Critical Understanding of U.S. Youths' Citizenship: Community Belonging and Engagement of "Successful Citizens"

A DISSERTATION
SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE SCHOOL
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
BY

Jasmina Josic

IN PARTIAL FULLFILLMENT OF THE REQUIRMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Joan G. DeJaeghere, David W. Chapman

July 2011

© Jasmina Josic 2011

Acknowledgements

My dissertation research has been a long, exciting, sometimes challenging, and overall rewarding experience. This work is a product created within a supportive network stretching thousands miles. Although I cannot fully express my gratitude to all of those who have supported and guided me during this doctoral program, I can at least attempt to briefly acknowledge some of them.

First, I need to thank young people who have participated in this study and shared their life experiences, their thoughts, their desires, and their life challenges. I am indebted to you for making this research study completed. I hope all of you will reach your goals and enjoy your life as meaningful members of your current and future communities, wherever you locate them. Additionally, I would like to thank the teachers and administrators who have welcomed me to their schools and enabled me to conduct this research study.

My dissertation committee was instrumental in shaping and conducting this study. My deepest gratitude goes to Dr. Joan DeJaeghere, my faculty co-adviser, who provided research inspiration, shared her creative ideas and knowledge, provided support in all research stages from the philosophical framework and initial pilot to the very last refinements, and challenged me to push forward and explore all possibilities. Thank you for working with me when I relocated to New Jersey; you have always found the right way to encourage me in this endeavor. Furthermore, Dr. David Chapman has been a wonderful faculty co-adviser, who has always stood by my ideas prompting me to expand my views, while also focusing my interests in research and professional experiences. In sharing his research work and experiences Dr. Peter Demerath provided this study with the needed anthropological perspective, and encouraged me to come out of my shell while in the field and rethink my philosophical frameworks. Dr. Andy Furco has always kindly offered input, suggestions, resources, and most importantly his support for my work.

My CIDE family (how I call the amazing informal support network of students and faculty in the Comparative and International Development Education program) has welcomed me to Minnesota and made me feel part of it, even when I resented the long winters and escaped for short visits to my friend and husband in New Jersey. I would

like to thank Kate McCleary, my dear friend and colleague with whom I started my doctoral journey even before we officially met in the program. My CIDE family is big, but I need to thank my closest friends: Jessica Werner, Elizabeth Stallman, Rhiannon Williams, Jinous Kasravi, Jae-Eun Jon, Raya Hegeman-Davis, and Lili Dong. I also want to thank Dr. Michael Paige, Dr. Gerald Fry, and Vicki Field who have expanded the notion of Minnesota family.

My doctoral journey in Minnesota and New Jersey was made easier with the support of my long-time friends who have shared their experiences and provided encouragement even when living in different parts of the country. Jelena Pješivac-Grbović, Nicole Seah, Dragoslav Grbović, and Tamara Đurić - I am thankful for your friendship.

Finally, I would like to thank to my family for their love and support during my academic journey thousands miles away from them. I am enormously indebted to my sister Emina, the kindest and most selfless person, who has enabled my academic independence. My parents, Zlata and Šefket, have always been on my side and offered encouragement. Moreover, the curiosity in human interaction of my nephew Luka provided initial inspiration for the work with young people.

Lastly, I would like to thank to two members of my immediate family – my daughter Gabriela and my husband Robert. This research journey received a new dimension by the birth of my daughter, as she prompts me to continue working on understanding the complex memberships of the new generations of youth who do not have a simple citizenship identity. Gabriela's smiles, babbling, and hugs provided needed energy during the weeks averaging only few hours of sleep. My work would not be possible without the support and love of my friend and husband, Robert. Thank you for always standing by me, encouraging me in my work, and helping balance it with our family life.

Dedication

I wish to dedicate this dissertation to my nephew Luka and my daughter Gabriela.
I hope you will feel meaningful belonging to your communities.

Abstract

As today's youth is growing up in societies made more complicated by globalization, the argument grows for expanding the discussion about citizenship education. In increasingly multicultural and interconnected societies, young people are developing new civic attitudes as well as "attachments and identifications" as citizens within three levels of communities: local-cultural, national, and global.

Unpacking the outcomes of democratic schooling and citizenship education in the United States through youths' experiences, this study examines this generation's ideas of citizenship in three ways. The first purpose is to inquire about the meaning of citizenship for young people, within the institutionalized relations and social processes of schooling. As local-cultural, national, and global communities are shaping their multifaceted identities, the second objective is to develop a critical understanding of youths' citizenship through their constructions of citizenship. The final objective is to better understand implications of youths' constructions and experiences for future citizenship education programs.

This study applies a newly envisioned conceptual framework for understanding youths' citizenship. Viewing citizenship as a membership in a society, the framework consists of three interrelated dynamics that shape the position of one's citizenship: the politics of institutionalized social relations, as enforced through social and political forces and policies that are considered universal; social processes and practices evident in educational, economic, political and other environments; and an individual's struggle for self-definition and identity formation as a citizen.

The research is rooted in qualitative interpretive design with elements of critical ethnography and informed by poststructural feminist theory. This method allows for expressing the researcher's reflexivity, as well questioning how youth develop a sense of agency as citizens based on their experiences with different social discourses and relations of power among various members of society. The study explores the perspectives of youth in two public schools located in New York City and in northern New Jersey. Using two purposive samples of 28 high-school juniors and seniors exposed to advanced social-studies curriculum, the data were collected during a 12-week period through class and school-activities observations, researcher journaling, small group

interviews of students, and follow-up interviews with individuals.

The use of countertopographies to metaphorically represent analytical findings brings the processes that shape youths' experiences as citizens to the forefront. The study reveals the spaces of belonging for these youth as citizens, and the processes of learning versus experiencing citizenship occurring in the space of schooling. This research recounts the construction of their citizenship as occurring within individual struggles to balance social expectations of success and one's motivation to learn and engage opportunities in their communities. In translating the findings into a discussion about the needs of citizenship education programs and possibilities of developing critical citizens, this study assists in positioning young people as individuals capable of developing agency and their voices as citizens in their own right.

Table of Contents

Prologue

November 5, 2008

Last night, Barack Obama was elected president of the United States.

This morning, over the cup of coffee and the morning newspaper, I remembered another event. On April 4, exactly seven months prior to the election, I sat in the large amphitheater at Baruch College in New York; the room was filled with over 400 high-school students, and more than 100 adults interested in hearing about everything these young people have done in the past year while becoming more engaged global citizens through programs offered by Global Kids.

I sat in the back with a number of visitors, mainly teachers and community-organization representatives from the tri-state area. We thoroughly enjoyed the program put together by the young people. Although they received logistical support from Global Kids staff, they developed the content themselves, and it was simply inspirational. These young people from local public schools had spent time after class to learn more about their roles in their communities, and even the world; these "kids" (as they call their peers) became engaged in their schools and communities.

During the second portion of the day, a big event took place: everyone in the room, including visitors, was asked to cast a ballot for a president. The process was explained as one way of exercising our citizenship. The activity was largely welcomed by everyone. It was during the 2008 presidential nomination period, when the Republican candidate, John McCain, was already confirmed, but the leading Democratic candidates, Barack Obama and Hillary Clinton, were still participating in state primaries.

The response rate was enormous, and after manually counting all paper ballots, the results were announced. With 98 percent of the vote, Democratic candidates had won over the Republican candidate. The next announcement was even more anticipated – was it Clinton or Obama? Out of those voting for Democrats, over 77 percent chose Barack Obama.

The young people across the entire room cheered, stood up, and openly showed their enthusiasm about that decision. The adult visitors followed and cheered this decision. I was moved and hoped that the kids might be right. I had heard their political perspectives in the morning sessions; they made very strong arguments as to why they

supported Obama. Many of those young people were not able to cast real votes seven months later as they were minors, but all who had had an opinion that day expressed it in a respectful manner.

That November morning, I remembered that I had already heard the election results in a different room, in a different context. I knew that the kids of New York can also teach adults a few things about U.S. presidential elections. Even those who cannot vote yet have shown that they still can make an informed choice.

Postscript

As I was saying good-bye to the 50 marvelous high-school students (and their extremely grateful families), I witnessed a scene that many who seek to improve youth civic engagement hope to see. A group of young men from all over New Jersey took a group picture, one probably perfect for Benetton ads (as crowds cheering for Obama were similarly described by the *New York Times*). The young men not only had diverse racial and ethnic backgrounds, they hailed from New Jersey's urban and suburban areas. The picture showed them together, proud of the knowledge and skills they had acquired in a summer program. As parents, other family members, and staff observed, the group smiled to the audience and presented themselves as "change we can believe in".

Chapter I:
Shaping an Inquiry about Youths' Citizenship

> Citizenship, as a concept, allows us access to the contested terrain of democracy and the very nature of democratic schooling. It also allows us to analyse, from a feminist perspective, critical educational policies as well as discursive frameworks used by national and international governmental agencies and to consider the impact of global developments more generally. As a concept, it is precisely what needs to be signified, since its very abstractness allows it to become both the object of study and the focus of political action. As Donald [1996] rightly argued, *citizenship has no substantial identity until it is located within a set of social and symbolic social relations* [emphasis added]. (Arnot & Dillabough, 2000, p. 16)

As globalization has revolutionized various spheres of society, educational environments are faced with "the growing gaps across generations in values, experiences, and preferred futures" as well as "the emerging forms of citizenship and civic attitudes" that individuals develop (Stromquist, 2002a, p. 91). Over the past 40 to 50 years, the literature on citizenship education has focused on understanding youths' civic knowledge and attitudes (CIRCLE, 2008). This trend has been very strong in the United States where a number of centers (e.g., CIRCLE, Center for Excellence in Government, and International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement) have not only followed these changes among and across generations of youth, but also examined them to understand young peoples' civic knowledge, skills, and motivation. Although a large body of research has studied how youths' civic knowledge and attitudes have changed over this period, a debate about the overall notion of citizenship in terms of its meaning and implications for citizenship education programs is an ongoing process (Cogan, 1997; Davies, Evans & Reid, 2005; McIntosh, 2005; McLaughlin, 1992; Preece, 2002).

The concept of citizenship has been identified as "complex and contested" by researchers (McLaughlin, 1992) even prior to larger discussions about the impact of globalization on education (Stromquist, 2002). The vibrant conversation on its meaning

in the U.K. educational system, particularly focusing on citizenship education in an increasingly multicultural society (Osler & Starkey, 2003; Osler & Starkey, 2005), is also becoming more prevalent in the United States (Cogan, 1997; Stromquist, 2008). In addition to dialogue about the meaning of citizenship, researchers are now inquiring more about citizenship education's purpose and goals in the United States (Avery, 2007; Westheimer & Kahne, 2004), while considering the changing demographics of communities and schools, new types of education delivery and content, growing concerns over different forms of youth participation using new technologies, or the lack of youth engagement in politics (Avery, 2007; Stromquist, 2002a). Keeping in mind these impacts of globalization (Stromquist, 2002a) and a stronger need for understanding the role of education in civic learning, there is a more pronounced call to evaluate these "emerging forms of citizenship" (p.91) among youth by exploring their constructions of citizenship. This study focuses on developing an understanding of citizenship among U.S. youth in large urban areas through their lived experiences. Examining youth's citizenship through lived experiences follows from DeJaeghere's (2008) work with educators that argued for attention to the lived experience of citizens.

Study Context

Similar to many other societies, the United States is a multicultural nation, based on its growing racial, ethnic, cultural, religious, and language diversity (Banks, 2001). The U.S. Census has estimated that about a quarter of the population in 2000 consisted of ethnic minorities, while only a decade prior this group represented a fifth of the total (Hobbs & Stoops, 2002). This rising ethnic population is accompanied by other types of diversity. As Osler and Starkey (2005) point out, in addition to "increasing diversity in local communities," migration and other effects of globalization are "having a direct impact on [all forms of] communities and schools" (p. 6). Overall, "[g]lobalization forces are bringing together multiple issues and exposing the powerful intersections of economics, politics, culture and technology" (Stromquist, 2002a, p. 93), changing the social fabric in which individuals operate.

As a result of greater global interconnectivity, today's youth is growing up in an environment where its school or local experiences are intertwined with its national and

global experiences (Banks, 2007). Youth is developing new forms of "attachments and identifications" as citizens at three levels: "their cultural community, their nation-state, and with the global community" (Banks, 2005, p. viii). Looking at U.S. youth, it is imperative to acknowledge that its identifications with and attachments to such settings might differ from previous generations.

National policymakers are giving more attention to the educational requirements of multicultural societies in globalized environments (Osler & Starkey, 2005). As a response to the necessity of revitalizing school curriculum accordingly, the Diversity, Citizenship, and Global Education Consensus Panel of international scholars convened by the Center for Multicultural Education at the University of Washington and the Spencer Foundation, has recently developed principles and concepts to guide citizenship education programs[1] in the global age (Banks, J., Banks, C., Cortes, Hahn, Merryfield, Moodley, et al., 2005). Yet, while considering citizenship education programs for the future, a better understanding of citizenship, as youth live and experience it, would be useful to inform the direction of these programs.

Problem Statement

The way citizenship education and its content are shaped within education "depends on our conceptual understanding of citizenship" (Stromquist, 2008, p. 17-18). Citizenship and citizenship education for youth in the United States, as well as in other societies, are primarily considered from the perspective of those able to participate in shaping policy, that is, the adults' perspective.

> We tend to think of young people as being on their way to being full members of society. Yet the very fact that we think of them in this way – as citizens in the making – highlights the fact that they are still only incompletely citizens, still falling short of full membership. (Hall & Williamson, 1999, p. 5, in Smith Lister, Middleton & Cox, 2005, p. 426)

[1] Banks et al (2005) refer to the term "citizenship education projects." The word "project" primarily addresses formal education but does not exclude citizenship education programs as a part of nonformal and informal education. This study uses the term "citizenship education programs," regardless of whether they are part of formal education or are executed in nonformal areas but closely collaborate with formal institutions.

Therefore, the dominant adult perspective is transmitted to youth through formal education and the process of socialization (Smith et al, 2005).

Public spaces, or the institutions within which meanings are created, are "firmly managed by adults" and do not provide enough opportunities to engage young people with each other and with adults in conversations about creating common understandings, including that of citizenship (Fielding, 2007, p. 308). In essence, citizenship's meaning is primarily developed in a positivist paradigm that constructs a normative perspective as applicable and transferable to all, including young members of society. It is assumed that youth learns citizenship from the teachings designed and framed by adults (Smith et al, 2005); hence older generations replicate the notion of citizenship that they live and experience (DeJaeghere, 2008). Therefore, the adults prescribe models that they see most fit society by producing a normative view in which citizenship is defined within certain democratic parameters and legalized in the constitution.

As formal education is the primary social institution and the process carrying political socialization of youth, both the institution and the process fit young people into models of citizenship and democracy acceptable to the adults creating the curricula. However, many developed societies, including the United States, are facing a situation in which "the curriculum and those who planned it [live] in an unreal world, a world *fundamentally* disconnected from" most of the students (Apple, 2006, p. 3). As a result, youth lack connection to the concepts of citizenship, underperform, or are unable to complete the mandated curriculum. These neoliberal perspectives, which are dominant in globalized societies, view "education as a part of mechanism of market exchange" (p. 17), rather than one of social exchange and influence this divide between curriculum and many young people's lives. Furthermore, the infusion of neoliberal ideas into curricula also affects the concept of democracy, "making it only an economic concept, not a political one" (p. 15), and likely changes notions of citizenship as well. As a consequence, "[o]ne of its effects is the destruction of what might best be seen as 'thick democracy,' substituting a much 'thinner' version of possessive individualism." (p. 15) Therefore, youth are not only taught democracy and citizenship as experienced and constructed by the adults, but are also being socialized into a paradigm in which they are

to shape their notions of citizenship through the neoliberal principle of "individual choice." (p. 9)

While considerable literature in the United States addresses young people's civic attitudes, knowledge, and engagement, less research has focused on how youth imagine the notion of citizenship as well as how it views and understands its civic role locally, nationally, and globally. Considering the complexities of multicultural societies, "a more critical understanding of young people's citizenship is required" (Smith et al, 2005, p. 429) in order to better inform the design of new types of citizenship education programs. This deeper perspective includes understanding how youth create a sense of citizenship through their lived experiences and develop their voices in their local-cultural, national, and global communities.

Research Questions

This study's purpose is to develop a critical understanding of U.S. youths' citizenship, their concepts of citizenship created through their experiences and actions in their local communities, their nation, and in the global community. More specifically, it asks the following:

1. What are youths' constructions of citizenship in the multicultural context of the United States?
    a. What institutional and social processes are shaping their citizenship at the various levels of society?
2. In what ways do young people's constructions of citizenship translate into potential citizenship agency?

Globalization processes leading to changes in "the political, economic, societal and media institutions, in the expectations that adults have for young people, and in the expectations youth have for themselves" (Torney-Purta & Amadeo, 2003, p. 269) have had their most significant impact in the last decade and a half. This study looks not only at young people's understanding of the concepts through which citizenship has meaning but also the relationship between their experience and the process of developing a sense of citizenship.

Study Objectives

Unpacking the outcomes of democratic schooling and citizenship education, this research examines U.S. youths' citizenship in three ways. While acknowledging the impact of institutionalized relations and social processes on the educational sector and on youth, the first objective is to inquire about the meaning of citizenship in the context of young people's experiences. As youths' complex identities are being shaped within different levels of society, the second aim is to develop a critical understanding of youths' citizenship, including how young people create a sense of it, enact their notions of it, and develop their voices as citizens through their actions in their communities. The final objective is to interpret the implications of the youths' constructions and experiences for future citizenship education programs that will assist youth in balancing citizenship identity across different areas of society. As part of the last objective, the potentials of developing critical citizenship education programs is discussed, based on the findings related to the institutional relations and social processes affecting youths' educational experiences of citizenship.

Organization of the Thesis

This inquiry about youths' understanding of citizenship is organized in five chapters. Following the explanation of the study rationale and the research questions, this chapter explains the key terms used throughout the study. Additionally, study significance and delimitations bounding it are explained.

The review of the literature included in the following chapter delves into discussion of the meaning of citizenship and provides a conceptual framework designed for the study's inquiry about understanding youths' citizenship. The chapter also discusses the larger socio-economic context shaped by globalization, the state of the U.S. citizenship education, conditions of youth civic and socio-political engagement, and the arguments for new citizenship education programs for globalized societies.

Chapter 3 provides a detailed description of the theoretical model in which the study's conceptual framework is positioned and informs the qualitative design of the study. The chapter also explains data collection and analysis procedures.

The findings of the study organized within four larger narrative structures are presented in chapter 4. The chapter provides a space for youth voices to stand out, but also includes some of my interpretations of their experiences.

The final chapter provides a space in which I engage in the interpretation of the key findings discussing these issues in the context of U.S. educational system. Positioning these issues alongside current discussions about citizenship education, I discuss the implications of these findings for youth citizenship and citizenship education programs, as well as raise questions that citizenship education field still needs to address.

Key Terms and Concepts

The research study relies on several concepts within the specific context of youth experiences. Considering my assumptions of these ideas, this section provides working definitions of youth, citizenship education and civic education, youth identity, and citizenship agency.

Youth. According to the United Nations Programme on Youth (UNPY) (2008), youth is defined as individuals between ages 15 and 24. This assertion also overlaps with a definition of children that includes individuals up to age 18, rather than 14. According to the UNPY, countries often distinguish youth as a category of people prior to the age at which a person is given equal treatment under the law and referred to as being of "legal age" or the "age of majority." This age is most commonly 18, after which they are considered adults. Despite the many definitions of youth across countries, UN agencies use the more inclusive idea of ages 15–24. However, they also suggest the importance of distinguishing two different groups, namely, teenagers (ages 15–19) and young adults (ages 20–24), due to the different sociological, psychological, and health problems these cohorts face.

This study examines young people ages 15–18 attending junior or senior year of high school. This age group was chosen because of the particular importance of youth learning opportunities while in high school, which represents "the last period when young people in America are guaranteed access to free education, and to civic education" (Kahne & Middaugh, 2008, p. 38). Additionally, this age covers a period "when many are making important decision[s] about their future and their relationship to the world"

(p. 38), such as holding a job or furthering their education. Another important change at the end of this time (specifically turning 18 and becoming of age) is their acquisition of new responsibilities and duties, especially as U.S. citizens. This change in legal position, or the process of awaiting this change, is a critical time span during which young people shape their citizenship.

Citizenship education versus civic education. While the terms "citizenship education" and "civic education" have in some cases been used interchangeably, the former in this study is spoken about as "education for citizenship" as elaborated by Starkey (2002). In recent debates about citizenship and citizenship education, Starkey (2002) distinguishes between education for citizenship and civic education since the latter "largely or exclusively focuses on information and knowledge" on what it means to be a citizen, while the former comprises the "affective and experiential aspects of learning" along with cognitive elements (p. 4). In this study any mention of the separate terms, civic or citizenship education, is done purposefully; however, in referring to the writing of other authors, this paper occasionally uses them interchangeably to keep the original authors' writings authentic.

