; Vasconcellos, 1997; Ewing, Schroeer, and Greene, 2004; and McDonald, 2006). More recently, there has been a shift toward examining the relationship between immobility and child health, particularly, in light of the concerns over the global, growing prevalence of childhood obesity (Sonkin, Edwards, Roberts, and Green, 2006). Usually, these studies

prioritise adults' or institutional everyday needs, activities, time, and livelihoods by relegating children to "mere consumers of adult time" (Qvortrop, 1994). Despite the relevance of such approaches, the emerging assumptions remain fragmentary.

Moreover, the exclusive focus on children's educational trip making is restrictive and problematic. The basis of this (flawed) assumption is that schooling is the dominant daily life experience of children and that all school-aged children attend an educational institution regularly. This perspective usually draws on the scholarisation, socialisation, familialisation, and institutionalisation discourses (Edwards and Alldred, 2000; and Qvortrup, 2007).

Studies such as that by Lewin (2009: 151) show that while access to primary education has improved in sub-Saharan Africa:

> "…over 32 million children remain out of school, only two-thirds of children reach the last grade of primary, and many of those enrolled are over age, repeating years, and failing to complete a full cycle of basic education, especially where this includes lower secondary grades."

This demonstrates how delimiting the assumption that schooling is the dominant daily life experience of all children is. Yet, the generalisations about the status, well-being and development of children remain contextualised within the family, the school, and the relationship between family (home) and school (Qvortrup, 1994; Boyden and Levinson, 2000; Edwards and Alldred, 2000; Rama and Richter, 2007 and Moss, 2011).

There seems to be little variability in the definitions used to specify and study childhood and children's lives. This implies that the discourses and conceptions of childhood and children's daily lives remain dominated by minority world ideals. Punch (2012: 3) states:

> "This is because the notion of the globalisation of childhood based on minority world ideals continues to persist, where childhood is perceived as a time for play and school but as incompatible with work…children who do not live up to such idealism is that they have 'abnormal' childhoods."

This bias creates no or limited conceptual space(s) to generate alternate insights (assumptions) about children's lives argue critics (Alanen, 1988, Edwards and Alldred, 2000; and Morrow, 2008). For example, the issue of children's irregular or non-attendance of school must be contextualised in terms of poverty and inequalities, rather than as an 'abnormality'. Overwhelmingly the African majority experience these conditions. Poverty

severely reduces an adult's capacity to care for children. Recent findings show that about 50 per cent of all children in South Africa experience employment deprivation, that is, there are no adults aged 18 years and older in employment in their household (Barnes, Wright, Noble and Dawes, 2007). Bhorat and Kanbur (2005: 4) estimate that for the period:

> "1995 and 2000, absolute and relative poverty levels amongst African-headed households increased, and for non-African households it either remained stagnant or declined."

Poverty rates remain higher in female-headed households, thus stressing the need to focus on African women in particular as this relates directly to the number of children living in poverty (Burman and Reynolds, 1986; Cheru, 2001; and Woolard, 2002).

Under such conditions, girls are more likely to drop out of school, forced to stay home or care for a sick household member. Ilahi (2000: 37) concurs

> "…exogenous shocks that lower household income (and wealth) may adversely affect girl time use and school a lot more than they would boy time use".

A study by the Kaiser Foundation found that about 8 per cent of children reportedly care for a family member sick with AIDS (Steinberg, Johnson, Schierhout, Ndegwa, Hall, Russel, and Morgan, 2002).

Beegle, Filmer, Stokes and Tiererova (2010) found that in sub-Saharan Africa grandparents are more likely to be responsible for child-care and children's living arrangements. The authors argue that this remains a general pattern for all children and not just amongst orphans. Such studies not only challenge filial assumptions but also speak to the idea of divergent childhoods and children's positioning within 'non-nuclear' and 'unconventional' forms of families. What questions can we ask? Can we raise questions about familial composition, structure, power, rights, assets, resources, opportunities and responsibilities within the different household types? How do such structures mediate in an individual's well-being (Delphy and others cited in Curtis, 1986)? Does a grandparents' daily life and mobilities provide a well-defined picture of children's spatial and daily mobilities? Should the inequitable adult-child relations persist and adults remain the focal point of the research and analysis on and about children and childhood? Yet, such assumptions and worldviews are embedded in our thinking and actions.

These highlighted cases show that normative assumptions about adult or household activities, travel patterns, experiences, and behaviours are an adequate proxy for children's activities,

travel patterns and choices remain uncontested. There are merits to such assumptions. However, in the circumscribed adoption of traditional, filial, gerontocratic, paternalistic or patriarchal values, and biological-essentialist approaches to examining children's lives, there is a failure to acknowledge the reality that some children live outside the "regulatory spheres of family and school" (Stephens, 1995: 12). Overall, this suggests a need to disembed, contest, or reframe existing and unreflected bases for empirical undertakings.

1.2.2 Social representations of and about children and childhood

By questioning mainstream assumptions about the family, the school, and the intersecting issue of child mobility or children's lives this also raises questions about how children are portrayed or (mis) / (re)presented across society. For example, Baraldi (2010: 275) notes that in children's portrayal and theorising in sociological studies the emphasis is on children in crisis or those that are marginalised. The author argues that such a discourse creates the binary categorisation and stereotyping of children and youth as 'abnormal' versus 'normal' children and youth and this influences the social policy and political direction and prioritisations. In other words, children's inclusion in socio-political contexts hinges on their construction and categorisation as 'abnormal' and in need of treatment or protection. At the same time, we are reminded that in reviewing key and current issues of concerns in youth, children and childhood in Africa, "by focusing on them as victims (or actors) in a discourse of crisis, ordinary young people in Africa who are not 'in crisis' are neglected" (Robson, 2004: 192).

Yet, there are other factors to consider. For instance, embedded in the normative assumptions about children is the idea that children and childhood are homogenous or universal. This generalised insight implies that children share similar experiences, circumstances, needs or problems and that childhood(s) are comparable. There is, however, considerable variability amongst and between children and their childhoods and contrasting images and portrayal of this. Globally, the social and cultural construction of the notion 'child' and 'childhood' varies (Qvortrup, 1994; Boyden and Levinson, 2000; and Omari and Mbilinyi cited in Evans, 2006). Alanen (2011: 147) observes that:

  "…childhood is socially constructed and reconstructed in relation to time and place, age, gender, ethnicity, class, etc. What has long been 'hidden' and naturalized in children's lives could now be seen as socially and historically constructed, therefore always also 'political'"

In recognising this, some critics suggest that there is a 'multiplicity of diverse childhoods' (Editorial, 1999; James and Prout cited in Evans, 2006), and in effect this is an extension of the constructivist approaches to engaging with children and their issues. This means that while children share a common experience of growth, change, and learning, they differ in innumerable ways, circumstances, including their needs, desires, and capabilities (Woodhead and Montgomery, 2003; and Redmond, 2008). Therefore, any analyses must take into account the structural aspects in terms of age, ethnicity, race (population group), gender, social class, geography, disability, and time (Alanen, 1998; Woodhead and Montgomery, 2003, and du Bois-Reymond, 2005). This approach acknowledges the differences within and among groups of children (James and Prout, 1990) and these nested contexts suggests that children are subjected to the same societal forces as adults but in different ways (Qvortrup, 1994).

Consequently, proponents of the Sociology of Childhood (for example James and Prout, 1990; Qvortrup, 1994; and Knutsson, 1997) argue that childhood is a structural category, comparable and parallel to the proto-sociological issues of ethnicity, race, class and gender. However, equating childhood to a class category may be challenging. Knutsson (1997: 41) reminds us that:

> "Childhood is indeed very far removed from Weber's classic definition of 'class' as the categories or groups of people with similar life chances which are clearly unlike those of other groups in society."

This, then, disembeds the entrenched but parochial conceptualisation of the notion 'class', that is, one's relation to the means of production, sources of income, location within the market, access to goods and services, status and or membership to political parties. Similarly, Wright (2005: 2) suggests that ambiguities in the conceptualisation of 'class' means that "…depending upon the context, different *concepts* of class may be needed." How do the emergent notions of childhood and children contest the conventional ideas of 'class', 'class relations', and 'class structure'? Knutsson (1997: 40) adds that:

> "Every society recognizes a defined period of time in an individual's life as childhood. As a category within society, childhood can be defined as the combined set of socially and culturally instituted arrangements for the identification, protection and gradual transformation of children into socially defined adults…Childhood is a framework for the organisation and location of the various social spaces in which children participate and through which they pass."

Qvortrup (1994: 35) explains that 'childhood' is similar to other marginalised social groups in history in that legally, empirically and normatively their access to resources, privileges, wealth and power is dependent on the age class they inhabit at various periods in their life course. However, some marginalised social groups such as the working class or women differ in terms of their ability to acquire power or activate their agency but for children this is not as straightforward. How do researchers and others represent all children's voices, including those children who have less to say or are unable to 'voice' their concerns or ideas?

Yet, the factors that mediate in the internal-external constructions, categorisations and identifications of a social group are as important to unearth. Howarth (2002: 145) reminds us "questions of identity, group membership and representation pervade daily interactions in contemporary societies." Moreover, there is the issue of the centrality of power.

Jenkins (2000: 11) explains that at the onset a child's sense of self and group identity develops through the adult-child interactions (primary socialisation). The role of the parent in the early years and their categorisation and comparison of their and others children is key to this process. Over time, the production and reproduction of categorisations and identifications is contingent on the set of relationships within and among the individual, interactional and institutional orders. This can produce different outcomes and consequences. While childhood is a permanent social category, for individual children it is a transient phase in their lives (Alanen, 1992; James and James, 2001; Qvortrop, 2003, and Woodhead and Montgomery, 2003).

However, another aspect of 'class' relates to social status or economic well-being, usually determined by household income. In the economic sense, children are conceptualised in terms of their familial dependency status (Qvortrup, 1994, Qvortrup cited in Edwards and Alldred, 2000 and Boyden and Levinson, 2000). The assumption is that the household and residential family are the "locus of joint decisions regarding consumption, production, labour force participation, savings, and capital formation" and that a benevolent or altruistic household head distributes these pooled resources (Agarwal, 1997 and Bongaarts, 2001: 4).

Critics (for example, Kabeer, 1994; and Agarwal, 1997) note that there is a failure to recognise, amongst other factors, the gender and age-based power relations structuring the intra-household resource allocation and decision-making. Unreflected and unitary

assumptions postulate that all children are at equal risk simply because they belong to particular adults or live in certain households. This merely obscures the material and social conditions of children. This excludes other categories of at-risk children, such as homeless children, or child-headed households.

Consequently, an understanding of mobility and transport must include an examination of the historical, social, economic, cultural, and political forces acting on a child, between and amongst children. These and other factors shape children's daily activities, livelihoods, agency, participation, interactions and survival across all societies and cultural contexts. Other factors such as culture, age, gender, race, ethnicity, disability or social class produce divisions between and among children. These are critical nodal points in the analysis of children and childhood, and in this context, child mobility. In other words, our representation, presentation, portrayal and 'inclusion' of children and childhood, we must take cognisance of the realities of children's lives.

1.2.3 Children's participation and voices

A number of other shortcomings or deficits are evident: Notably, the lack of consultation with children and an invisibility of their 'voices' in mobility research and within the policy and decision-making processes. Watson (2009: 1) notes that in the political economy, children are invisible because they are "not party to their self-sustenance as public political actors". The author (ibid: 254) comments on children's marginalisation, and positionality in the political and power hierarchies in society and ideas or idealisation about children and childhood. Watson suggest that is engenders stereotyping across the person, private and public realms in which children's lives intersect. The author utilises Stuart Hall's notion 'regimes of representation' to emphasise the point that stereotyping operates in all sectors (or practices) in society as well as the private and public spheres. This means that powerful and dominant groups in society can deploy strategies to maintain the cultural and social location and marginality of some groups.

In other words, children continue to be outside the political sphere. Perhaps we can transpose Marxist ideas to frame explanations of children's marginality in the political economy. The idea is that non-productivity can be ascribed a low status within a capitalist society. This argument is consistent with the earlier assertion about the need to renegotiate our concepts of

'class'. In other words, the nested contexts and social and structural factors are as important to understanding notions such as age stratification, ageism, age inequalities, gerontocracy, and stratification, or ideological and biological-essentialist stances. At the same time, the research process also masks a complex set of power, political, social and economic hierarchies.

The marginalisation of children and childhood also stems from concerns and questions about children's social competence and their abilities (Morrow and Richards, 1996; Boyden and Levinson, 2000; and Watson, 2009). Unlike the structural explanations of the Marxist, this approach focuses on cultural and moral dimensions. Mitchell and Reid-Walsh (cited in Watson, 2009: 1) note that given their age children are often regarded as less trustworthy or are seen as not knowing as much as adults. Kimmel (1988: 175) explains that across historical periods and different societies, chronological age remains an important "basis for prejudicial attitudes, discriminatory practices, and institutional policies. The importance and role of ageism differs greatly between societies."

Consequently, children's socio-political and cultural positioning and the power differentials between adults and children (and amongst children) have implications for their interaction with adults and participation in adult-led activities (Spyrou, 2011). This includes policy-making, research and programme implementation. Usually, adults and adult led institutions, such as nation states and governments act for, rather than with, children. This institutionalised ageism or age prejudice results in adultist, idealised, un-reflexive and legitimised generalised insights on and about children and their childhood (Alanen, 1992; Buchanan, 2006; and Rama and Richter, 2007). As a result, in such instances, children or childhood seldom remains the key research focus or unit of analysis.

However, unlike other marginalised groups, children need allies to challenge their subordinate positioning in society and to advocate for them as active social agents or actors in their own right (Painter and Philo cited in Matthews, Limb and Taylor, 1999: 135). On the contrary, critics argue that at a certain age children can actively construct their own social world (see Drakeford, Scourfield, Holland and Davies, 2009; Faulkner, 2009 and Alanen, 2010). In such instances, participation implies involvement, responsibility and active engagement in issues that affects one's social life (Moss, 2011).

Similar sentiments are expressed within child rights instruments and approaches. Moreover, the paradigmatic shifts particularly in sociological studies on childhood coincided with and were influenced by the development of child rights based approaches. Children's agency is a fundamental principle within the Sociology of Childhood discourse and children's participation and voices within children's rights discourse. These perspectives recognise children as participants, citizens and social agents or actors in society. For example, Article 12 of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (UNCRC) refers to age-appropriate participation. Article 7 of the African Charter on the Rights and Welfare of the Child (ACRWC) states:

> "Every child who is capable of communicating his or her own views shall be assured the rights to express his opinions freely in all matters and to disseminate his opinions subject to such restrictions as are prescribed by laws."

Despite the problematic nature of such ideals and ideas, Drakeford, Scourfield, Holland and Davies (2009: 248-249) argue that the merit of adopting such an approach is two-fold. Firstly, as an *investment* in their future roles as active citizens, and secondly children's insights are likely to present adults with different strands of understanding and views. The authors also suggest that in acknowledging children as citizens means that our conceptions and normative understanding of 'civil participation', 'citizenship' or 'citizen' needs reframing (Johnny, 2006). These are crucial concerns, given that South Africa's Bill of Rights guarantee that: "a child's best interests are of paramount importance in every matter concerning the child" (Republic of South Africa, 1996). Yet, mainstream representations and portrayals of children remain embedded and uncontested, particularly in child mobility studies and in policy-making on and about children. Can we continue to exclude children in this manner? What useful mobility and transport insights can children provide?

1.2.4 Metatheoretical and epistemological orientations

However, in reflecting on and about the social representations, positioning and portrayal of children and their childhood this also raises other questions. What implications does this have for the generation / production and dissemination of knowledge on and about children, childhood and in this case child mobility? How do researchers or academics construct, interpret, and view social reality? To some extent, this fits the views expressed in the earlier citation from Lyons (2003:5) that social scientists should construct and confront current meanings and explanations of mobility.

Reframing the discourses and debates on or about child mobility requires an articulation, albeit in a truncated form here, of how knowledge is contingent on a range of aspects. At what point do our experiences, ideological stances or orientations inform our framing of ideas, solutions, interactions and knowledge in social research? It raises questions of how we construct meaning around the role experiences, values and beliefs play and the intersection, of structural aspects in these processes. It also compels us to interrogate the nested ideological and philosophical hegemonies within the social sciences and other academic domains.

Billig (cited in Benschop, Halsema and Schreurs, 2001: 12) explains that temporal, cultural, spatial and social contexts affect everyday thinking to the extent that 'common sense' thinking can become the dominant ideological and socio-political views in a society. Schuetz (1953: 6) also explains that our actions are not solitary and detached from the social reality and action spaces we inhabit. This includes the process of knowledge production and the theorisation, problematisation and conceptualisation of social issues.

> "…it is the sedimentation of all of man's previous experiences, organized in the habitual possessions of his stock of knowledge at hand, and as such his unique possession, given to him and to him alone. This biographically determined situation includes certain possibilities of future practical or theoretical activities."

Thus, in what ways are our philosophical or epistemological positions a reflection of the dominant values, beliefs and norms in society and the specific historical time? Is this a reproduction, reification or refutation of a society's dominant ideologies or worldviews? This suggests that the process and approach to social inquiry is not value-free and objective. Such concerns aptly fall within the ambit of sociological inquiries and the intention of this dissertation.

This idea is congruent with ideas such as the 'sociological imagination' and 'defamiliarising the familiar'. For example, Jacobsen and Poder (2008: 4) suggest that the process of "defamiliarisation shatters the impenetrable walls of common-sense that prevents us from experiencing and understanding the world anew". Bauman and May (cited in Jacobsen and Poder, 2008: 4) explain that defamiliarisation is about critically examining the taken-for-granted assumptions in our society. Defamiliarisation has: "…the potential to disturb the comfortable certitudes of life by asking questions no one can remember asking and those with vested interests resent even being asked." Defamiliarisation, then, is not only about

understanding why and how we come to hold, reproduce and legitimatise beliefs, values, traditions, or ideologies but what implications this has for human or social action. It compels us to reflect on our own and not just others practice, thinking, writing and speaking.

The self-reflexive dialogue, then, is important given that the space within which an academic or social scientist operates produces power and positionality hierarchies that does direct thinking, values, speaking, writing and doing. This is evocative of Bourdieu's discussion of *habitus* and '*bodily (or corporeal) hexis*' (Editorial note by Thompson in Bourdieu, 1991: 12-13). *Habitus* is the set of dispositions, generating practices, perceptions and attitudes. These dispositions orientate action, inaction or reaction in all activities of daily activities. The dispositions are structured, inculcated, durable and transposable, thus the body becomes the "repository of ingrained dispositions" (Editorial note by Thompson in Bourdieu, 1991: 13). The way we walk, speak, think, feel and deploy ourselves is an expression and reproduction of these dispositions. Social contexts (*fields*) can also influence the action, reaction and inaction. Within the social science arena (*field*) what is the habitus and body hexis of the social scientist and sociologist? How does this *field* mediate in actions, reactions or inactions?

Our set of philosophical assumptions, or nested epistemologies shapes and is shaped by our approach to social inquiry. In other words, how does the inquirer position him / herself in relation to the study subject or participant? This is an important aspect to consider given that this study intends to deconstruct (ideas and structures) and reconstruct (put together ideas and structures in new ways) debates and discourses. In other words, knowledge production, reproduction, transformation and dissemination must be contextually located and understood. This also means acknowledging the personal and situational influences in knowledge production and dissemination. The focus turns to the 'social action' of the researcher, social scientist or specialist. This may explain the persistence of some shortcomings in the construction of knowledge about child mobility, that is, 'traditional' approaches remain cemented, legitimised and uncontested.

It is crucial, therefore, that social scientists, specialists and researchers re-evaluate or reflect on their problematisation, conceptualisation, theoretical approach and positioning in studies on and about childhood and children. Syprou (cited in Alanen, 2011: 147) argues that researchers lack of reflexive practice stems from three issues. Firstly, the lack of reflection on one's own role in knowledge production, secondly, how our own assumptions and the social

forces acting on our lives constrain children's voices, and thirdly, the lack of awareness about the power dimensions and epistemological hierarchies.

In relation to studies on and about children and childhood, Barker and Weller (2003: 35) observe that the positivist modes of data generation and knowledge production dominate. Children are constructed as passive study objects rather than as collaborators in the construction of diverse realities and social contexts. More importantly, the adult perspective and voice dominates in all spheres of the knowledge production and data generation. Does the hierarchizing and positioning of paradigms serve our interest in understanding the complexities and realities of contemporary society and children's exposure to a range of situations?

If we look at child mobility anew, then it requires a greater understanding of our own epistemological and axiological stances, as researchers, scholars, academics or specialists. It is also about the power differentials, particularly by age or gender that may exist between the researcher and the research participant. This dissertation does not advocate for a choice between the diametric opposites of positivism versus interpretivism. Rather, it shows that the 'traditional' methodologies, epistemologies and methods generally ignore children's knowledge by showing bias towards adult perspectives. It also suggests an adaptation rather than refutation of quantitative methods to take into consideration children and their experiences. We may need to do more in our thinking, writing and researching on and about children and their lives (Horton and Kraftl, 2006: 88).

These ideas and arguments on self-reflexive thinking and dialogue prompted a redirection of this dissertation. Initially the study objectives and aims were designed to replicate existing studies, in particular the production of a robust set of indicators for measuring child mobility and transport disadvantage and exclusion. The study would have produced notable results, with technical and systematic rationality, and be less onerous. However, the unreflected habituations and actions would not result in a challenging of the taken-for-granted assumptions, biases and the limitations in thinking, writing and researching on and about children, childhood and child mobility.

1.2.5 Theorising, social theory and sociological theory

It is important to note that a discussion of philosophical orientations must happen alongside the critical engagement with social theory. Abend (ibid: 192) in citing Bourdieu explains that words are sites of power and this extends to the theoretical positions we perpetuate and reproduce in our writing and thinking in scholarship.

> "The meaning of 'theory' is intimately related to very real institutional resources, careers, funding, prestige, status systems, sociology's public relevance, and so on."

Yet, C. Wright Mills (2000: 121) reminds us that methodological and theoretical engagement is at the heart of intellectual and academic endeavours. The author explains that methodological and theoretical positions, engagement and decisions are important to the practice of an academic. Metatheory and theory share a connection but their role in the research process differs (Merton, 1967: 140). This means that it is impossible to delink metatheory, theory, and social or sociological theory from what is important and relevant to sociology and the space it inhabits in society. Abend (2008: 184) also reminds us that some of the current issues and debates on theory are not new; rather theorists such as Robert Merton raised some of the issues.

Dillion (2010: 10) makes the point that: "One of the advantages of knowing sociological theory is that it allows us to try and make sense of virtually any aspect of social behaviour we might be interested in". This is important to think about in terms of the social interactions and actions of communities of practice. Morgan (2007: 53) explains that there usually exists a shared consensus about methods, methodologies and research questions and problems. This means that certain ideas, practices and beliefs are normalised, habitualised, legitimised and embedded in the research community. Kuhn (cited in Morgan, 2007: 53) suggests that these practices and beliefs can 'regulate' the group of practitioners rather than develop the subject matter. This means that paradigm shifts may have consequences for the larger field.

This implies that a group, regardless of composition, can exert a particular influence on a research agenda and the construction of the social realities and social phenomena. Thus, the internal and external influences on knowledge production are equally important to note. For example, Murphy (1983: 636) extends some of these arguments through the concept 'intra-field closure' and usurpatory practices in scholarship. The author explains that paradigm shifts or dominance and subversions rest on the successful mobilisation of power within

disciplines. The struggles to change a paradigmatic stance reveals the "the vested interests attached to the former paradigm as well as its nature as an instrument of exclusionary closure". This sensitises us to, amongst others, the issues relating to alienation, power, domination, and social closure or intra-field closure within the process of knowledge creation, production and dissemination. This links into the earlier comments on the dominance of particular metatheoretical and theoretical perspectives in the sector. Moreover, 'intra-field closure' is an extension of the Weberian notion of 'closure' and 'social action'.

If we are to account for children's positioning and their political, social, theoretical or empirical marginalisation in various spaces in society then what purpose, does it serve and who benefits from a limiting and fragmented view, of children? How do we understand the marginalisation of child-centred theories and approaches within the transport sector and the communities of practice? How can a social scientist legitimate alternate discourses and debates that will better represent children, childhood and child mobility? What effect will a 'paradigm shift' produce amongst a community of researchers, whose questions and procedures are being contested or disembedded?

In the same vein, Morrow (2011: 2) reminds us that theorising and theoretical positioning on and about children does have implications for how society will engage with and treat children. van Krieken and Bühler-Niederberger (2009: 188) remind us that there are a number of connections between mainstream sociological theories and the studies on childhood and as a result, there is place for "a robustly theoretical sociology of childhood". However, emergent approaches and theorisation on and about children and childhood continue to be a contentious issue in some quarters in the social sciences and humanities. At the height of the emergence and development of a Sociology of Childhood, Brannen and O'Brien (1995: 737) remark that the ambivalence towards the emergent views rests on the embedded view of children's need to be protected and safe. Another aspect that needs to be considered is the differentiated and fragmentary nature of societies and how children's positioning, portrayal and representation may not garner as much interest or concern as other socially differentiated groups.

The view expressed by Brannen and O'Brien (1995) continues to have currency. Baraldi (2010) adds that the initial interest in theorising on and about children was in part due to international (European or Northern) efforts and political will and engagement with child rights frameworks. Shanahan (2007) also explores the issue of marginalisation and suggests

that there are three dimensions to consider. This encompasses (1) the inadequate differentiation between the construct 'children' and 'childhood'; (2) the conflation of the notions of childhood as a social construct and as a social good, that is linked to notions of hope and prosperity; and finally (3) children's positioning or lack thereof within the political and policy sphere.

Despite such ambivalences, engaging with metatheory, theory, and social or sociological theory in the production of knowledge on and about children, childhood and child mobility is central and not marginal to the role and functions of sociology. This is a commentary of the ideas and assumptions produced and the socio-historical, political and ideological settings in which they are produced and received. At what level and how do we choose to 'do sociology', particularly if we are interested in facilitating a paradigm shift – in this case towards child-centred approaches. Perhaps, William James' (cited in Thayer, 1982: 227) assertion carries with it some note of 'truth' for us to ponder:

> "First, you know, a new theory is attacked as absurd; then it is admitted to; to be true, but obvious and insignificant; finally it is seen to be important that its adversaries claim that they themselves discovered it."

As academics or sociologists, we have a choice and the notion `choice' in itself implies human agency, social action and autonomy. This suggests that the theorising on and about child mobility, children and childhood are important in terms of how we frame or reframe our positions. It favours the view that sociology in general, and in South Africa in particular has no cause not to (re)engage with the social issues on and about children, childhood and child mobility.

1.2.6 Everyday life and daily mobilities

If the aim of this study is to disembed and reframe the mainstream approaches to child mobility this necessitates a rationale for the delineation and selection of daily activities, daily mobilities, time use, and social exclusion. This entails an account of the 'everyday' rather than its relegation as peripheral. Douglas (2010: 358) explains that the understanding of everyday life is a sociological interest. However, the study of 'the everyday' is ignored because the mundane nature of the activities is viewed as unimportant social issues for investigation (Horton and Kraftl, 2006: 71).

This raises questions about what children's mobility and transport characteristics tell us about their social lives and their engagement in everyday life, and vice versa. This also generates questions about the kind of knowledge, perspectives, and insights sociology, including the Sociology of Childhood or Mobility, offers transport experts and decision-makers. Interestingly, transport geographers and anthropologists are at the forefront of such developments, creatively analysing the everyday lives and mobilities of children (see for example McKendrick, 2000; Barker, 2003 and Horton and Kraftl, 2006; see Porter et al various publications). Such studies show that incorporating and creating child-centred conceptual frameworks contributes towards improving children's future outcomes and prospects (Levison, 2000). It also illustrates the importance of acknowledging the 'everyday' theoretically and empirically.

Kousholt (2012: 126) suggests that research into the social life of children in diverse everyday contexts provides vital insights into childhood as a part of societal structures and children's agency. This means that children and young peoples' everyday lives are equally important. There are studies, albeit a few, that have explored the relationship between the organisation and regulation of children's everyday life and their physical mobility and transport, or access needs and challenges. For example, Turner and Kwakye (1996); Rama (1999); Schildkrout (2002); Apt and Turner cited in Porter (2004); Dube (2007); Mashiri, Dube and Buiten (2007); Mashiri and Porter (2007); Porter and Abane (2008); and Porter, Hampshire, Mashiri, Dube, and Maponya (2010). It also shows the disjuncture in minority and majority world ideals on and about children and childhood. This reiterates earlier arguments, that children are not a homogenous group with shared experiences, needs, and challenges.

Some of these studies demonstrate that a lack of or inappropriate or poor services and infrastructure influence how some children spend their time and how their day is organised. For example, while boys and girls in rural households are responsible for different household activities, girls and younger children often carry a heavier burden (Rama and Richter, 2007). They are more likely to spend considerable amounts of time and effort transporting household goods, such as water, fuel, wood, food or crops. Girls, however, are more likely to be burdened with the porterage and head-loading (also discussed in chapter four, see Porter and Porter, Hampshire, Abane, Munthali, Robson, Mashiri, Tanle, Maponya and Dube, 2012; and Porter, Hampshire, Dunn , Hall, Levesley, Burton, Robson, Abane, Blell and Panther,

2013). Yet, girls and younger children have fewer opportunities to use transport technologies such as wheelbarrows or horse and carts to lighten their daily domestic labour. Little consideration is given to the physical, social, economic, education or health costs the girl child endures in the provision of essential household services.

What implications does the empirical and theoretical marginalisation of children's voices, particularly those living contexts were they bear the brunt or burden of domestic household labour? How will such marginalisation influence policy and political? In what way can an understanding of children's everyday life influence policy, innovation and technology dimensions?

The interconnectedness between children's everyday life, activities and daily mobility needs, experiences and problems is unacknowledged. In most mobility studies, children's social experiences and everyday life 'disappear' within adult or macro-level concerns. In contrast, Pooley, Turnbull and Adams (2005: 1-5) argue that:

> "…everyday journeys – to school, to work, to visit friends and relatives, to shop, for leisure and pleasure – all form part of the fabric that constructs our everyday existence. Without such trips life as we recognise it would not be possible and, to some extent, our very identities are constructed through the everyday mobility that we undertake…When we travel, how we travel, who we travel with, what we travel for and how often we travel all impinge on the construction of the self and on identity with people and places."

This counters assumptions that only adults and their life experiences, a proxy of children's experiences, are worthy of analysis. It also illustrates the interconnectedness and complexity of children's daily lives and mobilities, their time use and inclusion, or lack thereof, in society.

In other words, mobility and transport are more than just about the movement of goods and people, or infrastructure and provisioning. It incorporates an understanding of how transport, institutional mechanisms and infrastructure, or the lack thereof, influences everyday human conditions, existence, and survival. Moreover, transport and mobility, in combination with various factors can mediate in the construction of attitudes, perceptions and beliefs within and about individuals and social groups. Rather, children's mobility and transport problems, needs and experiences must be understood by locating their individual problems and experiences within the context of what is happening within the social groups and spaces they inhabit in society.

Bennet and Watson (2002) explain that by defamiliarising the everyday it shows the routine aspects of ordinary people's lives are worthy of scholarly examination. It shows that less powerful social groups and classes are of equal worth politically. Such studies can show how social relations and practices inform how individuals or groups experience everyday life. For example, insight into the forms of power and power relations associated with daily roles and responsibilities, and the sites or spaces where these activities take place. Why are girl's transport, porterage and head-loading responsibilities greater than that borne by boys? What does it say about how the sexual division of labour operates in childhood? What innovation and technological developments can be introduced to address the gendered nature of children and young people's everyday household and livelihood contexts?

Yet, sociologists have always been interested in how social forces[5], including transport-related innovations, technology and institutional structures shape the human life story or biography, that is, the day to day activities across life. Ferrante (2011: 3) argues that innovation and technology has (re)shaped the way individuals think about themselves and others, including the way we live and interact with each other in modern societies. Technology and innovation also creates forms of power and power relations, or mobility and immobility between children and adults and amongst children. This includes transport infrastructure, development and mobility.

Ellegård and Cooper (2004: 37-38) elaborate on these aspects:

> "People shape their daily life by continuously performing activities to satisfy their wants and needs. But their opportunities to act according to their wants and needs are restricted, first, by the natural and manmade material environment, second, by the individual's own capacity and capabilities, and third, by social institutions and structures like agreements, regulations and laws on social and economic couplings between individuals"

Generally, these ideas resonate with Mills' (1959) argument that the individual cannot be understood without understanding the history of the society, and likewise the history of society cannot be understood without understanding the individual. This argument lends itself to Mills' (1959: 8) distinction between, "'the personal troubles of milieu' and 'the public issues of social structure'". Personal troubles cover the range of issues an individual experiences daily. However, personal troubles become a public issue in that we raise

---

[5] Ferrante (2011:3) notes that social forces are: "anything humans create that influence or pressure people to interact, behave, respond or think in certain ways."

questions about how the social forces interact and contribute to personal troubles, and in this context child mobility. This reiterates the earlier point that individuals experience things in a personal way, and children's mobility and transport problems, experiences and needs also derive from the structure of society. For example, porterage and head loading are personal troubles affecting women and girls but if this form of labour impinges on their rights and access to education, health care or social services then it is a public issue.

In short, mobility and transport issues remain embedded in everyday life and are important threads in the fabric of society. Everyday life, experiences, and mobility patterns, then, remain linked to sociological understandings (analyses) of social problems and change. The usefulness of these formulations lies in the recognition that mobility-related problems cannot be isolated from life circumstances, social problems, social categorisations[6], social inequalities and the ability to participate in society. Thus, an analysis of daily activities enables us to frame our understanding of daily mobility, transport demands and patterns and its wider implications for children's lives. In this study, it has a particular bearing on the sociological significance of the children's everyday life and the mobility, social exclusion and marginalisation nexus.

de Boer (1986: 8-14) explains some of the roots of the marginalisation-mobility nexus in modern society by arguing that urbanisation, sub-urbanisation and the spatial specialisation of industries increases distances between home and work locations. Consequently, increasing the socio-spatial marginalisation of some groups, such as the aged or low-income earners without access to private vehicles and for whom public transport is unaffordable. de Boer (1986: 12) suggests that this provides adequate room for sociological theorising: "To do this it is necessary for sociology to immerse itself deeply in the daily life to study how life proceeds in space and time and under what conditions".

The very nature of contemporary society is its reliance on connectivity between individuals, communities, corporations and other institutions. Levels and different forms of mobility and transport modes and infrastructure are therefore important conduits, including or isolating people and their daily lives (Edmonds, 1998). Vilhelmson (1999: 177) notes that in a modern

---

[6] However, the socially constructed nature of 'exclusion' is also dependent on who is deeming or labelling a particular group as 'excluded'. This thesis does not investigate this aspect.

high speed society mobility is important to everyday activities and access to action spaces such as the need to travel to shops, schools, or health institutions.

Geurs, Boon and van Wee (2009: 71) define the social impacts of transport as:

> "…changes in transport sources that (might) positively or negatively influence the preferences, well-being, behaviour or perception of individuals groups, social categories and society in general (in the future)."

Such aspects also affect children and young people. Nonetheless, these factors are either insufficiently linked, or rarely considered or recognised as critical to understanding children's daily mobility patterns and challenges. This, then, fuels the theory-praxis-policy disjuncture. It also highlights the importance of examining and understanding the interplay between child mobility, daily life, activities, time use and social exclusion.

Despite, the evidence supporting the interconnectedness of everyday lives, mobility and the extent to which it mediates in social exclusion this aspect is unacknowledged in child mobility studies. The relationship between children's mobility and transport, including infrastructure, facilities or policy directions and their development, well-being and survival in society is not directly acknowledged or recognised. This also speaks to a more general concern about how 'transport', 'mobility', children, childhood, social exclusion, and marginalisation are problematised and conceptualised. Horton and Kraftl (2006:72) reiterate the point that to bring the 'everyday' into mainstream analysis, in this case sociological analysis, also requires engagement with the theoretical, methodological, and empirical aspects.

1.2.7 Mobility and social exclusion

Bryceson (2009) gets to the heart of this dilemma. The author (2009) explains that in general two main misconceptions contribute to the reluctance to acknowledge mobility and transport as a basic human need and right. The first highlights the lack of recognition of the interaction between roads and survival and livelihoods strategies, particularly, for poor and marginalised social groups. The second focuses on the inability to recognise the role transport plays in the development of other sectors in society.

Yet, such misconceptions remain contrary to emergent views in the field. For instance, de Boer (1986) argues that transport is a public good and this entails acknowledging and addressing all citizens' mobility interests and needs. Similarly, Tyler (2004) asserts that the provision of accessible transport is a necessary element in a just society. Consequently, Cass, Shove and Urry (2005: 539) notes that 'mobility rights' imply: "…that citizenship is no longer confined as in T.H. Marshall's famous model to civil, political and social rights, but that there are also what we might term mobility rights".

These authors suggest that a disregard of such principles infringe on individual and group rights as citizens, thereby impeding their ability to participate in society. This constrains an individual's social, welfare, and economic activities, and their physical and social networks (Edmonds, 1998; Njenga and Davis, 2003; and Czuczman, 2005). Moreover, the matter of 'rights' cannot be separated from the essence of citizenship and social justice. The latter, extolls the intrinsic worth and rights of all humans, including children, as citizens. Yet, human rights and universal rights remain powerful contemporary ideologies and approaches to human well-being and development outcomes.

Townsend's (cited in Webster, 1990: 20) definition of poverty also encapsulates such ideals: "…if people's circumstances militate against this participation then they are relatively deprived." Therefore, some social categories suffer discrimination, marginalisation and exclusion. Sheller (2008: 27) illustrates this aspect of mobility through the notion of 'personal mobility freedom'. A person's physical capacities, social obligations[7] or the natural aspects (physical terrain) can determine mobility / freedom (power), or immobility / unfreedom (powerlessness). These arguments restate the earlier positions that mobility and transport attributes remain embedded in all spheres of everyday life and activities. Mobility rights are as important as social, civil and political rights.

Spinney, Scott and Newbold (2009: 2) in citing Burns (1999) and Metz (2000) suggest that:

> "…a definition of transport mobility should include at least one or more of the following dimensions: (i) access to desired places such as socializing with family and friends; (ii) psychological benefits when social interaction and independence are important to the individual; (iii) the physical benefits of movement; (iv) the maintenance of social networks; and, (v) emotional security benefits of potential travel."

---

[7] This includes familial ties, work-related obligations, or the ascribed positions of gender, race, age, or ethnicity.

Cass, Shove, and Urry (2003: 539) argue that in linking the concept 'mobility' to 'social exclusion' highlights how the "combination of distance, inadequate transport, and limited ways of communicating can be unfair or discriminatory" for certain social groups. It also affirms Cooley's (1894) argument that transportation is a means of material communication, simultaneously influencing the physical organisation of society. Mobility, then, within these contexts extends beyond the idea of physical movement and independent mobility to include physical or mental abilities, safety, well-being, quality of life and rights (Schönfelder and Axhausen, 2003). This analysis appropriates the social, developmental and human rights conceptual frameworks.

Lucas (2011: 1323) explains that a social exclusion approach to transport disadvantages or transport poverty is advantageous in that it illustrates the impact of the lack of or inadequate transport provision on citizen's right to participate in society. In highlighting the social dimensions of transport disadvantage, it also brings to the fore issues of how individual capacities, competencies and abilities can hinder or facilitate participation. More importantly, the idea of reflecting all priority and vulnerable groups 'voices' and lived realities challenges the transport planners, policy makers and other decision-makers taken-for-granted assumptions about some social groups.

Various authors describe the ways in which transport can be a source of social exclusion for some individuals and social groups, including children, in societies (Stantchev and Menaz, 2006: 5; and Titheridge, 2004: 1). These forms of exclusion can reinforce or cushion each other – and there are some associations to 'accessibility' and 'mobility':

- Physical (spatial) - physical barriers to transport and other services
- Geographical - the lack of transport provision within residential areas
- Exclusion from facilities - lack of access to facilities and services
- Economic - transport costs can be prohibitive
- Time-based - travel time or inability to travel at a particular hour
- Fear-based - fear of using transport, such as safety fears
- Personally - mental or physical incapacities

There is a fluid connection between daily activities, mobilities and social exclusion, or participation in society. Yet, such formulations seldom frame child mobility studies. Ignoring this relationship can be detrimental to individuals, families, households, and communities

rights as citizens and to their well-being. This reiterates the point that mobility and transport are embedded in the social fabric of everyday life in society.

The uncontested or unreflected representations and portrayal of social groups has particular implications for their inclusion, participation, and well-being in society. The conclusion is that such positions and tensions deepen and reify social groups' marginalisation, subordination and invisibility, including children. It also illustrates the shortsightedness in others sectors, namely a failure to recognise the symbiotic nature of reliance on the transport sector, and vice versa. Therefore, there is a need to examine the current literature, policy and programmes related to child mobility and to understand what drives such ideological and philosophical positioning and hegemonies.

There are, however, accounts of the rethink and reframing of mobility discourses and debates of socially marginalised and vulnerable groups. A case in point is the global shift in political and ideological discourses to facilitate the mainstreaming of gender in transport studies and policies (Infrastructure for Poverty Reduction Task Team, 2004; African Union, 2005; and World Bank, 2007). The emergent empirical evidence asserts that globally the transport sector reproduces, reifies and perpetuates classical forms of social inequality such as patriarchy and gender-based cultural practices (Afshar, 1991, Turner, Grieco and Apt, 1998; Turner and Grieco, 2000; Fernando and Porter, 2002; Mahapa, 2003; Blackden, and Wodon, 2006 and Potgieter, Pillay and Rama, 2006).

In other words, the gender norm and sex-role differentiation (stratification) influences all aspects of life, including how, when or who a person travels with, or their mode of travel (Fernando and Porter, 2002). Transport policy-makers, decision-makers, planners and major donor agencies utilise this evidence to promote transport programmes and interventions that incorporate gender equality, women's empowerment and human development in society. This resulted in the embedding of gendered dimensions, gender and development paradigms, debates and contradictions (Sibanda cited in Fernando and Porter, 2002: 2) in transport policies and development lexicons and discourses (World Bank, 1997; Transport Research Board, 2005).

There is also a need to acknowledge that not all practices, programmes and interventions benefit women and girls in meaningful and sustainable ways. Some of the unintended and

harmful consequences (or latent manifestations) stem from well-intended actions (Pincus, 2006). Turner (2004: 2) suggests that gender mainstreaming in the transport sector has produced some imbalances in implementation and understanding of what a gendered approach entails. In other words, gender issues are add-ons in major projects "rather than as a gendered approach to the design of the whole project or programme". Alanen's (in Mason and Fattore, 2005: 31-32) use of the concept 'pseudo-inclusion' aptly describes the integration of gender into a sector policy, programme or intervention. Standing (2004) concurs and explains that in the developing country bureaucracies gender mainstreaming is a flawed idea because of the myths that such an approach signals an automatic transformation of gender relations. Bretherton (2001) explains that if gendered approaches were to be successful then the strategy of mainstreaming must happen at all the levels and processes in an institution. Institutionalisation requires that the behaviours, actions and rules on gender must be normalised and habitualised. Mobility and transport, then, are embedded in development practices in ways more far-reaching and contradictory ways than at face value.

Despite these ideological and paradigmatic shifts and contradictions there is a general protractedness with regards to the transfer of the lessons learnt and best practices from other user or social groups to child mobility studies. This is a general inertness to adopt child rights / centred approaches to create a better future for children (Thomsen, 2002; and Whitelegg, 2010). This, then, necessitates a disembedding of 'common-sense' and normative representations of childhood and child mobility. The research problems highlighted here are extensive and such engagement would require considerably more deliberations than a dissertation provides. However, these issues form the foundation for reframing, that is, reformulating or reconstructing approaches, arguments and debates selected for consideration.

1.3 Research aim and objectives, research questions and purpose of research

Broadly, this study aims to examine how child mobility is problematised, conceptualised and prioritised by practitioner communities working on research, programmes, policies and / or interventions. It raises concerns about whether child mobility remains peripheral to, or mainstreamed into transport policies, practices and interventions. This also encompasses questions about the evidence-base supporting the various policies and practices, and the ontological, methodological, axiological and epistemological orientations. Moreover, the

theoretical framework provides insights into the occurrence and persistence of these phenomena in society, that is, the portrayal, (re)presentation, positioning and prioritisation of children and childhood. This primer is relevant for the development of further research on and about child mobility and transport.

1.3.1 Research objectives and questions

The main objectives are to:

a) Determine how child mobility and transport issues are problematised, conceptualised and internalised within key research, statistics, policies or interventions

b) Examine the dominant philosophical and paradigmatic orientations and how these have shaped knowledge production and understandings of child mobility

c) Determine why the representations and portrayals of children and childhood reflect, reproduce and reify children's status in society and across historical, social, cultural and institutional contexts

d) Determine and examine the challenges and opportunities these understandings present for a sociological account of and (re)engagement with child mobility.

The following research questions guide this study:

i. How are child mobility and transport issues problematised, conceptualised and internalised within the relevant national survey data, key (national) transport policies, legislations and programme interventions in the country?

ii. What dominant or nested philosophical and paradigmatic orientations have shaped knowledge production and understandings of child mobility and transport needs?

iii. Why do these (re)presentations and portrayals of children and childhood reflect, reproduce and reify children's status in society and across historical, social, cultural and institutional contexts?

iv. What challenges and opportunities do these understandings present for a sociological account of and (re)engagement with child mobility globally?

1.3.2 Purpose of the research

Babbie and Mouton (with Vorster and Prozesky, 2001: 79) argue that social research serves many purposes. The aims, objectives and research questions characterise this research as *descriptive* and *exploratory*, rather than explanatory in design. Neuman (2011: 38) suggests the purpose of exploratory research is to develop preliminary ideas about a social issue. This generates new ideas for future or further research. The purpose of descriptive research is to

describe an issue more 'accurately' but it can also act to contradict, or disembed existing assumptions (Neuman, 2011: 38).

Brink, van der Walt and van Rensburg (2012: 114) explain that in the typical descriptive study:

> "The researcher does not manipulate any variables, and makes no efforts to determine the relationship between variables…the researcher just searches for accurate information about the characteristics of a single sample…or about the frequency of a phenomenon's occurrence."

This study does not examine any clearly defined hypotheses. This study, then combines both the exploratory and descriptive research purposes[8] to address the main aims and research questions. The two research purposes aptly depict this study's intent. Moreover, Neuman (2011: 38) also suggests that in practice, descriptive and exploratory research overlaps and this holds true for this study. In this context, we aim to challenge unreflected assumptions and 'disembed' children's constrained social positions by reframing the current discourses and debates. The deficits in the current approaches to child mobility also provide a rationale for adopting both research purposes. This type of categorisation supports the assertion that there is limited engagement and connection in research on children's everyday life, daily mobilities and their participation in society. This includes a privileging of some paradigms over others. In this context, we explore aspects of children's daily lives and mobility to create a more comprehensive picture of these aspects.

1.4 Delineating and delimiting the research problem: Key concepts

> "…concepts tend to outlive the historical configurations which gave them birth and infused them with meaning. The tendency is rooted in the natural propensity to absorb and accommodate new experiences into the familiar picture of the world; habitual categories are the main tools for this absorption. New experience does not fit the categories easily." (Bauman, 1982 cited in Jacobsen and Poder, 2008:3)

The following section provides a brief discussion of the key concepts informing and shaping the research. This section is important in that the conceptualisation of nomenclature and terminology is a statement of the study's underlying assumptions. It presents a synthesis of some of the social, cultural, political, economic, spatial, temporal and historical contexts mediating in the conceptualisation and operationalisation of these constructs.

---

[8] In contrast, an explanatory type research aims to explain the why and how of a situation to identify and explore the underlying causes behind the effects and the nature of the relationships (Brotherton, 2008; 12).

1.4.1 Mobility

The concept 'transport' refers to the movement of goods and people over any distance, by any means possible (Ali-Nejadfard, 2004). This construction draws on the generalised insight that transport infrastructure and development are key catalysts for economic development and growth. Sociologists such as Weber (Collins, 1986) also theorised about the impact of invention and innovation on society. Weber suggested that such developments stem from a rational desire to control the production factors. However, the focus on distance, modes of movement and infrastructure in this sense is restrictive and limiting in scope and application. In the context of this study, it does not assist in understanding the social, political, cultural and mobile aspects of everyday life and survival (Freudendal-Pedersen, 2009).

In contrast, the concept 'mobility' recognises that the *ease* or *difficulty* experienced in travelling to a facility or service is equally important (Ali-Nejadfard, 1997; and Edmonds, 1998). This incorporates the idea that the possibility or ability to move from one place to another will enable one to maintain, sustain or expand activity choices in everyday life (Duchâteau, 1998). It incorporates an examination of opportunities and possibilities for employment, shopping, residential choice and location, holidays, or leisure. This entails a focus on the patterns, availability and utilisation of different modes of transport.

It is important to note that the concept 'mobility' differs in meaning from 'transport'. Pooley, Turnbull and Adams (2005: 14-18) say 'mobility':

- "Enables people to participate in everyday life and the normative social, cultural, political or economic activities.
- Constructs or fosters a sense of community (real or virtual) through the action spaces people live in, carry out transactions and develop identities.
- Relates to the social construction of status, were technological innovations (including the car) mediates in the ascribing of social status.
- (Is) the by-product of increased personal mobility and travel (including) traffic congestion or accidents, pollution as well as physical, economic and social barriers for some social groups.
- Is linked to Beck's notion 'risk society' and the consequences of increased mobility and travel; (and) focuses on the way in which some social groups, such as (children are restricted by) personal mobility and action spaces.
- (Relates) to tourism and leisure and globalisation (because accessibility) and affordability of such activities are no longer constrained by economic status, gender or other social categories."

These formulations go beyond the focus of structural conditions and the issue of the availability of transport infrastructure and networks (Crous cited in Jordaan, 1997: 2). It takes into account social, cultural and political elements. Moreover, it looks at how communication technologies mediate in everyday mobility and highlights the connection to everyday life, social exclusion, social justice and human rights.

These discussions highlight the connection between concepts such as 'mobility' and 'accessibility' and 'availability'. For instance, Stantchev and Menaz (2006:4) explain that: "Accessibility is tied in to the complementary issue of equity" and is indicative of differences in access to goods, services and opportunities, all issues of citizen rights in society. In the same vein, Tyler (2004) notes that access should be about ensuring the benefits and responsibilities of living in society will be truly available to, and experienced by, all people.

Farrington (2007) explains the popularisation and politicisation of 'accessibility' rests in its recognition that access to services involves more than just transport issues. The 'constrained access negatively affects some groups' access to opportunities, facilities, activities and services vital to their social, political and economic participation in society. Yet, these concepts are used interchangeably to mean the same thing (Stantchev and Menaz, 2006; and Farrington, 2007).

Geurs, Boon and van Wee (2009: 76-77) argue that 'accessibility' takes into account how land-use, planning modes, transport systems and transport modes facilitate access to activities or destinations. The authors note that 'accessibility' encompasses a wide-range of meanings. This includes the physical components such as availability and physical access to transport facilities; characteristics such as travel time, cost and comfort of the service; the spatial and temporal distribution and characteristics of services and activities; and how these affect participation in the cultural activities of societies. In this study, the preference is towards the use of the notion 'mobility' to encapsulate a wide-range of crucial issues.

1.4.2 Social exclusion and exclusionary processes

Gore (1995) argues that in African scholarship 'social exclusion' is usually utilised to frame key social processes of nationality, citizenship, underclass and the institutionalisation of exclusionary practices across various societies. The author (Gore, 1995: 115) also explains

that 'social exclusion' is an "analytical approach to understanding existing socio-economic trends and problems" and is not another social problem in itself. Importantly, its wider application can enhance the understanding of processes of impoverishment, inequality, and poverty (Gore, 1995: 115; see Burchardt, Le Grand, and Paichaud, 1999; Levitas, 1999; Froud, Johal, Leaver, and Williams, 2002; Silver, 2006; and UNDP, 2007).

However, some critics argue that 'social exclusion' is distinct from poverty. Others (for example, Silver, 2006) fervently oppose this view, arguing that social exclusion *does* take into account the material and non-material issues: the economic, social, cultural, and political dimensions of disadvantage or deprivation. This concept makes it possible to examine a range of issues (Burchardt, Le Grand, and Paichaud, 1999; Levitas, 1999; Silver, 2006; and UNDP, 2007).

In reflecting on the earlier citation from Ellegård and Cooper (2004: 37-38), it is possible to examine the role that state and government policies and measures play in the exclusionary process. It raises concerns over whether these structures enable all citizens' equal access to services and participation in key activities in society (Hamilton, and Jenkins, 2000; Hodgson and Turner, 2003; Kenyon, Rafferty, and Lyons, 2003; Mackett, and Titheridge, 2004 and Cass, Shove, Urry, 2005).

Yet, this also speaks to issues of ideological and paradigmatic orientations. Pincus (2006: 21) suggests, "Hegemonic ideologies are often invoked by those in power who are trying to enact social policies". This leads to complex and combined forms of discrimination and prejudices, – intentional or unintentional. In other words, "Good people implementing bad policies can be just as harmful as those who intentionally discriminate" (ibid: 24). Pincus suggests that this gives rise to institutional and structural forms of discrimination. The 'structural discrimination' refers to how the individuals who implement the policies and programmes of a dominant group may not realise that some of these well-intended actions are harming the very groups they claim to protect. This presents an adequate rationale for supporting the use of the concept 'social exclusion' and its link to notions of power and powerlessness.

Murphy (1988) argues that social exclusion has its roots in Max Weber's formulation of economic action, status groups and social closure. Weber's theorisation of social closure and monopolization offers valuable insights into how exclusionary codes regulate society, and the

social relations of certain socio-economic groups. Weber's theory of social closure and monopolization is a theory of power and domination. It raises, amongst others, questions about how 'age' remains an exclusionary form in society.

1.4.3 Age differentiation and stratification

An earlier citation by Knutsson refers to how chronological age is a form of differentiation and stratification across societies. Clearly, chronological age gives rise to variations in the "social distributions of rights, responsibilities, dignity and respect in the contemporary world" and Lee (2001:1) explains that:

> "Chronological age is among the axes of human variability that have been linked to the social distribution of dignity and respect. Children can be marked out as a social group, distinguished by the visibility of their low chronological age. Their points of view, opinions and desires have often been ignored because their age has been taken as a sign that they are not worth listening to."

This also illustrates the growing interest in non-class forms of social division and identity, and the need to contest mainstream understandings of 'class' (Wright, 2005).

Important to our understanding of children's representation and ascribed status is age or age structure. Although this does not garner as much interest academically (Lee, 2001), an individual's social positioning remains influenced by more than just class position, gender, race or ethnicity. 'Age', then, remains a neglected force in the production and reproduction of a varying form of oppression and domination (Bradley cited in Kirby, 1999: 195). Bernardi (1985) points out that the concept of 'power' extends beyond the political realm and can be distributed and exercised in different ways. It is, therefore important to raise questions about how age affects the power, status or wealth a person, in this case a child, enjoys in society.

Bernardi's (1985) study of age class systems shows that age differentiation or stratification is a hallmark of all societies. The study shows that every age grade corresponds to a social position and the age class system is a means of social promotion. The author explains that the formal institutionalisation of the age class takes place through celebrating rites of passage but that the onset of this varies across cultures and societies. Similarly, Hogan and Astone (1986: 111) note that age grading differs and is dependent on biological heritage and cultural and social environment. This suggests that as with class, race, ethnicity and gender, age systems affect resource allocation, social relations and political / social positioning.

34

Foner (1980: 771, and Riley 1987) argues that age stratification is not a new field in sociology. The author cites earlier works of Sorokin ([1947] 1969), Lenski (1966), Mannheim ([1928] 1952), and Ryder (1965). A case in point, Parson's (1942: 604) observation supports Bernardi's historical account of age differentiation being embedded in all structural elements in a society, in particular kinship structure, formal education, occupation and community participation. In other words, age differentials are a hallmark of all societies. In the same vein, Elder (1975: 167-8) notes that age distinctions also influence access to privileges, rewards and power. Foner (1974: 188) adds that: "age is a basis of 'structured social inequality'".

Yet, age carries with it other complexities, diversities, and controversies (Stephens, 1995; Hodgkins and Newell, 1998; Woodhead and Montgomery, 2003; and Roscigno, Mong, Byron and Tester, 2007). Cockburn (1998 cited in Watson, 2009: 4) suggests:

> "The definition of everyone under 18 as 'non-adult' obscures the enormous diversity of the age range 0-18, in which people spectacularly change in terms of physical, emotional, intellectual growth and have a wide range of skills and competencies which express a huge number of divergent needs."

Consequently, Bass (2010, 339) notes that: "Age as social structure, whether measured as younger children vs older children, or by a generational marker of child and adult, is also used to define and understand childhood."

This study, therefore, adopts the South African Constitution age-specific, legal definition of a child. Section 28 of the Bill of Rights defines a child as a person in the age range 0 to 17 years (Republic of South Africa, 1996). This delineation is in keeping with international rights-based treaties such as the UNCRC and the ACRWC. It is also important to point out that the study recognises that this cohort is not a homogenous unit but differs in diverse ways and is context-dependant.

1.5 Max Weber on children, social action and rationality

This study raises the question of 'why and how the (re)presentations and portrayal of children and childhood reflect, reproduce and reify children's subordinate status in society and across historical, social, cultural and institutional contexts?' Yet, such normalised, legitimised and habitualised practices in contemporary society are in conflict with the contemporary and global shifts towards child rights, participatory approaches and notions of children as citizens.

Moreover, despite the theoretical reformulations, some of the dated assumptions and ideologies continue to pervade scholarly and empirical investigations. Why do the traditional and outmoded perspectives and approaches still have currency, particularly those that render children as passive observers lacking agency and autonomy? If we are to challenge and change the study on and about children and their childhood in general and child mobility in particular, then the social norms and perceptions must be given due attention.

In terms of classical sociological theories and theorists, Engels, Durkheim and Parsons were among the few to acknowledge children. Their constructions evolved within a specific historical context, that is, the Industrial Revolution and the rise of capitalism, and considered as encompassing male perspectives (Ambert and Qvortrup cited in Alanen, 1992). For example, Durkheim portrayed children as immature or helpless in that until "he outgrows childhood he remains 'a becoming'" (Durkheim cited in Alanen, 1992: 14). Children were conceptualised as immature, needing supervision and protection, mere observers in society. In contrast, Engels (1892) provided a detailed historical account of children's labour contributions to capitalism and industrialisation, and their exploitation as a working class.

Weber's construction and reference to children in some of his seminal texts tells of the myopic constructions of childhood and children within society at the given historical point. For Weber domination is the most important element of social action and his references to children incorporates such elaborations:

> "Domination in the most general sense is one of the most important elements of social action. Of course, not every form of social action reveals a structure of dominance. But in most varieties of social action, domination plays a considerable role, even where it is not obvious at first sight." (Weber edited by Roth and Wittich, 1978: 941)

The different citations below draw attention to patriarchal domination, traditional and affectual authority and the social action of the household head, usually the adult male along with the 'voluntary compliance' of household members. Conflict theorists also weigh in on this issue. For example, Cooper (1972 cited in Haralambos and Holborn, 2004: 473) refers to 'ideological conditioning' where children learn to conform and submit to authority through their socialisation in the family and household. Feeley (1972 cited in Haralambos and Holborn, 2004: 473) suggests that passivity is central to the authoritarian ideology of the

family and that within a capitalist society and the workplace the reproducing of such actions facilitates workers acceptance of their lack of power and control.

In the bibliographical account of Weber's life and work, Gerth and Mills (in Weber, Gerth and Mills, 1970: 13) suggest that for Weber: "man's relation to political authority may be modelled upon his relation to family disciplines." The following citation from '*Economy and Society*' also extends paternalistic relationships between children and parents to modern nation states and their citizens. The nation state is the patriarchal (paternalistic) ruler just like the father's rule over his children and property:

> "Furthermore, today, the use of force is regarded as legitimate only so far as it is either permitted by the state or prescribed by it. Thus, the right of a father to discipline his children is recognized as survival of the former independent authority of the head of a household, which in the right to use force has sometimes extended to a power of life and death over children and slaves. The claim of the modern state to monopolize the use of force is as essential to it, as its character of compulsory jurisdiction and of continuous operation." (Weber edited by Roth and Wittich, 1978: 56)

In a same text, in a section titled 'Household: Modes of Solidarity' (Weber edited by Roth and Wittich, 1978: 359) Weber observes that:

> "It is the fundamental basis of loyalty and authority, which in turn is the basis of many other groups. This 'authority' is of two kinds: (1) the authority derived from superior strength; and (2) the authority derived from practical knowledge and experience. It is, thus, the authority of men as against women and children; of the able-bodied as against those of lesser capability; of the adult as against the child; of the old as against the young. The 'loyalty' is one of subjects toward the holders of authority and toward one another. As reverence for ancestors, it finds its way into religion; as a loyalty of the patrimonial official, retainer, or vassal, it becomes a pan of the relationships originally having a domestic character."

The male adult has considerable authority over the persons under their 'control', and this includes children. More importantly, this conceptualisation of children's status within the household is also indicative of children's positions in society as a whole. Children's subordinate role in a hierarchical structure elevates the position, role and authority of the male adult.

If authority and power resides with the head of the household, then children's positioning, rights and access to privileges, wealth and power is dependent on the authority figure. For example, in the chapter 'Household, Neighbourhood and Kin Groups' in '*Economy and*

Society', Weber examines, amongst other relationships that are between father or male guardian and children. Weber draws attention to the equating of children, including girls, to household assets / property. Therefore, as economic goods they can be utilised in the maximization of economic advantage or gain and subject to the male adult authority and decision. In the chapter 'Patriarchalism and Patrimonialism', Weber examines the 'power of disposition' in relation to the 'economic value' and the calculable elements characterising household and family interactions:

> "The children of all women subject to the authority of a master are considered 'his' children if he so wishes, just as the offspring of his animals are his property. This holds whether the woman is a wife or a slave, and regardless of the facts of paternity. The purchase and selling of children is still a common phenomenon in developed cultures, In addition to the renting (into the *mancipium) and* mortgaging of children and of women. Indeed, such transactions are the original form of adjusting manpower and labor demand among different households." (Weber edited by Roth and Wittich, 1978: 1007)

This demonstrates the notion that instrumental rationality dominates and motivates the actor (male adult) but that the influence of traditional or cultural practice or custom is as important to acknowledge.

Weber uses similar comparisons to examine the relationship between hierocratic organisations (such as religious organisations) and its followers in another section. In these instances, the analogy deems the utilisation of domination and force by both the father and the nation state or hierocratic authority as natural, comparable, acceptable and justifiable. The legitimised domination serves the needs of the authoritarian interests of the political, economic, or hierocratic power. What Weber's analogies and assumptions do point to is that the patriarchal practices within the household and family infiltrated into the other social institutions in the society, including religion, economics and politics. This means that the household unit or family does play a role in the social reproduction and perpetuation of inequality across other social institutions. Moreover, it shows the relationship between private and public patriarchy and notions such as institutionalised patriarchy.

Weber's notion of the concept 'household' shows that the household is not just a unit of production, reproduction and consumption (see Bongaarts, 2001), but the "organisational environment of the individual" and thus the "original locus of patriarchal rulership and the capitalist enterprise" (Weber edited by Roth and Wittich, 1978: LV/LXXIV). Weber (Weber edited by Roth and Wittich, 1978: 356-359) suggests that:

"The household cannot be regarded as simply a primitive institution. Its prerequisite is not a 'household' in the present-day sense of the word, but rather certain degree of organized cultivation of soil…The size and inclusiveness of the household varies. But, it is the most widespread economic group and involves continuous and intensive social action. It is the fundamental basis of loyalty and authority, which in turn is the basis of many other groups."

