

YOUTH CITIZENSHIP:
REPRESENTATIONS AND MEANINGS

by

ANGÉLICA ARAÚJO DE MELO MAIA

B.A., Universidade Federal da Paraíba, 1992
M.A. Universidade Federal de Pernambuco, 1995

A GRADUATE PAPER SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF
THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF

MASTER OF EDUCATION

In

THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES

(Society, Culture and Politics in Education)

THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

(Vancouver)

October, 2009

© Angélica Araújo de Melo Maia, 2009

Abstract

This paper proposes a categorization of different approaches to youth citizenship. Considering distinct research orientations on the topic and reflecting on the description of pedagogical experiences involving citizenship education, three framings of youth citizenship are identified: a developmental approach, a critical approach and a process-based one. Each of these framings is discussed in the paper while concepts and relations are proposed in order to suggest how aspects such as conceptions of youth, the definition and scope of citizenship, agency, experience, identity, pedagogical strategies and instances towards youth-adult collaboration are framed in each of the different approaches. The ultimate goal is to provide a coherent analytical frame that can be used in future research and inform recommendations for better pedagogical practices in the field of youth citizenship education.

Table of contents

Abstract	ii
Table of contents	iii
Acknowledgements.....	iv
Dedication.....	v
CHAPTER 1: Introduction.....	1
CHAPTER 2: Approaches to youth citizenship.....	3
A developmental view	3
A critical view	4
A process-based view	6
CHAPTER 3: Expanding the analysis: Youth citizenship and the notions of agency, experience and identity	10
Youth citizenship and agency	10
Youth citizenship and experience.....	14
Youth citizenship, identity and positionality	17
CHAPTER 4: Bringing together youth citizenship, universalist and group-specific justice claims.....	21
CHAPTER 5: The categories in action: snapshots of practices based on distinct approaches to youth citizenship in Brazil	28
Snapshot 1	28
Snapshot 2.....	30
Snapshot 3.....	33
Summary table of categories	37
Chapter 6: Conclusions.....	39
References.....	42

Acknowledgements

I am grateful to the faculty, staff and my fellow students at the UBC for their support, especially to my colleague Renira Vellos who made very useful comments and suggestions to the paper.

I owe particular thanks to Dr. Deirdre Kelly and Dr Lisa Loutzenheiser for their caring supervision, their enthusiastic involvement in this project and their supportive suggestions and comments.

I thank Dr Claudia Ruitenbergh for enlarging my vision of education through the fruitful discussions in her classes.

Special thanks are owed to my parents, Arnaldo and Lamar, who have supported me throughout my years of education, both morally and financially and to my mother-in-law, Ester, whose support was essential for me to be able to accomplish this project.

Finally, I would like to express my gratitude to my partner Anderson, my daughter Leticia and my son João Guilherme, who agreed to embark with me on this journey and gave all the love and support I needed to complete the program.

Dedication

To my friend Maria Pilar Repulléz,
whose work against social injustice
in the world has been a source of
inspiration for me.

CHAPTER 1: Introduction

Youth citizenship is a concept that has been framed from multiple perspectives by different scholars in recent years (Sherrod, Flanagan & Youniss, 2002; Torney-Purta, Lehman, Oswald, & Shulz, 2001; Ginwright, Cammarota & Noguera, 2005; Smith, Lister, Middleton, & Cox, 2005; Lewis-Charp, Yu & Soukamneuth, 2006; Biesta, Lawy & Kelly, 2009). The understandings undergirding these perspectives range from essentializing, universalist and descriptive approaches to youth and citizenship to more critical views of what means to be a young citizen in specific contexts. Moreover, the varied studies attached to each perspective reflect an interest in discussing youth citizenship either in order to facilitate youth civic participation or to understand more clearly which aspects of youth identity are constitutive of citizenship.

As it might be expected, the notions of citizenship relate to the way the category youth is represented in specific frameworks. Thus, those who understand youth within the “transition to adulthood” model or as “coming of age” (Lesko, 2001) consider youth citizenship as a set of skills to be taught to young people so that they can become good citizens (Sherrod, Flanagan & Youniss, 2002; Torney-Purta, Lehman, Oswald, & Shulz, 2001). Alternatively, researchers who see youth as capable and responsible for making social changes in society will identify youth citizenship as a tool for empowering young people and helping them to act as social activists and provoke structural changes (Ginwright, Cammarota & Noguera, 2005; Lewis-Charp, Yu & Soukamneuth, 2006). Finally, there are scholars who have recently proposed a view of youth as a socially constructed category, and who, therefore, argue for an understanding of citizenship that is less instrumental or focused on achievement of goals. Instead, those scholars discuss youth citizenship as a process-based construct, framed around notions of self-identity, experience and reflective agency (Smith, Lister, Middleton, & Cox, 2005; Biesta, Lawy & Kelly, 2009).

Departing from the perception of those distinct approaches, the aim of this paper is to propose a categorization of current understandings of youth citizenship, relating them to corresponding pedagogical strategies for working with youth citizenship in formal and informal youth education contexts. In order to do that, I will analyse each of the perspectives on youth citizenship described above, taking as analytical instruments the following items: conceptions of youth, views and scope of citizenship, conceptions of agency, identity and experience, pedagogical implications and strategies, and how collaboration between youth and adults is framed in each perspective.

My interest in this topic derives from my work with disadvantaged youth in an NGO in Brazil. Talking to the young people at this institution, I noticed that although not using the term citizenship, they make choices that have a great impact on how they situate themselves within the various communities of which they are part (family, school, neighbourhood) and on how their communities see them as members. Examples include the decisions to drop out of school, the fact that many young people have to work hard to graduate, as well as experiences like leaving home to form a family, having children, joining sub-culture groups or finding a job. If one considers these choices as one dimension of citizenship practices, it becomes clear how important it is to reflect on a youth citizenship frame that contemplates those practices as important signs of how young people present and represent themselves as citizens. Doing so will open spaces for the discussion of citizenship learning conceptions that do not focus only on curriculum requirements but which acknowledge the dimensions of citizenship emerging in youth everyday lives (Biesta et al., 2009), focussing on the demands of a changing, multi-dimensional and complex world, where there are such strong patterns of economic, social inequalities and power imbalances.

CHAPTER 2: Approaches to youth citizenship

A developmental view

In its historical development, there has been a dominant framing of the concept of youth in terms of “citizens in the making” (Marshall, as cited in Biesta et al., 2009, p.6). From this point of view, youth citizenship is considered a set of skills that youth lack and that ought to be offered to them by institutions of civil society (family, schools, government), so that they perform as model citizens and establish a stable society when they become adults. Following this model, a range of scholars have discussed youth citizenship in order to suggest the best types of interventions, both in in-school and in out-of-school contexts, which would be effective to develop in youth appropriate civic behaviour (Sherrod et al., 2002; Torney-Purta et al., 2001).

Civic behaviour, in that case, refers to “knowledge of government structure and functions; attitudes towards proper political behaviour” and “a host of actions that comprise participation in civil society” (Youniss, Bales, Christmas-Best, Diversi, McLaughlin & Silbereisen, 2002, p.124). The ultimate goal of this view of youth citizenship education is the development of civic competencies, as youth are seen as the citizens of the future and those responsible for taking over the civic responsibilities of the previous generations.

Within the developmental approach to youth citizenship, there is also a line of research that focuses on the development of youth from a more positive standpoint rather than from a perspective of deficit. For the scholars following this view, youth are considered social assets and attention is given to “the kinds of supports and opportunities young people need to become healthy and functioning adults” (Lewis-Charp et al., 2006, p.21).

Ginwright, Cammarota and Noguera (2005) argue that although youth development theory recognize important features of young people when acting in their communities – and therefore

performing civic roles – it has quite an individualistic understanding of youth and places little attention on the socio-political processes (context) and identity issues (race, social class, gender, sexuality) shaping the lives of young citizens.

Research on youth citizenship adopting the developmental perspective sometimes incorporates youths' views about the meanings of citizenship, but such views are often analysed through the lens of the researchers (adults). Thus, such conception of citizenship restricts the possibility of youth playing leading roles in the construction of knowledge.