Citizenship. The term "citizenship" refers to two different descriptions of an individual's status in a society: legal citizenship (de jure) and social citizenship (de facto). This study delves into the complexities of social citizenship and the various interpretations of such status; the issues surrounding legal citizenship are mentioned only if they benefit an understanding of social citizenship. Therefore, citizenship in this study addresses an individual's position in a society, and not his or her legal status.

In the large-scale International Evaluation Association (IEA) Civic Education studies, two concepts, conventional and social movement–related citizenship, were identified in the measurement scales (Torney-Purta, Lehmann, Oswald & Schultz, 2001). The conventional construct is built around youth activities related to its political participation in a society, such as voting, joining political party, respect for the nation's government, knowledge of history, engagement in political discussions, and familiarity with the political issues through media. These practices are often viewed as "important behavior for 'good' citizens" (Kennedy, Hahn & Lee, 2008, p. 61). Social movement–related citizenship refers to the actions of individuals in groups whose primary concerns

is the betterment of human rights, the community, and society. Similar to these categories, other studies, such as the qualitative study conducted by Lister et al (2003) in the United Kingdom, suggest a related but expanded classification: "universal status, respectable economic independence, constructive social participation, social-contractual, and right to a voice." (p. 236) Therefore, it can be seen from these two large studies that there is some delineation between the political and social engagement within the individual's consideration of citizenship.

In reviewing the literature, the idea of citizenship always presumes one's engagement and participation in a community or a society. This study is most interested in youths' social, rather than political engagement, which is often the goal of studies on civic education. Chapter 2 includes a larger discussion on youth engagement.

As the young people included in this research are still primarily on the outskirts of political citizenship, the study assumes that political participation for a majority of participants is predominantly an abstraction. The research is particularly interested in the concept of social citizenship, or youths' meaning of and engagement with social movement–related citizenship, without disregarding the importance of political citizenship. Therefore, citizenship is viewed as membership in a society that also produces a sense of belonging to it (Lister, 2007) and "helps situate an individual in a society" (Conover, 1995 in Lister, 2007, p. 700). Specifically, the concept of citizenship from my perspective is the idea of citizenship identity often discussed in Banks's work (2001; 2006; 2007; 2008).

Youth identities. Banks (2007) suggests that within the social context of multicultural societies, the youth are developing different identities, such as local-cultural, national, and global identities. For youth, national identity is perhaps most profoundly shaped by the educational system. As Ross (2007) notes, modern societies have developed national educational systems to instill a sense of national identity among citizens with the goal of being productive members of the community and sustain the national economy.

This study often uses the term "youth identities," specifically citizenship identities, which may not be the same as individual identity. As Ross (2007) points out in a recent literature review on identity and citizenship, individuals have multiple, and to a

degree changing, identities. While they are members of particular social groups, the individuals also develop a "repertoire of identities" and can shift among them depending on the "particular social setting in which they find themselves." (p. 287) Therefore, the identities are socially constructed and developed in relation to others (Ross, 2007).

Cook-Sather (2007) suggests that "issues of identity and voice are complex and cannot be addressed once and for all" (p. 396) they need to be revisited in "each new context and with each new group of participants" (p. 396). The brief discussion about identity and identity formation included in this section is expanded in Chapters 2 and 5. For this study, the discussion of identity always refers to youths' identities as citizens in their communities.

Citizenship agency. "Agency" in this study means youths' citizenship agency or their ability to understand as well as consciously apply civic knowledge and skills to enact their citizenship and effect change. In other words, it represents the capacity to understand their social positions and participate in activities that influence their immediate and larger communities. While a positive influence of youth on their communities is desired, civic engagement may produce negative effects or not yield any impact. Discussion of agency continues in the coming chapters. Chapter 2 addresses the need to think about youths' agency in citizenship education programs; Chapter 3 positions youths' agency in a theoretical framework; Chapter 4 provides their perspectives on how their agency is shaped and enacted; and finally Chapter 5 analyzes the findings on youths' citizenship agency.

Study Significance

This research study on youth citizenship represents an effort to "produce different ways of living [as a citizen] in the world" (St. Pierre & Pillow, 2000, p. 1) and in educational spaces. Its primary goal is to contribute to vibrant discussions on the meaning of citizenship in a globalized environment and on the design of U.S. citizenship education programs.

This study reveals youths' views of their citizenship as constructed and experienced in the spaces of their schools or neighborhood communities, rather than through their sense of belonging to the nation. Two other critical processes related to

these youth being and becoming citizens stand out in this study. First, these youth encounter significant peer pressure not to engage in the activities within their communities; though, their close friends provide important support system for their initial or ongoing engagement in the school. Additionally, education produces socially stratified "successful citizen" – someone who is successful in school and life, and others who are failures. These two critical processes are linked to youths' social obligations to succeed individually and shape how these youth relate to and engage in their communities. As a result, youth as "successful citizens" do not have a sense of belonging to their national community. However, they have a sense of belonging to their schools and, to a degree, their local communities, both of which is shaped by the opportunities and resources available in those communities.

As U.S. educators and policymakers express interest in effectively engaging young people as citizens, this study not only raises the question of youths' meaning of citizenship. It also challenges current perspectives on secondary education curriculum and its contributions, or the lack of, on shaping young citizens as well as identifies approaches for meaningful ways to help young people learn about citizenship.

This study aims to produce rich qualitative analysis to complement rigorous quantitative studies that have called for a greater understanding of youths' ideas of citizenship in the design of future citizenship education programs. With this goal, this study can assist in repositioning today's youth from a marginalized group to individuals capable of developing agency and voices as citizens in their own right.

Study Delimitations

The research examines the experiences of students who are representatives of their particular communities from two public schools. These schools were selected based on their advanced social science programs focusing on citizenship education, and working relationships with the schools administrators who have assisted in making the initial contacts to obtain approval for work with their students. Due to time and resource available to me, the study engaged 28 students in the interviews, rather than a larger group of students. While I have joined some students' out-of-school activities during the

study, these opportunities were minimal due to my outsider position within these schools, or due to scheduling issues.

The research was conducted over a period of four months, where I had spent significant amount of time with students in both locations, a situation that allowed for an inductive approach to obtain rich descriptive data as elaborated in Chapter 3. Yet, my assumptions about citizenship and youth, my position as a social scientist, and my status as a global and other national, but not U.S., citizen had an impact on this qualitative interpretive study's analysis and findings. Chapter 3 includes detailed insight into these perspectives that potentially affect the interpretations of students' responses.

Chapter II:
Reviewing the Context of Youths' Citizenship

> Globalization is highlighting how education cannot be considered an isolated field but must attain centrality as a part of a comprehensive intellectual domain. (Stromquist, 2002a, p. 93)

This study attempts to further understand citizenship identity among American youth in large diverse urban and suburban areas. Since this exploration focuses on the concepts undergirding the meaning of citizenship, it is necessary to develop a conceptual framework for evaluating the construction of citizenship. This chapter first delves into the overall debate about the meaning of citizenship and the purpose of citizenship education. It then assesses the arguments in support of developing a particular conceptual framework for understanding how youth citizenship is shaped. The chapter next looks into the general educational environment as influenced by globalization as well as youth engagement in this globalized educational arena. The chapter briefly considers the goals and purpose of citizenship education, and particularly that of civic education in U.S. high schools. Lastly, prior to discussing the implications for citizenship education programs and broader educational policy, this chapter explores critical issues in citizenship education in a multicultural society and argues for exploring the making of citizenship in this multicultural environment.

The Meaning and Construction of Citizenship and Citizenship Education

The meaning of citizenship. The meaning of citizenship and how it is fostered in education and society have been an ongoing debate among scholars, policymakers, educators, and the public (DeJaeghere, 2002). It is evident from a large body of literature that the concept is "complex and contested" by researchers (McLaughlin, 1992, p. 236). McLaughlin (1992) notes that even "the concept of 'education for citizenship' contains a number of ambiguities and tensions, related to differing interpretations of the notion of 'citizenship'" (p. 236). Furthermore, "these contrasting interpretations of democratic citizenship, locatable on a continuum rather than in terms of discrete conceptions," can be

found between the "minimal" and "maximal" ends of the spectrum, and more specifically interpretations of four aspects of citizenship: identity, virtues, political involvement, and social prerequisites (p. 237). As previously argued, since those with the power to establish citizenship's meaning and transfer it to younger generations through the educational process, including researchers, have different perspectives on this concept, it can be expected that youth do not have a unified understanding of its meaning as well. Furthermore, many concepts contribute to varied connotations of citizenship. The following portion of this section unveils the theoretical framework guiding the discussion about the concepts that contribute to defining the meaning of citizenship between McLaughlin's opposing poles.

The process of shaping citizenship is to a varying degree formed through citizenship education, a component of U.S. social science curriculum (Hahn, 2005), as well as outside the formal educational system (Osler & Starkey, 2003). Traditionally, citizenship is viewed as legal status in the community, where "four concepts are often used to define citizenship, and by implication, citizenship education: 1) membership, 2) community, 3) rights and responsibilities, and 4) shared values or morals"[2] (DeJaeghere, 2008, p. 359). This conventional notion in terms of membership, rights, and responsibilities is prevalent in democracies (Smith et al, 2005). While social concepts of citizenship are subsumed within this more legal definition, social citizenship is not commonly discussed outside the framework of legal citizenship. The status of youth in this traditional context is ambiguous as its rights and responsibilities are constructed differently from those of adults. Youth is assumed to be "lacking in citizenship" (Smith et al, 2005, p. 429); therefore, it is guided throughout its educational experience on the rights and responsibilities of the citizens of a nation.

Also in this traditional context, citizenship education has mainly "focused upon developing knowledge of how government and other institutions in any given state work, [on] the rights and duties of citizens … and has been oriented largely towards the development of a sense of national identity" (Cogan, 1997, p. 3); hence, civic attitudes, knowledge, and engagement are emphasized. As such, citizenship education that creates "good" citizens of nation-states has most often used a minimalist framework, in which it

[2] For a more extensive discussion see DeJaeghere (2008).

instills the values, attitudes and behaviors rooted in the concept of democracy; "but, the aim is for students to acquire these values and behaviors without a larger understanding of the tensions in these values and behaviors in society" (DeJaeghere, 2007, p. 295).

However, in today's increasingly diverse societies, citizenship is now explored as a multidimensional concept consisting of "interconnected dimensions of thought, belief and action" that are conceptualized differently among individuals (Cogan, 1997, p. 2). As argued by Cogan (1997), citizenship is embodied within personal, social, spatial, and temporal dimensions; and citizens develop their identities and roles in the overlapping communities or spaces in which they live and actively interact with other members of these communities. Furthermore, Cogan (1997) argues that when it comes to citizenship education for future generations, "a fundamentally different approach" is needed, "one centered in the vision of the multidimensional citizenship" [emphasis removed] (p. 16). This framework fundamentally differs from the previous one as it calls for recognizing the variety of dimensions associated with one's citizenship.

In light of increasing multiculturalism and acknowledgment of different spaces of life experiences, there is a growing argument that minimalist form of citizenship education and its "good" form of citizenship are not addressing individuals' complex needs (Arnot, 2006; Avery, 2007; Banks, 2007). Westheimer and Kahne (2004) suggest that although there are three overarching conception of citizenship produced by citizenship education programs – what they refer to as "personally responsible, participatory, and justice oriented" citizenship (p. 238) – the central focus of all programs is the question: "what kind of citizen do we need to support an effective democratic society?" (p. 239).

New types of citizenship education, as called for by Cogan (1997) and recently by the Diversity, Citizenship, and Global Education Consensus Panel (Banks et al, 2005), include not only developing knowledge, skills, and values derived from democratic teachings and embodied in the minimalist framework, but more importantly helping youth "enhance an understanding of and ability to change society, rather than the mere adoption of citizenship values or behaviors" (DeJaeghere, 2007, p. 296). In essence, these new forms of citizenship education would embody the characteristics and principles of "maximal" citizenship.

Including Westheimer and Kahne's (2004) three overarching conceptions of citizenship, DeJaeghere (2007) advocates for developing critical citizenship education that can respond to the needs of multicultural societies. Critical forms of citizenship education can "help students and teachers understand their personal responsibility and place in society as part of a collective effort" (p. 296). Critical citizenship is also aligned to transformative citizenship education (Banks, 2008), which "enables students [to] acquire [the] information, skills, and values needed to challenge inequality within their community, their nations, and the world; to develop cosmopolitan values and perspectives; and to take actions to create just and democratic multicultural communities and societies" (Banks, 2008, p. 135). These two types of citizenship have many similarities; for this paper, critical citizenship, as described by DeJaeghere (2007), is used in the remaining discussion.

The argument for expanding the meaning of citizenship through youth input is further supported by the claim that "a major point of contrast between 'minimal' and 'maximal' interpretations of 'education for citizenship' is the degree of critical understanding and questioning on the part of students that is being aimed at" (McLaughlin, 1992, p. 245). However, as Kennedy, Hahn, and Lee (2008) have suggested in their study of Australian, Hong Kong, and U.S. youth, young people's notions of citizenship cannot be effectively described through simple dichotomies. In order to design new citizenship education programs that truly meet the needs of the future youth generations, it is important to expand the discussion on the meaning of citizenship by adding youths' critical understanding of citizenship and expand the framework of four concepts with young people's discussion on the additional concepts and actors that hold some role in developing their meaning of citizenship.

A conceptual framework for youth construction of citizenship. Kymlicka (2003) notes that "the term 'citizenship' typically refers to membership in a political community, and hence designates a relationship between the individual and the state" (p. 147). Similar to McLaughlin (1992), his argument views the idea as a continuum along which an array of relationships between an individual and the state is located. However, when citizenship is expanded to membership in the overall society, the latter relationship

also includes social institutions and processes affecting the individual, and in this case a group of individuals - the youth (Arnot & Dillabough, 2000; Lister, 2007). In particular, it is important to identify education as the most prominent social institution affecting youth, as well as a process ensuring political socialization of young people into citizens. Schools serve as institutions where formal teaching and learning for citizenship takes place; hence, citizenship education curriculum represents the link between the state, the school, and the individual youth.

The following section draws from research in the United Kingdom, United States, Canada, and Australia to expand a theoretical discussion of this relationship of an individual, the state and a society, and identifies a new conceptual framework for comprehending youths' citizenship. Viewing citizenship as a membership in the society, this framework consists of three interrelated dynamics that shape the position of one's citizenship. These include:

- the politics of institutionalized social relations, as enforced through social, political and economic forces and policies deemed universal (Arnot & Dillabough, 2000; Kymlicka, 2003; Preece, 2002; Smith et al, 2005; Stromquist, 2002);
- the social processes and practices evident in educational environments (Arnot, 2006; Arnot & Dillabough, 2000; Banks, 2007; Giroux, 1980; Osler & Starkey, 2003; Willis, 2003); and
- an individual's struggle for self-definition and identity formation as a citizen (Arnot & Reay, 2007; Banks, 2007; DeJaeghere, 2002; Kymlicka, 2003; Lister, 2007; Preece, 2002; Smith et al, 2005).

These three dynamics are so interlaced that it is impossible to look at one and keep the others constant. Their interdependent nature shapes the concept of citizenship on the continuum between the individual and the state or, from another perspective, the minimal and maximal extremes. This conceptual framework also lays the ground for examining youths' voices juxtaposed with the relations of power and the control of curriculum (Arnot & Reay, 2007). The following subsections discuss each dynamic separately while acknowledging their overlap, and suggest one way of representing their relationships.

The politics of institutional social relations. Citizenship education is primarily institutionalized within the formal education process but also occurs in multiple nonformal or informal learning opportunities such as extracurricular activities, youth organizations, and religious groups (Osler & Starkey, 2003). Today, perhaps more than ever, a number of societal, political, and economic forces deeply influence youth perspectives. As Bonder (2000) points out, "[y]oung people's opinions and, in particular, those related to citizenship, democracy, politics and social change are strongly influenced by dominant discourses as well as by the role which society offers to youth in the governance and development of their community." (p. 243) For instance, advancements in technology and communications make it possible for youth to find different ways of political engagement, which was observed in the 2008 U.S. presidential election. Information about conditions in other countries is more easily available, thus making youth more aware of disparities across regions. Online communication and blogging facilitate participation in educational programs and sharing opinions about current events. On the other hand, these advancements have also provided mass media with "powerful external influence" on youths' perspectives, values, and even their actions (Stromquist, 2002a, p. 89).

The strongest recent changes in social discourses and relations can be attributed to globalization. In her account of its role in education, Stromquist (2002) notes that globalization can be seen as originally stemming from modernization theory, which sees the free market as a primary mechanism, and liberalization and privatization as necessary complements. Indeed, market liberalization has been seen as a "key feature of globalization" (p. 22), and neoliberalism is an economic model that has spread globalization. Stromquist also argues that the role of economy in education is more pronounced, changing roles of the state and the individuals in relation to education.

Education in a globalized world can be observed from two perspectives: a "key *venue* to support [the growth of] globalization" or the "*means* to succeeding in a globalized world." (p. xiii–xvi) In serving as a venue, and in the name of increasing accountability and quality, education changes in response to neoliberalism's "three policy prescriptions: decentralization, privatization, and competition within free markets" (p. 26). The state's role diminishes when including these policies in education, and it

becomes more concerned with the overall production of knowledge (or creation of the means of success) rather than with student access, academic content, and the governance of educational institutions. As Apple (2006) observes, "[i]n this discourse, the fundamental role of schooling is to fill students with knowledge of what is necessary to compete in today's rapidly changing world," which is assumed to ensure that "['g]ood' students will learn 'good' knowledge and will get 'good' jobs." (p. 5) Furthermore, the idea of "individual choice" creates the assumption that the knowledge produced in the schools is neutral and "official" – meaning, there is one way of understanding and addressing problems, no matter the individual's position. However, "[q]uestions of whose knowledge, who chooses, how this is justified" are not considered in neoliberal relations of power, and this state's concern with construction of education producing neutral official knowledge "offers little agency to students, teachers, and community members" (p. 5) in acting as citizens of the globalized society.

As the schools are social "institutions that exist in a particular relationship with a state" (Giroux, 1980, p. 334), it is important to note that citizenship education curriculum is ultimately tied to a state that has a certain political and economic structure. The needs of a state for sustaining the existing order are extended through the curriculum and as such, citizenship education leads to reproducing institutional social relations. Through this dynamic, the curriculum then reproduces the existing type of democracy within that state (Arnot, 2006a; Giroux, 1980). While this conceptual framework is primarily grounded in the cultural production of citizens addressed in the next subsection, it also refers to social reproduction "in understanding the role of the state in contemporary capitalism" (Marston, 2000, p. 227). However, this framework follows Arnot's (2001) suggestion for cautious use of this theoretical perspective, in informing how the structure of schooling is shaped by capitalism.

Social discourses and their impact on social relations are not constant; observing their change over time, Willis (2003) provides an anthropological perspective on how the waves of "modernization" affect young people and their positions in society. In this context, Willis's term "modernization," viewed as a discourse stemming from "radical shifts in technological and material production and … accompanied by specific cultural forms" (p. 390), can be juxtaposed with globalization, and the phrase "waves of

modernization" can aid in understanding the changing effects of globalization on society and social relations. Regardless of the wave of modernization, "[p]ower brokers and policy planners are transfixed by the internal logic of their 'top-down' practices and initiatives," failing to recognize the unintended consequences and the bottom-up responses of affected groups, including youth (Willis, 2003, p. 390). Through the 'top-down' approaches, adults as power brokers attempt to institutionalize the social relations suitable to particular social conditions. However, the "'bottom-up' responses, [usually coming from youth] are often informed by quite different social perceptions, practices, and assumptions" (p. 390). While youths' reactions to changing discourses are framed within their abilities to act on or voice its position, "to adult eyes they may seem to be mysterious, troubling, and even shocking and antisocial" (p. 391). Therefore, a gap exists between adults as power brokers of the new social discourses developed by globalization and youth as the group affected by it.

Discussing the political landscape of gendered relations in the concept of citizenship, Arnot and Dillabough (2000) acknowledge that the feminist perspective frames citizenship through "discursive practices, social constraints, contemporary gender relations, and social and cultural reproduction (the manifestation of symbolic and material relations)." (p. 5) Other authors also argue that "both social forces and lived experiences 'shape the range of identities at play'" (Cockburn, 1998, p. 212, in Arnot & Dillabough, 2000, p. 3), and the following section further discusses the interplay of social relations, processes, and practices on an individual's experiences.

Social processes and practices. Political socialization has traditionally been the basis of citizenship education. Through "public-sponsored mass schooling," a state uses the process to guide students in developing specific forms of citizenship identity as members of the nation-state (Astiz, 2007, p. 122). However, as Astiz points out, many studies suggest that while youth acquire knowledge about the state, democratic process, and its role as citizens, it does not necessarily develop understanding how its participation can uphold the democratic system and promote social justice.