Adams (2005: 238) also notes that:

"In Weber's Economy and Society, patrimonialism refers mainly to forms of government that are based on rulers' family households. The ruler's authority is personal-familial, and the mechanics of the household are the model for political administration."

This implies that the household or family is a microcosm of the social stratification and differentiation in other social institutions in a society. Weber's assertions also highlight the concern about children's role and place in contemporary society. Intra-household dynamics and relations have more implications for children than for women in the household. While, the current range of models, such as the bargaining model examine the levels of cooperation, conflict and negotiation among males and females in the household (Agarwal, 1997), the issue of children, age and age stratification remains peripheral.

This study appropriates, or redirects Max Weber's analysis of social stratification and theorisation of 'social action', 'class', 'social closure' and 'monopolization'. The basis of Weber's theory of social closure and monopolization is a theory of power and domination. In this instance, the subordination of children and the reproduction of patterns of social relations across all institutions in society include communities of practice undertaking research, policy and practice. The theory of social closure and its application to class analysis offers a theoretical analysis of childhood or children. Parkin (cited in Murphy, 1986 and 2004) explains that closure theory derives from two modes, namely, exclusion and usurpation. The exclusion mode rests on the process of subordination, whereby the dominant group closes opportunities to a group it categories as inferior, or ineligible. Usurpation happens through the exertion of power on a group that is in a higher position in the hierarchical structure.

Murphy (1986) extends this idea and argues that some forms of exclusion, such as racism are covert, while others such as credentialism and sexism remain embedded within social, cultural and legal practices. Murphy (1986 and 2004) raises a number of concerns around, monopolization of what, and exclusion from what. The author questions the basis and rise of domination. Is the monopolistic action about a desire to control the means of production,

destruction, or knowledge? Murphy maintains Weber's conception of class in terms of the structural relationships of domination and exclusion is analytically useful to understanding the composition of a group and its engagement in collective action. Murphy asserts that in examining the usurpationary and exclusionary relationships, it is important to understand the type of status groups (amorphous, associational, or communal) and the organisational nature of their (re)action.

The question of ideology, then, is crucial to our understanding of individual or group position. This relates to the dominant social relations, the prioritisation of certain interests and its operation in different domains in society. It also speaks to the manner in which an underlying ideology gives rise to norms and its elevation to 'common-sense' or custom / tradition, and thus the particular way of seeing the 'social world' is appropriate and unquestionable. Such constructions result in the marginalisation of children and the notion of childhood as a minority group in society. Children's subordinate role in a hierarchical structure within the household and society are derived based on culture, age, gender and generation. These 'norms' are then embedded as rules or codes for exclusion.

The question arises about the type and nature of the collective or social action that can arise in society. How can "we understand the intentions of men and causally explain the course and consequences of their action" (Roth and Weber, 1976: 316)? Do adults deploy (in Murphy's analysis) a usurpatory or exclusionary form of closure? To what extent do theoretical, methodological, ethical and ideological actions produce inconsistencies?

1.6 Structure of the dissertation

Chapter One is an elaboration of the research problems and rationale framing the research aims and questions. The chapter outlines some of the theoretical, methodological and empirical deficiencies in research on and about children's mobility.

Chapter Two begins with a brief discussion of paradigms and 'paradigm debates' and a rationale for adopting the *pragmatism* and *critical constructivism* framework.

Chapter Three focuses on the conceptions, antecedents and variants of Weber's social closure theory, and its appropriation for understanding children's marginalisation in society. Moreover, how do Weber's arguments facilitate an understanding of the persistence,

reproduction, reification and legitimising of such attitudes across the different spheres and social institutions in society?

Chapter Four is an examination of children's portrayals, representation and social position in the different sources of literature and national data sets. This is not an extensive review of all sources but an attempt to challenge and reframe some of the traditional debates and discourses.

Chapter Five examines children's portrayals, representations and social position within the transport sector's priorities and policies. It also reflects on how the historical and cultural legacy of apartheid versus the development goals of the democratic South Africa influence (or should influence) policy construction on and about children.

Chapter Six: The concluding chapter presents a discussion and summary of the key points, and recommendations for further and future research

CHAPTER 2 : METATHEORETICAL POSITIONS AND EXPOSITIONS

"Are intellectuals an autonomous and independent social group, or does every social group have its own particular specialized category of intellectuals? The problem is a complex one, because of the variety of forms assumed to date by the real historical process of formation of the different categories of intellectuals." (Gramsci edited by Forgacs, 2000: 301)

2.1 Structure and aim of the chapter

The challenge of reframing discourses and debates on and about children's mobility is primarily a metatheoretical and theoretical one and in this study is supported by the review of secondary sources and data (re)analyses. This implies a departure in the way child mobility is understood. This is important if we are to legitimate alternate discourses and debates and improve on children's empirical representation and inclusion. This is a complex undertaking due to, amongst others, the similarities, diversities and nature of children's experiences and everyday lives but more especially, given the nature of the research questions raised.

This, then, requires questioning the current metatheoretical and theoretical preferences and privileging, the established discourses and debates and the resulting empirical generalisations. This means examining the socio-historical, cultural and temporal conditions in knowledge production, construction, communication and dissemination. The notion 'knowledge', then is a social construct and the power-knowledge-ideology linkages cannot be underemphasised.

To begin to address and challenge the discourses and debates, we start at the point of metatheory, or philosophical stance. This enables us to understand the interaction between normative assumptions, metatheoretical, theoretical and empirical generalisations in the construction of knowledge, and in this context knowledge about children and child mobility. In other words, metatheoretical standpoints are a commentary on the guiding practices utilised to explain and defend the study aims, objectives and approach to the research. At the same time, we are part of the society and phenomenon we attempt to investigate and understand. In terms of how we act and respond, or our social actions, conceptions of 'action' may be dissimilar and at times embedded in our ideological, theoretical or metatheoretical proclivities.

This section of the chapter begins with an introduction to some of the conceptual schemes and ideas that underpinning the metatheory discussions. This is followed by a *'laconic'* discussion of the dominant research philosophies and a discussion of the prospective metatheoretical or epistemic orientation(s) alternate(s) for consideration. This chapter concludes with a discussion of *pragmatic critical constructivism* as a prospective alternate to positivism and extreme of advocating of interpretivism. C*ritical theory, social constructivism,* and *pragmatism* are examined in some depth. These paradigms place considerable emphasis on the researcher or social scientist need to acknowledge and examine their (our) interests, beliefs, values and ideological worldview, and this links back to ideas elaborated on in chapter one. It is also important to note that this alternative in no way solves the epistemological and methodological deficits in child mobility studies; it merely offers an alternative for consideration.

Neuman (2011: 165) notes that the use of multiple theoretical lenses enables researchers to identify relevant data, to provide a set of concepts and interpret the meaning and significance of the data. Golafshani (2003) also suggests that the appropriation of social constructivism is an indication and acknowledgement that there are multiple constructions of reality, as such multiple methods of data collection is complementary. Given the multidisciplinary nature of the social phenomenon in this study, this suggests that a pluralistic and multiple-perspectives approach is more likely to achieve some sort of 'comprehensive' insights. Monti and Tingen (1999) argue that the use of multiple and different paradigms within a discipline is a positive sign. This facilitates a multi-lens approach to understanding a social phenomenon, problem or social group in society.

The thesis, then offers an explanation of children's current portrayal and (re)presentation in studies on child mobility and transport by 'blending' the relevant and appropriate paradigmatic and theoretical axioms. This is consistent with the pragmatic and the critical stance. This study utilises different 'lenses' to examine the social phenomenon to produce different knowledge and diverse questions; and thereby enrich our understanding and insights on certain aspects, relating to the social construction and production of knowledge, on and about child mobility.

In terms of the selected metatheoretical stances and their theoretical precepts, there is a bias towards the American pragmatic (classical) tradition. Classical pragmatism encompasses a

range and scope of topics; and this interests contemporary proponents. This is not to say that other contemporary Neo-pragmatic thinkers, for example, Rorty, Putnum, Davidson or Quine, are less important. At the same time, historian Kloppenberg (1996: 101) reminds us that 'old' ideas can engender new ways of thinking about contemporary social issues.

It is also important to bear in mind the affinities and distinctions among critical theory, constructivism and pragmatism, including the Weberian (and Neo-Weberian) assumptions. For example, Barbalet (2009: 201) highlights the possible connection between Weber's seminal tests and James's works in which he elaborates on religion and interweaves ideas of pragmatism in texts such as *The Varieties of Religious Experience* (1902). Jackson shares similar sentiments (in an undated draft paper) noting that Weber's methodological writings are largely pragmatic.

Delimitations: Scholarship on the philosophy of the social science is indeed extensive; and a survey of the antecedents and variants is not possible here (see Turner and Roth, 2003; Ritzer, 2005; Delanty, 2006; and Turner, 2009). Moreover, an in-depth engagement in the philosophies of the social sciences requires a distinct set of metaphysical questions, philosophical arguments and an elaboration of the breadth of conceptual positions, including the dissonances and consonances. This aspect is not central to the dialogue of this dissertation; in this case, it is but one spoke in the wheel, therefore, its 'coarse' treatment in this chapter. More importantly, research concerns and the nature of this study facilitate some debate and discussion about the general contours of the diverse arguments and the possibilities these present.

2.2 Metatheoretical foundations – dominant and competing standpoints

Traditionally, a philosophical perspective characterises and directs social inquiry about social phenomena or subjects in society (Dainty, 2008). This is regardless of social science discipline or area of inquiry. Yet, over time while each paradigm has its own set of assumptions, controversies, debates and advantages, some paradigms have occupied privileged knowledge positions and defined the nature of social inquiry in some disciplines and fields of study (Bryman, 1984). Consequently, the derived assumptions and conclusions become normalised, habitualised and legitimised as 'truths', not requiring contestation or disembedding. In the case of child mobility positivism and quantitative methods dominate.

Given the nature of social problems or phenomena in contemporary society, are such approaches to social inquiry beneficial and / or relevant? How do we represent, understand and explain reality, or the varying constructions of reality? Turner and Roth (2003: 1) reduce the metatheoretical contestations to three core issues and argue that these still have relevancy in contemporary deliberations:

> "A trio of core issues – the scientific status of intentional explanations (and agency), the nature of rationality, and the methodological hallmarks of science – seemingly persist through current discussion and debate. But the substance attached to these issues has fundamentally shifted and altered."

All the same, Guba and Lincoln (1994: 116) assert and remind us, that in the social sciences a more constructive approach to this dilemma is required.

The intention here then is to examine key metatheoretical paradigms and the extent to which each is congruent or incongruent with this study's overall aims, objectives and research questions. The starting point of this discussion is the key conceptual schemes that frame the debates, discourses and ideological contestations in the philosophy of the social science. Regardless of paradigmatic or philosophical foundations, a key set of concepts and ideas usually structure discussions around research design and approach choice.

Pearse (1992: 244) examines the notion 'paradigm'.

> "A paradigm is commonly described as any pattern, example, or model. Educational theorists and social scientists use the word to denote ways in which knowledge and behavior are structured or organized. In its broadest terms, a paradigm is a world view. Although seldom consciously articulated, a paradigm is an internally consistent orientation from which a conceptual and operational approach to functioning in the world is constructed. A paradigm may be likened to a view finder, and new paradigms provide different points of view. Hence, when a new world view appears, one speaks of a paradigm shift (Kuhn, 1970)."

Plack (2005) reminds us that the notion 'paradigm' is connected to historical, political, cultural, or ideological contexts (see Harrits, 2011).

Choice of paradigm usually shapes the underlying assumptions of a study. This implies a belief about data collection, analysis and utilisation, choice of tools for inquiry and research design. Traditionally, three philosophies of social science, namely **positivism, interpretivism** (humanism) and **critical social science** (critical theory) dominate and differentiate the approach to social research (see Delanty and Strydom, 2003; Babbie and Mouton with Vorster and Prozesky, 2001; and Neuman, 2011).

2.2.1 Positivism and (versus) Interpretivism

Positivism (scientism) remains the most prominent philosophy of social science inquiry. Plack (2005: 226) explains that positivism hinges on the idea that reality exists independent of social context and thus objectivity is maintained in the study of human behaviour. Positivism in the social sciences is an emulation of the logic of the natural sciences (Lincoln and Guba 1985 cited in Ponterotto, 2005:128-9).

Bryman (1984: 77) notes that quantitative methodology validates the natural sciences or positivist approach to conducting social research. The author explains that this entails a "…preoccupation with operational definitions, objectivity, replicability, causality, and the like." The operationalisation and conceptualisation processes, sampling process and frames, the identification of the different levels of variables and the hypothesis are some of the indispensable steps in such research.

However, many versions of positivism have emerged, for example, logical empiricism, postpositivism or naturalism. Delanty and Strydom (2003: 13) suggest that despite the variations of positivism, six basic tenets of positivism exist: *unified science*, *empiricism*, *objectivism*, *value freedom*, *instrumentalism* and *technicism*. For instance, unified science implies the universe is ordered, one-layered or homogenous, thus it is possible to gain knowledge about reality and construct a knowledge system about it. Objectivism articulates a separation between the subject and object of knowledge, with the researcher taking on an uninvolved / detached persona. Value freedom implies that: "… science should proceed in a neutral manner, free from all infection of personal, ethical, moral, social or cultural values" (Delanty and Strydom, 2003: 14).

It is important to note the citations in the introductory chapter highlighting the dominance of this mode of social inquiry in the research on transport, mobility, childhood and child mobility. The citations raise the issue of discipline and epistemic or ontological dominance and privileging; and how this determines the nature of the knowledge on and about social phenomenon. The issue of power differentials is important and raises questions about how a child is perceived by the researcher and within the research. The hierarchisation of adultist perspectives does not necessarily contribute to a better understanding of children's transport and mobility experiences.

The previous chapter also foregrounds another dimension to this argument, that of *intra-field closure*. This also resonates with Berger and Luckmann's (2007) explanations of the origins of institutionalisation. The authors (2007: 43-44) suggest that all human activity is subject to habitualisation, and over time it becomes embedded in that 'cultural' context and not easily displaced. This implies that positivism and quantitative methods are embedded in some institutional actions, habits, and this influences practitioners and scholars choice of methods and design,

These arguments can be deployed in understanding the institutionalisation and privileging of knowledge standpoints. In this instance, positivism over other metatheories in the examination of child mobility, or mobility and transport issues, in general. Moreover, it suggests that understanding why or how some knowledge standpoints come to dominate may be as important as how we investigate reality. It provides an understanding of the impetus needed to facilitate a paradigm shift, albeit a gradual shift, in the field.

Given this (these) understanding(s), the question is whether a paradigmatic shift necessitates a rejection of the positivist mode of inquiry, similar in stance to that adopted by some feminist researchers (see introductory chapter)? For example, some feminists support the idea that feminist research, gendered ways of knowing is incompatible with quantitative research, because it has an "inherently masculine agenda" (Caprioli, 2004: 258). In child mobility studies this could be labelled as an 'inherently adultist agenda'. Is such a hierarchising of worldviews conducive to the production of an in-depth understanding of child mobility or children's experiences in everyday life?

Yet, Caprioli (2004: 266) reminds us that a rejection of positivism is equally dangerous as a rejection of other paradigms. The author illustrates this through the importance of quantitative studies and analysis in feminist studies in the facilitating and developing of a systematic research agenda. In other words, different types of methodologies and worldviews should have equal consideration.

Interpretivism, then, raises the question of whether the social world can be studied using the principles espoused by the natural sciences. Moreover, the goals of the positivist or quantitative orientations differ from that of the interpretivist or qualitative. Schwandt (1998: 223) explains that the:

"mental sciences *(Geisteswissenschaften)* or cultural sciences *(Kulturwissenschaften)* were different in kind than the natural sciences *(Naturwissenschafte)*: The goal of the latter is scientific explanation *(Erkldren)*, whereas the goal of the former is the grasping or understanding *(Verstehen)* of the 'meaning' of social phenomena."

This approach is known as humanism, constructivism or phenomenology. In particular, Wallace and Wolf (1995: 241) suggest that the term *phenomenology*: "…asks us *not* to take the notions we have learned for granted, but to question them instead, to question our way of looking at and our way of being in the world". Bryman (1984: 78) explains that: "The philosophical underpinnings of qualitative methodology are typically attributed to phenomenology, *Verstehen* and symbolic interactionism."

The focus is in understanding human experience, by examining the "meaning systems that people generate as they socially interact" (Tuli, 2010: 100) or "...grasping how actions become reciprocally meaningful" (Ashley and Orenstein, 1985: 41). Gage (1989) and Tuli (2010) assert that individuals construct, interpret and experience the world through their interactions with each other, and with the social systems, or institutions.

Similarly, Hier (2005: 87) suggests that in this approach, the interpretivist sociologist "pay particular attention to the inter-subjective human components involved in the construction and maintenance of social life." This relates to how people understand or make sense of their life experiences and the ways in which they derive meaning from these. In other words, meanings, concepts, definitions, characteristics, metaphors, symbols and descriptions of social problems, phenomena or subjects characterise interpretivist or qualitative orientations (Berg, 2004). As a micro-level theory then the focus is on how social actors orientate themselves to each other, and how they do this based on meaning.

This conception also captures the micro-sociological analysis in the appropriation of the notion 'social construction of reality' (Turner, 1991). An earlier citation focused on the institutionalisation and the habitualisation of actions and the possible appropriation of such understandings for explaining the reproduction and perpetuation of privileged paradigms or positions in the sector. Berger and Luckmann draw on Hegel and Marx's concept of alienation in which people are separated from their own activity or praxis (Alvesson and Sköldberg, 2009: 26-27). Within this understanding, the notion of 'knowledge' and its

transmission and embedding in language is of importance and this relates to how language is used to legitimate meanings.

Knowledge, then, is a product of time, history, ideology, culture and other social shifts. This aspect is expanded within the interpretivist mode of social inquiry. It challenges the basic tenets of positivism. Instead, knowledge and reality are social constructs that along with language and symbols are deployed to produce meaning in everyday contexts. Schwandt (1998: 235-6) notes that constructivism brings to the fore the notion that knowledge is created in that human agents can shape and reshape reality.

As with positivism, interpretivism and constructivism has many variants (Schwandt, 1998; Delanty and Strydom, 2003 and Alvesson and Sköldberg, 2009). Weinberg (2009: 281-282 and 296) explains that the various scholars and schools of thought have adopted the term 'social constructionism'. Several precepts and antecedents in the works by, amongst others Husserl, Dilthey, Weber, Riekert, Habermas, Goffman and Mills (John Stuart) contribute to the development of the variants in the interpretivist, phenomological and constructivist orientations (Schwandt, 1998; and Delanty and Strydom, 2005).

Yet, there are affinities between constructivism and the other metatheories. For example, Neubert (2001) writes that constructivism and pragmatism share a number of affinities. The author (2001: 11) has a bias toward what he terms 'Deweyan Social Constructivism', advancing his conception of language utilisation with a social group as follows:

> "…my constructivist interpretation of Deweyan pragmatism is more biased to welcoming the turn to language that to opting for a realistic, empiricist or even metaphysical concept of experience. However, my suggestion to those inclined towards the Rortyan end of the neopragmatist arc is that the focus on interpretive communities, description, redescriptions, talking and other linguistic concepts be critically linked to a constructivist observer theory that anchors the hovering language games in the concrete socio-cultural practices, routines, and institutions in which the agents participate as self- and distant-observers. These cultural practices are always informed by discursive practices involving power relations."

Thus, notions of power, knowledge, ideology, reality, experience and history interlock, influencing how as observer, participant and agent we reconstruct or deconstruct and reinterpret social reality. Similarly, this strand can be appropriated to understand communities of practice in mobility studies and how certain social group experiences can be understood, particularly that involving power relations. That is, power relations between adult

and child, or observer and child. In what way is language and symbols used to signal these power relations; and how do they influence a researcher / social scientist's interpretation of children's everyday lives? To what extent can such understandings and accounts augment our knowledge of child mobility and transport?

Importantly and relatedly, Fairclough and Bourdieu make the necessary connections between language, action and power. Similarly, Fairclough (1989:2-3) reminds us about the power that words and language hold in society. Language and the linguistics mediate in the legitimisation and acceptance of ideologies and of common sense as worldviews.

Consequently, the array of methodologies and methods under the qualitative umbrella emanates from these philosophies and theoretical variations. Dey (1993: 2) points to the multiplicity of qualitative research traditions, for example the case study, action research, discourse analysis, or content analysis. The author cites Tesch's (1991:17-25 cited in Dey, 1993: 2-3) summation of three basic approaches, that is the 'language-oriented' approaches, the 'descriptive / interpretive' approaches, and the 'theory-building' approaches.

The interpretivist stance, then, is compatible with analyses on and about children and childhood; and with the ideals espoused in the Sociology of Childhood. For example, Darbyshire, MacDougall and Schiller (2005) employed a range of qualitative methods of data collection to study children's perceptions and experiences of place, space and physical activity and its association to childhood obesity. Children aged four to twelve years participated in the study and the data collection tools included focus group interviews, mapping activities and Photo-voice. The authors (ibid: 430) concluded that multi-method approaches were appropriate and relevant in that they complement each other and facilitated in the examination of children's diverse experiences. In this approach, children's voices are of equal importance.

In a similar vein, Clifton and Handy (2001: 16-17) note that in general studies on travel behaviour qualitative approaches can produce insightful assumptions about, amongst others, decision-making about travel and activity participation, choice and attitudes towards travel and travel modes, and travel needs and constraints of some priority groups. In short, a wide-range of transport and mobility related issues were, and could be, investigated. Yet, as Lyons (2003) and others note, in some quarters there is some disinclination towards other

metatheoretical avenues. Rosenbloom (2004 [2006]: 22) concurs and explains that many transport practitioners still struggle to accept results generated through qualitative or interpretivist approaches. At the same time, they do not challenge their dominant assumptions, models and approaches.

Thus, interpretivist and qualitative approaches to social inquiry are compatible with transport and mobility studies objectives. Clifton and Handy (2001) suggest that travel behaviour researchers are more likely to appreciate and utilise qualitative methods if they receive appropriate training on these methods and methodologies. What does it mean - are children conceived as participants in the research on and about them? Does this imply that the monomethod approach needs rethinking?

2.2.2 Critical Social Science (Critical theory)

At the outset, it is important to note that very few childhood studies, particularly mobility and transport related studies, adopt the critical theory stance. A cursory scan of literature shows that this particular worldview dominates education, policy and feminist research. Plack (2005: 233) explains that some critical theorists focus on, "how power dynamics shape individual and social consciousness"; thus its association / incorporation with, amongst others, conflict theory, racialised discourses, cultural studies, queer and feminist theory.

A generalised observation is that the theoretical axioms of this stance lend itself to the idea of the emancipatory function of knowledge in the pedagogical process (critical pedagogies) (Leonardo, 2004). How can such ideas be cascaded to studies on child mobility? In what ways can the knowledge we produce emancipate children?

In terms of the latter question, this would require us (academics and researchers) to shift our thinking to how we as knowledge producers perpetuate traditional values and beliefs through theory development and research. This reiterates points highlighted in chapter one on our 'thinking, reading, writing and speaking' on, about and with children. The emancipatory elements come in the form of reflective practice, reflexive sociology and self-dialogue in the diverse roles we inhabit in knowledge production, transformation and transmission. This means addressing and challenging our internalised role assumptions and unreflected habituations rather than the reification by language, theories or ideologies.

This means the notion 'emancipation' needs reinterpreting when considering children. As stated in the earlier chapter, unlike other marginalised, and adult, social groupings children need allies to challenge the perpetuation, reification and reproduction of their subordinate 'class' status in society. However, children are not a homogenous group, and by a certain age, some children can actively engage and participate in social activities, such as decision-making. What this signals, and reiterates is that there is a need for considerable reflexivity, particularly about the ideological, political and philosophical dimensions when considering children and their daily lives. A critical social science stance presents some important avenues for the analysis of child mobility, that is, in a theoretical and methodological sense.

Alvesson and Sköldberg (2009: 145) write that critical theory sits at an intersection between theory and metatheory.

> "Critical theory tends towards a fairly prominent theoretical and metatheoretical approach, and its level of abstraction often lies at some remove from the questions, concepts and interpretations that typify empirical research…One could even say that the insights of critical theory do not lend themselves easily to being used in empirical undertakings."

Similarly, Ritzer (2005: 501-502) reminds us that reflexive actions and habits are indispensable to the explanations of social phenomenon. It is in this light that the discussion on critical social science/ theory needs to be understood.

Critical Social Science (CSS) theorists position themselves as reacting against positivist ideas reducing the social world to patterns of cause and effect. This stance is similar to that of the interpretivists. The CSS worldview has its origins in the work of Karl Marx and overlaps with the Hegelian tradition (Agger, 1991; Babbie and Mouton, with Vorster and Prozesky, 2001; and Neuman, 2011). Critical theory is associated with the Frankfurt School; some of the key proponents include Adorno, Horkheimer, Apel, Marcuse, Pollock, Lowenthal, Benjamin and Habermas. The various proponents aim to "…reconstruct the logic and method of Marxism and make it relevant to emerging twentieth-century capitalism" (Agger, 1991: 107). However, the 'internal disputes' also give rise to different, yet related, strands of critical theory (Delanty and Strydom, 2003). Moreover, this has theoretical and methodological implications.

In Geuss' (1981: 1-2) deliberations, he suggests that critical theory consists of three theses:

"1. Critical theories have special standing as guides for human action in that (a) they are aimed at producing enlightenment in the agents who hold them, i.e. at enabling those agents to determine what their true interests are; (b) they are inherently emancipatory, i.e. they free agents from a kind of coercion which is at least partly self-imposed, from self-frustration of conscious human action.

2. Critical theories have cognitive content, i.e. they are forms of knowledge.

3. Critical theories differ epistemologically in essential ways from theories in the natural sciences. Theories in the natural sciences are 'objectifying'; critical theories are 'reflective'."

A number of key precepts and methodological dimensions are articulated in the above citation. The following discussions are an elaboration, albeit oversimplification, of some of these.

Firstly, while there is a rejection of the assumptions derived from positivist inquiries, there is no such rejection of the possible value of the empirical material itself. Moreover, this is indicative of an affinity to pragmatic constructions (Bohman, 2003: 91). The critical social sciences, thus, have a bias towards interpretation and explanatory power or critical thought. Bohman (1999: 459) notes, "A hallmark of recent critical social science has been the commitment to methodological and theoretical pluralism."

Alvesson and Skoldberg (2009: 162-168) argue that critical theorists seek to interpret and appraise empirical material and to locate the findings in an analysis of the socio-historical and cultural contexts. The latter diverges from positivism but implies a convergence with some tenets of interpretivism. The authors' (2009: 162) summations are that critical theorists do not articulate a definitive methodology. Unlike, the positivists or interpretivists there are clear articulations of the data collection process and the design of the study. In this worldview, the emphasis is on the examination and interpretation of the data, irrespective of method.

In Geuss's (1981: 1) introduction to '*The Idea of Critical Theory: Habermas and the Frankfurt School*' the author captures this perspective and some of these issues are reflected in the discussions to follow. Geuss focuses on Marxism as a theory and its implication for epistemology and the traditional approaches to knowledge construction. Instead of an emphasis, possibly an over-emphasis, on the process of data collection or the construction of measures, there is an emphasis on the construction of research problem statements and on the (re)interpretation, (re)examination or even a (re) / (de)construction of the data assumptions. Alvesson and Skoldberg (2009: 162-168) provide some useful examples of how research problems can be phrased, using this paradigmatic orientation. For example, "Why don't the

workers work harder than they do?' and instead asks, 'Why do they work as hard as they do?'".

Alvesson and Skoldberg (2009: 165-166, 167) explain that for critical theorists issues such as ideology are important to how we understand and explain social phenomena. For a critical theorist this entails a meticulous examination of existing theories and research that represent traditional (positivist, functionalist) thinking. The conclusion we can draw is that method or empirical preference and design is not necessarily the main concern for critical theorists. Rather, critical theorists embrace both the quantitative and qualitative methods of data collection. It implies that the empirical materials and methods are conceptualised as tools in a larger scheme. Bohman (2003: 91) explains that the goal is to produce knowledge that will "liberate human beings from all circumstances that enslave them".

In a sense, this is the stance adopted in this study. While, the empirical data may have its limitations, this does not mean that it should just be discarded. Instead, a re-examination and re-interpretation can yield 'fresh' insights and directions. Furthermore, it presses the researcher / social scientist to (re)examine the 'lens' through which they examine the social phenomena.

This also brings to the fore Horkheimer's (in Horkheimer [1931] and Hunter, 1993: 1-14) rationale for integrating the various conceptual tools and social-scientific methodologies of historical materialism. Clearly, the emphasis is on the value of integrating the material produced through positivist endeavours into a critical understanding of the social perspective. Moreover, the weight of such an approach lies in the value derived from a discursive and critical examination of the empirical research for sociological analysis. In '*The Present Situation of Social Philosophy and the Tasks of an Institute for Social Research*', Horkheimer (ibid: 13-14) observes the value and insightfulness of survey research and existing work in the generation of new and further writings.

Embedded in Horkheimer (in Horkheimer [1931] and Hunter, 1993), Geuss (1981) and Alvesson and Skoldberg's (2009) deliberations is the notion of 'abduction'. Interestingly, the concept 'abduction' is associated with Charles Peirce (or Pierce), a founding figure of pragmatism. Alvesson and Skoldberg (2009: 3-4) explain that the concept 'abduction' is appropriated from medical diagnosing, diagnosing errors in technical systems and the

interpretation of poetry. The concept aptly characterises and describes how the combination of data (empirical material), theoretical exchanges and socio-historical milieus mediate in the critical engagement, about or on, social phenomena or actors.

Yet, it also points to the idea that such engagements are iterative processes and knowledge production a dynamic process. Alvesson and Skoldberg (2009: 3-4) explain that abduction is not about a rejection of theoretical preconceptions but an combination of approaches aimed at enhancing understanding about social phenomenon. In terms of the connection to pragmatism, Migiro and Magangi (2011: 3759) explain that abduction it is a process of providing the 'best set of explanations'. In other words, it is a rejection of epistemological dominance or privileging, and a preference for deciphering the diverse social realities.

This is of relevance if we are to understand and interpret the 'multiplicity of diverse childhoods' (as discussed in the introductory chapter), then the critical social sciences along with its pragmatic, and post-positivist or methodological duality, undertones may provide the alternative worldview we can espouse. Moreover, it gives credence to the argument that children's mobility and everyday life experiences and activities are not necessarily universal. Aspects, such as culture, history or location in conjunction with micro or individual differences, including age, gender, race or ethnicity mediates in differentiating children's social realities.

Secondly, in the use of different empirical material, the main challenge is for the critical theorist / researcher to exercise 'reflexivity'. Interspersed and integrated in this understanding of 'reflexivity' are the concepts, 'the social construction of reality / knowledge' and 'abduction'.

Critical theory urges social scientists to be reflexive in their approach to social inquiry. Then again, what do critical theorists mean by the concept 'reflexive', or in this context 'reflexive sociology'? Neuman (2011: 109) suggests that "Discovering and understanding… paradoxical processes, called the **dialectic**, is a central task in CSS." This implies that in constructing meaning and producing knowledge, there must be an awareness of implicit and explicit nuances. That is, the ideological, historical, political and / or epistemic underpinnings that may exist, for whom? Critical theorists refer not only to the social phenomena, the social

actor(s), institution(s) or society but also to the social actors or agents responsible for the research. The introductory chapter of this dissertation also presents ideas of reflexivity.

Critical theorists, then, provide their interpretations of 'reflexive sociology' or 'self-reflections'. Goulder (1970 cited in Delanty and Strydom, 2003: 267-268) talks specifically to the critical theorist / methodologist / researcher and this is consistent with the views espoused by Syprou, Alanen and others. The author uses the notion reflexive sociology to encourage sociologists to "acquire the ingrained habit of viewing our own beliefs as we now view those held by others."

Geuss (1981) adopts and interprets this idea of 'self-reflection' as '*Ideologiekritik*'. This entails an agent, social scientist / researcher, scrutinising their true interests and through this process mediating a form of emancipation. In Geuss's analysis each agent's 'second-order' belief is usually shared with other agents of their social group, thus there is a consensus and normalisation of beliefs. In acknowledging and challenging the hitherto unreflected beliefs, epistemic principles or false consciousness, this gives rise to 'self-reflections'. Appelrouth and Edles (2008: 204-205) explain the notion false consciousness as "'the facts are there' – the inequality is there – but the person 'does not feel it'; he does not see or know of it." That is, an acceptance of the facts, norms, beliefs, and / or values, without questioning meaning, construction, or ones role in perpetuating or reproducing of these aspects.

Can we extend this explanation to the privileging and dominance of positivism and quantitative methods in transport and mobility studies in general, and child mobility studies in particular?

Geuss (1981: 2) argues that for the Frankfurt Scholars positivism was seen as a "'denial of reflection,' i.e. as a denial about theories could be both reflective and cognitive." Thus, *Ideologiekritik* is the confronting or contesting of the conceptions that frame our understanding of the social:

> "Agents don't *generally* come to think that their beliefs are false if they discover that they have been 'determined' by factors of which they are unaware …Ideologiekritik shows the agent that this world-picture is *false* consciousness by showing them that it is reflectively inacceptable to them i.e. by showing them that they could have acquired it *only* under conditions of coercion" (Geuss, 1981: 61-62).

Geuss (1981: 57-59) suggests the coercion here refers to self-imposed coercion, that is, the "false consciousness is a kind of self-delusion". Moreover, the social actor does not realise

the coercion is self-imposed. There is a greater interest in conforming to the norms, beliefs and standards of a particular system. Guess (1981: 61) explains:

> "It is also not hard to see in what sense the 'unfree existence' from which the agents suffer is a form of *self-imposed* coercion. Social institutions are natural phenomena; they don't just exist of and by themselves. The agents in society impose coercive institutions on themselves by participating in them, accepting them without protest, etc. Simply by acting in an apparently 'free' way according to the dictate of their world-picture, the agents reproduce relations to coercion."

Social research of this nature, then calls upon the researcher / social scientist to understand, acknowledge, and interrogate their (our) normative, epistemic, philosophical, political, ideological and in this context adultist preconceptions. This also entails reflecting on practices. Clearly, this has some affinities to interpretivism but is diametrically opposite to positivism, a case in point being, subjective versus objective knowledge construction. The latter, as indicated earlier in the sub-section has a preference towards, amongst others, objectivism and value freedom (Delanty and Strydom, 2003: 14). Value-freedom advances the neutrality, or detachment of the researcher / social scientist. The critical accounts, then, favour self-reflexivity and Goulder's citation implies that this type of engagement requires a 'paradigmatic shift'. Such a shift has occurred within mainstream social science disciplines, however not all thematic areas within the array of disciplines have acquiesced, in this context, studies on child mobility and transport.

To what extent can these precepts explain the behaviours of communities of practice? Is there an interest in presenting, reproducing and preserving norms, including epistemic or ideological stances?

Thirdly, there is the inextricable link to 'the social construction of reality / knowledge'. Moreover, it implies some convergence with interpretivist assumptions, that is, the idea that truth / reality / knowledge are created, uncreated and recreated and is thus a cyclical relationship. Consequently, observers, participants and agents have different understandings, or explanations of the same social phenomena. At different points in time and socio-historical contexts, the same questions may yield dissimilar responses from subjects or respondents. Thus, through reflection, including self-reflection, further insights and perspectives can be achieved, Embedded in this thinking and analysis is the notion: 'the social construction of reality or knowledge'. Ritzer (2005: 881) elaborates on Weber's internalisation of 'social

constructivism' as "infinite in its extension through time and infinite in its complexity at any one point in time."

Some proponents, such as Guba and Lincoln (1994) categorise constructivism as having a hermeneutical and dialectical methodological basis. This brings the above-mentioned formulations into a more structured and broader application under the critical theory umbrella. Alvesson and Skoldberg elevate this analysis in a broader context. The authors (2009: 174-175) categorise critical research as *triple hermeneutics*. Hermeneutic epistemologies also form the basis of amongst others, pragmatism, phenomenology and Neo-Marxist critical theory (Ritzer, 2005).

Alvesson and Skoldberg (2009) explain the triple hermeneutics as follows: Simple hermeneutics explores how an individual interprets their subjective and inter-subjective (cultural) world and the meaning they assign to this. Double hermeneutics locates itself in social science practice, attempting to interpret and gain knowledge about the individual's world. Ben-Arieh (2005:591) deploys the notion 'double hermeneutics' to explain children's involvement in research is also about their need to participate in society. The author writes that a 'triple hermeneutics' raises the issue about ideological and power relations and privileging that may exist within, for example, research processes.

Bentley (2003: 5) explains: "critical constructivists are interested in examining all aspects of knowledge production, including ownership of the knowledge". This is an infusion of critical theorists understanding that power and hegemony is bound to the production of ideology. There is a need to examine the social and political nature of knowledge construction. Bentley (ibid) argues that critical-constructivists focus on all aspects of the production, justification, and ownership of knowledge in society. The author also notes that critical constructivists do not rank forms of knowledge and thus their categorisation as pluralists. Kincheloe (1995 cited in Jofili, Geraldo, and Watts, 1991: 8) suggests that: "…the critical action researcher engages in a running metadialogue, a constant conversation with self, a perpetual reconceptualisation of his or her system of meaning"

Critical constructivism assumes that knowledge; including social scientific knowledge is dependent on history, culture or politics and can change over time. Moreover, it also requires asking the question: 'whose interests do particular knowledge serve?' Again, as noted earlier

in the citations from Fairclough and Bourdieu, in the social construction of knowledge the discourse, language and power nexus are extremely important to engage with, particularly in relationship to self-reflexivity and social action. Embedded in this self-reflexive and critical thinking is a desire to act accordingly. Thus, there is a convergence between social constructivism, pragmatism and critical theory. In this context, it puts the onus on the researcher to discern these and other cues produced in the research.

Fourthly, in its rejection of the objective and law-like, empirical approach to social inquiry, critical theorists argue for a social inquiry that is an emancipatory and transformative force in society (Babbie and Mouton with Vorster and Prozesky, 2001). Thus, locating and embedding some of the previously highlighted notions in the agent's action, reminiscent, again, of Marx's vision of changing society.

In acknowledging false consciousness, it triggers an emancipatory action. This links to the Marxist notion of **false consciousness** and **reification**, where individuals possess false or common sense views about their social conditions and lives; and conceptions about power and control (Ritzer, 2005 and Neuman, 2011). The individuals see themselves as controlled by social institutions and those with power. Thus, proponents advocate for an emancipatory and transformative social research. In recognising true interests, the agent, social actor or social group transforms and is transformed by the social inquiry. Moreover, the research and the researcher / social scientist are perceived as agents or tools creating varying levels of consciousness.

Yet, in the critical theorist's mind, this type of social action can vary. Neuman (2011: 109) explains that: "A CSS researcher asks embarrassing questions, exposes hypocrisy, and investigates conditions to stimulate grassroots actions". While, Marcuse (cited in Delanty and Strydom, 2003: 225) explains that:

> "Critical theory's interest in the liberation of mankind binds it to certain ancient truths. It is at one with philosophy in maintaining that man can be more that a manipulable subject in the production process of class society."

Thus, embedded in these arguments is Marx's belief that social inquiry is more than just interpreting and understanding social phenomena, it is about improving the human condition. However, the constructivist, and to some extent the self-reflexive undertones remind one that

social actors, regardless of social position or role, have a certain level of agency. That is, as much as the social forces in society shape the social actors' social conditions and lives, the social actors also have the potential to shape the social forces in society. Perhaps, this accounts for Geuss' use of the notion 'agent' as opposed to 'social actor' or 'individual'.

In deliberating on the critical theory canons, there are some affinities among the main aims, objectives, and concerns reflected in the research problems on this study. Moreover, a 'slightly clearer' picture emerges about the direction of this study. This study does not follow the classical or traditional form outlined in the two earlier metatheoretical frames. Rather, the basic idea is to understand, interpret, explain and examine traditional conceptions of child mobility. That is, 'confronting' the approaches, assumptions and conclusions. How do the critical theory canons mediate in the reframing of discourses and debates? How does finding a 'new' lens facilitate in the legitimising of an alternate set of beliefs to produce and promote a more conducive conceptual and theoretical understanding of child mobility.

A *fifth* dimension, not inherent in Geuss's earlier citation relates to the convergence between critical theory and non-Marxist variants of critical theory, in particular, precepts of Max Weber's theory. Interestingly, some of these elements have much in common with pragmatism.

To begin with, we focus on two 'dissimilar' traditions within conflict theory, and the branch that gives rise to critical conflict theories. Wallace and Wolf (1995) argue that the two branches differ in their conception of the social sciences and the views about social conflict in society. The first group, the authors suggest, includes Habermas, some of the Frankfurt Scholars, Mills (C. W), and Bourdieu (briefly highlighted in next chapter). The second group consists of, amongst others, Dahrendorf, Coser and Collins. Wallace and Wolf (1995: 142-143) refer to this second group of theorists as 'analytic conflict theorists'. The latter group has considerable relevance to this dissertation. Wallace and Wolf comment that Marxism and Neo-Marxism are central to the discussions of the first group, whereas Marx is included in the second group deliberations; there is a considerable interest in Weber.

Wallace and Wolf (1995: 142-143) suggest that there are three main differences between critical theorists and analytic conflict theorists. Firstly, the analytic conflict theorists argue that social scientist' opinions and concerns have a bearing on the problematisation of social

concerns. Yet, a social inquiry can be done objectively and yield empirical measures. In contrast, the critical theorists do not perceive value-fact or analysis-judgement dichotomies as separate processes.

Secondly, the analytical conflict theorists argue that the nature of societal stratification is more complex. There are different and complex power sources and social position in society and these do not necessarily align with each other. No single source can account for the power and status differentiations in society. A third factor relates to the nature of conflict in society. The analytical conflict theorist understands conflict as an inevitable and permanent aspect of social life, that is, they do not contemplate the vision of a conflict-free society. Marx envisaged a modern society moving towards a communist state and this contrasts Weber's view of increasing bureaucracy and rationalisation.

One such example is contemporary theorist, Randall Collins included in the next chapter. Ritzer (2005: 123) notes that in Collins's work on creating links to micro- and macro theories: "…he advocates the development of scientific sociology in which sociological research and theory move toward the construction of generalized explanatory theories". Collin's is also influenced by Goffman's work on micro-interactions, focussing on the everyday life experiences of individuals, and how these patterned interactions maintain social structures in society. In linking this idea to the intention to examine the everyday interactions and activities for children: how does this translate into the maintaining the social structure in society?

Wallace and Wolf (1995: 163) state that Collins also aims to show that a range of social phenomena should be explained: "on the basis of a general assumption of a conflicting interests and an analysis of the resources and actions available to people in particular social situations". Within Collin's formulation of 'Conflict Sociology', an individual's access to resources and their position, including education, age or gender in a number of different areas influences positioning in society. Thus, this formulation incorporates Weber's pluralistic assumptions about social stratification.

The theoretical chapter (three) then focuses on Weber's theory of social closure and concepts such as 'social action', 'monopolization', 'power' and 'domination'. The theory offers valuable insights into how exclusionary codes regulate society and the social relations of

certain socio-economic groups. It examines how dominant status groups, through property, class and power relations monopolize advantages in the market place by closing opportunities to groups it deemed as inferior and ineligible (Murphy, 1988; and Rawal, 2008). It introduces the idea of other forms of monopolization, such as monopolization of power, whereby other status groups coheres around race, language, gender, age, religion or educational qualifications; and exercise exclusion in society (Murphy, 2004). The group maintains their dominance through monopolistic action and the interest and power dynamics the group exerts.

These ideas will be positioned to understand and examine children's marginalisation in in general and particular. A number of elements presented here will be examined in a subsequent chapter. In terms of understanding the variants of critical theory and its applicability to this study as a whole, perhaps Bohman's (2003: 106-107) examination augments the arguments for a pluralistic approach aiming at critically '*deciphering*' and addressing a problem and a process of self-reflection. Moreover, the critical social sciences attempt at 'unifying' diverse epistemic approaches and explanations reflect its pragmatic character, particularly in the second interpretation of the critical social science approaches.

The discussions thus far have shown that the 'neat' delineations of the paradigms are mere 'illusions'. Instead, even within paradigmatic 'schools' there are vehement disagreements and differences in emphasis. This section and the chapter, in particular, is an oversimplified description of some of the dialogues, and more importantly does not examine all the critical commentaries. Thus, as stated earlier in the chapter, the treatment of the metatheories is cursory. The following sub-section elaborates on some of these epistemic shifts, the evolving pragmatic dialogues and the dissonances and consonances among and within worldviews.

2.3 Pragmatism and the pragmatic turn

In reflecting on the descriptions of the dominant paradigms, it is clear that while the numerous scholars and schools of thought differ in their articulations, they are all concerned with the same phenomena and ways of investigating these. However, the choice of the metatheoretical paradigm will always influence method and methodology, and the idea of a 'synthesis' of metatheory, methodology and method is not always appreciated. 'Purists' argue that quantitative and qualitative methods and metatheoretical stances are incompatible in

terms of epistemological, ontological, and axiological stances, their ways of investigating or establishing 'truths' remain dissimilar (Onwuegbuzie and Leech, 2005; and Denzin, 2010). As a result, such proponents oppose the idea of combining approaches and seldom consider the merits in opposing approaches. Embedded in this thinking seems to be an exaggerated interest in the methodology and paradigm rather than the social problem, actor or phenomena under investigation. Does such a preoccupation serve the interests of the discipline or society in general?

Weber (Weber translated by Henderson and Parson, 1947: 80) reminds us that:

> "Sociology…is a science which attempts the interpretive understanding of social action in order thereby to arrive at a causal explanation of its course and effects. In 'action' is included all human behaviour when and in so far as the acting individual attaches a subjective meaning to it. Action in this sense may be either overt or purely inward or subjective; it may consist of positive interventions in a situation, or deliberately refraining from such intervention or passively acquiescing in the situation. Action is social in so far as, by virtue of the subjective meaning attached to it by the acting individual (or individuals), it takes into account of the behaviour of others and is thereby orientated in its course."

Weber's interpretation raises a number of points. Firstly, sociology is a 'science' in that the method(s) of investigation may differ from positivism or the philosophy of science yet elements in the inquiry process are comparable, that is, the need for logic and structure. Secondly, actions and thoughts, respectively, motivation and reason are inseparable. It requires an understanding of researcher and research participants' motivations and reasoning. The notion of ethical neutrality and exclusion of value-judgement in social research is thus, an ideal, rather than a norm. In this citation, Weber extends the arguments pursued by the interpretivists but also aims to (re)position the nature of sociological and social research.

Yet, Weber is no stranger to quantitative approaches to social inquiry. Lazarsfeld and Oberschall (1965: 186) document at least six accounts of Weber's involvement in empirical, social research, including statistical analysis. For example, in 1890 in a report on Eastern Prussia Weber presented a 120 page of descriptive tables. The distinctive feature of Weber's report, in comparison to other reports in the series, is his comparative analysis with results from earlier studies which he use to present a historical context of the aspect(s) under study. It is through this engagement that Weber's ambivalence took root.

In terms of this study, the proposed worldview adopted here is an 'alternative' to the qualitative-quantitative incompatibility debate and its constrained corollary, the monomethod.

This dissertation advances the *complementarity debate* but in itself does not utilise data sets from the different approaches (Krauss, 2005). Instead, the focus shifts to the research question and problem. The *pragmatic critical constructivist* lens provides the framework to examine and understand the field. These concerns are congruent with aspirations embedded in the new social and sociological studies on childhood, child and mobility rights agendas and studies on mobility. In effect, it addresses 'global' concerns about the knowledge production, construction and dissemination, and in this instance specifically knowledge on and about child mobility. Antonio's (1989: 721 and 741) reflection on pragmatism's strength is insightful. The author reminds us that pragmatism in "no cure-all".

Perhaps, Seidman's (1996: 757) commentary about pragmatist perspectives around knowledge, power and social inquiry presents a fair entry point into the rationale for the choice of this lens. The author argues, and reiterates previous and similar arguments, that the intertwining of these elements is important for sociologists to heed, that is, the self-reflexive accounts of our research practices. This merely reiterates the key argument in this study and chapter. Yet, Pragmatism and sociology are not separate developments. Bogusz (2012: 22 see Seidman, 1996; and Holmwood, 2011) argues that:

> "Pragmatism and sociology…share a sense of life and action. Both are children of the same era (Durkheim 1983: 1)…'practice turn' of the 1990s was followed by the 'pragmatic turn' of the beginning of the 21st century internationally in social and cultural sciences as well as in philosophy."

Morgan (2007: 71) reminds us that pragmatism is not a new philosophy of social science. However, its acquiescence within sociology is a source of celebration, debate and contestation (Holmwood, 2011 and Lemieux, 2012). However, Barbalet (2009, 202) reminds us of this with a few examples of: "…extensive, unacknowledged but significant" use of pragmatism by some key social theorists (including Weber).

Returning to pragmatism, some of the key protagonists include, amongst others, Peirce, James, Mead, Dewey, Quine, Rorty, West, Bernstein, Sellers, Goodman, Putnam, and Davidson (Cherryholmes, 1992). This also includes works on pragmatism by Durkheim, Habermas, C. W. Mills and Cooley. While, Charles Sanders Peirce, William James and John Dewey are seen as the main founders of pragmatism, it is Pierce's extension of Immanuel Kant's work that set in motion the development of pragmatism (Bawden, 1904; Peirce, 1905;

Weiner, 1946; Thayer, 1982; and Betzner, 2008). For example, Axinn (2006) writes that Peirce attributed his interest in pragmatism to Immanuel Kant's work, in particular *'The Critique of Pure Reason'*. In the section of the text, 'Of opinion, knowledge and belief', Kant uses the concept 'Pragmatical belief' and earlier in the text 'pragmatical laws' (Kant transcribed by Meiklejohn, 2010-2013: 460).

Pragmatism consists of "different points of emphasis, interpretations, and reinterpretations" (Cherryholmes, 1992: 13) and even disagreements amongst the protagonists (Putnum, 1995; Delanty and Strydom, 2003; Baert (2003 in Pansiri, 2005: 196) and Gross, 2009). As someone unfamiliar to the discipline of philosophy, its main protagonists, the antecedents and the distinct arguments, and attempting the works of Peirce, James and Dewey and others is no easy feat. However, the attempt to engage with these works is to understand some of the elements or axioms in *pragmatism* and its appropriation, or translations into contemporary methodological stances, third methodological movement. Some of the connections to critical constructivism feature in earlier sections.

Betzner (2008: 42) suggests that in the attempt to summarise Classical American pragmatism, there is a tendency toward glossing over the differences in Peirce, James and Dewey's exposition of pragmatism. This is true of the approach adopted in this sub-section of the chapter. An intensive reading of some of the seminal works of the various protagonists clearly points to robust debate, challenges and scrutiny. However, at the outset, it is stated that the intention here is not to engage in an in-depth analysis of the various works. Rather, the desire was to unpack how pragmatic dictums converge with the broader aims and objectives of this study. Clearly, it does not produce a neat 'package', yet that is the nature of the social sciences and of pragmatism. The discussions below focuses on some of the common themes and those that advance the arguments cast in the earlier chapter and sections of this chapter.

The issue or theory of 'Truth': So how do we translate such understandings to this study? This reflects on worldviews dominating the contemporary inquiries on and about child mobility. To what extent do they portray children's everyday lives, experiences and needs? Do these inquiries acknowledge the diversity of childhood globally? How do we characterise the current state of the knowledge?

James (1907 in Thayer, 1982: 131-132) argues that:

> "Pragmatism's primary interest is in its doctrine of truth. All pragmatist writers make this the center of their speculations; not one of them is sceptical, not one doubts our ultimate ability to penetrate theoretically in the very core of reality. They only ask what we mean by truth"

Returning to Kant's views on knowledge, belief and opinion: In relation to pragmatic belief Kant provides the following example (Kant transcribed by Meiklejohn, 2010-2013: 460) for the reader to consider:

> "The physician must pursue some course in the case of a patient who is in danger, but is ignorant of the nature of the disease. He observes the symptoms, and concludes, according to the best of his judgement, that it is a case of phthisis. His belief is, even in his own judgement, only contingent: another man might, perhaps come nearer the truth. Such a belief, contingent indeed, but still forming the ground of the actual use of means for the attainment of certain ends, In terms of Pragmatical belief…Thus pragmatical belief has degrees, varying in proportion to the interests at stake. Now, in cases where we cannot enter upon any course of action in reference to some object, and where, accordingly, our judgement is purely theoretical, we can still represent to ourselves, in thought, the possibility of a course of action, for which we suppose that we have sufficient grounds, if any means existed of ascertaining the truth of the matter."

The knowledge we have at a particular point in time will thus influence the course of action taken. However, the same issue may be viewed in another manner, in that a different observer may have a different understanding, experience and knowledge of the issue. In addition, as more experience and knowledge is acquired over time the views and truths about issues will change. Moreover, Kant places emphasis not just on 'time', but the issue of 'space' in relation to our understandings and knowledge. Thus, the notions of truth, knowledge, opinion and belief influence actions; and this is contingent on issues such as 'time' and 'space' distinctively linking human thought with action.

The need to clarify ideas was at the core of classical pragmatic concerns. Turning to the seminal works of Peirce: Betzner (2008: 45) suggests that for Peirce 'truth' meant that an opinion or idea withstood scrutiny and evidence. In effect, it points to the issue of how knowledge is produced, verified and becomes accepted within society. Ideas need to contested and applied. It is about seeking clarity of ideas. This implies a connection among truth, action and inquiry, and that the pursuit of 'Truth' or 'truth' is a dynamic and sometimes an interminable process. Yet, Neo-pragmatists such as Rorty differ from the classical

pragmatists: "The pragmatic vision Rorty extols is that of philosophy as conversation instead of a quest for truth or wisdom" (Ritzer, 2005: 599).

Peirce (1905: 168) asserts that:

"You only puzzle yourself by talking of this metaphysical 'truth' and metaphysical 'falsity,' that you know nothing about. All you have any dealings with are your doubts and beliefs, with the course of life that forces new beliefs upon you and gives you power to doubt old beliefs. If your terms 'truth' and 'falsity' are taken in such senses as to be definable in terms of doubt and belief and the course of experience, (as for example they would be, if you were to define the 'truth' as that to a belief in which belief would tend if it were to tend indefinitely toward absolute fixity,) well and good: in that case, you are only talking about doubt and belief. But if by truth and falsity you mean something not definable in terms of doubt and belief in any way, then you are talking of entities of whose existence you can know nothing, and which Ockham's razor would clean shave off. Your problems would be greatly simplified, if, instead of saying that you want to know the 'Truth,' you were simply to say that you want to attain a state of belief unassailable by doubt."

Thus, Pansiri (2005: 197) suggests that 'belief', 'doubt' and 'habit' are some of the key concepts in pragmatism. Inherent in this thinking is the notion of social construction of reality "by the processes of institutionalization, legitimation and socialization". In other words, knowledge claims are context dependent and subject to beliefs, interests and projections." In other words, the embedded in the construction of 'Truth' is ideas relating to institutionalism and habitualisation.

Masadeh (2012: 135) then presents this account of the pragmatic interpretation of 'truth' in contrast to the positivist or interpretivist position, that the monomethod is rejected. The idea is that truth is socially constructed and there is a need to investigate using any effected method. Misak (1999: 2) suggests that for pragmatists "…the notion of truth must not be disconnected from the practice of belief, assertion and inquiry". Thus, there is no commitment to any one system of philosophy or reality. Instead, the theory of truth and the concepts of inquiry are inseparable and the main concern:

Denzin (1996: 62) in a review of Joas', '*Post-Pragmatism, Pragmatism and Social Theory*', notes that:

"For Joas, pragmatism turns on four key assumptions: human action is creative; humans have situated freedom; action is adaptation, fitted to the problematics of specific situations; and a

pragmatic approach to science as problem solving carries great potential for life in a democratic society. In this formulation, pragmatism is both a theory of action and a theory of praxis."

Inherent in this is the element of action, that is, the pragmatic theory of action and praxis.

James, in a seminal text, '*Pragmatism's Conception of Truth*' (Peirce, 1878 in Thayer, 1982: 97) notes pragmatism:

> "…asks its usual question. 'Grant an idea or belief to be true,' it says, 'what concrete difference will its being true make in any one's actual life? How will the truth be realized? What experiences will be different from those which would obtain if the belief were false? What, in short, is the truths cash value in experiential terms?' The moment pragmatism asks this question, it sees the answer: *True ideas are those that we can assimilate, validate, corroborate and verify. False ideas are those that we cannot.*"

In the above citation, James asks what the acquiring of 'truth' means and how it will be realised. This implies some level or type of 'action'. It suggests that questioning is important but has no value if the 'answer' or 'Truth' is uncontested.

Misak (1999: 2) writes, "The central thought of pragmatism is that philosophy must be connected to practice". This is not just in terms of an individual social scientist or researcher producing knowledge. Delanty and Strydom (2003: 278) suggest that embedded in this thinking is the desire to promote democracy and social justice. This, then, connects James and Dewey's version to contemporary pragmatic understandings and rationales. Moreover, the issue of the theory of praxis starts to emerge and our understanding of Joas and others connection of pragmatism to democracy in contemporary deliberations becomes less obscure; in particular, the links to gender, feminism and education (for example, Rorty, 1990; Colliver, 1999; and Rumens and Kelemen, 2010).

Two cases in point: Brennecke (2004) elaborates on the applicability and relevance of pragmatism in education. In particular, the author cites how between 1894 and 1904, John Dewey established a Laboratory School for children from six to 16 years, on the University of Chicago campus. Dewey developed educational applications to encourage to children to take charge of their learning and in doing so to draw on their own knowledge and experience. Moreover, in Brennecke and Dewey's account, the child is an important participant in society and the knowledge a child acquires is equally valuable to addressing societal problems. Such precepts if expropriated to studies on child mobility and transport can yield different results, outcomes and policy directions. Moreover, this pragmatic precept resonates with new social

studies on ideas on children and those relating to child mobility in this dissertation. Therefore, a community of practice not only produces knowledge it must translate this into action and implementation. Bénatouïl (1990) explains that 'action' is central to a pragmatic sociologist's thinking and doing.

On the 'Nature of inquiry' or 'habit as action': Dewey (Dewey, 1931 in Thayer, 1982: 26-27) remarks on this link between habit, action and beliefs by citing Peirce's views that: "beliefs are really rules for action, and the whole function of thinking is but one step in the production of the habits of action." Peirce (Peirce, 1878 in Thayer, 1982: 84 and 87) then explains that:

> "Now, the identity of a habit depends on how it might lead us to act…What the habit is depends on *when* and *how* it causes us to act. As for the *when*, every stimulus to action is derived from perception; as for the *how*, every purpose of action is to produce some sensible results…The essence of belief is the establishment of an habit, and different beliefs are distinguished by the different modes of action"

Clearly, the concept 'action' is analogous to 'habit' but also to the production of purposeful results (Peirce, 1878 in Thayer, 1982: 85). On the last point, we turn to James' work, '*What Pragmatism Means*'. This shows the distinction between James and Peirce's works. Moreover, it reveals a connection to Weber's conceptions of notions such as 'action', 'utility', or 'social action'.

James (James, 1907 in Thayer, 1982: 210) suggests:

> "The pragmatic method in such cases is to try to interpret each notion by tracing its respective practical consequences. What difference would it practically make to any one if this notion rather than that notion was true?"

This implies a degree of self-reflexivity, 'inward trouble' (James, 1907 in Thayer, 1982: 216) is relevant. Therefore, a researcher or social scientist needs to be clear about how, why and the value in adopting such a strategy.

Thus, in terms of the conception of 'truth' and 'action': "The test of truth is utility: it's true if it works" (Bawden, 1904: 421). Betzner (2008: 44) notes that:

> "Modern pragmatist Nicholas Rescher (2001) described that in pragmatism, what works in practice becomes the standard for the truth of assertions, the rightness of actions and value of appraisals. Gathering evidence is a method of estimating the truth of a thing; and if sufficiently warranted, the evidence stands in for the truth. An implication of pragmatism is that the best we can do to gather evidence is always good enough. Despite the challenge of the inquiry, one's best evidence gathering is never insufficient to determine truth."

Perhaps James infers this (James, 1907 in Thayer, 1982: 220): "The pragmatist clings to facts and concreteness, observes truth at its work in particular cases, and generalizes."

Masadeh (2012: 135) explains that in the pragmatic rejection of the hierarchising or privileging of some worldviews and the controls it exerts on the research design, process and the researcher there is a concern about how to address the social phenomena under study:

> "Similarly, Johnson and Onwuegbuzie (2004) make the case that pragmatism, despite some of its philosophical limitations, offers a bridge between 'objective' and 'subjective', or quantitative and qualitative, philosophical orientations, precisely because it does not allow for any notion of their incompatibility. That is, pragmatism rejects ontological or epistemological abstractions in favour of 'what works'"

Yet, Bryman (2006: 97-98) notes that while the mixed method approach challenges the hegemony of the monomethod: "…some writers express unease about the 'whatever works' position that underpins it, so far as research practice is concerned, combining quantitative and qualitative research."

Payne, Williams and Chamberlain (2004: 154) present another interesting observation in an article entitled, '*Methodological Pluralism in British Sociology*': "As individuals are naturally more concerned with their own studies than the totality of research, little effort goes into monitoring overall output". The authors also note that while sociological and public issues may require that we reflect on our choice of method(s) the challenge rests in our capacity, that is, competencies and skills rather than in our tolerance of the different methods. Yet, engaging in such debates within sociology is important (Crompton, 2008; and Savage and Burrows, 2009). The evolving and emergent paradigms provide the 'promise of necessary emancipation' in our desire to understand the social, but it does present other challenges.

However, other elements are also important to consider, particularly the relevancy to this dissertation. Migiro and Magangi, (2011: 3758) note: "The best paradigm is determined by the researcher and the research problem not by the method." Ercikan and Roth (2006: 21-22) also explain that methodological 'duality' in educational research is advantageous because the purpose of research is to generate knowledge about social issues and phenomenon in society. Methodology, method or paradigm is important but this should not dominate why or

how we do research. Tashakkori and Teddlie (1998: 21 and 22-23) concur and explain that rejects the "either-or of the incompatibility thesis and embraces both points of view."

Clearly, the primacy of the research question and articulation of the problem to investigate implies that the researcher has a fair amount of flexibility in choice of methodology and method. Dewey (Dewey, 1907 in Thayer, 1982: 320-328), in *'The Pattern of Inquiry'* presents the following outline to inquiry: (a) The antecedent conditions to the inquiry; (b) Institution of the problem; (c) the determination of a problem solution; (d) reasoning; (e) the operational character of meanings of facts and (f) common sense and scientific inquiry. This outline places the research question or problem at the centre of the inquiry, rather than the choice of tool, or data approach. For example under point (b), Dewey notes, "The way in which the problem is conceived decides what specific suggestions are entertained and which are dismissed; what data are selected and which rejected." Noticeably, this discussion is not an exhaustible or critical account of all the tenets or assumptions of Classical pragmatism, and Neo-pragmatism would obviously highlight and advance other arguments. The aim, however, was to create a framework for reframing of discourses and debates on and about child mobility.

2.4 Summary

In Zhao's (2011: 243) historical overview of the (re)constructions of children and childhood the author suggests that traditional "constructions of childhood has proven to be very useful in drafting social policies and launching political wars against social problems". Yet, such constructions and adultist idealisations remain embedded in some domains in contemporary society; and in some instances produce problematic and biased generalisations about children and their childhood. Shanahan (2007: 413-414), then, suggests that in challenging the taken-for-granted assumptions on children and childhood it will require a renegotiation of the normative and institutionalised conception key concepts and ideas in the discipline. This means that we need to contest our general worldviews and stances.