Lather (1991) proposes a chart for understanding the various kinds of paradigms of inquiry in their historical development, trying to categorize how those different paradigms work with specific ontologies, methodologies, epistemologies and views of science. Considering the location of the developmental perspective to youth citizenship within the paradigms of inquiry she presents, its theoretical underpinnings should be understood by reference to a structural descriptive/constructivist view of the world and of science. In fact, scholars who work with this view of citizenship range from positivist to interpretive approaches to knowledge and theory, depicting youth citizenship as a concept that can be categorized, understood and manipulated for the benefit of the whole society.

A critical view

Another current approach for discussing youth citizenship is reflected in the work of scholars involved with youth activism and political engagement. Such scholars offer a critique of the way youth are considered “second-class citizens” by the mainstream institutions in society, in the sense that they are portrayed as “passive consumers of civic life” (Ginwright et al., 2005, p.25) and their experiences of citizenship are given no space in the public arenas.

Furthermore, these scholars make a connection between youth citizenship and issues of race and class. In other words, they understand that citizenship education should be committed to creating possibilities for poor and/or racially oppressed youth in society to protest against injustice and discrimination and demand equality, social justice and participation in social arena (Ginwright et al., 2005).

Youth citizenship, from a critical perspective, is closely related to civic activism, which is described as the capacity of youth to organize on a collective basis to “resist dominant discourses and prejudices in the course of their day-to-day lives” and to take action “to transform the policy and institutions around them” (Lewis-Charp et al., 2006, p.22). Such resistance is characterized as being strategic and not just oppositional, as long as it entails social action to achieve a common good (Giroux, 1996, as cited in Noguera & Cannella, 2006). Rather than being shaped as objects of citizenship education (as in the developmental approach) youth are recognised “as agents who have the potential to act and thereby play a role in transforming the conditions in the neighbourhoods and communities in which they live” (Ginwright et al., 2005, p.33). In this way, this conception gives youth a more pro-active and autonomous role in the educational process around citizenship and in the social practices where citizenship knowledge becomes an instrument of change.

The mechanisms used to facilitate youth civic engagement acknowledge youth capacity for agency and thus do not involve direct intervention and modelling of expected patterns of behaviour. Instead, strategies are used to encourage youth to find their own ways to represent their concerns, their demands and their solutions for what they frame as problems in the various communities they participate in.

Regarding the paradigms of inquiry mentioned above (Lather, 1991), this critical approach to youth citizenship is also based on a structural view of the world. However, unlike the developmental perspective, this approach acknowledges youth as already pro-active citizens, particularly those who live in situations of marginalization and oppression related to class and race. Youth citizenship and youth agency are seen as powerful tools for effecting structural changes in society and fostering more equal and just communities.

A potential flaw in that theoretical view of youth citizenship is its main focus on marginalized youth, as if citizenship education should not involve all young people in society. Depending on their class, race and gender, some youth from a very early age engage in certain social practices and discourses that reflect specific meanings attached to citizenship and specific patterns of civic action. Citizenship is in fact, a process that involves all youth, although its discourse may be constructed in distinct ways to address specific groups, social classes, specific races and genders. Thus, by constructing citizenship practices as a prerogative of certain groups of youth (the oppressed youth), this approach leaves unchallenged the fact that citizenship itself is a concept which involves a constant struggle over power. That struggle results first from the difficulty to incorporate universalist and group-specific claims, and secondly from the fact that in our globalized world, not everyone (and not all youth) has access to political representation in the search for justice (Fraser, 2005), as it will be further discussed in this paper.

A process-based view

A last perspective on youth citizenship refers to the notion recently proposed by some scholars of “citizenship-as-process” (Smith et al, 2005; Biesta et al., 2009). Without denying the contribution of youth development approaches to citizenship or the value of critical approaches

which encourage civic engagement, community development and social change, the “citizenship-as-process” scholars highlight that there are other aspects of youth citizenship that apply to all youth and that ought to be considered.

These aspects refer to the ways young people understand citizenship and enact civic participation in their everyday lives, that is, the ways they engage with various social practices on a daily basis, reflecting specific meanings of what the roles of a citizen are. From this perspective, youth citizenship is based on a theoretical paradigm that does not necessarily attach the meaning of citizenship to the *achievement* of certain civic goals, whether such goals refer to development of ethical and responsible citizens or the political engagement resulting in social justice and structural changes.

It is actually a more inclusive view of citizenship, which does not simply look at youth citizenship as an instrument to produce certain expected outcomes, but primarily as a process through which youth constantly learn to signify and re-signify their practices and construct their own understanding of what it means to be a citizen in our current world. In my view, that process could have an enormous impact on the educational system, particularly because it would enlarge the scope of youth’s contribution to the process of knowledge production, allowing citizenship knowledge to be produced *with* youth and not only *about* youth.

It is interesting to notice how this model of citizenship is more flexible than the previous ones and such flexibility is noticeable at multiple levels. First, there is flexibility in terms of *who* is entitled to citizenship, which is not framed by the educational process as an exclusionary category. Rather than that, any young person, regardless of his or her social class, gender, health condition, ability/disability status, geographical location (from/in colonized/colonizing nations),

nationality, ethnicity and/or educational level should have access to some representation of citizenship.

Secondly, this model of youth citizenship is flexible at the level of *what* the object of citizenship is. It is flexible enough to accommodate universalist claims of citizenship or specific group's claims of citizenship, as far as it emphasizes the attention to context and to the specificities of each social process in which there is claim for citizenship rights. That flexibility does not mean that this theory of citizenship should become attached to a theory of subjectivity. The flexibility is intended to give the subjects of the process some space for negotiating their framings of justice "dialogically, through the give-and -take of argument in democratic deliberation" (Fraser, 2005, p.83). Considering that youth is a group often marginalized in terms of political representation in processes of democratic deliberation, this view opens the doors for challenging the exclusion of youth from political processes or even the exclusion of some groups of youth from access to power within youth political stances.

Last, the "citizenship-as-process" approach is flexible in terms of *how* to work with youth citizenship as an educational issue. The flexibility, at this level, allows pedagogical practices that are not only concerned with the meeting of instrumental needs or the fulfilment of pre-defined goals which are usually set from the outside and regardless of young people's views. Instead, the pedagogical process derived from that view of youth citizenship places young people as the key agents of the teaching/learning dynamics and takes young people's knowledge, experiences and representations as valuable input for the design of goals, practices and the evaluation of educational activities around citizenship.

A possible criticism is that, in contexts of extreme social injustice, where socially excluded youth are the majority, such a flexible perspective may interfere with the impact of strategic

decisions for involving the largest possible amount of young people in shared justice struggles. Thus, the use of this approach for analysing processes of youth citizenship in certain contexts may not be appropriate, which might explain why the first two approaches of youth citizenship are more commonly found in research addressing aspects of youth citizenship education.

CHAPTER 3: Expanding the analysis: youth citizenship and the notions of agency, experience and identity

Up to this point, I have proposed a first categorization of distinct approaches to youth citizenship focussing on how youth are represented in each of the three perspectives and on the understandings of citizenship on which the distinct paradigms are based.

Let me now expand the framework by using as guiding concepts three analytical categories: agency, experience and identity. I perceive those categories as significant interconnected constructs and possibly consistent analytical tools for examining youth citizenship as a more comprehensive and complicated process. The reason for that is that those concepts allow a shift from essentializing and narrow approaches to youth towards complex and dynamic interpretations of young people's identities and contexts.

Youth citizenship and agency

As it has been suggested in this paper, youth citizenship is considered a broad concept and, in distinct paradigms, it may refer to youth development as the transformation into responsible adults belonging to a nation-state and acting responsibly in order to develop their nation; it may also be understood as civic participation of oppressed youth minorities aiming at social change, or (more inclusively) it may cover all practices developed by youth that have impact on their life stories and on the configuration of the communities in which those young people participate (family, school, neighbourhood, peer groups, community organizations and others) (Smith, Lister, Middleton, & Cox, 2005).