The process of political socialization, imbedded in the citizenship education curriculum that attempts to produce neutral and "official" knowledge on citizenship,

interacts with and is partially influenced by the culture present and produced in the dynamic spaces of youths' lived experiences (schools and communities). In this interaction, citizenships education, as present in the overall school curriculum, shapes youths' citizenship identities; due to the complex nature of the spaces, citizenship is "culturally *produced*" in these spaces, but it also "culturally *produces* cultural forms" (Levinson & Holland, 1996, p. 14) that impact understanding and enactment of it. Giroux (1998) offers one way of understanding cultural production of citizenship within the spaces of experiences:

> Citizenship is a form of cultural production ... the making of citizens must be understood as an ideological process through which we experience ourselves as well as our relations to others and the world within a complex and often contradictory system of representations and images. (p. 16, in Arnot, 1997, p. 286).

Furthermore, understanding the nature of cultural production of citizen can be assisted by Ong's (1996) concept of "cultural citizenship". She suggests that cultural citizenship is a "dual process of self-making and being-made within webs of power linked to nation-state and civil society." (p. 738) This duality of one's citizenships can also be explored through the dynamics of this conceptual framework. Through institutionalized relations as well as social processes and practices, "youth is socially constructed as distinct from and 'other' to adulthood" and therefore, young people as citizens are "socially identified as distinct from and 'other' to adult citizenship" (Smith et al, 2005, p. 429). Young people's constructions of citizenship are in that sense designed in an exclusionary environment where institutionalized political, economic, and social forces uphold this perplexing position of youth as "citizens in the making" (p. 426), but also as "good" citizens able to secure "good" jobs that sustain the economic and political system. However, along with this prescribed identity of citizens in the making, young people negotiate their self-made complex citizenship identities through the interactions within their spaces of experiences.

These social processes, which on one hand produce young citizens, are also in constant interaction with the institutional relationships between the state and an individual.

Individual self-definition as a citizen. Educating youth on becoming citizens of nation-states and global society occurs inside and also outside school (Banks, 2007; Levin, 2007). While the policies and regulations on what constitutes citizenship are prevalent in U.S. social studies curriculum, the individual's role and the role of one's experiences in constructing one's citizenship is perhaps less visible. Nevertheless, an individual's experience is central to understanding the conceptualization of citizenship among youth. A witty metaphor by Stevick and Levinson (2007) depicts the importance of developing a sense of citizenship through one's experiences:

> In a famous joke, a ship is sinking, and one sailor asks the other, "Do you know how to swim?" The second replies, "Well, I read about it in school, and I think I can get the theory of it." There is an ever-growing sense around the world that democracy, like swimming, cannot be learned through rote classroom practice alone. Democratic citizenship requires real experience in democratic practices. (p. 8)

Since one's experience is important to his or her construct of citizenship, youths' lived experiences as citizens in various communities need to be translated into "lived citizenship: the meaning that citizenship actually [has] in people's lives and the ways in which people's social and cultural backgrounds and material circumstances affect their lives as citizens" (Hall & Williamson, 1999, in Lister, Smith, Middleton & Cox, 2003, p. 235). Looking at their "lived citizenship" facilitates closer attention to the social construction of young people's citizenship as well as development of their social identification within local, national, and global communities.

Acknowledging youth's position in society is important in understanding its experiences. In his anthropological research on working-class "lads" in the United Kingdom over several decades, Willis's (2003) work provides insights on their evolving knowledge of their roles within capitalist society. He argues that "[y]oung people are unconscious foot soldiers in the long front of modernity" (p. 390), where they are involuntarily forced to redefine their citizen identities in a changing political and social environment even though a set of expectations about individual rights and responsibilities is already made. Nevertheless, "[t]he experiences and knowledge of students … can help us, and them to understand their own place and formation within flows of cultural

modernization" (p. 413). Similarly, youths' lived citizenship can assist in understanding their constructions of citizenship and perspectives about or experiences of enacting their citizenship agency within different levels of a society.

Referring to Kymlicka's (1995) work on multicultural citizenship, Ladson-Billings (2005) suggests that individuals have "multiple civic identities" and that they "move … across many identities" based on how society responds to them. This multiple nature of civic identity is particularly pronounced with minorities, for whom the dominant social discourses might prompt them to shift their citizenship identities based on their desired social status (Ladson-Billings, 2005). Therefore, recognizing institutional and social relations in formulating young people's positions and their experiences is important in understanding how youth develop their citizen identities and translate their experiences into a sense of agency that further shapes their positions as citizens.

Lastly, in looking at the relationship among the three overarching dynamics, an individual's relationship with others, including dynamics of power and privilege, affects one's identity amid institutionalized concepts of citizenship (Giroux, 1980; Stromquist, 2006). The abstractness of the idea of citizenship has led some to view it as an "empty space that in theoretical terms could be occupied by anyone, assuming that anyone and everyone has the power to occupy such a place" (Donald, 1996, in Arnot & Dillabough, 2000, p. 3); it implies equal position among and within groups in which all members "could ascribe to" it (Arnot, 2006, p. 80). However, from historical narratives, it is clear that "only particular and privileged identities can and have occupied the place of citizenship" (Arnot & Dillabough, 2000, p. 3). In particular, the multicultural education literature emphasizes privileges and power associated with people deemed citizens by a society (Banks, 2007). Moreover, an individual's struggle for self-definition as a citizen within such institutionalized notions carries another dimension of power relations, namely, that between the individual and the collective. "In such a contested political arena, individuals (the 'I') are expected to identify with particular concepts of citizenship as members of the collective 'we,' to position themselves in relation to them and gain a sense of moral and political belonging" (Arnot & Dillabough, 2000, p. 3). It is often assumed that the collective represents all individuals, including youth.

As argued previously, there is a distinct relationship of power between adults and youth, in which the latter is viewed as a group that needs to learn about citizenship. Youth not only lack power but also many of the privileges associated with citizenship (Lister, 2007). In referring to work conducted by Cogan and Derricott (1998) and Torney-Purta et al (2001), DeJaeghere (2008) states that generally "conceptual frameworks of citizenship education do not explicitly address privilege and power as concepts of citizenship" (p. 372). Formal citizenship education does not offer youth an opportunity to learn about and recognize its limited status as well as learn about social discourses and power relations in its communities. In citizenship education programs, most youth learn only the ideals of democracy and citizenship, translating that knowledge into "good" citizenship, rather than critical citizenship (DeJaeghere, 2008). Therefore, understanding privilege and power, "which underlie inequalities and injustices" (p. 372) in society, need to be included in citizenship education cautiously to avoid creating any additional power relationships.

Using countertopographies to analytically map framework's three dynamics. "Critical topographies" or "countertopographies" (Katz, 2001, p. 721) suggested by the urban geographers concerned with the spaces of education, could help develop an understanding of citizenship through youths' experiences and relationships with institutions and social processes. While producing countertopographies represents a "political response" to the social reproduction of certain global capitalist discourses, it is also an attempt to initiate a "practical response" to new institutionalized social relations produced in complex global societies (p. 719). Since a topography is not only a "detailed description of a particular location" but also a representation of "the totality of the features that comprise the place" (p. 720), a critical topography or countertopography maps and analytically links particular places through "thick descriptions" of the complex connections among institutional social relations, social processes, and individuals. As such, countertopographies "involve precise analysis of particular processes that not only connect disparate places, but also in doing so enable us to infer connections in unexamined places in between" (p. 721-722).

In referring to the reinvigorated use of critical topographies, Katz (2001) points out that their key aspect is "the contour line," which does not merely connect different places impacted by particular social relations or processes, but more importantly marks "a particular relation to a process" (p. 721) by individuals and occurs in various spaces. As such, they allow for the variances in social processes across different places and spaces and map the experiences of the common struggles.

In essence topographies provide a visual representation of the places, a two-dimensional representation of a three-dimensional nature of the localities of all place using standardized characters and language to show the unique localities around the globe in a uniform manner. Similarly, countertopographies provide analytical mapping of the same or a similar process occurring across different spaces; while the spaces are never the same, the processes are analogous and can be discussed despite spatial differences. These abstractions assist in imagining the interaction of various contour lines, represent the study's results visually, and aid in raising practical implications of the findings.

In this study, countertopographies assist in mapping the constructions of citizenship through uncovering similarities among discrete places and address the processes "in between" (p. 721) the three dynamics of the conceptual framework. Furthermore, the contour lines help look into the relationships between youths and the processes of producing their position and roles as citizens in a multicultural, democratic society. Finally, mapping the processes and relations of the processes to the overarching dynamics leads to producing countertopographies of youths' learning, experiencing and constructing citizenship.

The beginning of this section explained a theoretical conceptualization of the meaning of citizenship through one's community membership; rights and responsibilities; and knowledge, skills, and values as a citizen along with minimal and maximal citizenship. The second portion constructed the conceptual framework considering all actors in a society. The following sections turn to the primary individuals in this study, youth, as well as the social conditions that require an examination of the concept of citizenship.

Globalization and Citizenship Education

The past decade has witnessed an increasing interest in citizenship education, including its purpose, the alignment of its goals with national perspectives, the assessment of students' learning outcomes, and the evaluation of the needs of citizenship education programs. This awareness can be seen through the number of large-scale studies, such as the IEA Civic Education Study, as well as national and regional evaluations, especially in the United States and in Western democracies, some of which are discussed later. Based on an extensive literature review from 1995 to 2005, Osler and Starkey (2005) identify six factors that can explain the recent attentiveness to citizenship education:

- global injustice and inequality is becoming more visible in research and in various reports;
- globalization and migration are affecting the social cohesion of the nation-states, which place more weight on unity and diversity in the educational system;
- concerns are growing about civic and political engagement, particularly among youth;
- a youth deficit, in which youth are seen as having little interest in community involvement and instead are oriented toward violence and antisocial behavior, is supposed;
- the Cold War ended, leading to numerous new democracies now interested in educating their citizens in different ways; and
- antidemocratic and racist movements particularly in Europe are on the rise (Osler & Starkey, 2005).

Although Osler and Starkey studied U.K. citizenship education, the authors argue that many conditions apply to other nations, and particularly to European countries and the United States. This part of the chapter addresses primarily the first four factors, as they are most relevant to this research.

Globalization significantly affects the distribution of resources within and among societies (Stromquist, 2002), has multiple effects on education (Knight, 2003), and consequently changes human life experiences and expectations (Stromquist, 2002a). Furthermore, with the ease of sharing information, issues of injustice and inequality

around the world, especially violations of basic human rights and fundamental freedoms protected by the U.N. Declaration of Human Rights (1948) as well as that of children as declared in the U.N. Convention on the Right of the Child (1989), are receiving more international attention (Osler & Starkey, 2005). Young people in the United States strongly support human rights around the world, which can be viewed in the youths' involvement in the Save Darfur campaign; providing healthcare supplies, such as mosquito nets, to developing regions; or revitalizing areas struck by environmental disasters, such as New Orleans, Indonesia, and Haiti.

In the past decade, many countries, including the United States, have made strong connections between human rights education and citizenship education (Banks et al, 2005), and today "there is a growing consensus internationally that human rights principles underpin education for citizenship in multicultural democracies" (Osler & Starkey, 2005, p. 6).

Another by-product of globalization is greater population migration, increasing diversity in some nation-states. Although the United States has been viewed as a multicultural country since its inception, the last two decades have featured ever-growing diversity, and consequently drastic changes in student demographics and needs. The U.S. Census has estimated that people of color made up 28% of the country's population in 2000 and predicts that they will make up 38% in 2025 and 50% in 2050 (Hobbs and Stoops, 2002). The census also indicates that in 2000 people under age 25 were more diverse than people over age 65, and ethnic minorities represented about 39% of younger groups, a significant increase from 1990s when about 25% of that cohort was of a minority group. Banks (2007) comments that

> American classrooms are experiencing the largest influx of immigrant students since the beginning of the 20th century. About a million immigrants are making the United States their home each year (Martin & Midgley, 2006).... In the 30-year period between 1973 and 2004, the percentage of students of color in the U.S. public schools increased from 22 to 43%.... In 2000, about 20% of the school-age population spoke a language at home other than English (U.S. Census Bureau, 2006). (p. vii)

In addition to the increasing ethnic, cultural, and language diversity, there is also more differentiation in poverty levels (Banks, 2007). These demographic changes are perhaps some of the strongest arguments for rethinking citizenship education.

At the same time, youth civic and political engagement seems to be decreasing compared to the levels and types of participation in previous decades (Carnegie Corporation & CIRCLE, 2003). A review of U.S. civic education trends indicates that young people participate more in community service and volunteer work (Sax, 2004). However, other developments are perplexing. Young people show declining civic attitudes in terms of being "less interested in political discussions and public issues, more cynical and alienated from formal politics, more materialistic, and less trusting" in governmental institutions and processes (Carnegie Corporation & CIRCLE, 2003, p. 18). Moreover, their civic knowledge is considered "inadequate," and their knowledge, attitudes, and engagement vary based on their backgrounds (p. 18). Finally, young people are "distinctly less likely to vote than older generations" (p. 18). This supposed lack of civic engagement is of fundamental concern to longer-established democracies, which are interested in sustaining that government model (Osler & Starkey, 2003).

Based on these apprehensions, primarily in the United Kingdom and to an increasing degree in the United States, governmental institutions see young people as apathetic citizens who have "fail[ed] to understand the political basis of the state and are ignorant of their responsibilities and their rights" (Crick, 2000, in Osler & Starkey, 2003, p. 245), and therefore, blame them for "problems and challenges facing society as a whole" (Osler & Starkey, 2005, p. 8). With the above assumptions about youth engagement, governmental institutions apply the deficit model of citizenship, whereby young people are seen as "citizens of tomorrow" (Smith et al, 2003, p. 425) but as today's "less good citizens" (Osler & Starkey, 2003, p. 245). In this context, citizenship education is seen as the means for addressing this insufficiency (Osler & Starkey, 2005). These trends are based on comparisons with previous generations and in this context describe youth as being deficient.

As the above discussion shows, these four contextual factors explain to a significant degree the increasing desire for revisiting citizenship education's purpose and principles for new generations. Governmental institutions expect in any democratic state

to advance youths' participation and engagement in the public and private spheres. However, aside from calls from researchers (Banks et al, 2005; Carnegie Corporation & CIRCLE, 2003; Hahn, 2005; Stromquist, 2008), the desired extent, type, and quality of youth engagement has not been officially proposed by U.S. institutions or policymakers (Westheimer, 2004).

Youth Civic and Socio-Political Engagement

Young people's engagement in society, and by implication in education, begins early in life but depends on one's motivation and capacities, on the cultural context, as well as family and community expectations (Hart, 1995). More specifically, despite the universal agreement on youths' participation and engagement as a basic human right to have a voice in the community, the social context largely determines the norms that affect that engagement (Hart, 1992). Therefore, the young people's capacities and motivation for engagement are largely impacted by societal factors, which can either encourage youths' involvement and engagement, or more often discourage that engagement (Hart, 1992; Katz, 2001).

Hart's (1992) model, the ladder of youth participation, developed through international research looking at youths' needs, opportunities for involvement, and possible outcomes, is an effective way to examine this issue. The framework distinguishes eight levels of participation, five of which represent engagement in an activity, organization, or institution and three are forms of nonparticipation. Degrees of participation include (a) youth-initiated participation, exercising shared decision-making with adults; (b) youth-initiated and youth-directed participation; (c) adult-initiated participation of youth, in which adults share the decision-making process; (d) participation during which youth is consulted and informed by adults; and (e) youth is assigned to participate, but also informed of that participation. Within these levels, youth has some voice and amount of influence in the activities. On the other hand, the model identifies three traditional types of engagement as nonparticipation – (a) use of youth as tokenism, (b) youth as decoration, and (c) manipulation of youth – since they do not include youths' voices. Hart (1992) argues that there is a "strong tendency on the part of adults to underestimate the competence of children while at the same time using them in

events to influence some cause" (p. 9). Although a number of adult-developed projects have positive experiences for youth, they only represent youths' performances and not their engagement (Hart, 1995). Through these projects young people are often tokenized, or viewed and used as a decoration within a project performance, and sometimes even manipulated.

Hart (1992) argues that youths' participation starts with them simply being informed by adults to the level at which project decisions and implementation are shared. In these five levels, youth participation is also viewed as a fundamental right to practice citizenship (Lister, 2007; UNICEF, 2006). The essential part is "meaningful action" (Bartlett, 2005, in Lister, 2007, p. 702) or youth engagement in "meaningful projects with adults ... in collaborative activities with other persons, including those who are older and more experienced than themselves" (UNICEF, 2006, p. 2). This involvement though is not to be restricted to informal or nonformal educational programs, but needs to occur primarily through youths' most meaningful and longest experience, their formal education. Hart's model clearly demonstrates that when discussing the possibilities of youths' participation in education, the greatest effects are produced when the focus is on the areas that lead to "meaningful action" and the development of their citizen identities with a sense of agency in their communities.

Engagement and participation in a society is a central part of legal and social citizenship. From the political-science perspective, engagement, particularly civic engagement, is "any activity, individual or collective, devoted to influencing the collective life of the polity" (American Political Science Association in Levin, 2007, p. 3). In this view, youth civic engagement is represented only in Hart's (1992) top three levels in which youth have power to either influence a decision or share it with adults. These activities can consist of an active role in school or community organizations with the goal of expanding the scope of activities, involvement in local governments to have representation in policy making, or starting a new local organization.

Young people's engagement is not only based on their skills and ability to be active; they must also possess knowledge and values that will assist them in becoming involved members of a society. Ideally, "a genuinely multicultural state recognizes not only that citizens are different in their language and culture, but also that citizens are

different in different ways, and so will relate to the state in different ways, with different forms of multicultural membership in the larger state" (Kymlicka, 2003, p. 153). A multicultural state can recognize the variety of types of youth participation and engagement, occurring in multiple arenas and intensities.

Although global efforts and national commitments through the UN Millennium Development Goals have brought increased attention to children's basic educational needs worldwide (UN Millennium Project, 2006), the United States has shifted its focus toward achievement rather than the right to quality education (Osler & Starkey, 2005). With the emphasis on standardization to ensure everyone's achievement, educational policy has moved toward high-stakes testing, which represents the most systematic way of reaching that policy's goals (Stromquist, 2008). However, young people's human right to have access to education that assists them become participating citizens is overlooked in this policy. In light of the stress on achievement, the question of what youth need to learn to be productive members of society becomes even more important. The following section delves deeper into U.S. citizenship education and its objectives.

Goals and Purpose of U.S. Citizenship Education

Citizenship education in social-studies curriculum is largely represented in some form of civic education during middle and high school. The state of civic education in the U.S. can be described as deteriorating at best. Cotton's (1996) literature review, based on 93 documents of civic education research and practices between 1982 and 1996, although dated is important in understanding how citizenship education has shifted (or not) during the years. This literature review depicts a gray picture, noting the strong consensus on students' lack of civic preparedness as "studies show that traditional citizenship education has failed our youth dismally in attempting to develop them into knowledgeable, active citizens" (Colville & Clarken, 1992, p. 7, in Cotton, 1996). Consequently, "[y]oung people in the United States are expressing a sense of powerlessness to affect constructive social or political change" (Berman, 1990, p. 75, in Cotton, 1996). The review also points out that in addition to a general neglect of citizenship education, civic education lacked relevance and the meaning in the teachings as well as a focus on citizen rights; concentrated on passive learning and text-bound

instruction; avoided controversial topics; centered on teacher control and student disobedience; and lacked attention to global issues (Cotton, 1996). Commenting on Cotton's work, Stromquist (2008) also notes that up until the end of the reviewed period, civic-education curriculum has not changed with regard to globalization; discussion of its impact on overall education and consequences for civic education has only happened in the past decade.

A report by Carnegie Corporation and CIRCLE: The Center for Information and Research on Civic Learning (2003) has expressed a similar concern and shows that the focus on civic education in the curriculum has declined, as today students enroll in only one course on government as opposed to as many as three courses on civics, democracy, and government in the period up to late 1960s. This sole class does not have a very "explicit discussion of a citizen's role" but rather "describes and analyzes government in a more distant way" (Carnegie Corporation & CIRCLE, 2003). Furthermore, the report identifies the obstacles to promoting civic education among youth, including 1) teachers' fear of criticism or litigation for addressing the topics considered "controversial or political in nature" (p. 15); 2) the national movement toward high-stakes testing (primarily focused on math and reading) ; additionally, due to the nature of testing to assess the measurable learning outcomes, the focus of civic education is often on the knowledge, rather than attitude and skills that are not easily measured by standardized tests; and 3) the decline in extracurricular participation and to a certain degree the drop in funding for those activities. Lastly, another finding is that social studies classes largely rely on prompting students to memorize rather than employ active learning. This point is perhaps closely related to Cotton's (1996) obstacles to promoting civic education, where high-stakes testing and avoidance of controversial issues also leads to encouraging memorization rather than interactive learning. Both reports depict a clear and continued withdrawal of high-quality education for young people to develop a civic as well as political commitment to their country (Kahne & Middaugh, 2008).