Notably, the shift to contest, reconstruct and renegotiate normative (re)presentations, positioning and portrayal of children emanated from sociology itself. Alanen (1999) describes the shift in thinking on and about children, as having emerged from a discontent with the existing state of childhood knowledge. The emergent paradigm, then, evolved from different

yet shared questions, concerns and views to bring to sociology and the study of childhood a range of perspectives already applied in other, more established fields of social science. Alanen (1999) notes that despite the different methodological and conceptual roots in the new Sociology of Childhood, there remains a shared view of children's agentic potential; and the idea of giving children a perspective, voice or status equal to other social groups in society.

Qvortrup (2003: 398), in an Editorial in the *Childhood* Journal, also notes that despite the ideological variances there is agreement about the relevancy of childhood research and about the need for broad methodological and interdisciplinary approaches. The guest editors on the 2009 special edition on child and youth mobility in the *Mobilities* journal (Barker, Kraftl, Horton, and Tucker, 2009: 1) concur. The editors recognise the need for "showcasing various conceptual and methodological inclinations and new directions" in the study of child mobility. Thus, the discussions on pragmatism point to the need to engage with methods and methodologies that will enable children to engage, collaborate, and participate in the construction of knowledge about their daily lives and experiences.

For example, in the view that childhood is a socially constructed concept, perceptions and understanding of childhood and children vary between and across cultural, historical, spatial and temporal settings (Woodhead and Montgomery, 2003). While 'childhood' is a universal feature of life, definitions, expectations and experiences contrast across cultures, societies and historical periods. Thus, the conceptions of the notions 'children' and 'childhood' are constantly (re)negotiated or (re)constructed. The critical constructivist axioms are embedded in these reconstructions and understandings of children and childhood and the discussion of this philosophy lends itself to current framings of children and to questions of children's empirical, theoretical and social representation.

In this chapter, the aim is not to engage in an in-depth description and discussion of the works of some of the major protagonists of pragmatism, or critical constructivism. In other words, how pragmatism and critical constructivism 'mediates' the paradigmatic and epistemic shifts necessary for social sciences (re)engagement; and reframing discourses and debates on child mobility and transport needs, experiences and problems. The focus is on the lens from which to view child mobility, children and childhood and connect this discussion to choices of research methods and theoretical perspectives. Moreover, the review of philosophies of social science is a reminder that to 'do sociology', we cannot disconnect the metatheoretical,

epistemological, theoretical, or practice threads. Rather, the engagement with metatheories enables us to problematise approaches to child mobility and provides an opportunity to reflect on current approaches and practices. It also heightens our understanding and need for theoretical frameworks congruent with the metatheoretical and epistemological underpinnings in a study.

CHAPTER 3 : WEBER'S TREATISE ON ACTION AND CLOSURE

3.1 Structure and aim of the chapter

Theoretical perspectives, in general are on and about transport and mobility; and focuses on how transport infrastructure, modes and nodes enable or impede economic growth and / or adult, particularly male, employment activities and opportunities. There is a notable bias toward the macro-level and adultist priorities. Theoretical conceptions on and about children's transport and mobility peripheralised, in that where and when children are 'included', they are usually portrayed or (re)presented as 'impediments' to the macrosociological and adultist priorities in society.

Mollnari and Emiliani (1993: 95) comment on the issue of 'social representation' and the relationship between the subject and the object in the (re)construction of meaning and value. This then explains children's normative positioning across different times, spaces, places and domains in society. Mitchell (2007: 4) also explains that representation of children can influence policy solutions and shape service provision. An examination of this is important to determining what problems exist and how it can be addressed.

These citations illustrate that 'action' and the factors motivating action, or behaviour, such as power, dominance, inequalities, exclusion, and marginalisation, or monopolization are enacted, reproduced, reified or contested in private or public places and spaces. Thus, social representations of social groups are important to consider, in particular how these representations are habitualised, normalised and institutionalised, in or by society. In this context, a sociological understanding of the actions of individuals or collectives is theorised.

In addition, the notion of 'action' is an important thread between the different chapters in this dissertation. 'Action' (*Handeln*) is also central to Weber's treatise, particularly the factors motivating and sustaining social actions (*Gemeinschaftshandeln*). Weber argues that all human behaviour is included in the notion 'action'. This includes reaction or inaction, that is, "failure to act and passive acquiescence" (Weber edited by Roth and Wittich, 1978: 22). Weber (Weber, 1958 cited in Murphy, 1988: 1) explains that interests (material or ideal) direct actions and conduct.

Roth (in Roth and Wittich, 1978: CII and LXX) then reminds us that the first part of *'Economy and Society'* is an in-depth articulation of 'interpretive sociology' and the concept 'action' and 'social action'. In the introductory chapter, Weber (Weber edited by Roth and Wittich, 1978: 4) explains:

> "Sociology (in the sense in which this-highly ambiguous word is used here) is a science concerning itself with the interpretive understanding of social action and thereby with a causal explanation of its course and consequences. We shall speak of 'action' insofar as the acting individual attaches a subjective meaning to his behaviour - be it overt or covert, omission or acquiescence. Action is 'social' insofar as its subjective meaning takes account of the behavior of others and is thereby oriented in its course."

In Weber's articulations, interpretive sociology as a 'science' and social action offer a rejection of positivist explanations of behaviour. Rather, there is a reinterpretation of the notion: 'causal explanations', "…thereby with a causal explanation of its course and consequences" (Weber edited by Roth and Wittich, 1978:4). It is an interpretation of a sequence of events in the lineage of a particular problem. This implies that rational and irrational motives for particular behaviours might exist. Is the interpretation of the event causally adequate? What is the "actually intended meaning"? Weber (Weber edited by Roth and Wittich, 1978:4) explains:

> "Action specifically significant for interpretive sociology is, in particular, behaviour that: (1) in terms of the subjectively intended meaning of the actor, is related to the *behaviour of others*, (2) is *codetermined* in its course through this relatedness, and thus (3) can be intelligibly *explained* in terms of this (subjectively) intended meaning."

At the same time, Weber suggests that an actor may not necessarily be conscious of the motives (Weber edited by Roth and Wittich, 1978:21-22):

> "In the great majority of cases actual action goes on in a state of inarticulate half consciousness or actual unconsciousness of its subjective meaning. The actor is more likely to 'be aware' of it in a vague sense than he is to 'know' what he is doing or he explicitly self-conscious about it."

The *ideal types* (categories or typologies) then present a theoretical explanation (framework) of the subjective meanings motiving particular behaviours (Weber translated by Graber, 1981: 20). Weber attempts to find the "highest possible degree of adequacy on the level of meaning". The ideal types then are the conceptual or theoretical frames the sociologist should use to analyse and understand particular behaviours and actions.

Roth (in Roth and Wittich, 1978: LXX) also explains that for Weber: "not all social actions is economically influenced and not all groups are economically relevant". However, all groups have some connection to the economic as they have to meet these needs. This has relevance to how we understand and examine children's positioning in the different spheres in society. This includes the dynamic interests that direct and augment this positioning and actions (societal, institutional, economic, political or individual); motivations; and behaviours, in relation to children and childhood. As a group, children have no direct connections with economics and politics. Yet, some of the behaviours, motives and actions of collectives in these spheres directly influence the livelihoods, survival and well-being of children. Ideal types for the notions 'action' and 'social action', then present both non-economic and economic typologies, both of relevance to the current study.

Turner (1983: 506) comments that Weber's writings are not easy to understand because of the many different connections he makes. This complexity and fluidity is what makes the notion 'action' and its typologies an appealing analytical frame. Such fluid formulations then enable us to examine a range of social actions, actors and relations in society. How do actors or collectives act in relation to children and what subjective meanings motivate particular behaviours? If the notion 'social action' or 'action' is extended, then it could also include, amongst others, capitalistic, political, legal, religious and research actions not just the economic actions. In a sense, this is what '*Economy and Society'* elaborates by showing how sociology and sociologists can deploy the notion 'action' in a range of contexts.

The argument can be transposed here (and as articulated in chapter two) relates to the permeation of dominant norms, values and ideologies in all spheres of life. Research, as calculated, scientific and rational action, then represents another conduit for augmenting, reinforcing, perpetuating and legitimising children's social marginality and subordinate positioning. These social actions, that is, research are embedded in social relations – between researcher and participants, and the researcher and the research. Such dialogues about the nature and influences of, or on methodology are not new.

A case in point, Weber's seminal text on social science methodologies delves into such issues (Weber translated by Shils and Finch, 1949). Shils (Weber translated by Shils and Finch, 1949: iv-v) suggests that for Weber the influences on actions are important.

"'Max Weber's pressing need to know the grounds for his own actions and his strong belief that man's dignity consists in his capacity for rational self-determination are evident throughout this essay - as well as his contempt for those whose confidence in the rightness of their moral judgment is so weak that they feel the urge to support it by some authority such as the 'trend of history' or its conformity with scientific doctrine in a sphere in which the powers of science are definitely limited."

Similar arguments on objectivity, ideology, methodology and action are outlined in chapters one and two. Therefore, it is pertinent to question and understand how child mobility is conceptualised, theorised and problematised. This includes why there is a persistence and reinforcement of the boundaries, margins, subordinate portrayal and depiction of children and childhood in mobility studies. This can account for the transport and mobility communities in practice normalisation, habitualisation and institutionalisation of children's 'invisibility' and 'marginalisation'. Importantly, these arguments are universal and present an opportunity to examine a range of themes and topics. Thus, we need to find a casually adequate explanation for the causes and implications of this action. The ideal types in Weber's categories of social action provide a frame for understanding why actors, researchers, specialists and policy makers continue to present children in a passive and subordinate position.

Weber's account of the actions of judges and officials can be transposed to understanding how communities of practitioners may reproduce and reify certain patterns of behaviours. What are the 'laws, values and norms' governing the community of practitioners or in Bourdieu's language the doxa, scientific habitus and capital that operates? In others words, why the normalisation, habitualisation and institutionalisation of particular behaviours? Weber (Weber edited by Roth and Wittich, 1978:14) proposes that the:

"…subjective interpretation of action must take account of a fundamentally important fact… Actors thus in part orient their action to them, and in this role such ideas have a powerful, often a decisive, causal influence on the course of action of real individuals. This is above all true where the ideas involve normative prescription or prohibition."

In a section entitled the 'Economy and Social Norms – Legal Order and Economic Order', Weber explains that 'un-reflective habituation' is embedded in human and social action and behaviour. This results in a universal and unquestionable acceptance of norms, values, beliefs, behaviours and attitudes. Weber (Weber edited by Roth and Wittich, 1978:312) says:

"The broad mass of the participants act in a way corresponding to legal norms, not out of obedience regarded as a legal obligation, but either because the environment approves of the

conduct and disapproves of its opposite, or merely as a result of unreflective habituation to a regularity of life that has engraved itself as a custom."

Unsurprisingly, Whitelegg (2010: 3) describes generally the attitude toward children as transport users and a priority group in the "dismissive model of the universe". The author explains that professional planners, economists, traffic engineers and others in the transport sector do not productively engage with children, or acknowledge their competence. When or where child-focused theories, methods and methodologies are used, the results and findings may possibly be dismissed, given lip service, or be part of the popular rhetoric to create the 'illusion' that children matter. However, simply adding children as subjects, or objects, in a study does not obviate adult or macro-level biases. Conceptualising children's transport and mobility patterns and behaviours in this manner then, can be problematic and limiting (as highlighted in chapter one).

Alanen's use of the concept 'pseudo-inclusion' is relevant to examining how children are included in some endeavours (in Mason and Fattore, 2005: 31-32).

> "Pseudo-inclusion is another common practice. Here children are, or at least seem to be, a genuine concern, but in the end they disappear from view. This occurs by way of treating children as 'dependent variables' of, or appendages to, some category of adults (such as parents). Pseudo-inclusion occurs also by way of focusing merely on those who 'have' children, take care of or work with them, or in some other way participate in the organising of children's everyday life conditions. Pseudo-inclusion is the case also when the focus is on the institutional regimes (family, school, child-work professions) under which children are subsumed, instead of focusing on children living and acting in these regimes."

At the same time, Knutsson (1997: 118) reminds us that:

> "Children have a right to be included as a focus in economic and political planning, and there can be no excuse, theoretical or otherwise, for excluding them from the consideration within economic and political development planning."

Thus, the nature and manner of the inclusion is as important to consider; and equally important are the 'interests' driving how or why this inclusion is taking place. Does it provide beneficial outcomes for children, or is there a bias towards 'adultist' prioritisations?

This chapter, focuses on providing a theoretical explanation of why dominant (re)presentations and portrayals of children and childhood continue to be reified, reproduced and perpetuated? What social structures and circumstances give rise to these particular

behaviours and actions? Can we extract a plausible theoretical explanation of this social phenomenon?

The chapter has two parts. The first part is a brief and broad discussion of the theoretical perspectives used in the study on and about children. The second part is a descriptive synopsis of how transport, transportation, and mobility has been conceptualised, problematised and theorised by some selected mainstream and male-stream sociologists. In this section, the focus shifts to Max Weber's theorisations of the economic significance of transport and transportation to rationalistic, bureaucratic and capitalistic actions. These expositions also permeate the analysis and conception of closure and monopolization. The chapter also demonstrates Weber's varying use of the key construct 'action'. The intention of the section is to draw attention to how the developing discipline of sociology marginalised and marginalises the lives and experiences of children and childhood, including other marginalised social groups.

Given the period in which Weber and other contemporaries produced their seminal works, children's labour and work remained an invaluable yet 'invisible' factor in capitalist production. Their class position and status was deemed inconsequential. For instance, Engels (1892), in *'The Condition of the Working-Class in England in 1844'*, notes this about children's labour contributions and educational participation under industrialisation. This also indicates the conception of schedulisation and scholarisation under capitalism and industrialisation and its eventual embedding in children's lives and the child discourses in modern societies (Engels, 1892: 54-55).

Similarly, Horrel and Humphries (1995) also draw attention to the various forms of labour and work children engaged in during the period 1781 to 1872. Children were most likely to be employed in agriculture, mining, factory, outwork, trades or as casuals. Children's labour participation and contributions remained unrecognised yet indispensable to economic gain and capitalistic desire. Moreover, their status as workers or the working class remained unacknowledged, and so too their invisibility in theorisations about class struggles under capitalism and industrialisation. Children's class position continues to be a point of ambiguity and contention. Engels (1892: 68) also highlights the empirical marginalisation of children in the reporting of data on manufacturing.

The second part of the chapter focuses on Max Weber's theoretical exposition and conception of social action and closure. The section also explores prior expansions of the notion 'closure', and how such elements lend themselves to analysing children's social exclusion, or closure. That is, how or why there is a reproduction and reification of children's marginalisation and invisibility in mobility and transport studies? Why do the unreflected and normative assumptions and constructions persist within the transport and mobility studies in particular and society in general? This is important to think and write about, particularly how different forms of social action, dynamic interests, domination or closure can be appropriated in this study.

It is important to emphasize that macro-sociological interest in transport and transportation has never waned. The most noticeable indication of this interest is the evolving and emerging conceptual and lexical schemes, namely 'transport', 'transportation', 'travel behaviour', or 'accessibility' through to the use of 'mobility', 'transport social exclusion', or 'transport disadvantage'. Despite the muted or selective interest within sociology, these developments are an indication of an interest and acknowledgement of the importance of transport and mobility in society. Moreover, it shows the desire of a subgrouping of sociologists to 'construct, deconstruct and reconstruct' the transport and mobility issues in a modern, developed or developing society, globalised and networked society. However, within such expositions the marginalisation of children's daily lives, including their mobility and transport needs is evident. This chapter then offers a theoretical understanding, and explanation of the persistence of this phenomenon in contemporary society and in the social sciences, through an examination of Max Weber's typology of social action, closure and monopolization.

3.2 Weber on social action and transport (technology and innovation)

Delanty (2009) explains that, in general the interest in capitalistic action during the Industrial Revolution and the rise of modernity remains a central concern for classical and contemporary social theorists. In other words, 'What was the cause of the development of modern capitalism'? Delanty (2009: 19) explains that:

> "The emergence of social theory coincides with the emergence of modernity. It can be seen in the most general sense to be a reflection on the nature of modern society. Social theory aims to provide a general interpretation of the social forces that have shaped the modern world…But modernity was not only experienced in terms of crisis, it was also experienced as a promise of

new freedoms, and for many contained within it a utopian impulse. This tension between crisis and future possibility encapsulates both the spirit of modernity and the responses of social theorists to the predicament of modern society."

For example, Weber (2005 [1910]: 28) made the following responding remarks on Werner Sombart's lecture on '*Technology and Culture*':

"By comparison, capitalist development today apparently goes hand in hand with technological development, so much so that technicians have seriously come to believe that technology and its evolution may be the exclusive leading element in our cultural development. Today I do not have to criticize this view since Sombart has already remarked on it. I only assert that whether or to what extent this really is the case is precisely a problem for us sociologists, and also that the contrast between the present and the past is and will indeed remain for us a problem of the first order, and certainly cannot be solved without the collaboration of technicians."

Consequently, Delanty (2009: 34) notes that within the Weberian approach, 'culture' is theorised as a self-generating force providing the individual with opportunities to derive meanings and direct their interests and social actions. The rationalisation and intellectualisation of culture, thus, saw the traditional modes of thinking and ways of doing being replaced and challenged. Technological developments were therefore, no longer constrained by traditional or cultural norms and values, that is, value-rational actions. In a broader sense, do cultural and traditional norms and customs impede children in a modern and industrialised society?

Hence, Weber's view on the dominance of scientific and instrumental rational action in the modern capitalist society explains the role of transport and transportations developments under such conditions. Morrison (2006) argues that Weber identifies four types of 'rationality', that is, theoretical, formal, practical and substantive rationality. These four types are central to Weber's theory of rationalisation. However, formal rationality, the application of calculable and numerical standards, dominates in modern, industrialised societies and supplants the other types of rationality (Morrison, 2006: 285; and Ritzer, 2007: 43). Morrison (2006) also suggests that in Weber's writing he draws a distinction between 'rationality' and 'rationalisation'. Morrison (2006: 279-281) notes that:

"Rationalization, we argued, refers to the overall historical process by which reality is increasingly mastered by calculation, scientific knowledge and rational action. Rationality, by contrast, is a term Weber used to refer to the capacity of social action to be subject to calculation of the means and ends of action by taking up a methodical orientation to reality."

In this regard, the concepts 'rationalised technology' and 'rationalised capitalism' are important to explain the connections and analysis of technological developments (Collins, 1986). Weber (2005: 27-28) states:

"What matters for us here is to develop a much more specific concept of 'technology' than that which is often (though not always) associated with the materialist conception of history…By comparison, capitalist development today apparently goes hand in hand with technological development, so much so that technicians have seriously come to believe that technology and its evolution may be the exclusive leading element in our cultural development."

In effect, the development of technology, inventions and innovations reflect a desire to control the factors of production. Moreover, the control and appropriation of this and other factors of production requires a rationalised, calculable and bureaucratic *action* from, or by the actor(s). It also signals a shift away from value-rational action to scientific or instrumental rational action (Dillion, 2010). However, Weber adds another dimension to this issue of technology and innovation under capitalism. Collins (1986) argues that for Weber, innovations and inventions under capitalism were not necessarily driven by a scientific desire but rather by the spirit of calculation, instrumental rationality, and systematic measurement.

Collins (1986: 113) explains that:

"There is a crucial Weberian point here: The movement of high-status persons into the sphere of technology marks a shift in social motivations. For low-status artisans have never been at the cutting edge of technological innovation. As we have seen, development into a socially successful technique is what makes an innovation successful and it has always taken persons with power or economic resources to carry this out. If Schumpeter is right that private empire-building through the deliberate search for technological innovation is the essence of capitalist dynamics, then this shift in the status system of business was a key development."

This assumption underpins Weber's, and other social thinkers, theorisation of technology developments and transportation inputs.

In this dissertation, Weber's seminal text '*Economy and Society*' holds some of the key elements we need to understand and explain the social phenomena under study. Linking back to Delanty's citation at the start of this section, Roth (in Weber edited by Roth and Wittich, 1978: XXXVI and XXXV) writes this about this seminal text:

"The construction of such trans-epochal and trans-cultural types as, for example, enterprise and *oikos* or bureaucracy and hierocracy, makes sociological theory historically comparative. In this way sociological theory provides the researcher with the dimensional concepts and empirical types that, are prerequisites for the kind of comparative mental experiment and imaginative

extrapolation without which causal explanation is impossible in history. Weber's sociological theory, then, grew out of wide-ranging historical research and was meant to be applied, again to history, past and in the making…*Economy and Society* builds a sociological scaffolding for raising some of the big questions about the origins and the possible directions of the modern world…*Economy and Society* demonstrates the rather concrete level on which he wanted to approach sociological theory and historical generalization."

The text examines, "models such as bureaucracy, patrimonialism, charismatic rulership and community, hierocracy, church, sect and others that are constructed from different times and places" (Roth and Weber, 1976: 310-311). This explains the complex, yet detailed descriptions and analyses of various processes and changes across historical periods. In short, Weber seeks to show that the process of rationalisation shaped historical and social processes.

Central to the understanding of 'rationality' and 'rationalisation' is the notion of 'action'. In other word, what motivates an individual or actor to act? What process / procedure is deployed and what is the goal or objective of the action? Roth (in Weber edited by Roth and Wittich, 1978: LXIX) explains that throughout his economic analysis, Weber explored the motivations behind economic actions in particular:

> "Men are creatures of habit, but they are also strongly motivated by their material and ideal interests to circumvent conventional and legal rules; in all societies the economically powerful tend to have a strong influence on the enactment and interpretation of the law."

Subsequently, the introductory paragraph of Chapter 2 of '*Economy and Society*' provides the following definition of action but more specifically 'economic action' (Weber edited by Roth and Wittich, 1978: 63):

> "'Action will be said to be economically oriented' so far as, according to its subjective meaning, it is concerned with the satisfaction of a desire, for 'utilities' (*Nutzleistungen*). 'Economic action' *(Wirtschaften)* is any peaceful exercise of an actor's control over resources which is in its main impulse oriented towards economic ends. 'Rational economic action' requires instrumental rationality in this orientation, that is, deliberate planning. We will call autocephalous economic action an 'economy' *(Wirtschaft),* and an organized system of continuous economic action an 'economic establishment' *(Wirtschaftsbetrieb)*".

A number of key ideas are articulated in the notion 'action'. For example, the words "concerned with the satisfaction of a desire, for utilities". The concept 'utilities' is defined as follows (Weber edited by Roth and Wittich, 1978: 68-69):

> "By 'utilities' *(Nutzleistungen)* will always be meant the specific and concrete, real or imagined, advantages *(Chancen)* of opportunities for present or future use as they are estimated

and made an object of specific provision by one or more economically acting individuals. The action of these individuals is oriented to the estimated importance of such utilities as means for the ends of their economic action. Utilities may be the services of non-human or inanimate objects or of human beings. Non·human objects which are the sources of potential utilities of whatever sort will be called 'goods'. Utilities derived from a human source, so far as this source consists in active conduct, will be called 'services' *(Leistungen).* Social relationships which are valued as a potential source of present or future disposal over utilities are, however, also objects of economic provision. The opportunities of economic advantage, which are made available by custom, by the constellation of interest, or by a conventional or legal order for the purposes of an economic unit, win be called 'economic advantages.'"

In this regard, Weber introduces notions such as the modes of appropriation and expropriation, gaining control of a particular utility. Interestingly, this relates both to humans (children) and to non-humans (transport and transportation). Therefore, utilities can be human or non-human and tangible or intangible in form. Thus, the goods and services, or resources an actor can control are important to satisfying economic ends.

More importantly, Weber proposes that social action can be divided into four types (Weber edited by Roth and Wittich, 1978: 24-25):

"Social action, like all action, may be oriented in four ways. It may be: (1) *instrumentally rational (zweckrational),* that is, determined by expectations as to the behavior of objects in the environment and of other human beings; these expectations are used as 'conditions' or 'means' for the attainment of the actor's own rationally pursued and calculated ends; (2) *value rational (wertrational),* that is, determined by a conscious belief in the value for its own sake of some ethical, aesthetic, religious, or other fann of behavior, independently of its prospects of success; *(3) affectual* (especially emotional), that is, determined by the actor's specific affects and feeling states; *(4) traditional,* that is, determined by ingrained habituation."

This lends itself to the ideas purported in the notions 'action' and 'utility'.

These categories, or ideal types, of social action are conceptual or analytical constructs providing a frame to compare, contrast and understand everyday real life motivations, behaviours and actions of individuals, in particular settings and epochs. For example, "What are the social preconditions for the emergence of capitalism" (Collins, 1980: 929)? It is within this context that we need to understand the modes of appropriation and expropriation of utilities for economic gain or advantage.

3.2.1 Locating transport and transportation

In '*Economy and Society*', Weber transposes ideas of actions for economic gain to transport and transportation. Weber (cited in Collins, 1986) theorises about the technological developments and innovations, such as long distance transfer of economic goods, labour, and other materials across geographic areas, as necessary preconditions for the expansion of capitalism and the development of modern states. Control over the factors in the production process is equally important.

In Chapter 2 of '*Economy and Society'*, under the section titled 'Typical measures of rational economic action' this is explained (Weber edited by Roth and Wittich, 1978: 71-72):

> "The following are typical measures of rational economic action: (1) The systematic allocation as between present and future of utilities, on the control of which the actor for whatever reason feels able to count. (These are the essential features of saving.) (2) The systematic allocation of available utilities to various potential uses in the order of their estimated relative urgency, ranked according to the principle of marginal utility. These two cases, the most definitely 'static', have been most highly developed in times of peace. Today, for the most part, they take the form of the allocation of money incomes. (3) The systematic procurement through production or transportation of such utilities for which all the necessary means of production are controlled by the actor himself. Where action is rational, this type of action will take place so far as, according to the actor's estimate, the urgency of his demand for the expected result of the action exceeds the necessary expenditure, which may consist in (a) the irksomeness of the requisite labor services, and (b) the other potential uses to which the requisite goods could be put; including, that is, the utility of the potential alternative products and their uses. This is 'production' in the broader sense, which includes transportation. (4) The systematic acquisition, by agreement *(Vergesellschaftung)* with the present possessors or with competing bidders, of assured powers of control and disposal over utilities. The powers of control may or may not be shared with others. The occasion may lie in the fact that utilities themselves are in the control of others, that their means of procurement are in such control, or that third persons desire to acquire them in such a way as to endanger actor's own supply."

Innate in the above citation is the issue of 'transport and transportation', these using concepts such as 'services' and 'goods'. It also implies that the actor must exercise a fair level of control over resources, and is similar to the ideas espoused about women and children as resources or goods within the household and available to the patriarch. Moreover, Weber is referring to the private appropriation of the factors of production (Collins, 1986).

However, the issue of the role of monopolistic action and legitimised domination also comes into play. Weber explains that securing monopolistic advantages is important to group or individual interests, that is, maintaining and maximising their dominance in a market. The

decisions and actions are characterised as instrumental rationality. For example, Weber (edited by Roth and Wittich, 1978: 84) provides this explanation of how monopolistic advantages may be secured in terms of transportation and transport:

> "With a view to the securing or monopolistic advantages, this could take several forms: (I) the pure regulation of opportunities for purchase and sale, which is typical of the widespread phenomena of trading monopolies: (2) the regulation of transportation facilities, as in shipping and railway monopolies; (3) the monopolization of the production of certain goods; and (4) that of the extension of credit and of financing."

Weber deploys the ideas of appropriation, expropriation and monopolization to maritime commerce and shipping. Weber (translated by Henderson and Parson, 1947: 223-224) explains that under a capitalist model this would differ from previous arrangements:

> "For maritime commerce the typical arrangement in the past times has been the appropriation of the ship by a plurality of owners who have tended to become more and more sharply differentiated from the workers on the ship…To-day, it is usual for all kinds of equipment and tools to be appropriated under one controlling agency."

Moreover, in the volume '*From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology*', under the sub-heading 'Qualitative changes in administrative tasks', Weber (translated and edited by Gerth and Mills, 1970: 212-215 and 230) explains the connections between rationalised capitalism; the factors of production; and modes, or transport facilities. This shows how Weber connects the ideas of capitalism, rational economic action and transport and the control over goods and services. Moreover, it speaks to how a specific class will maintain, appropriate and monopolize interests:

> "Among essentially technical factors, the specifically modern means of communication enter the picture as pacemakers of bureaucratization. Public land and water-ways, railroads, the telegraph, et cetera – they must, in part, necessarily be administered in a public and collective way; in part, such administration is technically expedient…Railroads, in turn, are intimately connected with the development of inter-local traffic of mass goods. The traffic is among the casual factors in the formation of the modern state…Today, it is primarily the capitalist market economy which demands that the official business of the administration be discharged precisely, unambiguously, continuously, and with as much speed as possible…Often bureaucratization has been carried out in direct alliance with capitalist interests"

This implies that there is a synergistic relationship between the State and its institutions, the political spheres, and the economically influential interest groups in a society, all notions of legitimised domination. Morrison (2006: 386) explains that there are two broad social consequences of bureaucratisation. Firstly, as bureaucracy develops, the governed fall into a

position of compliance. "Underlying this problem is the influence of moneyed elites who tend to wield power over bureaucratic agencies…advance their interests by manipulating structures of power" (ibid). A second consequence relates to the development of 'secrecy' with bureaucracies operating as closed organisations and excluding the citizenry in key decision-making activities, posing questions about governance and civic participation.

Button and Nijkamp (1997: 215) note that:

> "Modern transport affords mobility, facilitates post-Fordist production and allows political cohesion. Degrees of access to transport networks affect social patterns at all levels of spatial aggregation. Transport supply, however, is regulated by political interests and market pressures both of which reflect changes in social attitudes, structures and priorities."

It also demonstrates the intersection between the State, political spheres, and economically influential interest groups in a society. It prompts us to think about policy construction and foci, the key focus in chapter five.

More importantly, some of the elements in '*Economy and Society*' and other Weberian texts provide a suitable frame for understanding classical and contemporary explanations of transport and transportation. This is important to examine, particularly in relation to the claims in this dissertation, that such theorisations usually marginalise micro-level issues; and some social group priorities and needs.

3.2.2 Theoretical congruencies

The above theoretical accounts resonate with macro-level perspectives and dominant discourses in society, namely that transport is a critical catalyst for economic growth and development. Thus, transportation and transport are seen as a means for development (Colonna and Fonzone, 2003). The linkages between transport development and economic growth are well documented, particularly the definitive benefits to trade, productivity and employment generation (Czuczman, 2005). Collins (1986: 110) explains that in command economies: "Whenever a transport construction boom occurred, one would have to conclude at least one component for a potential capitalist expansion was present." Such notions are embedded in modernisation theory (Webster, 1990).

A case in point, Charles Horton Cooley (1894) produced a seminal text, '*Theory of Transportation*'. A number of elements in this text are similar to Weber's exposition of

transport and transportation, and contemporary conceptions of 'mobility'. In the first instance, Cooley also draws attention to the transport-economic, development-growth nexus. Cooley (1894: 263/ 41) remarks that:

"Precisely because transportation underlies social development it is in turn determined by that development. It is a tool of the economic, the political, the military organizations, and the character of the tool varies with their needs…The chief characteristic of the economic revolution begun in the latter part of the previous century, was industrial concentration and specialization. These could not go far without better means of land movement, and the canals first and then the railroads supplied that means."

Despite the debates and criticism, the particular assertion remains embedded in contemporary transport discourses globally. For example, Rostow (1959) argues that the development of roads and harbours were a necessary precondition for the launching of economic growth and industrial development. Moreover, Rostow observes there is a mutually beneficial relationship among transport, the technological revolution in agriculture and an expansion in capital imports. Rostow (1959: 5) explains that:

"Technically, the preconditions for sustained industrialization have generally required radical change in three non-industrial sectors. First, a build-up of social overhead capital, notably in transport…Framed by these three forms of sectoral development, yielding both new markets and new inputs for industry, the initially small enclaves of modern industrial activity could begin to expand, and then sustain expansion, mainly by the plough-back of profits."

This is in keeping with contemporary understandings. For example, Bryceson, Bradbury, and Bradbury (2007: 2) present the following opinion:

"In early modernization theory, roads were considered to be an important catalyst of economic development (Rostow 1962). Despite subsequent discrediting of modernization theory as overly simplistic, the belief in the power of roads to spur development has largely prevailed to the present. However, there is no consensus on exactly how roads become critical to economic development and if they actually warrant the faith vested in them. More recently, in the context of growing concern with the impoverishing effects of uneven spatial development, rural roads have been accorded an even more ambitious brief, that of poverty reduction. Chambers (1983, 1997) argued that physical isolation sustains poverty and accentuates vulnerability. Rural road investment is logically assumed to alleviate poverty associated with spatial isolation."

Njenga and Davis (2003: 218) note this about the construction and examination of the transport problems of different groups of poor people in rural communities, and current practices within the transport sector:

"Traditionally, transport investment proposals are advanced based on their contribution to increased economic efficiency through market expansion and reduced transport costs. The

sector's effect on (poor) people is assumed to be through the indirect, trickle-down outcomes of economic growth. It is increasingly becoming clear that poverty reduction needs more than just economic mechanisms to be effective. Thus, use of economic criteria for transport sector investment is only a partial view of transport needs in developing countries. The facilitation of motorization through transport infrastructure bears little relationship to the daily transport needs of poor people in rural areas. Transport is integral to the provision of, and access to, basic services; and the combination of an effective transport infrastructure and means of transport (both motorized and nonmotorized) are necessary for the delivery of positive livelihood outcomes."

Clearly, the macro-sociological perspectives on transport and transportation and its mediation in economic growth and poverty alleviation are deeply embedded within the discourses and approaches adopted by existing practitioner communities. However, the micro-sociological aspects, as Njenga and Davis (2003) note are sometimes underplayed or unrecognised. This also relates to the portrayal and representation of some social groups in comparison to others. Weber's (Weber edited by Roth and Wittich, 1978: 47) perspective resonates with the citations in the introduction of this chapter reminding us that:

> "…the power of representation may be (a) completely appropriated in all its forms-the case of self-appointed authority *(Eigenvollmacht);* (b) conferred in accordance with particular *characteristics,* permanently or for a limited term; (c) conferred by specific *acts* of the members or of outside persons, again permanently or for a limited term-the cases of 'derived' or 'delegated' powers."

Returning to Cooley's thesis on transportation it is also an in-depth elaboration on the interrelationship between transportation, the social, physical, political and economic spheres, structures and institutions in society. Such nuances are important to examine. For example, Cooley theorises about the connection between transportation and all other spheres, structures and institutions in society, through the notion of 'communication'. The function of transportation is defined in terms of mechanism of social organisation, that is, storage, transportation, writng, printing, mail or gestores (ibid: 1894: 264/ 42). Tansport is constructed as a social mechanism organisation and structuring the very nature of society and its organisations and institutions.

> "This mechanism is Communication in the widest sense of that word; communication of ideas and of physical commodities, between one time and another and one place and another. These are the threads that hold society together; upon them all unity depends. And transportation, the means of material communication between one place and another, is one of the strongest and most conspicuous of these threads."

Engels's (1892) writings also posit transport and transportation innovations in the context of 'communication' expansions. Engels (1892: 14-15) writes about the infrastructural growth and the decline in physical distance and communication with the advent of technology and innovation. The development of roads and other transport infrastructure in the 1800's is seen to be transforming the "means of communication by land".

Therefore, the availability of various modes of travel, innovative technologies, communication technologies and the diverse uses of space have resulted in new forms of 'communication' and social organisation within societies. Ferrante (2011: 7) explains that industrialisation changed notions of time and space and transformed people's daily lives and their interactions. Similar themes are produced in Weber's key texts.

Also, elements of Cooley and others assertions are consistent with the elements in the contemporary mobility / mobilities paradigms (for example, works by Urry 2000, 2002, and 2007 and Kaufmann, 2002). A case in point, Urry (2011: 4-5) identifies: "five interdependent 'mobilities' that there are producing social life organised across multiple distances." This encompasses *corporeal* travel (movement / travel of people); *physical* movement of objects (such as, food or water); *imaginative* travel (multiple print and visual media); *virtual* travel (real time interactions across geo-spatial divides); and *communicative* travel (person-to-person messages). These formulations, the focus is on the actor, individual, or micro-level, rather than the space-time or geographic or macro-level dimensions of mobility. These formulations show the interconnection and complementarity of communication and transport and transportation. It also implies the debates about the primacy of macro-versus-micro levels are invalid, in that both positions are equally important to an understanding of social issues.

Such analyses, as articulated by Urry and others, incorporates social, cultural and psychological factors, that is, areas of mobility and mobilities that the social sciences or even transport sociologists previously ignored (Urry cited in Freudendal-Pedersen, 2009: 3). The social inequalities and differentiations are rooted in the quality and level of social integration, networks and ties between and within groups; and the factors that inhibit or facilitate the interactions (Beckman, 2004: 81). Thus, the strength or weakness of the 'ties', connections or relationships produced in society is dependent, in part on the multiple technologies of travel, degrees of access, proximity and communications. It relates to the movement of objects,

people, ideas, and images across varying distances, and the spatio-temporal characteristics. Consequently, everyday activities and life spaces can be located far apart; and people do not have to be in the same physical space to engage, or work with each other. This analysis also speaks to the time-space contractions and social constructions of space evident in the Industrial Revolution and contemporary societies. Clearly, children's mobility and transport needs, experiences and challenges intersect and extended such formulations, yet these are absent in social analyses.

Cooley's (1894) thesis also focuses on the location of towns and cities. In general, this issue is of relevance as the growth of modern capitalism precipitated a growth in urban, industrialist and capitalist cities. Thus, Cooley's conception of the notion 'transport' encompasses mechanical and geometrical understandings on the one hand, and the other, the rational desire for economic gains. Cooley (1894: 236/ 14) explains that transportation as a movement of goods or people needs to be constructed to consider the complex and multidimensional nature and impacts.

Capitalism and the Industrial Revolution, thus influenced urbanisation and 'urbanism' in many ways, including where cities were located and constructed. Cooley (1894: 313/ 91) notes that: "Population and wealth tend to collect wherever there is a break in transportation", and translates this into a theory of the urban location. The 'break' in this context relates to the transfer of goods from one mode of transport to another, for example from rail to ship; temporary storage; and ownership changes. Macionis and Plummer (2012: 12) note: "After the Industrial Revolution, the unparalleled importance of economics led to the founding of cities near rivers and natural harbours that facilitated trade." The Industrial Revolution fostered and reinforced mutual relationship among businesses, cities and large urban populations.

Cooley (1894: 321-322/ 99-100) summarises the theory of urban location and the vital influence of transportation as follows:

> "Transportation, itself guided in its course chiefly by the physical diversity of the earth's surface, is the main cause of the location of cities in an industrial society. The mode of its action is that population and wealth tend to collect at a break in transportation; the reason being in the first place the necessity for the material and symbolic machinery of transfer at breaks, and in the second the tendency of other economic activities to collect where that machinery exists."

These formulations are of relevance to contemporary sociological interest in spatial construction, structure, urban and planning aspects; and in transportation planning in urban areas. Yago (1983) has the opinion that:

> "…transportation research can continue to be an important area of sociological research. In recent years, the prevalence of spatial and technological determinism in studying transportation impacts and change has given way to subtler and more informed considerations of the historical and institutional context of spatial and technological processes…Neither human ecology, urban political economy, locational theory, nor social physiological theory can claim exclusive understandings of how transportation affects urban life… Emerging out of past gaps in transportation research is an exciting research agenda that could increase our basic understanding of social and technological processes."

Moreover, de Boer (1986: 3) adds another important element noting:

> "...increasingly motorised traffic once thought to be beneficial for our mobility and freedom has had a devastating influence on residential streets and thus on essential conditions for social integration and individual development. New infrastructure, built to relieve existing over-loaded streets and roads and to improve accessibility, acts like a barrier, frequently destroying the existing social fabric by carving a corridor through built areas."

In other words, while modernity, urbanisation and sub-urbanisation facilitated spatial (re)structure (re)construction and specialisation, an unintended consequence is the socio-spatial marginality of some groups in society. For example, the home and work spatial (dis)location impedes low-income earner access to economic or other activities. Such groups are less likely to have access to private vehicles and for many the available public transport is unaffordable. Concepts such as 'spatial marginalisation', 'spatial exclusion' and 'transport deprived' are now embedded in the transport and urban planning lexicon and conceptual schemes. Swiderska and Sheate (1998: 4) also use the concept 'travel poverty' explaining that: "This occurs when people cannot attend events or facilities which are available to others due to a lack of access to choice in relation to travel." This also signals the general importance of engaging with Weber's Theory of Closure.

As Flamm and Kaufman (2006: 168) note:

> "Considering the importance mobility has taken in modern society, with so much emphasis on the concept that it has even become an ideology, sociological analysis today can no longer function without an in-depth analysis of the role of mobility in social integration and its implications in terms of social differentiation, or even exclusion."

Clearly, the assertions and expositions about the centrality of mobility and transport to sociological undertakings cannot be ignored. Moreover, while a number of mainstream assumptions are deeply embedded within society and communities of practice, this indicates that over the years there have been some laudable efforts towards more reflexive thinking, writing and researching about transport, transportation and mobility. This also entails an interest in macro and microanalysis of these issues.

These constructions provide a theoretical and conceptual framework for understanding empirical ways in which transport and transportation issues have been historically located within sociology and social theory. Moreover, this historical contextualising of the problematisation and theorisation of transport and mobility is consistent with critical constructivist views. That is how the social phenomena under study are part of and shaped by the historical and cultural contexts.

These articulations in childhood, children, transport, and mobility studies speak to sociology as not limited or limiting in insights and issues investigated. Moreover, there is a need to continue to define and refine new areas and pathways of interest and inquiry (Akpan 2010, Burawoy 2011 and Xaba 2011). Such articulations are important to the development of the sociological and theoretical imagination. It forms the basis for our (re)engagement, (re)framing and (re)problematising the intersecting childhood, children, mobility and transport concerns.

In this context, Mills' (1959: 8) key questions for sociologists are germane to studies on child mobility.

> "(1) What is the structure of this particular society as a whole? What are its essential components, and how are they related to one another? How does it differ from other varieties of social order? Within it, what is the meaning of any particular feature for its continuance and for its change?
>
> (2) Where does this society stand in human history? What are the mechanics by which it is changing? What is its place within and its meaning for the development of humanity as a whole? How does any particular feature we are examining affect, and how is it affected by, the historical period in which it moves? And this period - what are its essential features? How does it differ from other periods? What are its characteristic ways of history-making?
>
> (3) What varieties of men and women now prevail in this society and in this period? And what varieties are coming to prevail? In what ways are they selected and formed, liberated and repressed, made sensitive and blunted? What kinds of `human nature' are revealed in the conduct and character we observe in this society in this period? And what is the meaning for 'human nature' of each and every feature of the society we are examining?"

The question of ideology is crucial to our understanding of how individuals or groups positioning is (re)shaped, the dominant social relations, the prioritisation of certain interests and how these operate in different domains in a society. This suggests that the particular way of seeing the 'social world' is appropriate and unquestionable. Yet, a hallmark of sociology is to demystify, debunk and contest common-sense beliefs. Therefore, if we are to reframe and disembed the normative assumptions, ideological stances and assertions, then the research questions posed in this study are necessary. It provides a rationale for interrogating children's current positioning; and marginality in child mobility and transport studies specifically, and in society in general.

This section has provided a curt introduction into Weber's interest in transport and transportation. It also included some discussion on some of the classical and contemporary perspectives on transport and transportation. The same configurations present in Weber's analysis of transport and transportation underpin the theorisations on and about closure, monopolization and domination. Similar typological frameworks such as 'social action', 'rationality', and 'rationalisation', therefore, support sociological understandings of both manifestations in society. While, it has become a wealth-creating industry in its own right, micro-level impacts of transport on the quality of life and standard of living of individuals and their communities were under-emphasized and under-theorised in such formulations. Furthermore, while transport, transportation and mobility studies have a place within sociology, the macro-level concerns have impeded our understanding of how these aspects affects the daily lives, livelihoods and survival of individuals; and some social groups across societies. This accounts for the interest in social closure and exclusion as frames of analyses.

3.3 Closure - expositions, antecedents and variants

Across Europe, the European Union's adoption, during the 1980's and 1990's, of the concept 'social exclusion' has resulted in its current predominance in social policy there (Todman, 2004). This includes its preference in studies for transport disadvantages (see for example Social Exclusion Unit (SEU), 2003 and Lucas, 2011). Stanley and Vella-Brodrick (2009: 92) note:

> "Barriers to accessibility were seen as centering around: the availability and physical accessibility of transport; the cost of transport; services located in inaccessible places; safety and security - fear of crime; travel horizons - people on low incomes were found to be less willing to travel to access work than those on higher incomes."

Moreover, in the varying formulations, characteristics such as race, language, gender, age, religion or lack of educational qualifications could be examined to understand how, or if, these and other factors preclude some social groups from participating in society. Thus, an examination of closure and children's marginality is applicable and timely.

Although closure theory does not enjoy as much scholarly recognition as other Weberian concepts and precepts, nonetheless it remains of interest to a select number of scholars and disciplines, particularly economics and education. Murphy (1983: 632) presents this opinion:

> "On the surface Weberian closure theory hardly appears to be a unified approach. Contemporary closure theorists have worked independently to the extreme of even ignoring each other's publications. They have built their theories on different parts of Weber's writings and have developed somewhat different aspects of closure theory."

This subsections examines Weber's conception of 'closure' and its influence on the key works of some social thinkers, amongst others, Parkin, Collins, Murphy and to some extent Bourdieu. *Some* modes of application have relevance to this study. Social closure theory is thus an important analytical framework to consider, not just in the context of this study. The section begins with a discussion of Weber's conception of the construct 'closure' and more importantly the manner of its deployment in social analysis. Hence, the subsequent session is an overview of how 'closure' has been adopted or adapted, and how some of this has relevance to the issues under investigation here.

The construct 'closure' is considered to be the earliest or closest reference to the notion 'social exclusion'. The works of Max Weber, Emile Durkheim and René Lenoir, in general are cited as contributing to the emergence of social exclusion discourses and analytical frames. Durkheim's work is said to resonate with the idea of 'social inclusion' in terms of his explanation of the need or function of solidarity, social order, integration and social cohesion in society (Parkin cited in Burchardt, Le Grand, and Paichaud, 2002; Todman, 2004; and Rawal, 2008).

Lenoir's work is influenced by Weber's Treatise on Closure. Lenoir's study focused on structural, institutional and other dimensions creating exclusionary processes in France during the 1970s (Levitas, 1999; Pierson, 2002; and Estivill, 2003). The author noted that certain physically, mentally or socially marginalised groups were administratively excluded

from the state's social protection system. Denying opportunities to groups defined as inferior and ineligible is how dominant status groups, through property, class and power relations, monopolize advantages in the market place (Murphy, 1988; and Rawal, 2008). Differentiation and stratification is, based on a social group's representation as disabled or poor; and the concept of negative versus positive class privilege starts to emerge.

Béland (2007: 126-127) explains that:

> "As early as 1965, social commentator Jean Klanfer published a book entitled *L'Exclusion sociale: Étude de la marginalité dans les sociétés occidentales* [Social exclusion: The study of marginality in western societies]. In this moralistic book emphasising personal responsibility, the term 'social exclusion' refers to people who cannot enjoy the positive consequences of economic progress due to irresponsible behaviour (Klanfer, 1965). Less than a decade later, René Lenoir published *Les exclus: Un français sur dix* [The excluded: One Frenchman out of ten]. For Lenoir, the excluded are those citizens who are separated from mainstream society because of factors like disability, mental illness and poverty…Focusing on social and economic conditions rather than personal responsibility to explain social problems, Lenoir thus defines social exclusion in an extremely broad manner (Lenoir, 1974). Although the meaning of the term 'exclusion' has changed since the mid-1970s, Lenoir's book is widely regarded as the 'founding document' of the modern discourse about exclusion in French society (Frétigné, 1999: 63)."

Of particular relevance is Weber's elaboration of 'closure' and it is in '*Economy and Society*' that he refers to 'closure'. In this section, some of these will be highlighted and their relevance to the overarching concerns of this study weighed. Weber's articulation of the concept 'closure' is in the chapter 'Basic Sociological Terms' in a section on 'Open and Closed Relationships' and is preceded by the section on 'Communal and Associative Relationships'. These two sections are a fair, albeit odd, starting point to understanding the different forms and ways Weber envisaged 'closure' operating in different social spheres or organisations. At the heart of this discussion is the issue of action, particularly economic action, levels of rationality and typologies of relationships that orientate action and interest.

To begin with 'Communal' relationships are described by Weber as being constituted because of "subjective feeling of the parties, whether affectual or traditional, that they belong together" (Weber edited by Roth and Wittich, 1978: 40). This implies some level of habituation and loyalty. Morrison (2006: 359) argues that: 'affectual (emotional) action' sits between rational and irrational action. The action is dependent on the emotional state of mind

and feelings of an actor and as such the "emotional action lacks a specific orientation to a goal or a set of ultimate values."

Gerth and Mills (Weber translated by Gerth and Mills, 1970: 56-57) add:

> "Less 'rational' actions are typed by Weber in terms of the pursuit of 'absolute ends' as flowing from affectual sentiments, or as 'traditional'. Since absolute ends are to be taken as 'given' data by the sociologist, an action may be rational with reference to the means employed, but 'irrational' with respect to the ends pursued. 'Affectual' action, which flows purely from sentiment, is a less rational type of conduct. And finally, approaching the 'instinctual' level, there is 'traditional' conduct: unreflective and habitual, this type is sanctified because it 'has always been done' and is therefore deemed appropriate. These types of 'actions' are construed operationally in terms of a scale of rationality and irrationality."

This prompts us to think about the formation, function and structure of a family and household; and where or how children will be located or their positioning(s). Can we argue that there is no specific goal or ultimate values guiding the actions of the actor? In the introductory chapter, the issue of patrimonial and patriarchal forms of administration of households seems to suggest otherwise. This implies that the different forms of rationality and action coexist and intersect.

Moreover, Weber (Weber edited by Roth and Wittich, 1978: LXX and 340) asserts:

> "Not all social action is economically influenced, and not all groups are economically relevant…Social action may also combine economic and non-economic goals, or none of these cases may occur. The dividing line between groups with primary and secondary economic interests is fluid."

Therefore, a household does not necessarily exhibit only non-economic characteristics or actions. This may also include other organisational forms in which affectual and traditional relationships and actions dominate.

Weber considered communal relationships as directed by 'peaceful conflict', or 'competition' (Weber edited by Roth and Wittich, 1978: 38):

> "The term 'peaceful' conflict will be applied to· cases in which actual physical violence is not employed. A peaceful conflict is 'competition' insofar as it consists in a formally peaceful attempt to attain control over opportunities and advantages which are also desired by others. A competitive process is 'regulated' competition to the extent that its ends and means are oriented to an order."

This is in contrast to 'associative' relationships, which Weber explains are also characterised by conflict over competing and conflicting interests and supremacy. An 'associative' relationship depends on a value or instrumental rationality. Weber (Weber edited by Roth and Wittich, 1978: 38) notes:

"…orientation of social action within it rests on a rationally motivated adjustment of interests or a similarly motivated agreement, whether the basis of rational judgment be absolute values or reasons of expediency. It is especially common, though by no means inevitable, for the associative type of relationship to rest on a rational agreement by mutual consent. In that case the corresponding action is, at the pole of rationality, oriented either to a value-rational belief in one's own obligation, or to a rational *(zweckrationale)* expectation that the other party will live up to it."

Such ideas can be transposed to the way in which political or economic organisations and the levels of conflict and competition such relationships and actions arising.

Weber presents further typologies of social relationships, that is, open or closed. It is in this context that the notion 'closure' emerges. Weber (Weber edited by Roth and Wittich, 1978) argues that communal and associative relationships can be 'open' or 'closed' in who can or cannot participate; or whether their position 'permits' participation and its extent. This implies that 'open' and 'closed' economic and non-economic relationships can exist, including the 'open' and 'closed' relationships of a household, family, kin-groups and organisations. The type of action and the decisions to open or close a group will depend on whether or not the group sees the participation of others as beneficial or not. This also reflects the discussions on modes of appropriation and monopolization. Weber (Weber edited by Roth and Wittich, 1978: 43-44) explains:

"A social relationship, regardless of whether it is communal or associactive in character, will be spoken of as 'open' to outsiders if and insofar as its system of order does not deny participation to anyone who wishes to join and is actually in a position to do so. A relationship will, on the other hand, be called 'closed' against outsiders, so far as, according to its subjective meaning and its binding rules, participation of certain persons is excluded, limited, or subjected to conditions. Whether a relationship is open or dosed may he determined traditionally, affectally, or rationally in terms of values or of expediency. It is especially likely to be closed, for rational reasons, in the following type of situation: a social relationship may provide the parties to it with opportunities for the satisfaction of spiritual or material interests, whether absolutely: or instrumentally or whether it is achieved through co-operative action or by a compromise of interests. If the participants expect that the admission of others will lead to an improvement of their situation, an improvement in degree, in kind, in the security or the value of the satisfaction, their interests, will be in keeping the relationship open. If, on the other hand. Their expectations are of improving their position by monopolistic tactics, their interest is in a closed relationship."

Weber elaborates on the ways in which closed social relationships monopolize closure and the situations or contexts where such actions may arise. Weber uses the concept 'rights' to establish when or if closure is promoted or not in a setting, in this analysis. At the same time, Weber mentions 'individuals or sub-groups' with right to promote or inhibit closure. In this discussion, Weber (Weber edited by Roth and Wittich, 1978: 43-44) refers to hereditary versus alienable appropriation to describe a person who has 'membership' in a closed relationship:

> "There are various ways in which it is possible for a closed social relationship to guarantee its monopolized advantages to the parties. (a) Such advantages may be left free to competitive struggle within the group; (b) they may be regulated or rationed in amount and kind, or (c) they may be appropriated by individuals or sub-groups on a permanent basis and become more or less inalienable. The last is a case of closure within, as well as against .outsiders. Appropriated advantages will be called 'rights.' As determined by the relevant order, appropriation may be (I) for the benefit of the members of particular communal or associative groups (for instance, household groups), or (2) for the benefit of individuals. In the latter case, the individual may enjoy, his rights on a purely personal basis or in such a way that in case of his death one or more other persons related to the holder of the right by birth (kinship), or by some other social relationship, may inherit the rights in question or the rights may pass to one or more individuals specifically designated by the holder. These are cases of hereditary appropriation. Finally, (3) it may be that the holder is more or less fully empowered to alienate his rights by voluntary agreement, either to other specific persons or to anyone he chooses. This is alienable appropriation. A party to a closed social relationship will be called a 'member'; in case his participation is regulated in such a way as to guarantee him appropriated advantages, a privileged member *(Rechtsgenosse)*. Appropriated rights which are enjoyed by individuals through inheritance or by hereditary groups, whether communal or associative, will be called the 'property' of the individual or of groups in question; and, insofar as they are alienable, 'free' property."

Later in the text, Weber (Weber edited by Roth and Wittich, 1978: 46) explains that the main motivations for closure in a relationship are: (1) to maintain a particular prestige of the group; (2) advantages in relation to consumption, monopolization of consumption; and (3) scarcity of acquisition opportunities. These motives are however interrelated; and the different forms of action, rationality and relationships coexist in a fluid form. Weber also suggests such connections (Weber edited by Roth and Wittich, 1978: 41) in most relationships have:

> "…this characteristic to some degree, while being at the same time to some degree determined by associative factors. No matter how calculating and hard-headed the ruling considerations in such a social relationship- as that of a merchant to his customers-may be, it is quite possible for it to involve emotional values which transcend its utilitarian significance."

Thus, non-economic and non-rational or irrational actions can influence economic and rational actions; thus the means that the means suites the end of deriving benefits.

How do these axioms on closure assist in an analysis of children's social exclusion? There are various levels at which this analysis could be deployed. *Firstly*, within the household and family structure: In the introductory chapter, reference is made to Weber's analysis of the patriarchal structure and authority within the family and the household. Within this setting it is 'expected' that all members of the household are subservient to the patriarch and that a more communal and compliant relationship, through personal loyalty would exist. This also depends on the shared belief of the legitimacy of the authoritative head: "may ascribe legitimacy to a social order by virtue of: (a) *tradition:* valid is that which has always been; (b) *affectual,* especially emotional" (Weber edited by Roth and Wittich, 1978: 36). In other words, agency and autonomy is predicated on a set of commonly accepted 'rules'. Any deviation from the norm would be approved, if this act were to benefit the household or its head.

In the biological or familial composition of the unit this, would imply that a closed relationship is likely to exist (Weber edited by Roth and Wittich, 1978: 44). In this context then, non-economic relationships among members of the household would more likely give rise to affectual and traditional social actions. These constructs can be utilised to explain parent and caregiver actions in relation to children and children's subordinate positions within the hierarchic structure of the household. Weber suggests that the household 'communism of the family' rests on traditional and affectual foundations (Weber edited by Roth and Wittich, 1978: 153).

However, in relation to staff, including any employed children, the household may base this employment on an open relationship. Decisions to include or exclude a group or individual will depend on what benefits can be derived; and this would be biased towards economic interests. Thus, the first encounter of inclusion and exclusion begins with the household and family. What other forms of stratification and differentiation are likely to mediate in the positioning of the members in a household or family, particularly children? How would this influence their access to rights, responsibilities, dignity and respect, power or access to resources?

We are reminded simultaneously of Weber's reference to the family as an 'organisation', where situations of 'peaceful and competitive' conflict arise but that this is regulated. There is thus, a desire for shared advantage and benefit. However, who actually benefits? The

action of an individual "is meaningfully oriented to that of others" (Weber edited by Roth and Wittich, 1978: 23). Can this explain the changing 'authority figure' relationship between children and their parents, over the life course? Younger children and youth will not have the same levels of negotiating autonomy and agency (Punch, 2001). A number of critics (Boyden and Levinson, 2000; and Punch, 2001) argue that birth order, gender, sex composition of the sibling group and age or age group mediates in children and young people's participation levels in household-related activities and decisions. In relation to household work allocation, Punch (2001) suggests that there is an expectation that the elder and older children do more household work and take on more responsibilities than younger siblings take. This suggests that there are levels of advantage and disadvantage experienced by household or family members. Similar arguments are raised in an earlier chapter through the citation of Argawal's work.

Yet, similar assumptions can be directed at children in a household and family. Cockburn, Dauphin and Razzaque's (2009: 37) study illustrate that:

> "This way of measuring poverty assumes that all members share the fortunes and misfortunes of the household equally. This hypothesis seems particularly problematic in the case of children. Some adults, led by parental altruism, might choose to sacrifice part of their resources in favor of their children. Or, as a household survival strategy, the weakest children might be sacrificed. A gender bias in the allocation of resources, typically in favor of male children, is also possible. Many studies have indeed shown that inequity in the intra-household allocation of resources is frequent."

Weber also asserts "…the relative prestige of age within a community is subject to much change" (Weber edited by Roth and Wittich, 1978: 950). While this is in reference to the age prestige where old age brings with it considerable status and position but at a time of scarce resources, war or economic shifts this may also change. This idea can be transposed to examine the age differentiation and age group prestige even among children. What value or benefit could be derived from changing or maintaining children's status in a household or family? Who would benefit and who would be disadvantaged? These assumptions challenge and unmask the view of the household as a unit of equality. Rather, it conceals elements of inequality and stratification. Delphy and Leonard (cited in Macionis, 2008: 584) suggest that the household or family is an economic system and is thus comparable to other economic systems, structures and institutional processes and situations.

Secondly, children's relations to institutions and organisations: A child's class position is usually derived through their parent's position. Boyden and Levinson (2000: 16) observe that in most economic analyses, children are at risk simply because they are part of a particular household or family. In an earlier chapter, Watson's citation explains children's non-productive or non-income generating status contributes and reifies their invisibility in the political economy. Thus, Marx and Weber's conception of 'class' does not accommodate children as a 'class'. Wright (2002: 839) explains that property or the lack thereof is important to understand class position or situation. The author explains that for both Marx and Weber the propertyless have only their labour to offer. As a group, they do share the same class situation they are property-less but in terms of Weber's analysis can we argue that children have nothing but their labour to offer?

Yet, another view constructs children as 'goods'. Nauck and Klaus (2007: 500) examine the theoretical notion 'value of children' and conclude that:

> "…It is thus obvious that *one's own* children are very efficient, non-substitutable intermediate goods in the social production function for the maintenance, and increase, of physical well-being. The short-term planning horizon then gives priority to the work utility of children as compared to the future insurance utility. It is more than understandable that under these conditions the visible sign of having control over such an important intermediate good, namely the 'possession' of children, simultaneously increases social status."

In other words, children's 'relationship' with institutions is through adults, family or households. These familialisation and institutionalisation discourses of children extend beyond the family and household (Rama and Richter, 2007). This type of external and internal, communal, closure then renders children invisible and marginal as actors. Yet, such actions flow from traditional and affectual rational, or irrational, actions and can influence economic actions. This action results in the maintaining, reproducing and embedding of legitimate, patriarchal and patrimonial authority across all organisational structures in society. This implies that the parochial understanding of class needs to shift if we are to understand how closure operates in different contexts; and how actions, behaviours and motivations are aligned in the pursuit of interests.

Moreover, Weber reminds us that "Economic action may be traditionally oriented or may be affectually determined" (Weber edited by Roth and Wittich, 1978: 107). This then implies that the organisational environment of children is shaped by traditional and affectual norms,

customs and conventions, albeit at a conscious or unconscious level, and that understanding these underlying ideologies becomes as important. Therefore, the relationship between children and adults and all other spheres in society is not as straightforward as the tendency in analyses usually suggests. In this study on and about children and childhood, the affectual and traditional rational behaviours are of relevance. These quadrants are pertinent to understanding social actions taken in relation to children's inclusion or exclusion in various spheres of societies. Can the 'irrational' or 'non-rational' form the basis for 'rational actions'?

Ritzer (2007: 29) argues that Weber was less interested in traditional and affectual rational actions. Such actions are located in the non-economic and sometimes in the irrational axis of Weber's analysis. Elster (2000: 34) suggests that:

> "In his gloss on the category of affectual behaviour, Weber notes that 'action is affectual if it satisfies a need for revenge, sensual gratification, devotion, contemplative bliss, or for working off emotional tension.' This is a rather unsatisfactory and hodge-podge list, confused by the fact that revenge (certainly) and sensual gratification (arguably) are ways of working off emotional tension."

Elster (2000: 35 and 36) also suggests that Weber argues that there are some comparisons and differences between affectual behaviour and value-rational behaviour. Affectual actions differ in that an individual may not consider the cost of a risky action or behaviour. In a similar manner, where control is important in relation to the factors of production, the difference between affectual and value-rational behaviour is around the control an individual can exercise and what is the 'end'. Yet, an emotion such as revenge can be: "(i) purely emotional, (ii) purely instrumentally rational, (iii) value-rational and instrumentally rational and (iv) emotional and instrumentally rational...(v) purely value rational"

The point of raising this shortcoming is not to negate the importance and relevance of such an analysis, or conceptual frame, rather it is to show that there are elements within Weber's vast works that can form the basis of reflective engagement.

3.3.1 Neo-Weberian expositions and appropriations

A cursory scan shows Parkin, Murphy, Collins and Bourdieu develop and advance Weber's ideas of closure, that is, the economic dimensions of it. Murphy (1983: 653) explains that:

"The closure problematic is in addition particularly appropriate for the analysis of the conditions underlying its own existence and for the advancement of a reflexive sociology. Closure theorists cannot avoid conceiving their own strategies as they conceive the strategies of others - in terms of usurpation and subversion, monopolization, exclusion, and conservation - in short, in terms of closure"

In a sense, this is the central weakness in adopting this theoretical or conceptual frame for this dissertation. The formulations of the concept 'closure' are deployed to analyse economic actions, that is, the instrumental and value-rational actions. Like Neuwirth (1969), Parkin (1974: 4) also suggests that the use of the 'closure' depends, "upon the acceptance of certain refinements and enlargements upon the original usage".