Accordingly, agency is a complex concept in the field of youth and citizenship studies. In different theoretical approaches, young people are either framed as lacking agency, a view

criticized in Lesko (2001), or as in need of emancipatory education so that their capacity for agency is encouraged or strengthened (Lewis-Charp, Yu & Soukamneuth, 2006; Rubinstein-Avila, 2006). The question I focus on here is what conception of agency is related to each of the theories of youth citizenship mentioned above.

According to Calhoun (2002), a general view of agency “suggests not merely the ability to act, but to act in ways that demand the recognition and/or response of others”. This definition of agency noticeably emphasizes the recognition or response from others as a defining aspect when identifying if an action reflects agency or not. In fact, I suggest that both the developmental theory of youth citizenship and the critical perspective are based on this concept of agency. In other words, the developmental view refers to agency as the ability to respond to national rules and expectations (defined by others) by reproducing patterns of civic behaviour that would be characteristic of “good” and “respectable” adults/citizens. The critical perspective, alternatively, defines agency as the capacity to perform collective acts of resistance to structures and systems also imposed by others. The difference between those two approaches is that while the former has an individualistic character and links citizenship to acceptance of the *status quo*, the latter moves agency from the realm of individualism to the field of collective action and is based on a process of contestation.

In contrast, Biesta and Tedder (2006) define agency “as the situation where individuals are able to exert control over and give direction to the course of their lives” (p.9). Here it is possible to notice a shift in the definition of agency towards a category less dependent on the impact on others and more connected to self-control and self-determination. Actions are considered agentic to the extent that they confer some autonomy to the person to design his/her life trajectory. Being less normative – as agency would not require any kind of previous learning of appropriate

agentic behaviour – this theoretical approach suggests a certain level of independence in relation to structural constraints. In our post-modern world, however, according to Bauman, there is a “yawning gap” between the right of self-assertion and the capacity “to control the social settings which render such self-assertion feasible” (Bauman, as cited in Biesta et al., 2006, p.8), and thus, agency is also needed to exert “(a certain amount of) control over the conditions that shape one’s opportunities for action” (Biesta et al., 2006, p.8). Consequently, a reliable definition of agency cannot leave out the important interplay between individual action and structural conditions.

Further in the same study, the authors suggest that the conditions for agency should be understood as “the interplay between individuals and contexts” (Biesta et al., 2006, p.16). They propose that research on agency should focus on “locating, comparing, and predicting the relationship between different kinds of agentic processes and particular structuring contexts of action” (Emribayer & Mische, as cited in Biesta et al., 2006, p.16). Examining that interpretation, I suggest that agency can be better understood by focussing on the mutual interdependence or relational *power* of individual actions and contexts, to the extent that actions are framed by environments but also have a continuous impact on them. From this perspective, agency is not a fixed and autonomous exercise of power through action, but is a constantly reframed category, reflecting the person’s perception of the options available to him/her at particular moments and the choices made by that person to respond to the constraints imposed by the context. At the same time, I frame citizenship as being constructed and de-constructed according to the youths’ self-perceived *power* to shape their contexts (in order to maintain, change, or negotiate existing or future conditions) or to resist being shaped by them.

Based on my argument that youth citizenship should be seen as a self-reflective, process-based and relational construct, I define agency as *young people’s disposition to develop patterns*

of action which reflect a historical and at the same time fluid engagement with their self-identities and their contexts. Such patterns of action are always changing in order to address the insights derived from the interplay of past experiences, present evaluations and future expectations.

In that definition, I highlight the use of the word disposition to describe what I identify as a noticeable tendency from the part of young people to perform those patterns of action. I also call attention for the fluidity of what Biesta and colleagues (2006) describe as “agentic orientations” and their situation within a temporality that brings together meanings attached to the past, present and future. As youth citizenship is inscribed within this framing of agency, it is possible to talk about it as a more inclusive dynamics, when compared to those views of citizenship that describe agency as a fixed set of skills, imposed on youth from above and which are only interested in using citizenship as a discourse for engaging young in hegemonic practices directed to the maintenance of national identity, political power and dominant *status-quo*. At this point, the connection between this definition of agency and the view of “citizenship-as-process” described in the previous section becomes clear, to the extent that as a dynamic and open perspective of citizenship, this view is capable of accommodating a flexible, fluid and relational scope for agency.

Finally, the focus on the role played by self-reflection calls for a discussion about the meanings of personal experiences and their interaction with context and time, making it possible to understand the interplay between the personal and the social aspects as young people attribute meanings to their citizenship practices at different stages of their lives. In sequence, I examine how personal experiences inform meanings of youth citizenship.

Youth citizenship and experience

According to Smith and colleagues (2005), citizenship is experienced by youth in their everyday lives in multiple ways, depending on the level of inclusion or exclusion internalized by each young person at different moments of his or her life. Accordingly, when young people are presented with a discourse of citizenship based on the “lacking-citizenship” or “citizens-of-tomorrow” model, they tend to experience citizenship as something unavailable to them as youth and dependent upon their capacity for internalizing or learning the skills necessary to become good citizens. This view leads not only to a neglect of the ethical nature of citizenship available to any human being at any stage of his or her life, but it also leads to an implicit attachment of citizenship practices to the power inherent in the distinction youth/adult, as if only adults had the right to exert the powers conferred by full citizenship.

Similarly, when presented with the model of the “respectable economically independent citizen” (Smith et al, p.426), youth are led to experience citizenship as dependent on their capacity for finding a job and becoming productive. This model of citizenship is problematic because it connects citizenship practices to economic factors that often escape from young people’s scope for agency, inasmuch as those factors are influenced by structural socio-economic constraints. The experience of citizenship, thus, becomes excluding and frustrating to the large group of young people who are not able to become part of the work force in society.

There is yet another conceptual frame, which is the notion of active citizens, common in the UK government youth citizenship policy (Smith et al., 2005, p.427). This notion of citizenship is less structured around economic and productive roles and more related to accepting duties of political engagement, community service, moral and social responsibilities. Although apparently more inclusive of youth’s everyday experiences to define the realm of citizenship practices, this

conception ignores how young people see the options of moral, social and political engagement made available to them. In addition, considering the regulatory goals of this perspective, there is little scope for youth to construct their views of citizenship based on their personal judgements and to exercise their critical evaluation of the model of “active citizen” imposed on them.

In the critical approach to youth citizenship, experience is framed as a collective process. In fact, there are more opportunities than in the contexts described above for young people to analyse and attribute meanings to the events of their lives. But those opportunities are still limited by a collective presupposed sense of oppression which is the guiding background for any interpretative effort of youth participating in the process.

In the citizen-as-process approach I propose, experience stands out as one of the key factors. In fact, experience is seen *as the lens through which citizenship meanings are assigned and re-assigned to practices, in light of what the continuous act of self-reflection reveals to youth about the options available to them at each moment in time and the feasibility of each option in terms of its interplay with the context, that is, in relation to how each option impacts and is impacted by contextual/historical variables.*

Let me give a practical example. Let's suppose a poor young woman of colour from a rural community decides to go to the nearby big city to find a job. When arriving there, she is lucky enough to engage in a government program for youth that offers temporary jobs with a small monthly payment. At that moment, her understanding of citizenship is aligned with what the traditional model of citizenship requires from youth, in the sense that by working, she becomes the economically independent person. As such, she is likely to become that citizen who will be able to bring prosperity to his or her nation and who is not involved with any activity related to social instability, that is, unemployment, crime, immoral conduct, and others.