Despite the increased attention to citizenship, civic, and democracy education around the world, the United States, which has served as a model of democratic philosophy for many countries, operates much differently: "the trend in U.S. public education has been to eschew a central commitment to educating democratic citizens"

(Levinson, 2005, p. 330). Giroux (1980) has long argued that "citizenship education became entwined in a 'culture of positivism,' one that displayed little interest in the ways in which schools acted as agents of social and cultural reproduction in a society marked by significant inequities in wealth, power, and privilege." (p. 330) This culture of positivism that has prevailed for more than two decades, as Levinson (2005) argues, has recently been challenged by a growing number of studies that indicate the need for renewed commitment to high-quality citizenship education.

The IEA Civic Education Study that surveyed 14-year-olds showed that U.S. youth has a well above average level of knowledge about the constitution and function of the national legislature as compared with their counterparts in 27 other countries (Torney-Purta & Barber, 2004), a finding that exemplifies the earlier discussion about the goals of U.S. citizenship education and its teaching methods. However, "the conceptual foundation that [U.S. students] have concerning democracy and citizenship is only average when they are compared with students in other countries (even some in new democracies)" (p. 2). Additionally, young people's "acceptance of norms of participation" and their intention to vote "are not as high as considered healthy for democracy" (Torney-Purta & Amadeo, 2003, p. 273). While U.S. youth has scored average or higher in some respects, the results are somewhat alarming in terms of the needs of a long-standing democracy such as the United States.

As a result of the conditions above, U.S. citizenship education has "often fostered citizen passivity rather than action," attempted to "develop patriotism conceptualized citizenship responsibility primarily as voting, and reinforced the dominant, social, racial and class inequality in American society" (Banks, 2007, p. 4). Citizenship education's purpose has been to produce "good" citizens, whose understanding of their roles was formulated through their learning experiences in schools that "focused on transmission of civic knowledge" (Homana, Barber & Torney-Purta, 2006, p. 3). Moreover, in its traditional form, citizenship education in the United States and many other nations has embraced an assimilationist ideology with the goal to "eradicate the community cultures and languages of students from diverse ethnic, cultural, racial, and language groups" (Banks, 2007, p. 20). However, this goal of citizenship education has also changed over time.

In the United States, the assimilationist ideology of constructing citizenship to fit an Anglo-Saxon Protestant concept of "good" citizenship was challenged during 1960s and 1970s civil-rights movements (Banks, 2007), which triggered ethnic-revitalization movements; during this period, ethnic, racial, and cultural groups that had been marginalized brought a greater attention to their status and contributed to a more emphatic emphasis on multicultural education and citizenship (Banks, 2006). Today, with increasing migration, social diversity, and focus on basic human rights, the essential goal of educating for democracy, as Banks (2007) suggests, relies on the "delicate balance of diversity and unity" (p. 153) where all members of society can develop their citizen identities. As Banks argues, citizenship education should be transformed to meet the needs of all. In this broader context of multiple and overlapping needs, "citizenship education is defined as *opportunities* provided by schools to engage students in *meaningful learning experiences* ... to facilitate their development as politically and socially responsible individuals."[emphasis added] (Homana et al, 2006, p. 3).

Stromquist (2008) suggests that in thinking of future generations, education for citizenship should also consider the processes that indirectly shape one's notions of citizenship. "Updating civic education for the 21st century requires a recognition of globalization in its many forms and both positive and negative consequences" (Stromquist, 2008, p. 17). Reviewing the work on political socialization that underlies democratic and citizenship education prior to this century, Torney-Purta (2000) notes that "the most important message is that scholars need to move beyond a narrow view of outcomes and inputs to the political socialization process, taking a more complex, reciprocal, and situated view" (p. 94). Additionally, she suggests that models of youth engagement in older political-socialization studies are being questioned by more recent citizenship education research that centers on youth involvement in their communities.

According to Westheimer and Kahne's (2004) finding, citizenship education programs with different goals produce varying outcomes in the form of individuals' conceptions of citizenship and their actions, all of which may still successfully educate youth on democracy; yet, democratic values and citizens' actions might not overlap across these programs. Westheimer and Kahne's research suggests the need for recognizing the interplay of individuals within a specific context or educational process, a

relationship that affects citizenship education's goal and design. Based on this literature review, citizenship education programs need to take into account the multiple needs of multicultural societies and of individuals to assist their understanding of their positions in society.

Critical Issues in Citizenship Education in a Multicultural Society

Earlier sections of this chapter addressed some of globalization's most notable impacts on society, social relations, and the experiences of individuals, especially youth, by reshaping communities. The growing ethnic, racial, cultural, language, and religious diversity in many nations profoundly impacts the needs of education, and particularly citizenship education curriculum currently employed in nation states. Within these diverse societies, the individuals have distinct yet overlapping cultural, national, and global identifications (Banks, 2001), and Banks (2007) notes that "most students have conscious identification with their communities and nation-state," while "often they are only vaguely aware of their status as world citizens" (p. 132). As such, young people "do not have comprehensive understanding of the full implications of their world citizenship" (p. 132) and how it relates to their overall status as citizens. "[T]he challenge for citizenship education is to engage with this constantly shifting and contested terrain" of social relations in globalized multicultural societies and recognize the differences in needs among youth (Arnot, 2006, p. 80).

When it comes to U.S. public education, Levinson (2005) points out at the apparent separation of academic discourses of "multiculturalism" and "citizenship" in the research and literature, which needs to be bridged through connecting the discourse of citizenship with the discourse of difference in the multicultural society (p. 330). The Diversity, Citizenship, and Global Education Consensus Panel similarly calls for reevaluating and reshaping citizenship education programs to fit the needs of the multicultural societies:

> Increased diversity and increased recognition of diversity require a vigorous reexamination of the ends and means of citizenship education. Multicultural societies are faced with the challenge of creating nation-states that recognize and incorporate the diversity of their citizens and embrace an overarching set of

> shared values, ideals, and goals to which all citizens are committed. (Banks et al, 2005, p. 7)

The Panel has developed principles for educating citizens in the global age (Banks et al, 2005). "[R]ecognizing both challenges and opportunities of ethnic, racial, cultural, and language diversity" (Banks, 2007, p. 5), the main purpose of these principles is to help "students not only to grasp the complexity of the world but also to provide them with a *sense of agency* and to enable them to acquire *skills and knowledge* to help *shape* their communities, the nation and the world" [emphasis added] (Osler, 2005, p. 17). Additionally, these new programs "must enable students to examine the *power* of individuals and, particularly, groups to effect change through collaboration and co-operation" [emphasis added] (p. 17).

The panel's recommendations are also supported by the results of the earlier mentioned large-scale studies, such as the IEA Civic Education Study, which indicate that U.S. citizenship education needs to be evaluated and reshaped to fit the needs of the multicultural society (Hahn, 2005). The findings suggest that students' achievement level in tests of civic knowledge and skills varies based on socio-economic status and ethnic group (Hahn, 2005). More specifically, there was a significant difference in civic knowledge scores between white non-Hispanic and Asian students as opposed to African American and Hispanic students (Baldi et al., 2001, in Hahn, 2005). As Avery (2007) summarizes, additional studies in the United States such as the 2006 National Assessment of Education Progress Civic Assessment, a study by Conover and Searing (2000), and a study by Fridkin, Kenney, and Crittenden (2006), along with the IEA Civic Education Study provide "evidence that minority, immigrant and lower income students have consistently fewer opportunities to engage in the research-based pedagogical approaches [leading to the meaningful citizenship engagement] than do their counterparts" (p. 7). The evidence from these studies discussed by Avery (2007), as well as from Kahne and Middaugh's (2008) research, implies that U.S. citizenship education programs do not produce equitable outcomes for all largely due to uneven opportunities and access.

In discussing citizenship education in multicultural society, Banks (2007) critically looks at the relative inclusion of diversity issues and raises several questions about citizenship education's construction and purpose:

> Whose concept is *citizenship education*? To whom does the concept belong? Who constructed it? Whose interests does it serve? Whose lived experiences does it reflect? Can individuals and groups on the margins of the society effectively participate in a transformation of the concept and of society? (p. 4)

These questions are particularly relevant to the discussion about the meaning of citizenship for U.S. youth. As discussed earlier, "citizenship education has been constructed historically by powerful and mainstream groups" [emphasis removed] (Banks, 2007, p. 4) in ways that primarily serve their interests while overlooking or diminishing the interests of the less powerful. Unequal power relations exist not only between adults and youth but also "between and among various ethnic, racial, and cultural groups" (Ladson-Billings, 2005, p. 73). As Preece (2002) points out, citizenship is "learned differently by different social groups according to their assumed status in society and according to how policy decisions privilege certain qualities of the good citizens above others" (p. 28). For that reason, it is important to further the discussions on the multiple requirements of citizenship education to address an increasingly diverse population of youth (Hobbs & Stoops, 2002) in an environment where social relations define its status as a "less good citizen" (Osler & Starkey, 2003, p. 245) or a group with less power (Lister, 2007).

Keeping in mind the multidimensional nature of citizenship (Cogan, 1997), the variety of identifications young people form within interconnected communities as well as the interplay of identity with the social processes and institutionalized power, Banks (2007) argues that "the aim of citizenship education should be to attain a delicate balance between education for unity and nationhood and educating citizens to recognize, confront, and help resolve inequality manifested in forms such as racism, sexism, and classism" (p. 4). Revitalized citizenship education can enable all students, including those who have benefited from traditional assimilationist policies, to "acquire the knowledge, values, and skills needed to interact positively with people from diverse ethnic, racial and cultural groups and to develop a commitment to act to make their communities, the nation, and the world moral, civic, and equitable" (p. 12). Then students will not only "participate within, but also help transform and reconstruct society" (p. 14). From another perspective, "to educate future citizens merely to fit into

and not to transform society would result in the perpetuation and escalation of these problems" of inequality (Banks, 2007, p. 14). An individual's relation to other people and groups is often overlooked in U.S. citizenship education (Lister, 2007). Citizenship education research in the United States (Avery, 2007; Kahne & Sporte, 2008; Torney-Purta & Amadeo, 2003; Westheimer & Kahne, 2004) and the United Kingdom (Lister et al, 2003; Osler & Starkey, 2003) has shown that programs can not only teach transformative knowledge (Banks, 2007) but also instill a different set of values and behaviors (Osler, 2005).

As presented in this section, a number of authors have called for reshaping citizenship education to suit future generations in a multicultural society (Avery, 2007; Banks et al, 2005; Westheimer & Kahne, 2004). However, in order to make these programs more applicable for young people, a critical understanding of youths' meaning of citizenship and their ability to enact it needs to be obtained. This research study moves in the direction of this goal.

Critical Citizenship: A Goal for the Future Youth Generations

Questions about citizenship education lie at the heart of today's discussion as to what direction new citizenship education programs should take to address the needs of the increasingly diverse societies. Borrowing the inquiry from Banks (2007) inquiry about to whom does the concept of citizenship education(and by implication the concept of citizenship)belong, the researcher relies on the philosophical discussion that considers youth a marginalized group, which lacks the power to effectively shape the concept of citizenship or effect change in a society. The youth in essence represents the *other*, grouped into a single entity set "outside the boundaries and pathways of the dominant culture" (Arnot & Reay, 2007, p. 313) shared with adults. Although some studies, such as Westheimer and Kahne's (2004) research of three types of citizenship education programs, show that some projects provide meaningful learning experiences and help youth develops as citizens, this section is interested in discussing youths' position and ability to shape the concept of citizenship.

Several earlier arguments can assist in understanding young people's relative lack of power. First, seen only as "citizens in the making," youth is viewed as a group that

needs to be taught how to become a citizen, is still not a full member of society, and is temporarily without a right to be fully engaged in creating its meaning. Second, youths' participation in society is most commonly expressed in a form of non-participation or in the form of tokenism of their existence in society (Hart, 1992; UNICEF, 2006). Lastly, educational institutions and processes produce this relationship between youth and adults, reinforcing the former's diminutive position (Arnot, 2006; Smith et al, 2005). Therefore, per default of 'nonparticipation' in the meaningful learning activities as called for by Homana et al (2006), Levin (2007) and Lister (2007), youths are not participating in the process of transforming the concept of citizenship for a multicultural society.

While discussing citizenship education programs, this study relies on Arnot's (2006) query of "what sort of citizens will be needed in the future and how best should youth be prepared for such a major social change" prompted by globalization (p. 69). In a time when neoliberal policies are changing the purpose and values of democratic states, Giroux (2005) argues that the "transformative power of the collective action" rooted in those values purposively has not been included in the reproduction of the institutional social relations today (p. 11). Therefore, an individual's role in upholding the transformative power of those values is perhaps more important than ever. Educating youth to acquire literacy levels that equip them with the knowledge, skills, values, and experiences to exercise full citizenship in a democracy – is a crucial component of citizenship education.

Previously discussed principles of new citizenship education programs note that "students should learn about the ways in which people in their community, nation, and region are increasingly dependant upon other people around the world and are connected to economic, political, cultural, environmental and technological changes taking place across the planet" (Banks et al, 2005, p. 5). In the larger process of acquiring such political literacy, youths' awareness of their positions and power "represents the first step in getting [youth] to act as 'engaged' citizens willing to question and confront the structural basis and nature of the larger social order" (Giroux, 1980, p. 357). Although Giroux's (1980) argument was developed a quarter century prior to these principles, in essence he suggests that youth needs to be taught "civic courage," or in other words "students should learn not only how to weigh the existing society against its own claims,

they should also be taught to think and act in ways that speak to different societal possibilities and ways of living" (p. 358).

Banks (2007) argues that citizenship education "needs to be reconceptualized because of the increased salience of diversity issues throughout the world" (p. 19). He advocates for a new form of citizenship for youth, multicultural citizenship, which "recognizes and legitimizes the rights and needs of citizens to maintain commitment both to their cultural communities and to the national civic culture" (p. 157). Through multicultural citizenship, youth will have a "balance of cultural, national, and global identifications" (p. 25). Banks's (2007) proposal to incorporate individuals' local, national, and global perspectives in citizenship education is similar to those of other authors for education for cosmopolitan citizenship. Banks (2007) points out that his notion of global identification is similar to Nussbaum's (1994) cosmopolitanism, a quality describing people "whose primary allegiance is to the community of human beings in the entire world" (p. 1). According to Nussbaum (1994), one does not need to give up community or national identifications in order to promote this commitment, but one develops a balance of the latter two identities while striving for the betterment of all people and global public interests. Similarly, Osler (2005) believes that education for cosmopolitan citizenship is a way of addressing the diversity of today's interdependent societies. Based on Osler's previous research with Vincent (2002) and Starkey (2005), she asserts that education for this form of citizenship "addresses diversity at local, national and international levels, while at the same time engaging the concerns of young people themselves" (p. 17). Cosmopolitan citizenship does not exclude youths' identities as different and unique to that of adults, but rather youth as cosmopolitan citizens are "confident in their own identities" alongside adults (Osler and Starkey, 2003, p. 246), inaugurating an interesting new dynamic between youth and adults.

The discussion about cosmopolitan citizenship is just as contested as the debate on citizenship overall (Rizvi, 2005) due to the abstractedness of actions of engagement within cosmopolitanism, namely activities for peace, human rights, justice, and democracy (Osler & Starkey, 2003). However, another conflict has advanced in parallel: the debate about critical citizenship reaches above redesigning citizenship education for active or even critical citizens (Stromquist, 2006) and expands citizenship "beyond the

notion of a bundle of rights" (Lister, 2007, p. 694). Enabling youth to develop a sense of agency through social awareness and civic courage, as well as "acquire skills and knowledge to help shape their communities, the nation and the world" (Osler & Starkey, 2005, in Osler, 2005, p. 17) helps develop critical citizens. This goal continues "challeng[ing] the conventional political view of citizenship reproduced in ... citizenship curriculum" (Arnot, 2006, p. 82) to allow for youth to enact new types of citizenship. Acknowledging the needs of the today's youth, Hahn (2005) argues for additional examination of U.S. citizenship education programs and if necessary reshaping them so that the youths can potentially become critical citizens of a multicultural society.

Lapayese (2003) argues that critical global citizenship education "involves a pedagogy of transformation," in which citizenship education employs critical thinking, meaningful experiences, and radical activism to aid students and teachers in examining social discourses and power structures (p. 201). In support, DeJaeghere (2008) adds that "the concepts of power and privilege must be deconstructed to understand the exclusionary nature of citizenship" (p. 374), which can assist in analyzing the position of youths' citizenship. At the same time, keeping the focus on youth, privilege and power also need to be reconstructed through "creating a sense of belonging, participating in meaningful experiences, critiquing access to knowledge and resources, and dialoguing about and enacting one's rights" (DeJaeghere, 2008, p. 374). Basing citizenship education on the examination of social discourses along with deconstruction and reconstruction of power structures would help youth create "an empowered sense of citizenship" (DeJaeghere, 2008, p. 374) or a sense of agency along with the knowledge and skills needed to become critical citizens. Furthermore, citizenship education should take into account that youth "ought to be educated not for the present but for a better future condition of the human race, that is for the idea of humanity" (Marcuse, 1972, p. 27, in Giroux, 1980, p. 334).

Summary

As this literature review has shown, the understanding of youths' conceptualization and enactment of citizenship in a multicultural society is an area that requires further examination. Osler and Starkey (2003) note that most research has been

devoted to the state and policy levels, and less has delved into the experiences of students, or even teachers. Additionally, Lister (2007) recently points out that majority of the literature focuses on youths' citizenship practice, which "constitutes them as citizens" (p. 717), rather than on whether youth need the same rights and responsibilities as adults. Understanding youths' "lived citizenship" through their experiences and citizenship practice is the first step to understanding their meanings of citizenship, identities as citizens, and individual empowerment through a sense of agency .

Young people's construction of the meaning of citizenship and their ability to enact it are explored in this study through a conceptual framework consisting of three overarching dynamics:

- the politics of institutionalized social relations, as enforced through social, political and economic forces and policies deemed universal;
- the social processes and practices evident in educational environments; and
- an individual's struggle for self-definition and identity formation as a citizen .

While these dynamics overlap in numerous ways, a look at the processes that occur in between them and shape youths' experiences and positions in society also aid in examining how these dynamics relate to youths' construction of citizenship.

The research study actively explores youths' citizenship in a multicultural U.S. society through two interrelated research questions:

1. What are youths' constructions of citizenship in the multicultural context of the United States?
    a. What institutional and social processes are shaping their citizenship at the various levels of society?
2. In what ways do young people's constructions of citizenship translate into potential citizenship agency?

The study is developed around the multidimensional perspective on citizenship that recognizes different spaces in a multicultural society within which individuals develop and enact their citizenship; namely, recognizing that individuals, including youth, live in local, national, and global communities. Moreover, in these complex communities impacted by globalization, young people are developing new forms of attachment and identities as citizens of a society.

The study pays special attention to U.S. youth in large urban and suburban areas, examining their experiences of "lived citizenship" and how they translate into their meanings of citizenship and sense of agency – the ability to understand their roles and positions in society and participate in activities that positively influence their immediate and larger communities.

Chapter III:
Framing the Inquiry about Youths' Citizenship through Theory

> We must think that what exists is far from filling all possible spaces. (Foucault in St. Pierre, 2000, p. 479).

This study follows Foucault's thought that critical examinations of ordinary processes can lead to thinking of them in different ways and uncover other possibilities. A critical debate on youths' citizenship is an ongoing effort fueled by ever-changing institutional relations and social processes that affect an individual's citizenship identity. The findings of this study include suggestions for other forms of understanding youths' citizenship.

This chapter provides the rationale for connecting the study's research inquiry with the theoretical framework and methods used to examine youths' perspectives. A detailed explanation of the framework is followed by a clarification of the methodology and research design, including a description of the methods selected to collect data. The chapter also presents an explanation of the participants as well as of data-collection and data-analysis processes. The chapter highlights the assumptions I hold as a researcher, affecting my approach and interpretation of youths' perspectives.

Theoretical Framework

The research methodology flows from the theoretical framework and its implications for the field of education and provides a "larger context for the methods being applied" (Rust, 2003, p. v). Rust suggests that the methodology represents a model in which the appropriate theory is applied through an inductive or deductive approach. Moreover, the theoretical framework grounds the methods for data collection and leads to obtaining "the most compelling evidence" (p. vi). This study relies on two theoretical approaches in different ways. The interpretive qualitative design allows this study to use elements of critical ethnography to guide its methodological approach. Furthermore, poststructural feminist theoretical framework informs the study's inquiry, and its approach to methods and data analysis. This section first briefly discusses rationale for

including the elements of critical ethnography in its interpretive qualitative design; a later section on methodology furthers this argument. The larger portion of this section discusses the ways that poststructural feminist theory informs the conceptualization of this study and the design of its inquiry into youths' citizenship.