For example, Parkin (1974: 4) uses the term 'closure' to examine class formation between / among and within groups. The author suggests that closure can affect any group in the stratification order. Parkin's conception of 'closure' is through the terms 'power of *exclusion*' and 'power of *solidarism*'. The former is characterised by the need to maintain or enhance privileges, through subordination processes. While the former relates to the process a dominate groups may employ, solidarism relates to how an excluded group may choose to deal with their situation.

> "…strategies of solidarism direct pressure upwards in so far as claims upon resources threaten to diminish the share of more privileged strata. Thus whereas exclusion is a form of closure that stabilizes the stratification order, solidarism is one that contains a potential challenge to the prevailing system of distribution through the threat of usurpation."

An example of the later would include Civil Rights Movements or the Apartheid Struggle in South Africa. Yet solidarism (usurpation) may not necessary relate to children, that is, what collective civic action can this group take?

Randall Collins's seminal work centres on 'credentialism' and 'political labour' and how this operates within the labour market and in employment. Collins (cited in Murphy, 1988: 32) transposes the concept 'culture' to demonstrate how having or not having educational qualifications and academic knowledge produces exclusion or closure.

> "Collins focuses especially on academic knowledge as the content of a particular status culture- an intellectual culture- and on education credentials as the basis of status-group exclusion. Education, like ethnicity, and social class, is perceived as a status culture that often has little proved relationship to on-the-job performance. To that extent it is cultural, rather than a job performance, basis of exclusion from work positions. Education is treated as 'pseudoethnicity', in that it involves the imposition of a particular ethnic or class culture."

Murphy (1988: 9) reminds us, "Weber's theory of monopolization, closure, class, and status groups is in fact a theory of power and domination."

Murphy (1988: 2 and 3) examines, amongst other ideas, this idea of rules or codes of social closure and their structure in governing practices of monopolization and exclusion. For example, in the workplace how do seniority, experience and credentials set senior staff against younger staff? Or in terms of gender how the "deeply embedded gender rules in term of informal customs still constitute tracks which lead directly to male monopolisation and the exclusion of women" influence the formal rules regarding women's exclusion? Yet, we are reminded that the rules or codes can be uprooted, contested and changed: "…exclusionary codes are not permanent, however much they may appear so while they are flourishing." Absent from this analysis is the issue of age hierarchies and age stratification, yet these ideas are relevant to the issues under study.

Morrow (1990: 478) suggests that Murphy's contribution to closure theory lies in his threefold typology of rules as principal, derivative and contingent forms of exclusion; and the overall structure of the exclusion, tandem, dual or polar. To begin with, a principal form of exclusion is a set of exclusion rules also embedded in the legal system. This means that the State can control, monopolize and dominate who has access to what, and when. This is seen as linking to Weber's notion of a 'class situation'. The derivative forms of exclusion are derived from the principal form. An example of this is credential requirements for occupations that may exclude or negatively impact on marginalised racial, social, religious or gender groups in a society. The principal forms and the derivative forms of exclusion are linked but not identical. A contingent form of exclusion is directly derived from the principal form but "their nature and existence is contingent on these principal forms of exclusion" (Murphy, 1988: 72). Murphy (ibid) cites the example of gender in contemporary society. The structures then refer to how these different forms of exclusion reinforce or oppose each other.

For children this would imply that a contingent and principle forms of exclusion might exist. For example, in South Africa there is no formal law barring children's civic and decision-making in public or private spheres, yet children are absent from these processes and spaces. However, there are some laws controlling when children should start and complete their education, enter into employment, enter into legal contractual agreements, or own property.

Murphy (1988) suggests that tandem structures of closure are most likely to exist in contemporary societies. Murphy (1988: 73) states that:

> "…with derivative and contingent sets of exclusionary rules harnessed to one principal form of exclusion, A second type consists of dual or paired structures of exclusion, in which there are two principal, and relatively complementary, sets of exclusion rules."

In what ways has closure theory been utilised to examine and understand a range of social issues and problems in society? A synopsis of some to these expositions and variants are presented below.

In earlier chapters of this dissertation, the notion of 'intra-field closure' was introduced in relation to the actions of practitioner communities. It prompts questions such as how and why there is the dominance of certain paradigms, methodologies and prioritisations, or agendas within the fields of study, including child mobility. Murphy (1983) explains that exclusionary closure at this level is also about power, domination, and monopolisation and conflict (competition and interest). Murphy (1983: 635-636) says:

> "The fields of scholarship and science are characterized by closure based on particular types of knowledge. Those who share that knowledge are the bearers of specific conventions, share a sense of identity, and make a claim to social esteem and social honor; hence, they constitute a particular type of status group. Those who do not hold the knowledge are declared inferior outsiders who are deemed ineligible for specific opportunities. This is essentially a process of subordination and mobilization of power by which scholars claims to be made to social esteem and social honor. The acceptance of scholarly and scientific forms of exclusionary closure is, like exclusionary closure based on credentials, race, sex, and property monopolies, inherently problematic and has the potential to provoke usurpation practices by those who are declared outsiders. The object of this counter-struggle is to escape subjection and disesteem and to bite into the advantages and scholarly esteem of the dominant groups. What appears as a structured field consists of sedimented forms of patterned relationships which have resulted from previous practices and strategies of exclusionary closure and usurpation. This closure problematic can be used to analyze relationships between the scholarly community at large and the remainder of the population, or relationships among scholarly disciplines, or relationships within scholarly disciplines…The imposition of a paradigm on a field is an example of intra-field closure."

Murphy (1988:18-21) raises Bourdieu's analysis of the scientific capital and habitus encapsulated in such arguments. While Bourdieu may not have made the connection to closure theory, his views on domination and monopolisation within the scientific and scholarship fields is equivalent to exclusionary closure and intra-field closure. '*Homo Academicus*' (published in 1988) encapsulates these ideas and Fisher's (1990: 581) review of the text explains that:

"Bourdieu documents the battles between those who have social power and those with scientific power; between the administrators and researchers; between the older traditional academics and the younger heretics; between the professors and the lecturers; and between the established 'canonical' disciplines, such as philosophy and history, and the newer marginal disciplines, such as sociology and psychology. In order to describe and analyze this field and the battles for dominance, he uses the theoretical concepts, 'field,' 'habitus,' forms of 'capital,' which are in turn linked to forms of power and classification."

Bourdieu's notion of '*doxa*', that is, common assumptions and understandings, extends this idea of monopolization and domination within the space of social science. Thus, Murphy's (1988: 20) view of the equivalency of Bourdieu and Collins's analyses to the tenets in closure theory and exclusionary closure is:

"Bourdieu's analysis can best be regarded as a special theory of closure – the analysis of the special case of the scientific field in terms of closure theory, just as Collins's analysis can best be regarded as a special theory of closure – the analysis of the special case of educational credentials in terms of closure theory. Both Collins's and Bourdieu's analyses are versions of closure theory which have been restricted to particular fields in their focus, application, and development. Both are restricted versions of the overall conceptual package that Weber, and more recently Parkin, has (sic) attempted to develop into closure theory."

Bourdieu (1989:19-20) reminds us about the connection between social spaces, symbolic representations and social positioning in a society.

"Social space…presents itself in the form of agents endowed with different properties that are systematically linked among themselves…In other words, through the distribution of properties, the social world presents itself, objectively, as a symbolic system which is organized according to the logic of difference, of differential distance. Social space tends to function as a symbolic space, a space of lifestyles and status groups characterized by different lifestyles. Thus the perception of the social world is the product of a double structuring: on the objective side, it is socially structured because the properties attributed to agents or institutions present themselves in combinations that have very unequal probabilities...On the subjective side, it is structured because the schemes of perception and appreciation, especially those inscribed in language itself, express the state of relations of symbolic power."

Bourdieu (1989: 23) also introduces the notions of 'symbolic power' and 'symbolic capital', reminiscent of Weber's notion of closure and un-reflective habituation. 'Symbolic power' implies the power to transform or preserve the embedded notions and constructions with some words, for example:

"…the power to conserve or to transform current classifications in matters of gender, nation, region, age, and social status, and this through the words used to designate or to describe individuals, groups or institutions."

Embedded in the clarification of 'symbolic capital' are elements of closure theory, that is, monopolistic action, dynamic interest and the power a group exerts. This is useful for a dominant group with the power to mobilise and to transform, or preserve the perceptions of social groups' positions and statuses societies. Bourdieu (1989: 23) argues that:

> "We can thus, I hope, better understand what is at stake in the struggle over the existence or non-existence of classes. The struggle over classifications is a fundamental dimension of class struggle. The power to impose and to inculcate a vision of divisions, that is, the power to make visible and explicit social divisions that are implicit, is political power par excellence. It is the power to make groups, to manipulate the objective structure of society".

Apart from Weber, Parkin, Collins, Murphy and Bourdieu, Neuwirth's (1969), 'A Weberian Outline of a Theory of Community: Its application to the 'Dark Ghetto'' published in *The British Journal of Sociology* also draws attention to closure theory to examine the experiences of ethnic communities in American societies. In particular, the author examines the prohibiting of economic and political opportunities through 'community closure'.

> "Once communal relationships have been formed, the community members will tend to monopolize economic, political, and / or social advantages. The process aiming at such monopolization is called 'community closure'."

Neuwirth (1969: 157) raised questions about 'communal closure' and domination in communities by noting that:

> "The economic and social controls which representatives of the white society exert directly upon residents of the Dark Ghetto are further means to prevent community closure. They are forced to pay high rents for substandard housing; they are frequently overcharged for food and other household items; lacking knowledge and other opportunities, they may be charged fraudulent interest rates for credit purchases…These examples reflect rather obvious and deliberate attempts at preventing community closure. The white community also introduces other, more subtle attempts, which are officially designed to alleviate problems of the ghetto but which actually tend to perpetuate the Negroes' powerlessness".

This implies that a combination of internal and external factors reinforce or cushion each other to preclude participation in society (Silver, 2006). Moreover, this illustrates that in some instances, the application of Weber's concepts and arguments may require modification or amplification (Neuwirth, 1969: 1654). Race and class operate tangentially in community closure. At the same time, the notion of 'class' and 'status' start to emerge as important to understanding where in the 'imagined' hierarchy, different groups will be positioned. Weber (Weber in Gerth and Mills, 1970: 181) asserts that: "Now: 'classes,' 'status groups,' and 'parties' are phenomena of the distribution of power within a community."

Parkin (1974:1) suggests that it is as important to understand "social relations both within and between classes or strata". This means that the notion 'status' is equally important to this analysis and understanding. Parkin (ibid) recognises that stratification and differentiation along lines of race, ethnicity, religion or language are inadequately captured in discourse of 'class'. How the 'concept' class is understood is also dynamic. Implying that aspects of social inequalities, stratification and unequal access to resources, privileges, wealth and power (Macionis and Plummer, 2008), as captured in Neuwirth's study.

If notions of 'class' are tied to economic understandings of labour and property ownership, then can we translate these understandings to envisage childhood as 'class' group? Weber's formulation of class and status is examined in relation to how such ideas can be transposable to children's positioning in a hierarchic structure in society. That involves children in relation to adults, children in relation to other children and children in relation to institutions and organisations. At this point in the discussion, the issue of 'status' needs to be considered and how, despite its distinction from 'class', sometimes operates in tangentially. Moreover, this has some relation to how we understand the idea of children as a social group being subject to exclusionary closure. As cited and argued in earlier chapters, particularly the Knutsson (1997) citation, childhood is far removed from Weber's classical definition of 'class' and parochial understandings of the concept. Weber (Weber translated by Gerth and Mills, 1970: 185) notes, "Now 'status groups' hinder the strict carrying through of the sheer market principle."

Status, then, is not solely determined by economic position or attributes, rather it is based on honour and prestige. This group can be constituted of both the propertied and the property-less. Weber (Weber edited by Roth and Wittich, 1978: 305-306) defines the notion 'status' and 'status groups' as

> "…an effective claim to social esteem in terms of positive or negative privileges; it is typically founded on a) style of life, hence b) formal education…c) hereditary or occupational prestige…Status groups are often created by property classes. Every status society lives by conventions, which regulate the style of life"

This understanding may not lend itself to formulations of children and childhood as a 'class', yet children's lives are affected by society's ascriptions and constructions according to the notion 'status group'. Children as a 'type of community' may differ in innumerable ways; however, they share a common experience of growth, change, and learning, and the manner

in which they are treated across different settings. Yet, this social class and status grouping is fluid in terms of age stratification and differentiation.

Age classes or age groups represent an open system of stratification, permitting mobility with each new-year reached by a child. James and Prout (1990: 223 and 233) suggest that 'age classes' are a construction embedded in the notion 'scholarisation':

> "Promotion through the school age class system takes place at regular scheduled intervals and is voluntary, that is, individuals are promoted through the system irrespective of their individual characteristics. In any particular school, the different age positions carry with them differential status and responsibilities; their school work is different and they carry with them different rights, duties and privileges…exploring the critical meshing between age and social status is a key area in which the emergent paradigm for childhood could be moving these debates forward. In everyday life age is used as a dividing line to legally exclude children from all kinds of 'adult' spaces. Inconsistent though these lines of demarcation are in English culture, age set boundaries and limits to children's activities."

These formulations can be extended to children and childhood, that is, in the intersection between age, space, and activities. In terms of 'age-prohibition', this entails prohibition from and control over, the spaces children can occupy in the course and types of activities they can engage in. Therefore, childhood is a site / space of resistance, negotiation, staging and scripting. Kovařík (1994: 103) describes the:

> "Two concepts- *stage* and *script*…used as spatial and temporal characteristics of the *Lebensweldt* to describe how the space and time of children are structured or, more precisely, prestructured. Stage is the way of designing and structuring space (including limits and barriers established by society to demarcate a stage). Script or scenario refers to structuring time and preparing a schedule for childhood by prescribing certain activities and excluding others."

The argument that children are a 'status group' thus has weight because, they have a particular style of life, level of formal education and occupational prestige, and in this case the negative representation is as a 'non-productive' member in a capitalist and industrial society. Age hierarchies and stereotypes also apply to children, relating to their lack of relationship to the labour and production processes. Such assumptions influence how we treat children. It also determines the time, action spaces and places they are prohibited or allowed to inhabit. This also relates to their ability to negotiate and their autonomy. Thus, children are an 'obscured' part of the political economy.

Hagestad and Uhlenberg (2005: 343) highlight that age is a criterion for participation in society's division of labour. Role and responsibility allocations, particularly within the capitalist system and economy are dependent on, amongst other, age. This implies in a Neo-Weberian understanding of class, a process of rationalisation and bureaucratic 'interference' is constructed to disengage 'older' workers from labour participation.

Roscigno, Mong, Byron and Tester (2007:315) explain that:

> "Ageist stereotypes are an important barometer of status and inequality within culture, but they are also influential in terms of the behaviors and actions they may spur. Ageist attitudes and discrimination result in lower levels of overall organizational commitment for older workers, and a 'push' out of a particular workplace or full-time employment. We explicitly refer to this as a 'push' rather than voluntary self-selection because ageist treatment causally precedes a given employee's decision to leave."

The authors argue that "stratification, social closure and power are therefore relational and interactional" and such examine the context of everyday interactions. Here, the authors refer to everyday interactions in the workplace, namely; "*positional* power derived from managers location in the workplace hierarchy" and the "implications of the discretionary use of power toward ageing workers".

Yet, Roscigno, Mong, Byron and Tester (2007: 317-318) suggest the treatment of ageing workers is a reflection of ideological and cultural practices and attitudes toward ageing people, within communities and societies. Moreover, the workplace is a microcosm of the realities and actions of the wider society. The authors draw an analogy between age, gender and race whereby "gate-keeping actors may reflect unrealized or unacknowledged cultural bias".

> "Fundamental to social closure theory are cultural and ideological processes that prompt and/or function to justify unequal treatment. In this regard, broad and explicit cultural stereotypes pertaining to older workers undoubtedly play a role. Since organizations are porous relative to the societies within which they are embedded, there is good reason to believe that cultural stereotypes will be enacted within workplaces, and especially by actors with vested interests in status and position-based hierarchies. This is certainly true in the case of race and gender, whereby employers and managers draw from stereotypes (e.g., dependability, criminality, etc.), and sometimes quite explicitly, in their monitoring, sanctioning and discriminatory behaviors. Age stereotypes, we suspect, often work similarly."

Thus, age discrimination is a form of social closure that is as entrenched as social class, race, and gender divisions in societies. Macionis and Plummer (2008: 422) explain:

"To conflict theorists, age-based hierarchy is inherent in industrial-capitalist society. Capitalist culture has an overriding concern with profit, and hence facilitates the devaluation of those categories of people who are economically unproductive."

These conceptualisations of children then are indicative not only of the 'theoretical' positioning of children but of children's position in society as a whole. Children are assigned a subordinate role in a hierarchic structure and are in a subordinate position to adults (Boyden and Levinson, 2000; and Woodhead and Montgomery, 2003). These arguments articulate a very biased and limited view of children and their lives. The theory of social closure and its application to class and status analysis offers a theoretical frame for the analysis of childhood or children. Children have been assigned a subordinate role in a hierarchical structure; and the embedded exclusionary rules or codes foundational to culture, gender and generation. This results in the marginalisation of children and the notion of childhood as a minority group in society. On this issue, Qvortrup (1994: 22) notes:

"In what has been said so far about the relationship between adulthood and childhood we largely have the elements for categorizing childhood as a *minority group*. In its classical definition a minority group is one which is defined by its subordinate relationship to a dominant group (the adults); it is a "status which carries with it the exclusion from full participation in the life of society" (see Wirth, 1945: 347). There is not necessarily a contradiction between a class and a minority group – indeed a suppressed class will probably always be carrying minority status, but the concept of *class* is more demanding …"

However, the 'time' and 'age' aspects embedded in notions of childhood also present a challenge to constructing childhood as a 'class' group. Finch (cited in James and Prout, 1990: 222) reminds us that age; as with gender is biological but specific social meanings are constructed around these notions. Yet, age groups intersect with other social categories, such as class, race, gender and ethnicity in the hierarchising of social position and social circumstances in societies. Macionis and Plummer (2008: 422) use the notion 'triple jeopardy' to explain how intersectionality influences older minorities; and this this can be extended to understanding children's life situations.

Turner (1989: 590) highlights some interrelated dimensions of importance to consider in the conception of childhood, age and class issues by suggesting that:

"Following Weber and T. H. Marshall, we can conceptualise the social structure of society in terms of three interrelated dimensions, namely economic class, political inequalities and cultural life-styles…Following Marshall's analysis of citizenship, we can identify a second dimension of social structure, namely status or citizenship as socio-political entitlement. For

example, age groups make claims against the state as a status group on the basis of a right of citizenship, independently of their social class position. While political entitlement is clearly influenced by economic class, political rights cannot be simply reduced to economic conditions. However, by elaborating the work of Pierre Bourdieu, we can develop a third dimension of social stratification, namely the idea of status as cultural lifestyle. Ageing and age groups are demarcated not only by economic and political practices, but also by specific life-styles, a cultural habitus and by dispositions which differentiate them from other, competing social groups."

Within these contexts, age, gender, race, education and ethnicity contribute to the understanding of exclusionary closure to which children or groups of children are subjected.

Within the new social studies of childhood however, such an idea is central to understanding children's marginalisation, exclusion and invisibility. That is, 'childhood' is understood as a relatively permanent element in the life of modern societies, and as such, childhood is a socially constructed structural category, comparable and parallel to the proto-sociological issues of ethnicity, race, class and gender (James and Prout, 1990; Qvortrup, 1994; and Alanen, 1998). As with class position, age differentiation and stratification are fluid but closed in disability, gender, race and ethnicity. As a result, children can be categorised or treated as a 'marginalised social group', similar to other social groups. This also gives rise to differences between and among children, and thus the assertion about diverse childhoods as important to acknowledge.

The question then is what elements of Weber's formulation we can adopt, modify, or challenge in an attempt to *elevate* this and other ideas. Weber's theory of closure and monopolization, and its elaboration by Collins, Parkin and Murphy and others offers valuable insights into how exclusionary codes regulate society. It introduces the idea of forms of monopolization, such as monopolization of power, whereby status groups 'organise' around race, language, gender, age, religion or educational qualifications and exercise exclusion in society (Murphy, 2004). The group maintains their dominance through monopolistic action, the dynamic of interest and the power exerted by the group. Murphy (1988: 1) adds that codes of social closure can be formal or informal, overt or covert; regardless of form, these govern the practice of monopolization and exclusion in societies. In a manner, adults represent a dominant group and their actions direct how they position and represent children and childhood across society.

It is also important to note that the appropriation of Weber's constructs and arguments presents only one plausible explanation. As highlighted in chapter two, the social constructivist perspective supports the idea of different constructions of reality. The manner in which 'closure' is applied may not sit comfortably with its conventional appropriations but that is the nature of social theorisations. Such formulations, it must be noted, only presents a part of the understanding or explanation of particular social phenomena or problems. If another lens were adopted, it may produce diverse constructions of reality. Moreover, this dissertation asserts that Weber's theorisations, albeit adultist has particular relevance to how we understand, examine and explain various realities, experiences and differentiations within and between childhoods and children.

3.4 Summary

How does social closure theory advance our understanding of children's exclusion in studies and scholarship, on and about child mobility and in the varying spheres in society? In the synopsis of closure theory, it is clear that exclusionary closure applies to children in different cultural fields of the spaces and places they inhabit; and how the adults in these public or private power domains construct this. However, closure theory is premised on the desire to monopolise and appropriate in the interests of capitalistic accumulation. Yet, children do have a connection to the economic, even if not directly observed. The examination, albeit in a reductionist manner, of typologies of social action and closure suggests that non-economic and economic actions cannot be neatly delineated in analysis. Affectual and traditional rational action can form the basis for value and instrumental rational actions and behaviours. A desire to protect children may give rise to adults making decisions on children's behalves, for example, which mode of travel to use, who to travel with, who to ask about a child's travel experiences, or what to prioritise or construct in a policy on child transport. This then speaks to the issues of un-reflective habituation: why do we reproduce, reify and perpetuate actions that disempower and devalue children, or other socially marginal groups, in a society. In a way, the application of closure theory provides a 'plausible causal explanation' of this particular social practice in society and scholarship.

CHAPTER 4 : DOXA AND INTRA-FIELD CLOSURE -SHIFTING THE LENS

"Economy and Society clearly states that men act as they do because of a belief in authority, enforcement by staff's, a calculus of self-interest, and a good dose of habit" (Roth in Introduction to Weber edited by Roth and Wittich, 1978: XXXV).

"What would the earth be like if, for the first time in human history, adults collectively focused attention on the lives of the youngest members of the race? Granted, most adults generally try to act in the best interests of children, although they do so from their own adult-centric perspectives as nurturers and protectors. For adults to listen to children or view the world through the eyes of children departs radically from the dominant paradigm" (Ben-Arieh, 2005:105).

4.1 Structure and aim of the chapter

The following research question: '*How are child mobility and transport issues generally problematised, conceptualised and internalised within research; and the relevant national survey data in the country*?' is addressed in this chapter. The chapter is structured into two parts. The **first** part (section 4.2 and 4.3) addresses current practices and the main conclusions and assumptions derived from the adoption of the preferred or privileged paradigms and epistemic orientations[9]. The **second** part (section 4.4) of the chapter explores the development of emergent research paradigms and practices in research on and about children. This part also presents an overview of some key findings from the national, South African time use surveys. The intention is to illustrate the diversity of childhoods and the reality of children's mobility and transport needs in the country.

In the last decade, there has been a proliferation of child mobility and transport research done globally. Despite, this surge in scholarly output and knowledge, there are some notable deficiencies. Firstly, there are a limited number of studies on and about child mobility and transport in Africa and South Africa. Secondly, a cursory scan of the field indicates there are a preference for, and privileging of some, paradigms and theoretical orientations over others. Only in a few studies, usually from geography or anthropology, are children the unit of

---

[9] In the document retrieval, the internet and electronic library databases, for example Science Direct, EBSCO Host Web, and E-Library were used. The main shortcoming is the 'over-reliance' on accessible published, peer-reviewed and open-access (on-line) documents, and on English language material.

analysis and the main focus: methodologies consistent with research on and about children are used.

The argument is that this pattern, in part is due to the confluence of disciplines; and the dominance of norms, practices and codes existing within the various disciplines themselves; and the dominance of some disciplines over others. This factor also speaks to the aversion some disciplines have to paradigms, methodologies and theories falling outside the positivist frame. Yet, these emergent frames are relevant and applicable to understanding children's lives.

Bourdieu's (1991: 8) (including Weber, Murphy, Parkin and others) argument provides some context to the position, 'doxa', 'cultural capital', 'closure' and 'intra-field closure', and the current state of knowledge on and about child mobility.

> "Although the field does not necessarily know the boundaries that delimit the various spaces of play, admittance to the field, like entry into the game, presupposes a *metamorphosis* of the newcomer, or better yet, a sort of *metanoia* marked in particular by a bracketing of beliefs and of ordinary modes of thought and language, which is the correlate of a tacit adherence to the stakes and the rules of the game."

Specialists in this sector have presented a biased and limited view of children and their lives. Children, in the research process continue to be assigned a subordinate role in hierarchical structures. This is due to embedded exclusionary rules, derivative or contingent, based on factors such as culture, gender, age and generation. In this context, problematising and conceptualising demands adopting sociological dimensions to understand why patterns and practices have become rooted in the daily practices of different domains in society (Murphy, 1983: 636).

Weber's theorisation was not intended for confronting the childhood issues raised here, nonetheless the varying formulations of closure is applicable and relevant to the broader questions arising about children's marginalisation within the sector. It suggests that the status quo, that is, adopting dominant approaches and un-reflective habituation, is inconsistent with the sociological imagination and the discipline's aims. In research on and about children's' transport and mobility, we have to ask: 'who is the study actually for, about; and why?' As articulated in an earlier chapter, *critical constructivism* and *pragmatism* also embody the notions of self-reflection and unpacking the 'hegemonic ideologies' underpinning our social

actions in scholarship. Consequently, this chapter raises questions about how a sociologist can (re)engage with transport, mobility and childhood issues.

This chapter does not follow the norms on literature reviews. Rather than focusing on the extensiveness of the literature, this chapter looks at what assumptions the current and dominant methodologies and paradigms have produced; and to what extent this is a reflection, or lack thereof, of children's mobility and transport issues. It also surveys the few available studies detracting from the norm. The chapter does not privilege any particular paradigm but in adopting the critical constructivist and pragmatic ethos implies that the central focus should be child mobility and children; and that the research problems and questions raised should mediate in research design and methodology choices.

A selection of scholarly publications will be examined in this chapter, not to, imply that other themes or areas are less important. The aim is to 'problematise the literature to make space for this study to contribute' and as such to 'foreshadow how the present study addresses the problematisation' and presents an alternate perspective for consideration. Golden-Biddle and Locke (2007: 37-44), in reference to the first part suggest there are three possible ways to identify a gap(s) in the existing scholarly writings, that is *extant literature as incomplete, inadequate,* and *incommensurate.*

- Incomplete: The existing literature is not fully complete; there is / are a gap(s)

- Inadequate: The current literature does not sufficiently incorporate different perspectives and alternative views. This subduing of emergent perspectives implies a better understanding and explanation of the phenomena is possible

- Incommensurate: In identifying the knowledge gaps and deficiencies this creates the space to argue for the consideration of an alternative perspective and one, which will reformulate or redirect future studies

These conceptual frames and this theoretical lens underpin the reflexive engagement with the literature in the chapter. As stated in earlier chapters much of the literature is from studies undertaken in developed countries or Northern countries.

4.2 Hierarchising adult needs and voices

Several authors argue that to understand children's travel patterns and choices, adult or household travel patterns, experiences, and behaviours should be examined. Previous

research supporting this argument includes works by Jones, Dix, Clarke, and Heggie (1983); Turner and Niemeier (1999); Goodwin, (1983) and Kitamura (1988) both cited in McDonald (2005); McDonald (2005 and 2008); Copperman and Bhat (2009); and Lang, Collins, and Kearns (2011).

These studies are concerned with the growing preference, or reliance on, the car in the daily school journey, particularly in urban and industrial locales, or those characterised by the steady growth of internal migration. The various authors show there is a trend toward vehicle chauffeuring, the accompanying or escorting of children in the daily school journey, children as passengers, or companions in adult activities. This includes children trip chaining[10] to reach afterschool and other activities. The assumption is that car-orientated travel has an adverse effect on children but more importantly on parents, families and households. This includes impacts on adult-led and including institutional activities and priorities, such as traffic management and land-use planning (DiGuiseppi, Roberts, Li, and Allen, 1998; and McDonald, 2005).

Consequently, carers or parents' decision-making about school travel will depend on prioritising activities, such as work, education, shopping, recreation and visits to social or health service providers, in relation to children's activities and travel demands. Neutens, Schwanen, and Witlox (2010: 27; see Jones, Dix, Clarke, and Heggie; 1983) argue that activities such as:

> "…paid work and fetching children require a high degree of commitment and therefore tend to define important anchor points in an individual's daily schedule around which discretionary activities of lower priority are scheduled later."

The obligatory activities are categorised as 'fixed' as their spatial distribution or location within the urban environment makes it difficult to re-schedule. Therefore, parents will structure their daily activities, schedules and travel needs around children's activities and travel demands, or vice versa (Jones, Dix, Clarke, Heggie, 1983; and McDonald, 2005).

In most modern (Western) families or those living in urban setting, where both parents are usually working outside the home, the activity schedules are fixed and time bound. The

---

[10] "Complex chains (are) chains between different anchors (e.g. home and work) consisting of more than one trip, or chains between two like anchors (e.g. home and home) consisting of more than two trips" (Sarmiento, 1996).

adult's construction of time and space-place interactions can therefore be said to "exert a powerful and constraining force on the daily activities of children" (James and Prout, 1990: 219). Hence, the inference is that adult household decision-making about the organisation of daily activities and schedules influence children's activities, time use, modal choice, travel patterns and behaviours. Such studies have produced important but debatable assumptions and arguments. That is, the focus and prioritisation remains with the adult, and the child is constructed as an impediment to adult mobility and freedom.

This sub-section, then, examines children's travel to and from school but in terms of dependent mobility and accompanied travel. Consequently, some of the factors shaping children's dependent mobility and accompanied travel includes the sex-roles and activities allocations within the household, mothers' labour force participation, car ownership and utilisation, household income and parental concerns about safety (DiGuiseppi, Roberts, Li, and Allen, 1998; and McDonald, 2005). The central focus of such studies generally has been on adults, families and households[11]. Typically, parents will be viewed as responsible for children, with the assumption that this shapes travel behaviour and attitudes (Edwards and Alldred, 2000). Yet, children's dependent mobility and accompanied travel remains far more complex, multifaceted and usually their perspectives and experiences remain obscure.

4.2.1 Gendered mobilities and the gender gap[12]

Some studies explain that family lifecycles, age structures and family relationships, including several other variables such as household employment or income strongly influence decision-making around travel and transport within families and households (for example, Jones, Dix, Clarke, and Heggie, 1983 and Bernard, Seguin, Bussiere, and Polacchini, 1996). Giuliano (cited in Sarmiento, 1996) notes that travel will always be a significant part of a larger structure of household activities. Therefore, understanding the "character of everyday process of travel organisation" requires an understanding of travel through the activity framework (Jones, Dix, Clarke, and Heggie; 1983). This requires an examination of the set of activities

---

[11] Amoateng and Richter (2007) argue that while *family* and *household* tend to be used interchangeably, they remain two conceptually distinct terms. Usually, 'family' refers to relations by blood, marriage or adoption whereas a household does not need to consist of family members.

[12] Macionis and Plummer (2008: 370) note that the notion 'gender gap' refers to the "measure of the levels of inequality between men and women, and has been measured by four key indicators: economic participation, educational attainment, health and survival and political empowerment." The authors however note that for women there remain two key areas of work, paid employment and work done in the home. All these aspects influence women's mobility and travel demands and needs.

each person in the household participates in; and distinguishing between the activities, as 'obligatory' or 'discretionary'. This approach usually focuses on adults' trip-generating activities and the decision-making processes; and how all travel can be utilised in the modeling and management of urban travel behaviours.

Yet, from a sociological perspective this is an oversimplification of household activity patterns, behaviours, and decision-making. In contrast, much of the recent gender-orientated transport and mobility literature incorporates an analysis of intra-household social dynamics (Law, 1984; and MacDonald, 1999). A recurring theme is the connection between household member travel patterns and behaviours; and the intra-household, social and power relations; sex-roles; gender differentials in daily household activities; and child-rearing patterns. Most studies focus on and argue that the connection between daily commuting patterns, work and household responsibilities remains complex, and will be different for men and women. This is a proxy of children's travel patterns.

However, a pronounced characteristic is the gender bias that obscures fathers or men's involvement in their children's life. The general assumption is that men's participation in household activities usually remains at their own discretion. This also speaks to the discourses surrounding men and women's roles and responsibilities in the family, implying that intra-family time allocation in households continues to place time and household labour burdens on women. In households with limited or scarce resources women's family responsibilities may increase, without accounting for her paid labour participation. The intra-household or intra-family childcare time allocation generally can be characterised in terms of the Hochschild's notions of the 'second shift' and 'stalled revolution' (Milkie, Raley, and Bianchi, 2009).

Yet, in the face of adversity, the gender-role stereotyping is being challenged. Studies such as those by Montgomery, Hosegood, Busza and Timæus (2006: 6) suggest that:

> "Cultural ideas about the gendered division of labour further permeate the realm of parenting. From our data, there is no sign that women's employment is seen to detract from their mothering. However, because fathering is so closely aligned with providing, when men get involved with other aspects of fatherhood, they are regarded as men who mother, rather than men who father. This can have damaging consequences for such men's identities and their ability to undertake tasks that do not conform to the norm. Yet men clearly play a significant role in parenting, including of children not biologically their own."

However, by ignoring the environmental factors precipitating father's involvement or social fathering, this also obscures our understanding of children's daily lives. For example, children travel with whom, how do they travel and in what activities do they participate?

That women bear the greater part of the burden of family responsibility, unpaid household work and child-care activities is concluded in an extensive body of research (for example Grieco, Pickup and Whipp, 1989; Badgett, and Folbre, 1999; Chobokoane, and Budlender, 2001; Craig, 2002; Fernando and Porter, 2002; Economic and Social Commission for Asia and The Pacific and United Nations Development Programme, 2003; and Uteng and Cresswell, 2008). The assumption that gender will be an important predictor of travel patterns and behaviour of some household members can then be made (also in Jones, Dix, Clarke, Heggie, 1983; and Turner and Niemeier, 1997). This includes children's travel patterns and behaviours.

There is considerable consensus that regardless of spatial or geographic disparities, there are commonalities and differences[13] among women's experiences; needs and challenges; and this transport and mobility burdens; needs and experiences (Bryceson, and Howe, 1993; Sieber, 1998; Bamberger, 1999; Fernando and Porter, 2002; and Riverson, Kunieda, Roberts, and Walker, 2005). Therefore, a great deal of the literature on children's dependent mobility and accompanied travel focuses on mothers' (women's) time use and daily task scheduling and activities, commuting patterns, and decisions about travel modes (McDonald, 2008).

Grieco, Pickup and Whipp (1989: 2-3) support these views and produce the following summary of the ways in which gender in combination with diverse contexts and personal attributes influence women's travel patterns, time use and daily activities. Women's mobility and travel remains rooted in the values and assumptions of 'family' and 'community', cultural and traditional contexts. Based on this gender-role stereotyping of responsibilities and daily activities, men's and women's travel needs, demands and patterns differ. While, women have specific needs based on their own travel activities much of what they do goes unrecognised (Grieco, Pickup and Whipp, 1989). Hamilton, Jenkins and Gregory (cited in

---

[13] Parpart, Connelly, Barriteau, (2000: 13) argue that: "the category 'women' remains pluralistic, so treating women as a homogenous group results in a bias in theorizing. Class, race, and culture as well as other proto-sociological categories become 'powerful determinants and therefore create differences that must be taken into account' when theorizing about women."

Potgieter, Pillay, and Rama, 2006) note that previous transport research studies tend to exclude journeys under one mile most of which will be made by women and children.

Consequently, various studies conclude that women, in contrast to men will most likely make multi-purpose journeys, 'trip chaining' in scattered locations. These trips, furthermore usually relate to task-orientated activities, such as employment, household or family, and personal needs and demands (Sarmiento, 1996; Turner, Apt, Grieco and Kwakye, 1998; MacDonald, 1999; and Best, and Lazendorf, 2004). In relation to children's dependent mobility and accompanied travel, this usually includes travel to school, nurseries or child-care facilities; the location of the child-carer; travel with child-carers to shopping facilities; visiting friends; or for personal business. Vovsha and Peterson (2005 cited in McDonald 2008) found that 40 per cent of children were escorted to school and 35 per cent from school; and that woman usually escorted children. Amongst other, some of the variables influencing this pattern include the age, gender and number of school-going children, parental marital status, mother's labour force participation, car ownership, affordability of available travel modes; and mothers' travel times, schedules, patterns, and travel modes.

Relating such assumptions to the South African context can pose some challenges. For example, despite the progressive nature of education legislation, to date many children still enter grade 1 without Grade R, or any other pre-primary, Early Childhood Development (ECD) services (Richter, Dawes, Rama and Chandan, 2007). While the phasing in of Grade R classes in formal schools has resulted in the growing numbers of children enrolling for such classes, the concern for pre-Grade R, Early Childhood Development still remains (Department of Education, 2009). The recent National Household Transport Survey indicates that less than two million children travel to preschools; and the majority walk to school taking 30 minutes or less for the trip (Department of Transport, 2005). About less than 10 per cent of pre-school children, take more than 30 minutes to walk to school. The survey data does not include data on accompanied travel, who accompanies the children to preschool or school, nor the number of trips parents (and other adults) undertook with children (Department of Transport, 2005).

While the approach to accompanied and dependent travel prioritises adult needs, it does present some useful insights and possible avenues for further consideration. What types of mobility needs do younger children and their parents have, and does this differ from that of

school-going children? How does this influence the adult and child travel and time schedules? To what extent do the policies and interventions accommodate the needs of these divergent user groups?

Moreover, the national survey data for South Africa does not pay any attention to children's dependent and accompanied travel. Rather, the focus is on travel modes, cost or time aspects. This focus on structural and economic dimensions is consistent with theorisation around the link between transport and development (as articulated in chapter three). Yet, the micro-level complexities are unrecognised. This suggests that even when appropriate methodologies are utilised, the prioritisations and analyses are biased toward macro-level concerns.

4.2.2 Parental marital status, employment and children's age

A substantial amount of evidence supports the view that the nature of men and women's labour force participation, and parenthood, in combination with a complex set of domestic and household responsibilities and arrangements produces gender differences in travel patterns (Jones, Dix, Clarke, and Heggie, 1983; Sarmiento, 1996; MacDonald, 1999). Much of this literature is from findings from developed or Northern countries. For example, in Sarmiento's (1996) found that women's work trips generally were shorter when compared to men's trip making, in urban areas of developed countries (Jones, Dix, Clarke, and Heggie, 1983; and MacDonald, 1999). While, numerous factors determine trip-length, one of the main factors was women's 'need' to work closer to home, because of household and family responsibilities. Sarmiento (1996: 41) cites numerous studies showing that: "…married women have shorter commutes than unmarried women, and women's commute distance tends to decrease with the presence of children especially at younger ages".

Fagnani (1987 in MacDonald, 1999: 272) shows that in France:

> "…married women with children were likely to adjust their work schedules and travel patterns to meet their children's needs. However, married men were unlikely to do this. Women with more children also had shorter work trips."

Essentially, marital status and child dependency constrains mothers' and women's work-trip lengths, but as MacDonald (1999) notes, parenthood may not be the only factor accounting for women's shorter work trips[14].

---

[14] These issues will not be addressed as they do not relate to this study's research problem, however marital status and household responsibilities were cited as other reasons for gender differences in work trip-length.

Turning to other reasons: age and gender of a child is also another explanatory variable. For example, Jones, Dix, Clarke, and Heggie (1983: 75) observe that in families with younger children, particularly those at pre-school age, this usually: "creates two trip-making units: the employed male and the mother-and-infant pair". Moreover, with car ownership this influences the decision-making about who uses the car, with mothers who escort children to and from school given preference. This often results in the males or fathers opting to car pool to work.

These trip-making units however become more complex with the birth of other children. The age of the school-going children will have an important influence on the daily and joint travel and activity decisions of the family. Jones, Dix, Clarke, and Heggie (1983: 80) conclude that "…up to age six the older child, along with the infant, has to be accompanied on all journeys (generally including school journeys)". The authors also note that if a mother works, it will usually be outside of the husband's work hours[15], or within preschool hours (Jones, Dix, Clarke, and Heggie, 1983: 75). MacDonald (1999) suggests that this may be due to levels of household responsibilities associated with the preschool stage (Bostock, 2001). However, as children get older accompanied travel will be reduced. For older children it may mean independent mobility or being 'chauffeured' to an activity by either parent.

Similarly, Sarmiento (1996) also found that single adults with young children undertook complex trip chains on the way to and from work. This pattern is also exhibited for single adults with school-age children, and dual income couples with preschoolers. Working mothers were more likely to link trips than working fathers, and the mothers were more likely to link trips when the children are younger. Jones, Dix, Clarke, and Heggie (1983: 75) describe how shopping patterns will be reorganised around school and preschool exit times. Interestingly, Rosenbloom (1987 cited in Sarmiento, 1996) proposes that women's shorter work trips may be related to their linked trips. This may include, amongst others, trips to the grocery store versus the need to be closer to home, in case of family emergencies. Also, married women with children reportedly made more than 20 per cent more person trips than married men with children (Sarmiento, 1996).

---

[15] MacDonald (1999) suggests mothers may be working nonstandard hours, for example evening, night, or rotating hours.

Behrens's (2004) Cape Town study shows some comparable results. Younger children seldom travel alone. Usually, an adult will accompany younger children. However, younger children from high-income households undertake more trips, and this presumably is the result of greater trip coupling with parents or caregivers. This may be because of transporting older siblings. Interestingly, 13 to 18 year olds from high income households were more likely to be accompanied by an adult household or non-household member on most trips they undertake. The article did not explore the possible reasons for the decline in, or lack of, independent mobility for this cohort, or the social class differences. Moreover, the focus is on travel patterns and behaviours amongst urban school-going children.

4.2.3 Mother's work status, income level and choice of travel mode

Household factors, such as car ownership and access or lack thereof, also affects choice of travel mode to and from school in children's dependent mobility and accompanied travel, particularly in urban areas. Yet, as Bostock (2001: 11) notes that very little attention has been paid to "the experience of carlessness in the context of disadvantaged lives". Usually, the ownership and access to a car dominates the spatial, locational and temporal aspects of everyday life in contemporary urban and industrial societies. It becomes the key focus of discussions around mother's escorting and accompanying children, and children's loss of independent mobility.

This accounts for the limited focus on mothers and their children utilising non-motorised modes, such as walking or biking, and public transport in the daily journey to and from school, and other activities. The common aspect remains the impact of child mobility and transport needs on adult time, daily activity and well-being, regardless of the focal points of these studies. Nonetheless, the findings are of relevance to the South African context. Walking continues to be the main mode of travel amongst low-income households, and women and children in particular (Department of Transport, 2005). Moreover, this pattern of reliance on non-motorised and corporeal transport is characteristic to sub-Saharan Africa, particularly in the rural areas (Bryceson and Howe, 1993 and Porter, 2002).

Bostock (2001) explains how the lives of low income or poorer income mothers with young children (preschool aged children) have been impacted on, because of their reliance on walking as the main daily mode of travel. Poverty constrains the resources and travel mode

choices for low income, or poorer families and households, in urban and rural settlements (Servaas, 2000; Froud, Johal, Leaver, Williams, 2002; and Porter, 2002). Armstrong-Wright and Thiriez (cited in Mitric and Carruthers, 2005) explain that low income groups pay particular attention to transport expenditures and its affordability, so moderating choice of transport mode. For some, walking becomes the most affordable choice. The utilisation of public transport depends on income levels and the affordability of public transport. Consequently, a great deal of the travel and daily trips remain localised, meaning that access to vital services and better quality care and social networks can be restricted.

Results from the South African National Household Travel Survey (SANHTS) show comparable results (Department of Transport, 2005). For example, 49 per cent of households with an up to R500 monthly income were likely to spend more than 20 per cent of this income on public transport. However, 68 per cent of households, with an income of more than R6000 reported 0 per cent spending of income on public transport. This implies that private car ownership may be higher in this income bracket but no details were included on what share of the monthly or personal income would be spent on transport. Socio-economic status, thus mediates in modal choices in a household. Who in the household is mostly likely to be allocated resources for public transport usage? This is important to consider in terms of the issues highlighted in this sub-section.

Another dimension to the children's dependent mobility and accompanied travel, and the choice of non-motorised travel modes deals with mothers' labour force participation and work patterns. McDonald (2008) found that in the United States of America, mother's work status strongly influences children's choice in non-motorised travel modes, particularly walking and biking, but this did not apply to fathers' work status. The author (ibid) also concludes that mothers (30 per cent) were more likely than fathers (11 per cent) and other sibling (6 per cent) to escort or accompany children on school trips. This finding is consistent with other studies showing that age and sex of a child mediates in children's dependent and accompanied travel, particularly in the 5 to 14 year old age range.

For example, the SANHTS shows in the 0 to 6 year age group, over half the children make at least one week-day trip and yet, the survey data does not provide details about dependent mobility. In addition, in the age range 0 to 19 years it was estimated that a total of 15 million week day trips were undertaken; and only about 41 per cent of these were for educational

purposes (Department of Transport, 2005: 54-55). This means that other activities are taking place and this gives rise to transport patterns such as these. Issues relating to dependent mobility, accompanied travel for children, and whom children travel with, are relevant but unrecognised. The inability to capture such nuances in survey data also speaks to a range of metatheoretical, epistemological and ideological stances, marginalisations and deficits. It is not just about disaggregating the data by age, gender, or other factors.

This exclusion and marginalisation of mothers (carers) and children's dependent mobility creates transport and mobility problems for these user groups. Turner, Apt, Grieco and Kwakye (1998) explain that transport planners and decision-makers seldom acknowledge this type of context in women's travel needs and demands, in rural and urban settings. Instead, policy and planning will be biased to the single purpose, predominately-male journeys to work, rather than the women / carer journeys with dependent children (Grieco, Pickup and Whipp, 1989; Turner, Apt, Grieco and Kwakye 1998; and MacDonald, 1999). This androcentric assumption represents a skewed perception and reality of child dependent patterns of travel and activities (Parpart, Connelly, Barriteau, 2000). Instead, the prevailing patriarchal, gerontocratic and gendering assumption about women and children creates additional burdens and barriers to daily mobility. Such deficiencies in planning and policy development can contribute to reducing women and children's economic and social productivity, their access to public services and their political and community participation. In other words, Murphy's typology of exclusion, particularly contingent forms of exclusion, or closure seems to typify the above scenario.

4.2.4 Mother's concerns about safety, risk and other environmental barriers

Bostock (2001) argues that the above highlighted aspects in combination with the stress and fatigue associated with regular walking with young children contributes to the mother's sense of social exclusion, and undermines their health and well-being. Bostock (2001: 16) explains that:

> "Analysis of these data revealed a recurrent theme about the hazards of walking with pre-school children to the local shops (and the stresses of denying them treats once inside)…They described the difficulties of getting children ready, the unpredictable nature of the weather, as well as the nightmares of walking with small children along long and busy roads. These experiences were fundamental to their experiences of shopping with young children"

Servaas (2000) also notes that non-motorised travel modes may be affordable but can sometimes be unpleasant and dangerous. Bostock (2001) explains that some other hazards the mother-child unit experiences include walking through neglected and dangerous neighbourhoods and streets. Some mothers reported that such transport services and infrastructure barriers compelled them to negotiate with relatives to 'borrow' transport resources to meet the health-care needs of their children (Bostock: 2001:12).

Some of the problems mother-child urban public transport users experience includes the following (Department for Transport, United Kingdom, 1998: 49):

- "Buggy-accessibility (prams), so parents tend to walk
- No time to get on and off buses with children
- Bus drivers seldom wait for buggy types to get settled on the vehicle
- Travelling with families (especially with children at fare-paying age) can be very expensive and, where taxis were cheap, taxi prices for such a group tend to be comparable, but taxis will not always take large numbers of children
- Shopping and travelling with children and their buggies and bags can be very difficult
- Children can be difficult to control on buses, especially on long routes.
- Single tickets will be bought because cheap fare passes cannot be used at peak times
- At train stations, station steps can be difficult to negotiate, especially with children
- Problems of access to children's hospital, clinics and other medical facilities
- Buses don't always stop if they see a family with a lot of children
- Access to split families for the non-custodial parent can be difficult and can reduce the number of visits made if too inconvenient."

Trips with children then are difficult, expensive and time-consuming; and in combination with unreliable public transport modes, children's behaviours, and driver's attitudes barriers to adequate participation in everyday activities may be created (Department for Transport, United Kingdom, 1998:49). The SANHTS shows that bad driver behaviour on public transport and home-transport node locations were some of the issues that households found problematic (Department of Transport, 2005).

Another element of considerable importance is that of safety and risk and the impact this has on children's access to education or other activities in society. This can relate to concerns about children with independent mobility:

> "Furthermore, children are exposed to dangers such as sexual assault and road accidents when walking to and from school. This can result in non-attendance or irregular attendance." (Mbelle and Human Rights Watch, 2004: 3)

Yet, we need to also ask whether children's and their parent's perceptions of risk and safety are compatible? This remains an important issue within sociology, the social construction of risk. Harden (2000: 57) found that children's conception of risk was contingent on space, time, people and behaviour. Moreover, children "did not simply accept official discourses on children and risk" rather their understandings of private and public risk are located in their experiences and interactions.

While women, particular those with dependent children and children globally remain the main users of public transport and non-motorised transport on public roads urban transport planners and policy-makers (Grieco, Pickup and Whipp, 1989; Turner, Grieco, Apt and Kwakye, 1998; and MacDonald, 1999) seldom prioritise them. While such studies focus on women or mothers rather than children, nonetheless, they provide valuable insights about the daily transport and mobility experiences of women and their children.

Moreover, while, motherhood may no longer be a barrier to employment in South Africa, the literature on women's labour force participation, child-care and commuting remains scant. What does the lack of such studies in South Africa say about our understanding of the intersection between motherhood, child-care and child mobility needs? Can our transport policies be said to be relevant or catering to all citizens' needs? Clearly, a consideration of these issues can result in the development of gender-neutral and child-friendly transport and planning policies and programmes catering for the needs of all citizens in South Africa.

The selected studies show that while it is impossible to discount the adult and androcentric prioritisations and ideologies, reflexivity remains important. In accepting and replicating some study assumptions and epistemologies, what 'narratives' of the daily life, mobility experiences and challenges remain obscure? Yet, children and women continue to be relegated to a minority status group contributing to a misrecognition and misrepresentation of their daily lives and realities. This further disempowers and isolates marginalised social groups in a society. Un-reflective habituation then does not serve the overall thinking of scholarship within sociology, the humanities nor the social sciences. Yet, there are other thematic areas within child mobility studies, which suffer the same fate.

4.3 The journey to and from school

Globally, children's daily school journey[16] remains the central focus of studies on child mobility and transport. Historically, this interest is rooted in numerous adultist social and political agendas (Cairns, Sloman, Newson, Anable, Kirkbride, and Goodwin, 2004). Primarily, the community of practitioners are concerned about children's safety and their growing loss of independent mobility in urban environments. The studies prioritise the issues of physical street improvements, particularly in the immediate vicinity of schools. This includes an examination of traffic calming, speed zones, cycle lanes and safe crossings in urban centres.

Over time, this focus has shifted to include the impact of congestion and possible measures to promote more sustainable and healthier modes of daily travel to and from school. These developments stem from two politically driven agendas. Firstly, the impact on the environment of the shift in modal choices to the car or other motorised modes of travel; and secondly, the associated health risks such as childhood obesity. The former, is premised on the view that considerable external costs are derived as a result of utilisation of motorised travel modes in the daily school journey, particularly in urban areas (Jan, 1993; Ewing, Schroeer, and Greene, 2005; and Wilson, Wilson, and Krizek, 2007).

For some scholars strong predictors of modal choice include amongst others, the home-school distance, increased car ownership, mothers' labour force participation, child-care arrangements, changing social norms, individual attributes, family, neighbourhood, and parental concern about safety (DiGuiseppi, Roberts, Li, and Allen, 1998; Morris, Wang, and Lilja, 2001; and McDonald, 2005 and 2008). Other distal factors, such as school closure, school profile, school admission policies, or access to private versus public schooling are also feasible explanatory factors for the increase in school trip length and shift in modal choice in some contexts. As stated in the introductory chapter there is a bias towards findings from developed or Northern countries with only a limited number of studies from developing or Southern countries. The following sub-sections examine some of these factors.

---

[16] The following terms are also used: transport, commuting, trip making, trip-generation or mobility, and in relation to schoolchildren: children's educational trip making, school travel, learner travel or education-related trips.

4.3.1Travel patterns and modal choice in the daily school journey

A comparative analysis of the global and national travel pattern and trends in the daily school journey are presented in this sub-section. Some micro-level factors influencing modal choices, such as a child's gender, age, or level of education; and their household income or locale, that is, geospatial location of schools in relation to children's homes or neighbourhoods is examined. How, globally, capitalism, industrialisation and its social changes, such as urbanisation, modernisation and mechanisation have transformed, the nature of human activities including urban transportation is highlighted.

Weber also comments about cities in the chapter entitled 'The City (Non-Legitimate) Domination' in '*Economy and Society*', by developing a typology to reflect historical transformations in function and economic activities. These typologies are the '*consumer city*', '*producer city*', and the '*merchant city*'. These relate to the population's power to purchase, produce or consume; and relates to economic opportunities or productive activities of the city. Thus, the activities, nature and function of a city, or settlement transform and are transformed by the political economy.

Returning to the topic at hand, this implies that everyday activities and geo-spatial and temporal action spaces also change. This also relates to the daily school journey. Over the past few decades, considerable social changes in urban environments and developed countries have seen a decrease in the use of non-motorised[17] modes of travel to and from school (McMillan, 2007). Cairns et al (2004: 65) observe that in Britain while the 'school run' accounts for a small proportion of all car traffic, younger children are more likely to travel to school by car. Previous studies such as those by Bradshaw and Atkins (1996 as cited in Cairns et al, 2004: 65) also show that school travel by car continues to increase, even when car ownership remains constant. The authors found that amongst two-car households, the proportion of primary school-age children escorted by car rose from 38 per cent to 53 per cent in the last two decades.

McDonald (2005) observes that in the United States of America (USA), the car accounted for 16 per cent of all school trips in 1969 compared to 55 per cent in 2001. During the school term, school trips account for 50 per cent of children's weekday trips, while 75 per cent of

---

[17] Usually refers to walking, biking/ bicycling, or animal-drawn carts as travelmodes.

trips by youth were undertaken by car. Fewer children walk or bike to school dropping from 42 per cent to 13 per cent. McDonald suggests that one factor playing a role in the changing of modal split is the increase in the home-school trip length.

Ewing, Schroeer and Greene (2004: 55) found in their examination of school location and travel modes in the USA that school sizes have been on the increase. "Between 1940 and 1990, the total number of elementary and secondary public schools fell by 69% despite a 70% increase in the U.S. population." Instead, mega-schools were developed and located on the peripheries, thereby serving a larger catchment area. The increase in the home-school proximity has resulted in a decline in walking and biking rates. The authors also cite poor walking environments[18] as another factor contributing to the decline in these modes, and a rise in car use. It also shows that urban spatial forms either enable or constrain mobility (Sheller, 2008), including child mobility in the daily school journey. Similar trends were noted in other developed countries (Morris, Wang, and Lilja, 2001 and Lang, Collins, and Kearns, 2011).

Clearly, ages of children and family socio-economic status plays a role in travel modal choice to and from school. Recent studies for South Africa show that in the metropolitan areas more children travel by car to school (Behrens 2002 and 2004; Department of Transport, 2005; Lombard, Cameron, Mokonyama and Shaw, 2007). However, a number of factors mediate in the choice of the car as the preferred mode of travel.

For example, Behrens (2004a and 2004b) found that in Cape Town education trips by car were reportedly higher (91 per cent) among high, than middle or lower income households. The study also highlighted two other key patterns for modal choice among schoolchildren. Children from high-income households have a wider choice in terms of school selection and are not necessarily restricted to neighbourhood schools. Across all age groups walking remains, the main mode of travel but household income can mediate in this. For children from low and middle-income households walking is their primary means of transportation for all trip purposes. Children from middle and low-income households were more likely to use public transport; and this pattern increases with age. This implies greater independent mobility for children living in low and middle-income households. It is also indicative of

---

[18] "'Poor walking environment' means a built environment of low densities, little mixing of land uses, long blocks, incomplete sidewalks, and other hallmarks of sprawl." (Ewing, Schroeer and Greene, 2004: 55)

lower household private car ownership. Bostock (2001) explains that no access to, or ownership of a car remains a fair indicator of socio-economic status and of walking as a main travel mode. Walking, then, is the most important travel mode for children but this modal choice is contingent on household income levels and proximity of school.

So, how do these global and local trends in modal choice and split for the daily school journey compare to the national trends for South Africa? The *Moving South Africa* report noted that scholars[19] account for 26 per cent of South Africa's urban population, estimated at about 22 million (Department of Transport, 1998). The travel behaviour of this relatively substantial group of passengers remains largely dependent on cheap non-motorised means of transportation (NMTs). The SANHTS and other reports suggest this pattern persists and is consistent with trends in modal split and choice trends in other developing countries (Baker, Basu, Cropper, Lall and Takeuchi, 2005; and Department of Transport, 2005; and Department of Education, South Africa, 2006).

The SANHTS report also shows that all modes of education trips were about 50 per cent higher than the number of work trips, respectively, about 16 million compared to 10 million work trips. Moreover, walking instead of the car remains the main mode of travel to educational centres (Department of Transport, 2005 also in previous studies by Mbatha, 2005 and Rama, 1999). While 76 per cent of scholars and students walk to school or an educational institution, this figure remains higher for rural (91 per cent) than urban (71 per cent) and metropolitan (57 per cent) areas. Most of the learners (90 per cent), walking to school are from lower income households, with a monthly household income of R500 and less. As stated earlier, most of these children usually attend schools within their neighbourhoods.

Motorised modes of travel, including the car, train, bus and taxi, on the other hand account for about 42 per cent of all education trips in metropolitan areas, and about 27 per cent in urban areas (Department of Transport, 2005; and Lombard, Cameron, Mokonyama and Shaw, 2007). Taxi and car usage remains higher in households with a monthly income of R3000 and more. Household income and age then remain some of the key determinants of children's modal choice in the daily school journey in South Africa.

---

[19] Concepts such as 'learner', 'scholars', and 'pupils' are used interchangeably to mean the same thing, that is, children enrolled in schools. However, 'students' usually refer to young people enrolled in tertiary institutions or engaged in post-school studies. In this report the term 'student' includes those 18 years and older, and registered at a tertiary or further education institution.

The study seems to suggest a relationship between choice of mode of travel to educational institutions and urbanisation levels. While car use in school travel is higher in the metropolitan areas, car ownership in South Africa is described as being in its infancy (Department of Transport, 2005: 7). Nevertheless, the anticipated growth of car ownership in the country could result in a demand for road space, concerns and problems associated with scholar transportation in urban settings.

So far, the literature review of children's educational trip making has focused on some of the factors influencing children's travel behaviour and the trends in travel mode to school. In the next section, issues of school choice and location, or proximity are examined.

4.3.2 Home-school location and choice of school

Several authors support the argument that home-school distance strongly influences modal choice for school travel (Wilson, Wilson, and Krizek, 2007; Müller, Tscharaktschiew, and Haase, 2008; and McDonald, 2008). McDonald (2005) notes that fewer children reportedly walk or cycle to school, because fewer children live within walking distance of school. This suggests that there is a relationship among home-school proximity, choice of school and travel mode. However, a range of factors influence parental and sometimes children's decision-making about school choice.

Müller, Tscharaktschiew and Haase (2008) suggest that school profile is a key factor influencing school choice and therefore modal choices. The authors define 'profile' as school attributes, such as choice of language for teaching and learning, the courses and levels available, authority responsible and governance, private versus public ownership and special needs education. The study found that because of school closures[20] in urban areas in Germany, parents and children were increasingly selective about school choice. For most schoolchildren, public transportation is their preferred travel mode resulting in an increase in household spending on school transport. However, transport costs varied according to modal choice during the different seasons and by weather patterns. Hence, school choice, home-school location and environmental factors play a role in children's modal choice.

---

[20] Authorities identified school closure based on low enrolment rates, that is, under- utilisation and the decline in the population density of the catchment areas acting as feeders to the schools.

In contrast, Broccolichi and van Zanten (2000) argue that school choice is far more complex than understood. The authors argue that educational policies on school admissions also influence parental decision-making on school choice. The authors explore the issue of school hierarchies and pupil flight from local public schools in France. France's education system requires that pupils enrol at neighbourhood schools. Yet, the hierarchisation of public schools, through the publication of a league of tables and national evaluations has fuelled the competition and flight from schools on the urban periphery (also in Alexiadou, 2002). Broccolichi and van Zanten (2000: 51) argue that this issue is under-researched because:

> "…it calls into question established ideals concerning equality of opportunity and social integration through schooling".

Therefore, parents opting to enrol their children in a school outside their residential location are flouting the law; and studies with such a focus could raise legal and administrative inquiries.

Nonetheless, the analyses show that class situation, that is, upper or middle class families have an increased capability to gain access to private or well-resourced schools of their choice (Broccolichi and van Zanten, 2000; see Hirsch, 1995). Moreover, the social networks and good public transport systems in their neighbourhoods mean that there are minimal risks associated with the daily school journey. In contrast, working-class families lacking the financial and socio-cultural resources, or cultural capital capacity have limited or no options but to send their children to neighbourhood schools (Tooley, 1997; and Alexiadou, 2002). In these schools, workers' and foreigners' children, with the greatest social, economic and scholastic difficulties have been concentrated (see Vulliamy, 2001; Reay and Lucey, 2003 and Villett and Hardill, 2007).

Broccolichi and van Zanten (2008: 59) explain that the working-class families:

> "…may be called `captives' of their school district because they live far from the few private schools that might admit them, do not know anyone who goes to them, and would probably find the tuition and transportation costs involved prohibitive. In these extreme cases, parents have no reason even to imagine they have a choice; they may not even be aware of the significant differences between schools…Meanwhile, families relatively conscious of the implicit hierarchies among schools and class groups do not have the resources necessary to get their child admitted to the school they would like."

This disparity widens the gap between 'advantaged' and `disadvantaged' schools and the socio-economic groupings within and across communities.

Of course, poor households and families also desire better outcomes for their children and choice of education and school profile remain equally important. For example, in Pakistan the lowering of private school fees; increased household incomes; reduced home-school distance; and differentiation in school attributes play a role in decisions to enrol children in private schools (Alderman, Orazem, and Paterno, 2001). Interestingly, the findings show that parental concerns about home-school proximity affect decisions about schooling choice in much the same as school fees (Alderman, Orazem, and Paterno, 2001: 317). Increased parental or household income may influence parent's willingness to pay for school improvements, or reducing the home-school proximity; it does not, however increase enough to facilitate children's entry into private schools.

These studies show that regardless of income, more or less the same factors determine or prohibit family's decision-making on school choice. Studies suggest that attending a private school and car ownership "are associated with lower odds of walking and a higher likelihood of car travel to school" (Timperio, Ball, Salmon, Roberts, Giles-Corti, Simmons, Baur, and Crawford, 2006: 45). Most low or poor income families gravitate to the neighbourhood schools (Burgess and Briggs, 2006) and children are more likely to walk to school. While, these studies on school choice do not necessarily consider issues of child mobility or transport, the arguments raised are of relevance to educational accessibility in post-apartheid South Africa. The SANHTS, however, does not focus on residential-school location issues and the possible transport barriers that exist in school choice.