Later, she starts going out with a man and gets pregnant. She becomes a single mother and loses her job for that reason. Frustrated, she returns to the countryside, and is rejected by her family. Yet, she can find work in the plantations and with the help of friends, she reconstructs her life. At that specific moment, her new condition of being a single mother makes her re-think the options available to her as a citizen. Following that, she makes new choices which are framed by contextual events (loss of job, gender/motherhood, race, poverty) and which at the same time impact the world around her (the way she is seen by the family, her new identity of a rural peasant, her economical and emotional independence). The fact that in the second phase of her life, the girl made choices that did not match the expected pattern of behaviour of a “good” citizen does not mean that she is not engaged in citizenship learning. Instead, my argument is that each choice she made should be seen as opening possibilities for practising distinct aspects of agency and citizenship. That she was able to struggle and find a new identity as a peasant testifies to the importance of experience as an essential factor in the way youth learn what being a citizen entails. As Biesta and colleagues (2009) argue, “different contexts provide different opportunities for acting and being, and thus different opportunities for citizenship learning” (p.18).

As a result, learning about citizenship should be a holistic experiential opportunity for youth to reflect on their life trajectories and on the meanings of their actions. Not with a patronising and prejudiced idea about what is going to be counted as experience, but with the respect for the person who, while taking risks and making difficult choices, is entitled to moments of self-expression, recognition and encouragement. That conception of citizenship education may be critiqued for ignoring ideals of collective engagement of youth around shared needs and objectives or being too pluralistic (Arnot, 2006), but I would argue that a comprehensive

pedagogical approach to citizenship should depart from individual lived experiences and at a later moment, give youth conditions to negotiate patterns of collective organization towards shared political processes identified as significant at specific socio-historical moments.

I have mentioned how agency and experience are framed in each of the conceptions of youth citizenship proposed in my framework. I now turn to the analysis of identity as the third key component of my analysis.

Youth citizenship, identity and positionality

In the context of this paper, identity is defined at the intersection of the way people see themselves and the way they are seen by others. Thus, identity focuses not only on the idea of self, as proposed by Erikson (1962), but it refers to a construction connected to processes of social interaction and a sense of community belonging. Moreover, following Hall's definition (1996), identity is seen as a process where the dynamic qualities of human social and self-expression interact and change *over a period of time*; therefore it cannot be conceived as a fixed category. In light of this conception of identity, what would be its role in the construction of a theoretical framing for the analysis of youth citizenship?

To start with, citizenship practices can play an important role in the construction of one's identity in a cyclical and interdependent dynamics. In the developmental approach to youth citizenship, identity is a pre-defined construct. If there is a model of adult/citizen which is considered the ideal, then there is a tendency towards talking about citizenship and identity as rather uniform and predictable categories. Ideal citizenship practices are those which play a decisive role in the shaping of youth's identities, particularly on those identity areas related to national belonging. Anything that falls out of the nationally sanctioned patterns of identity and

ideals of citizenship is cast as deviant or problematic. There is an emphasis on identity from a rather individualistic and regulated perspective that does not emphasize youths' collectively constructed meanings and representations of the reality.

Alternatively, identity is framed as a collective category in a critical view of youth citizenship. In other words, a defining identity feature is the location of the young individual within a group of other youth who share a common social situation – often related to some kind of oppressive or unjust condition – resulting from a shared ethnicity, gender, class or other social issue. As a consequence, the understanding of citizenship emphasized by the critical scholars is based on a notion of identity that is collectively experienced and any citizenship process is conceived to primarily address collectively defined forms of oppression and change structural barriers that prevent youth full access to citizens' rights. This notion of identity allows an increasingly stronger balance between self-expression, social identity and community belonging goals. There might be some tensions emerging when the identified forms of oppression derive from different kinds of conditions at the same time (related to gender, class, ability, sexuality race), which might generate intra-group differences and interfere with the processes of collective organization. Nevertheless, the idea of intersectionality allows a negotiation of goals, struggles and strategic interventions in the arena of social movements, to the extent that it recognizes the importance of addressing multiple levels of oppression with the same focus and intentionality.

At the beginning of the paper I referred to a definition of citizenship that was inclusive of all actions that had an impact on a person's life trajectory and not only on the communities where that person belonged. Following such definition, which concerns the citizenship-as-process theoretical line, the meanings of citizenship (felt both as presence and lack) emerging in everyday events should be highlighted as important means through which a young person

constructs and deconstructs his or her self-perception and identity, the perception of his/her social life and his/her sense of belonging.

Bauman (2001) suggested that in the post-modern world, the human being cannot think about himself or herself as having one integrated and defined identity. Instead, he argued that

Instead of constructing one's identity gradually and patiently as one builds a house – through the slow accretion of ceilings, floors, rooms, connecting passages – a series of 'new beginnings', one experiments with instantly assembled yet easily dismantled shapes, painted one over the other; this is a truly *palimpsest identity* (p.87, his emphasis).

Such *palimpsest identity*, in spite of being constructed through a form of random bricolage, cannot be conceived without reference to the categories that support and give meaning to the shifts and/or discontinuities that take place in the process of identity assemblage, among which I identify class, race and gender, and without consideration of how such categories are experienced by the *subject/citizen*. Here, the relationship between self-expression, social identity and community belonging becomes a complex issue, fraught with apparently irreconcilable contradictions.

The complexity arising from the above-mentioned aspects of identity can be analysed by examining how identity and citizenship concepts may challenge each other. In its historical development and even today from the liberal democratic point of view, citizenship has had a strong purported commitment to equalizing differences, to the extent that as citizens, all people are equal (or should be). The problem is that identity, according to the views I proposed above, is a concept that is heavily dependent on the recognition of difference, as a first step to achieve parity of participation in society at the cultural level. This is what Fraser (1996) calls recognition justice. The confrontation of this kind of justice claims with citizenship claims that tend to

minimize group differences in the name of universal citizenship rights often leads to a dilemma. In other words, in order to propose a definition of citizenship that takes into account identity issues, it is necessary to find a way to integrate equality and difference in the same paradigm. As Arnot (2006) points out:

Citizenship from an egalitarian perspective would need to accommodate all social cleavages, such as those of religion, social class, ethnicity, race and sexuality, and be inclusive of 'other' social categories such as refugees and asylum seekers, migrants, travellers, etc. (p.133)

The question arising from that perception is what kind of pedagogic approach to citizenship is capable of dealing with such a fundamental and delicate ambiguity? And how can we speak to youth about citizenship and identity without falling into discredit or being taken as incoherent (to say the least)?

CHAPTER 4 – Bringing together youth citizenship, universalist and group-specific justice claims

A possibility for advancing the dilemma identified in the section above is opened by applying Nancy Fraser's taxonomy of "affirmative" and "transformative" approaches to citizenship processes and by the adaptation of what Arnot (2006) describes as a critical pedagogy of difference to deal with justice claims in the field of youth citizenship education.

Let me discuss Fraser's and Arnot's ideas more deeply in order to clarify the meanings of the terms suggested in the paragraph above. First, it is clear that only by making the concept of citizenship more reflective of the existing differences in society, will there be a possibility for it to become a relevant pedagogical tool. It is essential to reframe traditional discourses of citizenship (Arnot, 2009), so that they become inclusive of processes which disrupt the binary private/public and address particular racial, gender, socio-economic realities and specific cultural and local categories.

A dimension of youth citizenship practices that entails a critical component requires a discussion of the collective meanings of youth citizenship and of the interrelation between such meanings and the previously mentioned categories for framing identity (race, class, gender, nationality, and others). Arnot (2006) mentions that recognizing differences (class-based, gender-based or race-based) "may mean that the concept of citizenship loses its universalistic elements and the celebration of a community of interests" (p.133).

This dilemma can be better understood in the light of Fraser's theory of justice. In her earlier work (1995a, 1996), she suggests that two basic types of injustice can be identified in the world: one related to the maldistribution of material resources (including natural resources, health, education) and another related to the misrecognition or non-recognition of cultural resources

(identities, races, genders, sexualities and others). She argues that the two types of injustice are often intertwined and therefore should be addressed with the same intensity, although in some circumstances, there could be some tension between redistribution and recognition claims. On one side, there is the acknowledgement that equality requires ensuring that there is justice in terms of what Fraser calls fair redistribution of material resources. On the other side, the search for equality in terms of redistribution, in the scope of race and gender, may represent a neglect of oppression derived from imbalances of power between specific genders or racial groups (Fraser, 1996).