Critical ethnography. The study's concern with youths' constructions of citizenship through their experiences relies on critical theories and approaches in shaping its design. Critical social theorists argue that understanding of either the problems or solutions in education cannot be developed without examining both "inside" and "outside" forces and conditions affecting those being studied (Anyon, 2009, p. 3). As this study is concerned with developing understanding of youths' citizenship, the three dynamics of the study's conceptual framework (institutionalized social relations, social processes, and an individual's self-definition as a citizen) urge a deeper look into the conditions and forces affecting youths' constructions of citizenship. Using the "analytics of exogeny", Anyon (2009) suggest that social critical work is engaged in understanding "the context and social forces in which the object of the study is embedded" (p.3) and not merely describing the study object. This study is concerned with understanding of exogenous forces affecting the schooling and in turn affecting the construction of citizenship in relation to experiences of schooling, such as institutional social relations and social processes. Therefore, elements of critical ethnography are employed in this study to afford the researcher a mode of interaction with the study's participants and social structures affecting participants' educational experiences shaping their citizenship (Madison, 2004).

Poststructural feminist theory. Through the conceptual framework of three dynamics, this study's inquiry is fundamentally aligned with the theoretical framework of poststructural feminism that allows for developing an inductive approach to the search for youths' interpretations and understandings of citizenship in the larger context of their experiences within educational institutionalized structures and processes. Poststructural theory and methods examine the function and effects of existing social structures, critiquing them while considering their contexts (St. Pierre, 2000). In essence, this

research study questions the structure in which citizenship education programs take place and how they impact citizenship by examining youths' citizenship to uncover different possibilities for these programs.

A poststructuralist feminist approach is not a search for "finding out 'exactly' what is going on" (St. Pierre, 2000, p. 477) since universally ascribed descriptions of knowledge, truth, rationality, and subjectivity prevalent in the past centuries were relevant to the discourses and practices of the worlds in which they were developed, and not as much to the world of today. While a poststructuralist's work is critiqued as lacking clarity and being diffused, the approach in itself represents a movement toward a framework that encourages to think differently from structured philosophies that are concerned with exact answers (St. Pierre, 2000). Poststructuralism leads to a diversity of understandings that are not predetermined by the discourse and process, but rather can be reinvented based on their unique positions in society (St. Pierre & Pillow, 2000).

As St. Pierre (2000) suggests, poststructural feminism covers the examination of not only the group of people slotted into a category of woman, but also others assembled into a single category due to their similarities, such as youth, even though there are many differences among individuals' other identities that are subsumed into this single category. For instance, race, ethnicity, or social class are not acknowledged in the category of youth. Removing the focus from the differences and using a single identity opens the possibilities for creating the structure, or a hierarchy among the categories, as well as leads to the manipulation or oppression of some identities (St. Pierre, 2000). Therefore, poststructural feminist methods are concerned with examining the essences of these larger categories that erase the differences among a diverse group of people. The approach is concerned with more fully representing disadvantaged groups that are placed in that position by a structure upheld by social discourses and processes.

Without a doubt, there are many similarities among youth, particularly its age range. Nevertheless, these similarities should not suppress the differences that also exist among young people. However, by grouping a diverse body into a category, a structure of institutionalized social relations positions youth into a cohort that is coddled for the purpose of protecting it, while stripped of the possibility of holding power in society. This study design suggests that viewing youth as a marginalized group needs to occur in

the context of their experiences in society; therefore, in searching for youths' understanding of citizenship through their experiences, it is necessary to consider the spaces in which their experiences as members of the larger group of young people occur, as well as the structures that shape these experiences. While numerous and intricate differences among young people could also be teased out, this study focuses on understanding how youth within their cohorts conceptualize citizenship.

Poststructuralism is also concerned with understanding language since it "mirrors the world" (St. Pierre, 2000, p. 481). However, its meaning should not be assumed and should be separated from what it signifies or from what is not said (Britzman, 2000). As a result, Derrida's concept of différance represents a crucial characteristic of poststructuralism suggesting that language's meaning is neither constant nor complete, but rather shifts depending on social context to encompass other similar or different meanings (St. Pierre, 2000). This idea is instrumental in this study as it emphasizes the transitory characteristic of meaning; the definition of citizenship shifts over time depending on the context and the participant's social position. It also reminds the researcher to avoid confusing youths' perspectives with her own through recognizing the construction of youths' understanding in the specific context of their experiences.

This analysis also further examines youths' agency and its related power. As opposed to the humanist approach, which considers agency a natural component of all individuals and views power as a product of one's agency, poststructuralism judges these concepts from a relational perspective (St. Pierre, 2000). Power does not belong to an individual, but rather exists in relations with other individuals; hence what Foucault names relations of power are examined as always-present components that change based on the relations of individuals (St. Pierre, 2000). According to Foucault (1976/1978), power is not a constant that can be acquired or controlled; "power is not an institution, and not a structure; neither is it a certain strength we are all endowed with; it is the name that one attributes to a complex strategic situation in a particular society" (in St. Pierre, 2000, p. 490). In analyzing the relations of power observed by youth and the researcher, poststructuralism helps grasp the reality produced by such relations, specifically, the situations within which youths create their constructions of citizenship and the environment in which their agency is shaped.

A poststructural perspective aids in viewing youth not as a constant category that is predetermined by social discourses and processes, but rather as a living (and therefore changing) group that can be reinterpreted through its own language that examines its position, power, and agency in changing social realities (Britzman, 2000; Preece, 2002). From the poststructuralist perspective, youths' agency is not an inherit characteristic that can simply be adjusted by their will; "agency seems to lie in [youths'] ability to decode and recode its identity within discursive formulations and cultural practices" (St. Pierre, 2000, p. 504).

This study began in a search for answers as to how young people understand the concept of citizenship and how they enact their citizenship. In this quest, the answer will not come in one form, as there is no one single answer, just as youth is not one individual encompassing all possible variances among people that age. A poststructuralist feminist approach suggests, there are many truths, and understanding all of them requires ongoing questioning of the relations that create different positions among people. Therefore, the answers lie in the youths' meaning of citizenship created in their relations with other members of society. The meaning shifts with changes in social discourses and processes and is not complete just as their lives are not yet complete. The study is formulated around the critique of today's predominantly positivist perspective of citizenship as a universal category that predefines its subjects and assumes no power relations among various members of society. This framework questions the structure that holds these conditions and seeks to produce diversity of understandings of youths' citizenship shaped through their interactions with the complexities of the spaces of experiences.

Finally, reflexivity is a vital component of the poststructuralist method; it "sees [youths'] experience as an interpretation that has to be interpreted according to our understanding of context" (Preece, 2002, p. 23). Reflecting on one's own position, recognizing subjectivity during the entire research, and making sense of the data while understanding the self are important characteristics of the poststructuralist method. The following section provides a detailed account of my pre-understandings and personal assumptions that foreground the understandings of the need, purpose, and approach to studying U.S. youths citizenship.

Underlying Assumptions and Pre-understanding

The pre-understanding described in this section are informed by DeJaeghere's (2002) interpretive work on educators' citizenship – they are pre-understandings from various lived experiences (others and personal).

Pre-understanding from the pilot study. This research study has been informed by an extensive literature review as well as findings from a pilot study conducted during the summer of 2007. The study was designed as exploratory project relying on small group interviews and online journaling of students participating in an international studies summer program. The students were asked several specific questions related to their experiences as citizens. During data analysis four themes emerged: (1) models of citizenship among youth (constructive social participation, social-contractual, and a right to a voice) resembling the citizenship models from Smith's et al (2005) study in the United Kingdom; (2) global citizenship as an advanced type of citizenship; (3) barriers to the enactment of citizenship, primarily their age, focus on "themselves," legal status, as well as "language" and the media; and (4) the failures (and potential) within education to develop a sense of citizenship. The students also identified a wide range of issues that globalized citizens will face in the future.

The findings from the pilot study further shaped this dissertation's conceptual framework and research design. While the conceptual framework was largely informed by the literature review, the preliminary data assisted in selecting one that aligns youths' perspectives and poststructuralism. The findings also guided the interview protocol for this research study.

Pre-understandings based on the literature review. While the literature review describes in-depth the context in which the research study is developed and the issues that need to be addressed, this section briefly mentions a few pre-understandings that might be useful to reiterate. The focus of this study is young people ages 15–18. In developing the argument for the necessity of understanding youths' citizenship, this study views youth as a group holding a marginalized position in society, a position created within the framework that suggests the absence of youths' engagement via sharing their voices

(Fielding, 2007). While this disadvantage should not be equated with the marginalization that other groups encounter, youth occupies a unique place in which power is withheld until it earns adult status. Though temporary, this position defines youths' relations with others, and therefore their identities, which affects their perspectives and experiences.

The argument about young people's multiple identities further influences the overall research approach. Within today's complex multicultural societies, the young people are developing local-cultural, national and global identifications as members of those societies (Banks, 2007). In this globalized environment, a multidimensional concept of citizenship responds to the variances in citizenship identities across the different (local, national, and global) spaces in which individuals operate daily (Cogan, 1997). This research study adopts the variances both in citizenship identity and the spaces in which citizenship is exercised and often refers to the multiple levels of experiences in a multicultural society.

Underlying personal assumptions. Holding true to the concept of reflexivity, this section reveals my assumptions in regards to the issues this study examines. A number of life events have shaped my perspectives on citizenship and awakened my interest in this topic, as I still engage in the process of understanding my experiences and citizenship identity. As I continue to study, I understand that globalization's increased interconnectivity and population migration have benefited me perhaps more than I have ever expected. I have spent a third of my life in the United States as an international student, which opened the door to unknown academic passions and career desires. However, along with the academic and professional opportunities, I have also come to realize my unique position in this society.

During my graduate studies, I have started considering myself more a member of U.S. society though my legal citizenship is that of Bosnia-Herzegovina. I have developed a sense of belonging in this society and hold a sense of duty to my country. A sense of belonging to both nations and yet not truly fitting in either creates a nebulous in-betweenness. However, living in the northeastern United States, I am aware that many who reside here share this position. While I remain in close contact with my country, I am also developing more associations in the United States and engaging in community

networks and actions that are only relevant to this part of the world. I wonder whether being an engaged citizen of my host nation and a fairly detached legal citizen of my birth country are negative attributes or simply a natural evolution of one's position in a larger society into that of a global citizen.

While I currently reside in a multicultural country, the United States, I spent my formative years in one that was often described as multiethnic. My secular family never placed strong emphasis on our ethnic background and taught me to embrace differences with my friends as something that can expand and enrich my life. I grew up in a Bosnian Muslim family and have celebrated not only Ramadan and Bairam (Eid) but also two Easters and two Christmases. However, the strange revelation of my mother's original birth certificate in which she was described as a Bosnian Serb has produced some confusion about my identity and never escaped my thoughts.

A personal quest for understanding my citizenship was mainly formed during my work with the U.S. peacekeeping mission in Bosnia-Herzegovina and was even more pronounced during my studies in the United Studies. Working "for" the peace-building process, I worked under the protection of the U.S. flag in the entity of Bosnia-Herzegovina, which considered my ethnic group undesired. The unexpected friendships with colleagues who were on the other side of the battle lines while at the same time being openly rejected by legal officials have intersected during the daily work, confused my ideal perspectives on differences among people, and brought into question my beliefs about respect and the unity of people.

Starting my undergraduate study in the United States, I temporarily escaped from the personal struggle of understanding my background and its role on my social position in my country and in the world. Soon after, I read enough to understand the politics of "unity" in my birth country of Yugoslavia that opted for a more exclusive solution of not recognizing some ethnicities. As a result, my ethnic group had to select one of the available options, becoming something that it was not. I finally understood my mother's birth certificate. While the legal act granting status might have been a mere practicality and was changed in the mid-1970s by recognizing my and a few other ethnic groups, it left a profound impact on my perspectives on individuals' positions in society and the relations of power between different groups as well as their impacts on youth identity.

Having spent a large portion of my life in the United States, I chose to conduct a study here not as an escape from addressing the same questions in my country, but rather as a way of being better able to handle my biases by researching the area where I belong the most at this point in my life. In addition, I have selected a location where the feeling of in-betweenness is fairly common among young people. Afterward, I would like to develop a possible framework for this sort of work in my country.

My interest in U.S. youths' perspectives on citizenship started while I was working for a summer program for young people interested in international studies. Working with very diverse groups over several years prompted me to further rethink their roles in society. I often wondered how much impact those extremely talented and inspired youth will make, and in which ways they will choose to show their membership, or decide not to show it. In working with them, observing their experiences, and hearing their perspectives, I was motivated to continue working with this demographic and develop a study to expand current notions of youth citizenship.

This interest in citizenship and citizenship education progressed rather naturally during my doctoral program. Expanding my cognitive understanding was imperative in formulating this study. These experiences have strongly shaped my assumptions about the role of institutions and overall society on social and legal citizenship identity. While these assumptions have followed me to the schools I visited, they were also the forces that brought me to this stage of developing the study.

Methodology

The study's research design is rooted in the interpretive paradigm. A qualitative interpretive study with the elements of critical ethnography has been chosen as the core of the methodology that is informed by poststructural feminist approach.

Through the elements of critical ethnography, the study observes young people from an urban and a suburban school as members of two distinct communities, which are also in differently structured public school systems. The students are not a monolithic group within their contexts, but rather a complex assembly of individuals who "have very different identities and respond and are responded to differently" (Cook-Sather, 2007, p. 393) based on those identities shaped in- and out- of school. Thus, the elements of

critical ethnography are used to clarify their distinct experiences and positions as well as the shared culture among students affected by the institutional relations and processes (Madison, 2004).

Informing the study with a poststructural feminist theory, the three dynamics of the conceptual framework assist in making sense of youths' position in the society as citizens, as well as in understanding youths' potential citizenship agency. A poststructural feminist framework on citizenship builds on the theoretical foundations and pedagogies that Cook-Sather (2007) depicts as a model that "recognize[s] and reposition[s] students as authorities on and authors of their own educational experiences and representations of those experiences" (p. 390). In essence, this theoretical approach assists in seeing the structures and processes shaping youths' constructions of citizenship, and understanding the interplay of dynamics affecting their potential agency as well as the role of the school and educational experience in this interplay.

The design permits the researcher to question how youth participating in this study develop a sense of potential agency as citizens based on their experiences, social discourses, and relations of power (Preece, 2002). In this study, youths' conceptualization of citizenship are explored through their "lived citizenship: the meaning that citizenship actually [has] in people's lives and the ways in which people's social and cultural backgrounds and material circumstances affect their lives as citizens" (Hall & Williamson, 1999, in Lister et al, 2003, p. 235). Therefore, in the role of a researcher, I also interpret youths' notions and enactment of citizenship based on their ideas of their shared experiences in schools and other social environments (Preece, 2002).

This design also allows for the researcher's reflexivity, or acknowledgement of my position and personal pre-understandings that impact this research study and the understanding of youths' citizenship (St. Pierre & Pillow, 2000). The interpretation of youths' perspectives relies on Cook-Sather's (2007) notion of "translation," a process through which the researcher "can translate herself rather than focus on translating the students; and she can support students translating themselves" (Cook-Sather, 2007, p. 397).

As Patton (1987) notes, "qualitative analysis is not guided by hypotheses but by questions, issues, and a search for patterns" (p. 15). Consequently, this study is not

directed by the researcher's hypothesis of what citizenship means for youth in multicultural societies, but rather by questioning their experiences and how such experiences in varying contexts influence the socially constructed meaning of citizenship. This study engages in the

> process of research within which we carefully attend to, interpret, and render students' experiences, perceptions, identities, and roles in collaboration with students and thereby learn a new way of thinking and a new language, develop an understanding of new practices, and form new kinds of relationships and modes of engagement based on those. (Cook-Sather, 2007, p. 397)

Therefore, this study is inductive in nature and seeks to identify the "common themes that cut across the data" and are reported through rich, thick descriptions (Merriam, 2002, p. 7) of youths' constructions and experiences of citizenship.

Participants

Youths' perspectives were gathered through qualitative data collection methods among a small, purposive group of diverse youth in junior and senior year of high school. The cohort hails from two schools in geographically close areas: Mountain View High School (MVHS) in Bergen County, northern New Jersey and Franklin Heights High School (FHHS) in Brooklyn, New York. Students in each group attended two sections of the advanced social studies classes offered at the schools. Appendix D provides some personal details on the study participants.

This group was selected based on the careful assessment of these youth being "information rich" sources of data for this particular topic (Patton, 1987, p. 52). The urban youth were attending an after-school program that focuses on helping them develop and enact their citizenship. Similarly, the suburban youth were participating in an advanced social-studies curriculum. Therefore, both have a common experience of engaging in a specially designed learning environment that exposes them to thinking about citizenship. While data may be considered "contaminated" based on their previous exposure to a curriculum focusing on citizenship education, the participants were chosen particularly due to the youths' rich experience (Merriam, 2002). Another similarity is that both schools have high rates of retention and graduation.

In addition to comparable experiences of the participants in this topic, the students were likely to have other, different experiences. While both groups attend public schools, the different educational structure in New Jersey and New York as well as variances in urban and suburban locations primarily through socio-economic status are key distinctions between two groups of participants. While one school's enrollment primarily consists of white students, the second school was predominately students from ethnic minorities. The perspectives and experiences of students from both schools are affected by institutionalized social relations and processes, prompting other differences. The study looks to students' perspectives to inquire whether there are other underlying portions of these dynamics that shape youths' constructions of citizenship.

Although the participants come from two locations, this is not a comparative study, but rather an interpretive look at students with different educational experiences that are inevitably impacted by the institutional relations and social processes. This particular research is looking at the variability among the individuals, taking into consideration their experiences; it is not looking at the variability between the schools. However, the study acknowledges that students in one location have more similar experiences among themselves than with those in another place. Nevertheless, the purpose is to examine youths' conceptualization through a variety of their experiences and provide a more complex picture of their citizenship. The findings assess students' realities, that is, their racial or ethnic background, school system, and other factors visible to me or identified by the participants.

Methods and Data Collection

The data were collected through three methods: school and class observations and researcher's journaling, small group interviews, and follow-up individual interviews. The methods build on one another and provide multiple ways of discovering youths' perspectives. Moreover, they allow for a dialogue between youth and the researcher, researcher reflexivity, and young people's reflection on the process of sharing their perspectives in interviews and on their communication with the researcher. The same procedures were used in both locations.

Data collection took place from February to May 2009. I observed two social studies classes in each school for two class periods weekly. In total, 28 students from these four classes participated in the semiformal group interviews over a period of five weeks: 17 students were from MVHS, and 11 students were from FHHS. Additional two students in MVHS showed up for only one group interview. Majority of the MVHS participants were females, with only 3 males; participants in the FHHS were evenly distributed by gender. About the same proportion of the participants from each school participated in the individual interview, totaling 17 students. The small group interviews focused on obtaining a wide range of students' perspectives and experiences, while the follow-up interviews assisted in better understanding particular experiences as well as served as a member check.

School and class observations. The observations of classes and extracurricular activities took place throughout the entire period of data collection. An attempt was made to visit each location twice a week, except for particular scheduling problems. During this time, I had informal conversations with students and teachers and occasionally engaged with the students in class-project discussions as invited by the teachers or students. Observational notes, which also included my reflections on the dynamics of small group interviews and the overall day spent in school, were recorded after each class. Observations particularly focused on identifying similarities and patterns among students, in essence, noting the culture in both locations. In addition, informal conversations with the four teachers and a supervisor of the department were also included in the journal and have informed findings.

During the first two weeks, the entire participant cohort was observed during social studies classes. Attention was given to anything significant about the topics covered, class participation, teaching techniques, student interest in the topics, and conversations among students about them. During each visit, the teachers have allocated a few minutes to introduce the study to the students and answer questions. This conversation as well as informal ones before and after classes aided in connecting with the students.

Small group interviews. During the second portion of data collection process, small group interviews of students from the observed classes were held during lunch breaks or afterschool on the school's premises. The interviews were preserved with a digital audio recorder; the files were stored on a secured computer and transcribed.

The interviews started after a month of class observations. All students from the observed classes were invited to participate in a once-a-week small group interviews. I was allocated a portion of class time to talk about the study and the interview process. As an attempt to increase retention, the students were encouraged to come with a best friend, which resulted in an additional interviewee in each school. The tangible incentives for participation, including snacks for each interview session, were minimal. The students participating in the small group interviews were organized into smaller groups of three to eight students depending on their class schedules; the groups met for three to five meetings.

Based on the findings from the literature review as well as from the pilot study, a semistructured interview protocol for small group interviews was developed and approved by the University of Minnesota Institutional Review Board (IRB). Appendix C includes a list of sample questions used for starting discussions during the first several interviews. In addition to the listed questions, emerging topics identified throughout the data collection were raised during later meetings.

Follow-up interviews. The follow-up interviews with individual students were held toward the end or after the small-group-interview period. These interviews were used to clarify my understanding of participants' constructs of citizenship shared in the group interviews and also revealed in the preliminary findings. Prior to these interviews, I reviewed students' group responses and identified areas that required further explanation; there was no general protocol for these interviews. In essence, the follow-up interviews served as the member checks, or the process allowing to go back to individual participants and inquire about the accuracy of my interpretations (Freeman, deMarrias, Preissle, Roulston & St. Pierre, 2007).

Consents of participants and their parents or guardians. Prior to the start of data collection, the process and instruments were reviewed and approved by the schools' Boards of Education. In addition, the University of Minnesota IRB Committee reviewed the process as an expedited case; the study's IRB Code number is 0901P57004.