How have the institutional and legislative transformations influenced parents' decisions about school choice, post-apartheid? Selod and Zenou (2001) raise questions about whether children continue to attend schools in their neighbourhoods, or if parents opt to send their children to better-resourced schools outside their neighbourhood. The SANHTS shows about 90 per cent of the learners and students from poor households live within 30 minutes walking distance from educational institution (Department of Transport, 2005). Of the children who walk, about 560 000 children spend more than two hours a day walking to and from school (Department of Transport, 2005; 97). Walking rates are higher for children in rural areas than in urban or metropolitan areas.

Selod and Zenou (2001) conclude that where children attend schools outside their neighbourhoods, the children bear the cost of integration, including the spatial considerations.

The authors explain that parents seeking good quality education may be willing to allow their children to commute over long distances to the schools of their choice. In such instances, the parents' future human capital incentives and investments in their children outweigh the transport costs, distance and safety concerns among other factors. Choice of school can result in up to a 20 per cent increase in the average distance travelled to school in urban areas (DiGuiseppi, Roberts, Li, and Allen, 1998).

Similarly, Black, Collins and Snell (cited in Ewing, Schroeer and Greene, 2004: 56) note that:

> "A British study found a significant relationship between mode choice and perceived distance from home to school, with the probability of traveling by automobile instead of by foot increasing from 20% at a 0.5-mi distance to 50% at 1.25 mi and 80% at 2 mi."

Accordingly, the South African Schools Act No 84 of 1996 upholds the fundamental human right of access to education (Republic of South Africa, 1996). While the Act does not place restrictions on parental rights to school choice, it stipulates that a school's governing body is responsible for its admission policies. This policy cannot discriminate against children based on their parents' inability to pay school fees, or any other criteria deemed discriminatory. It delegates the responsibility to the provincial Minister of Education or Members of the Executive Council at provincial level to provide free transport to poor children walking long distances to school (Department of Education, South Africa, 2008). The National School Funding Norms stipulates that if school travel time exceeds 1.5hours, 180km by car, 3-5km if walking then hostel accommodation should be sought (Department of Education, South Africa, 2008). The Department's 2008 Education for All Country report notes that it was in the process of developing a policy on learner transport.

The conclusion that can be drawn is that the legislative and institutional transformations post-apartheid have not had a significant impact on parental choice and decision-making around school enrolment. Children from poor or low income households continue to attend schools within walking distance of their homes. Only a small proportion of children with mobility problems have been accommodated. For example, in 2006 while over 11 million learners were enrolled at ordinary public schools, only 200 000 learners were benefiting from Department's free learner transport programme at a substantial and disproportionate cost of R440 million (Department of Education, 2008 and 2009).

The Department of Education's 2009 policy of no-fees schools, for example only applies to schools located in neighbourhoods deemed as poor or low-income and do not apply to well-resourced schools in well-off neighbourhoods. This intervention prohibits parental school choice for low or poor income families and households. Moreover, the National Scholar Transport policy explicitly states that parental choice of school will not be subsidised with public transport (National Department of Transport, 2009: 22). Therefore, parents will incur the transport costs associated with their decision to enrol their children in schools outside their neighbourhoods. Provincial departments of transport and education will be responsible for identifying scholars who will benefit from this service if home-school distances exceed 3km.

Instead, the departmental policies create barriers in school choice; parents and children who decide to opt for better resourced schools will incur the transport costs. Perhaps Murphy's notion of 'principal form of exclusion' can be transposed to show how policies and legal frames, in themselves can be forms of closure and exclusion. Clearly, the two Department's policies do not complement each other; particularly on the issue of parental right of choice, (the next chapter will address these and other issues).

Therefore, parents' decision-making about school choice is constrained through a combination of factors. This includes policy restrictions and the inequitable provision of services such as poor or unaffordable transport networks and the location and proximity of 'good quality' schools (Goldring and Hausman, 1999; and Smith, Beckhelling, Ivaldi, Kellard, Sandu, and Tarrant, 2006). Many families and households in poorer neighbourhoods may not have access to cars, and regular, reliable, or affordable public transport may be problematic. Where transport modes and attributes differ across neighbourhoods, children remain at a particular risk and disadvantage. Parental decision-making about choice of school remains open for parents with higher socioeconomic levels and access to efficient and reliable services and infrastructure.

These inequities post-apartheid continue to fuel the rich-poor differentials among and between schools and communities (Maree, Aldous, Hattingh, Swanepoel, and van der Linde, 2006; Department of Education, 2008; and Maarman, 2009). For many of the children and their families high levels of poverty characterise the broader socio-economic environment in which many of the find themselves in. As stated in an earlier chapter, a recent study shows

that 50 per cent of all children experience employment deprivation (Barnes, Wright, Noble and Dawes, 2007). This means that families and households will be less willing to divert the limited household income on scholar travel (Olvera, Plat, and Pochet, 2007).

All these factors contribute to the poor living standards, lower educational attainment, social fragmentation and problems of social and spatial exclusion for children from low income or poorer families and neighbourhoods (Burgess, Gardiner, and Propper, 2001; de Castro, and Menezes, 2002; Adelman, Middleton, Ashworth, 2003; Blanden, 2006; Bastos and Nunes, 2009, and Maarman, 2009). Graaf (1997) argues that children and their families' social and economic environments will determine their educational performance, before these children can even enroll at a school. Maarman (2009) observes that 53 per cent of South African schools were categorised as Quintile 1 schools, those regarded as the poorest by the provincial education departments. The African majority post-apartheid overwhelmingly remain 'captives' of their school districts and residential locations (Broccolichi and van Zanten, 2008).

However, anecdotal information[21] suggests that in some instances parents place education quality, or perceived quality ahead of transport barriers. For example, Northdale a previously Indian designated area in Pietermaritzburg, South Africa, during the apartheid and post-apartheid years has a number of public schools that have produced exceptional matriculation, or grade twelve results. These schools serviced children from the mainly Indian neighbourhoods. However, under post-apartheid South Africa it is a common scene to find access to these schools blocked by busses, bakkies, taxis or private cars on a school morning or afternoon. Many of these vehicles are used to ferry children from the previously African designated suburbs in and around Pietermaritzburg to the schools in Northdale. It is also clear that many of the families are subsidising the children's transportation, not the provincial government departments. However, a small proportion of the children also come from neighbouring provinces such as the Eastern Cape or neighbouring countries such as Lesotho, all with a desire for access to quality education. This has given rise to informal boarding schools being established across the city, having, and its own set of negative implications on

---

[21] Personal observation, I live close to a number of the primary and secondary schools in Northdale and every morning workers compete with scholar transport modes and this usually results in traffic congestions at school drop zones. Moreover, some illegal boarding homes in the city have been in the news for the appalling conditions under which children are staying. Large contingents of workers from neighbouring countries and provinces have also taken up residence in the formal and informal housing settlements in Northdale and children attend the local schools in the hopes of achieving a brighter future.

children's achievement, safety, health and well-being. Such issues, while physically observable are empirically absent; and yet they produce powerful narratives beyond the concern about child mobility and mobility rights.

4.3.3 Rural schools and transport

In a similar vein, children in rural areas are captives of their school districts. Villet and Hardill's (2007: 53) notion of "spatial entrapment of marginalized communities" and its emphasis on the spatial and social mobility dimensions of social exclusion can also be employed to describe this situation. This includes Bourdieu's theorisations of social spaces and the meanings it can find in relation to conceptions of 'class'. Reay and Lucey (2003: 126 and 130) explain that:

> "Class 'is based on securing, fixing and holding some people in space so that others can move' (Skeggs, 2000). Secondary school 'choice' is one instance of the ways in which the social, physical and psychological intertwine to fix the working classes in working-class spaces…There are painful social and psychological consequences for…minority ethnic working-class children…have to live with 'destiny effects' (Bourdieu, 1990) that are the inevitable consequence of moving on to secondary schools that are stigmatized both locally and within the wider public imagination."

Tooley (citing Gerwitz et al and Ball et al, 1997: 217-218, see Reay and Lucey, 2003) asserts that school choice also reinforces social fragmentation and disconnection of some social groups from mainstream society: "Choice is very directly and powerfully related to social class differences…Choice emerges as a new factor in maintaining and indeed reinforcing social-class divisions and inequalities."

In rural areas moreover, distance combined with, amongst others, access, age, poverty, gender and disability can mediate in enrolment and attendance at school. A UNICEF study in Nepal shows that: "…for every kilometre a child walks to school, the likelihood of school attendance drops by 2.5 per cent" (UNICEF, 1999: 31). Findings from a study on young people, aged between 15 and 24 years living in a rural location in South West England also shows that transport costs, lack of knowledge about public transport facilities and limited public transport remain key barriers to accessing educational facilities, work opportunities and participating in social activities, or visiting friends (Storey and Brannen, 2000).

Amongst others, physical terrain also remains a particular challenge. For example, Wintermeyer, McLachlan and Palframan (2004: 331) explain that the terrain in the rural areas of Eastern Cape, South Africa is not necessarily easy to navigate:

> "The Umtata Region is an area on the east coast of the Eastern Cape in the former Transkei. Its topography is undulating low hills with rock outcrops along the sea edge…Infrastructure is generally very poor. Transport is occasionally very poor. Settlements are very dispersed over most middle lying areas. There are several small centres such as Coffee Bay and Kwaaiman that offer central functions such as specialised shops and a clinic. Schools, home shops and churches are dispersed amongst the settlements, which mostly family groupings of two or more rondavels or newer buildings. All settlements are connected to primary gravel and tar roads by smaller gravel paths and roads."

Porter, Hampshire, Mashiri, Dube and Maponya (2010: 1095) made similar observations of education and access in a study. The authors found that in some rural off-road and isolated communities, children enrolled in Grade 1 much later than is legislated, as seven years old.

> "One 22-year old pupil reflected, as we walked home from school with him over steep, scree slopes: '*When I think about school my heart becomes bitter for the distance I travel to school is very long for me. At times I think about dropping out of school like other children in my location*'. His school career only started at the age of 12 because of the long, difficult journey. It is common for parents to delay children's school entry in all the remote villages where we worked, because of the journey length. This delay in starting school can cause serious embarrassment when the child is in class with much younger pupils: '*when I have to stand in the assembly with little children…they laugh at me saying that I am an 'ancestor' of the schoo*l' [girl 18 years, Bolani]."

Structural and macro-level barriers therefore do influence children and young people's representation and presentation. The travel distances and other mediating factors also push some children to consider dropping out of school.

Rural schools, then, have very different needs, resources, capacities and problems (Arnold, 2000). A 1996 report for South African found that (Department of Education, NCSNET and NCESS, 1997: 11):

> "One of the most significant barriers to learning remains the inability of learners to access the educational provision that does exist and their inability to access other services, which contribute to the learning process. In most instances, the inability to access education provision results from inadequate or non-existent services and facilities, which are key to participation in the learning process. For example, in many poor communities, particularly in our own country in rural areas, learners are unable to reach centres of learning because there is no transport facilities available to learners or the roads are so poorly developed and maintained that centres cannot be reached. While such barriers affect all learners in poorly serviced communities, it is important to recognise that particular groups of learners are more severely affected by these

barriers. In general transport systems, which do exist, are inaccessible to learners with disabilities, particularly learners who use wheelchairs. So, for example, learners with disabilities who should be attending school or who wish to go to adult education classes are unable to even reach the school or class because the public transport system, which is available, is either physically inaccessible or unwilling to transport them. At the same time they are unable to walk to school or classes and in this way they are totally excluded from the education system."

In response to this, the National Department of Education (2003) released a report titled '*Review of the Financing, Resourcing and Costs of Education in Public Schools*'. High transport costs and poor transportation infrastructure were identified as some of the persistent problems rural communities experience. Clearly the one-size fits all approach does not address the complex problems faced by rural schoolchildren. Interventions such as bussing moreover are dependent on a critical concentration of target learners in a particular area. However, this does not mean that all children live close to each other; households with school-going children may be randomly distributed throughout rural communities. This will then influence whether it is economically effective, using economies of scale to determine bus routes. Interestingly, the report concludes that various options for different localities need to be investigated.

Yet, State institutions adopt these measures without a consideration that other alternatives could be possible. For example, Ntuli (2009, BuaNews website) reports that:

"Learners attending rural schools will no longer have to walk great distances to get to school, thanks to a R87 million boost to school transport. Addressing the media on Monday the provincial MEC for Education Ina Cronje said the department has allocated the funds to provide transport to all rural learners who walk up to 6km to schools…Ms Cronje also revealed that they are working together with the Department of Transport to explore various economically sound approaches to learner transport to include other options."

Another default intervention is the subsidisation and distribution of bicycles, in that this intervention is not dependent on a particular geographical concentration of target learners (National Department of Education (2003). The introduction of bicycles is not necessarily a prudent response. Mahapa (2003) found that schoolchildren who received bicycles were not aware that repairs were free of charge. Some parents were purchasing the subsidised bicycles in their children's name but using it to access employment and other opportunities and activities. Men or boys are more likely to use the bicycles (see Malmberg-Calvo, 1994; and Cunha-Jacana, 2006). Mahapa (2003: 21) suggests this is an "indication of the need for low

cost mobility by everyone in the community", not only children. Mahapa (2003: 26) also refers to cultural and gender impediments (see Fernando and Porter, 2000; and Potgieter, Pillay and Rama, 2006). A case in point, girls reported that their brothers taught them how to ride the bicycle, placing girls with no brothers at a disadvantage. Their bicycles were under-utilised. Cunha-Jacana (2006: 17) states: "transport is not gender-neutral". Women and girls, particularly in rural areas must participate in the decision-making around the adoption of transport technologies.

In South Africa the walking rates continue to be higher for children in rural areas than in urban or metropolitan areas. In rural areas about 20 per cent of children are likely to spend more than 46 minutes travelling to school and fewer than 20 per cent of all walking trips in the rural areas are undertaken in 46 minutes (Department of Transport, 2005). Potgieter, Pillay and Rama (2006: 21) note that in the Flagstaff and Port St John's area of the Eastern Cape at least 43 per cent of children less than twelve years of age travel to school independently.

Recent estimates also suggest that in 2003, the number of school-aged children walking more than five kilometres to school dropped to 319 000, from 350 000 for 2001 (Department of Education, South Africa, 2006). While, SANHTS cites a higher number of children spending more than two hours a day walking to and from school, nonetheless this has implications for children's daily life and education attainment. A case in point, Flyvbjerg (2001: 141) makes an important link between home-school location and children's development:

> "My job was to carry out a survey of social, educational, and health services with the purpose of finding arguments for and against centralization and decentralization in these three sectors. One of the arguments I found was in a British study showing how young children's performance in school decreases with increasing distance between home and school. The study was presented in a well-known textbook with an instructive figure documenting the negative correlation between distance and learning. 'Thus it would appear,' the authors concluded, 'that there are good psychological as well as economic reasons for minimizing the school journeys of young children.' This was a clear-cut argument for decentralized schools, that is, many schools close to where the children live, as opposed to fewer schools with longer distances to travel between home and school."

In Mbatha's (2005: 51) study of caregiver perceptions of transport for children in the rural areas of Emmaus in Bergville (South Africa), teachers expressed similar sentiments. The

home-school location and travel distances do influence children's performance and concentration during school time, particularly amongst younger children.

> "But teachers believed walking affects the young children the most as one primary teacher commented: *'but I've noticed it to those in grade one because they walk long distances'*, and as a result *'it takes them time to actually concentrate on what the teacher is saying because they are still tired and their brains are tired as well'* [Teachers group: Ezinyonyana Primary School]. Seemingly, the school rules also add to the problem: *'if they come late they are punished so one can see that makes also makes things even worse, the child will not concentrate in class, you see'"*

Mbatha (2005) also notes that in the Emmaus area, private bakkies, that is, pick-up trucks or vans transport children to and from school, particularly in the off-road communities with no access to public transport. Yet, such arguments are seldom used in decision-making because macro-level, political, economic and budgetary factors dominate. Instead, 'reactive' and emotive responses are forthcoming only in the instances of tragedies.

> "'I will not tolerate any more of this. One death is one too many, but one child killed is too much,' Ndebele said. This follows the death of three school children who were killed instantly in a road accident involving a Toyota bakkie at approximately 15:30 today (26 February 2004) along the Greytown/Dundee Road, approximately 13 kilometres from Greytown towards Dundee. It is alleged that the driver of the bakkie, in which approximately 17 school children were being conveyed, lost control due to a left rear tyre that burst causing the bakkie to overturn. Three children, aged 8, 4 and 12 were killed instantly. The driver of the bakkie and 14 other learners sustained serious to slight injuries and were admitted to the Greytown Hospital." (Former KwaZulu-Natal MEC for Transport Mr S'bu Ndebele, 2004, KwaZulu-Natal Transport website archive)

During the development of the *National Scholar Transport Policy and Strategy* in 2004, the KwaZulu-Natal provincial department of Transport highlighted the following barriers and challenges in scholar transport, for both urban and rural areas in the province (KwaZulu-Natal Transport website archive, 2004):

- "No scholar transport operator data is available to facilitate proper scholar transport planning
- Few scholar transport operators are in possession of legal operator permits
- Scholar transport operators work independently from existing bus and taxi industry structures
- Large numbers of scholar transport operators are using illegal modes of transport such as bakkies, trucks, etc.
- The bus and taxi industry has failed to service the scholar transport market. Hence, the rise in scholar transport operators
- Lack of a uniform approach in scholar transport enforcement by different enforcement agencies

- Scholar transport is characterized by non-compliance to safety standards"

In 2009, the draft policy was released and implementation and monitoring of some of the above aspects are yet to be realised.

However, the observed marginalisation of children in mobility and transport needs and problems in rural areas may point to other issues. Porter, Blaufuss and Owusu-Acheampong (2006) suggest that the complexity and diversity of children's daily lives in rural areas is important to uncover and examine. The authors suggest that in addition to the home-school location and the travel distances, children's supply of household labour, inaccessible terrain, age, gender, household income, expenditure patterns and varying levels of transport infrastructure and services all contribute to children's mobility and transport needs and challenges in rural areas.

Howley and Smith (2000: 5-6) suggest other points for consideration:

> "This all-too-brief consideration of dominant and alternative research frameworks may suggest a more satisfactory series of answer to the question about the silence of education research on the topic of rural school busing (with respect to children, families, and communities)…And, finally, because the issue of rural school busing (from the perspective of children, families, and communities) won no history within the functionalist scheme, contemporary researchers have inherited little scholarly incentive to investigate it. Of course, all of this means that the usual channels for funding education research have also ignored the issue. Though no formal entity is leaning heavily upon education researchers *not* to investigate rural school busing, lack of researchers' interest in rural school busing cannot be attributed to laziness and ignorance, but to a system of perception and preparation with deep historical roots."

The author implies that dominant research frameworks and prioritisation of some research agendas over others influence what researchers may be interested in studying. Arnold (2000) also suggests that the response may also be an indication of flawed design and methodology; and poor data analysis on rural schools. Similar elements are highlighted in the previous chapter, the dialectic conflicts of researchers and academics; and reiterates how researcher and academic interests may be in conflict with funder and policy-makes views and priorities.

4.4 Shifting the epistemological lens and excavating 'new' insights

The previous sections have presented a 'sample' of the literature and assumptions derived from adultist, androcentric, gerontocratic and traditional approaches to child mobility and

transport. As stated earlier, this is not a comprehensive survey but rather directed at demonstrating some of the deficiencies highlighted in chapter one. It is clear that the positioning of children within the research process and the researcher's positioning are also important in the assumptions derived and the resulting measures or interventions.

Yet, in shifting our lens, we can produce other equally important insights into and about child mobility issues. This section of the chapter also explores some themes that capture diverse childhoods and social realities of children through examining some 'peripheralised' themes. It further raises questions about whether national data sets can be better utilised to contribute to a 'paradigm shift'. In this next sub-section, some of these issues will be examined in relation to primary and secondary data sources.

Some critics, for example, James and Prout, 1990, Alanen 2005, and Whitelegg, 2010 attribute the 'dismissive or pseudo' attitude to children to the prevailing socialisation perspectives to emphasise the proximal and distal influences on children. The adult-centred approaches and prioritisation of adults' perspectives work to generate adult concerns about children and in some instances protect adults (Alanen, 1988: 54).

Knutsson (1997: 66) presents another view, that of the 'positional' perspective:

> "Depending on the position and location of the observers, perceptions and views will vary significantly – including among people who work for the betterment of children. In certain cases positional perspectives have led to a great deal of misunderstanding. An illustration of the need to be aware of these perspectives…distinction between 'the private child', 'the commercial child' and the 'public child'"

These perspectives influence how parents and adults advocate for children and can result, as Knutsson and Mayall explain in conflicting behaviours and attitudes. Mayall (2000: 245) suggests that consequences flow from the adoption of un-reflective stances:

> "…in defining children as inferior, as objects essentially of adult socialisation – we depersonalise children. In proposing that we know best the best interests of the child, we deny children's rights. We deny children the right to participate in the structuring of their childhoods. Though we may work to protect children and provide for them, we find it much harder to take children seriously as contributors to social thinking and social policies."

At the same time, some paradigms and perspectives are preferred over others, usually empirically grounded, positivist studies and macro-level explanations of transport and

mobility problems (Rosenbloom 2004). Positivism also, "carves a sharp distinction between investigator and investigated, and creates a hierarchical relationship between the two" (Sprague and Kobrynowicz, 2006: 32).

Brownile (2009: 703) explains that, amongst other concerns, it raises the following: "…*who* is carrying out the research is inevitably linked with, and, therefore, as relevant as, questions about 'knowledge for *what*' and 'knowledge for *whom*'." This also includes questions about, or on: subjectivity-objectivity; investigator-participant relationship; what constitutes knowledge; how the knowledge is acquired; what the different ways of knowing or acquiring knowledge are; what informs or has informed our perspectives, opinions, beliefs and attitudes, or what the form or nature of the reality is. Some of these issues were highlighted in earlier chapters. This is important to internalise, because, "a crucial source of knowledge and understanding about childhoods and children's lives comes from research" (Kellett, 2010; 6).

To recount: Within the positivist paradigm, the notion that research is value-neutral is important. Yet, Namenwirth (cited in Lather, 1986: 257) suggests that: "Scientists firmly believe that as long as they are not *conscious* of any bias or political agenda, they are neutral and objective, when in fact they are only unconscious." This reiterates Weber's views on action as being motivated on a conscious or unconscious level.

Cochran, Marshall, Garcia-Downing, Kendall, Cook, McCubbin and Gover's (2008: 24) comments are also applicable. The authors argue that:

> "Epistemology is the understanding of knowledge that one adopts and the philosophy with which research is approached. This issue cannot be disentangled from history or from the social position one holds within society because of that history. Knowledge reflects the values and interests of those who generate it, and it is these values that then determine the methods that are used and the conclusions that are drawn. These values and worldviews can lead majority cultures to disregard knowledge that is gained through another set of values and worldviews."

This explains why much of the existing body of knowledge not only conceals and omits children or childhood, it also assigns values based on a dominant adultist perspectives. Therefore, 'communities of practice', which include researchers, academics, policy-makers, research funders and users of the knowledge are all veritable actors in research agenda settings, and in the research process itself. Hence, research, knowledge and the underlying assumptions are not necessarily neutral, objective or apolitical. It is constructed,

reconstructed or deconstructed within, or by the communities of practice (Prout and James (1990) cited in Grover, 2004). This is true of all types of social research, including studies on childhood, children and child mobility and transport.

Hesse (cited in Lather, 1986: 257) examines this demise of neutral research and concludes:

> "The attempt to produce value-neutral social science is increasingly being abandoned as at best unrealizable and at worst self-deceptive and is being replaced by social sciences based on explicit ideologies."

Consequently, this leaves 'some' social scientists in a 'tenuous' predicament with regard to paradigmatic positioning. Gage's (cited in Guba and Lincoln, 1994: 116) notion 'paradigm war', perhaps captures some of this tension and competition social scientists may encounter within this sector. Dockett and Perry (2007: 47) explain:

> "Within many research arenas, there is growing recognition that children's lives are complex and multi-faceted, and may be quite different from the childhood lives remembered by adults. Moving away from the positivist approach of categorizing all children according to stages and developmental expectations, there is an increasing trend to recognize the 'historical and cultural influences that ensure that every child has an individual and unique experience of his or her childhood' (Greene and Hogan, 2005: xi). Accompanying this trend is the belief that as educators, researchers and adults, we have much to learn about children and children's experiences, from children. This belief assumes that children 'both construct their worlds and are constructed by their worlds' (Kincheloe, 2004: xii), as they engage in daily practices."

Therefore, the way in which a researcher perceives and positions themselves in relation to children influences the entire research process including the interpretation of the data and the derived assumptions (Qvortrup, 1990). This too implies that the manner in which adults as research participants perceive children will "contribute to the shape of data interpretations formulated by adults about children" (Grover, 2004: 82). Punch (2002) explains that the ways in which adults perceive children and their status in society will also shape ways of listening, talking to and understanding children (see Corsaro, 2005 and Komulainen, 2007). Therefore, as suggested earlier, the multiple identities and ideologies researchers inhabit influence the conceptualisation and problematisation of a research problem. This means that the institutionalised forms of socialisation and its complex set of adult-child power relations are reproduced within the research process.

Consequentially, adults can organize themselves more hierarchically and on a larger scale than children and can therefore exercise considerable power and domination, though

consciously or unconsciously motivated actions, even within the research process. Their occupation of certain culturally defined roles and different types of power is an effective combination enabling them to exert authority. Strasser (1980: 111) explains that "power appears in everyday life in different guises: as psychological constraint and social domination as well as physical force and communicative manipulation." This reinforces Kellett's (2010: 17) assertion that this produces a power dynamic and in relation to the creation of knowledge, "renders children doubly disempowered". Consequently, Spyrou (2011: 18) not only asserts that power mediates all research production but emphasises the validity and cogency in researcher self-reflexivity, and examination of inter-subjective influence in the generation of knowledge, about or on children's lives.

However, these issues are not isolated to childhood studies or child mobility studies. These are concerns all researchers have to take cognizance of. Aldred (2008: 887-888) aptly sums up these dilemmas researchers may find themselves in, and this includes those of us interested in child mobility or childhood studies. Like Syprou, Whitelegg and others, the author also suggests reflexivity in research ethics and positioning as a researcher:

> "While the 'research relationship' often appears in the singular, today's researchers frequently face a number of highly mediated and perhaps competing research relationships within an increasingly commodified and contractual research environment. These relationships include their position within their own employing organization, their relationships with organizations employing their interviewees or of which their interviewees are members (from campaign groups to commercial organizations), their relationships with broader publics who may have an interest in their research, and relationships with ideals which may (or may not) be embodied in the objects or subjects of research. Such complex, conflicted relationships may be elided by easy talk about 'stakeholders' and 'users' that portrays external benefits from research as enhancing its value. While researchers should be accountable to others, such assumptions silence power imbalances and competing interests: what happens when benefits to some 'stakeholders' harm others?…Social researchers need a critical reformulation of research ethics to take account of the increasingly corporatized and bureaucratic contexts within which we work, including our workplaces and our research 'objects'."

Constructive engagement and critical thinking, sociological imagination depends on the willingness to challenge ones' own biases. It means reflecting on habituation and being open to other modes of reason and evidence. Therefore, social science research about, on, or with, children also requires as Syprou (2011) notes, a level of self-reflexivity. On the issue of social research and knowledge production in childhood studies, Knutsson (1997:10) notes that:

"…The special technical expertise and methodological competence provided by the knowledge community are valued and are in demand, but more exploratory and philosophical questions tend to be dismissed as unpractical. This can be a very unpractical mistake. To devote part of our analytical energy to some of the fundamental factors which may condition our mind-sets, influence what we see and colour the glasses we all carry, knowingly or not, is therefore a very practical proposition. Indeed, we need not fear asking fundamental questions about what we are doing and about the nature of the perceptions and assumptions in which our strategies and our actions are built. We must fear not doing so, in the final analysis, that is a sure recipe for ending up – in the words of Bertrand Russell – being brilliantly wrong"

However, there has been a global shift, albeit a gradual one, to reconceptualising and theorising on and about children and childhood, within the discipline of sociology (Alanen, 1992; and James and Prout, 1999). These 'new' developments also stem from the political dominance and significance of the global and national child rights instruments and movements.

The 'alternative' or 'evolving' approach is much more diverse and contentious, in some quarters because it requires a shift in thinking about children, childhood, interactions with children and child participation. This is not to say that it is the 'Band-Aid' to the epistemological, ontological, ethical or methodological limitations characteristic in traditional models of children and childhood. Within sociological theorising, in particular, it is an attempt to engage with perspectives and paradigms already applied in other, more established social science fields. As this sub-section will illustrate proponents of this new paradigm(s) also challenge some of their own epistemic and paradigmatic stances.

In effect, the new social studies on childhood contests adult, paternal, essentialist, and traditional perspectives of children and childhood. As demonstrated in the introductory chapter, some critics argue that while children have some characteristics in common, they do differ in numerous ways. This debunks the assumptions that children are a homogenous unit and childhood is universal. Instead, proponents propose that historically, socially and culturally, perceptions and construction of childhood and children vary (Woodhead and Montgomery, 2003). Therefore, temporal, cultural, historical, political, economic, and social differentials need to be taken into account when examining life experiences and situations children are exposed to globally. Differences within and between / among groups of children exist; and factors including age, gender, race, social class, economic status or geography mediate in their life chances, livelihoods and survival (Alanen, 1998; James and Prout, 1999;

Woodhead and Montgomery, 2003, and du Bois-Reymond, 2005). Children then are exposed to the same social forces as adults and like adults, children experience this in different ways and to varying degrees (Qvortrup, 1994).

This paradigm shift also recognises children's agentic potential and autonomy. This, Barker and Weller (2003: 35) contend: "has also led to new ways of engaging with children, characterised by mutuality and 'negotiation not imposition'" Qvortrup (1994: 4) suggests this means interacting with children as "'human beings' rather than 'human becomings'". In other words, there is recognition of the child as a, "person, a status, a course of action, a set of needs, rights and differences - in sum, as a social actor" (James, Jenks, and Prout, 1998: 207). This translates into recognising children's social agency and active participation in all spheres of everyday life and acknowledging the universality of child rights. It includes children's engagement in the research process and the civic and political landscape, with the latter relating to the social construction of the concept 'citizen' (Drakeford, Scourfield and Holland, 2009 and Moss, 2011). Moss (2011) suggests this requires reconceptualising children's engagement and participation outside formal contexts and institutions. Clearly, this is a considerable departure from the normative attitudes and taken-for granted assumptions about children and childhood conveyed by traditional, gerontocratic, patriarchal and essentialist perspectives.

Consequently, proponents working under the rubric 'Sociology of Childhood' propose a range of theoretical positions and methodological paradigms. Some suggest the epistemological framework adopted for women parallels the social position children find themselves in. Balen, Blyth, Calabretto, Fraser, Horrocks, and Manby (2006: 31-32) suggest that to acknowledge children as 'knowing subjects' means that:

> "...children are *epistemologically privileged* in that they are better placed than adults to produce 'situated' knowledges that prioritize the importance of their everyday experiences... emphasizing the notion of a 'children's standpoint' is a step towards generating knowledge that is rooted in the 'actuality' of children's lives"

In terms of the concept, 'feminist standpoint' Sprague and Kobrynowicz (2006: 38) explain:

> "The epistemological advantage of women is that a sexist society puts them in contradictory social locations, constructing them as both subject and object. They have an 'outsider within' advantage and can play on the friction created by their gap between their experience and conceptual frameworks that are available to make sense of it."

In reflecting on this progression, authors such as James, Jenks and Prout (1998: 30-31) introduce some concerns; namely, the built-in and contradictory assumption that childhood is universal. The authors argue that in the feminist standpoint epistemology, while there is an underlying assumption that all women as a group constitute a minority status group, this does not account for the different life experiences and struggles. An example is the differences between the white middle class women and their black working class counterparts. Clearly, such assumptions detract from the ideas purported in the new social studies of childhood.

Alanen (1992: 106-109 and Alanen cited in Qvortrup, 1994) also questions whether this 'feminist standpoint' implies a separate but analogous development, when accounting for the social positioning of children as social agents:

> "Extending this logic from women to children...is to ask similar questions in the case of children: What do children know? Is there a children's standpoint for sociology to adopt? Would such a standpoint be essential for a sociology of childhood?'

The author raises a series of questions about the discourses of 'voices' and problems of knowledge. This includes questions of how children's knowledge of their social conditions and their society fits into the dominant research paradigm ideas about knowledge creation or generation and participant / knower knowledge.

This reassessment and contestation of normative notions of childhood is indicative of a renegotiation of childhood, adult-child relationships and child-child interactions (Brembeck, Johansson, Torell, and Falkström, 1998). Corsaro (2005:6) also explains that the emergence of the 'new' paradigm within sociology coincides with the rise of constructivist and interpretive theoretical and methodological perspectives, within the discipline. The author (2005:18-19) introduces the terminology 'interpretive reproduction' to describe these paradigmatic shifts. This argument can be extended to draw on positivism-postpositivism debates. Lather (1986: 259, see Krauss, 2005) argues that postpositivism: "allows a search for different possibilities of making sense of human life, for other ways of knowing which do justice to the complexity, tenuity, and indeterminacy of most human experience". These concepts and arguments foreground innovative and creative characteristics of children's everyday interactions and their active participation in society.

However, this paradigm is not without its challenges and limitations. The debates to follow and the practice of a child's right to be heard, to express their views and for their views to be

give due weight, and to participate in the private and public spheres must also be examined, within the context of the emergence and universality of rights discourses. For example, Articles 12 and 13 of the UNCRC and Articles 7 to 9 of the ACRWC outline all children's rights to participate and to express their opinions and views.

Yet, as Kaime (2008) notes, in Africa there exists a paradoxical relationship among these legal obligations, cultural practices and paternal attitudes. The latter reinforces and perpetuates adult concerns and dominance. Even in culturally and socially diverse societies, the hierarchical adult-child relationships continue to produce power and status disparities (Moses, 2008: 331). Children are conceptualised within a dependency framework and as passive members of their societies. Consequently, international discourses and legal instruments do not improve children's participation in society, or give value to their voices.

An-an'im (1994: 65, also cited in Harris-Short, 2003:133) suggests that states elites become signatories to these Conventions out of political expediency:

> "Delegates are usually concerned with negotiating the official positions of their governments into 'expedient ambiguity' than with achieving conceptual clarity on the basis of the realistic beliefs, attitudes and practices of their national constituencies"

The author (1994) suggests that in obliging states to a westernised norm of human rights, they create implementation, consensus and communication impasses at grass-root levels. This western hegemony of human rights moreover operates within a system that disadvantages some states and societies. This raises questions about consensus building and collaborative policy dialogues between / among states. An-an'im (1994: 65) explains:

> "In contrast, delegates from the South not only lacked that sense of familiarity, authenticity and support at home, but may also have had no alternative positions to present since their national constituencies did not have the chance to articulate different proposals out of their indigenous experiences and in response to the realities of their own contexts"

Returning to the study at hand, these arguments suggest that in the South African context, with its social and cultural diversity, there may be implementation challenges too. In some communities and institutions, parents and adults may find the universal tenets embodied in child rights discourse and their own cultural and traditional practices diametrically opposed, or radically different (Moses, 2008). Kaime (2005: 231) explains that within African traditional societies, the adult-child relation and interactions are characterised by filial respect

and reinforced "by the ethic of domination". While children are recognised as valuable members of society in need of special care and protection, they are "are normally considered to be deficient in their decision-making capabilities" (Chirwa cited in Kaime, 2005: 231).

Similarly, Greene and Hill (2008) explain that the Kaluli people in Papua New Guinea "assume that babies 'have no understanding' and do not address them or treat them as communicative partners". Thus, notions about age or childhood, like all other master statuses are subject to cultural and societal forces; and influence the nature and extent of communication and interactions between / among children and adults, and amongst children too. To some extent, this may explain the resistance to transform traditional, cultural and social practices, resulting in inconsistent implementation of universal human and child rights. This devalues children's voices and participation in societies. The next chapter investigates some of the policy and policy-making intricacies, and the positioning of children's voices and participation.

However, in the production of knowledge, there are evolving issues too. Gallacher and Gallagher (2008) note that qualitative studies on children are increasingly characterised and dominated by participatory methods and methodologies, because it gives due weight to children's agency and perspectives. Yet, some proponents (for example, Komulainen, 2007, Gallacher and Gallagher, 2008; Gallagher, 2008) argue that there are a number of epistemological, ontological and ethical implications with theorising and social research of this kind. Lather suggests that 'emancipatory knowledge', for example, is the cornerstone of participatory research, in that it aims to empower the oppressed to understand their life circumstances and change their situation. Yet, children are not necessarily able to change their realities nor its depiction.

Therefore, the question about how are 'participation, empowerment and agency' incorporated. Komulainen (2007: 26) questions whether:

> "…'listening to children' in social research is an empowering or a rhetorical device. Is it simply one that attempts to furnish young children with a western value of competence, while at the same time, paradoxically, purporting to undermine hegemonic notions of a 'skill'? For Prout (2000), the observation that children can exercise agency should be a point of analytical embarkation and not a terminus. In other words, merely replacing one essentialist argument (that children are incompetent) with another (that they are competent) appears unsatisfactory. It

is possible that children can be, at the same time, vulnerable and competent; however, their positioning in this respect tends to be in the hands of adults."

Gallacher and Gallagher (2008), however argue that the development of a range of participatory techniques in itself can perpetuate children's subordinate positioning in research. The authors (2008: 503) suggest that:

"This implies that the children's involvement in their research was dependent upon these adult devised techniques…As such, we cannot help but consider the impetus towards 'empowerment' in 'participatory' childhood research somewhat ironic. The very notion of 'empowerment' implies that, without aid and encouragement from adult-designed 'participatory methods', children cannot fully exercise their 'agency' in research encounters. In this way, advocates of 'participatory methods' risk perpetuating the very model that they purport to oppose."

While children construct and manage, participation in their own social world during peer group interaction, how they "manage participation in adult-led discourses of various kinds" remains debatable according to Hutchby (2005: 66-67). The author describes such interactions as 'talk' in institutional settings, that is, contexts such as school classrooms, medical settings, social services and the family. This links to earlier points where Moss (2011) suggests that a child's engagement and participation needs to be understood outside formal levels and institutions.

Arguably, this influences the methods and methodologies a researcher adopts, including in child mobility studies. Barker and Weller (2003: 35-36) reflect on:

"The challenge for researchers is to develop research strategies that are 'fair and respectful' to children as the subjects, rather than objects of the research…Many children find traditional methods such as questionnaire surveys either intimidating (since they require a high degree of literacy), inappropriate (since they are often devoid from any context) or boring (since they are no 'fun')...New 'methodologies of representation' have been developed to enable children to communicate through, for example, drawing, photography, stories or song."

Hence, Greene and Hill (2008) propose that the selection of research method be in accordance with a child's level of understanding, knowledge, interests and location.

The dominance of the qualitative paradigm is problematic on another level. It produces epistemic tensions in the positivistic-humanistic epistemologies and quantitative-qualitative approaches. This leads to positivism and quantitative approaches being disregarded, or frowned on. The justification for this attitude lies in the manner in which children are treated and positioned within studies of this kind.

This paradigmatic shift represents an important approach to describing and understanding children's life situations and experience, despite all the apertures. Such an approach remains critical to producing and constructing good quality research; and richer knowledge and understandings about children, particularly for policy-driven initiatives. For instance, de Boer (1986) highlights the lack of a humanistic, or interpretivist approach to understanding transport's impact on social life and social change in societies. This necessitates a shift from research on children, to research with or about children in child mobility studies (Barker and Weller, 2003 and Kellet, 2010). This means an adoption of more interpretivist, constructivist or transformative epistemologies.

However, this does not entail a complete rejection of research conceptualised within a positivist frame. While this current study leans more towards ideas espoused by proponents of pragmatism, ideas espoused by Sociology of Childhood proponents, such as Saporiti and Qvortrup have relevance. These authors' ideas about what constitutes child-centred methodologies are important and does not only relate to primary research, because it is not the only way in which data on children can effectively be produced. These arguments reiterate earlier assertions that experts and decision-makers in the transport sector should be asking about the kinds of knowledge, perspectives and methodologies the sociological purview can facilitate. Thus, sociology and more especially the 'Sociology of Childhood' presents a range of possible theoretical and methodological approaches for transport practitioners to consider.

Data about children in public statistics generally focuses on the production of children and vital statistics; expenses incurred on behalf of children; and system efficiencies, such as educational attainment or throughput. Usually, the family, the household or the programme is the unit of observation or analysis (Boyden and Levinson, 2000 and Ben-Arieh and Goerge, 2001). This includes the reporting of, or on, children in national statistics (Qvortrup, 1990). This empirical marginality and invisibility fuels knowledge gaps and generates a passive, univocal and constrained view of children.

Qvortrup (1994: 7) explains:

> "The statistical treatment of children as well as their representation in other accounts from political bodies reflect the position children generally hold in both society and adult imagery - namely that of dependents. Indeed, dependent is an ingrained category...and one may therefore

suggest sorts of a 'common understanding' between those individualizing sciences that indicate children to be 'not-yet'- humans and those authorities which for reason of planning and economy subsume children under more handy and convenient categories."

Yet, proponents of the Sociology of Childhood, such as Saporiti (1985) Qvortrup (1990) and Corsaro (2005) support the idea of the child as the unit of observation and analysis within quantitative studies. Proponents of this view argue for the utilisation of official statistics, large-scale surveys, other empirical research and administrative data to understand children's social conditions and everyday life (see Hernandez and Charney, 1998 and Rama, Naidoo, Shikumo, Asiimwe, Mothobi, Ramseook, Boyce, Richter, and Bhana, 2007). Rather, the adoption of child-centred methodologies in data collection and analysis can counter the traditional ideologies and social inequalities characterising macro-level research methods.

For example, Saporiti (1985) argues for the use of children, or the child and childhood as a unit of observation by re-examining and tabulating statistics from the United Kingdom and Italy on children, their families and life situations. The author illustrates that in reconfiguring the data, childhood can be constructed beyond the notions of it, as a single and universal phenomenon, to recognise that childhoods vary. Further, both primary and secondary sources are of equal importance, so cognisance must be taken of the limitations, weaknesses and qualities of the different data sources. Saporiti (1985) suggests the use of children, or the child and childhood as a unit of observation by re-examining and tabulating statistics, particularly national or official statistics.

Hakim (1982 cited in Smith, 2008: 4) explains that:

"…[S]econdary data analysis is any further analysis of an existing dataset which presents interpretations, conclusion or knowledge additional to, or different from, those produced in the first report on the inquiry as a whole and its main results"

While, Vartanian (2011: 17) argues that:

"Secondary data may subvert the research process by "driving the question," or only looking at questions that can be answered by the available data. Researchers need to keep in mind that this sort of approach may be appropriate for doing exploratory work and for developing hypotheses, but not for testing hypotheses."

Importantly, Hofferth (2005) notes that if data is used in an exploratory manner the same data should not be used to test the established hypothesis; rather different data should be sought.

Therefore, this study articulates patterns and ideas; and explores existing relationships between and among the various factors, rather than testing or confirming a hypothesis.

Anderson, Prause and Silver (2011: 5) also explain that:

> "SD also introduces multi-disciplinary perspectives...which helps to avoid tunnel vision that is a risk within any specialization. For example, both economists and developmental psychologists use the National Longitudinal Surveys (NLS) to study the interchange between children's development, labor force economics, and a host of family circumstances."

While all data has imperfections, there are contested views on the merit of utilising secondary data. For example, Anderson, Prause and Silver (2011: 58) note: "Another myth about using SD [*secondary data*] is that it is inferior to the alternative of collecting one's own data." Hofferth (2005) highlights some of the key reasons for this bias. This includes, amongst others: lack of familiarity with the data; complexity of the data; data collection errors and no control over data quality; absence of key variables; fit between research question and data set; measurement; data mining; identifying the important issues; and the cost of learning a new data set.

Yet, there are some advantages or potential associated with this type of research. The use of secondary data in research offers the possibility of re-analysing previous findings. It utilises the same basic procedures as primary data. Further, it provides a cost-effective and time saving approach to gaining a more comprehensive understanding of specific phenomena. Secondary data analysis can be a useful approach to designing subsequent primary research, and can provide valuable baseline findings for further and future comparative purposes. Secondary data analysis can form the basis and rationale for conducting primary research using child-centred epistemologies and methodologies. This re-emphasises the relevance of mixed method designs and the pragmatic paradigm (and the need for such discussions in chapter two).

4.4.1 'New' avenues for further and future research

The United Nations Committee on the Rights of the Child's response to South Africa's Initial Country Report shows the needs of both qualitative and quantitative approaches to data collection as means of monitoring the rights, well-being and livelihoods of children in the country (Committee on the Rights of the Child, 2000).

"The Committee is concerned that the current data collection mechanism is insufficient to afford the systematic and comprehensive collection of disaggregated quantitative and qualitative data for all areas covered by the Convention in relation to all groups of children in order to monitor and evaluate progress achieved and assess the impact of policies adopted with respect to children"

The Committee proposed that:

"…the system of data collection be reviewed with a view to incorporating all the areas covered by the Convention. Such a system should cover all children up to the age of 18 years, with specific emphasis on those who are particularly vulnerable, including girls; children with disabilities; child labourers; children living in remote areas, including those in Eastern Cape, KwaZulu-Natal and the Northern Province as well as other disadvantaged Black communities; children belonging to the Khoi-Khoi and San communities; children working and/or living on the streets; children living in institutions; children of economically disadvantaged families; and refugee children."

This implies that the project on children's mobility, transport and time use must not be seen in a narrow manner. Within the child rights framework there is an increasing interest in producing and utilising research evidence in policy development and for practice interventions. Harper, Jones and Tincati (2010: 5) write that: "Data sources and data interpretation in a particular political context, along with disciplinary approaches play a major role in shaping policy outcomes." This raises questions about the role of science or social science knowledge in informing and guiding policy development and practice interventions. These are some issues discussed in the next chapter.

However, this sub-section suggests that the thematic straitjackets 'imposed' by academics and professionals do not necessarily produce the knowledge to reflect diverse childhoods and children's everyday realities. As indicated in the above citation, some of the issues being raised have direct transport and mobility implications. However, transport and mobility is embedded in every action and activity of everyday life. What are some of the thematic areas that child mobility and transport studies can include, particularly in South Africa?

- Children's supply of household work and daily household survival strategies

The growing interest in analysing and theorising on and about children's supply of household labour stems from an interest in, amongst others, the acquisition of gender roles, mother's paid work outside the home and changing understandings of childhood, child labour and work (Goodnow, 1988; and Bonke, 1999). Noticeably, children do not only demand household work, they also supply household work within the family, and the extent to which girls and boys engage in this type of work differs (Bonke, 1999; Schildkrout, 2002; Porter,

2004 and Rama and Richter, 2007). Children's supply of household work can also influence their future outcomes.

Francavilla and Lyon (2003) found that a large proportion of children, particularly in rural areas spend some time in each week on household production activities. This includes activities such as collecting firewood, fetching water, food preparation and childcare. These activities constitute a major time burden and can affect regular attendance at school and future employment prospects. A recent study in South Africa established that some children engaged in household work before they leave for school, and on arriving at school late were turned away (The Nelson Mandela Foundation Report research by the HSRC and the Education Policy Consortium, 2005).

Rama and Richter's (2007) re-analysis of the 2000 South African Time use Survey shows more girls than boys spent time on the collection of water, and they spent on average 55 minutes versus the 49 minutes spent by boys on this activity. The total time spent on the collection of water ranges from 10 minutes to 270 minutes, and as might be expected, a significantly higher proportion of the children living in rural areas collect water. Similarly, girls spent on average just over one and a half hours on the collection of fuel, firewood or dung compared to just over an hour spent by boys. The data shows that older children (15 to 17 years) spent on average more time (103 minutes) on the collection of fuel sources than children 10 to 14 years old did. It is children in rural areas who are most affected by such activities, and girls in particular.

Interestingly, the 2010 Survey of Time Use (Statistics South Africa, 2013) shows that despite the developmental achievements of the country, there are still householders collecting water and fuel sources for daily consumption. The latest results show that girls in the age range 10 to 17 years spent on average 120 minutes, compared to 72 minutes spent by boys on household chores that include fetching water and fuel sources. The study generally found household work and household-related transport burdens, such as water, wood, dung and fuel collection fall disproportionately on women and young girls. In 65 per cent of households this was a general trend, regardless of geographic location, urban formal, urban informal, tribal and rural formal. These studies show that poor and inadequate basic services and infrastructure within or near children's homes and households remain some of the underlying causes of children's poverty; irregular / non-attendance at school; poor health status; and

burdensome and time-consuming household domestic work. Children and women continue to bear the burden of inequitable basic services and infrastructure; and the household labour supply is obligatory and not at the child or family's discretion.

Moreover, children's roles as transporters also limit the time and energy available to access and participate in education, recreational activities, health and social services. Porter and Blaufass (2004:10) found that in parts of rural Southern Ghana, head-loading impaired children's attendance at schools and influenced their health, children complained of headaches and tiredness. Teachers described how children sometimes carried head-loads, such as wood, rice or cassava of between 8 to 15 kg and their walking distances to local markets or grinders in the village varied. The children carry the goods either before or after school. Girls and boys were affected by such labour practices but that it was mainly girls who were most affected. This implies that for many children the school trip is coupled with vital household survival, income generating and livelihood activities, and highlighting the importance of analysing 'trip-chaining' activities and patterns.

Floro (1995: 1913) explains that a:

> "…significant aspect of economic life takes place in an area of production largely ignored in standard macroeconomic analysis, namely, the household production of non-marketed goods and services. In other words, household-produced goods and services are vital for social reproduction and human development".

A large amount of unpaid work also in the communities, ranging from transport provision for ill, dependent and vulnerable people, to the administration of schools and social organisations such as clubs (Fleming and Spellerberg, 1999).

Data from the 2000 and 2010 Time use Survey also show that children in the age range 10 to 17 years engaged in the physical care of children, including, washing, dressing, feeding; and in caring for the sick, disabled and elderly persons within their own households. For some of the children engaging in child-care or caring activities, this included the supervision of other children and adults needing; care and the accompanying of a household member to service centers. The 2010 data shows the mean time spent by children on non-System of National Accounts (SNA) activities was 95 minutes and on non-productive acties 1 322 minutes. However, women and girls spend more time on the non-SNA activities, which include household, care and community care activities. Yet, children's contribution to unpaid

household work is usually unrecognised, despite many families being dependent on this for the maintenance and up-keep of the household; and the well-being of younger, sick or elderly household members (Rama and Richter, 2007).

The 1999 Survey of Activities of Young People (SAYP) shows that:

"Nearly half (45% or 6, 04 million) of South African children aged between 5 and 17 years (inclusive) were engaged in one or another kind of work-related activities, when using low time-based cut-off points. When higher cut-off points used, 36% (4, 82 million) of such children were engaged in work. As many as 51% of children living in the deep rural areas, that are mainly in the apartheid-created former `homelands', were engaged in at least one form of work activity. Among children living in commercial farming areas, 35% were engaged in work activities. In informal urban areas the proportion of children involved in work decreased to 30% and informal urban areas to 19%" (Statistics South Africa, 2001: 1).

This illustrates that while the home-school context is normalised as the site of daily life, children's social circumstances and characteristics give rise to different experiences of childhood. In addition, physical terrain, high transport costs, safety concerns, geographic location of the educational facilities in relation to residences, seasonality, and the well-being or health status of members of the household, also influences the time spent on domestic activities and the travel time to school. Yet, access to education is linked to various rights instruments, for example the UNCRC and the MDGs. In South Africa, it is entrenched in the Constitution.

Consequently, these challenges children encounter and experience on a daily basis exclude and marginalise them, as well as limits and localises their experiences (Rama, 1999). It also infringes on their right to education and future socio-economic opportunities, all of which perpetuate, reify and exacerbate intergenerational cycles of poverty, and gendered dimensions of inequity. Importantly, in recognising children's daily lives extending beyond the home-school dyad, it follows that the notions of children and childhood need to be reconceptualised (Alanen, 1992).

- Children's supply of income for the daily household survival and livelihood

In some instances, in addition to children's supply of household work, children's engagement in paid labour also contributes to a higher level of household income. For example, SAYP provided some empirical evidence as to why children engage in economic activities

(Statistics South Africa, 2001). The data shows that 58.6 per cent of children feel a duty to help the family; 14.7 per cent to assist family with money; and 15.7 per cent do work for pocket money. Proportionately fewer children work to gain experience (2.4 per cent), or to earn money for their schooling (1.9 per cent).

Studies on children working in commercial and subsistence agriculture in South Africa also show that children work mainly before and after school hours, over week-ends and during school holidays, as well as during peak seasons (Streak, Dawes, Ewing, Levine, Rama and Alexander; 2007). Kondylis and Manacord's (2006: 1 and 24) study of rural Tanzania suggests home-school distances do influence children's participation in employment. The study aims to understand the low, school participation rates in rural areas, and preference for full time employment.

> "…a rise in distance to school pushes children to specialize into either full-time school or full-time work, hence lowering the probability that they will combine work with school…we find that higher distance to school leads a lower propensity to combine work with school, and to a higher propensity to devote to full-time work."

Levison (2000: 127-130) explains that children are seldom recognised as economic agents:

> "Work is a fundamental part of the domain of economics, whether we care about meeting basic needs or maximizing productivity or GDP; yet most work of children has been invisible to economists…Adults have defined work in ways that exclude many of children's activities, even those sharing many characteristics with 'real work.' Most of children's tasks have been banished to the private (female) side of the public/private dichotomy. Try as they might – and working children have organized to this end – children do not have the power to bring legitimacy to their work preferences."

Seldom are such issues considered in transport policy and planning. That is, the role of children as social and economic agents; maintaining the social organisation and networks; a social division of labour; and transporters for sustaining and contributing to the livelihoods, survival and income strategies in their households and communities. The 2010 Time use Data suggests that children in the 10 to 17 year age range have males spending higher mean times on SNA production (28 minutes) than females (18 minutes). This includes work in establishments and some forms of work not for establishments. This means that some children may be engaged in paid employment with implications beyond their mobility.

163

- Leisure and after school activities

Educational trip-making patterns additionally do not fully account for all children's trip purposes. Behrens (2004a and 2004b) shows that trips related to social and recreational activities were as important in children's daily travel. It is thus clear that child transport and mobility patterns, challenges and experiences need to be examined. Not all children have access to private or accompanied travel to access leisure and after school activities. Sohow or do they participate?

Pilling, Holloway and Turner (1998) found that in the United Kingdom policy initiatives seeking to encourage the use of public or non-motorised modes of travel usually focus on the journey to school or scholar transport, whilst ignoring young people's travel for leisure. The authors argue that several factors influence young people's choice of travel for leisure, and policy-makers often ignore such attributes. For example, young people in the Greater Manchester Area (about 91 per cent) reported that convenience was the most important attribute of the modes they chose for their trips. This was followed by cost and safety.

The authors propose three phases of developing mobility needs for school-going children, namely, children aged from around five to 10 years old, children 11 to 16 years old, young people in the age range over 16 years old and into their early twenties. Amongst older primary and secondary children, independent mobility enables them to use a range of travel modes to access schools, and travel further distances to get to school. Public transport therefore becomes a necessity. This, then, necessitates an examination of travel to work, training, further education, leisure and other services, especially times at which travel to such activities take place, the distances young people may possibly travel. Moreover, younger children's access to leisure, sport, and other services must be included in such an analysis.

How would geographic location influence the type of leisure and after school activities, children can participate in? Do children in rural areas have the same leisure and after school activities as children in urban areas? To what extent do class, gender, race and age mediate in children's abilities to participate?

For example, coupled with concepts such as poverty and time poverty is the idea of 'leisure poverty'. The latter refers to the lack of income to participate in normative leisure activities,

such as going to the movies (Macionis and Plummer: 2012: 435). Children's social and class situations influence their ability to participate in leisure. For example, Shildrick and MacDonald (2006: 131) argue that cultural and leisure activities intersect:

> "Once one starts to investigate the relationship between youth cultural experiences and 'race, class, social segregation and exclusion' (Bose´ 2003, p. 174) it becomes clear that not all young people are able to- or want to- access leisure experiences or create cultural identities in the same way.."

There is however a paucity of research on and about this aspect, particularly youth culture and leisure in South Africa, or Africa. The data from the 2010 Time use Survey suggests that children 10 to 17 years have localised leisure activities, such as watching television for a mean time of 114 minutes); listening to the radio for 67 minutes; and cultural activities 185 minutes. The data shows that girls spend on average less time on such activities than boys do. Does this suggest that children and young people are less interested in leisure, or are there are other aspects that mediate in this? This is important if we are to 'fully' understand and appreciate the lived realities of children and young people and not just their mobility and transport needs and experiences. This also raises issues of children's social connectedness and inclusion in society.

Weber (Weber edited by Roth and Wittich, 1978: 375) in a section on household disintegration presents a broad conceptualisation of 'education'. This can be transposed to examining the developmental stimuli in a child's life.

> "Moreover, the individual receives his entire education increasingly from outside his home and by means which are supplied by various enterprises: schools, bookstores, theatres, concert halls, clubs, meetings, etc. He can no longer regard the household as the hearer of those cultural values in whose service he places himself."

This reasserts the earlier citation from Stephens (1995: 12) that there is a failure to acknowledge the reality that some children live outside the "regulatory spheres of family and school".

- Access to health and other social services

The reduction of child mortality and the improvement of maternal health remain two of the key child-focused MDGs. Both represent and continue to be goals developing countries struggle to achieve. In recent years, a number of studies have investigated the link between the realisation of these goals and the ways in which transport and road infrastructure

constrains delivery of, and access to, health services, including young girl's access to reproductive health and contraceptives.

A recent World Bank report (Babinard and Roberts, 2006: 15-23) found that numerous factors act as barriers delaying access to maternal and neonatal care, namely transport costs, travel times and distance, access, risk perceptions and choice, this includes social and cultural norms and inadequate neonatal transport services. These factors influence the ease to reach in reaching a facility, the frequency of visits to clinics and hospitals, and the survival of mothers and children. The report also illustrates a number of interventions to reduce costs and improve access to care for mothers and children. For example, the motorcycle ambulances being operated in the Oliver Tambo District of South Africa, in both rural and urban communities form part of the Safe Motherhood Project. Clearly, the transport sector plays a vital role in the achieving of these goals, and more importantly in improving the future health outcomes of, and survival, for children and young people.

The above example emphasizes a number of pertinent connections. Firstly, the example illustrates and resonates with the point made in the introductory chapter that there remains a lack of awareness about the impacts and interactions between / among roads and infrastructure; and individual and community survival and livelihood. Secondly, it resonates with the arguments that improving children's access to basic services and infrastructure will improve children's access to, and outcomes for education, health and social services (Leipziger, Fay, Wodon and Yepes, 2003). At the State and government, level there needs to be greater inter-sectoral and interdepartmental collaborations and integration.

Thirdly, similar areas of concerns about barriers to access and mobility have been raised in reports investigating the connection between transport, mobility and social exclusion (highlighted in chapter one). Exclusionary processes or barriers to full participation and inclusion in society should be potential inclusions in policies and implementation processes. This further supports the argument that the complex and interrelated relationship between everyday activities, time use, mobility and social exclusion needs to be understood, if appropriate transport interventions for children and other social groups will be developed and implemented.

- Out of school children

Berry and Guthrie (2003) estimated that in 2000, over 1,2 million children of school going age in South Africa were not attending school, and that about 40 000 attend school on an irregular basis. This includes children working on farms, street children, children with disabilities and children who leave school early for reasons related to family circumstances, such as financial constraints and a high degree of mobility between urban and rural areas. The Department of Education's recent estimates for 2008 show that 96 per cent of children between the ages of 7 and 15 years were attending an education institution (Department of Basic Education, 2010). It noted that in the age range 16 to 18 years, there has been a progressive drop in attendance. Some of the cited reasons for this include: no money to pay school fees (26 per cent); illness (12.3 per cent); education is useless or uninteresting (12.2 per cent); pregnancy (6.4 per cent); family commitments such as child-care (4.8 per cent); working at home or having a job (8 per cent); school education institution is far away (2 per cent); and failed exams (7.2 per cent). How does this group of children access vital services, or potential employment opportunities? What mode of transport are they most likely to use? How do we accommodate this marginalised cohort empirically, socially and culturally?

- Time use patterns and behaviours

The above sections highlight the issue of methods and methodologies, that is, if we are to explore the realities of children's everyday life and mobility needs, how do we do this? In some of the cited examples, the time use survey is utilised. This emphasizes the point that some of the assumptions made in this dissertation are available within some of the national (or official) data. The time use surveys are thus just one tool that can be used to examine child everyday mobility, time use and the forms of social exclusion encountered.

Time use (budget) surveys then are important tools for developing economic indicators and time-based filters to enable a differentiation between non-economic and economic work (Flemming and Spellerberg, 1999; Ver Ploeg, Altonji, Bradburn, DaVanza, Nordhaus, and Samaniego, 2003 and Gershuny, and Sullivan, 2006). Yet, such studies seldom include adequate and relatable data on children of all ages (Flemming and Speller, 1999; and Ben-Arieh and Ofir, 2002).

Ben-Arieh and Ofir (2002) argue that the value of child-centred time use studies lies in the ability to gauge children's participation across different societies, and their visibility as contributors and recipients of social resources. For example, Larson and Verma (1999: 701-702) explain that children's time in education is an important capital resource.

> "The quantity of hours and years that a population of children spends in school provides an approximate measure of human capital production. Time devoted to schoolwork is transformed into marketable knowledge and skills."

Franke (2000) suggests this provides insight into a young person's future outcomes in education attainment, employability and financial self-sufficiency. Such data can also identify how out-of-school children may be utilising their time.

Time use characteristics or dynamics in this context have particular implications for children's mobility. A case in point, Copperman and Bhat's (2003: 16) found that children's activity and travel patterns differ from those of adults. Children's activities and time use were influenced by, amongst other factors, intra-household and inter-household interaction, that is, time spent at someone else's home and differed after school and over weekends. The authors argue for individual surveys on children's time use particularly: "…in the context of activity-based modelling and in understanding the determinants of participation in non-motorized travel and physical activity".

Hertkorn and Kracht (2006: 2) also remind us that in general:

> "It is not sufficient to describe travel behaviour only in categories like number of trips, average trip length, total travel budget and total distance travelled during the day. Trips have to be regarded as part of a activity-travel-pattern, because most trips, at least at weekdays, are related to activities that take place at different locations than the home location of the individual. Time use data and especially diary surveys are of major importance for the investigation of the interplay of time use and travel demand. The activity repertoire of a person determines which places are frequented. The scheduling and the duration of single activity blocks determine the departure times and the transport mode for trips. The sequencing indicates which relations are present between activity episodes."

However, examining immobility or 'inactivity' is equally important, particularly for children (Hubert, Armoogum, Axhausen, and Madre, 2008). What does this tell us? Why are children inactive? Does it point to socio-economic factors, safety concerns, child-care arrangements, transport infrastructure, service affordability, or availability? Do adults and children have comparable conceptions and experiences of inactivity or immobility?

Yet, we are reminded that there are methodological and technical distinctions between trip and activity based diaries (Hubert, Armoogum, Axhausen, and Madre, 2008). Travel time use surveys combine activity, time use, and travel demand models. Data is collected on transport and travel characteristics, such as details on levels of activity, reporting of short and infrequent trips; then the distinct focus is on the spatio-temporal dimensions (Kitamura, Fujii, and Pas, 1997; Harvey cited in Pendayal and Bhat, 2004; and Hertkorn, and Kracht, 2006). It is possible then to examine frequencies, durations and repetition rates of transport and travel-related activities, including information on household member activities, within and outside of the household (Doherty cited in Hertkorn, and Kracht, 2006).