Taking into account Fraser's notions of redistribution and recognition claims, the remaining question is what kind of justice struggles are involved in the concept of citizenship. In her earlier work, Fraser responds to the posed question in the following terms:

My inclination is to follow Jürgen Habermas in viewing such issues bifocally. From one perspective, political institutions (in state-regulated capitalist societies) belong with the economy as part of the 'system' that produces distributive socioeconomic injustices; in Rawlsian terms, they are part of 'the basic structure' of society. From another perspective, however, such institutions belong with 'the lifeworld' as part of the cultural structure that produces injustices of recognition; for example, the array of citizenship entitlements and participation rights conveys powerful implicit and explicit messages about the relative moral worth of various persons. 'Primary political concerns' could thus be treated as matters either of economic justice or cultural justice, depending on the context and perspective in play (Fraser, 1995a, p.72)

The passage above indicates an attempt to accommodate citizenship issues either in the scope of recognition or in the scope of redistribution. In other words, it is true that citizenship

should be concerned about what Fraser (1996) calls redistributive issues, that is, ensuring that equal conditions are given to all members of society, but it is also clear that no redistributive measure will be effective if imbalances related to aspects of recognition (which affect racialized minorities and oppressed genders, for example) are not redressed. As a result, youth citizenship should be involved with facilitating identity constructions based on redistributive and recognition-driven conceptions of justice at the same time. But would that approach really cover all aspects involved in the contemporary challenges of citizenship practices?

In a recent work, Fraser (2005) argues that, along with redistribution and recognition strategies to deal with injustice, inequality and oppression in the world, it is necessary to consider political issues, which should be addressed through representational strategies. She challenges the fact that today struggles for justice are still framed within the “Keynesian-Westphalian” imaginary (p.69). She uses this term to elucidate how disputes for justice are usually located within the scope of the modern nation-state. As a consequence, citizenship is a category that is primarily defined in relation to the nation-state to which one belongs.

The question is that, in a world where transnational businesses and political organisms impose socio-economic and political processes that bring about maligned consequences which exceed the limits of the nation-state, it is not possible to talk about justice simply within the realm of specific geographical territories. Instead, there is a need to establish a conception of justice and of citizenship that goes beyond the nation-state and that allows global problems of maldistribution, misrecognition and lack of political representation (misframing) to be addressed and resolved (Fraser, 2005).

The instruments proposed by Fraser (1995a, 1996, 2005) to operationalize the above-mentioned kinds of justice redress are affirmative and transformative practices. She defines

affirmative practices as those intended to bring remedy to injustice by “correcting inequitable outcomes of social arrangements without disturbing the underlying framework that generates them” (Fraser, 1995a, p.82). In contrast, transformative practices would be remedies to injustice “aimed at correcting inequitable outcomes precisely by restructuring the underlying generative framework” (p.82). As an illustration to those definitions, I mention some examples of affirmative and transformative practices in each of the three areas of injustice proposed by Fraser.

As far as recognition is concerned, affirmative practices would be laws and measures to revalue disrespected group identities while transformative practices would entail a whole destabilization of group identities and differentiations with the intention of changing everyone’s sense of belonging (Fraser, 1995, p.82-83). With regards to redistribution, an example of an affirmative practice would be the increase in the consumption share of economic disadvantaged groups through cash transfers programs that do not challenge the system of production; a transformative practice would involve a re-structuring of the political-economic system towards socialist models (Fraser, 1995a, p.84). Finally, in the field of representation or political frame-setting, affirmative practices would be guided to redraw the boundaries of existing territorial states in order to have the representational claims of the politically excluded addressed, but the ways political space is partitioned in territorial nation-states is not challenged. Conversely, transformative practices challenge the whole division of political space along territorial lines, and propose a change in the global political frame-setting, with the argument that some types of global injustices are not territorial in character and therefore should be addressed beyond the borders of nation-states (Fraser, 2005).

Let me now apply the affirmative/transformative framework to the field of citizenship. The consideration of a globalized arena for citizenship brings into question the *who* of citizenship practices, or in other words, demands a reconfiguration of who is entitled to citizenship, under which circumstances, and suggests that it is time to change the way citizenship (and the justice claims associated with it) is established, so that it becomes a more inclusive process which is capable of responding to claims voiced not only by citizens of certain nations, but by claimants defined at a global level (Fraser, 2005).

With regards to the relation between youth and citizenship, while there are certain aspects of citizenship which are lived, shared and perceived by most young people across the globe, the inclusion of youth in the discussion about citizenship as equally powerful and respected subjects is still a prerogative of very few. Not only are young people denied opportunities to voice their perceptions of citizenship because of their youth status, but there are considerable differences among youth from distinct nations, ethnicities, social classes and genders in terms of who has access to information and dialogue and who does not. Yet, young people in many parts of the globe are affected by framings of citizenship in play within their countries and beyond them.

The implications of the discussion above for the scope of youth citizenship are that it requires paradigmatic changes in order to reflect the challenges of a globalized world (meaning a world that exceeds national borders) and to involve all youth affected by any kind of social injustice, not only at the level of recognition and redistribution, but also at the level of political representation (Fraser, 2005). Those changes should make space to both affirmative and transformative practices in the field of youth citizenship practice and education, depending on the context for action, the identity constructs and the agentic orientation of the youth involved, the instances towards adult-youth collaboration allowed by the educational system, the location

of the process, the structural constraints imposed on the pedagogical practices and mainly depending on the orientation adopted concerning the three approaches to youth citizenship described before (community development, social change or process-learning). As it will be illustrated in the next section, the critical and the citizenship-as-process approaches to youth citizenship place more emphasis on transformative practices than the developmental approach, to the extent that they are more concerned with changes than with reforms.

The next step is to clarify which strategies can be proposed in the pedagogical process to encourage youth engagement in citizenship practices, while at the same time bringing together the three levels of justice struggles to address local/global issues and universalist/group-specific claims.

From a pedagogical point of view, there should be considerable changes made in the field of citizenship education. According to Arnot (2006), teachers remain the key actors in the process of fostering educational environments where citizenship entails not only awareness of imbalances in terms of material resources. It also involves awareness of the inequities resulting from gendered citizenship regimes in and out of classroom, of the prejudiced nature of certain political regimes, where ethnicity clearly leads to oppressive conditions for some racialized groups and of the lack of representation of young people in political instances that directly affect them. It is up to the teacher to find out, in the pedagogical practice, the right balance between those three types of citizenship claims (redistribution, recognition and representation) as perceived by the young people he or she works with. At the same time, the teacher should be sensitive to the dynamics of the educational process itself, so as to avoid being manipulative of youth and to guarantee an educational atmosphere where pedagogic democratic rights can be exercised. In this way, the teacher should attend to the nature of the language used, the content

covered, and ensure that different perspectives are considered in the design of citizenship frameworks by learners¹ (Arnot, 2006).

This conception of youth citizenship is not simple in terms of implementation. The palimpsest-model of identity characteristic of our post-modern world results in youth having to adopt distinct positionalities at different spaces and at different times of their lives. The possibility of adopting multiple positionalities has the dual character of allowing a certain level of collective engagement (among people who share the same identity-orientation at that specific time), but also of generating situations where young people may be seen as contradictory and volatile (as they engage with multiple subject positions that are seen as opposing or incoherent).

I argue that such dual character is not a bad aspect of exercising youth citizenship. Contrarily, I think that identity positionality (either collective or individual) gives youth the chance to experience conflict and learn to make choices while providing them with opportunities to negotiate their agentic orientations as individuals and as members of groups.

Today, youth citizenship, as many other social constructs, stands as a concept that cannot be grasped without a confrontation of its historical meanings to the specific circumstances where other new meanings of citizenship are experienced by youth. That interplay generates strong tension, and citizenship learning should address those moments of conflict with the required attention and pedagogical intentionality in order to make space for local as well as for global representations of citizenship and to enable the redress of universalist and group-specific justice claims.