The process of data collection required obtaining the passive consent from the students' parents or guardians as well as their assent. Developed to assist in the process of data collection, the following forms are included in Appendix B:

- Assent Form for Students (Interviews)
- Consent Form for Parents (Interviews).

Data Analysis

As noted earlier, this inductive research is shaped as a qualitative interpretive study with elements of critical ethnography and informed by poststructural feminist framework. Data analysis was informed by these two approaches and occurs through a number of steps primarily focusing on the two types of interviews but also on my reflections through journaling.

Baxter (2002) argues that feminist-poststructural analysis not only concentrates on "deconstructing the cultural processes responsible for constituting structures of oppression," but more importantly "provides a way of understanding the world through a rich plurality of voices and perspectives" (p. 5). Therefore, focusing on the latter mentioned purpose of poststructural feminist analysis, this analysis leads to understanding the role of institutional social relations that impact the process of young people learning to be citizens while also provides a way to look at the multiple positions youth can take as members of a society. Moreover, poststructuralism aims to create a space for "others" to have a voice and be heard (Baxter, 2002). This study's analysis opens up a space for youths to express their perspectives. It also leaves room for adding my voice through interpreting their constructions of citizenship and expressions of their agency. In summary, while feminist poststructuralist analysis assist in focusing on the educational structures and processes, it also facilitates the expression of "the words of marginalized or minority speakers," or youth in this study (p. 9).

The elements of critical ethnography in the study's methodology connect to its theoretical and conceptual frameworks. As Carspecken (1996) has indicated in his qualitative research, a critical ethnography enables an understanding of "holistic modes of human experience and their relationship to communicative structures" (Kincheloe and McLaren, 2000, p. 300). Guided by a variation of Carspecken's five stages of critical ethnography, the preliminary phases of the analysis process involved "examining researcher bias and discovering researcher value orientations" (p. 300) prior to the data collection and after each interaction with study participants. In addition, Carspecken's five stages were adapted to this study's context by "compiling the primary record through the collection of monological data, preliminary reconstructive analysis, dialogical data generation, discovering social system relations, and using systems relations to explain findings" (p. 300). In particular, monological data collection comprises my reflections on the overall research process and journaling about the school and class observations. On the other hand, dialogical data generation represents data collected during the small group and follow-up interviews. References to the adaptation and use of other Carspecken's stages are included later in this section.

The data analysis process represents the movement from the raw information collected to the creation and interpretation of its meaning (Rubin & Rubin, 2005). Therefore, the analysis occurs throughout the research, including the data collection period (Rubin & Rubin, 2005). The analysis focuses on (1) my (the researcher) reflections during field journaling, (2) the interviews, and (3) development of narrative structures and their interpretations.

Analysis of the researcher's reflections. The reflections recorded during data collection were scrutinized by reviewing the field notes as well as commentaries made after the school visits, a process of understanding the monological data that allowed only for the researcher's voice, as suggested by Carspecken (1996). During this process, the emphasis was placed on preliminary reconstructive analysis that further informed the interviews, but was also used after the data collection was completed to find categories of meaning among participants' responses rather than my perspectives; the preliminary reconstructive analysis also informed the overall analysis process. These categories of

meaning were evaluated along with my personal assumptions and pre-understandings from the pilot study and literature, specifically those related to the interplay of the conceptual framework's three dynamics discussed earlier. These categories identified in the journals, pre-understandings, and assumptions were assessed for "discovering social systems relations" (Carspecken, 1996) that could further be shaped into countertopographies in the interpretation process.

Analysis of interviews. The analysis of the interviews, informed by Carspecken's (1996) preliminary reconstructive process, follows some of Kvale's (1996) suggested steps to provide a common procedure across all groups of students. This process started as early as the participants "describ[ed] their lived world during the interview" (p. 189). This first step involved very little or no interpretation of these descriptions from either the participants or me. Whenever possible, I conducted the next step that required me to "condense and interpret the meaning of what the interviewee describes and 'sends' the meaning back" during the interview process (p. 189). During this phase, the dialogue with the participants permitted an evaluation of the accuracy of my interpretations. Throughout these two initial steps, the participants were encouraged to "[discover] new relationships during the interview" or more specifically afterward (p. 189).

The following step included my "interpretation of transcribed interviews" through assessing the content (p. 189). During the analysis I developed the interviews' meaning, using several approaches, such as categorization, narrative structuring, and interpretation (p. 190).

The process of coding for categories of meaning focused on youths' constructions of citizenship and citizenship agency through their descriptions of life experiences. I first listened to the interviews, created initial codes, and recorded comments on those codes in a separate memo for each group of students. Afterward I read the transcripts, further developing the codes and making additional comments in the memos. Upon reading all transcripts in one group, the memo for that section was revised to include additional comments and ideas. After completing the process for all groups, the codes and the memos were combined. This process paid specific attention to the interview narratives,

as they potentially contribute to understanding groups' identities or their experiences in the context of social processes and discourses (Kvale, 1996). The categories of meaning identified in the transcripts reflect the essences of youths' constructions of citizenship, how those notions connect to institutional relations and social processes most prominent in their lives, their ability to enact those ideas, as well as the experiences reflecting their sense of agency as citizens. Moreover, these categories identify dominant stories reconstructed in the narrative structures within countertopographies, which are then used as bases for the interpretation process.

Development and interpretation of narrative structures. The categories of meaning identified in the analysis of interviews assist in reconstructing dominant stories within narrative structures; focusing on finding a coherent story around those categories, narrative structures bring in statements from the dialogical data as well as the categories found in the monological data. Hence, narrative structures place the findings in the context of youths' experiences, through what Carspecken (1996) refers to as "discovering social system relations" or in this study, through discovering the overarching processes shaping youths' citizenship experiences. Narrative structures provide outlets for reflecting on youths' constructions of citizenship, how those constructions are related to the institutional relations and social processes most prominent in youths' lives, their ability to enact those constructions of citizenship, as well as reflecting on youths' sense of potential citizenship agency. I interpret youths' conceptions and experiences in the context that, while impacted by institutional social relations and processes, was addressed in the dialogue with youth. Additionally, using youths' constructions of citizenship I engage in reconstructing the notions of youths' citizenship and agency. Chapter 4 reports on the narrative structures through producing countertopographies, which analytically map the findings and later assist in better understanding their practical implications.

Finally, narrative structures in countertopographies assist in interpreting the meaning and experiences in the discussion section of Chapter 5. In this stage, the study does not rely on what Carspecken (1996) refers to as "systems relations" to explain the findings, but rather uses the conceptual framework of three dynamics to further analyze the key findings within the social environment. Also, during this process, I engage in the

process of "translation," as suggested by Cook-Sather (2007), for the works in which student voices are explored. This method attends to the "complexities of identities and voices" of young people, but also to the researcher's understanding of the "interpretation and representation ... [of] students' languages, lived (context-specific) experiences, and how and by whom those are represented" (p. 396). Interpretations via translation also comprises identifying the areas within the social context, primarily the educational setting and curriculum, which need to include youths' voices.

Similar to Nygreen's (2008) study of youths' political identity through a sociocultural approach, this study, framed as a critical ethnography and informed by a poststructuralist feminist paradigm, views youths' citizenship identity, position in society, and citizenship agency as changing over time due to the institutional practices and social processes. Impacted by the interplay of three dynamics, youths' citizenship identities and agency is shaped and changed during their various life experiences. The narrative structures and the interpretations attempt to contribute to understanding those identities and agency through multiple perspectives offered by the youth and observed by the researcher. While understanding the context-specific experiences, I use the narrative structures to link the findings with the institutional relations and social processes addressed in the narratives and impacting the experiences. The final sections of the thesis problematize the identified issues, posit them in the context of today's discussions, and address possible implications of study findings for citizenship education programs.

Quality Criteria

Quality criteria of the study findings were based on Cho and Trent's (2006) alternative framework for constructing validity in qualitative research that considers "evolving" study purposes and representations within the research. Data validity is promoted "by reflecting on what matters specific to the problem/research in [the] research purview." (p. 333) In essence, the alternative framework for constructing validity helps identify approaches that best suit the particular qualitative research without a focus on searching for one true answer, as might be the case in quantitative research.

Data validity in this study was obtained through a combination of methods, member checks, thick descriptions, and alignment of the participants with the theoretical

framework. First, the validity was promoted through triangulation of data collection methods of observations and multiple small group interviews along with the researcher's reflexivity (Merriam, 2002). Follow-up interviews, moreover, functioned as reflexive member checks of the preliminary interpretations (Freeman et al, 2007). Furthermore, within the framework of interpretive qualitative design, the reported narrative structures were supported with thick, rich descriptions of youths' experiences (Merriam, 2002). Lastly, by having two groups of participants, the union of data analysis was further strengthened as the data was derived from youth in two educational systems and different (but to a degree interconnected) social environments, but both participating in a program that stimulated their thinking about citizenship.

Chapter IV:
Uncovering Youths' Understandings of Citizenship

> "Writing [poststructural] ethnography as a practice of narration is not about capturing the real already out there. It is about constructing particular version of truth, questioning how regimes of truth become neutralized as knowledge, and thus pushing the sensibilities of readers in new directions" (Britzman, 2000, p. 38).

In seeking to develop a critical understanding of youths' citizenship, three main constructions stand out among their shared experiences and perspectives: belonging, engagement, and success. Each construction is presented in a separate countertopography, with the particular idea representing the process that affects young people in both study sites. As countertopographies "involve precise analysis of particular processes that not only connect disparate places, but also in doing so enable us to infer connections in unexamined places in between" (Katz, 2001, p. 721/2), they allow for focusing on the processes that affect youth regardless of location. As such, countertopographies assist in understanding how youths' citizenship are being shaped by the discourses and social processes, as well as youths' reactions to this production of their citizenship identities. Furthermore, countertopographies are shaped with several contour lines that link different relationships among youth, social institutions, and processes to the main constructions. In addition, contour lines illustrate representations of the experiences that shape youths' voices or the relations of power that affect citizenship. Therefore, the findings reveal similar processes taking place in distinct places as opposed to the variances in the responses of students from different backgrounds.

This chapter first provides information about the study sites to highlight the contexts of youths' lived experiences and the various processes that affect them. Next, it lays out the three countertopographies of belonging, engagement, and success. The final section is a countertopography of shaping youth's citizenship agency through the three constructions as well as other experiences. The contour lines in each countertopography first focus on the participants' shared experiences and narratives. Afterward, they delve

into the complexities of the relations they address or describe the distinct experiences of a group of students.

This study's findings contribute to advancing the understanding of belonging and engagement from young people's perspectives, as well as introduce the idea of a "successful citizen" that is produced through education. The concepts of belonging and engagement have been discussed in earlier studies as components of citizenship. However, the concept of success has not been widely addressed as a component of youths' citizenship, though various studies have explored citizenship in the form of achievement. From the perspective of shaping youths' citizenship identity, education for success aims to produce "successful citizens" able of sustaining national systems. A degree of achievement, academic or professional, is subsumed within this goal. The construction of "successful citizens" as it relates to youths' belonging and engagement is presented in these findings.

Contextualizing Youths' Communities: Schools, the Places of Education

The research project was conducted in two schools, two places of education: Mountain View High School (MVHS) and Franklin Heights High School (FHHS). A place of education is an exact location on a map, where teaching and learning is expected to occur. Beyond the exact longitude and latitude, the schools have localities; their surrounding neighborhoods, which are connected to the schools through various processes and in turn have an impact on that particular place (e.g., on decision making about school policies or procedures, availability of resources, or climate of engagement). The notion of an exact location, which always places a school at a certain place on a map, provides a finite way of understanding the locality's boundaries.

The localities of these two places differ in many ways. MVHS is in a small, northeastern New Jersey school district, which includes two small towns, Glendale and Harrington, in an area primarily developed with the boom of the commuting trend into New York City in the 1980s. Glendale, where MVHS is located, has a population of just over 13,000. One main street runs through downtown Glendale; the rest of the town primarily consists of individual houses and a few townhomes. Glendale's population is predominantly White (91.8%), and Hispanics and Asians are the largest minority groups

(at a combined 6.5%). Other minority groups make up less than 1% of the town's population respectively.[3] About 10% are foreign-born, primarily from Europe. The 2009 estimated median household income was just over $107,000 and the estimated median house value was $485,000. Due to scarce rental properties, only 7% of residents are renters.

FHHS is located in Brooklyn, New York City (NYC). Its students predominantly reside in two neighborhoods around the school, with a number coming from communities far away. One nearby neighborhood has recently been gentrifying and is considered an up-and-coming area. Although an increasing number of younger residents are moving to the area, the majority of residents (78%) are renters. The neighborhood is predominantly Black (70%); Whites and Hispanics are the next largest racial groups (at a combined 17%), and 24.5% of residents are foreign-born, primarily from the Caribbean islands. Estimated median household income in 2009 was $53,600. The median home (house, condo, or coop) value is just under $561,000. Part of the second neighborhood, home to many students, is depicted by some study participants as "bad" for its lack of opportunities and unsafe environment. Estimated median household income in 2009 was $40,500. About 85% of residents are renters, and the median house or condo value is just under $545,500. Blacks comprise the largest group of residents (84%), while Whites and Hispanics combined are the next largest groups (11%); additionally, just under 30% of residents are foreign-born, primarily from the Caribbean.

Just as their localities differ, these two places of education do not have much in common. Attracting around 1,000 students from Glendale and Harrington, MVHS is a fairly large school offering a number of specialized programs for various types of learners, including six so-called university programs (UP). Located on top of the hill in a residential area of Glendale, the school building is in the 1970s contemporary style with large windows and has spacious classrooms. In addition, MVHS has a well-equipped library located at the center of the building with a reading area, study area, magazine section, and two computer classrooms. The hallways are full of murals made by students (each representing a particular group of students or a generation) as well as neatly done bulletin boards surrounding the classroom entrances. During class periods, every corner

[3] All demographic data in this section was obtained from City-data.com.

of the long hallways is staffed by a teacher who is not teaching that period; while on "teacher duty," they serve as resources to students and guests in the building, but also ensure quiet during the class period. Finally, the school has modern technological equipment visible throughout the school, athletics fields, and parking areas for the teachers, administrators, students, and visitors. Students are driven by their parents or guardians or take a school bus to arrive on campus. Seniors (and a few juniors) receive permits for parking their cars in the school's lot.

FHHS is a charter school designed by the non-profit organization, Global Kids, which works on increasing youth engagement in the city. The school belongs to the small-school movement in NYC. The nonprofit organization provides numerous after-school activities as well as opportunities for out-of-school engagement. The school opened in fall 2006 and enrolls approximately 500 students. FHHS is located on the third and part of the second floors of a school building located across from a small park, museum, and residential street (where students suggest not to venture). The four-story building, built in 1930s, with impressive high ceilings and large windows (with bars on the lower level windows) is shared with two other high schools belonging to the small-schools movement. Technological equipment (i.e., TVs with a VCR or DVD player; computers with CVR monitors) is rolled into classrooms on carts, no athletic facilities are on-site, and all three schools share the cafeteria. In addition, during the time the study was conducted, the library was not available to students. Instead, one teacher whose class was observed brought in her own magazines to class; when students finished an assignment early and waited for others, she provided them with magazines. The building interior does not have any particular decor: its hallways have only one mural, and few organized bulletin boards. Students walk to the school from neighboring streets or take city buses or the subway.

Understanding these two places of education assists in viewing the three main processes within the context of the youths' experiences. Finally, Appendix D summarizes basic information about the participants; more personal information and life experiences of some students are included in the countertopographies.

Belonging: Youths' Relations to Communities

Conceptualizing citizenship through belonging is based on youths' view of an individual's relationship with a community. Citizenship is

> a community, not necessarily in a sense of just like a physical community, like our town's community or like people's community, but it's like the feeling you get when you're around the people you're comfortable [with], like you're willing to work with them for like a mutual benefit…. So, in that way, the community is, like a base part of citizenship. (Max)

Max's perspective is further explained by his friends in MVHS. Citizens "have a place where [they] belong" (Amanda); they "see themselves as a … part of a greater whole, a part of society" (Jack). The expectations of citizens grounded in the construction of belonging are to know the community, care for it, and be active. Max, Amanda and Jack often refer to their level of knowing, caring, and activism in their school or in Glendale; although they do not have commonalities in the types of engagement or how they wish to impact their communities, they share this construction of citizenship, especially how they belong to their communities. Despite different views of their role in communities, Max and Jack are good friends and expressed interest for participating in the study during my very first visit to MVHS. Amanda joined the interviews during the second week of the sessions through her friend Laurie; Amanda was not in the observed classes but wanted to join the study.

In similar way, Whitney joined the study in FHHS; her friends Tanya and India were participating and she wanted to talk about her experiences as citizen. Admitting that she refers to an ideal citizen, Whitney notes that a citizen, a person who belongs to a community, ought to "be courageous, or maybe proud, you know, to advocate for that [community], or just represent it to the fullest." Furthermore, when considering citizens on the national level, one is expected to "be proud of [one's] country and want to stand up to [one's] country," said Juliann. A self-proclaimed most-talkative person in her interview group, Juliann primarily talks about her experiences in the school (MVHS) and her church community, but also how she shapes her national identity alongside strong political perspectives of her parents and a lack of questioning difficult national issues in school.

Capturing the notion of belonging, this countertopography is shaped through two contour lines. It first presents the relations of these youth to their communities as spaces of their experiences, followed by drawing the relationship between the community's structure and their sense of belonging at several levels of their communities.

Communities: The spaces of youth experiences. Space is more than a two-dimensional representation of a place on the map; it provides a multidimensional view of where multiple processes occur and interact with each other; as such, it has no finite boundaries. A space includes a school, immediate neighborhoods, and various processes that occur within each or interact with the processes in the other communities. Therefore, the space of a community becomes a complex unit that is not always localized as a place of education.

Participants describe their communities as spaces where people live, interact through various processes, and impact other individuals and places through these processes. At the same time, the members of that space represent an integral component, if not the community in a nutshell. Therefore, what matters most is the connection among community members and one's association with that community.

> I guess the people who know your name, who know who you are, who you feel comfortable with, [it] depends how comfortable you feel, how well you know your community.... So I guess it's knowing the area is what makes it a community, knowing the people. (Nico)
>
> So, community is something people share, anything they make up for themselves. That's my definition of community. (Amira)

As these youth explain, a community may have actual localities but can also be a fluid connection among its members without an exact location (e.g., a community of students participating in a club initiative). Additionally, the space of a community provides or lacks a certain level of opportunities and safety for its members.

The participants see themselves as citizens of their communities through their individual relationships with that community. The connection starts by living in the community or being part of it by simply being there; one is a citizen of a community regardless of how one views one's belonging to it. Growing up in the urban community

that he describes as poor and has high crime rate, Samuel, who wishes to open fashion designer business in his community, reflects on his relationship with this community:

> As long as you are part of this, the system I mean, you're a citizen, as long as you're a part of it, just like he said, an ecosystem. Like, you might be a shark or the tadpole or the sun that keeps everything running, whatever you are, you are a citizen.... Even if the society does not accept you, you're there, and you gotta work on it.

Samuel sits in the back of the class I observed in FHHS; he rarely signs up for a group work and completes most of the class work by himself; even though he exudes a preference for individual work, he is well respected by his colleagues – the comments he rarely makes in the classroom are always insightful, and received with admiration by others.

In understanding youths' communities, as spaces of their citizenship experiences, the participants draw a distinction between membership in and belonging to a community. Membership is a product of their everyday experiences or interactions with the communities (while attending a school, living in a particular neighborhood, or engaging in activities related to communities), which is granted by simply being in those communities. On the other hand, belonging represents a sense of being meaningful part of a community, or almost a meaningful membership within those communities. Although they acknowledge their basic memberships in all communities where their experiences are located, these youth do not express belonging to all of their communities due to the lack of meaningful membership. Therefore, their belonging is constrained to a limited context where meaningful experiences of membership occur, and their construction of belonging is produced as a form of constrained belonging.

In talking about how their membership is applied within various levels of communities (school, local, national, and global), and their interactions within that community, these young people identify their belonging or not belonging to those communities. They acknowledge that they engage in their communities when it affects their lives and produces rewards, such as personal growth, interaction with other members, or improving a college application, whether through school activities, youth organizations, or religious pursuits. "I think it really just depends on your motivation and

then what your goals are, and, like, whether or not you feel like you want to help other people." (Lara) The possible benefit (altruistic or material) that comes with the individual's goals shapes the type of involvement and therefore, youths' feelings of belonging to that community. In addition to their individual interests, objectives, and abilities to engage, the structure of a community and available opportunities shape their understanding of the ability to make an impact; hence their individual as well as community characteristics shape their belonging, and by implication the notion of citizenship.