Hubert, Armoogum, Axhausen, and Madre (2008: 651) examined six national travel and time use surveys from Belgium, France and Great Britain, and concluded that both approaches complement each other. Travel diaries usually focus on the travel related activities resulting in an overestimation of immobility, whereas time use surveys provided detailed information on all activities including travel-related activities.

> "This initial analysis has shown the usefulness of a parallel analysis of travel diary and time use surveys. It has also shown that TUSs can obtain relatively realistic trip rates…TUSs can be a very valuable data source for travel behaviour analysis."

Yet, the categorisations of activities in time use surveys can be problematic. Several activities, for example, cooking, making drinks, setting and serving tables and washing up are categorised as one code, rather than as separate activity codes. Such categorisations produce a general picture of contributions to household work and other activities,; and children's activities, such as babysitting, caring for pets, ironing, washing clothes, washing dishes and sweeping become invisible (Gager, Cooney and Call, 1999). Adults usually determine the grouping and ranking of activities however, children's views about their daily activities and its importance may differ.

Vogler, Morrow, and Woodhead (2009: page) elaborate on some other complexities:

> "Problems associated with the on-time diary are the need for literacy, prior instruction of participants, and the tendency of participants to exclude activities perceived as embarrassing. They also take up time and the onus is on research participants to complete their diaries. Very often, too, people 'multi-task', perform two or more activities simultaneously, and it can be difficult to capture this. Clearly, time diaries as a method on their own are not adequate to capture the complexities of children's time use."

The adoption of a child rights and child-centred approaches to studies on children and childhood studies encouragingly has resulted in a gradual shift away from the traditional approaches to theorising about children. The inclusion of approaches recognising children as social and economic agents has enabled researchers and policy-makers to consider children's social world beyond formally organised school and family life (Alanen, 1992; Boyden and Levison, 2000; and Levison, 2000). These arguments underscore the importance for a comprehensive and 'realistic' approach to understanding interrelationships between / among child mobility, access needs, daily lives and impediments to full participation in society.

Roets, Cardoen, Bouverne-De Bie and Roose (2013: 3 and 9) refer to the interpretive '*lifeworld orientation approach*', which places the focus on children's everyday life, action and interactional spaces, and the socio-cultural and political forces acting on the individual. Moreover, it raises questions about children and young people construction and defining of 'leisure time activities'

> "It is argued that taken-for-granted problem definitions tend to wield an alienating and colonising influence on people's everyday experiences. This frame of reference requires an exploration of people's everyday experiences and problem constructions, which allows us to uncover the field of tension between taken-for-granted, institutionalised problem constructions and everyday life experiences… the quality of interactions between children, and of adults among the children, is essential, and implies an intriguing search for interpreting what children deem desirable while spending time."

This highlights the varied and multifaceted range of socio-cultural issues the transport sector needs to incorporate. Interestingly, in current studies children's livelihood, survival and recreational mobility needs tend to be mentioned in passing, or excluded. Clearly, children as a target and user group are inadequately catered for, both empirically and politically.

4.5 Summary

This chapter was structured in two parts. The first part examined some of the conclusions and assumptions that are derived from the adoption of the preferred or privileged paradigms and epistemic orientations. While such approaches have relevancy, we must not be complacent. Un-reflected habituation can result in neglecting lived realities and as such, issues of human rights and children's rights. This also means that we have to reframe our approach to listening, talking, thinking and writing on, and about, children. Some of these issues were examined through the review of literature with adultist biases.

Krappmann, 2010 (501-502 and 512-513) reminds us that giving children a 'voice' and respecting their right to participate is also about giving due weight and consideration to their comments, criticisms and recommendations. The author states:

> "Obviously, the Convention asks for more than just for listening to the child. It requires taking account of the views the child, which means that the child and his or her expectations and interests, have to be included in the decisions affecting the child, or, to say it more general: in shared eff orts to shape the daily life with its minor and major issues. Participation is a very good term for that what results from expressing views, listening and giving due weight to the views, interests and goals of the child….By far the provisions of the Convention are not yet fully implemented. Among the factors impeding full implementation are traditional misconceptions of the child. The farther we look back into the past, the clearer we can observe how much progress the process of re-defining such attitudes and behavioural patterns has already made."

The second part of the chapter explored the development of emergent research paradigms and practices in research on, and about children and generated some areas for further and future research on, and about child mobility and transport needs. The intention is to illustrate the diversity and some realities of childhoods in the country. Children also need transportation and in some instances become modes of transport in transporting goods and providing services. Geographic location, age, gender and other biographical characteristics moreover mediate in children ability to access available public or private transport. In recognising children's lives extend beyond our conceptions and adult idealisation of home and school a further different yet nuanced picture of children's lives starts to emerge.

CHAPTER 5 : PRINCIPAL CLOSURE, POLICY FOCI AND SETTINGS

"As policy originates and is sustained by practices, and practices…involves people's values, emotions and sense of identity…In the new modernity good policy analysis requires greater inclusion of the voices and actions of a large variety of actors. This is a different way of describing active democratic participation." (Wagenaar and Cook in Hajer and Wagenaar, 2003: 171).

5.1 Structure and aim of the chapter

When we consider policy issues we also need to consider the different spheres in which (re)presentations of social groups are reified, reproduced and perpetuated. Rosenheim (cited by Skolnick, 1975: 37) argues that the conceptions of childhood influence policies and decisions concerning children. This means that some of the assumptions driving the positioning and discourses on children emanate from the taken-for-granted or tacit assumptions of the larger society.

The discussion in this chapter focuses attention on how the transport sector in South Africa might be striving to maintain the balance between its national obligations and the regional or international development goals at the cost of micro-level issues. In other words, there is a reluctance or failure to acknowledge how policies, particularly some public policies have micro-level impacts on the daily lives of citizens. The chapter begins with a broad discussion of scholarship on and about policy and policy-making. This is followed by an overview of the impact apartheid ideology on transport and transportation policy, interventions and services. The argument is that while some of these policies and laws have been reversed under the democratic process, structural barriers continue to challenge the ideals of a just society. This is followed by an overview of the policy landscape under post-apartheid in particular transport policy prioritisations. To what extent are children's rights and voices mainstreamed into policy formulations?

5.2 Scholarship and discourses on policy and policy making

Nested value-systems, epistemologies and ideologies influence how social groups are presented and represented in society; and the empirical assumptions that are derived from the normalised and habitual standpoints. Yet, Berger (1963: 31) (as with Mills, Bauman and others) reminds us that the role a sociologist plays and the perspectives we bring is equally

important. Should we accept the long-standing assumptions and views produced or reproduced in studies on children and child mobility; and embedded in policy discourses, lexical frames, interventions and prioritisations? How do communities of practitioners effectively engage with policy interest groups and policy-making processes? Brock and Harrison (2006: 1 and 2) state:

> "For research to influence policy – and hence livelihoods – both researchers and those who fund research need to better understand the complex and dynamic world of policy and policy processes…while social scientists – who are trained to describe policy processes in terms of politics and power – rarely lead projects or set the research agenda. Beyond this, there are several key characteristics of research processes that influence the likelihood that research findings will influence policy processes. Reflexive practices on the part of researchers – in which they reflect openly and explicitly about their own position, and the implications this has for what can and cannot be done with the findings of their research – enhance the chances of successful engagement with policy makers."

Some of these issues Weber develop in '*Economy and Society*' in his connection between Sociology of Domination and Sociology of Law. The implications are that even the construction of laws is inseparable from notions such as 'social action', 'domination', 'monopolization', 'legitimacy', 'authority' and 'closure' (Weber edited by Roth and Wittich, 1978: LXXXIII).

> "The chapter on political communities links the chapters on the more "universal" groups and the Sociology of Law with the Sociology of Domination; it describes the development of political community from rudimentary beginnings to complex differentiation."

Weber presents three types of legitimate domination or authority, in rational, traditional and charismatic grounds (Weber edited by Roth and Wittich, 1978: 2125). 'Rational grounds' has relevance to Weber's views on law.

> "Rational grounds - resting on a belief in the legality of enacted 'rules and the right of those elevated to authority under such rules to issue commands (legal authority)…In the case of legal authority, obedience is owed to the legally established impersonal order."

Legitimacy, acceptance and compliance of the norms and values thus are important, particularly those categorised as 'law'. This implies that a level of administration and bureaucracy exists to enforce compliance. Weber presents the notions of 'law' versus 'convention' under the section 'Legitimate Order'. Laws and conventions thus have the same motivations or interests but how they are embedded in a society is different. The 'law' is derived through a rationalistic desire to maintain and enforce compliance; the conventions

then reinforce the norms, values and conventions within a society or in a social group. The subtlety lies in *laws* being enforced whereas *conventions* are about compliance and group cohesion (Weber edited in Roth and Wittich, 1978: 33 and 34). Law then relates to statutory enactments, that is:

> "The legitimacy of an order may, however, be guaranteed also (or merely) by the expectation of specific external effects, that is, by interest situations. An order will be called *convention* so far as its validity is externally guaranteed by the probability that deviation from it within a given social group will result in a relatively general and practically significant reaction of disapproval; *law* if it is externally guaranteed by the probability that physical or psychological coercion will be applied by a *staff* of people in order to bring about compliance or avenge violation."

Yet, there is a distinction between private versus public law and how this is embedded and enacted in society. Weber (Weber edited in Roth and Wittich, 1978: 641) defines 'public law' as being linked to State or government in of administrative and bureaucratic actions:

> "Sociologically, one might define public law as the total body of those norms which regulate state-orientated action that is those activities, which serve the maintenance, development, and the direct pursuit of the objectives of the state (*Staatsanstalt*), objectives which must themselves be valid by virtue of enactment or consensus."

Weber later states the 'government', which is linked to aspects of administration is also bound by vested interests. Whose interests drive such considerations and constructions, economic, political or religion interests?

On the other hand, policy relates to how a government will address or act, using administrative and bureaucratic processes in relation to the law. Academics, practitioners, politicians and others also have varied ways in which to define, describe, classify and construct 'policy'. Thus, the concept 'policy' has no universally accepted definition. Usually, policy refers to the regulating aspect of politics, the legal-rational aspects. In part, some of the confusion and tension stems from categorisation, conceptualisation, operationalisation and teleological orientations of the notion 'policy'.

Kahn (cited in Zimmerman, 1979: 487) explains that policy is a general guide to action, with the aim of achieving specific goals, presenting guiding principles, and providing the elements for a strategic plan for all of governmental public activities. This suggests that 'policy' is usually synonymous with government, or the state. Similarly, Anderson's (1997) definition recognises the problem and action-orientated character of policy and the various interest

groups, particularly in government-related undertakings. The author (1997: 9) defines policy as: "a relatively stable, purposive course of action followed by an actor or set of actors in dealing with a problem, or matter of concern."

Similarly, policies are defined as whatever governments choose *not to do* (Dye cited in Howlett and Ramesh, 1995: 4; and Anderson, 1997). Umar and Kuye (2006: 808) explain:

> "This focuses not only on government action, but also inaction, given that it is only government that can *authoritatively* act on the whole society. If indeed the intention behind public policy is to ensure decisions (including the allocation or no allocation of resources) that can impact on the society, then, rightly as Dye argues, even government inaction can create that impact."

Dye's statement controverts assumptions that policymaking and political actions subscribe to and are compatible with the principles of social justice, moral foundations, or value choices. Hence, the assertion that policy, particularly government policy, is not necessarily a 'formal' guide to action, ergo inaction in itself can be viewed as a policy direction or action.

A policy may not necessarily accomplish the set of intended social, economic, political and developmental goals. Therefore, Smith (1973) explains that the taken-for granted assumption that once a policy has been formulated it will be implemented, and have the desired developmental impact on the lives of the target group(s), no longer holds true. This is important to understand and examine given that governments are multi-levelled and responsibilities diffused; thus rendering policy formulation to be a complex and dynamic process.

Policies also differ according to their purposes and consequences adding to this tension. Public policy remains one of government's main areas of concern, as the state usually controls a huge proportion of societal resources, so its policies affect everyone, albeit in different ways. Public policies can therefore be described as prospective and authoritative, in that they outline officially endorsed government actions and commitments. This definition also sheds light on hierarchical dimensions, implying that the policies are designed and authorised by legitimate public authorities (Colebatch, 1998). However, this also raises questions about whether all public policies have similar 'standing', functions, purposes, or outcomes.

What constitutes a 'public policy' as opposed to a 'social policy'? Colebatch (1998) argues that 'public policy' encompasses any policy taken by a government. It refers to government institutions dealing with the environment, taxes, defence, *transport*, or economics. The rationale for this categorisation being that these sectors *do* have social implications but the problems and their resolution may seldom be conceptualised as directly impacting on citizen welfares. Rather, the macro-economic and developmental impacts of the policies are emphasised.

Social policy is perceived as a subset of public policy, and is understood to have a direct social impact on the citizens of a society. A social policy therefore reflects the societal norms and values because it outlines how a government will address social problems and micro-level behavioural elements of a society. In this context, social policy remains a beneficial and redistributive measure in society. This covers the array of actions intended to address or redress, amongst other problems, housing, public health, education, criminal justice, social security, or social care. These are usually directed at specific social groups, such as children, the elderly, or people with disabilities. A social policy, then, is usually constructed to address basic needs, human rights, welfare, or the well-being of social groups, or individuals in society, particularly those deemed to be vulnerable, marginalised, disadvantaged, or socially excluded.

Yet, Titmuss (1974 cited in Leibfried and Mau, 2008) asserts that:

> "When we use the term 'social policy' we must not, therefore, automatically react by investing it with a halo of altruism, concern for others, concern about equality and so on. Nor must we unthinkingly conclude that because Britain - or any other country - has a social policy or has developed social services, that they actually operate in practice to further the ends of progressive redistribution, equality and social altruism. What is 'welfare' for some groups may be 'illfare' for others."

This reiterates the earlier cited assertions by Smith and Dye. More importantly, this distinction precipitates a lack of, or poor, integration and alignment between policies categorised as 'social' and 'public'. This also reinforces the earlier point about the lack of inter-sectoral alignment between transport and non-transport policies.

Therefore, policy is more than just about problem solving or action. *Some* of the definitional and conceptual arguments allude to theoretical models and teleological stances. It highlights

the fact that policy is a non-linear process, with varied levels of complexity and diversity. Thus, to be effective and coherent, the different elements of the policy must fit together in a consistent manner. This means that policy is also about process, design, networks and environment. These aspects are vital to a general understanding of how legislative and policy landscapes are shaped and are being shaped. More particularly, it is critical to acknowledge and understand these and other complexities if we are to examine children's marginalisation, or inclusion, in transport policies and legislation in South Africa.

Colebatch (1998: 13) proposes that questions should be raised about policy as a process, and not just as an outcome, consequence, or condition. Some writers suggest that an appropriate approach to understanding policy-related complexities would be to breakdown policymaking processes into discrete but related parts. In this regard, Anderson (1995: 39-40) developed a five-stage model of the processes, namely: *the problem identification and agenda setting, formulation, adoption, implementation,* and *evaluation*. Howlett and Ramesh (1995:12) argue that this model facilitates learning about the social construction of policy problems and objectives. This includes identifying and understanding the role of various actors across different cycles. It also implies that policymakers do not necessarily address problems in a linear manner.

Schneider and Sidney (2009) propose the use of the term 'policy design' in that it includes a text and set of observable practices. The authors (2009: 104-105) propose the following set of examinable policy dimensions, problem definition and goals; the distribution of benefits and burdens; target population or beneficiary; policy directives; agency incentives or disincentives; implementation plans; social construction of reality; rationale for the policy; and underlying assumptions about problems, people and institutions. Embedded in this formulation are the critical constructivist frames. Schneider and Sidney (2009: 105) assert:

> "Social construction refers to an underlying understanding of the social world that places meaning-making at the center. That is, humans' interpretations of the world produce social reality; shared understandings among people give rise to rules, norms, identities, concepts, and institutions. When people stop accepting, believing in, or taking for granted these constructions, the constructions begin to change; 'people consciously and unintentionally replicate and challenge institutionalized routines and prevailing assumptions'. The policy design approach directs scholars to examine who constructs policy issues, and how they do so, such that policy actors and the public accept particular understandings as 'real,' and how constructions of groups, problems and knowledge then manifest themselves and become institutionalized into policy designs, which subsequently reinforce and disseminate these constructions.

> Constructivist approaches to social inquiry, such as policy design theory, emphasize that human agency means that constructions, even strongly institutionalized ones, are inherently unstable and subject to change."

Vigar (2002) argues that no single model can explain a situation. The author explains that political, economic or social interests, stakeholder groups, institutional relations, the problematising of issues, solution and user group prioritisation are equally important. That is, the role or influence of power, monopolization, and ideology must not be underestimated. The author uses the transport policy framework for the United Kingdom as a case study to explain the shifts and factors catalysing or inhibiting policy directions. It includes how new policy agendas and discourses are opposed, or promoted. In short, policy is an institutional output, a form of institutional communication, and as such, interaction among institutional relations, structures and networks remain crucial to understanding its transformative character.

Max Weber's theory of domination and rationalisation has contributed to studies on organisational structures and social changes in society. Weber focused on the growing influence of bureaucratic organisation, legitimisation of rules, or order and monopolization of interest following capitalist expansion in modern societies. The 'rational action' inherent in mass bureaucratisation challenged traditional practices and values within society.

Therefore, the forms of domination, legal-rational, traditional and charismatic are important to understanding the accompanying social change such processes facilitated. Within a Weberian schema, this also suggests a rationalisation of social interactions; questioning how the class, status, or party groups organise; the actions they engage in; and the material interests of the different classes (Wright, 2002). Thus, policy development cannot be analysed beyond the broader bureaucratic rationalisation, culture and private-public participation.

Immergut (1998: 20 -21) draws on Weberian ideas to elaborate on the issue of power-share and monopolization of interests within political spheres and among the various actors:

> "Political institutions and government policies, for example, may facilitate the organization of interests by recognizing particular interest groups and/or delegating government functions to them (as discussed in the literatures on private interest government, interest group liberalism, and corporatism). More fundamentally, government actions may encourage (or discourage) the mobilization of interests by recognizing the legitimacy of particular claims or even by

providing these persons with the opportunity to voice their complaints…Not only may political institutions, political authorities, and political culture play a critical role in the definition, mobilization, and organization of interests, but the structure of political opportunities will shape the strategies of organized interests and their beliefs regarding the efficacy of different types of political action."

On the issues of associative relationships, Immergut (1998: 17) concludes that:

"In sum, the political demands that come to be expressed in politics are not an exact reflection of the preferences of individuals but rather deviate considerably from this potential 'raw material' of politics. Various institutional factors influence the political processes that adjudicate among conflicting interests and may hence privilege some interests at the expense of others."

Therefore, the significance of examining multiple decision-makers across institutions and the multiple decisions they undertake and institutional relations (see Anderson, 1997; Howlett and Ramesh, 1995). This also lends itself to closure theory and the maintenance of interest and monopolization of power.

Consequently, Colebatch (1998) suggests that instead of asking 'who makes policy?' it should be 'who participates in the policy-making process?' In line with this thinking, Howlett and Ramesh (1995: 52) differentiate policy actors into five categories: elected officials, appointed officials, interest groups, research organisations and mass media. Therefore, different actors participate in the policy process either based on their authority, expertise or knowledge, position or status and / or power relations in the sub-system or system. Vigar (2002) proposes the use of the concept 'sociological institutionalism' as it presents a framework to examine the role power plays in policy implementation and the micro-politics of power situations.

Campbell (2002) suggests that a world culture paradigm also raises the issue of the diffusion of the dominance of Western cognitive and normative frameworks. In particular, it highlights the impact of homogenous, national political institutions and policymaking structures and institutions. The arguments by An-an'im (1994), Harris-Short (2003) or Kaime (2005) about the impact of the diffusion of Westernised human rights norms, values and attitudes aptly illustrates the tenets of this model. Campbell (2002) also suggests that examining how policymakers frame policies and make them politically acceptable is equally important. The author (2002: 27) introduces the concept 'frames' to explain that: "In order for their policy

programs to be adopted, political elites strategically craft frames and use them to legitimize their policies to the public and each other." This implies that:

> "…policy makers act strategically; they may use frames to conceal their true motives from others whom they are trying to persuade. However, it is often difficult empirically to determine when policy makers are expressing their true motives rather than framing their arguments in terms that they believe will conform with what others want to hear."

Also, embedded in these arguments is the social construction of target or user groups, or notions of 'agenda-setting'. Schneider and Ingram (1993) argue that in examining the issues relating to problem identification and agenda setting or prioritising includes understanding how target groups are identified for assistance. In the social construction of target groups, the authors (1993: 334) explain that through cultural characterisations or popular images, the behaviour of certain social groups can be portrayed in a negative or positive manner. As a result, different messages about different target groups are embedded in policy. In support of Schneider and Ingram's argument, Nicholson-Crotty and Nicholson-Crotty (2004: 240) also argue that social problems reflect social anxieties and perceptions about particular groups of people or social issues, rather than a reflection of the reality. Therefore, the societal and government perception about a social group will have an influence on public officials or political elite views on the social group; and in turn shaping the policy agenda and design.

In the context of this study, do transport systems enable all citizens' equal access to services, and participation in normative activities? To what extent do state and government policies and frameworks play a part in exclusionary processes (Hamilton, and Jenkins, 2000; Hodgson and Turner, 2003; Kenyon, Rafferty, and Lyons, 2003; Mackett, and Titheridge, 2004 and Cass, Shove, Urry, 2005)?

However, all these factors and arguments do not comprehensively elaborate on the policy environment, or the context in which policy occurs (Anderson, 1995). Further, Anderson (1995: 51) explains that a policy environment: "both limits and directs what policy-makers can effectively do." The concept 'environment' denotes geographic characteristics, demographic variables, spatial and locational elements, political culture, social structure and economic systems in a society. In combination with ideologies, historical contexts, culture, religion, institutional and political factors, all these factors can play a pivotal role in shaping policy content, orientation and outcome. This means that the situational, structural, and subjective conditions existing in and across a society cannot be ignored. It also suggests that

the policy-making process and policy environment are equally influenced by the nature of the social problem, social forces, social relations, and the social structure in a society.

For instance, the geo-spatial orientation will reflect the tensions and agreements between global, national, and local policy discourses, actors and institutions. This would relate to whether the policy, its priority and prioritised groups reflect national, provincial, or local government, international and regional interests, or not. It also determines the approach that will be adopted to address the perceived policy issues or social phenomena in society. A case in point is the questions posed about the possible tension between universal principles of social justice, humane governance and particular national circumstances (Weiss, 2000). The critique is that in adopting approaches to policy-making and implementation, this must be rooted in understanding the possibilities and challenges of the local situation, such as level of government ownership and commitment, rather than implementing the global blueprints for social, political, and economic reforms.

Santiso (2001) explains that increasingly the push for good governance in the developing world has become both an objective of, and a condition for, development assistance, especially, by international agencies such as the World Bank (WB) and the International Monetary Fund (IMF). Similarly, Singh (2003) argues that the imposition of such conditionality has the potential to undermine a country's ownership of the reform, and domestic democratic processes. This type of action has also prompted criticism that such initiatives continue to be externally driven, donor orientated, top-down approaches not promoting real policy changes and positive outcomes for poor and vulnerable communities and individuals in developing countries (Mhina, 2000; and Santiso, 2001).

The ideas and arguments advanced in the above sections also point to theorising about policy based on traditional policy models, and not just from the social construction perspective. The latter perspective stems from theorising about social and cultural knowledge constructions and its reproduction and institutionalisation across societies (Vigar, 2002; and Calhoun, Gertis, Moody, Pfaff, and Virk, 2007). The theory provides an understanding of how and why some groups or ideas are advantaged more than others can. In addition, how the selective construction, negotiation, and transformation of knowledge into policy can reinforce, or change a social, or user groups positioning in society. Moreover, conceptualising mobility and derivatives of it in terms of social construction, social stratification, and social conflict

perspectives fosters an understanding of how the distribution of transport resources such as infrastructure and capital can institutionalise and reproduce social inequalities in a society. In this instance, the policies can act as exclusionary processes. Consequently, the social construction theory remains a powerful tool for understanding public policy as it relates to powerless and marginalised groups in a society.

5.3 Apartheid ideology and policy

In the context of apartheid, the law and ideological standpoints converged so the role of the State, institutions and systems was to create exclusionary processes. The dominance of the white minority, then, was maintained through monopolistic action and pushed by the dynamic of interest power they were able to exert. Thus, principal and derivative forms of exclusion co-existed. Murphy's articulation of principal forms of closure can be extended to understand how a legal system was used to monopolise interests and subordinate some social groups. The discussions also highlight the relevancy of Parkin's notion of 'solidarism' and exclusion.

Prior to South Africa's first democratic elections in 1994, all State apparatuses and institutions played a crucial role in advancing a racially prejudiced ideology favouring white minority advancement and political and economic monopoly. The State appropriated the government machinery to establish institutional mechanisms to promote racial segregation and separate development (Johnstone, 1970). The legislations and policies were constructed to normalise structural superiority, interest and dominance across all sectors and aspects of daily life for white minorities yet reinforce and perpetuate a subordinate status of the Black[22] majorities.

This racial discrimination and spatial separation of the different races and their dispossession from their land has a long history in the form of policies such as the 1913 and 1936 Land Acts. Yet, it remains important to note that the electoral victory of the Nationalist Party (NP) in 1948 saw the intensification and consolidation of white political power and control. Policies such as the Group Areas Act of 1950, the Bantu Authorities Act of 1951 and the Promotion of Bantu Self-Government Act of 1959 sanctioned the spatial separation and physical movement of the majority of African people from areas the State demarcated

---

[22] Historically, the term 'Black' or 'non-White' is used to describe Apartheid established social differentiations of people categorised as African, Coloured, or Indian. These remain contentious and problematic. However, the case for its retention rests on its significance for monitoring and evaluating the pace of social change and equity across the country.

exclusively for White people. The government's abolition of African people's rights to freehold land tenure in the 'White' urban areas resulted in an escalation in forced removals, evictions and displacement of many Black families and their communities (Wilkinson, 1998). The majority of African people were forced to live in one of the ethnically engineered 'reserves or homelands' called Bantustans. The Bantu Homelands Citizenship Act of 1970 made it mandatory for all Africans to be a citizen of a Bantustans[23] (Lipton, 1972).

This spatial marginalisation is important to consider in terms of the structural and legislative barriers to transportation and transport. The irony is that despite the spatial and geographic marginalisation the South African economy, capital was principally dependent on 'cheap and surplus' labour power of African people, predominantly the men (Johnstone, 1970, and Lipton, 1972). Limited livelihood opportunities in the Bantustans also meant that most people were forced to sell their labour in 'white' South Africa. So, despite the allusion of independence, political autonomy and self-development of the Bantustans[24], its communities and governing authorities remained entirely dependent on 'white' South Africa for most of its financial resources, economic development and welfare (Lipton, 1972; Schlemmer and Webster, 1978; and Egerö, 1991). This contributed to the homelands high levels of unemployment, underdevelopment and growing inequalities in the homelands (Maasdorp, 1978; and Soussan, 1984). This situation is contrary to the theorisations about the role that transport and spatial location plays in capitalist and industrial expansion.

Pouliquen (2000) explains the implications of such socially and racially engineered structural inequalities, noting that the socio-political exclusion of people from access to infrastructure, particularly along ethnic, caste, or racial lines can be one of the worst forms of isolation and communal closure individuals and communities can suffer. In South Africa, this produced a socio-political, economic and cultural environment in which marginalisation, inequalities and the intergenerational poverty cycles are perpetuated and exacerbated (Burger, 2005). These growing geo-spatial distortions and fragmentations contributed to the marginalisation and deprivation of the African majority. The World Bank estimated that per capita spending on basic services and infrastructure in the white and urban enclaves were equivalent to the top

---

[23] This paved the way for the further re-categorisation of African people along ethnic or tribal lines, such as Xhosa, Zulu, Sotho, Tswana, or Sepedi. This period was also characterised by the promotion and institutionalisation of the policy of Separate Development.
[24] Up to ten homelands were created. The 'independent' homelands of Transkei, Bophuthatswana, Venda and Ciskei (TBVC states) and the 'self-governing territories' of Gazankulu, KwaNgwane, KwaNdebele, KwaZulu, Lebowa and Qwaqwa.

four to five countries in the world, and were in sharp contrast to public spending in the areas demarcated for non-Whites (cited in National Institute of Economic Policy and the Reconstruction and Development Office, 1996).

The lack, absence or poor quality of basic infrastructure and services, particularly, housing, roads, transportation, electricity, sanitation and water, health, education and social welfare services became, and to date remain some of the most defining characteristics of poverty and deprivation in the Bantustans, and the few established Black townships[25] and informal settlements in apartheid South Africa. Yet, women and children, particularly the African majority were most likely to suffer the consequences of inadequate living conditions, inadequate or no basic services, forced evictions, and displacement under apartheid. The Bantustans became the 'dumping ground' for people regarded to be inessential to the economic development of South Africa. This included children and their caregivers, mainly women, the unemployed, the elderly or people with disabilities. Women and children would have borne the brunt of social, physical, distance, time and economic costs of meeting some of the household basic services and infrastructural needs. This would include the daily collection and transportation of water, wood, paraffin, other sources of fuel, and sanitation and refuse (Porter and Phillips-Howard, 1997). In some instances, such tasks or household chores would have required that the women and children undertake several trips per day on foot, and would have included head loading. Yet, such burdensome gender and age differentiations and patterns persist today.

Price (1986) comments on how this spatial and racialised segregation even shaped access to public health including the cost of transport to visit health facilities. The author explains that:

> "The drive to enhance the political respectability and power of the bantustan rulers also helps to explain the structure of rural health services for Blacks. Each bantustan has its own department of health, complete with minister and associated bureaucracy. This is dysfunctional because the bantustans are not discrete geographical entities, and their pieces are interspersed with each other and with 'White' SA. The implications for health care are disastrous. The ten-fold duplication of the departments of health wastes money and scarce skilled personnel. The remaining resources are inefficiently used because the ethnic hospitals serve ethnically defined populations. The result is that often the services closest to people are not the services they use because they 'belong' to a different bantustan. They may have to travel much further to a

---

[25] While no homelands were planned for Indian and Coloured people, they too lived in racially demarcated urban townships, and were also subjected to discriminatory practices and policies (Lipton, 1972).

hospital of their own bantustan and ethnic group. Prohibitively expensive travel costs may prevent patients from receiving any care at all."

Under apartheid, the national, regional, local governments and Bantustans had their own public transport systems and general transportation policies (McCarthy and Swilling, 1984). According to Soko (2006: 353), the Bantustans made little or no attempt to develop transport systems and infrastructure, as they were financially dependent on South Africa. This system was problematic and the unequal allocation of resources meant that service delivery for the African majority was non-existent, or inadequate. The main function of the available transport infrastructure and networks in the homelands and in South Africa was to move the workers to employment centres (McCarthy and Swilling, 1985; Khosa, 1992, and Department of Transport, 1998). In the rural agricultural nodes, the aim was to provide market and sector-related access for white commercial farmers, while bypassing most other rural communities within the homelands (Porter and Phillips-Howard, 1997; and Department of Transport, 1998).

The impact of such fragmentation and racialised service delivery had a profound impact on the daily mobility and transport needs of people in the homelands and South Africa. McGrath (1978: 163) elaborates on the wider implications of separate and selective development and financial discrimination on transport and mobility needs for everyday activities:

"Commuting times to the place of work, leisure available, and the range of job choices open to individuals all vary significantly between race groups, and introduce further sources of distortions in welfare."

Transport, particularly public transport became highly politicised and an area of contestation (Khosa, 1992).

The Apartheid State transportation planners were acutely aware of the commuting challenges the apartheid policies generated, and the fragmentation and separation of powers posed. Their decision to support transport subsidisation and regulate the growing taxi industry was driven by economic, ideological and political, rather than humane concerns. A number of concerns prompted this State controlled action. Namely, the ongoing bus boycotts were negatively influencing local economies across the country, and the growth in the unregulated taxi industry impinged on State subsidies received by bus companies (Khosa, 1992). McCarthy and Swilling (1984: 385) note that during apartheid, the Department of Transport's

subsidisation of transportation of 'bona fide employees' began as early as 1957 (also in Ellison, 1992). There was also increased pressure from capital and business to reduce commuting distances and times of the Black workers (Khosa, 1992). The rapid growth of long-distance daily travel resulted in some workers and frontier commuters travelling between 50 to 70 kilometres or more, in inadequate transport to access employment centres (Soussan, 1984: 203; and McCarthy and Swilling, 1985: 383).

The Department of Transport, like the mining and agriculture sectors, also relied heavily on Bantustan labour for its infrastructure development and services in South Africa. The Bantustans served as the main site for the reproduction of labour and the provision of a reserve army of cheap labour for driving economic growth in 'white' South Africa (Zimmerman, 2000). Transport investment in infrastructural development was viewed as the key to economic development in the country. For instance, Johnstone (1970: 129) elaborates on this interrelationship, noting that in 1969 the Minister of Transport announced that thousands of Africans from the Bantustans were to be employed to work on the railways in South Africa. This resulted in the 'temporarily' relaxation of the influx control laws to ensure labour flow and speedy completion of the railway infrastructure.

In sum, transportation planning and development was designed to ensure the spatial and geographic marginalisation of the racial groups but more importantly the transport capital development and interventions were biased toward white, urban, capitalist needs and self-interest (Ellison, 1992; Department of Transport, 1998; and Nojekwa, 2009). As a result, the vast majority of African people did not have easy access and mobility to basic and critical services. User ease, meaning, time spent, cost and effort to reach or use a facility or service was the least of the transport sectors priorities. Furthermore, despite the apartheid government subsidisation of transport the public transport expenses would also have accounted for a large percentage of expenditure in these mainly poor-income households in the Bantustans, with the consequent bus transport boycotting to resist fare increases (Ellison, 1992). This marginalisation, using principal and communal forms of closure had severe consequences for people's daily interactions, activities, survival and livelihoods. Yet, the situation of the subordinate group did not garner much consideration.

5.4 Post-Apartheid policy shifts and prioritisations

During the transitional period of the early 1990s, one of the main areas of concern and debate was the repeal of apartheid State discriminatory policies, and the development of polices advocating for human rights for all, and the creation of a non-sexist and non-discriminating society. The African National Congress (ANC) took cognisance of the deeply entrenched racial and structural conditions of inequality across the country and unveiled the *Reconstruction and Development Programme* (RDP) as its election manifesto (African National Congress, 1994). The document outlined the ANC's vision for a five-year, large-scale infrastructure development programme in South Africa. The elimination of poverty, marginalisation, and inequalities generated by decades of apartheid was at the heart of the RDP developmental goals and targets. Six RDP priority goals were identified, including meeting basic needs, and building infrastructure incorporating transport infrastructure development.

After the first democratic election in 1994, the ANC-led government enacted the RDP base document as the *RDP White Paper* (RDP WP) (Republic of South Africa, 1994). It was expected that the RDP would lead to the realisation of the incumbent government's ambitious developmental priorities. In support of the RDP WP and its socio-political and economic developmental goals and targets, a wide range of White papers and strategy documents on energy, transport, water, sanitation and health were produced at national and provincial levels. The government also established an RDP Office in the Presidency in 1994. The Office was tasked with overseeing the service provision backlog and redressing inequities in "employment, land redistribution, improved access to housing, water, electricity, telecommunications, transport, a clean and healthy environment, nutrition, health care and social welfare" (Republic of South Africa, 1994). In 1994/5 the RDP office was allocated a budget of R2.5 billion, with a precipitous increase to R5 billion in 1995/6 (Reconstruction and Development Office, 1996). This financial allocation was in sharp contrast to the 2000 estimate by the Development Bank of Southern Africa, that over a five-year period between R47 billion and R53 billion would be required to eliminate the years of service provision backlog across the country (Wall, 2000).

By June 1996 the government adopted a strategy that was a significant departure from the Keynesian approach of the RDP. It was replaced by a neo-liberal, macro-

economic framework, *Growth, Employment and Redistribution: A Macroeconomic Strategy* (GEAR). Some critics argued that the policy shift was contrary to the spirit of the RDP, and the earlier ideology and economic vision of the ANC (Habib and Padayachee, 2000; Cheru, 2001; and Bond, 2005). However, Munslow and FitzGerald (cited in Pycroft, 1998: 153) give a number of reasons for the shift to GEAR. This included the failure of the RDP to deliver expected outputs, the institutional weakness of the RDP office, in particular its inability to effectively co-ordinate development activities, and its failure to collaborate with departments at national and provincial levels. Clearly, the RDP office had insurmountable tasks, targets and timeframes within which to achieve equitable development.

However, GEAR was touted as being different from RDP, in that it advocated for more competitive market-led solutions to stimulate the economy and create jobs, and was accompanied by strategies to privatise state institutions, liberalisation and deficit reduction. GEAR placed emphasis on macro-economic stability, in the form of 'redistribution in government expenditure priorities, deficit reduction, and the role of sectoral policies in meeting basic needs and improving services to previously disadvantaged people, and the poor'. This policy promised to reduce poverty and inequality, through boosting economic growth and slowing down the budget deficit. The embracing of neo-liberal policies was accompanied by the dissolution of the RDP office in 1996. However, numerous critics contend that embracing of neo-liberal economic policies has had a dismal developmental outcome for South Africans (Bond, 1999; Desai, 2003; Streak, 2004; Bond, 2005 and Goebel, 2007). They argue that the neo-liberal policies continue to deepen apartheid's disparities and inequities, particularly poverty and unemployment levels (Bhorat and Kanbur, 2005; and Barnes, Wright, Noble and Dawes, 2007).

Interestingly, by 2006 the government announced an additional macro-policy, *Accelerated and Shared Growth Initiative for South Africa* (AsgiSA). Asgisa was meant to augment the existing policy goals and objectives in GEAR (Mlambo-Ngcuka cited in Leggasick, 2007). The argument was that AsgiSA provided time-bound milestones for the country to achieve. An example was the achievement of a six per cent economic growth rate beyond 2010 and the 'halving of unemployment and poverty by 2014. The initiative prioritised government action and investment in six broad categories: infrastructure, interventions in the second economy, sector strategies, education and skills, public administration issues, and macro-

economic issues'. One of the key targets of AsgiSA has been to accelerate infrastructure investment growth by 15 to 20 per cent per annum to 2014 (Musondu-Nyamayaro, 2007).

During 2009 and 2010, government created a further structure to oversee and drive its development goals. The National Planning Commission was tasked with mapping out the development path and objectives for South Africa over the next 20 years (National Planning Commission, 2011: 1):

> "The commission is expected to put forward solid research, sound evidence and clear recommendations for government."

Implicit in all the national macro-policy shifts, institutional mechanisms and capital investments post-apartheid was the prioritisation of the role of infrastructure in economic development, and the expansion of physical infrastructure. Transport and transport infrastructure, in particular was prioritised as key to generating employment, promoting economic development and alleviating poverty in the country (Rust, McCutcheon, and Coetzee, 2008). To facilitate this process, government has sharply increased the financial allocations and expenditure on transport and transport infrastructure. Rust, McCutcheon, and Coetzee (2008: 51) observe that in 2005, the South African government planned to invest R320 billion in infrastructure expansion over the next five-year period, and has since increased that amount. In the 2010 Budget Speech, the Minister of Finance Pravin Gordhan (Gordhan, 2010) announced that over the next three years the public sector, which includes the transport sector aimed to spend R846 billion on its infrastructure programme.

In 2009, given this increased investment and prioritisation in infrastructure growth and outcomes for the country, government announced the formation of the Infrastructure Development Cluster (Republic of South Africa, 2009). The cluster will be responsible for overseeing the co-ordinated and integrated implementation of the planned R787-billion infrastructure expenditure anticipated for the period 2009 to 2012 (Republic of South Africa-Presidency, 2008). This will include the building of schools and houses, the provision of water and sanitation and the improvement in public transport. Surely, this could be grounds for improved, efficient and coherent inter-sectoral and multi-sectoral coordination?

Clearly, the prioritisation of transport infrastructure and development has received attention at the highest political level. These priorities have been conceptualised within the dominant

discourse that transport and capital investment in infrastructure remains a critical catalyst for economic growth and development in a country. The social and socially mediated facets continue to be given slight attention and prioritisation. The schismatic developments between macro and micro (meso) aspirations seem to persist and become embedded in thinking about transport and transportation.

5.4.1 National and local policy environment and influences

The above sections presented a broad and brief overview of how macro policy-decisions and agendas influence current policies and programmatic goals in the country. What are the national and local municipal priorities that need to be considered? To what extent do the legislative frameworks provide an enabling environment for service delivery and implementation, particularly in transport and transportation infrastructure for communities?

During South Africa's transitional period, one of the many challenges political parties had to consider was how to protect citizen's individual rights, as well as how to restructure and integrate different institutional mechanisms and organs of the State. The newly elected democratic government recognised that the progressive realisation of socio-economic rights, the restructuring of state institutions and redress of policies would need to be supported by a credible and rigid constitutional framework. This meant that in drafting a constitution for the country, a number of critical factors would need to be considered namely that the constitution should not be easily amended, and that the constitutional practices and conventions should be ignored. The South African Constitution was adopted in 1996 (Republic of South Africa, 1996).

In general, a constitution will determine the authority and overarching framework for the multi-levels of a government to establish, organise and conduct itself. The South African Constitution stipulates how each tier of government will be structured, operate, the powers that will be entrusted to each, how such power will be exercised and the nature of the relationship between the different tiers of government and the organs of State. The Constitution provides the legislative framework for the diffusion of roles and responsibilities of the national, provincial, local government and municipalities: and determines who will be responsible for functions such as policy development, implementation and service delivery.

The discussions that follows provides a brief understanding of the policy environment within which the current Department of Transport has been structured, organised and functions.

Part A and B of Schedules Four and Five of the South African Constitution outlines national and provincial government responsibility for enacting legislation and for the provision of available resources for the implementation of services delivery (Republic of South Africa, 1996). Section 152 and 153 of the Constitution specifies local government and municipality role and responsibility to implement basic services and infrastructure in communities; and for residents in their area of jurisdiction. It stipulates the developmental role and responsibilities to ensure provision of services to communities; and the promotion of safe and healthy environments. Therefore, local government and municipalities, nine provinces and 283 municipalities remain responsible for the provision of basic services, infrastructure and the maintenances of the infrastructure. This includes the delivery of water, electricity, refuse-removal, municipal transport infrastructure and services.

These constitutional arrangements also require a fair amount of policy, bureaucratic, and fiscal alignment, and cross and multi-sectoral linkages. The Local Government Transition Act of 1993, the 1997 Municipal Infrastructure Investment Framework (MIIF), and the 1998 White Paper on Local Government were among the initial set of overarching frameworks that provided for the creation of structures to strengthen the co-ordination and enable local government and municipalities to enact their constitutional role in development and service delivery (Pycroft, 1998). This also needs to be accompanied by an equitable fiscal distribution, increases in actual expenditure and efficiencies in the provision of the physical infrastructure (World Bank, 1994, and 2004).

This separation of roles and responsibilities and fiscal allocations, however can present a number of challenges and opportunities for a multi-level of government. Poor governance, weak institutional frameworks, limited bureaucratic implementation and absorptive capacity at various levels of government have the potential to divert benefits away from the poor and most vulnerable. Smith (1973: 197) identifies other factors including "lack of qualified personnel, insufficient direction and control from political leaders, opposition to the policy itself and corruption." The author (1973: 197) suggests problems of governance and service delivery in developing countries and in countries with newly formed democratic governments relates to: "interest groups, opposition parties, and affected individuals and groups often

191

attempt to influence the implementation of policy rather than the formulation of policy." These types of shortcomings can affect the pace of development and social reform, as well as threaten to reverse some of the human development and welfare achievements of a country. In South Africa, these issues have not gone unnoticed or unchallenged. The recent service delivery protests illustrate this disjuncture between the realisation of fundamental human rights and the realities of policy implementation and service delivery across the country.

For example, nineteen schools in the Tlakgameng area at Ganyesa near Vryburg in the North West Province were indefinitely closed because about five schools were burnt when service delivery protests turned violent (Independent Online, 2010). The protests began in May 2010, just before the schools closed for the June vacation. The local community had embarked on the service delivery protests because a 22km stretch of road between the villages of Tlakgameng and Ganyesa had not yet been tarred, and had become a safety concern for the community. It was reported that the provincial Department of Public Works, Roads and Transport promised to attend to the problem but had to deliver on this promise (Independent Online, 2010). This slow pace of service delivery angered the residents of the community. Many other communities across the country have also grown impatient with the slow pace, poor quality, or non-existent service delivery from their local government and municipalities.

The Minister of Finance also highlighted the problems of poor service delivery in his 2010 Budget speech (Gordhan, 2010):

> "We are mindful of the fact that even though transfers to municipalities have increased strongly over the past five years, service delivery problems persist. We are working with the Minister of Cooperative Governance and Traditional Affairs to resolve these problems, to improve financial management and to ensure that higher spending allocations translate into real improvements in people's lives."

In terms of opportunities and a way to resolve such issues: As highlighted in the Minister of Finance's Budget Speech 2010, steps were being taken to resolve these issues. In December 2009, Cabinet approved the *Local Government Turnaround Strategy (LGTAS)*, a flagship strategy of the Department of Cooperative Governance and Traditional Affairs (CoGTA). The strategy document takes cognizance of the challenges encountered at local government and municipality level, and it provides a framework to address these: 'systemic factors linked to the model of local government; policy and legislative factors; political factors; weaknesses in accountability systems; capacity and skills constraints; weak intergovernmental support

and oversight; and issues associated with the inter-governmental fiscal system' (Department of Cooperative Governance and Traditional Affairs, 2009). Its five strategic objectives includes:' meeting basic community needs; building clean, responsive and accountable local government; improving functionality, performance and professionalism in municipalities; improving national and provincial policy, support and oversight to local government; and strengthening partnerships between local government, communities and civil society'.

These issues resonate with some of Smith's key points highlighted in earlier paragraphs. In any context good governance and human rights will be mutually reinforcing, with human rights informing the principles of good governance and good governance the promotion of human rights for all. Sheng (2007:2) comments that: "good governance has *eight* major characteristics: participatory, consensus oriented, accountable, transparent, responsive, effective and efficient, equitable and inclusive and follows the rule of law." In effect the LGTAS document presents a blue print for good governance practices that local government and municipalities need to incorporate. Thus, the legal frameworks and enabling mechanisms exist to ensure good governance and service delivery implementation, the problem is the realisation of ideals.

> "Standards for access for all other social, government and economic services must be clearly defined, planned, and where possible implemented by each sector working together with municipalities in the development and implementation of IDPs." (Department of Cooperative Governance and Traditional Affairs, 2009: 6)

The LGTAS document's 2014 minimum standards target for basic services also emphasize the national Department of Transport's role in providing policy and planning guidelines for roads and transport infrastructure for local governments and municipalities across the country. It describes the role of the national Department of Transport as largely facilitative and regulatory, while the implementation of legislation and policy remains located with the provincial departments, local government, municipalities, and a range of public entities (Department of Transport, 2007). More importantly, the LGTAS document echoes sentiments expressed in the national Department's key legislative and policy documents.

For instance, the previous Minister of Transport Mac Maharaj highlights this distinction in role and responsibilities in the Foreword of the 1996 White Paper on National Transport Policy (Department of Transport, 1996: 2- 10):

"In accordance with the Constitution of the RSA, powers and responsibilities for transport are shared between the various levels of Government. The policies described in this document are those of the national Government. I am confident that provincial and local Governments, who have participated at all stages of this policy review process, will adopt these policies as a broad framework within which they will develop their own specific and more detailed policies."

Under the section on policy goals and objectives, it also notes that:

"A strong, focused, professional Department of Transport will play a leading role in co-ordinating transport policy, and developing and implementing strategies. This it will do in close co-operation with other government departments, other levels of government, and other stakeholders. There will be closer co-operation between transport and land-use planning. Appropriate service delivery mechanisms for the provision of infrastructure and operations will as far as possible be carried out through the use of agencies outside of government."

The Department (Department of Transport, 2008) defines it legislative mandate and mission, respectively as:

"The Department of Transport, as envisaged in the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa Act 200 of 1993 and replaced by Act 108 of 1996, is responsible for maximising the contribution of transport to the economic and social development goals of the society by providing fully integrated transport operations and infrastructure…Lead the development of integrated efficient transport systems by creating a framework of sustainable policies, regulations and implementable models to support government strategies for economic, social and international development."

Clearly, the Department of Transport's function, roles and responsibilities reflect the principles contained within the country's constitutional framework. The separation of roles, responsibilities and functions has been understood by the multi-levels of government and by the Department of Transport, in particular. The various strategy and policy documents show that the social, economic and development goals and targets of National Government and the Constitution remain embedded in the Department of Transport's objectives, policies and strategies.

Post 1994 the Department of Transport has developed and released numerous policy and strategy documents on various aspects of transport and transportation in the country. The cornerstone of all transport policies and strategies remain: the Constitution, the White Paper on National Transport Policy of 1996, the Moving South Africa Strategy (1999), and the National Land Transport Transition Act (22 of 2000). The 1996 White Paper was a culmination of the Department's review of apartheid transport policies, and the extensive

consultation with sector stakeholders on the Green Paper on National Transport Policy (Department of Transport, 1996). The Policy shows recognition that the transportation systems were inadequate and unable to meet the basic accessibility needs of citizens such as their access to work, health care, schools and shops in both the rural and urban areas of the country. It set out key actions and recommendations for improving public transport, including transport for scholars. Interestingly, all these different policy and legislative frameworks recognises albeit inadvertently, that non-transport service needs also influence mobility and accessibility, acknowledging that the contribution of transport lies beyond wealth creation and includes all aspects of daily life.

5.4.2 Global policy influences

In light of the developments Musondu-Nyamayaro (2007) notes that one of the areas that would need to be addressed would be the lack of alignment and synergy between / among the National Transport Policy and some of the current national and global targets and goals. Any future amendments to the policy would need to include stronger emphasis on social development aspects and not just the transport and economic growth connections. Goals and targets, such as the poverty reduction targets or the MDGs will need to be incorporated into the main transport policy and strategy documents. These highlight that national policies cannot be analysed in isolation from the impact of global policy shifts and goal setting. Policies in South Africa remain influenced by international and regional instruments and organisations. Furthermore, given South Africa's roles and responsibilities in the African Union, the Southern African Development Community (SADC), the New Partnership for African Development (NEPAD), and the United Nations, it is important to consider coherence; and to assess synergistic linkages between the national transport priorities and the regional, continental and global organisation's initiatives.

For example, in April 2005 African Ministers of Transport met in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia to discuss and adopt the transport targets and indicators considered essential in the achievement of the MDGs in Africa (African Union, 2005). African Union member states, including South Africa, reviewed and endorsed the "*Declaration of the African Ministers Responsible for Transport and Infrastructure on Transport and the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs).*" For achievement by 2015, the declaration set seventeen MDG-linked goals specifically relating to mobility, road safety, employment, education and the environment.

Target 1, for instance focuses on mobility needs of the rural population and their access to employment with the goal to halve the proportion of rural population living beyond 2 km of an all-season mode of transport by 2015. The Target incorporates the aims of MDG 1, the eradication of extreme poverty and hunger.

Target 3 remains of particular interest in that it focuses on child mobility, as well as the overwhelming disparities and deprivation in rural areas. This Target encompasses MDG 2, achievement of universal primary education; and MDG 3 to promote gender equality and empower women. It also acknowledges transport as a crucial input to education. Target 3 stipulates that:

> "…rural access and urban mobility improved and cost reduced to eliminate constraints on the time, which all children have to participate in education and to enable effective education to be delivered and reached safely by 2015." (African Union, 2005: 2)

The transport indicators for Target 3 comprise: determining the percentage of schools with have reliable access, and the percentage of households with transport constraint in education, such as lack of time for girl to attend for school, cost of access, poor quality education services, and unsafe access to school (African Union, 2005). These goals and indicators give recognition to the social impact of poor accessibility and mobility on children's educational attainment. In particular, it emphasises the plight of the female child because their role as transporters can interrupt their enrolment and regular attendance at school. Importantly, this represents a considerable shift in regional transport sectors considerations and inclusion of children as a key user or priority group. The key now would be to monitor and evaluate the implementation of these transport and mobility goals across Africa, in particular the rural regions. This would include monitoring the degree of synergy and cohesion between these global and regional goals, and the national legislations and policies.

Holm-Hadulla (2005: 1) argues then that transport developments must complement developments in other sectors, relevant to the realisation of the MDGs:

> "While the MDGs can only be achieved through a coherent multi-sector approach, ranging from improvement in education and health facilities to political and economic reforms, the role of transport is prominent. Sound transport infrastructure is the precondition for measures in any other sector to effective…means of transportation are available at affordable prices…in order to achieve the Millennium Development Goals, transport must be an engine rather that an obstacle to development."

Yet the following assumption still prevails:

"We don't do childhood poverty [...] we do large roads." (cited in Sutton, de Toma, Lind, Gunnarsson, Tibblin, 2005: 55).

5.5 Ambiguities, contradictions and conflicting interests

"Social reality unfolds in three levels: (1) the face-to-face interpersonal level; (2) the macro level of societies, inter-societal systems, institutions (e.g., economy, polity law, kinships, religion, science, etc) and, stratification; and (3) the meso level of corporate units (groups, organisations and communities) and categoric units (membership in social categories like class, ethnicity(, age) and gender)." (Turner, 2013: 5)

The well-being and rights of children have always been extremely important in South Africa. During the 1970s and 1980s, the increased participation and activism of children and adolescents in the apartheid struggle resulted in large numbers of these children being arrested, imprisoned and held in custody (Rama and Bah, 2000). Consequently, during the late 1980s, several international meetings took place with the aim to examine the impact of apartheid on the lives, human rights and well-being of children, women and families in South Africa. At the onset of the political transformation process, one of the primary priorities was to assess the situation of children. In this regard, the RDP office commissioned a report (published in 1996) aimed at providing a comprehensive account of the impact of apartheid on children. The review process identified policies, programmes and legislations that would need to be in place, or be amended to improve quality of the lives of children in the country.

On a global scale, the government also furthered its commitment to prioritising the needs of children, through its ratification of a number of international child rights instruments. In 1995, it ratified the UNCRC. In 2000, it ratified the following instrument, the ACRWC; the International Labour Organisation (ILO) Minimum Age Convention; and the ILO Worst Forms of Child Labour Convention. In ratifying these and other child-centred international instruments, South Africa remains legally obligated to monitor the implementation of the rights and protection of children, as set out in these instruments, alongside its national legislations and policies on children.

The South African Constitution remains the paramount document, particularly the Bill of Rights which enshrines the natural, civil and human rights to which citizens will be entitled. A number of Sections pertain to the rights of children, both directly and indirectly. An

important point to consider in South Africa is that the courts possess supreme status based on the provisions of the Constitution (Gildenhuys and Knipe, 2000). This means that any legislation made by the legislature can be subject to scrutiny by the Supreme or Constitutional Court; and may be declared illegal if it conflicts with the stipulations of the constitution.

For instance, Section 26 of the Bill of Rights articulates the right of all citizens to access adequate housing, and Section 27 the right to access health care services, including reproductive health care; sufficient food and water; and social security (Republic of South Africa, 1996). Both Sections underscore States obligation to enact legislation and other measures, within its available resources, to achieve the progressive realisation of these rights. Section 28 articulates children's right to basic nutrition, shelter, healthcare services and social services, as well as their protection from maltreatment, neglect, abuse, or exploitative labour practices. Section 29 recognises all citizens' right to education, and this includes children's access to basic education. Section 28 (2) explains that 'a child's best interests are of paramount importance in every matter concerning the child'. This means that the rights and interests of children as a social group in society must be acknowledged throughout the multi-levels of government, and in their development strategies and policies.

The Children's Act No 38 of 2005 also reiterates these principles:

> "In all matters concerning the care, protection and well-being of a child the standard that the child's best interest is of paramount importance, must be applied." (Chapter 2, General Principle 9 in Children's Act No 38 of 2005)

In its implementation, relevant organs of the state in the national, provincial and local government must enact their roles and responsibilities. However, in terms of inter-sectoral implementation all organs of state at all levels must be involved in the care, protection and well-being of children, proposing an integrated service delivery. Incontrovertibly, improving children's access to and outcomes for education, health and social services depends on a complementary investment in housing, water, refuse removal, sanitation, telecommunication networks, transport infrastructure and facilities, and electricity (Leipziger, Fay, Wodon and Yepes, 2003). That is, investments by one sector inevitably contribute to improved outcomes in others sectors. Yet, this highlights a central weakness, a schismatic relationship between the transport sector and other policy sectors, in particular sectors in which children are the

prioritised or a target group. In the same vein, non-transport policies also influence mobility levels and must be considered an essential part of mobility management policies (Stead and Banister, 2004: 327).

Home-school locations, for example are important to consider. During apartheid, the racial ideologies of the South African government strongly influenced all spheres of daily life, including schooling and access to schools (Wilkinson, 1998; Selod and Zenou, 200; and Bond, 2005). Residential areas for the Black majority were in peripheral locations and the education received by the children was of an inferior quality. The first democratic elections in 1994 resulted in the abolishing of many of the racialised, discriminatory and restrictive policies. In principle, the concept 'accessibility' remains central to all legislations, and viewed as equally important in the provision of education and housing. In post-apartheid South Africa, there remain few land-use or education restrictions and people can live or study anywhere (Selod and Zenou, 2001).

Historically, the responsibility for addressing scholar transport remained with the provincial departments of Transport and/ or Education. This contributed to the spatial inequity in the implementation of these programmes. The Department of Transport is constitutionally obliged to provide the budgetary and policy apparatus to facilitate the development of transport networks and infrastructure in the country including the provision of scholar transport (Mngaza, Dhlamini, and van Zyl, 2001). However, this may not necessarily reflect the reality, particularly for some children.

A number of case studies in the country show that sometimes national, provincial and local government actions conflicts with the stipulations of the Constitution. These examples include the relocation of communities and its implications for mobility and social aspects of daily life. In Johannesburg, the coupling of zero tolerance toward informal land occupation, the implementation of the Urban Renewal Programme and concerns about access to safe water and environments has resulted in the forced removal of shack settlements on the flood-prone banks of the cholera-threatened Jukskei River in Alexandra (Huchzermeyer, 2004). Households were relocated some 30km away from Alexandra in an un-serviced site in Roodepoort, with little consideration for the time, distance, social and economic costs around access to work, school or other basic services.

Another example is the study of a community relocated to Sol Plaatjies in Johannesburg. The study showed that many children were still commuting to their old school, and experienced considerable problems when trying to register at schools nearer to their new home (Wilson, 2003). The high transport costs resulted in many households choosing which of their children would go to school. In other parts of the country, infringements on children's constitutional rights resulted in court proceedings. For example, in 1999 the High Court ruled in favour of children and their parents who were informally occupying a sports field in Wallacedene in Cape Town. This was popularly referenced as the Grootboom case (IDASA, 2002; and Huchzermeyer, 2004). In taking Section 28 of the Constitution into account, the High Court and later the Constitutional Court reiterated children's right to shelter, and instructed the local authorities to provide minimum basic shelter and services, until such time as the parents were able to shelter their children themselves.

These cited examples also illustrate that while the issue of mobility rights may not be explicitly articulated in any of the Sections of the Bill of Rights, non-transport policies also affect individual mobility and access (Stead and Bannister, 2004). This chapter asserts that it is erroneous to assume that transport policy does not influence outcomes for children. Yet, children's rights and ability or capacity to move freely, access services and facilities, as well as participate in any activities in their communities, schools and in society is being compromised. In part, this relates to the reluctance to view mobility and transport as a basic human right and need and the transport sector to acknowledge children's rights and citizenship.

5.5.1 Politics of children's participation, (re)presentation and citizenship

Hinton (2008: 285) argues that children are an important stakeholder group yet their views:

> "…are often undervalued. As a group children are starkly absent from many forums that affect their lives. The UNCRC in 1989 served as a catalyst for broad consensus that children's opinions and observations must be taken seriously. Yet, children's perspectives have failed to inform the allocation of countless resources used in their name. This remains the case despite the proliferation of literature that recognises children's capacities in multiple domains."

In South Africa, children's right to participate and to have their voices heard and acknowledged is enshrined in Principle 10 of Chapter two of The Children's Act No 38 of 2005:

"Every child that is of such an age, maturity and stage of development as to be able to participate in any matter concerning that child has the right to participate in an appropriate way and views expressed by the child must be given due consideration."

The National Land Transport Transition Act of 2000 and the National Land Transport Act of 2009 also includes stipulations for public participation. For example, Chapter 2, Part 2 of the The National Land Transport Transition Act of 2000 articulates the principles for the 'determination, formulation, development and application of land transport policy'. Bullet point l states that:

"The participation of all interested and affected parties, including vulnerable and disadvantaged persons, in transport planning must be promoted, taking into account that people must have the opportunity to develop the understanding, skills and capacity necessary to achieve equitable and effective participation."

Part 3, which articulates the Powers and Duties of Minister, states that:

"Where this Act requires public consultation and participation before taking any decision or performing any official act, prescribe the procedures to be followed in this regard"

Similar principles are stated in the National Land Transport Act of 2009, which also enables Ministers and other authority figures at all levels of the department to promote public participation in the transport planning process. Consequently, the National Department of Transport has more than 300 stakeholder organisations (Musandu-Nyamayaro, 2007) which participate in policymaking. Yet, children are "starkly absent" from the public and formal levels of policy and decision-making within this sector.

For example, in 2009 the Department released the *National Scholar Transport Policy* (National Department of Transport, 2009). In the drafting of the policy about 100 stakeholders were consulted, yet the main beneficiaries of the policy, the children were not included. Service providers, the contracted or non-contracted vendors of scholar transport in mainly urban centres were consulted because the policy is directed at business opportunities for Small Micro and Medium Enterprises. Transport is viewed as a vehicle for economic growth and job creation. The policy details regulation, funding, communication, monitoring and evaluation, and safety and service quality of scholar transport provision in the country. Theses ideals and goals are yet to be realized.

"A taxi driver was arrested on Wednesday after he was caught transporting 49 schoolchildren in a 16-seater minibus taxi between KwaZulu-Natal's Mooi River and Estcourt, the Department of

Transport said. What made the situation even worse was that the driver was five times over the legal alcohol limit." (Mail and Guardian online, 3 February 2010)

However, the 2009 National Scholar Transport Policy did use empirical evidence to support some of its policy and interventions and the main source of data was the National Household Travel Survey 2000. Yet, this contradicts some of the national development plans perspectives on providing evidence and data-driven policy goals and the right to participate. The survey data was collected using proxy reporting. An adult in the household provided the data on children's school travel. The empirical marginalisation of children and their voices in the decision-making processes does not support the development of child-friendly and child-centred policy frameworks. Clearly, this requires a paradigmatic shift in practice, ideology and thinking.

This institutionalisation of exclusionary practices then mirrors children's subordinate positioning in other spheres of society, such the family, religion and the economy. Weber (Weber, Roth and Wittich, 1978, 44) states this about rationally determined relationships and closure practices:

> "Closure on the basis of value-rational commitment to values is usual in groups sharing a common system…Typical cases of rational closure on grounds of expediency are economic associations of a monopolistic or plutocratic character."

At the same time, Weber reminds us that gerontocracy, patriarchy and patrimonial domination generally co-exists in situations (Weber edited by Roth and Wittich, 1978: 231 and 1011). The issue of authority, legitimacy and domination are important in power and control. Such ideas can be transposed to how notions of citizenship and civic engagement are constructed:

> "All citizens of a society are not equally able to voice their opinions and a society does not value all opinions equally…Thus, listening to young children is the first step to regarding children's rights as rights of citizenship, rather than as rights defined – and restricted – by age…Honouring young children's rights to express their views creates more effective policy and it fosters stronger, more cohesive and inclusive communities. In these ways it contributes to a healthy democracy which recognises that children's rights are the human rights of any citizen." (MacNaughton, Hughes and Smith, 2007: 469)

We are reminded by the earlier citation from Morrison (2006: 386), that moneyed elites can wield power over bureaucratic agencies. Weber also refers to social groups that attain

economic or social advantages through political assistance (Weber, Roth and Wittich, 1978, XLIII and 986). Thus, there is a relationship between political and economic power.