¹ I am aware of the fact that in many contexts, teaching conditions do not allow such ideal pedagogical practices to occur. Aspects such as traditional educational policy, large groups of students, prescribed curriculum goals and outcomes with little flexibility, lack of teacher training to address controversial issues in classroom, lack of parental participation in the school educational process and a general market-based approach to education represent serious barriers to the achievement of an educational atmosphere where pedagogic democratic rights can be exercised.

CHAPTER 4: The categories in action: Snapshots of practices based on distinct approaches to youth citizenship

In the previous sections, I provided a categorization of approaches to youth citizenship at a theoretical level. I defined terms, discussed and related analytical categories and contextualized the approaches in relation to global, local, universalist and group-specific justice claims.

Now I turn to the description and study of some educational practices where the different approaches to citizenship can be perceived and fulfill specific pedagogic goals. It should be highlighted that the aims of this analysis is not to evaluate the citizenship approaches in terms of which one is better than the other, but to raise awareness of the fact that each approach fits certain historical contexts, social challenges, and serves specific political purposes in relation to particular social groups.

While the first two snapshots do not necessarily report real experiences, they all mention situations and facts that reflect typical contexts in the socio-historical time each of them refers to. The accounts are based on my own experience as a student in the 1970s in a private school in Brazil and as a facilitator working in a social movement with youth in the 1980s. The third snapshot refers to a very recent project taking place in a capital city in the south of Brazil and is based on an account produced by Brazilian scholar Luis Gandin (2009).

Snapshot 1

The context is a classroom in a private school in Brazil in the 1970s. A teacher of civic education describes to learners what a good citizen is by highlighting the importance of voting, by enforcing the basic principles of the Brazilian constitution and by talking about the political parties in Brazil. Learners listen to the information but nobody says anything, except for asking

some comprehension questions. There is no attempt from the part of the teacher to elicit students' understandings of citizenship, nor is there any reference to how citizenship entails political participation from all groups at all levels in society. It must be said that in Brazil, the political regime is a dictatorship and the main focus of the civic education classes is to engage students in a discourse guided to the development of passive and normalized citizens, who do not have any awareness of their political identity and who are not ready to contest the political regime in play in their country.

The analysis of the context described above, which actually is based on my own experience as a high-school student, reveals an approach to youth citizenship aligned with the developmental category suggested in this paper. The curriculum of civic education consists of a pre-defined set of information that ought to be transmitted to students, either because they lack it or because such information would strengthen their compliance with desirable civic behaviour. Knowledge is usually transferred to students in a passive and often anti-dialogical context. Sometimes, a constructive view allows learners to contribute to the learning process, as long as their contribution does not challenge the expected learning outcomes. Aspects such as the role of individual and collective experience in the construction of meanings, young people's creativity and scope for agency are somehow neglected in favour of an adult-conceived, unilateral and instrumental learning process.

As to the pedagogical strategies used in this perspective, they range between traditional teaching methods and more socio-constructive strategies. Sometimes there is an emphasis on considerable input coming from the teacher, with little students' participation. In this way, the teaching strategies focus on the delivery and reception of knowledge, which refers to pre-established contents. These strategies could be associated with Freire's conception of "banking"

education (Freire, 2000), and learners are seen as passive receptacles of information. Recently, in some contexts, these strategies are being replaced by more socio-constructive methods where the teacher elaborates the information he would like to convey departing from previous input provided by the learners. It is a less teacher-centred pedagogical strategy, but it does not mean that learners actually influence the leaning contents and prescribed outcomes.

In the specific snapshot described, the ultimate aim is the reproduction of the *status quo* through the modelling of some patterns of behaviour and the use of a normalizing discourse which does not motivate any discussion of the exclusionary, unequal and unfair structures of the Brazilian society at that time. Obviously, that is an extreme example of the developmental approach, as it refers to a historical period where the political agency was actually restricted for all citizens of Brazil. However, the representation of citizenship as a process reinforcing the national model of a good, respectable and productive citizen is still present in many of the Brazilian public policies on youth education.

If it is true that a classroom is a place where young people can learn considerably about citizenship practices, it is also clear that official knowledge (which often reflects the interests of the dominant groups in society) should not be imposed on them but presented as one alternative, among those that ought to be considered, discussed and criticised as young people learn to construct their representations of citizenship.

Snapshot 2

The context is a non-governmental organization in the period following the re-establishment of democracy in Brazil (late 1980s). A group of facilitators (including myself) work with young people who live in a slum area in a big city in Brazil. The main aim of the project is to engage

youth in citizenship practices in order that they learn how to organize themselves in a social movement and stand up for their rights, bringing improvements to the communities to which they belong.

Most young people targeted by the project are of colour, but the guiding organizing principle of the activities developed is their situation of poverty and social exclusion in terms of material resources. The issues of race and ethnicity, although acknowledged, are little emphasized. The group dynamics of the pedagogical process is based on dialogue, but the facilitators provide a lot of input to guide the discussions towards their aim, which is young people's perception of their situation of exclusion and marginality. Youth should also feel encouraged and empowered to collectively perform as citizens by organizing demonstrations, events and raising money to help community leaders obtain improvements for their communities from the public authorities.

The view of youth citizenship dominant in this educational process is the critical one. There is a purpose to raise young people's awareness of their civic roles and of their responsibility in the struggle for improving the living conditions of their community. Civic education contents do not simply approach themes related to nation-state principles and national belonging, but address aspects related to social injustice at the community level; social exclusion based on class; unfair youth state-relations; commitment to global aspects of citizenship regarding environmental issues and others. Collective forms of organization are valued in the citizenship experience, young people's scope for agency is encouraged in spite of structural constraints and their experience, knowledge and creativity help shape the citizenship meanings and practices resulting from the learning experience.

In a critical approach to citizenship education, pedagogical strategies used by the instructors are distinct from the ones used in the developmental approach. The teacher or the instructor adopts a more dialogical attitude in the process of knowledge construction. There is interest in eliciting from learners their previous views about the topics approached and advance the knowledge on those topics through dialogical strategies where all learners are encouraged to participate. In addition, the facilitator tries to foster a constant awareness of the fact that what students identify as challenges in their lives should be understood in light of broader issues, such as injustice, exclusion, prejudice, privilege and oppression. Finally, all knowledge constructed in the educational process is considered valid for designing practical forms of intervention in students' reality, so that changes are achieved, even if they are of small scale. In this perspective, pedagogical strategies include discussion circles, mobilizations around issues affecting students' communities, identification of possible areas demanding socio-political intervention and organization of learners to demand action from public authorities concerning identified issues. Also, there are strategies to encourage learners to develop leadership skills, so that they feel empowered to take on leading roles in their communities' associations and in broader political organisms in society.

This approach to youth citizenship primarily took place in informal educational contexts in Brazil – at least at the beginning of the democratic period - such as NGOs, community associations, Catholic Church projects (UNICEF, Ayrton Senna & Itaú Social, 2007). With the consolidation of the democratic process in Brazil and the claims for social justice and inclusion coming from civil society, a critical view of youth citizenship became part of the government discourse (Brasil, SMET, 2002), although this fact has not had many practical implications for youth citizenship within official education until recently. Even if official education has

incorporated some of the contents of a critical view on youth citizenship, the pedagogical strategies used are far from being as participatory as they are in informal contexts.

In my view, if the critical perspective on youth citizenship became the common approach within the context of official education, it would have a positive impact on the quality of youth participation in citizenship practices, motivating young people to adopt collective forms of political action to bring about social change. At the same time, as the critical view of citizenship is strengthened, it makes space for process-based conceptions of citizenship, where each young person is recognized as the protagonist of his or her personal citizenship process, constructing and voicing his or her own representations and meanings of what it is to be a citizen entitled to make universal (and collectively-shared) as well as identity-based (more group-specific) claims.

Snapshot 3

The context is the municipal system on education in Porto Alegre, the capital city of Rio Grande do Sul, in the south of Brazil, in the 1990s. There is a big structural change in the system for the establishment of the project *Escola Cidadã* or the Citizen School Project (Gandin, 2009). According to Gandin, the project “proposed a radical democratization of three items: access to schools, governance and knowledge” (p.343). As for the democratization of knowledge, the project opens the doors for the problematization of the notions of “core” and “peripheral” knowledge by including as central themes in the educational process issues that until then did not have any space in the curriculum.