The participants also speak of not belonging, which is expressed through one's unwillingness to be associated with a community or feeling about how members are integrated into it. Living in a space does not necessarily translate into belonging to it. Describing her neighborhood as distant from the spaces of her experiences, Amira commented: "I live there, but do I belong there? That's questionable." She indicated that she does not hang out in her neighborhood or know her neighbors. She just lives there. Similarly, discussing the level of safety and opportunities in his neighborhood, Dustin sees himself as different from others in his community; he wants to overcome the expectations about its residents and does not want to "fall on the bad track." "I see myself as a member of my community, but I don't see myself as somebody that belongs to that community," he said.

Local, national, and global communities: "Do I belong there?" This section presents participants' views of different spaces of their experiences and how they use the notion of belonging to express their associations with those communities. They delineate several levels of spaces within their local communities; they also discuss their association or the lack of it with the national and global communities.

Local communities. When looking at their local communities, students identify three types of spaces: school, towns or neighborhoods with a close relationship with the school, and neighborhood communities not integrated with it.

School as a community. Many participants see their school as a functioning community, and sometimes the only one they can associate with. Students do not

necessarily hang out in their neighborhoods. Nico's comment "I feel more connected to the school and feel like it's also my community" echoes Amira, who notes, "I don't really stay in my area, but FHHS is the only community for me to think of, if that makes sense." Similarly, Amanda, who is a junior at MVHS feels school is a community where she belongs:

> In a weird way I associate my community more with, like, the school than the town I live in just because, like, I spend a lot of time here and, like, I know [almost] everyone here…. But I know more about people here than I do, like … about some of my neighbors and stuff. So, and, like, this is the place that I understand best. If I try to associate myself with one group, I would probably say, like oh, with MVHS, so it's, like, a sheltered community and whatnot. But I think it's a pretty good community.

The school is a space they know and understand, where they can connect and interact with others or have opportunities to engage. It is also where they identify their personal development through learning takes place. "The school is my community, 'cause that's where I'm five days of the week; ... and that's where I learned from. That's why I consider school part of my community." (Dustin)

The association with the school community is also built through active participation in school activities and events. They consider clubs and initiatives as mini-communities, where members care for each other and work toward creating something for their community. Amanda and Juliann discuss the drama club:

> Amanda: It's funny in Drama, because you can, like, it's very much a community in a sense that people in Drama can get mad at each other, but, like, out of that context, like, you stick up for the people even if you don't like them that much, because they're in Drama…. I think that's community; that would qualify.
> Juliann: Absolutely. I would consider the drama club a community. And, so. (pause) There's this one kid, Nervous. That's the name we gave him. We call him Nervous. I think his given name is Ryan. But we make fun of him all the time. Obviously we call him Nervous. He's a nervous kid, but if anyone else would ever make fun of him, we're kind of, like, [Amanda: You're going down!]

> "You can't do that! You can't make fun of him." So it's kind of like we're community-oriented in that we stick up for all the other people.

The high school is depicted as having a more "level playing field" (Laurie), which "gives more chance[s] to prove yourself" (Darlene) in classes or various opportunities in school. Darlene's family has recently experienced financial difficulties as her father went into early retirement during the height of the 2008 financial crisis, and she acknowledged that she and her family had to change their lifestyle and expectations, especially while living in an affluent area. In the school "it matters what you can do" (Darlene) and to show one's potential, while in the community "it matters who you know" (Darlene). Admitting that her family is not well connected, Darlene is very active in school where her skills are recognized and she is valued as a person, rather than for her background. Therefore, students divide the school and neighborhoods into separate spaces based on their structures and accepted interaction patterns among members.

Town or neighborhood with a close relationship with the school (town-school). The space of a town-school community is described as a "tight community" (Jennifer), where "people know each other or know a good number of other people" (Anna); they know what is happening, attend social events, or volunteer for activities. The community is therefore associated with their neighborhood where people do things together. Margaret, who comes from a large family, has a lot to say about her Glendale community. She had a difficult transition to MVHS upon completing a private middle-school, because she did not know any other students in her high school. She reflects on her neighborhood:

> Well, my community, I consider my community my neighborhood. I grew up in a very close tight-knit neighborhood. I mean, we have Sunday dinners every other week. Like you know, it's, like, the expression that it takes a village to raise a child or family. That's basically how I grew up. There's always kids running around. It's always, like, really noisy. There's always people going and coming. So that's what I consider my community. It's my neighborhood.

These students are involved in the town's activities, as paramedics or doing activities for local political parties, senior centers, sporting centers, or ethnic communities. However, despite characterizing this space as a tight community, these young people do not

socialize there. Instead, they often go somewhere else to hang out, separating the spaces where they learn from where they interact with peers.

This space is also described as a "functioning community" (Kim), whose members are willing to help each other when needed. Recalling her family's difficult times while she was fighting cancer, Kim adds,

> But I think when things happen, a lot of people are very supportive of each other. Like a few years ago, I was sick and people would make dinner for us and, like, my parents were going through a hard time with me. So I think together we support each other.

Community members are friendly and helpful, but the space is "rather the same socio-economically," and growing up there, youths are exposed only to "people of similar backgrounds" (Laurie).

However, even when they are described as "tight" communities or having relationships with their schools, these town-school communities do not always provide opportunities for leadership. This absence of leadership opportunities, which can be translated into lack of meaningful membership, creates a constrained belonging even in these communities. Whitney, who is very engaged in GK programs, notes that even though she was one of the young organizers for a farmers market in her neighborhood, she is part of but does not belong to her local community. She says, "[W]e're doing things we're told to do, not creating. [The] farmers market was not my idea," and therefore, she identifies as an active participant but not as belonging to the community of people who are engaged in leading farmers market.

Neighborhood communities not integrated with schools. Many urban and a few suburban students do not see their neighborhoods as functioning communities: they are not close-knit; the members do not interact; and these youth do not feel a part of it. Amira, who already shared that she does not spend time in her community notes "[N]o one knows who I am." Although Susi comes from a much smaller suburban community than Amira's urban, she talks about the disinterest of her neighbors with her and her family; she shares, "I'm alienated from everything for no reason." Max, who admits to still be seeking his position in MVHS, shares that outside of school he does not engage in his community, because "in our towns, they are not community, no one is really

interested in cooperating here or working together to achieve anything." Susi and Max do not see their towns as communities and describe them as disconnected from schools due to disinterest of its members in cooperation to benefit the community; though, unlike Amira and other urban youth, Susi and Max do not address the structure and institutional relations of their communities as contributing to this feeling.

The urban communities are described in terms of their members' immigrant backgrounds, as well as the levels of safety and noise, rather than the available support and opportunities, which are often mentioned in suburban neighborhoods viewed as integrated with the schools. "My community has a lot of culture" (Samuel), where the culture is seen in terms of institutions (e.g., a museum, parks, or events) along with diverse immigrants and what they contribute. Members of varying socio-economic status are included in this definition since the community "has a lot of poor" people (Samuel) and "has a lot of crime" (Anthony). The poverty level of community is used to allude to the crime in community and expectation to engage in behaviors that affect safety in the community. Tanya, who is originally from impoverished area of New Jersey, stays at her aunt's place in order to attend FHHS and have access to engagement opportunities offered through GK. She reflects on her daily walk to school and passing bystanders on the street:

> Where I come from, to school, I walk down this (smiles and pauses), it is dangerous! ... So, mostly, mostly it's dangerous-looking. They have that attitude. They're always fighting and all that stuff.

The sense of safety affects how these young people relate to the community and is perhaps most visible at the schools' front doors. The suburban entrance has wide glass doors observed by elderly safety personnel. Students simply pass through while guests register at the safety personnel desk and receive a simple pass. However, the urban school has heavy metal doors, New York Police Department–staffed security officers, and metal detectors. Students and guests go through a security check every time they enter.

Waiting in a line and going through security in the urban area affect youths' sense of belonging to the community where the school is located. In addition to believing that this setup is preparing them for future lives where they will always be examined, they

feel annoyed, uncomfortable, humiliated, or aggravated by the procedure and refer to the neighborhood as the reason for having it. Generally, the students dislike going through the process every day.

Overall, these youth do not mention any positive impact the urban communities have on their schools or education; on the contrary, several students specifically describe their struggle to resist the neighborhood's negative effects. They mention spending a lot of time at home or "exploring other neighborhoods" (Samuel). One student describes his community by including crime as an integral characteristic: "My community is just like any other community. There's a lot of culture. There's a lot of crime. It's, like (pause), but there's also good aspects of it. People like to do nice things" (Anthony). Derek presents his community, which all participating students and teachers from the urban school identified as the least safe:

> I grew up, you know, right down Hamlin Ave., which is right across the street. But, yeah, there's no good jobs, and, like, rioting, killing, and stuff like that. It's not very quiet, you know. It's very noisy and stuff.

Dustin, living on the same block, added: "I mean community is, my community is (pause, sad smile) ... bad. Something is always happening outside; police is always standing around the corner. It's destructive." The lack of safety and related challenges students discuss further contribute to distancing the neighborhoods and schools as separate communities. As a result, despite their membership in their neighborhoods, these students do not have a feeling of belonging to them.

The belonging to these three types of local communities is constrained in different ways for urban and suburban youth. While schools represents spaces in which majority of students identify belonging through meaningful membership, suburban and urban communities often represent the spaces with which these groups of youth have different types of relationships – majority of suburban youth feels belonging to their communities, while majority of urban youth lacks this feeling. Therefore, urban youth feels larger constraints of belonging to their spaces of experiences.

National community. When talking about their national community, the participants tend to discuss their national identity. Even though many express the phrase "I am proud to be an American", they have an ambivalent relationship with their national identity. Their expression of pride and love for America is often followed by the question: "What is [an] American?" (Amanda; Amira)

The participants hold varying levels of awareness about "larger America" or what are the issues outside their immediate communities. Urban students in particular acknowledge that America consists of people from different ethnic and socio-economic backgrounds, and suburban students note that they "don't know much about differences among groups of different socio-economic status and background." (Amanda) Furthermore, participants of mixed ethnicity or those who are more recent immigrants have reservations about having an American identity. Dustin, who moved to the United States five years ago, says, "I consider St. Lucia my nation," not America. Amira does not say that she is American, as her heritage is complex, even though she was born in the United States; her friend Tanya completes the thought for her:

> You know what's really funny. I was telling to a friend of mine today in [the] classroom. I was like, "I don't say that I'm [Tanya (completes sentence): Say American!]." Yeah! I don't say that. Because, it's kind of like this, "Oh, where you're from?" Well, um, I was born here! But! (smiles) But, my mom is Trinidadian. My father is born here, but he grew up in Guyana, and, like, cousins and I live here, with my brother. I was first born (smiles) so, I don't really know what to call myself in a sense, but at the same time, I don't think that I'm ... (points to Tanya to finish her statement) [Tanya: American.] because, like, what is American in my definition, 'cause everyone come here, came from somewhere. [The] only [people] who are really American are Native Americans. Everyone, um, everybody from here is from somewhere. Everyone came here and people set rules and act like everyone is from here, but no, no one's really American unless they were Native Americans.

Several participants discuss the role of heritage in developing American identity, noting that it affects national pride and patriotism. Margaret, who identifies herself as

Irish American, says that her heritage is important even though neither she nor her parents have visited Ireland. She comments,

> I think because our cultures and our backgrounds do still play a huge, like, a huge part in our lives, especially if you're, like, first or second generation. Like, I think that has a lot to do with, like, the whole American identity thing.

While they acknowledge the uniqueness of their country, its diversity "makes it hard to have a unifying pride about the U.S." (Susi) This often undefined personal connection to a single national identity in a multicultural country contributes to the notions of constrained belonging to their national community.

Aside from seeing themselves as Americans, no participants express belonging to the national community. On one hand, they attribute the lack of belonging to youth's insignificant role and powerlessness. For example, Anthony identifies as a person, who does not have a "significant part" in the nation because, as he says, "I'm a minor and I don't have a say in anything." Similarly, Roni comments, "I don't help make decisions," while Stephanie explains, "I don't have a voice. I can't vote." These youth do not identify belonging to the national community since they do not have any involvement in national-level activities.

Belonging is not only aligned with individual abilities to engage, but also with the magnitude of impact they can make on their communities. Many youths express that they can affect the school or local community, and to a degree global, but not so much national community. Lara summarizes many youths' feelings about involvement: "you can see the effects of your involvement in a local community, local engagement, rather than on a larger level." Working as a peer educator in GK and FHHS, Nico elaborates on the limitations of the impact he can create with his actions:

> I personally can make a difference; I think I do make a difference in my community. But as the nation goes, I don't think that I am as, you know, influential, or, you know, make that much of a difference for a nation. It's massive. It's [the] entire America. It's huge, and plus, working over here won't reach California, won't reach Maryland, so I guess it depends how much, how much you spend at work. I don't do so much nation[al] work, but do more of a community-based and global-based work. It would be a lot, lot harder on a

> nation[al] level, mainly because I don't know that much people. I'm not with an organization that works on a nation[al] level. I would like to work on a national level one day, to do changes, but now, I don't think that I'm, I'm that good yet, or at least I'm not in school enough to inspire lot of people at the same time. (Nico)

Several students also note that it is easier and "more convenient" to get involved in a local community, where

> [you] know what to do and what can you do, [but on a national level,] I have to go out of my way. I mean, when you think of [national] level, it's, like, a really big place, and it's harder to recognize the consequences of your actions. (Amelia)

Therefore, while these youth feel able to produce the strongest impact in their schools or local communities, no participants express an ability to make an impact nationally, which along with their powerless position, shapes their constrained belonging to the national community.

Global communities. Many students see themselves as a part of and belonging to a global community. Several students explain that even though they are not operating outside U.S. borders, they belong due to their interests or engagement in international issues, especially human rights. Referring to her involvement in the University Program (UP) classes and in numerous international school initiatives, Jennifer says:

> I think you have to today, because we're so connected with, like, the world, and just, I mean, boundaries are just getting smaller and smaller, and how easy it is to travel, and news and everything that it's hard not to be and especially with the things that we're involved with.... And to think that you have some people that have [an interest] in that, like, especially at young age in high school, it shows that we feel, like, a part of a global community.

They recognize that the global community does not have as tangible borders as local or national communities do.

> Well, I mean, I try to make the world as good of a place as I can within my abilities, you know. I do, do some charity work, and I, like, community service work, like, in some small way, like, for my community. I guess it helps. I mean, on a grander scale does that help the world? Not necessarily but I mean, on the

> same point, I think a lot more of opportunities will be presented to me as an adult, and I think for now it's probably good to start with small things that I can handle. (Max)

These students realize they are living in an interconnected world that affects their lives; they develop a sense of belonging to this larger and somewhat abstract community.

> I think it's very hard for people of our age to see themselves, like, not part of a global community. Like, I know it's possible, but at the same, the same thing, like, even in the act of self-interest, even, like, self-preservation, you want to be aware of what's going on around the world. (Max)

Not all students feel they belong to global communities. Several, primarily from the suburban school, note that they see themselves "a part of my local community first, before I think of being a member, like, contributing to a global society" (Jack).

Not belonging to a single community. A few students express the feeling of not belonging to any community, including the school, neighborhood, or a church. Even though they participate in some school activities, they do not feel as "essential members" (Anthony); they attribute this lack of belonging to a misalignment of community structure with their personal character or philosophies. Similar to Anthony, Amelia refers to her style of interaction and learning as contributing to her feeling of not having a community.

> I just feel independent from everything. I'm a very independent person. I don't belong. I don't really feel like I have any sense of community.... I don't really feel like I, like, have a place. When I go somewhere, I, like, absorb everything that I need to absorb and I get all my experiences, and then I, like, move on.

Overall, although a majority of participants questioned their membership and involvement in their communities, only few students explicitly said they do not belong to any community.

Engagement: Youths' Interactions with the Spaces of Communities

Citizenship conceptualized through the construction of engagement presumes interaction with a community. Often, a citizen acts to benefit the community rather than just oneself, as a citizen is "[s]omeone who participates to better a group as a whole."

(Juliann) The participants' focus on active participation as the root of engagement is guided by the view that the "whole idea of citizenship should not be based off what you know but rather what you can do." (Al) Taking actions that affect the community are expected from citizens, as "you're in the community – you should do something." (Tanya) This activity also involves political engagement, meaning "making sure that government works, [even] civic disobedience ... sometimes." (Amanda)

The countertopography of engagement is shaped through four contour lines: the relationships between community opportunities and youths' engagement, insight into the types of youths' experiences, processes enabling engagement (locating out-of-school involvement and the dual effect of the peer pressure), and meaningful connections with other community members.

Community opportunities and engagement. Many participants acknowledge that a community affects one's current and future actions in different ways. Across youths' responses, three characteristics were identified – community location, social networks and connections, and an individual's position – and all relate to available opportunities.

"[W]here you live," or, in other words, location is connected to the number of the accessible resources that create opportunities for engagement. The amount of opportunities has been singled out as the most important component of youths' engagement in the community. "Some opportunities are given to people who live in, example Orange County [New York], in general, in suburban areas," (Nico) and urban areas are seen as having less opportunities. Giving an example of a friend in another high school where internships are offered through school, Nico comments, "where you come from [is important]. I have never heard of [an internship] like that being offered in this high school."

As the location is associated with the community's financial wealth, "opportunities go to people who have it." (Nico) Several participants from MVHS acknowledge their privileges through a discussion of the challenges for nearby urban students. Anna, who is a peer mentor to an urban student, reflects on this difference through the drop-out rate in her school and that of her mentee.

> [W]ell I think that if you really look at Glendale, just as a community compared to the other communities in America, like in more urban areas ... ; I have met a lot of people that I work with [in the urban area], and, like, he's 17. He's finished. He did everything. He has an older sister about the same age, and he was dropped out of school… I know a lot of other kids that have dropped out of school at such a young age. There are a lot of people that drop out of school, but they are like. (pause) In Glendale I can name the four kids in my grade that dropped out of school. Like there're a lot of a difference in dropping out of school, stuff like that.

Her friend Jennifer, who spent her earlier years in an urban area, admits that,

> if we hadn't moved to Glendale … I could have been one of those, like, sketch balls outside of the plaza[4] parking lot, like, not caring about anything. From moving, I definitely received such better education, and, like, so many more opportunities that I wouldn't [have] had [there].... I feel like I definitely have a better perspective of the world and I am learning more than I would have [there], because it's just a different environment. Like there is a lot poverty that you're exposed to, like, and I just had a lot more opportunities here.

"Who you know" (Darlene), "who raises you," (Nico), and "how are you raised" (India) are other characteristics of a community that influence individual engagement. Identifying these as social networks, these youth acknowledge the necessity of developing their own; yet, they also recognize that some connections are not accessible to all. For example, parental involvement in political circles provided some of their friends an opportunity to attend the 2008 presidential inauguration events, which they saw only on a television. On the other hand, community networks do not always lead to advancement but can also pressure one to stay in the same circle. In essence, social networks are reinforced in a community, and it might be difficult to break out of them. Reflecting on his engagement through GK programs, Nico notes:

> So you see [in the] Brooklyn community, Brooklyn and Bronx, some areas are very dangerous, and even unsafe. (pause) I can honestly tell [you] that I see people in my class, and you know they are not going to make it that far, and you

[4] She refers to Garden State Plaza, the largest shopping center in New Jersey.

> know they're gonna stay in the same cycle where, (pause, speaks slower) I'm almost proud of myself of not being caught in the same way that these kids do, but I guess it depends where you hang out, where you grew up.

Social networks also impact "what they teach you" (India), and participants point out the social stratification that occurs through education and their communities.

Lastly, "what you can do," or an individual's potential, depends on the community location and connections. While youths are largely encouraged to develop it in school through various forms of engagement, the level and type of engagement outside high school does not depend solely on their skill, but again on available resources and opportunities to engage in the existing social networks or in the various types of activities.

Meaningful and constrained experiences as members. Youths' notions of belonging are shaped by their experiences as community members and different engagements they have, which can be grouped into three categories: co- or extra-curricular programs, community-organized events and programs, and individually initiated activities. Most often, the participants refer to their co- and extra-curricular engagement, in which they feel able to have meaningful membership – they can take leadership roles, express their ideas and see the impact their engagement creates. The other two categories of engagement are less often mentioned; in general, through these engagements they show their membership in a community, but not necessarily provide leadership or create an observable impact. Therefore, these youth express that they are engaging as meaningful members or engaging as constrained members.

Engaging as meaningful members. Many participants are enrolled in UP, a specially designed curricular program, or participate regularly in GK activities. All students enrolled in these programs identify them as a defining experiences that shape their engagement in the school, local, and sometimes global community.