Friedman (2006: 20-21) suggests that within South Africa there has to be a general shift in thinking about citizen right to participate and how to promote effective and meaningful participation. This has some similarities to the Tisdall and Davis's discussion about which categories of groups or individuals are 'allowed' to engage in governance issues. The authors argue that conflicting views are part of the concept of citizenship and effective governance and should not exclude grassroot voices.

Grant and Maloney (cited in Tisdall and Davis, 2004: 133-134) present a typology to explain who are 'legitimated' to participate in policy and decision-making. For example, there are a range of insiders:

> "'core' insiders who are able to bargain and exchange with policy makers over a range of issues; 'specialist' insiders who have narrower policy niches but are still seen as reliable and authoritative; 'peripheral' insiders who carry little influence although they participate as 'insiders'."

In the South African drafting of the National Scholar Policy it is clear that children are considered as 'outsider' groups, having no legitimate status within government. Tisdall and Davis (2004: 133) explain that:

> "Policy communities have tight membership and ideology and more frequent interaction and bargaining between government actors and other interests, whereas issue networks have more members, less consensus, and fewer and weaker interactions between government actors and other interests. Thus policy communities are more likely to influence policy than are issue networks."

This idea resonates with Murphy's concept of intra-field closure and ursurpation.

Cobb, Danby and Farrell (2005:14) write that children are usually seen as needing protection or behavior regulation and that the policies, legislation and practices emanate from the adult constructed discourses of protection. This is accompanied by "pervasive control of the everyday lives of children". However, the last decade has seen a growth in literature and research on and about children and young people's participation and representation in policy and decision-making. Yet, such insights have been largely ignored (Tisdall and Davis, 2004; and Hinton, 2008). The numerous studies, particularly from developed countries have and continue to produce substantial evidence bases for effective and progressive policy shifts and realisation of children's rights.

O' Brien and Tranter (2010, and as cited in Whitelegg, 2010) illustrate, for example, how various municipalities in Canada have acknowledged interconnections between / among public health issues, urban and transport planning, and improved living environments for children. The rationale for such studies stems from an awareness that urban environments form part of the social, spatial and geographic setting of everyday life for most children. Through their work at Canada's Centre for Sustainable Transportation, O' Brien and Tranter and others (see for example Gilbert and O' Brien cited in O' Brien and Tranter, 2010) promoted child-friendly community designs by developing guidelines for land-use and transport planning. This has given rise to programmes that encourage walking to school, such as the Walking School Buses (WSB) (O' Brien and Tranter, 2010; Land Transport New Zealand, 2007; and Kearns, Collins, and Neuwelt, 2002). Kearns, Collins, and Neuwelt (2002) describe the walking school bus as a structured means of travel for school-going children with an adult at the front and back of the line. The benefits of the walking school bus lie in the health outcomes for children, their safety and in fostering sociability. These programmes have been initiated in cities and suburbs across the United Kingdom, Australia, New Zealand, and the United States.

These interventions also incorporate and adapt some of the elements of the UNICEF *Child Friendly Cities* (CFC) initiative (O' Brien, 2004). The UNCRC has become a key framework guiding the adoption of child-friendly neighbourhood environments and integrating children's rights and needs into planning decisions, and into programme and policy interventions with and for children. Specifically, the key tenets, that is, that the best interests of the child remain paramount, and children have the right to survival, protection, development, participation and non-discrimination. Francis and Lorenzo (2002) also note that across many developed countries, in cities from Berkeley, California to Milan in Italy, local systems and structures of governance have adopted the CFC initiative of involving children in the planning and design processes of cities. Such developments promote the philosophy of children as active agents, social actors and recognise children as rights holders in society. Therefore, the emerging research supports the integration of children's experiences and needs into the planning and policy-making processes.

This then raises some critical questions about the reluctance to mainstream children's rights, and the entrenchment of hierarchical attitudes to children in all the sectors in the country. This remains contrary to South Africa's historical struggle and legislative enactment for the

rights of children as citizens of this country. There have been some attempts to engage with children. For example, the Dikwankwetla project was established to promote children's participation in the drafting of the Children's Bill, "with a particular emphasis on children made vulnerable through adult illness and death in the context of HIV/AIDS" (Jamieson and Mũkoma, 2010: 75-76). The project team developed resource packs, which simplified the various principles and laws in the Bill.

> "The consolidated Children's Bill was written in complex legal language and contained over 300 clauses that covered a range of different services. To make it accessible, the team drafted an illustrated resource pack containing a child friendly version of the Bill. The pack was designed after the first workshop, during which children identified the challenges facing them, and it focused on the chapters and clauses corresponding to the issues raised, namely children's rights, parental responsibilities and rights, prevention and protection services. It also contained activities designed to enable children to learn about, and develop opinions on, what was lacking in the Bill and what clauses they were satisfied with. At the second workshop children used the resource pack to develop submissions for presentation at the parliamentary hearings, as well as action plans for an advocacy campaign in their own neighbourhoods, which they called 'Children are the Future, Give them their Rights'."

Percy-Smith (2010) also raises some critical thoughts about child participation. The author argues that for many children active citizenship and participation remains an abstract life experience. Children may not feel empowered, nor given the opportunity to effectively participate in formal decision-making structures. Instead, the author suggests that questions need to be raised about how such spaces for participation have been effectively constructed, that is, what were the key catalysts? Thus, critically examining successful child participatory models will enable researchers, child right activists and policy-makers to understand why in some instances children's experiences and needs remain obscure. This raises questions about the lack of spaces for children's participation in the transport sector in South Africa. This also requires a rethink of "children's participation as a more diverse set of social processes rooted in everyday environments and interactions" (Percy-Smith, 2010). As noted, giving children a voice and promoting their participation can take many forms. The challenge would be to examine to what extent experts in the sector understand and may consider adopting child participation as a concept, or a philosophy.

In concluding, we can refer to Flyvbjerg's work on the analytical approach '*phronetic social scien*ce'. Flyvberg (2001: 139 and 140) draws on the works of, amongst others, Aristotle, Nietzsche, Weber, Bourdieu, and Rorty and suggests that:

"Phronetic research is dialogical in the sense that it includes, and, if successful, is itself included in, a polyphony of voices, with no one voice, including that of the researcher, claiming final authority. Thus, the goal of phronetic research is to produce input to the ongoing social dialogue and praxis in a society, rather than to generate ultimate, unequivocally verified knowledge. This accords with Aristotle's maxim that in questions of social and political action, one ought to trust more in the public sphere than in science…Phronetic social science explores historic circumstances and current practices to find avenues to praxis. The task of phronetic social science is to clarify and deliberate about the problems and risks we face and to outline how things may be done differently, in full knowledge that we cannot find ultimate answers to these questions or even a single version of what the questions are."

Granted, the approach Flyvberg adopts is incongruent with the approach in this study, although some of his views have currency. The brief synopsis of the transport policies shows that even existing empirical evidence on children's mobility and transport is unacknowledged. Consequently, Flyvberg argues that practice (praxis) rather than discourse, theory, paradigm or methodology must have primacy (2001: 57). In this instance, we need practical and achievable solutions and a better understanding of the social realities of citizens.

5.5 Summary

This chapter highlights the point there is non-recognition and misrecognition of the impact that the transport sector has on other sectors. This exists despite the enabling mechanisms and legislative frameworks to ensure adequate and appropriate transport and transportation infrastructure, In addition the policy and legislative frameworks of the country advance the ideals of human rights and social development. Instead, there is a belief that the problems of health, education and social protection are not the responsibility of the transport sector, and vice versa. Sutton, de Toma, Lind, Gunnarsson, Tibblin (2005, 22) also explain, "…problems are not going to be solved through action in one or two particular sectors alone such as health and education."

The chapter also examined: (1) children's social representation, inclusion and positioning within South Africa's transport policy and interventions; and (2) the extent to which these frameworks incorporate national data on children's daily transport and mobility activity patterns. In terms of the first point, the transport policies utilise the taken-for-granted or tacit assumptions about children as passive citizens and a homogenous group. There is limited focus on the needs and experiences of children. In terms of how the data is integrated, there is an attempt to develop evidence-based policy outcomes for children but children voices are invisible. The main text of the policy documents, however, demonstrates a hierarchisation

and prioritisation of adultist, macro-level and institutional needs. The notion of 'pseudo-inclusion' aptly describes this approach and the discourses toward children and childhood in the transport sector policies and programmes in the country.

Congruently, contemporary mobility and transport discourses promote the idea of transport as a public good, good governance and human right; and implies that all citizens' interests and needs are of equal importance. Johnston (2007: 171) writes an existing fallacy is still the belief that, "…any transport improvements available…will benefit all of its residents equally". Clearly, developmental goals and equity are the cornerstones of the democratic State and government in South Africa; however, the lived reality of many citizens is far from this ideal. Clearly, children's rights are not mainstreamed into policy and decision-making processes in some sectors.

Within the transport sector, there is also a bias towards studying the impact of child mobility on adult mobility, their daily lives and schedules with children's voices, experiences and needs remaining obscured. It certainly impedes the development of child-centred and participatory transport policies and interventions. "The participation of children is located in the tensions between children perceived as competent and / or incompetent" (Cockburn, 2005: 109), and the desire to put children first. These ambiguities and contradictions imply that notions about children as citizens and active civic partners are in the infancy stage. The schismatic relationship between ideology, political interest and reality in South Africa suggests that the transport sector is yet to realise the relevance of micro-level understanding of user, stakeholder and target groups is a delicate balancing act.

The argument, here, is that the study of children and childhood is incomplete unless mobility and transport issues are located in an understanding of the complexities and varying realities of children's everyday life. This means that the reframing and redesigning of epistemological and methodological approaches to understanding children's mobility and transport is necessary. This means that the legal, political, policy and ideological positions must undergo similar transformations and reflections.

The relationship between research and policy then, is a complicated one. Amongst others, the process is influenced by research project approaches and epistemological dominances; by the institutional contexts; and policy-making and budgetary prioritisations and processes. It is

clear that this is an area requiring considerable academic attention, particularly the child mobility issue. A limitation of this study is that this area is something this research does not investigate in-depth. While, stating the theoretical discourses and debates on and around policy, the issue of how to create a sustainable theory-research-praxis relationship still needs further work. This type of undertaking will require a different set of research questions and methodologies. Yet, it is important to highlight as a possible area for further and future research.

CHAPTER 6 : REFRAMING THE DISCOURSES AND DEBATES

"Every knowledge claim is open to potential criticism" (Bernstein, 1992: 813)

6.1 Introduction

This study asserts that the everyday life, daily activities, mobility and transport interactions remains peripheral within the Sociology of Childhood and Mobilities in particular and sociology in general. Yet, how children and young people maintain, sustain or expand their activity choices and action spaces has implications for their rights as citizens and for the ideals of citizenship. In particular, it speaks to their agentic potential, their autonomy and capabilities to participate and engage in society's wide-ranging 'normative' activities. In other words, mobility and transport are embedded in the fabric of everyday life and produce diverse or comparable outcomes between children and young people. The 'everyday', then, provides valuable insights into the positioning, construction and (re)presentation of self and identity and social relations, ties and networks.

Subsequently, Hodgson and Turner (2003: 266) argue that social exclusion is about processes because there are complex issues and relationships at play. Moreover, the emphasis shifts from consumption to participation:

> "The emphasis on the process of being excluded has the effect of questioning traditional stereotypes and cultural visions of the excluded, which portray them as being in that state through some intrinsic quality or lack in themselves. These definitions force the question 'how did this person or group come to be excluded'. The focus on process rather than state forces the reader/audience to understand that this is a dynamic process."

Yet, the notion 'participation' conveys other assumptions. What elements characterise a citizen and citizenship? What 'cultural' discourses dominate and determine who has legitimacy and authority across and within different spheres of society? Therefore, the usefulness of these formulations lays in the recognition that mobility and transport is inextricably linked to explanations of social problems, inequalities, spatial (dis)locations, social interrelationships, stratification and differentiation.

This study then aims to examine the way is child mobility is problematised, conceptualised and prioritised by community of practitioners working on research, programmes, policies and

interventions. It also aims to provide an explanation for the reproducing of traditional worldviews, particularly those that construct a passive view of children. This also raises questions about the evidence-base supporting the various policies and practices, as well as the ontological, methodological, axiological and epistemological orientations. The study then is exploratory in nature and as a primer aims to encourage the exploration of 'new' avenues, insights and domains within sociology in general. This concluding chapter, then, provides a brief summary of some of the key points for consideration, and the recommendations for future application and further studies.

6.2 Summary of key points

6.2.1 Children's social (re)presentation

In the context of adult-child relationships, the issue of power and identity plays an important part in social representation. Rabello de Castro (2004: 470) reiterates how hierarchies and operate and who controls how these positions are characterised. Usually, children are positioned as 'lacking' certain attributes in relation to adults but never adults as lacking certain attributes in relation to children.

> "Thus conceived, difference between children and adults has served to regulate social (domestic and collective) practices as well as public policies concerning the status of children in our modern societies. Children's identities have been thus defined by 'an act of power' since the establishment of adults' identities excludes supposed undesirable aspects, which are projected onto children (for instance 'childishness'), and fixes them as hierarchically superior in relation to children's identities."

As articulated in earlier chapters, within research and academic scholarship, practices and discourses such power dynamics are embedded, regardless of the actor being cognisant or not. The argument here is that these power differentials and traditional approaches to (re)presenting children carry limited weight. Such idealisations generate a passive, univocal, skewed and constrained portrayal and (re)presentation of the child in society. It serves to reproduce, reify and perpetuate hierarchies, particularly in adult-child interactions.

However, it also raises questions about legitimacy and authority, whether at an institutional or individual level. Yet, by hierarchising adult-children interactions and ascribing children a subordinate status, we are implying that their participation in knowledge production is

insignificant so this devalues their role as knowledge-bearers and constructors. Crivello, Camfield and Woodhead (2009: 57) states:

> "Failure to include them (children) in research may be due to lack of creativity and appropriate adaptation of methods on the part of researchers, a belief that young children cannot be reliable sources of data, or an assumption that caregivers 'know best' so can speak on behalf of young people."

In hierarchising adult's voices and representations, some academic discourses and debates on child mobility and transport create illusions that children matter. A parent may know that a child's journey to school takes 30 minutes and that the child walks to school but does the parent walk with or talk to the child to truly understand the 'journey', 'the risks', or 'the social activities' involved? In the parent's description of the time, do they take into account their own experience of time in travelling that distance or of the child's experiences? This study asserts that while there may be challenges to shifting our thinking about how we represent children and their worlds, this conscious action can better inform our practice, theory and methodological. It will give an understanding of children's view, lived realities, attitudes and perceptions.

6.2.2 Children's participation and voices

Ennew (2000: 3) borrows anthropologist Edwin Ardener's theory of 'muted' groups to explain why children's voices and their right to participate sometimes go unacknowledged. This theory is constructed to look at the issue of power and domination; reasserting the significance of Weber's theory of closure and domination. The author explains that the dominant group controls communication and expression, such as language and rules and that:

> "Groups are muted not because they do not speak or because they are not observed (for children are often minutely observed by developmental psychologists), but because they cannot express their reality in modes that are acceptable to dominant groups."

In maintaining dominant and traditional approaches to understanding children and childhood, we fail to acknowledge the global shifts to human child rights. Yet, the extensive literature and research over the last decade demonstrates that children and young people are able to communicate and express their views and concerns about social issues, problems and experiences, including mobility and transport. Ways of talking to, listening to, interacting with, and writing on and about children in the research process is an evolving field. Yet, in some academic domains, such developments are peripheral.

More importantly, the Sociology of Childhood, child rights movement and developments in the Sociology of Youth have transformed the child and youth studies landscape. The emerging lexical schemes, debates and discourses within transport and mobility studies and the Sociology of Mobilities has seen a shift to transport and mobility as a human right and a necessity in a just society.

Weber's theory on closure and action provides an explanation of the perpetuation, reification and reproduction of traditional attitudes to children in all domains in society. The theory of social closure and its application to class and status group analysis offers a theoretical conceptualisation for the analysis of childhood or children as a status group. Children are assigned a subordinate role in a hierarchical structure, and the embedded exclusionary rules or codes derived on the basis of culture, gender, age and generation. This results in the marginalisation of children; and the notion of childhood as a minority group in society. The differential treatment of children not only points to the age and ontological differences between adults and children but to the issue of power and interests, and adult ability to actively exercise agency (Qvortrup, 1994). This conceptualisation of children and childhood not only indicates the theoretical positioning of children but of children's position in society as a whole. The utility of the closure theory applies to theorising of the role adults as a social category and institutions and the state in excluding children; rationalisation of adult dominance; and lack of, or limiting children's agency and autonomy.

If we were to include and acknowledge children's voices this is also a step toward acknowledging children's agency and their right to participate in society. It also points to a renegotiation of how the concept of 'citizen' and 'participation' is understood in modern society. In addition, children's participation can contribute to how they are positioned, constructed and prioritised in policy. This means that children's representation in society and a reframing of this is as important and linked to the issue of children's voices and participation. This suggests a contesting of children's invisibility, pseudo-inclusion, empirical, theoretical, political and social marginalisation.

6.2.3 Metatheoretical and epistemological orientations

Linked to the above points is the issue of how research on and about children is conducted and the dominant, metatheoretical and epistemological orientations framing these studies. In

this study, the proposal is that a 'pragmatic orientation' be considered. This approach does not ascribe primacy to method and methodology but rather asserts the research problem or question should mediate in this selection. Yet, the critical constructivist orientation also has some relevance: how do we understand the lived realities between and among children? Hill (2006: 70) reiterates this point:

> "By contrast, from a social construction perspective, the data generated in communication with research participants are regarded as a product of joint respondent–researcher interaction, not a provision of 'pure' information or viewpoints from the respondent (Huberman and Miles, 2002). For these and other reasons, it can be valuable for any researcher to understand how potential respondents may view particular methods or indeed how they have actually reacted to them in practice"

Such thinking, writing, reflecting and doing requires a cerebral and paradigmatic redirection to acknowledge that the qualitative and quantitative approaches are complementary and a rejection of the mono-method approach. Such an approach is premised on the view that the researcher has the necessary competencies in qualitative and quantitative methods of data collection and analysis. In adopting a pragmatic stance this opens up the possibilities of innovations in how children are included in research.

It points to the possible emergence or refinement of data collection tools, processes and data analysis. For example, Fargas-Malet, McSherry, Larkin and Robinson (2010) argue that the development of Sociology of Childhood has brought with it the emergence of 'new' participatory methodologies, an adaption of the traditional methods (surveys or questionnaires) and the possibility of developing multi or mixed method approaches to address children's lives, experiences and attitudes. The authors provide a detailed description of how data collection tools, such as drawings, photos, the use of prompts or sentence completion tasks; have enriched the experiences of collecting data on and with children. The authors also note that a critical and reflexive approach needs to be taken in the choice and rationale for particular methods. Are methods being selected because it is fun for the children or because they produce useful and relevant data on and by children? Such discussions are reminiscent of the discussions in chapter two, namely that a pragmatic worldview provides new avenues for the development of methods to address the research questions raised. Moreover, the issue of self-reflexivity is prioritised in the discussions in chapter two and links to Hill and Fargas-Malet et al's comments.

6.3 New 'insights' and avenues for further and future research

Despite, the noteworthy developments in the Sociology of Childhood it *still seems* to be 'peripheralised' in relation to mainstream sociological concerns. In part, the reluctance to accept these alternate constructions of children and childhood is that it requires a re-orientation or re-negotiation of the historical, economic, political, cultural and social value systems; and the adult idealisation of children and childhood. A case in point, a cursory review of key first year undergraduate sociological texts show a strong assertion of the dominant and traditional themes, discourses and debates. Yet, emergent themes and developments, such as children and childhood and / or age stratification are given reductionist treatment, or excluded from the text. Mobility and transport are rarely alluded to. Any references to mobility, in its broadest sense are usually subsumed within the discussions on concepts, such as the 'risk, networked or surveillance society'. Ironically, mainly anthropologists and geographers have exploited the innovations and avenues for further children / childhood and transport / mobility studies. Consequently, these disciplines have produced some of the seminal works on child mobility, including studies on child mobility in sub-Saharan Africa. These works also reflect the dominant thematic interests of the specialists.

At this point, it is apt to reflect on Sheller's (2011: 6) description of the broad range of issues and themes that constituting mobilities research. Sheller suggests the need for a robust and innovative research approach and methods, for the range of themes that are constituted under the mobilities umbrella, adding weight to the arguments in this dissertation. The author thus argues that mobilities research promotes interdisciplinary or transdisciplinary, and multiple method approaches.

> "…of many different kinds of contemporary (im)mobility at a variety of scales, including public and private transport systems; tourism, migration and border studies; mobile communications and software-supported infrastructures; automobility, aeromobility, velomobility and various kinds of passengering; children's mobilities, elderly mobilities and studies of gendered mobilities; walking, climbing, dancing, biking and other forms of trained bodily movement; and studies of the regulation, governance and legal structures"

This above citation aptly sums up some of the vibrancy of this emerging field of research. There is ample room for academics and researchers to engage with any number of issues, raising the question of why the marginalisation of this area of research within mainstream

sociology. Perhaps the answer lies in the 'purist's rejection of the confluence of disciplines and themes, yet this counters the ethos of the sociological imagination.

In relation to children, some of these were highlighted in preceding chapters. At the same time, it is important to reflect on chronological age, differentiation and stratification within such analyses. Moreover, how do we (re)engage with children and childhood studies within sociology in South Africa? Sirota (2010) and Bühler-Niederberger (2010) suggest that childhood and children's issues should be part of mainstream sociology, not just a discipline on its own. Bühler-Niederberger (2010: 382) worries that an unintended consequence of the drive to raise the profile of Sociology of Childhood may lead to a situation of: "co-constructors of the categorical difference" reinforcing and perpetuate the idea that children should be studied separately. Similarly, Sirota (2010: 263) asks about how:

> "…sociology of childhood should be articulated within general sociology. To what extent does it offer an opportunity to renew sociological paradigms? In any case, it seems necessary to escape from the danger of a sociological field closing in upon itself."

Regardless of the area of specialisation, these are issues with implications for us as communities of practitioners. Chapter 4 highlights some of the new avenues for further and future studies, and Sheller's citation presents additional ideas to reflect on.

REFERENCES

Abend, G. 2008, "The Meaning of 'Theory'.", *Sociological Theory*, vol. 6, no. 2, pp. 173-199.

Adams, J. 2005, "Rule of the Father," in *Max Weber's Economy and Society: A Critical Companion*, C. Camic, P. S. Gorski, & T. M. Trubeck, eds., Standford University Press, Standford, California.

Adelman, L., Middleton, S., & Ashworth, K. 2003, *Britain's Poorest Children: Severe and Persistent Poverty and Social Exclusion*, Centre for Research In Social Policy, Save the Children, UK, London, United Kingdom.

African National Congress 1994, *Reconstruction and Development Programme: A Policy Framework*, African National Congress, South Africa.

African Union. Declaration of the African Ministers Responsible for Transport and Infrastructure on Transport and the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). 2005.

African Union & UN Economic Commission for Africa 2005, *Transport and the Millennium Development Goals in Africa*, African Union, Addis Ababa.

Afshar, H. 1991, *Women, Development, and Survival in the Third World* Longman, London and New York.

Agarwal, B. 1997, ""Bargaining" and Gender Power Relations within and beyond the Household in *Feminist Economics* 3:1 pages 1 to 51", *Feminist Economics*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 1-51.

Agger, B. 1991, "Critical Theory, Poststructuralism, Postmodernism: their Sociological Relevance", *Annual Review of Sociology*, vol. 17, pp. 105-131.

Akpan, W. 2010, "Confronting the Referentialisation Challenge: Back to Hope, Being, and Other 'Forgotten' Sociologies", *South African Review of Sociology*, vol. 41, no. 3, pp. 117-126.

Alanen, L. 1988, "Rethinking Childhood", *Acta Sociologica*, vol. 31, no. 1, pp. 53-67.

Alanen, L. 1992, *Modern Childhood? Exploring the 'Child Question' in Sociology* Institute for Educational Research: University of Jyvaskyla, Yliospistonkatu.

Alanen, L. 1998, "Childhood as Generational Condition: Towards a Relational Theory of Childhood, Paper presented at the 14th ISA (International Sociological Association) World Congress, in Montreal, Canada. 26 July to 1 August", International Sociological Association, Canada.

Alanen, L. 2010, "Editorial: Taking Children's Rights Seriously", *Childhood*, vol. 17, no. 1, pp. 5-8.

Alanen, L. 2011, "Editorial: Critical Childhood Studies?", *Childhood*, vol. 18, no. 2, pp. 147-150.

Alderman, H., Orazem, P. F., & Paterno, E. M. 2001, "School Quality, School Cost, and the Public / Private School Choices of Low-income Households in Pakistan", *The Journal of Human Resources*, vol. 36, no. 2, pp. 304-326.

Aldred, R. 2008, "Ethical and Political Issues on Contemporary Research Relationships", *Sociology*, vol. 42, no. 5, pp. 887-903.

Alexiadou, N. 2002, "Social Inclusion and Social Exclusion in England: Tensions in Education Policy", *Journal of Education Policy*, vol. 17, no. 1, pp. 71-86.

Ali-Nejadfard, F. "Rural travel and Transport Planning and Transport Related Interventions: A Case Study in Malawi", in *Paper presented at the 1997 South African Transport Conference*.

Ali-Nejadfard, F. 2004, *Rural Travel and Transport and Economic Development: Problems and Prospects - Examples from Malawi and Zimbabwe*, ARNESA, ARNESA.

Alvesson, M. & Skoldberg, K. 2009, *Reflexive methodology: New Vistas for Qualitative Research*, Second edn, Sage, London.

Amoateng, A. Y. & Richter, L. M. 2003, "The State of Families in South Africa," in *State of the Nation: South Africa 2003-2004*, J. Daniel, A. Habib, & R. Southall, eds., HSRC Press, Pretoria, pp. 242-267.

An-na'im, A. 1994, "Cultural Transformations and Normative Consensus on the Best Interest of the Child", *International Journal of the Law and the Family*, vol. 8, pp. 62-81.

Anderson, J. E. 1997, *Public Policymaking* , Third edn, Houghton Mifflar Company, Boston.

Anderson, J. P., Prause, J., & Silver, R. C. 2011, "A Step-by-Step Guide to Using Secondary Data for Psychological Research", *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 56-75.

Antonio, R. J. 1989, "The Normative Foundations of Emancipatory Theory: Evolutionary Versus Pragmatic Perspectives", *American Journal of Sociology*, vol. 94, no. 4, pp. 721-748.

Appelrouth, S. & Edles, L. D. 2008, *Classical, and Contemporary Sociological Theory: Text and Readings* Pine Forge Press, Los Angeles, California.

Arnold, M. L. 2000, *Rural Schools: Diverse Needs Call for Flexible Policies*.

Ashley, D. & Orenstein, D. M. 1985, *Sociological Theory: Classical Statements* Allyn and Bacon, Boston.

Awosan, J. A. 2009, *Currents of Thought in African Sociology and the Global Community: How to Understand Research Findings in the Context of Sociological Perspectives* Universal Publishers, Boca Raton, Florida.

Axinn, S. 2006, "The First Western Pragmatist, Immanuel Kant", *Journal of Chinese Philosophy* pp. 83-94.

Babbie, E., Mouton, J., Vorster, P., & Prozesky, B. 2011, *The Practice of Social Research*, Twelfth edn, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Babinard, J. & Roberts, P. 2006, *Maternal and Child Mortality Development Goals: What can the Transport Sector do?*, World Bank, Washington DC, TP-12 August 2006.

Badgett, M. V. & Folbre, N. 1999, "Assigning Care: Gender Norms and Economic Outcomes", *International Labour Review*, vol. 138, no. 3.

Baert, P. & Rubio, F. D. 2009, "Philosophy of the Social Sciences," in *The New Blackwell Companion to Social Theory*, B. S. Turner, ed., Wiley-Blackwell, Sussex, pp. 60-80.

Baker, J., Basu, R., Cropper, M., Lall, S., & Takeuchi, A. 2005, *Urban Poverty and Transport: The Case of Mumbai* World Bank Policy Research Working Paper 3693: WPS3693.

Balen, R., Blyth, E., Calabretto, H., Fraser, C., Horrocks, C., & Manby, M. 2006, "Involving Children in Health and Social Research - 'Human becomings' or 'active beings'?", *Childhood*, vol. 13, no. 1, pp. 29-48.

Bamyeh, M. A. 2013, "From the Editor", *International Sociology*, vol. 28, no. 2, pp. 143-144.

Baraldi, C. 2010, "Children's Citizenships: Limitations and Possibilities of Childhood Sociology in Italy ", *Current Sociology*, vol. 58, no. 2, pp. 272-291.

Barbalet, J. 2009, " Pragmatism and Symbolic Interactionism," in *The New Blackwell Companion to Social Theory*, B. S. Turner, ed., Wiley-Blackwell, Sussex, p. 199.

Barker, J. & Weller, S. 2003, ""Is it fun" Developing child centred research methods", *International Journal of Sociology and Policy*, vol. 23, no. 1/2, pp. 33-58.

Barker, J. 2003, "Passengers or Political Actors? Children's Participation in Transport Policy and the Micro Political Geographies of the Family", *Space and Polity*, vol. 7, no. 2, pp. 135-151.

Barker, J., Kraftl, P., Horton, J., & Tucker, F. 2009, "Introduction: The Road Less Travelled - New Directions in Children's and Young People's Mobility", *Mobilities*, vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 1-10.

Barnes, H., Wright, G., Noble, M., & Dawes, A. 2007, *The South African Index of Multiple Deprivation for Children: Census 2001* HSRC Press, Cape Town.

Bass, L. E. 2007, "The Sociology of Children and Youth," in *21st Century Sociology: A Reference Handbook*, C. Bryant & D. Peck, eds., SAGE Publications, Thousand Oaks, CA, pp. 140-147.

Bastos, A. & Nunes, F. 2009, "Child Poverty in Portugal: Dimensions and Dynamics", *Childhood*, vol. 16, pp. 67-87.

Bawden, H. H. 1904, "What is Pragmatism?", *The Journal of Philosophy, Psychology and Scientific Methods*, vol. 1, no. 16, pp. 421-427.

Beckmann, J. 2004, "Mobility and Safety", *Theory, culture and society*, vol. 21, no. 4/5, pp. 81-100.

Beegle, K., Filmer, D., Stokes, A., & Tiererova, L. 2010, "Orphanhood and the Living Arrangements of Children in Sub-Saharan Africa", *World Development*, vol. 38, no. 12, pp. 1727-1746.

Behrens, R. "Findings of an Activity-Based Household Travel Survey in Cape Town, with particular Reference to Walking as a Travel Mode", in *Paper presented at the 21st Annual South African Transport Conference*, South African Transport Conference, Pretoria.

Behrens, R. 2004, "Child and Learner Travel in Cape Town: Problems and Prospects", *Urban Forum*, vol. 15, no. 3.

Behrens, R. 2004, *The Importance of Scholar and Child Travel in South African Cities, and a Review of Improvement Measures*, University of Cape Town, Cape Town.

Ben-Arieh, A. & Goerge, R. 2001, "Beyond the Numbers: How do We Monitor the State of Our Children?", *Children and Youth Services Review*, vol. 23, no. 8, pp. 603-631.

Ben-Arieh, A. & Ofir, A. 2002, "Opinion, Dialogue, Review: Time for (more) Time Use Studies: Studying the Daily Activities of Children", *Childhood*, vol. 9, no. 2, pp. 225-248.

Ben-Arieh, A. 2005, "Is the Study of the "State of Our Children" Changing? Re-visiting after 5 years", *Children and Youth Services Review*, vol. 28, no. 7, pp. 799-811.

Ben-Arieh, A. 2005, "Where are the Children? Children's Role in Measuring and Monitoring their Well-being", *Social Indicators Research*, vol. 74, pp. 573-596 .

Bennet, T. & Watson, D. 2002, *Understanding Everyday Life (Sociology and Society)* Open University and Blackwell Publishing, Oxford.

Benschop, Y., Halsema, Y., & Schreurs, P. 2001, "The Division of Labour and Inequalities between the Sexes: An Ideological Dilemma", *Gender, Work and Organization*, vol. 8, no. 1, pp. 1-18.

Bentley, M. L. 2003, "Critical Consciousness Through A Critical Constructivist Pedagogy", Annual Meeting of the American Educational Studies Association, Mexico City, Mexico.

Berg, B. L. 2004, *Qualitative Research Methods for the Social Sciences* Allyn and Bacon, USA.

Berger, P. L. 1963, *Invitation to Sociology: A Humanistic Perspective* Penguin Books, Harmondsworth.

Berger, P. L. & Luckmann, T. 2007, "The Social Construction of Reality [1966]," in *Contemporary Sociological Theory*, Second edn, C. Calhoun et al., eds., Blackwell Publishing, USA, pp. 43-53.

Bernard, A., Seguin, A.-M., Bussiere, Y., & Polacchini, A. "Household Structure and Mobility Patterns of Women in O-D Surveys: Methods and Results based on the Case Studies

of Montreal and Paris: Paper presented at the second national conference on women's travel issues", s.n, s.l.

Bernardi, B. 1985, *Age Class Systems: Social Institutions and Polities based on Age* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, London.

Berry, L. & Guthrie, T. 2003, *Rapid Assessment: The Situation of Children in South Africa* The Children's Institute, University of Cape Town, Cape Town.

Best, H. & Lanzendorf, M. 2005, "Division of Labour and Gender Differences in Metropolitan Car Use an Empirical Study in Cologne, Germany", *Journal of Transport Geography*, vol. 13, pp. 109-121.

Betzner, A. E. 2008, *Pragmatic and Dialectic Mixed Method Approaches: An Empirical Comparison,* Doctor of Philosophy, Faculty of the Graduate School of the Universityof Minnesota.

Béland, D. 2007, "The Social Exclusion Discourse: Ideas and Policy Change", *Policy and Politics*, vol. 35, no. 1, pp. 123-139.

Bénatouïl, T. 1990, "A Tale of Two Sociologies: The Critical and the Pragmatic Stance in Contemporary French Sociology", *European Journal of Social Theory*, vol. 2, no. 3, pp. 279-396.

Bhorat, H. & Kanbur, R. 2005, *Poverty and Well-being in Post-Apartheid South Africa: An Overview of Data, Outcomes and Policy*, University of Cape Town and Cornell, University of Cape Town and Cornell.

Blackden, C. M. & Wodon, Q. 2006, *Gender, Time Use, and Poverty in Sub-Saharan Africa*, World Bank, Washington, D.C, World Bank Working Paper No. 73.

Bohman, J. 1999, "Theories, Practices, and Pluralism A Pragmatic Interpretation of Critical Social Science", *Philosophy of the Social Sciences*, vol. 29, no. 4, pp. 459-480.

Bohman, J. 2003, "Critical Theory as Practical Knowledge: Participants, Observers, and Critics," in *The Blackwell Guide to the Philosophy of the Social Sciences*, S. P. Turner & P. A. Roth, eds., Blackwell Publishing, Malden, MA, USA.

Bond, P. 1999, "Basic Infrastructure for Socio-economic Development, Environmental Protection and Geographic Desegregation: South Africa's Unmet Challenge", *Geoforum*, vol. 30, pp. 43-59.

Bond, P. 2005, *Elite Transition: From Apartheid to neoliberalism in South Africa* University of Kwa-Zulu-Natal Press, Pietermaritzburg.

Bongaarts, J. 2001, *Household Size and Composition in the Developing World*, Policy Research Division, Population Council., New York, Working Paper 144.

Bonke, J. 1999, *Children's Household Work: Is there a Difference between Girls and Boys*, The Danish National Institute of Social Research, Denmark.

Bonner, S. E. & Kellner, D. M. 1989, "Introduction," in *Critical Theory and Society: A Reader*, S. E. Bonner & D. M. Kellner, eds., Routledge, Great Britain, pp. 1-21.

Bostock, L. 2001, "Pathways of Disadvantage? Walking as a Mode of Transport among Low-income Mothers", *Health and Social Care in the Community*, vol. 9, no. 1, pp. 11-18.

Bourdieu, P. 1989, "Social Space and Symbolic Power", *Sociological Theory*, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 14-25.

Bourdieu, P. 1991, *Language and Symbolic Power* Polity Press and Basil Blackwell, Oxford.

Boyden, J. & Levison, D. 2000, *Children as Economic and Social Actors in the Development Process*, Expert Group on Development Issues Ministry for Foreign Affairs Stockholm, Sweden, Sweden, Working Paper 2000:1.

Brannen, J. & O'Brien, J. 2012, "Childhood and the Sociological Gaze", *Sociology*, vol. 29, pp. 729-737.

Brembeck, H., Johanesson, B., Torrel, V. B., & Falkstrom, M. Renegotiations of Today's Childhood. Paper presented at an international conference, 'Research in childhood: Sociology, culture and history', October 1999, Denmark. 1999.

Brennecke, L. 2004, *Pragmatism: An Overview of the Philosophy*, s.n, s.l, EDF 607.

Bretherton, C. 2001, "Gendr Mainstreaming and EU Enlargement: Swimming against the Tide", *Journal of European Public Policy*, vol. 8, no 1 pp. 60-81.

Brink, H., van der Walt, C., & van Rensburg, G. 2012, *Fundamentals of Research Methodology for Healthcare Professionals*, Third edn, Juta, Cape Town.

Broccolichi, S. & van Zanten, A. 2000, "School Competition and Pupil Flight in the Urban Periphery", *Journal Education Policy*, vol. 15, no. 1, pp. 51-60.

Brock, K. & Harrison, E. 2006, *Linking Research, Policy and Livelihoods: Challenges and Contradictions*, NRSP , NRSP Policy Brief.

Brotherton, H. T. 2008, "The Nature and Relevance of Research," in *Researching Hospitality and Tourism*.

Brownile, J. 2009, "Researching, Not Playing, in the Public Sphere", *Sociology*, vol. 43, no. 4, pp. 699-716.

Bryceson, D. 2009, "Roadmapping Development and Poverty Alleviation," in *Africa, Transport and the Millennium Development Goals*, M. Grieco et al., eds., Cambridge Scholars Publishing, Cambridge.

Bryceson, D. F. & Howe, J. 1993, *Rural Household Transport in Africa: Reducing the Burden on Women*, African Studies Centre - Leiden, Netherlands, Working paper vol. 15/ 1993.

Bryceson, D. F., Bradbury, A., & Bradbury, T. 2006, "Roads to Poverty Reduction? Dissecting Rural Roads' Impact on Mobility in Africa and Asia", TRL, Crowthorne.

Bryman, A. 1984, "The Debate about Quantitative and Qualitative Research: A Question of Method or Epistemology?", *The British Journal of Sociology*, vol. 35, no. 1, pp. 72-92.

Bryman, A. 2002, *Triangulation*, s.n, s.l.

Bryman, A. 2006, "Integrating Quantitative and Qualitative Research: How is it done?", *Qualitative Research*, vol. 6, no. 1, pp. 97-113.

Buchanan, A. 2006, "Children aged 0-13 at Risk of Social Exclusion: Impact of Government Policy in England and Wales", *Children and Youth Services Review*, vol. 28, pp. 1135-1151.

Buliung, R., Sultana, S., & Faulkner, G. 2012, "Guest Editorial: Special Section on Child and Youth Mobility - Current Research and Nascent Themes", *Journal of Transport Geography*, vol. 20 , pp. 31-33.

Burawoy, M. 2005, "2004 American Sociological Association Presidential Address: For Public Sociology", *The British Journal of Sociology*, vol. 56, no. 2, pp. 259-294.

Burawoy, M. 2009, "From Earth to Heaven: South African Sociology in the International Context: Address to the Banquet of the XIVth Annual Congress of the South African Sociological Association, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, 30 June 2009", *South African Review of Sociology*, vol. 40, no. 2, p. 219.

Burawoy, M. 2011, "Meeting the Challenge of Global Sociology - from Gothenburg to Yokohama ", *South African Review of Sociology*, vol. 42, no. 1, pp. 143-147.

Burchardt, T., Le Grand, J., & Piachaud, D. 1999, "Social Exclusion In Britain 1991 -1995", *Social Policy and Administration*, vol. 33, no. 3, pp. 227-244.

Burger, R. 2005, "What We have Learnt from post-1994 Innovations in Pro-poor Service Delivery in South Africa: A Case Study-based Analysis", *Development Southern Africa*, vol. 22, no. 4, pp. 483-499.

Burgess, S., Gardiner, K., & Propper, C. 2001, *Growing Up: School, Family and Area Influences on Adolescents' Later Life Chances*, Centre for Analysis of Social Exclusion, London School of Economics, London, CASE paper 49.

Burgess, S. & Briggs, A. 2006, *School Assignment, School Choice and Social Mobiilty*, The Centre for Market and Public Organisation (CMPO), Bristol, CMPO Working Paper No. 06/157.

Burman, S. & Reynolds, P. 1986, *Growing up in a Divided Society: The Contexts of Childhood in South Africa* Raven Press, Johannesburg.

Button, K. & Nijkamp, P. 1997, "Social Change and Sustainable Transport", *Journal of Transport Geography*, vol. 5, no. 3, pp. 215-218.

Bühler-Niederberger, D. 2010, "Introduction: Childhood Sociology - Defining the State of the Art and Ensuring Reflection", *Current Sociology*, vol. 58, no. 2, pp. 155-164.

Bühler-Niederberger, D. 2010, "Childhood Sociology in Ten Countries: Current Outcomes and Future Direction", *Current Sociology*, vol. 58, no. 2, pp. 369-384.

Cairns, S., Sloman, L., Newson, C., Anable, J., Kirkbride, A., & Goodwin, P. 2004, *School Travel Plans: The Influence of Soft Factor Interventions on Travel Demand*, The Robert Gordon University and Ecologica, London, UK, Draft final report to the Department for Transport.

Calhoun, C., Gertis, J., Moody, J., Pfaff, S., & Virk, I. 2007, *Contemporary Sociological Theory*, Second edn, Blackwell Publishing, USA.

Campbell, J. L. 2002, "Ideas, Politics, and Public Policy", *Annual Review of Sociology*, vol. 28, pp. 21-38.

Caprioli, M. 2004, "Feminist IR Theory and Quantitative Methodology: A Critical Analysis", *International Studies Review*, vol. 6, no. 2, pp. 253-269.

Cass, N., Shove, E., & Urry, J. 2003, *Changing Infrastructures, Measuring Socio-Spatial Inclusion / Exclusion*, Department of Sociology, Lancaster University, Lancaster, United Kingdom, Final Report.

Cass, N., Shove, E., & Urry, J. 2005, "Social Exclusion, Mobility and Access", *The Sociological Review*.

Cherryholmes, C. H. 1992, "Notes on Pragmatism and Scientific Realism", *Educational Researcher*, vol. 21, no. 6, pp. 13-17.

Cheru, F. 2001, "Overcoming Apartheid's Legacy: The Ascendancy of Neoliberalism in South Africa's Anti-Poverty Strategy", *Third World Quarterly*, vol. 22, no. 4, pp. 505-527.

Chobokoane, N. & Budlender, D. 2001, *Methodology Used to Measure Childcare in the South African Time Use Survey: Paper prepared for the IATUR Conference, 2001*, Statistics South Africa, Pretoria.

Cilliers, S. P. 1984, "Origins of Sociology in South Africa 1984", pp. 122-131.

Clifton, K. J. & Handy, S. L. 2001, *Qualitative Methods in Travel Behaviour Research* .

Cobb, C. L., Danby, S., & Farrell, A. 2005, "Governance of Children's Everyday Spaces", *Australian Journal of Early Childhood*, vol. 30, no. 1, pp. 14-20.

Cochran, P. A. L., Marshall, C. A., Garcia-Downing, C., Kendall, E., Cook, D., McCubbin, L., & Gover, R. M. S. 2008, "Indigenous Ways of Knowing: Implications for Participatory Research and Community", *American Journal of Public Health*, vol. 98, no. 1, pp. 22-27.

Cockburn, J., Dauphin, A., & Razzaque, M. A. 2009, "Child Poverty and Intra-Household Allocation ", *Children, Youth and Environments*, vol. 19, no. 2, pp. 36-53.

Cockburn, T. 2005, "Children's Participation in Social Policy, Chimera or Authenticity", *Social Policy and Society*, vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 109-119.

Colebatch, H. K. 1998, *Policy* Open University Press, Buckingham.

Collins, R. 1980, "Weber's Last Theory of Capitalism: A Systematization", *American Sociological Review*, vol. 45, no. 6, pp. 925-942.

Collins, R. 1986, *Weberian Sociological Theory* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Colliver, J. A. 1999, "Constructivism with a Dose of Pragmatism: A Cure for What Ails Educational Research", *Advances in Health Sciences Education*, vol. 4, pp. 187-190.

Colonna, P. & Fonzone, A. "New Ways of Viewing the Relationship between Transport and Development", s.n, s.l.

Committee on the Rights of the Child 2000, *Concluding Observations of the Committee on the Rights of the Child: South Africa. 2000/02/23. CRC/C/15/Add.122. (Concluding Observations/Comments)*, Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, Geneva, Switzerland , CRC/C/15/Add.122.

Cooley, C. H. 1894, "The Theory of Transportation", *Publications of the American Economic Association*, vol. 9, no. 3, pp. 13-148.

Copperman, R. B. & Bhat, C. R. 2009, *Children's Activity-Travel Patterns and Implications for Activity-Based Travel Demand Modeling*, s.n, s.l.

Corsaro, W. A. 2005, *The Sociology of Childhood*, Second edn, Pine Forge Press, Thousand Oaks.

Craig, L. 2002, *The Time Cost of Parenthood: An Analysis of Daily Workload*, The Social Policy Research Centre, University of New South Wales, Sydney NSW 2052, Australia, SPRC Discussion Paper No. 117.

Creswell, J. W. & Clark, V. L. P. 2007, *Designing and Conducting Mixed Methods Research* Sage, Thousand Oaks.

Crivello, G., Camfield, L., & Woodhead, M. 2013, "How Can Children Tell Us About Their Wellbeing? Exploring the Potential of Participatory Research Approaches within Young Lives", *Social Indicators Research*, vol. 90, pp. 51-72.

Crompton, R. 2008, "Forty Years of Sociology: Some Comments", *Sociology*, vol. 42, no. 6, pp. 1218-1227.

Cunha-Jacana, C. 2006, *Bicycles as a Lever for Rural Women's Empowerment: Lessons Learned from Bicycle Projects in sub-Saharan Africa and an Alternative Approach in southern Mozambique*. s,l, s.n

Curtis, R. F. 1986, "Household and Family in Theory on Inequality", *American Sociological Review*, vol. 51, no. 2, pp. 168-183.

Czuzman, K. 2003, *Transport: a Critical Catalyst the Role of Transport in the MDG...*, DFID and Transport Resource Centre Scheme, London.

Dainty, A. 2008, *Methodological Pluralism in Construction Management Research*.

Darbyshire, P., Macdougall, C., & Schiller, M. 2005, "Multiple Methods in Qualitative Research with Children: More Insight or Just More?", *Qualitative Research*, vol. 5, no. 4, pp. 417-436.

de Boer, E. 1986, *Transport Sociology: Social Aspects of Transport Planning* Pergamon Press, Oxford.

de Castro, M. L. S. & Menezes, J. S. S. 2002, "The Process of Social In(ex)clusion in Schools: Data from Reality - Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Comparative and International Education Society", s.n, Orlando, Florida.

Deforge, R. & Shaw, J. 2012, "Back- and Fore-Grounding Ontology: Exploring the Linkages between Critical Realism, Pragmatism, and Methodologies in Health and Rehabilitation Sciences", *Nursing Inquiry*, vol. 19, pp. 83-95.

Delanty, G. & Strydom, P. 2003, *Philosophies of Social Science: The Classic and Contemporary Readings* Open University Press, Berkshire, England.

Delanty, G. 2009, "The Foundations of Social Theory," in *The New Blackwell Companion to Social Theory*, S. P. Turner, ed., Wiley-Blackwell, Sussex.

Denzin, N. K. 1996, "Review - Post-Pragmatism - Pragmatism and Social Theory by Hans Joas", *Symbolic Interaction*, vol. 19, no. 1, pp. 61-75.

Denzin, N. K. 2010, "Moments, Mixed Methods, and Paradigm Dialogs", *Qualitative Inquiry*, vol. 16, no. 4, pp. 419-427.

Department for Transport, U. K. 1998, *Social Exclusion and the Provision of Public Transport- Main report*.

Department of Basic Education, S. A. Learner Attendance Policy and Procedures, 2009. Notice 982 of 2009. 2009. Government Gazette No 32414.

Department of Basic Education, S. A. 2010, *Report on the General Household Survey (GHS): Education Focus*, Department of Basic Education, Pretoria.

Department of Cooperative Governance and Traditional Affairs 2014, *Local Government Turnaround Strategy (LGTAS)*, Department of Cooperative Governance and Traditional Affairs, Pretoria.

Department of Education, National Commission on Special Needs in Education anf Training (NCSNET), & National Committee on Education Support Services (NCESS) 1997, *Quality of Education for All: Overcoming Barriers to Learning and Development*.

Department of Education 2003, *Report to the Minister - Reviewing of the Financing, Resourcing and Costs of Education in Public Schools*, Department of Education, Pretoria.

Department of Education, S. A. 2006, *Monitoring and Evaluation Report on the Impact and Outcomes of the Education System on South Africa's Population: Evidence from Household Surveys*, Department of Education, Pretoria.

Department of Education, S. A. 2006, *Education Statistics in South Africa 2006*, Department of Education, Pretoria.

Department of Education, S. A. Report on Learner Transport. 2008.

Department of Education, S. A. 2008, *Education for All (EFA) Country Report South Africa*.

Department of Education 2009, *Education Statistics in South Africa 2009*, Department of Education, Pretoria.

Department of Transport, S. A. White Paper on National Transport Policy. 1996.

Department of Transport, S. A. 1998, *Moving South Africa: A Transport Strategy for 2020*.

Department of Transport 2005, *National Household Travel Survey 2003: Key results - The First South African National Household Travel Survey 2003*, Department of Transport, Pretoria.

Department of Transport, S. A. 2008, *Department of Transport, South Africa: Annual Report 2007-2008*, Department of Transport, South Africa, South Africa.

Department of Transport, S. A. Final Draft: National Scholar Transport Policy. 2009.

Desai, A. 2003, "Neoliberalism and Resistance in South Africa", *Monthly Review*, vol. Electronic Journal.

Dey, I. 1993, *Qualitative Data Analysis: A User-Friendly Guide for Social Scientists* Routledge, London.

DiGuiseppi, C., Roberts, I., Li, L., & Allen, D. 1998, "Determinants of Car Travel on Daily Journeys to School Cross Sectional Survey of Primary School Children", *BMJ*, vol. 316, pp. 1426-1428.

Dillon, M. 2010, *Introduction of Sociological Theory: Theorist, Concepts, and their Applicability to the Twenty-First Century* Wiley-Blackwell, United Kingdom.

Dockett, S. & Perry, B. 2007, "Trusting Children's Accounts in Research", *Journal of Early Childhood Research*, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 47-63.

Douglas, J. D. 2010, *Everyday Life: Reconstruction of Social Knowledge* Transaction Publishers, Brunswick.

Drakeford, M., Scourfield, J., Holland, S., & Davies, A. 2009, "Welsh Children's Views On Government and Participation", *Childhood*, vol. 16, no. 2, pp. 247-264.

du Bois-Reymond, M. 2005, "Book Review: Towards Sociology for Childhood. Thinking from Children's Lives", *Young*, vol. 13, pp. 381-383.

Dube, S. 2007, *Placing Children at the Forefront of Transport Policy and Strategy*, CSIR, Pretoria.

Duchâteau, H. 1998, *Mobility and Accessibility - The Case of Brussels*, Operations Research and Decision Aid Methodologies in Traffic and Transportation Management, Brussels.

Economic And Social Commission For Asia And The Pacific & United Nations Development Programme 2003, *Integrating unpaid work into national policies*, UNDP, New York, ST/ESCAP/2236.

Editorial 1999, "Differentiation of Childhood", *Childhood*, vol. 6, no. 2, pp. 163-166.

Edmonds, G. 1998, *Wasted Time: The Price of Poor Access* International Labour Organisation: Development Policy Department, Geneva.

Edwards, R. & Alldred, P. 2000, "A Typology of Parental Involvement in Education Centring on Children and Young People: Negotiating Familialisation, Institutionalisation and Individualisation", *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, vol. 21, no. 3, pp. 435-455.

Egero, B. 1991, *South Africa's Bantustans: From Dumping Grounds to Battlefronts*, Nordiska Afrikan Institute, Uppsala, Discussion Paper 4.

Elder Jr, G. H. 1975, "Age Differentiation and the Life Course", *Annual Review of Sociolog*, vol. 1, pp. 165-190.

Ellegard, K. & Cooper, M. 2004, "Complexity in Daily Life- A 3D Visualisation Showing Activity Patterns in Their Context", *International Journal of Time Use Research*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 37-59.

Ellis, C., Adams, T. E., & Bochner, A. P. 2011, "Autoethnography: An Overview", *Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, vol. 12, no. 1, p. Article 10.

Ellison, A. P. 1992, "South Africa's Transport Policies", *Journal of Transport Economics and Policy*, vol. 26, no. 3, pp. 313-318.

Elster, J. 2000, "Rationality, Economy and Society," in *The Cambridge Companion to Weber*, S. Turner, ed., Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Engels, F. 1892, *The Condition of the Working-Class in England in 1844* George Allen and Unwin Ltd, London.

Ennew, J. 2000, *How can we Define Citizenship in Childhood?*, HCPDS: Harvard Center for Population and Development Studies, Cambridge, Working Paper Series , Volume 10 Number 12.

Ercikan, K. & Roth, W.-M. 2006, "What Good Is Polarizing Research Into Qualitative and Quantitative?", *Educational Researcher*, vol. 35, pp. 14-23.

Estivill, J. 2003, *Concepts and Strategies for Combating Social Exclusion: An Overview* International Labour Office – STEP/Portugal, International Labour Organization 2003, Portugal.

Evans, R. 2006, "Negotiating Social Identities: The Influence of Gender, Age and Ethnicity on Young People's 'Street Careers' in Tanzania", *Children's Geographies*, vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 109-129.

Ewing, R., Schroeer, W., & Greene, W. 2005, *School Location and Student Travel Analysis of Factors Affecting Mode Choice* Transportation Research Record 1895.

Fairclough, N. 1989, "Introduction: Critical Language Study," in *Language and Power*, C. N. Candlin, ed., Longman, USA, pp. 1-16.

Fairclough, N. 1989, *Language and Power* Longman, USA.

Farrington, J. H. 2007, "The New Narrative of Accessibility: Its Potential Contribution to Discourses in (Transport) Geography", *Journal of Transport Geography*, vol. 15, pp. 319-330.

Faulkner, K. M. 2009, "Presentation and Representation: Youth Participation in Ongoing Public Decision-Making Projects", *Childhood*, vol. 16, no. 1, pp. 89-104.

Fernando, P. & Porter, G. 2002, *Balancing the Load: Women, Gender and Transport* Zed in association with International Forum for Rural Transport and Development, London.

Ferrante, J. 2011, "Sociology: A Global Perspective," International: SIxth edn, Wadsworth: Cengage Learning, USA.

Fisher, D. 1990, "Homo Academicus. by Pierre Bourdieu; Peter Collier Review", *The Journal of Higher Education*, vol. 61, no. 5, pp. 581-591.

Flamm, M. & Kaufmann, V. 2006, "Operationalising the Concept of Motility: A Qualitative Study", *Mobilities*, vol. 1, no. 2, pp. 167-189.

Fleming, R. & Spellerberg, A. 1996, *Using Time Use Data: A History of Time Use Surveys and Uses of Time Use Data*, Statistics New Zealand, New Zealand.

Floro, M. S. 1995, "Economic Restructuring, Gender and the Allocation of Time", *World Development*, vol. 23, no. 11, pp. 1913-1929.

Flyvbjerg, B. 2001, *Making Social Science Matter: Why Social Inquiry Fails and How it can Succeed Again* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Foner, A. 1974, "Age Stratification and Age Conflict in Political Life", *American Sociological Review*, vol. 39, no. 2, pp. 187-196.

Foner, A. 1980, "Review: The Sociology of Age Stratification: A Review of Some Recent Publications", *Contemporary Sociology*, vol. 9, no. 6, pp. 771-779.

Francavilla, F. & Lyon, S. 2003, *Household Chores and Child Health: Preliminary Evidence from Six Countries*, World Bank, Draft.

Francis, M. & Lorenzo, R. 2002, "Seven Realms of Children's Participation", *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, vol. 22, pp. 157-169.

Franke, S. 2000, *School, Work and the School-work Combination by Young People*, Statistics Canada.

Freudendal-Pederson, M. 2009, *Mobility in Daily Life: Between Freedom and Unfreedom* Ashgate, Surrey.

Friedman, S. 2006, *Participatory Governance and Citizen Action in Post-Apartheid South Africa*, International Labour Organisation, Geneva, DP/164/2006.

Froud, J., Johal, S., Leaver, A., & Williams, K. 2002, "Not Enough Money: The Resources and Choices of the Motoring Poor", *Competition & Change*, vol. 6, no. 1, pp. 95-111.

Gage, N. L. 1989, "The Paradigm Wars and Their Aftermath: A "Historical" Sketch of Research on Teaching since 1989", *Educational Researcher*, vol. 18, no. 7, pp. 4-10.

Gager, C. T., Cooney, T. M., & Call, K. T. 1999, "The Effects of Family Characteristics and Time Use on Teenagers' Household Labour. ", *Journal of Marriage and Family*, vol. 61, pp. 982-994.

Gallacher, L.-A. & Gallacher, M. 2008, "Methodological Immaturity in Childhood Resarch?: Thinking Through 'Participatory Methods'", *Childhood*, vol. 15, no. 4, p. 499.-516.

Gallagher, M. 2008, "'Power is not an evil': Rethinking Power in Participatory Methods", *Children's Geographies*, vol. 6, no. 2, pp. 137-150.

Gershuny, J. & Sullivan, O. 2003, "Time Use, Gender, and Public Policy Regimes", *Social Politics*, vol. 10, no. 2, pp. 205-228.

Geurs, K. T., Boon, W., & van Wee, B. 2009, "Social Impacts of Transport: Literature Review and the State of the Practice of Transport Appraisal in the Netherlands and the United Kingdom", *Transport reviews*, vol. 29, no. 1, pp. 69-90.

Geuss, R. 1981, *The Idea of Critical Theory: Habermas and the Frankfurt School* Cambridge University Press.

Gildenhuys, J. S. H. & Knipe, A. 2000, *The Organisation of Government: An Introduction*, First edn, van Schaik, Pretoria.

Goebel, A. 2007, "Sustainable Urban Development? Low-cost Housing Challenges in South Africa", *Habitat International*, vol. 31, pp. 291-302.

Golafshani, N. 2003, "Understanding Reliability and Validity in Qualitative Research", *The Qualitative Report*, vol. 8, no. 4, pp. 597-607.

Golden-Biddle, K. & Locke, K. D. 2007, *Composing Qualitative Research*, Second edn, Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks.

Goldring, E. B. & Hausman, C. S. 1999, "Reasons for parental choice of urban schools", *Journal Education Policy*, vol. 14, no. 5, pp. 469-490.

Goodnow, J. J. 1988, "Children's Household Work: Its Nature and Functions", *Psychologial Bulletin*, vol. 103, no. 1, pp. 5-26.

Goodwin, P. 1989, "Seven: Problems of Women's Mobility and Employment in the One Person Operations of Buses," in *Gender, transport and employemnt: The impact of travel constraints*, M. Grieco, L. Pickup, & R. Whipp, eds., Avebury, England, pp. 127-149.

Gordhan, P. 2010, *Budget speech 2010: Minister of Finance*.

Gore, C. 1995, "Social Exclusion and Social Change: Insights in the African Literature," in *Social Exclusion: Rhetoric, Reality, Responses*, G. Rodgers, C. Gore, & J. B. Figueiredo,

eds., International Labour Organization (International Institute for Labour Studies), Geneva, pp. 103-117.

Gramsci, A. & Forgacs, D. 2000, *The Gramsci Reader: Selected Writings 1916-1935* New York University Press, New York.

Greene, S. & Hill, M. 2008, *Researching Children's Experience: Methods and Methodological Issues (Part 1)*.

Grieco, M., Pickup, L., & Whipp, R. 1989, *Gender, Transport and Employment* Avebury, Aldershot.

Gross, N. 2009, "A Pragmatist Theory of Social Mechanisms", *American Sociological Review*, vol. 74, pp. 358-379.

Grover, S. 2004, "Why Won't They Listen to Us? On Giving Power and Voice to Children Participating in Social Research", *Childhood*, vol. 11, no. 1, pp. 81-93.

Guba, E. G. & Lincoln, Y. S. 1994, "Competing Paradigms in Qualitative Research ," in *Handbook of Qualitative Research*, N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln, eds., Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA, pp. 105-117.

Habib, A. & Padayachee, V. 2000, "Economic Policy and Power Relations in South Africa's Transition to Democracy", *World Development*, vol. 28, no. 2, pp. 245-263.

Hagestad, G. O. & Uhlenberg, P. 2005, "The Social Separation of Old and Young: Root of Ageism", *Journal of social issues*, vol. 61, no. 2, pp. 343-360.

Hamilton, K. & Jenkins, L. 1989, "Two: Why Women and Travel?," in *Gender, transport and employment: The impact of travel constraints*, M. Grieco, L. Pickup, & R. Whipp, eds., Avebury, England, pp. 17-45.

Hamilton, K. & Jenkins, L. 2000, "A Gender Audit for Public Transport: A New Policy Tool in the Tackling of Social Exclusion", *Urban Studies*, vol. 37, no. 10, pp. 1793-1800.

Haralambos, M. & Holborn, M. 2004, *Sociology: Themes and Perspectives*, Sixth edn, HarperCollins Publishers, London.

Harden, J. 2000, "There's no Place Like Home: The Public / Private Distinction in Children's Theorizing of Risk and Safety", *Childhood*, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 43-59.

Harper, C., Jones, N., & Tincati, C. 2010, *Opportunities and Challenges in Promoting Policy - and Practices - Relevant Knowledge on Child Rights*, Overseas Development Institute, London, Working Paper 318.

Harris-Short, S. 2003, "International Human Rights Law: Imperialist, Inept and Ineffective? Cultural Relativism andthe UN Convention on the Rights of the Child", *Human Rights Quarterly*, vol. 25, no. 1, pp. 130-181.

Harrits, G. S. 2011, "More Than Method?: A Discussion of Paradigm Differences Within Mixed Methods Research", *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 150-166.

Hendricks, F. 2006, "The Rise and Fall of South African Sociology", *African Sociological Review*, vol. 10, no. 1, pp. 86-97.

Henschen, T. 2013, "Kant's Pragmatism", *British Journal for theHistory of Philosophy*, vol. 21, no. 1, pp. 165-176.

Hernandez, D. J. & Charney, E. 1998, *From Generation to Generation: The Health and Well-being of Children in Immigrant Families* National Academy Press, Washington DC.

Hertkorn, G. & Kracht, M. 2006, *Analysis of a Large Scale Time Use Survey with respect to Travel Demand and Regional aspects*, German Aerospace Centre, Berlin.

Hier, S. P. 2005, *Contemporary Sociological Thought* Canadian Scholars' Press Inc, Ontario.

Hill, M. 2006, "Children's Voices on Ways of having a Voice: Children's and Young People's Perspectives on Methods used in Research and Consultation", *Childhood*, vol. 13, no. 1, pp. 69-89.