Among those issues, there are problems deriving from the lives and perceptions of the excluded groups in the Brazilian society. The adolescents attending the municipal schools are given the chance to choose, together with their communities, the topics they would like to

approach in their education. The aim is to include in the pedagogic experience not only “official knowledge”, which generally reflects the concerns of the dominant classes, but the knowledge coming from the perspective of the marginalized communities. As Gandin explains, the project “goes beyond the mere episodic mentioning of cultural manifestations or class, racial, sexual and gender-based oppression. It includes these themes as an essential part of the process of construction of knowledge” (p.345).

What are the pedagogical implications of such an approach to knowledge construction in regards to the framing of youth citizenship promoted? At one level, there is an effort to include a critical view of citizenship in the formal education system by making part of the knowledge constructed reflective of the learners’ marginalized living conditions. In addition, the educational context promotes the discussion of the local problems by students, preparing them to be active citizens in their communities, who can demand better life conditions and take part in the struggles for change in public policies. Such view of youth citizenship falls into the second category proposed in our youth citizenship frame.

However, it seems that the Citizen School project also offers possibilities for frames of youth citizenship that go beyond issues of political activism in the communities. By bringing to the discussion not only issues of class, but also questions of race and gender and by offering more individualized attention to students who have some kind of difficulty in their educational process, the project allows a process-based approach to citizenship.

The organization of the curriculum in progressive cycles of instruction enables learners to have an individualized process of identity perception and knowledge construction that respects each adolescent’s own pace and at the same time democratizes knowledge access without being insensitive to difference. As far as equity is concerned, the fact that the project problematizes the

relation between official and marginalized knowledges facilitates the strengthening of popular culture, the self-assertion and increased self-esteem of marginalized youth and at the same time it raises awareness among youth from upper classes of the processes of exclusion, oppression and social inequality taking place in the Brazilian society and the need for changes in access to material, cultural and political resources.

Finally, the project emphasizes a view of citizenship that is sensitive to issues of race and gender, motivating a discussion about topics that have long been invisible in the Brazilian society, although racism and sexist practices are common at all levels in the public and private arenas and remain a source of political oppression for many young people. In summary, a process-based approach to youth citizenship, in this case, blends with a critical view to foster citizenship practices that respond to the challenges of redistributive injustices, identity-based or recognition power imbalances, and to the oppression generated by political misrepresentation of youth in the larger context of Brazilian society.

The pedagogical strategies used in a process-based view of citizenship incorporate and expand the ones proposed by the critical approach. The difference consists in addressing not only citizenship issues that require redistributive measures (such as the difficult socio-economic situation of most learners), but giving full attention to aspects of race, gender and disability that account for processes of exclusion experienced by certain young people. Also, there are strategies to redress disadvantages identified by individual learners, using either affirmative action (differentiated instructional settings and methods, personal attention from teachers, longer periods at school), or transforming the whole educational system in order to accommodate differentiated skills, knowledge and culture (the establishment of progressive cycles of instruction mentioned in the third snapshot). Finally, pedagogical strategies for citizenship

education that in a critical approach, are used in more informal contexts become an integral part of school education, covering all aspects of learners' everyday lives and emerging in the syllabus of all courses (cross-curricular knowledge). The process-based approach demands awareness from the part of the teachers/facilitators, so that they are able to make use of every teaching opportunity to challenge unfair citizenship regimes, to questions learners' biased pre-conceptions and to elicit alternative patterns of behaviour guided towards more equity, justice and inclusion in society.

In sequence, we present a table where the main features of the three distinct approaches of youth citizenship presented in this paper are summarised. It must be said that many other levels of analysis that were not addressed here could be added, such as: conception of knowledge, pedagogical interactions, links with governance processes, and others. Future research is needed to continue with the theoretical work started and expand the scope of the connections established.

Summary table of categories proposed

Approach	Developmental	Critical	"Citizenship-as-process"
Some authors	Sherrod et al.; Torney-Purta et al.; Youniss et al.	Ginwright et al.; Lewis-Charp et al.; Noguera & Cannella; Rubinstein-Avila	Smith et al.; Biesta et al., Lesko, Arnot, Gandin
Youth defined as	Coming of age	Capable, social actors/activists, subjects of social change	Socially constructed category
Youth citizenship	Skills, pre-defined national political principles, rights and duties	Empowerment tools for community activism	Process-based: self-identity, experience, reflective agency: interdependence between youth agency and structural demands
Scope of citizenship	Community development, citizen committed to nation-state principles	Political engagement, activism, challenging of nation-state scope for citizenship, importance of local issues	All practices – struggles related to personally-experienced oppression, and group-based oppression, challenging of nation-state scope of citizenship
Agency and citizenship	Agency restricted by external structural factors	Agency partially restricted by external structural factors	Agency is given priority over external structural factors but is established at the interplay of individual and context
Experience and citizenship	Relevant experience is pre-defined by models of citizenship to be learnt	Experience is attributed collective meanings and guides the configuration of citizenship practices towards processes of social change	Experience is seen as opportunity for youth to reflect on their life trajectories and on the meanings of their actions, constructing their own citizenship representations
Identity and citizenship	Identity is a fixed category and can be modelled by educational intervention	Identity is constructed through individual, but mainly through collective practices	Identity is a complex and multi-dimensional construct, and the notion of difference plays an important role in its understanding

Pedagogical implications	Educational process does not provide youth with necessary knowledge to challenge the <i>status quo</i> , at most it encourages youth to engage in reform practices.	Educational process is committed to motivating youth to learn about their realities, to question the injustice in society and to engage in political struggles to produce positive and radical changes to their communities	The educational process is also critical of injustice and inequity in society, but addresses issues that go beyond the question of redistributive/class based exclusion to address issues of race, gender and other specific sources of marginalization perceived by youth.
Pedagogical strategies	Unilateral transmission of knowledge, little or no dialogue, activities are directed to reproducing pre-defined views of the world, little scope for creativity.	Dialogical activities, all youth are encouraged to participate with in the design and content of activities, which focus on aspects of learner's lives and encourage critical intervention to change unfair contexts. Emphasis on creativity and reflectivity.	Dialogical activities directed to challenging biased assumptions about reality. Marginalized groups and knowledges are placed as central aspects in the learning process through activities that develop youth awareness to prejudice, exclusion, intolerance and foster a continuous struggle against unfair regimes of citizenship. Emphasis on process, not on product, on creativity, self-reflexivity and respect for the other.
Stance toward youth-adult collaboration	Adult as source of knowledge, little scope for dialogue or exchange of knowledge between adults/youth	Adult as facilitator, mediator; youth knowledge is valued but is guided towards the need for social change, political action and intervention	Adult as observer, who facilitates knowledge construction, problematizes given assumptions, raises questions, does not necessarily provide answers, but instigates youth individual and collective agency directed to resisting and fighting unfair citizenship regimes.

CHAPTER 6: Conclusions

I would like to begin this section by addressing my own positionality in the process of writing about youth citizenship. While I define myself as a woman of colour and from a developing country, I do not see myself as a young person or as part of a disadvantaged group. That puts me in the privileged position of being able to speak about a reality of which I see myself as both knowledgeable and ignorant at the same time.

While I take full responsibility for the meanings and the silences of my theoretical intervention, I want to declare my awareness of the partial and situated nature of my ideas. Regardless of the many years I have worked with youth, I recognize that I have my own pre-conceptions about citizenship and that they have played an important role in the process of designing my framework. I do not see that realization as a weakness. In fact, I believe that in the spaces left by our fear or our ignorance lies the great chance to face the unknown and the hidden angles of ourselves. Next, I turn to the insights derived from my theoretical engagement with youth citizenship notions.

Although I have proposed an analytical framework for approaching the theme of youth citizenship, this does not mean that the categories presented should be understood as fixed and isolated from each other. In fact, in most real life situations involving young people, the three framings of youth citizenship co-exist and interact with each other, reflecting the diversity of political perspectives, the multiplicity of interests and the dynamics of power when knowledge is produced about youth, for youth, with youth or by youth.