Hillman, M., Adams, J., & Whitelegg, J. 1990, *One False Move: A Study of Children's Independent Mobility* Policy Studies Institute: Carfax Publishing, London.

Hillman, M. 1993, "One False Move...A Study of Children's Independent Mobility: An Overview of the Findings and the Issues They Raise," in *Children, Transport and Quality of Life*, M. Hillman, ed., Policy Studies Institute, London, pp. 7-18.

Hinton, R. 2008, "Children's Participation and Good Governance: Limitations of the Theoretical Literature", *International Journal of Children's Rights*, vol. 16 , pp. 285-300.

Hirsch, D. 1995, "School Choice and the Search for an Educational Market", *International Review of Education*, vol. 41, no. 3-4, pp. 239-257.

Hodgkins, R. & Newell, P. 1998, *Implementation Handbook for the Convention on the Rights of the Child* UNICEF, New York.

Hodgson, F. & Turner, J. 2003, "Participation Not Consumption: The Need for New Participatory Practices to Address Transport and Social Exclusion", *Transport Policy*, vol. 10, pp. 265-272.

Hofferth, S. L. 2005, "Secondary Data Analysis in Family Research", *Journal of Marriage and Family*, vol. 67, no. 4, pp. 891-907.

Hogan, B. 2009, "Towards a Truly Pragmatic Philosophy of Social Science", *Human Studies*, vol. 32, pp. 383-389.

Hogan, D. P. & Astone, N. M. 1986, "The Transition to Adulthood", *Annual Review of Sociology*, vol. 12, pp. 109-130.

Holm-Hadulla, F. 2005, *Why Transport Matters: Contributions of the Transport Sector towards the Millennium Development Goals*, GTZ, Eschborn.

Holmwood, J. 2011, "Pragmatism and the Prospects of Sociological Theory", *Journal of Classical Sociology*, vol. 11, no. 1, pp. 15-30.

Horkheimer, M. & Hunter, G. F. 1993, *Between Philosophy and Social Science: Selected Early Writings Studies in Contemporary German Social Thought* MIT Press, London.

Horowitz, I. L. 1964, "Max Weber and the Spirit of American Sociology", *The Sociological Quarterly*, vol. 5, no. 4, pp. 344-354.

Horrell, S. & Humphries, J. 1995, "'The Exploitation of Little Children': Child labour and the Family Economy in the Industrial Revolution", *Explorations in Economic History*, vol. 32, pp. 485-516.

Horton, J. & Kraftl, P. 2006, "What Else? Some More Ways of Thinking and Doing 'Children's Geographies'", *Children's Geographies*, vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 69-95.

Howarth, C. 2002, "Identity in Whose Eyes? The Role of Representations in Identity Construction", *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour*, vol. 32, no. 3, pp. 115-162.

Howlett, M. & Ramesh, M. 1995, *Studying Public Policy: Policy Cycles and Policy Subsystems* Oxford University Press, Toronto.

Howley, C. B. & Smith, C. R. 2000, *An Agenda for Studying Rural School Busing*, AEL, Charlston, West Virginia.

Hubert, J.-P., Armoogum, J., Axhausen, K. W., & Madre, J.-L. 2008, "Immobility and Mobility Seen through Trip-Based Versus Time-Use Surveys", *Transport reviews*, vol. 28, no. 5, pp. 641-658.

Huchzermeyer, M. 2004, "From "Contravention of Laws" to "Lack of Rights": Redefining the Problem of Informal Settlements in South Africa", *Habitat International*, vol. 28, pp. 333-347.

Human Sciences Research Council, Nelson Mandela Foundation, & Education Policy Consortium 2004, *Emerging Voices: A Report on Education in South African Rural Communities* Human Sciences Research Council, Pretoria.

Hutchby, J. 2005, "Children's Talk and Social Competence", *Children & Society*, vol. 19, no. 1, pp. 63-73.

IDASA 2002, *The Grootboom Case and Women's housing right* IDASA Budget Brief No. 111.

Ilahi, N. 2000, *The Intra-Household Allocation of Time and Tasks: What have We Learnt from the Empirical Literature?*, World Bank, 13.

Immergut, E. M. 1998, "The Theoretical Core of the New Institutionalism", *Politics and Society*, vol. 26, no. 1, pp. 5-34.

Independent Online. Nineteen Schools Closed After Arson. Independent Online July 2010. 2010.

Infrastructure for Poverty Reduction Task Team 2004, *Second Workshop of the Infrastructure for Poverty Reduction (InfraPoor) Task Team (27-29 Oct 2004, Berlin): Issue Note for*

Thematic Discussions 1 Theme: Gender Mainstreaming in Economic Infrastructure, Infrastructure for Poverty Reduction (InfraPoor) Task Team, Berlin.

Jackson, P. T. 10 A.D., *Social Science as a Vocation: Weber, Pragmatism, and Experiential Inquiry*, s.n, s.l.

Jacobsen, M. H. & Poder, P. 2008, *The Sociology of Zygmunt Bauman: Challenges and Critique* Ashgate, England.

James, A. & Prout, A. 1990, *Constructing and Reconstructing Childhood: Contemporary Issues in the Sociological Study of Childhood* Falmer Press, Hampshire.

James, A., Jenks, C., & Prout, A. 1998, *Theorizing Childhood* Polity and Blackwell Press, Cambridge.

James, A. L. & James, A. 2001, "Tightening the Net: Children, Community, and Control", *British Journal of Sociology*, vol. 52, no. 2, pp. 211-228.

Jamieson, L. & Mukoma, W. 2010, "Dikwankwetla - Children in Action Children's Participation in the Law Reform Process in South Africa," in *A Handbook of Children and Young People's Participation: Perspectives from theory and practice*, B. Percy-Smith & N. Thomas, eds., Routledge, Oxon, pp. 73-83.

Jan, A. 1993, "The External Costs of Escorting Children," in *Children, transport and quality of life*, M. Hillman, ed., Policy Studies Institute, London.

Jenkins, R. 2000, "Categorization: Identity, Social Process and Epistemology", *Current Sociology*, vol. 48, no. 3, pp. 7-25.

Jofili, Z., Geraldo, A., & Watts, M. 1999, "A Course for Critical Constructivism through Action Research: a case study from biology", *Research in Science &Technological Education*, vol. 17, no. 1, pp. 5-17.

Johnny, L. 2006, "Reconceptualising Childhood: Children's Rights and Youth Participation in Schools", *International Education Journal*, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 17-25.

Johnson, D. P. 2008, *Contemporary Sociological Theory: An Integrated Multi-Level Approach* Springer, New York.

Johnson, R. B. & Onwuegbuzie, A. J. 2004, "Mixed Methods Research: A Research Paradigm Whose Time Has Come", *Educational Researcher*, vol. *33*, no. 7, pp. 14-26.

Johnston, D. C. 2007, "These Roads were made for Walking? The Nature and Use of Rural Public Transport Services in Garut ", *Singapore Journal of Tropical Geography*, vol. 28, pp. 171-187.

Johnstone, F. A. 1970, "White prosperity and White Supremacy in South Africa Today", *African Affairs*, vol. 69, no. 275, pp. 124-140.

Jones, P. M., Dix, M. C., Clarke, M. I., & Heggie, I. G. 1983, *Understanding Travel Behaviour* Gower, Aldershot.

Jordaan, P. W. "Measuring Accessibility: A Case Study in the Northern Province: Paper presented at the 1997 South African Transport Conference", South African Transport Conference, Pretoria.

Jubber, K. 2007, "Sociology in South Africa A Brief Historical Review of Research and Publishing", *International Sociology*, vol. 22, no. 2, pp. 527-546.

Kabeer, N. 1994, "Benevolent Dictators, Maternal Altruists and Patriarchal Contracts: Gender and Household Economics," in *Reversed Realities: Gender Hierarchies in Development Thought*, N. Kabeer, ed., Verso, London, pp. 95-135.

Kaime, T. 2005, "The Convention on the Rights of the Child and the Cultural Legitimacy of Children's Rights in Africa: Some Reflections", *African Human Rights Law Journal* pp. 221-238.

Kant, I. & Meiklejohn, J. M. D. 2010, *The Critique of Pure Reason* The Pennsylvania State University, Pennsylvania.

Kaufmann, V. 2002, *Re-thinking Mobility: Contemporary Sociology* Ashgate, England.

Kearns, R. A., Collins, D. C. A., & Neuwelt, P. 2002, "The Walking School Bus: Extending Children's Geographies?", *Area*, vol. 35, no. 3, pp. 285-292.

Kellett, M. 2010, *Rethinking Children and Research: Attitudes in Contemporary Society* Continuum International Publishing, London.

kenyon, S., Rafferty, J., & Lyons, G. 2003, "Social Exclusion and Transport in the UK: A Role for Virtual Accessibility in the Alleviation of Mobility-Related Social Exclusion?", *Journal of Social Policy*, vol. 32, no. 3, pp. 317-338.

Khosa, M. M. 1992, "Routes, Ranks and Rebels: Feuding in the Taxi Revolution", *Journal of Southern African Studies*, vol. 18, no. 1, pp. 232-251.

Kienzle, H. J. 1970, "Epistemology and Sociology", *The British Journal of Sociology*, vol. 21, no. 4, pp. 413-424.

Kimmel, D. C. 1988, "Ageism, Psychology, and Public Policy", *American Psychologist*, vol. 43, no. 3, pp. 175-178.

Kincheloe, J. L. 2008, *Critical Constructivism* Peter Lang, New York.

Kirby, M. 1999, *Stratification and Differentiation* Palgrave MacMillan, London.

Kitamura, R., Fujii, S., & Pas, E. I. 2004, "Time Use Data, Analysis and Modelling: Toward the Next Generation of Transportation Planning Methodologies", *Transport Policy*, vol. 4, no. 4, pp. 225-235.

Kivinen, O. & Piiroinen, T. 2006, "Toward Pragmatist Methodological Relationalism From Philosophizing Sociology to Sociologizing Philosophy", *Philosophy of the Social Sciences*, vol. 36, no. 3, pp. 303-329.

Kloppenberg, J. T. 1996, "Pragmatism: An Old Name for Some New Ways of Thinking?", *The Journal of American History* pp. 100-138.

Knutsson, K. E. 1997, *Children: Noble Causes or Worthy Citizens* Arena and Ashgate Publishing Limited, England.

Komulainen, S. 2007, "The Ambiguity of the Child's 'Voice' in Social Research", *Childhood*, vol. 14, no. 1, pp. 11-28.

Kondylis, F. & Manacorda, M. 2006, *School Proximity and Child Labor: Evidence from Rural Tanzania*, Department of Economics, RHUL and CEP, LSE, London.

Kousholt, D. 2012, "Family Problems: Exploring Dilemmas and Complexities of Organizing Everyday Family Life," in *Children, Childhood and Everyday Life: Children's Perspectives*, M. Hedegaard et al., eds., Information Age Publishing, Charlotte, pp. 125-139.

Kovarik, J. 1994, "The Space and Time for Children at the Interface of Psychology and Sociology," in *Childhood matters: Social theory, practice and politics*, J. Qvortrup et al., eds., Avebury Ashgate Publishing, Aldeshot.

Krappmann, L. 2010, "The Weight of the Child's View (Article 12 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child)", *International Journal of Children's Rights*, vol. *18*, pp. 501-513.

Krauss, S. E. 2005, "Research Paradigms and Meaning Making: A Primer", *The Qualitative Report*, vol. 10, no. 4, pp. 758-770.

KwaZulu-Natal Department of Transport 2004, *Child Killers Will be Prosecuted*, KwaZuku-Natal Department of Transport, KwaZulu-Natal.

Land Transport New Zealand 2007, *The Walking School Bus: Coordinator's Guide*.

Lang, D., Collins, D., & Kearns, R. 2011, "Understanding Modal Choice for the Trip to School", *Journal of Transport Geography*, vol. 19, pp. 509-514.

Larson, R. W. & Verma, S. 1999, "How Children and Adolescents Spend Time Across the World: Work, Play, and Developmental Opportunities", *Psychological Bulletin*, vol. 125, no. 6, pp. 703-736.

Lather, P. 1986, "Research as Praxis", *Harvard Educational Review*, vol. 56, no. 3, p. 257.

Law, R. M. 1984, *Women and Urban Transport: Gender, Mobility and Policy Issues in South Africa,* Master of Town and Regional Planning, University of Natal.

Lazarsfeld, P. F. & Oberschall, A. R. 1965, "Max Weber and Empirical Social Research", *American Sociological Review*, vol. 30, no. 2, pp. 185-199.

Lee, N. 2001, "Introduction: Childhood and Human Variation," in *Childhood and Society Growing Up in an Age of Uncertainty*, Open University Press, Buckingham.

Legassick, M. 1978, "Legislation, Ideology and Economy in post-1948 South Africa," in *Change, reform and economic growth in South Africa*, L. Schlemmer & E. Webster, eds., Ravan Press, Johannesburg.

Leipziger, D., Fay, M., Wodon, Q., & Yepes, T. 2003, *Achieving the Millennium Development Goals: The Role of Infrastructure*, World Bank, World Bank Policy Research Working Paper 3163.

Lemieux, C. 2012, "What Durkheimian Thought Shares with Pragmatism: How the Two Can Work Together for the Greater Relevance of Sociological Practice", *Journal of Classical Sociology*, vol. 12, no. 3-4, pp. 384-397.

Levinson, D. M. 1998, "Accessibility and the Journey to Work", *Journal of Transport Geography*, vol. 6, no. 1, pp. 11-21.

Levison, D. 2000, "Children as Economic Agents", *Feminist Economics*, vol. 6, no. 1, pp. 125-134.

Levitas, R. 1999, "Defining and Measuring Social Exclusion: A Critical Overview of Current Proposals", *Radical Statistics*, vol. Summer, no. 71, p. online publication.

Lewin, K. M. 2009, "Access to Education in sub-Saharan Africa: Patterns, Problems and Possibilities", *Comparative Education*, vol. 45, no. 2, pp. 151-174.

Lewis, M. W. & Grimes, A. J. 1999, "Metatriangulation: Building Theory from Multiple Paradigms", *The Academy of Management Review*, vol. 24, no. 4, pp. 672-690.

Lipton, M. 1972, "Independent Bantustans?", *International Affairs*, vol. 48, no. 1, pp. 1-19.

Lombard, M., Cameron, B., Mokonyama, M., & Shaw, A. 2007, *Report on Trends in Passenger Transport in South Africa*, Development Bank of Southern Africa, Midrand, South Africa, Development Paper No: 174.

Lucas, K. 2011, "Making the Connections between Transport Disadvantage and the Social Exclusion of Low Income Populations in the Tshwane Region of South Africa", *Journal of Transport Geography*, vol. 19, pp. 1320-1334.

Lyons, G. 2003, *Inaugural Lecture: Transport and society*, Unit for Transport and Society Faculty of the Built Environment University of the West of England Frenchay Campus Coldharbour Lane, Bristol.

Lyons, G. 2012, "Transport and Society - 10 Insights for the Renaissance: Paper prepared for the African Renaissance Conference, 24-25 May 2012, Durban", African Renaissance Conference, Durban.

Ma, A. & Norwich, B. 2007, "Triangulation and Theoretical Understanding", *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, vol. 10, no. 3, pp. 211-226.

Maarman, R. 2009, "Manifestations of 'Capabilities Poverty' with Learners Attending Informal Settlement Schools", *South African Journal of Education*, vol. 29, no. 317, p. 331.

Maasdorp, G. 1978, "Incomes and Employment: Unemployment in South Africa and its Implications," in *Change, reform and economic growth in South Africa*, L. Schlemmer & E. Webster, eds., Ravan Press, Johannesburg.

MacDonald, H. I. 1999, "Women's Employment and Commuting: Explaining the Links", *Journal of Planning Literature*, vol. 13, no. 3, pp. 267-283.

Macionis, J. J. & Plummer, K. 2008, *Sociology: A Global Introduction*, Fourth edn, Pearson and Prentice Hall, England.

Macionis, J. J. & Plummer, K. 2012, *Sociology: A Global Introduction*, Fourth edn, Pearson and Prentice Hall, England.

Mackett, R. L. & Titheridge, H. 2004, "A Methodology for the Incorporation of Social Inclusion into Transport Policy: Paper presented at the World Conference on Transport Research, held in Istanbul Turkey, July 2004", Centre for Transport Studies, University College London, London, Great Britain.

MacNaughton, G., Hughes, P., & Smith, K. 2007, "Young Children's Rights and Public Policy: Practices and Possibilities for Citizenship in the Early Years", *Children & Society*, vol. 21, pp. 458-469.

Mahapa, S. M. 2003, *Spatial and Social Exclusion: Travel and Transport Needs of Rural Women in Limpopo, South Africa,* Doctor of Philosophiae in the department of Geography, Geoinformatics and Meteorology, Faculty of Humanities, University of Pretoria, University of Pretoria.

Mahapa, S. M. 2003, *Integrating Gender into World Bank Financed Transport Programmes: A Case Study, South Africa, Shova Kalula*, Word Bank, World Bank.

Mail and Guardian On-line. Forty-nine schoolchildren crammed into 16-seater taxi. Mail and Guardian . 2010.

Malmberg-Calvo, C. 1994, *Case Study on Intermediate Means of Transport Bicycles and Rural Women in Uganda*, World Bank, SSATP Working Paper No 12.

Manasse, E. M. 1944, "Moral Principles and Alternatives in Max Weber and John Dewey", *The Journal of Philosophy*, vol. 41, no. 2, pp. 29-48.

Maree, K., Aldous, C., Hattingh, A., Swanepoel, A., & van der Linde, M. 2006, "Predictors of Learner Performance in Mathematics and Science according to a Large-scale Study in Mpumalanga", *South African Journal of Education*, vol. 26, no. 2, pp. 229-252.

Marx, K. & Engels, F. 1845, *Theses On Feuerbach*, On-line text, s.l.

Masadeh, M. A. 2012, "Linking Philosophy, Methodology, and Methods: Toward Mixed Model Design in the Hospitality Industry", *European Journal of Social Sciences*, vol. 28, no. 1, pp. 128-137.

Mashiri, M., Dube, S., & Buiten, D. 2007, "Fostering Child-Centred Approaches to Transport Research, Planning and Policy Development: A Pilot Study", *Commonwealth Youth and Development*, vol. 5, no. 2, pp. 63-75.

Mashiri, M. & Porter, G. 2007, *Children, Mobility and Transport in sub-Saharan Africa: Draft Review Report on the South Africa Pilot*, University of Durham, Durham, RES-167-25-0028 Inception Report.

Mason, J. & Fattore, T. 2005, *Children Taken Seriously in Theory, Policy and Practice* Jessica Kingsley Publishers, London.

Matthews, H., Limb, M., & Taylor, M. 1999, "Young People's Participation and Representation in Society", *Geoforum*, vol. 30, pp. 135-144.

Mayall, B. 2000, "The Sociology of Childhood in relation to Children's Rights", *The International Journal of Children's Rights*, vol. 8, pp. 243-259.

Mbatha, T. 2005, *Factors Affecting Caregivers' Perceptions of The Mode of Transport For School Going Children In Rural Areas: A Case Study of Emmaus area,* Master of Arts, University of KwaZulu-Natal, Pietermaritzburg.

Mbelle, N. & Human Rights Watch 2004, "Forgotten Schools: Right to Basic Education for Children on Farms in South Africa", *Human Rights Watch*, vol. 16, no. 7 (A), pp. 1-60.

McCarthy, J. J. & Swilling, M. 1985, "The Apartheid City and the Politics of Bus Transportation", *Cahiers d'Etudes*, vol. 25, no. 99, pp. 381-400.

McDonald, N. C. 2005, *Children's Travel: Patterns and Influences,* A dissertation submitted in partial satisfaction of the requirements of Doctor of Philosophy in City and Regional Planning, University of California, Berkeley.

McDonald, N. C. 2006, *Children's Travel Patterns: Evidence from the 2001 National Household Travel Survey*, University of Virginia, Virginia.

McDonald, N. C. 2008, "Critical Factors for Active Transportation to School among Low-income and Minority students: Evidence from the 2001 National Household Travel Survey", *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, vol. 34, no. 4, pp. 341-344.

McGrath, M. D. 1978, "Income and Material Inequality in South Africa," in *Change, reform and economic growth in South Africa*, L. Schlemmer & E. Webster, eds., Ravan Press, Johannesburg.

Mckendrick, J. H. 2000, "The Geography of Children: An Annotated Bibliography", *Childhood*, vol. 7, no. 3.

McMillan, T. E. 2007, "The Relative Influence of Urban Form on a Child's Travel Mode to School", *Transportation Research Part A*, vol. 41, pp. 69-79.

Merton, R. K. 1967, *On Theoretical Sociology: Five Essays, Old and New* The Free Press, New York.

Mhina, A. 2000, "Good Governance and Development in Tanzania: Some Ethical Issues", *Journal of Social Philosophy*, vol. 31, no. 4, pp. 429-438.

Migiro, S. O. & Magangi, B. A. 2011, "Mixed Methods: A Review of Literature and the Future of the New Research Paradigm", *African Journal of Business Management*, vol. 5, no. 10, pp. 3757-3764.

Milkie, M. A., Raley, S. B., & Bianchi, S. M. 2009, "Taking on the Second Shift: Time Allocations and Time Pressures of U.S Parents with Preschoolers", *Social Forces*, vol. 88, no. 2, pp. 487-517.

Mills, C. W. 1959, *The Sociological Imagination* Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Mills, C. W. 2000, *The Sociological Imagination: Fortieth Anniversary Edition* Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Misak, C. J. Pragmatism. Canadian Journal of Philosophy Supplementary Volume 24. 1999.

Mitchell, L. M. 2007, *New Debate about Children and Childhood: Could it Make a Difference to Early Childhood Pedagogy and Policy?,* Doctor of Philosophy in Education, Victoria University of Wellington.

Mitric, S. & Carruthers, R. 2005, *The Concept of Affordability of Urban Public Transport Services For Low-Income Passengers.*

Mngaza, K., Dhlamini, P., & van Zyl, O. 2001, "Addressing Learner Transport Issues in Gauteng. Paper presented at the 20th South African Transport Conference South Africa, 16 - 20 July 2001".

Mollnari, L. & Emiliani, F. 1993, "Structures and Functions of Social Representations: Theories of Development, Images of Child and Pupil", *Papers on Social Representation*, vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 95-106.

Montgomery, C. M., Hosegood, V., Busza, J., & Timæus, I. M. 2006, "Men's Involvement in the South African Family: Engendering Change in the AIDS Era", *Social Science and Medicine*, vol. 62, no. 10, pp. 2411-2419.

Monti, E. J. & Tingen, M. S. 1999, "Multiple Paradigms of Nursing Science", *Advances in Nursing Science*, vol. 21, no. 4, pp. 64-80.

Morgan, D. L. 2007, "Paradigms Lost and Pragmatism Regained Methodological Implications of Combining Qualitative and Quantitative Methods", *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 48-76.

Morris, J., Wang, F., & Lilja, L. 2001, *School Children's Travel Patterns - A Look Back and A Way Forward*, Transport Research Centre, Melbourne, Transport Research Centre.

Morrison, K. 2006, *Marx, Durkheim, Weber: Formations of Modern Social Thought* Sage, Los Angeles.

Morrow, R. A. 1990, "Social Closure: The Theory of Monopolization and Exclusion by Raymond Murphy", *The Canadian Journal of Sociology*, vol. 15, no. 4, pp. 477-482.

Morrow, V. & Richards, M. 1996, "The Ethics of Social Research with Children: An Overview", *Children & Society*, vol. 10, pp. 90-105.

Morrow, V. 2008, "Editorial: Changing Times at Childhood: Finding a Conceptual Home?", *Childhood*, vol. 15, pp. 301-307.

Morrow, V. 2011, *Understanding Children and Childhood* , Centre for Children and Young People, Southern Cross University, Australia, Report number 1.

Moses, S. 2008, "Children and Participation in South Africa: An Overview", *International Journal of Children's Rights*, vol. 16, pp. 327-342.

Moss, D. 2011, "The Form of Children's Political Engagement in Everyday Life", *Children & Society* pp. 1-11.

Murphy, R. 1983, "The Struggle for Scholarly Recognition: The Development of the Closure Problematic in Sociology", *Theory and Society*, vol. 12, no. 5, pp. 631-658.

Murphy, R. 1986, "Weberian Closure Theory: A Contribution to the Ongoing Assessment", *The British Journal of Sociology*, vol. 37, no. 1, pp. 21-41.

Murphy, R. 1988, *Social Closure The Theory of Monopolization and Exclusion* Claredon Press Oxford, Oxford.

Murphy, R. 2004, "The Structure of Closure: A Critique and Development of the Theories of Weber, Collins, and Parkin", *The British Journal of Sociology*, vol. 35, no. 4, pp. 547-567.

Musandu-Nyamayaro, O. "Transport and the Accelerated Growth Initiative in South Africa: Have we mainstreamed?", South African Transport Conference, Pretoria, South Africa.

Müller, S., Tscharaktschiew, S., & Haase, K. 2008, "Travel-to-school Mode Choice Modelling and Patterns of School Choice in Urban Areas", *Journal of Transport Geography*, vol. 16, pp. 342-357.

National Institute of Economic Policy (NIEP). & Reconstruction and Development Office. 1996, *Children, Poverty and Disparity Reduction: Towards Fulfilling the Rights of the Children in South Africa. A report commissioned by the Reconstruction and Development Office.*, Reconstruction and Development Office. Presidency, Pretoria. South Africa.

National Planning Commission 2014, *Diagnostic Overview*, Republic of South Africa, Presidency, Pretoria.

Nauck, B. & Klaus, D. 2007, "The Varying Value of Children: Empirical Results from Eleven Societies in Asia,Africa and Europe", *Current Sociology*, vol. 55, no. 4, pp. 487-503.

Neubert, S. 2001, *Pragmatism and Constructivism in Contemporary Philosophical Discourse*, University of Cologne, University of Cologne .

Neuman, W. L. 2011, *Social Research Methods: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches*, Seven edn, Pearsons, Boston.

Neutens, T., Schwanen, T., & Witlox, F. 2011, "The Prism of Everyday Life: Towards a New Research Agenda for Time Geography", *Transport reviews*, vol. 31, no. 1, pp. 25-47.

Neuwirth, G. 1969, "A Weberian Outline of a Theory of Community: Its Application to the `Dark Ghetto'", *The British Journal of Sociology*, vol. 20, no. 2, pp. 148-163.

Nicholson-Crotty, S. & Nicholson-Crotty, J. 2004, "Social Construction and Policy Implementation: Inmate Health as a Public Health Issue", *Social Science Quarterly*, vol. 85, no. 2, pp. 240-256.

Njenga, P. & Davis, A. 2003, "Drawing the Road Map to Rural Poverty Reduction", *Transport reviews*, vol. 23, no. 2, pp. 217-241.

Nojekwa, L. 2009, *Poverty Audit Report: Can Government Policies be said to be Pro-poor? An Exploration of Policy Studies in Poverty and Inequality Institute*, Open Society Foundation for South Africa, South Africa, Working Paper No. 4.

Ntuli, S. Rural schools in KZN get R87mil Boost for Transport. BuaNews April. 2009.

O' Brien, C. Planning transportation for and with children: Good news for pedestrians and cyclists. NCBW Forum Article [October]. 2004.

O'Brien, C. & Tranter, P. J. 2010, "Positive psychology, walking and well-being: Can walking school buses survive a policy of school closures? ", *World Transport Policy and Practice*, vol. 15, no. 4, pp. 42-52.

Olsen, W. 2004, *Triangulation in Social Research: Qualitative and Quantitative Methods can be Mixed*.

Olvera, L. D., Plat, D., & Pochet, P. 2003, "Transportation Conditions and Access to Service in a Context of Urban Sprawl and Deregulation: The Case of Dar es Salaam", *Transport Policy*, vol. 10, pp. 287-298.

Onwuegbuzie, A. J. & Leech, N. L. 2005, "Taking the "Q" Out of Research: Teaching Research Methodology Courses Without the Divide Between Quantitative and Qualitative Paradigms", *Quality & Quantity*, vol. 39, pp. 267-296.

Pansiri, J. 2005, "Pragmatism: A Methodological Approach to Researching Strategic Alliances in Tourism", *Tourism and Hospitality Planning & Development*, vol. 3 , no. 3, pp. 191-206.

Parkin, F. 1974, *The Social Analysis of Class Structure* Tavistock Publications, London.

Parkin, F. 1974, "Strategies of Social Closure in Class Formation," in *The Social Analysis of Class Structure*, F. Parkin, ed., Tavistock Publications, London, pp. 1-18.

Parpart, J. L., Connelly, M. P., & Barriteau, E. V. 2000, *Theoretical Perspectives on Gender and Development* IDRC.

Parsons, T. 1942, "Age and Sex in the Social Structure of the United States", *American Sociological Review*, vol. 7, no. 5, pp. 604-616.

Payne, G., Williams, M., & Chamberlain, S. 2004, "Methodological Pluralism in British Sociology", *Sociology*, vol. 38, no. 1, pp. 153-163.

Pearse, H. 1992, "Beyond Paradigms: Art Education Theory and Practice in a Postparadigmatic World ", *Studies in Art Education*, vol. 33, no. 4, pp. 244-252.

Peirce, C. S. 1905, "What Pragmatism is", *The Monist*, vol. 15, no. 2, pp. 161-181.

Pendyala, R. M. & Bhat, C. R. 2004, *Emerging Issues in Travel Behavior Analysis - Workshop Resource Paper – Abridged Version*, Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, University of South Florida, USA.

Percy-Smith, B. & Thomas, N. 2010, *A Handbook of Children and Young People's Participation: Perspectives from theory and practice* Routledge, Oxon.

Pierson, J. 2002, *Tackling social exclusion* Routledge, London.

Pilling, A., Holloway, B., & Turner, J. Catching them young - young peoples travel and the scope for influencing their travel behaviour. Paper based on research conducted for the Chief Scientist Unit of th eUK Department of Environment. 2004. s.l, s.n.

Pincus, F. L. 2006, *Understanding diversity: An introduction to class, race, gender, and sexual orientation* Lynne Rienner Publishers, Boulder, CA.

Plack, M. M. 2005, "Human Nature and Research Paradigms: Theory Meets Physical Therapy Practice", *The Qualitative Report*, vol. 10, no. 2, pp. 223-245.

Ponterotto, J. G. 2005, "Qualitative Research in Counselling Psychology: A Primer on Research Paradigms and Philosophy of Science ", *Journal of Counselling Psychology*, vol. 52, no. 2, pp. 126-136.

Pooley, C. G., Turnbull, J., & Adams, M. 2005, "The Significance of Travel and Mobility," in *A Mobile Century? Changes in Everyday Mobility in Britain in the Twentieth Century*, C. G. Pooley, J. Turnbull, & M. Adams, eds., Ashgate, Aldershot, pp. 1-12.

Porter, G. & Phillips-Howard, K. 1997, "Agricultural Issues in the former Homelands of South Africa: The Transkei", *Review of African Political Economy*, vol. 24, no. 72, pp. 185-202.

Porter, G. 2002, "Living in a Walking World: Rural Mobility and Social Equity Issues in sub-Saharan Africa", *World Development*, vol. 30, no. 2, pp. 285-300.

Porter, G. "Youth, mobility and Rural Livelihoods in sub-Saharan Africa", in *A presentation at the UK African Studies Association Biennial Conference*, University of London, London.

Porter, G. & Blaufuss, K. 2004, *Children, Transport and Traffic in Southern Ghana*, University of Durham, London.

Porter, G. 2004, *Improving Policy on Children's Mobility and Access through Development of a Participatory Child-Centred Field Methodology/ Toolkit*, University of Durham, London.

Porter, G. 2005, *Spatio-Temporal Perspectives on the Social Benefits and Costs of Roads and Road Transport: A Discussion Paper with Special Reference to Women and Children*, University of Durham, London.

Porter, G., Blaufuss, K., & Owusu-Acheampong, F. 2006, "Getting to School: Achieving Universal Primary Education", *id21 insights*, vol. 63.

Porter, G. 2006, *Children, Mobility and Transport in sub-Saharan Africa*, University of Durham, Durham, RES-167-25-0028 Inception Report.

Porter, G. 2007, "Transport, (Im) Mobility and Spatial Poverty Traps: Issues for Rural Women and Girl Children in sub-Saharan Africa".

Porter, G. & Abane, A. 2008, "Increasing Children's Participation in African Transport Planning: Reflections on Methodological Issues in a Child-Centred Research Project", *Children's Geographies*, vol. 6, no. 2, pp. 151-167.

Porter, G., Hampshire, K., Bourdillon, M., Robson, E., Munthail, A., Abane, A., & Mashiri, M. 2010, "Children as Research Collaborators: Issues and Reflections from a Mobility Study in Sub-Saharan Africa", *American Journal of Community Psychology*, vol. 46, pp. 215-227.

Porter, G., Hampshire, K., Mashiri, M., Dube, S., & Maponya, G. 2010, "'Youthscapes' and Escapes in Rural Africa: Education, Mobility and Livelihood Trajectories for Young People in Eastern Cape, South Africa", *Journal of International Development*, vol. 22, pp. 1090-1101.

Porter, G., Hampshire, K., Abane, A., Munthali, A., Robson, E., Mashiri, M., Tanle, A., Maponya, G. and Dube, S. 2012"Child Porterage and Africa's Transport Gap: Evidence from Ghana, Malawi and South Africa", *World Development,* vol. 40, no. 10, pp. 2136–2154.

Porter, G., Hampshire, K., Dunn, C., Hall, R., Levesley, M., Burton, K., Robson, S., Abane, A., Blell, M., and Panther, J. 2013, "Health impacts of pedestrian head-loading: A review of the evidence with particular reference to women and children in sub-Saharan Africa", *Social Science and Medicine,* vol. 88, pp. 21390-97.

Potgieter, C.-A., Pillay, R., & Rama, S. 2006, *Women, Development and Transport in Rural Eastern Cape, South Africa*, HSRC Press, Cape Town.
Pouliquen, L. 2000, *Infrastructure and poverty (First Draft)*, World Bank.

Price, M. 1986, "Health Care as an Instrument of Apartheid Policy in South Africa", *Health Policy and Planning*, vol. 1, no. 2, pp. 158-170.

Punch, S. 2001, "Household Division of Labour: Generation, Gender, Age, Birth Order and Sibling Composition", *Work, Employment and Society*, vol. 15, no. 4, pp. 803-823.

Punch, S. 2002, "Research with Children: The Same or Different from Research with Adults?", *Childhood*, vol. 9, no. 3, pp. 321-341.

Punch, S. 2012, "Childhoods in the Majority World: Miniature Adults or Tribal Children?", *Sociology*, vol. 37, no. 2, pp. 277-295.

Putnum, H. 1995, *Pragmatism: An Open Question* Blackwell Publishers, Oxford.

Pycroft, C. 1998, "Integrated Development Planning or Strategic Paralysis? Municipal Development during the Local Government Transition and beyond.", *Development Southern Africa*, vol. 15, no. 2, pp. 151-16.

Qvortrup, J. 1990, "A Voice for Children in Statistical and Social Accounting: A Plea for Children's Rights to be Heard. " in *Constructing and Reconstructing Childhood:*

Contemporary Issues in the sociological study of childhood, A. James & A. Prout, eds., Falmer Press, London.

Qvortrup, J. 1994, "Childhood Matters: An Introduction," in *Childhood matters: Social theory, practice and politics*, J. Qvortrup et al., eds., Avebury Ashgate Publishing, Aldeshot.

Qvortrup, J. 2003, "Editorial: An Established Field or a Breakthrough Still Pending?", *Childhood*, vol. 10, no. 4, pp. 395-401.

Qvortrup, J. 2007, "Editorial: A Reminder", *Childhood*, vol. 14, pp. 395-400.

Rabello de Castro, L. 2004, "Otherness in Me, Otherness in Others: Children's and youth's constructions of self and other", *Childhood*, vol. 11, no. 4, pp. 469-493.

Rama, S. 1999, *The Influence of Transport on the Life Experiences and Life Chances of School Goers: A Case Study of the Pietermaritzburg District,* Master of Arts [Sociology], University of Natal, Pietermaritzburg [University of KwaZulu-Natal].

Rama, S. & Bah, S. M. 2001, "Monitoring child rights in a society in transition: The opportunities afforded by a transformed statistical agency and the culture of child rights activism - Paper presented at the International Association for Official Statistics: "Statistique, Développement et Droits de l'Homme" , Montreux, 4. - 8. 9. 2000", International Association for Official Statistics: "Statistique, Développement et Droits de l'Homme" , Montreux, 4. - 8. 9. 2000, Switzerland.

Rama, S. & Richter, L. 2007, "Children's Household Work as a Contribution to the Well-Being of the Family and Household in South Africa," in *Families and Households in South Africa*, first edn, A. Y. Amoateng & L. Richter, eds., HSRC Press, Cape Town, pp. 135-169.

Rama, S., Naidoo, E., Shikumo, E., Asiimwe, S., Mothobi, I., Ramseook, Y., Boyce, G., Richter, L., & Bhana, A. 2007, *The Identification of Data Systems on Orphan and Vulnerable Children. Research report commissioned by the Department of Social Development.South Africa*, Department of Social Development.South Africa and Human Sciences Research Council., Durban and Pretoria.

Rawal, N. 2008, "Social Inclusion and Exclusion: A Review", *Dhaulagiri Journal of Sociology and Anthropology*, vol. 2, pp. 161-180.

Reay, D. & Lucey, H. 2003, "The Limits of 'Choice': Children and Inner City Schooling", *Sociology*, vol. 37, no. 1, pp. 121-142.

Redmond, G. 2008, "Child Poverty and Child Rights: Edging towards a Definition", *Journal of Children and Poverty*, vol. 14, no. 1, pp. 63-82.

Republic of South Africa. White Paper on Reconstruction and Development: Government's Strategy for Fundamental Transformation. Notice No. 1954 of 1994. 1994. Vol. 353, No. 16085.

Republic of South Africa, P. Growth, Employment and Redistribution A Macroeconomic Strategy 14 June 1996. 1996. South Africa, Republic of South Africa.

Republic of South Africa. Constitution of the Republic of South Africa No. 108 of 1996. No. 108 of 1996. 1996.

Republic of South Africa. South African Schools Act No 84 of 1996. No. 1867. 15 November 1996. 1996.

Republic of South Africa. National Land Transportation Transition Act No 22 of 2000. 2000.

Republic of South Africa, P. 2008, "Infrastructure Investment," Republic of South Africa, Presidency, Pretoria.

Republic of South Africa, P. 2009, *Government's Programme of Action 2009*, Republic of South Africa, Presidency, South Africa.

Republic of South Africa. National Land Transport Act No 5 of 2009. 2009.

Republic of South Africa. Children's Act, No. 38 of 2005. 28944. 2010.

Richter, L. M., Dawes, A., Rama, S., & Chandan, U. 2007, "South Africa," in *The Greenwood Encyclopedia of Children's Issues Worldwide: Sub-Saharan-Africa*, L. Arnston, ed., Greenwood Press, Connecticut, pp. 445-470.

Riley, M. W. 1987, "On the Significance of Age in Sociology ", *American Sociological Review*, vol. 52, no. 1, pp. 1-14.

Ritzer, G. 1997, *Postmodern Social Theory* McGraw-Hill, New York.

Ritzer, G. 2005, *Encyclopedia of Social Theory* Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks.

Ritzer, G. 2012, "An Introduction to Sociology in the Global Age," in *Introduction to Sociology*, G. Ritzer, ed., SAGE Publications, Inc, London, pp. 1-33.

Riverson, J., Kunieda, M., Roberts, P., & Walker, W. M. Challenges in Addressing Gender Dimensions of Transport in Developing Countries: Lessons from World Bank's Projects (Theme - Transport for Social Responsibility) - Presentation at TRB 2006 session 675 - TRB 2006 - Mainstreaming Gender into Transportation: Case of Developing Countries. 2006.

Robson, E. 2004, "Children at Work in Rural Northern Nigeria:Patterns of Age, Space and Gender", *Journal of Rural Studies*, vol. 20, no. 2, pp. 193-210.

Roets, G., Cardoen, D., Bouverne-De Bie, M., & Roose, R. 2013, "We Make the Road by Walking: Challenging Conceptualisations of Leisure Time for Children in Poverty", *Children & Society* pp. 1-11.

Rogan, M. J. 2006, *Dilemmas in Learner Transport: An Impact Evaluation of a School Transport Intervention in the Ilembe District, KwaZulu-Natal,* Masters of Development Studies, University of KwaZulu-Natal.

Rorty, R. 1990, *Feminism and Pragmatism*, University of Michigan, University of Michigan.

Roscigno, V. J., Mong, S., Byron, R., & Tester, G. 2007, "Age Discrimination, Social Closure and Employment", *Social Forces*, vol. 86, no. 1, pp. 313-334.

Rosenbloom, S. "Understanding Women's and Men's Travel Patterns The Research Challenge", Transportation Research Board, ed., Transportation Research Board, Washington DC, pp. 7-29.

Rostow, W. W. 1959, "Stages of Economic Growth", *The Economic History Review*, vol. 12, no. 1, pp. 1-16.

Roth, G. & Weber, M. 1976, "History and Sociology in the Work of Max Weber", *The British Journal of Sociology*, vol. 27, no. 3, pp. 306-318.

Rumens, N. & Kelemen, M. 2010, "American Pragmatism and Feminism: Fresh Opportunities for Sociological Inquiry", *Contemporary Pragmatism*, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 129-148.

Rust, F. C., McCutcheon, R. T., & Coetzee, L. 2008, "Transport Research: Quo Vadis? Paper presented at Proceedings of the 27th South African Transport Conference", South African Tranport Conference, Pretoria.

Rylander, A. 2012, *Pragmatism and Design Research – An Overview*. s.l, s.n.

Santiso, C. 2001, *Good Governance and Aid Effectiveness: The World Bank and Conditionality*, The Georgetown Public Policy Review, Washington DC, Volume 7 Number 1 Fall 2001, pp.1-22.

Saporiti, A. 1985, "Statistics and Childhood," in *Understanding Children's Rights*, A. Verhellen, ed., University of Gent, Gent, pp. 185-195.

Sarmiento, S. "Household, Gender and Travel: Paper presented at the second national conference on women's travel issues", n.l, Maryland, pp. 37-52.

Savage, M. & Burrows, R. 2009, "Some Further Reflections on the Coming Crisis of Empirical Sociology", *Sociology*, vol. 43, no. 4, pp. 762-772.

Schildkrout, E. 2002, "Age and Gender in Hausa society: Socio-economic Roles of Children in Urban Kano", *Childhood*, vol. 9, no. 3, pp. 344-368.

Schlemmer, L. & Webster, E. 1978, *Change, reform and economic growth in South Africa* Ravan Press, Johannesburg.

Schneider, A. & Sidney, M. 2009, "What is Next for Policy Design and Social Construction Theory?", *The Policy Studies Journal*, vol. 37, no. 1, pp. 103-119.

Schonfelder, S. & Axhausen, K. W. 2003, "Activity Spaces: Measures of Social Exclusion", *Transport Policy*, vol. 10, pp. 273-286.

Schuetz, A. 1953, "Common-Sense and Scientific Interpretation of Human Action", *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research*, vol. 14, no. 1, pp. 1-38.

Schwandt, T. A. 1998, "Constructivist, Interpretivist Approaches to Human Inquiry," in *The Landscape of Qualitative Research: Theories and Issues*, N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln, eds., Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks.

Seidman, S. 1996, "Pragmatism and Sociology: A Response to Clough, Denzin and Richardson", *The Sociological Quarterly*, vol. 37, no. 4, pp. 753-759.

Selod, H. & Zanou, Y. 2001, "Location and Education in South African Cities under and after Apartheid", *Journal of Urban Economics*, vol. 49, pp. 168-198.

Servaas, M. 2000, *The Significance of Non-Motorised Transport for Developing Countries Strategies for Policy Development: A Study on the Effectiveness of Non-Motorised Transport In Relation to Economic Growth, Reduction of Poverty and Quality of Life In Urban Areas and on the Applicability of Arrangements Developed in the Netherlands.*, I-ce, Interface for Cycling Expertise, Utrecht, the Netherlands.

Shanahan, S. 2007, "Lost and Found: The Sociological Ambivalence towards Childhood", *Annual Review of Sociology*, vol. 33, pp. 407-428.

Sheller, M. 2008, "Mobility, Freedom and Public Space," in *The ethics of mobilities: Rethinking place, exclusion, freedom and environment*, S. Bergmann & T. Sager, eds., Ashgate, United Kingdom, pp. 25-38.

Sheller, M. 2011, "Mobility", *Sociopedia.isa*.

Sheng, Y. K. What is Good Governance? 2007. Thailand, United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific.

Sieber, N. 1998, "Appropriate Transport and Rural Development in Makete district, Tanzania", *Journal of Transport Geography*, vol. 6, no. 1, pp. 69-73.

Silver, H. 2006, *The Process of Social Exclusion: The Dynamics of an Evolving Concept*, Brown University and University of Manchester Chronic Poverty Research Centre, USA.

Singh, K. 2003, *Aid and Good Governance: A Discussion Paper for The Reality of Aid*, Public Interest Research Group (India), India.

Sirota, R. 2010, "French Childhood Sociology: An Unusual, Minor Topic or Well-Defined Field?", *Current Sociology*, vol. 58, no. 2, pp. 250-271.

Skof, L. 2008, "Pragmatism and Social Ethics: An Intercultural and Phenomenological Approach", *Contemporary Pragmatism*, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 121-146.

Skolnick, A. 1975, "The Limits of Childhood: Conceptions of Child Development and Social Context", *Law and Contemporary Problems* pp. 38-77.

Smith, E. 2008, *Using Secondary Data in Educational and Social resarch* Open University Press, England.

Smith, N., Beckhelling, J., Ivaldi, A., Kellard, K., Sandu, A., & Tarrant, C. 2006, *Evidence Base Review on Mobility - Choices and Barriers for Different Social Groups* , Centre for Research in Social Policy, Department forTransport, UK, Final Report CRSP 554.

Smith, T. B. 1973, "The Policy Implementation Process", *Policy Sciences*, vol. 4, pp. 197-209.

Social Exclusion Unit 2003, *Making the Connections: Final Report on Transport and Social Exclusion*, Office of the Deputy Prime Minister, England.

Social Exclusion Unit 2004, *Tackling Social Exclusion: Taking Stock and Looking to the Future Emerging Findings*, Office of the Deputy Prime Minister, England.

Soko, A. Z. 2006, *Capacity Building and Development for Transport and Infrastructure Development: Are we ready for 2010?*

Sonkin, B., Edwards, P., Roberts, I., & Green, J. 2006, "Walking, Cycling and Transport Safety: An Analysis of Child Road Deaths", *Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine*, vol. 99, pp. 402-205.

Soussan, J. 1984, "Recent Trends in the South African Housing Policy", *Area*, vol. 16, no. 3, pp. 201-207.

Spinney, J. E. L., Scott, D. M., & Newbold, K. B. 2009, "Transport Mobility Benefits and Quality of Life: A Time-Use Perspective of Elderly", *Transport Policy*, vol. 16, pp. 1-11.

Sprague, J. & Kobrynowicz, D. 2006, "A Feminist Epistemology," in *Handbook of the Sociology of Gender*, J. S. Chafetz, ed., New York, Springer, pp. 25-44.

Spyrou, S. 2010, *Children's Educational Engagement with Nationalism in Divided Cyprus*.

Spyrou, S. 2011, "The Limits of Children's Voices: From Authenticity to Critical, Reflexive Representation", *Childhood*, vol. 18, no. 2, pp. 151-165.

Standing, H. 2004, "Gender, Myth and Fable: The Perils of Mainstreaming in Sector Bureaucracies", *IDS Bulletin.* Vol 35, no 4, pp 82-88.

Stanley, J. & Vella-Brodrick, D. 2009, "The Usefulness of Social Exclusion to Inform Social Policy in Transport", *Transport Policy*, vol. 16, pp. 90-96.

Stantchev, D. & Menaz, B. 2006, *Third Annual Thematic Research Summary – Equity and Accessibility*, Transport Research Knowledge Centre, Leeds, UK, Issue 1.0 [Deliverable D2.E-3.3] Contract No. GMA2/2001/52046-S07.13187.

Statistics South Africa, Department of Labour, & International Labour Organisation 2001, *Survey of Activities of Young People in South Africa, 1999: Tables on Children's Work-related Activities*, Statistics South Africa, Pretoria, (Report No. 02-02-01 (2001)).

Statistics South Africa, Department of Labour, & International Labour Organisation 2001, *Survey of Activities of Young people in South Africa, 1999: Country Report on Children's Work-related Activities*, Statistics South Africa, Pretoria, (Report No. 02-02-02 (2000)).

Statistics South Africa 2013, *A Survey of Time Use 2010*, Statistics South Africa, Pretoria.

Statistics South Africa 2013, *Statistical Release P0302: Mid-year Population Estimates*, Statistics South Africa, Pretoria, Statistical release P0302.

Stead, D. & Banister, D. 2001, "Influencing Mobility Outside Transport Policy", *Innovation*, vol. 14, no. 4, pp. 315-330.

Steinberg, M., Johnson, S., Schierhout, G., Ndegwa, D., Hall, K., Russel, B., & Morgan, J. 2013, *Hitting Home: How Households Cope with the Impact of the HIV/AIDS Epidemic - A Survey of Households Affected By HIV/AIDS in South Africa*, Henry J. Kaiser Family Foundation., South Africa.

Stephens, S. 1995, *Children and the Politics of Culture* Princeton University Press, New Jersey.

Storey, P. & Brannen, J. 2000, *Young People and Transport in Rural Areas - A Summary of the Report*, Thomas Coram Research Unit, Institution of Education, London.

Strasser, H. 1980, "Stratum and Class Formation: Principles of a Theory of Social Inequality", *The Canadian Journal of Sociology*, vol. 5, no. 2, pp. 103-120.

Streak, J., Dawes, A., Ewing, D., Rama, S., & Alexander, L. 2007, *Children working in the commercial and subsistence agriculture in South Africa: A child labour-related rapid assessment study*, Human Sciences Research Council in Association with Department of Labour, as lead department in the Child Labour Programme of Action, Pretoria.

Streak, J. C. 2004, "The GEAR Legacy: Did GEAR Fail or Move South Africa Forward in Development?", *Development Southern Africa*, vol. 21, no. 2, pp. 271-288.

Sutton, D., de Toma, C., Lind, H., Gunnarsson, A., & Tibblin, A. 2005, *"We don't do childhood poverty – we do large roads!" The EU, the Millennium Development Goals and Children*, Save the Children Europe Group .

Swiderska, C. & Sheate, W. R. 1998, "Solving the Rural Transport Dilemma: A Case Study of North Devon", *World Transport Policy and Practice*, vol. 4, no. 2, pp. 4-11.

Tashakkori, A. & Teddlie, C. 1998, *Mixed Methodology: Combining Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches* Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, California.

Thayer, H. S., Peirce, C. S., James, W., Dewey, J., & Mead, G. H. 1982, *Pragmatism: The Classic Writings* Hackett Publishing Company, Indianapolis.

The African Member States of the Organization of African Unity. African Charter on the Rights and the Welfare of the Child. 1999.

The Centre for Sustainable Transportation & O' Brien, C. 2004, *Child-friendly transport planning*, The Centre for Sustainable Transportation, Canada.

Thomsen, T. U. "Workbook for the Workshop on Children and Traffic", Roskilde University, Roskilde.

Timperio, A., Ball, K., Salmon, J., Roberts, R., Giles-Corti, B., Simmons, D., Baur, L. A., & Crawford, D. 2006, "Personal, Family, Social, and Environmental Correlates of Active Commuting to School", *American Journal of Preventative Medicine*, vol. 30, no. 1, pp. 45-51.

Tisdall, E. K. M. & Davis, J. 2004, "Making a Difference? Bringing Children's and Young People's Views into Policy-making", *Children & Society*, vol. 18, pp. 131-142.

Titheridge, H. 2004, *Social Exclusion and Transport Policy*, University College London, London.

Titmuss, R. M. 2008, "What is Social Policy?," in *Welfare States: Construction, Deconstruction, Reconstruction*, S. Leibfried & S. Mau, eds., Edward Elgar Publishing, Surrey.

Todman, L. 2004, *Reflections on Social Exclusion: What is it? How is it different U.S. conceptualizations of disadvantage? And, why might Americans consider integrating it into U.S. social policy discourse? (Italy)*.

Tooley, J. 1997, "On School Choice and Social Class: A Response to Ball, Bowe and Gewitz", *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, vol. 18, no. 2, pp. 217-230.

Transportation Research Board 2004, "Report of a Conference: Research on Women's Issues in Transportation - Technical Papers", Transportation Research Board, Chicago, Illinois.

Transportation Research Board 2004, "Report of a Conference: Research on Women's Issues in Transportation", Transportation Research Board, Chicago, Illinois.

Tsekeris, C. 2012, "Advances in Reflexive Sociology: Theory, Agency and Dialogical Inquiry", *Italian Sociological Review*, vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 66-75.

Tuli, F. 2010, "Review Article: The Basis of Distinction between Qualitative and Quantitative Research in Social Science: Reflection on Ontological, Epistemological and Methodological Perspectives", *Ethiopian.Journal of Education and Sc.*, vol. *6*, no. 1, pp. 97-107.

Turner, B. S. 1989, "Ageing, Status Politics and Sociological Theory", *The British Journal of Sociology*, vol. 40, no. 4, pp. 586-606.

Turner, B. S. 2009, *The New Blackwell Companion to Social Theory* Wiley-Blackwell, Sussex.

Turner, J. & Kwakye, E. A. 1996, "Transport and Survival Strategies in Developing Economy: Case Evidence from Accra, Ghana", *Journal of Transport Geography*, vol. 4, no. 3, pp. 161-168.

Turner, J., Grieco, M., & Apt, N. "Gender, Transport and the New Deal: The Social Policy Implications of Gendered Time, Transport and Travel: Paper presented at the Social Policy Association Conference, Lincoln, July 1998", Social Policy Association Conference, pp. 1-5.

Turner, J., Apt, N., Grieco, M., & Kwakye, E. A. 1998, *Users Not Losers: Gender Representation in Transport Design and Operation*, s.n, s.l.

Turner, J. & Grieco, M. 2000, "Gender and Time poverty: The Neglected Social Policy Implications of Gendered Time, Transport and Travel", *Time Society*, vol. 9, pp. 129-136.

Turner, J. 2004, "Mainstreaming Gender in the Transport Sector: From Rhetoric to Practice", *International Forum for Rural Transport and Development Forum News*, vol. 11, no 3, pp. 1-2.

Turner, J. H. 2013, *Theoretical Sociology: A Concise Introduction to Twelve Sociological Theories* Sage Publishers, Los Angeles.

Turner, S. 1991, "Social Constructionism and Social Theory", *Sociological Theory*, vol. 9, no. 1, pp. 22-33.

Turner, S. P. 1983, "Weber on action", *American Sociological Review*, vol. 48, no. 4, pp. 506-519.

Turner, S. P. & Roth, P. A. 2003, "Introduction. Ghosts and the Machine: Issues of Agency, Rationality, and Scientific Methodology in Contemporary Philosophy of Social Science," in *The Blackwell Guide to the Philosophy of the Social Sciences*, S. P. Turner & P. A. Roth, eds., Blackwell Publishing, Malden, MA, USA, pp. 1-18.

Turner, T. & Niemeier, D. 1997, "Travel to Work and Household Responsibility: New Evidence", *Transportation*, vol. 24, pp. 397-419.

Tyler, N. 2004, *Justice in Transport Policy*, School of Public Policy, University College London, London, School of Public Policy Working Paper Series: ISSN 1479-9472 - Working Paper 8.

Umar, K. & Kuye, J. O. 2008, "Rationalism and the Problematique in Policy Making and Analysis: The Case of Public Policy Targeting in Africa", *Journal of Public Administration*, vol. 41, no. 1, pp. 807-821.

UNAIDS 2010, *An Introduction to Triangulation*, UNAIDS, Switzerland.

UNDP 2007, *Ghana Human Development Report 2007: From Exclusion to an Inclusive Society*, UNDP, Ghana.

UNICEF & Bellamy, C. 1999, *The State of the World's Children, 1999* UNICEF, New York.

United Nations. Convention on the Rights of the Child. 1990.

Urry, J. 2000, "Mobile Sociology", *British Journal of Sociology*, vol. 51, no. 1, pp. 185-203.

Urry, J. 2002, *Mobility and Connections*, Dept of Sociology, Lancaster University Paris, April 2002, Paris.

Urry, J. 2005, "Mobility and Proximity", *Sociology*, vol. 36, no. 2, pp. 255-274.

Urry, J. 2007, *Mobilities* Polity Press, Cambridge.

Urry, J. 2011, "Does Mobility have a Future," in *Mobilities: New Perspectives on Transport and Society*, M. Grieco & J. Urry, eds., Ashgate, Surrey, England.

Uteng, T. A. & Cresswell, T. 2008, *Gendered Mobilities* Ashgate, England.

van Krieken, R. & Bühler-Niederberger, D. 2009, "Rethinking the Sociology of Childhood: Conflict, Competition and Cooperation in Children's Lives," in *The ISA Handook in Contemporary Sociology: Conflict, Competition, Cooperation*, A. Denis & D. Kalekin-Fishman, eds., Sage, Los Angeles, pp. 185-200.

Vartanian, T. P. 2011, *Secondary Data Analysis* Oxford University Press, New York.

Vasconcellos, E. A. 1997, "Rural Transport and Access to Education in Developing Countries: Policy Issues", *Journal of Transport Geography*, vol. 5, no. 2, pp. 127-136.

Ver Ploeg, M., Altonji, J., Bradburn, N., DaVanza, J., Nordhaus, W., & Samaniego, F. 2003, *Time-use Measurement and Research: A Report of a Workshop*, National Academies Press, USA.

Vigar, G. 2002, *The Politics of Mobility: Transport, the Environment and Public Policy* Spon Press, London.

Vilhelmson, B. 1999, "Daily Mobility and the Use of Time for Different Activities. The case of Sweden", *GeoJournal*, vol. 48, pp. 177-185.

Villette, S. M. & Hardill, I. 2007, "Spatial Peripheries, Social Peripheries: Reflections on the "suburbs" of Paris", *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy*, vol. Intern 27, no. 1/2, pp. 52-64.

Vogler, P., Morrow, V., & Woodhead, M. 2009, *Conceptualising and Measuring Children's Time Use*, Young Lives, Department of International Development, University of Oxford.

Vulliamy, G. 2001, "Review Essay: A Sociology of School Exclusions", *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, vol. 22, no. 1.

Wacquant, L. J. D. 1989, "Towards a Reflexive Sociology: A workshop with Pierre Bourdieu", *Sociological Theory*, vol. 7, no. 2, pp. 26-63.

Wagenaar, H. & Cook, S. D. N. 2003, "Understanding Policy Practices: Action, Dialectic and Deliberations in Policy Analysis," in *Deliberative Policy Analysis: Understanding Governance in the Networked Society*, M. A. Hajer & H. Wagenaar, eds., Cambridge University Press, Edinburgh, pp. 139-172.

Wall, K. 2000, "Summary of Chapter 7: Delivering Development: Municipal Service Delivery," in *DBSA Development Report: Building Developmental Local Government*, Development Bank of Southern Africa, South Africa.

Wallace, R. & Wolf, A. 1995, *Contemporary Sociological Theory: Continuing the Classical Tradition*, Fourth edn, Prentice Hall, New Jersey.

Watson, A. M. S. 2006, *The Child in International Political Economy: A Place at the Table* Routledge, Oxon.

Watson, A. M. S. 2009, "Children's Human Rights and the Politics of Childhood ," in *The Ashgate research companion to ethics and international relations*, P. Hayden, ed., Ashgate Publishing Limited, England, pp. 247-260.

Watts, M., Jofili, Z., & Bezerra, R. 1997, "A Case for Critical Constructivism and Critical Thinking in Science Education", *Research in Science Education*, vol. 27, no. 2, pp. 309-322.

Weber, M., Henderson, A. R., & Parsons, T. 1947, *The Theory of Social and Economic Organization* William Hodge and Company Limited, London.

Weber, M., Shils, E. A., & Finch, H. A. 1949, *Max Weber on the Methodology of the Social Sciences* The Free Press of Glencoe, Illiniois.

Weber, M., Gerth, H. H., & Mills, C. W. 1970, *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology* Routledge and Kegan Paul, London.

Weber, M., Roth, G., & Wittich, C. 1978, *Economy and Society: An Outline of Interpretive Sociology* University of California Press, Berkerly.

Weber, M. & Graber, E. E. 1981, "Some Categories of Interpretive Sociology", *The Sociological Quarterly*, vol. 22, no. 2, pp. 151-180.

Weber, M. 2005, "Remarks on Technology and Culture", *Theory, culture and society*, vol. 22, no. 4, pp. 23-38.

Webster, A. 1990, *Introduction to the Sociology of Development*, Second edn, Palgrave Macmillan, New York.

Webster, E. 2004, "Sociology in South Africa: Its Past, Present and Future", *Society in Transition*, vol. 35, no. 1, pp. 27-41.

Weinberg, D. 2009, "Social Constructionism," in *The New Blackwell Companion to Social Theory*, Wiley-Blackwell, Sussex, p. 281.

Weiner, P. P. 1946, "Peirce's Metaphysical Club and the Genesis of Pragmatism", *Journal of the History of Ideas*, vol. 7, no. 2, pp. 218-233.

Weiss, T. G. 2000, "Governance, Good Governance and Global Governance: Conceptual and Actual Challenges", *Third World Quarterly*, vol. 21, no. 5, pp. 795-814.

Wells, K. 2009, *Childhood in a Global Perspective* Polity Press, Cambridge.

Whitelegg, J. 2010, "Editorial", *World Transport Policy and Practice*, vol. 15, no. 4, pp. 3-4.

Wilkinson, P. 1998, "Housing Policy in South Africa", *Habitat International*, vol. 22, no. 3, pp. 215-229.

Wilson, E., Wilson, R., & Krizek, K. J. 2007, *Examining the Implications of School Choice on Travel Behavior and Environmental Emissions*.

Wintermeyer, B., McLachlan, G., & Andrew Palframan, A. 2004, "The Effects of Location on Rural School Buildings in the Eastern Cape, with specific regard to Maintenance and Vandalism", *Unknown*.

Woodhead, M. & Montgomery, H. 2003, *Understanding Childhood: An Interdisciplinary Approach,* The Open University and Wiley Publishers, United Kingdom.

Woolard, I. 2002, *An Overview of Poverty and Inequality in South Africa*, DFID, South Africa, Working Paper prepared for DFID (SA).

World Bank 1994, *1994 World Development Report: Infrastructure for Development*, World Bank, New York.

World Bank 2003, *2004 World Development Report: Making Services Work for the Poor*, World Bank, New York.

World Bank. Transport and Gender. Gender and development briefing notes 1[1], 1-2. 2007.

Wright, E. O. 2002, "The Shadow of exploitation in Weber's Class Analysis", *American Sociological Review*, vol. 67, no. 6, pp. 832-853.

Wright, E. O. 2005, *Approaches to Class Analysis* Cambridge Press, London.

Xaba, J. 2011, "The 2011 XVIIth SASA Congress: An Overview", *South African Review of Sociology*, vol. 42, no. 3, pp. 128-132.

Yago, G. 1983, "The Sociology of Transportation", *Annual Review of Sociology*, vol. 9, pp. 171-190.

Zhao, G. 2011, "The Modern Construction of Childhood: What Does It Do to the Paradox of Modernity?", *Studies in the Philosophy of Education*, vol. 30, pp. 241-256.

Zimmerman, S. L. 1979, "Policy, Social Policy, and Family Policy: Concepts, Concerns and Analytical Tools", *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, vol. 41, no. 3, pp. 487-495.