Furthermore, I have established an analytical framework that is not only supported by current research approaches to the topic, but which also reflects my own interpretation of such research and of the citizenship processes I am able to observe in my daily life. Such

interpretation is also mediated by my past experience as a young person and as a citizen, as an individual and as a political subject who belongs to a specific community and nation. In this sense the work I developed should be seen as a dialogical intervention which offers itself to criticisms, comments and reconstruction, once it acknowledges the existence of a multiplicity of perspectives in the current world.

With regards to my role as a teacher/instructor/facilitator that had the chance to work with youth of distinct classes, ethnicities and genders in Brazil, the experience of reflecting on citizenship enables a refined pedagogical practice. I am able to look at my pedagogical contexts with critical eyes and feel more confident to try out new modes of activities in order to facilitate citizenship practices which are sensitive to the specific needs of the groups I work with, but which do not lose sight of the global challenges of the world we all belong to.

After having discussed youth citizenship from a multi-dimensional standpoint, which covered aspects such as views of youth and of citizenship, agency, experience, identity, pedagogical implications and strategies and stance of youth/adult collaboration, I realize that one of the greatest challenges of youth citizenship, in its pedagogical dimension, is exactly finding the subtle point in the continuum of recognition, redistribution and representation where a meaningful and ethical understanding of citizenship can be fostered, albeit for a limited time and a provisional purpose, but at least coherent with the needs and expectations of the young people involved.

I conclude by recognising the need for theoretical and empirical interventions that take as guiding principles youth identity, experience and agency and reflect on the challenges young people have to face today in order to further the discussion developed in this paper. Such interventions should focus on a framework of youth citizenship that is responsive to the

requirements of a post-modern world which exists in the interface of the local and the global, and where citizens shape themselves by negotiating their personal identities and the structural dimensions of their existence.

References

- Arnot, M. (2006). Gender equality, pedagogy and citizenship: affirmative and transformative approaches in the UK. *Theory and Research in Education*, 4(2), 131-150.
- Arnot, M. (2009). 'Freedom's children'? Gender, individualization and the neo-liberal learner citizen, in M. Arnot (ed.) *Educating the gendered citizen*. London/New York: Routledge.
- Bauman, Z. (2001). 'Pariahs and parvenus', in P. Beilharz (ed.) *The Bauman reader*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Biesta, G & Tedder, M. (2006). How is agency possible? Towards an ecological understanding of agency-as-achievement. [Learning Lives project working paper]. Retrieved on May 20, 2009 from: http://www.learninglives.org/Working_papers.html
- Biesta, G & Tedder, M. (2007). Agency and learning in the life course: Towards an ecological perspective. *Studies in the Education of Adults* 39(2), 132-149.
- Biesta, G., Lawy, R., & Kelly, N. (2009). Understanding young people's citizenship learning in everyday life. *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice*, 4(1), 5-24.
- BRASIL, Secretaria de Educação Média e Tecnológica. (2002). *PCN+ Ensino Médio: orientações educacionais complementares aos Parâmetros Curriculares Nacionais. Ciências Humanas e suas Tecnologias*. Brasília: MEC, SEMTEC.
- Butler, U.M., Princeswal, M. (2008). Cultures of participation: Young people's engagement in the public sphere in Brazil [Non-Governmental Public Action Programme Working Papers]. Retrieved on April 12, 2009, from http://www.lse.ac.uk/collections/NGPA/publications/WP6_Cultures_of_Participation_web.pdf
- Calhoun, C. (2002). Dictionary of the social sciences [electronic resource]/ edited by Craig Calhoun ... [et al.]. Oxford : Blackwell, 2002
- Erikson, E. H. (1968). *Identity, youth and crisis*. Norton, New York.
- Fraser, N. (1995a). From redistribution to recognition? Dilemmas of justice in a 'postsocialist' age. *New Left Review*, 212 (July/ August), 68-93.
- Fraser, N. (1995b). Recognition or redistribution? A critical reading of Iris Young's *Justice and the Politics of Difference*. *The Journal of Political Philosophy*, 3 (2), 166-180.

- Fraser, N. (1996). *Social justice in the age of identity politics: Redistribution, recognition, and participation*. The Tanner Lectures on Human Values, delivered at Stanford University, April 30–May 2, 1996. Retrieved on Aug 1st 2009 from <http://www.tannerlectures.utah.edu/lectures/Fraser98.pdf>
- Fraser, N. (1997). *Justice interruptus: Critical reflections on the "postsocialist" condition*. New York: Routledge.
- Fraser, N. (2005). Reframing justice in a globalizing world. *New Left Review*, 36, 69-88.
- Freire, P. (2000). *Pedagogy of the oppressed* (30th anniversary ed.). New York: Continuum. (Original book published 1970).
- Gandin, L.A. (2009). The Citizen school project: Implementing and recreating critical education in Porto Alegre, Brazil, in M.W.Apple, W. Au & L.A. Gandin (eds.) *The Routledge international handbook of critical education*. London/New York: Routledge.
- Ginwright, S., Cammarota, J., & Noguera, P. (2005). Youth, social justice and communities: Toward a theory of urban youth policy. *Social Justice*, 32(3), 24-40.
- Hall, S. (1996). Introduction: Who needs identity?, in S. Hall and P du Gay (eds.) *Questions of Cultural Identity* (pp. 1-17). London, Sage.
- Lather, Patti (1991). *Getting smart: Feminist research and pedagogy with/in the postmodern*. New York: Routledge.
- Lesko, Nancy. (2001). *Act Your Age! A Cultural Construction of Adolescence*. New York: Routledge.
- Lewis-Charp, H., Yu, H. C., & Soukamneuth, S. (2006). Civic activist approaches for engaging youth in social justice. In S. Ginwright, P. Noguera, & J. Cammarota (Eds.), *Beyond resistance!: Youth activism and community change* (pp. 21-35). New York: Routledge.
- Mignolo, W. (2007). Delinking: The rhetoric of modernity, the logic of coloniality and the grammar of de-coloniality. *Cultural Studies*, 21:2, 449-514. Retrieved on July 1st 2009 from http://waltermignolo.com/txt/publications/WMignolo_Delinking.pdf
- Mouffe, C. (2000). Deliberative democracy or agonistic pluralism. *Political Science*, 72, 1-17. Retrieved on August 2nd 2009 from http://www.ihs.ac.at/publications/pol/pw_72.pdf

- Noguera, P., & Cannella, C. (2006). Youth agency, resistance and civic activism: The public commitment to social justice. In S. Ginwright, P. Noguera, & J. Cammarota (Eds.), *Beyond resistance: Youth activism and community change* (pp. 333-347). New York: Routledge.
- Rubinstein-Avila, E. (2006). Publishing "Equinox": Broadening notions of urban youth development after school. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*, 37(3), 255-272.
- Sherrod, L. R., Flanagan, C., & Youniss, J. (2002). Dimensions of citizenship and opportunities for youth development: The what, why, when, where, and who of citizenship development. *Applied Developmental Science*, 6(4), 264-272.
- Smith, N., Lister, R., Middleton, S., & Cox, L. (2005). Young people as real citizens: Towards an inclusionary understanding of citizenship. *Journal of Youth Studies*, 8(4), 425-443.
- Torney-Purta, J., Lehman, R., Oswald, H. and Shulz, W. (2001) *Citizenship and education in twenty-eight countries: Civic knowledge and engagement at age fourteen*. Amsterdam: International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA).
- UNICEF, Airton Senna, Itaú Social (2007). *Adolescentes e jovens do Brasil: Participação Social e Política*. Retrieved March 2009, from: <http://www.unicef.org/brazil/pt/voz2007.pdf>
- Youniss, J., Bales, S., Christmas-Best, V., Diversi, M., McLaughlin, M., & Silbereisen, R. (2002). Youth civic engagement in the twenty-first century. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 12, 121-148.