> [T]he decision to join the UP, it really kind of changed my view of my decisions in the community, ... changed how I view my role in the community and showed

> me that I can make a difference and kind of, like, shaped what I want to do with my life. (Jennifer)
>
> I feel I would have been a much different person had I not learned and known so much on what's going on around the world. I would have, I would have been a part of my community, but not as directly affected by it until I joined the UP. (Anna)

Engagement in these two programs was evident through youths' leadership roles and collaboration with their peers and adults in and outside of their schools. Through UP, students attend particular electives and can participate in additional off-campus activities, such as a university conference on human rights, visit representatives from various domestic and international agencies in Washington, D.C., or develop and teach a class session for middle-school students. In GK's co-curricular and after-school programs, students can lead a workshop at a youth conference, design the conference's main workshop, participate in various initiatives concerned with education and human rights domestically or globally, and serve as a student member of the GK Board of Directors. Nico, notes that he is still a junior but he was selected to develop a workshop about global health, the main workshop about the theme of the GK Annual Youth Conference. He shares,

> My workshop will be the morning workshop, which is the workshop that everyone will see, the workshop that everyone will do in the morning, so it's kind of a big thing to do…. I dedicated so much work into it, then sharing it with the people last Saturday … the people whose going to facilitate it, and they loved it. I really feel good about it, 'cause I gave up all of this time and work, and it paid off, 'cause it's going to be shown in front of all of these people.

Another form of engagement comprises school-based clubs and organizations or school activities open to all students: Interact, National Honors Program, Debate or Mock Trials, Student Government, Newspaper, Drama, Fencing, Track, or planning the tenth-grade conference. As these types of activities are organized, supported, or funded by the school administration, their availability differs among the schools. No matter the variety of activities, students engaged in them consider them communities where they have a

voice and feel that their engagement is in some way contributing to their school, local or global community.

Engaging as constrained members. Many participants also identified activities in their local communities as important experiences. By doing these activities, "you feel like you're actually doing something, because together you have a common interest and you feel a part of community" (Amira). Yet, these pursuits vary by the level of leadership opportunities available or offered within, and youth's direct involvement on affecting their communities through these engagements. Juliann notes her experiences in the church community, where priest's wife considers her "superwoman" in terms of what she is able to accomplish in her work with children or within choir; however, the leadership roles are not available to her due to her age. Overall, these engagements include interacting with friends in the church or church-organized mission trips; Boy Scouts or Girl Scouts; volunteering in community, such as an Emergency Medical Technician (EMT) or at a daycare or senior center; community-organized large-scale events, such as the Pride Parade or block parties, or ongoing projects such as serving as a gardener in the botanical garden; and involvement in the political organizations, such as Young Republicans or Organizing for America.

While almost all participants mentioned their experiences as community members through engagement in organizations, several also talk about individual actions benefiting the community or a larger cause. For example, Kim notes that her experience as a brain-cancer survivor motivates her to assist other sick youth in her community; instead of asking for gifts for her Sweet Sixteen celebration, she raised money for the pediatric-oncology wing in the local hospital where she was treated. Like Kim, other students identify individually initiated engagement as grounded in their life experiences, including writing a letter to the president to ban smoking, purchasing and donating items for military personnel from personal savings, attending an event to question the governor about public-parks policy, or shoveling snow on the street. Many participants explain their experiences as community members through a range of activities. However, a few students, mainly from the urban community, do not have many examples of experiences as members.

Enabling the engagement.

> I think it's just being involved that really motivates teens like us. I mean, I'm in fencing, [the] republican club, and I used to be in skating and drama club, and I run track. And I think it's just the whole idea of being involved and willing to step up to the challenge is, like, really what motivates a lot of us. (Al)

While most participants consider themselves motivated and willing to engage, this section highlights the experiences of finding and funding opportunities outside school as well as the dichotomous roles of peer pressure.

Locating and funding engagement. While school activities are fairly available, participants discuss some challenges of engaging outside school, especially during summer. These opportunities exist but vary by the type of engagement, and finding them "depends how hard you're willing to go to look" (Al). Lara, who is actively involved with her church youth group notes that unless young people are involved with school or a youth group, "you have to seek it out for yourself.... You really have to want to do something." (Lara) Even when they decide to look outside of school or a familiar organization, several participants note that some places are "not so welcoming to volunteers" (Amy). Amy, who aside from her activities in UP is not active in school clubs, recalls her experience in the senior center where she was brushed off when asking to volunteer. Students say that community organizations are not doing a good job in reaching out to youth, as it is hard to find opportunities outside school and at their age.

> I feel like the people in charge of the communities or the programs, they don't reach out. They wait for people to come to them. They don't, like, make it as easy as it should be to, like, help out. I know if it was easier for me, I'd probably do it a lot more often. (Kim)

Contrary to this experience, participants note that private organizations are very active in sending invitations for various summer-leadership trips in the country or abroad. A few students have taken part in these trips, while several criticize them for being too expensive and organizations just wanting to get their money.

In addition to difficulties locating activities, many students note that the level of activism is based on one's monetary means. Many students say that money is sometimes necessary, whether for volunteering, leadership positions, or even working. Discussing unpaid internships as an expected first job youth is suppose to hold, Samuel notes, "most things that you might wanna do cost money to start; like everything costs money. Like, you need money to do almost everything, and, like, most jobs don't accept you till you're 18. Like the majority." Youth also observed that although schools and colleges focus on volunteering, one's finances present an obstacle in many situations.

> So it's sort of funny, especially with colleges and high schools talking about volunteer hours and stuff, because, like, sometimes … you need to have a certain amount of money to be able to get that done. Not all the time, but obviously like what [she] is doing with her church. Obviously that's a great opportunity, but for some of those things, like, there's still, like, money that needs to be spent to help others. (Amanda)

In general, youths note that there are opportunities, but it is not easy to locate them and some activities require financial support, such as interning, leadership camps or trips, and international volunteering. This monetary component prevents or discourages youths' engagement.

Peer pressure. Participants speak about their peers and friends as providing both support and discouragement. When considering initial engagement, several students acknowledge the role of their friends or peers, both critical in getting involved; peers serve as role models, while friends provide a support system. Laurie describes the beginning stages of her engagement in school:

> I started joining clubs as a freshman and then I realized how much I like[d] it, and how I liked the school and how much I wanted to be involved because, like, I thought these juniors and seniors were so cool. I thought that they owned the school pretty much, and, like, I was, like, that looks like a really fun thing to do, like, to be so comfortable in a place.

Laurie's experience echoes that of Nico in ninth grade when a senior held workshops at the freshman orientation:

> I liked it, mostly because the first time I went, it was seniors who was facilitating once again. No longer was it adults, and the students took part of the process of the decision making, who taught us kids. So I started to wonder, I realized that I want to be part of that membership; I want to be one of the people who taught other people; I wanna be the one who had a role, who made a decision in the organization.

Furthermore, involvement in clubs often occurs through some friends who are already members as that lessens peer pressure, and once one has a circle of friends, one engages more freely in other activities. As Laurie explains, "I wouldn't be doing most of what I'm doing if it wasn't for my friends." However, friends change interests and behavior over time, which impacts one's own engagement.

> Friends changing is what determine how you change or, like, how you react to something, like, a friend changing. It's what kind of determines what path you take. And, I don't know, maybe, like, the fact that I have different friends now is what governs why I do some of the activities that I do. (Lara)

Although their friends and peers are identified as having a positive influence on their engagement in school, they have the opposite influence on activities outside school. Friends expect them to socialize, rather than work or volunteer for a community activity. Lara shares her experience of this type of situation, and Al and Amy fill in:

> Lara: I know I've been in situations where I've had the option to maybe, like, go to a food bank on a Saturday or something but, like, someone's said, "Oh, do you want to go to the mall?" And I didn't want to be, like, "Well, I'm going to skip out on the mall and go to the food bank instead."
>
> Al: Yes.
>
> Lara: So and I won't tell you what those situations ended like because…. But, like, it's hard to try and, like, fit in and…
>
> Amy: Balance everything.
>
> Lara: ... do that at the same time because a lot of the kids sometimes don't feel the same way. Like, it's hard growing up when there're people around you who maybe haven't reached that maturity level or just don't even see a point in, like, kind of being an active part of a community.

Amy affirms, "[T]here's definitely, like, pressure to not volunteer and not be a good citizen, especially from, like, your friends." Lastly, MVHS students note "fake engagement" or the "superficial interests of other kids" (Juliann) in their community; some youth participate in certain projects due to the activities' popularity rather than having an interest in their purpose. In addition, many participants briefly acknowledge that some peers have a "total lack of interest" (Lisa) in the community.

No matter the type of engagement, participants tend to compare their level of activity with others, particularly their peers. Many students note that they have big ideas but acknowledge that they do not do as much as they wish, contributing it primarily to a lack of effort. Commenting "I'm definitely not as great as I thought I was," Juliann summarizes how students compare overall effort in the community. The level of greatness is not elaborated, but these participants seem aware of peers who do more than they are doing.

Mentoring into engagement.

> And I think that's what a lot of teens are missing today. They're missing good motivation and a good idol to follow. (Al)
>
> Mr. Burke, like, everyone knows him, and you know it would be nice if every community had their own little Mr. Burke. Maybe their kids would also be different. (Anna)

Youths' discussions of their experiences as community members often refer to individuals who have influenced their engagement. This section addresses youths' perspectives on the role of mentors in developing their interest in their communities or advancing their engagement levels. The participants identify particular teachers, peers, friends, and also people who serve as symbolic mentors.

The students from MVHS's UP often speak about the program's impact on their overall personal growth, engagement levels, and decisions about their future education. They always refer to Mr. Burke, the social studies supervisor who oversees the program: he recruits students, teaches classes, brings speakers, organizes at least one special trip to supplement the curriculum, and even provides individual advisement. "Applying for the

UP, like, learning about it, and I think Mr. Burke was a big part in, like, shaping, I don't know, who I am today," says Anna, who is an active in student government organization, Interact club, and even organized a new club focusing on raising funds for international small initiatives. UP participation does not happen on its own, the group claims. They had someone who helped them understand the benefits of participating and getting engaged in various ways during the program. Jack shares a long list of activities in his community and then adds:

> Mr. Burke was very encouraging. He always encourages people to learn outside the classroom, and … to do things outside what is required. You know you're required to do homework. You're required to do projects, but you're not required necessarily all the time to go out and help people. And you know just taking our own initiative to go out and make a difference is really positive thing that has changed my life.

The group is always excited when talking about Mr. Burke. He is "awesome"; "we love Mr. Burke"; "our lives would have been different [without him]!" He is not simply their counselor or a teacher in the program; "he's our mentor," adds Jack. He encourages them to engage in the community and learn about various global issues. He organizes numerous trips and provides "amazing opportunities that none of us would have ever had if it hadn't been for him" (Jennifer); even more importantly, he cares about each student. He even writes personalized letters of recommendation, not just generic ones that other teachers have been described as doing. Anna concludes: "I guess he may be the one who we all kind of aspire to become ... trying to be big members of our community, but he's, like, the ideal member of [the] community. Maybe every community needs someone like that."

Students from both schools discuss several teachers who affect their engagement; in particular, the conversations focused on the four teachers whose classes were observed. In general, students acknowledge that teachers who are "engaged and try hard" (Amanda) are the memorable ones and make an impact on student learning. They value teachers who love their subjects and "who actually [make] you think" (Nico). It was recognized that both teachers and students contribute to the overall classroom experience; though, "anyone can read a book, but it takes a good teacher to make the content interesting."

(Amelia) Students agree that they do not like teachers who are too structured and not interested in different learning approaches; they appreciate those who use engaged learning practices, teach them "real life lessons" (Juliann), and attempt to connect with and understand them. These teachers are identified as not only impacting their overall learning but also their community membership.

An example of an engaging teacher was Ms. Thomas. Her sociology class was highly popular with five sections and possibly offering one more, though Ms. Thomas admitted she could not teach all of them. Her class was always dynamic: Ms. Thomas would move in front of the classroom, raise intriguing questions about relevant social institutions, relations, and processes, and find a way to engage different types of students. Participants acknowledge that they not only love the topics, but more so her approach; also, she teaches them life lessons and addresses topics that others in their school or community, including family, do not want to discuss with them. When I asked her if parents are concerned with her approach to these topics, Ms. Thomas smiled and said that the school is very supportive in making this a good course. As a sociology teacher, she has to address issues that will affect her students in the near or distant future. She also supports student events, such as the drama club's play, in which many of her students participate. Juliann notes that she is the only teacher who actually comes and stays at the plays; very few teachers come to these events or visit very briefly. Because of this attentiveness to her students' needs, Ms. Thomas is often cited as a great teacher and as mentor.

Prominent individuals serve as symbolic role models, a representation of possible achievement. For minorities in the urban school, President Barack Obama reminds them of what they can accomplish. They share how opportunities changed after Obama was elected:

> [N]ow I feel, I always kind of felt like I can do something. But now it's, like, around that ethnicity and nationality, I can actually do something now, because Obama just came; he stood up and like he was, like, … shining light for everybody. So now, now I think that I can actually get somewhere, before I guess, I thought so, but I didn't think that it could be possible. I never thought that a Black person would ever reach that high, honestly. Never. (Dustin)

These students note that the overall expectations of minority youth have changed. Nico describes an experience in the mall when he was "goofing around" with his friends. A woman approached them, asked them if they know who the president is, and said that they should stop playing around and be more responsible. Nico ended by saying:

> Now, we have a different president, and they expect more of us, because we can't make anymore that excuse that we cannot do it, because of, you know, the system won't let us do it. But now, … here's an African American president, so, almost they're saying there's no excuse for you [not] to do what you want.

Youths stress the importance of having a role model – whether a teacher, administrator, friend, peer, or powerful individual – who can either explore activities that otherwise would not be considered or guide them toward recognizing and achieving their potential. Each mentor provides a different dimension to youths' engagement; nevertheless, young people who experience some sort of mentoring reflect on these idols eagerly and recognize the outcomes of these relationships.

Success: Educational Processes Producing "Successful Citizens"

The construction of success, while examined in education overall (Demerath, 2009; Varenne & McDermott, 1998), has not been included so far in citizenship education. Participants address the role of success in their overall educational experiences as well as in their education for citizenship. Citizenship conceptualized through the construction of success relates to the notion of receiving a good education, obtaining a good job, and having successful life in order to meet the expectations of adults as citizens.

Created through three contour lines, this countertopography first looks at education as a social structure that creates a value system favoring success. Next, it explores how the meaning of success is shaped in and by education. Finally, it addresses how American society's value of success through opportunities influences curriculum and educational experiences.

Education as a social structure preparing or failing youth. Public education's overarching purpose is to develop productive members of society who can sustain the

national economy. Although there are different ways to reach this goal across countries, the nations generally design educational system with a relatively standardized curriculum ensuring teaching and learning leads to the type of citizens and the value system desired by that particular state. Young people's understanding of the role of education confirms this view – education prepares them for life while instilling the value of individual success. Participants identified two purposes of education: preparing them for adult life as citizens and creating social stratification within communities. While both purposes were present among the participants' perspectives, suburban students predominantly reflect on their education as a preparation for life, and urban students on the educational experiences producing successes and failures.

Education as preparation for life. As preparing for adulthood, education essentially enables youth to function within existing community norms and obtain knowledge and skills to do well according to those standards. Many participants speak about education as a medium that "helps learn social skills that are necessary for being a functioning member of a society." (Jennifer) These lessons consist of learning to interact with all types of people, including those who have different opinions, and handle conflict. While preparing a group of FHHS students for their first meeting with a local NGO, with whom they were to prepare a community initiative, Ms. Williams noted that students needed to be respectful of the place of business and its employees through how they address and talk with staff. In essence, Ms. Williams was teaching them how to interact with adults in a formal environment.

Participants had varying perspectives as to whether their education has prepared them for the future. Many talk about it as a positive experience that also motivates them to learn more. Samuel shares that he is looking to become an entrepreneur, and further education is going to help him.

> Like, once you know how to do something, then you can do it. So it is, like, knowledge is power.... For me, the more educated I am, the more interested I am about the world, everything. Like, it kind of, like, motivates me. (Samuel)

On the other hand, a few students point to the importance of experiences outside formal education. Anthony notes that being "street smart" is also essential and that there are "all

sorts of other ways besides knowing your ABCs" that represent one's education. Despite talking about learning outside of school, Anthony does not mention any experiences in his community; he is usually the one who is calming down the unruly left corner of their classroom, though he never takes a leadership role in the class projects and group works.

Furthermore, several participants note that education has not equipped them enough to be members of society. Praising the quality of her small private middle school and critiquing her public high school, Amelia comments:

> I believe that we are really, like, undereducated in, like, major subjects that are, like, crucial for, like, the future I think.... I feel that education not only is about, like, factual knowledge, but it's also about, like, having, like, experiences and, like, being able to apply what you've learned.... I don't think that what I've gained is enough to prepare me for the real world; I learned math and science, but I don't have any, like, life skills.

Amelia then points out how her poor public speaking skills in her view hide her intellectual capacity.

Social stratification through education: "School is meant to make people fail, too." Social stratification through and within education is linked to the availability of opportunities and social stratification in communities. Many participants note that education in essence determines who succeeds in life. "Education has taught us how to operate in a familiar environment," (Jennifer) as it usually focuses on the areas where students live. Several students acknowledge that education is not offered in the same way to all. Schools in different communities have varying resources, curricula, and opportunities, though "it would be good if everybody went through the system. If everybody who goes to school, they're teaching them the same way, so everybody learns the same stuff." (Dustin)

Similarly, through their academic performance in school, students learn the limits of their potential. Dustin, who often shared creative ideas in class, does not complete his homework and usually receives only the median grade. He acknowledges the importance of homework, but notes that he needs to help his grandparents after school and he cannot always set time aside to do necessary preparation for school tasks.

> I think that the school is not only meant to make people do well. [It also] is meant to make people fail too, because you need, you need people that would work hard, would do any job that didn't do [well] in school. So I don't think that the school is made to say for everybody, "You pass. You become the next president. You will become the next engineer." I think it's meant to say that by giving you an F, I'm saying that when you get older, you will be sweeping streets, and you're getting As, so when you get older, you have a chance to be a principal.

Academic performance depends on many factors in and outside the classroom. No matter the quality of class preparation for standardized tests, only students attending those classes could be sufficiently ready for them. Yet, while observing one urban class geared for the mandatory state exam in that subject, the number of students in the class sharply decreased toward the end of the year. If they do not pass this test, students will not graduate from high school. Therefore, similar to Dustin's point about one's future career, success in life was diminished by not passing this exam, no matter the reasons for not attending class; hence, social stratification through education occurs in this classroom as well.

Participants from both schools recognize that the relationship between a school and its community also creates social stratification. Several participants from urban school talk about institutionalized structures in education, including the building's physical appearance with metal bars on the windows that remind some of jail and the metal detector at the entrance. The latter device is also seen as what the community expects from the students. Dustin, who lives a block away, observed:

> In my community, you are looked at as, because of who you are or [how you] look, you are looked at as somebody to be on that bad line. So, when you come to the metal detector, they treat everybody, like, ah (exhales), as if, like, we're all gonna do something and keep us on that line back purposefully and just talk to us badly.

Furthermore, talking about the morning ritual of being scanned, Anthony, Samuel, and Dustin discuss it as preparing them for an expected failure:

> Anthony: I think they kind of setting us up for that, early.
>
> Samuel: Yeah, it feels like, like, a little training.

Anthony: Yeah!

Dustin: Like, putting us in that attitude, like, subconsciously.

Despite a higher rate of crime and a lack of support for youth in some urban communities, these students see education and particularly their school as a means to escape destructive destinies and shape productive lives. They know that staying in school and resisting peer pressure is important, but the community might be "weak" in assisting them in building their future. These students specifically note their desire for making education a more comfortable and safe experience for students.

> For me, I would change the school education in a way to have kids feel like they haven't left home, but for them to know that they came here to learn. Like, I change this, like, the metal detectors downstairs and treat kids like I expect them to be better, not treat them like they are [a] failure, even if maybe some of them are going to be. Treat them like they're expected to be better and make them feel like they can be better. (Dustin)

Students in each community have different educational experiences, and education often becomes criteria for judging others, as "people judge you based on how well you're educated, how smart you are." (Amira) Moreover, these standards are viewed as affecting one's life as a citizen.

Therefore, as a social structure, education helps one obtain knowledge and skills to function within the community, interact with others, and acquire a job to do well in life. Essentially, it enables the production of functioning members of the community, where such people are able to sustain the social system in place. Even though education is meant to aid children in reaching their potential, the process is not viewed as producing equal results. As society consists of people of different status and opportunities; education's outcomes, as viewed by these youth, are also diverse: they vary by community and even stratify within it. In essence, through both roles of education identified by young people, the focus of education is placed on their success or failure in their communities.

College as "the path everyone's told to go on" to succeed.

> But that doesn't mean that everybody has to go and get a college degree to be successful. It all depends on how you define success. And I think our society defines success too much on money, too much on material things like whether you have that Mercedes and that big house. And maybe some people want that. Maybe that's what's going to make them happy, but not everyone. (Lara)

In discussions of societal expectations of youth, as well as adults, as citizens, participants focus heavily on the concept of education for success. They agree that "as a country, [U.S. society] just expect[s], like, every child to go to school and be successful." (Kim) The assumption is that all members will go to college and develop successful careers, which are shown through their earnings. Furthermore, this expectation is based on the traditional American dream value system:

> This is like going back a ways, but, like, the whole American dream thing to be successful, to have, like, a house of your own, the whole, like, family thing. I think without going to college now in America, you can't reach the American dream. And, like, in a society everyone's, like, suppose[d] to achieve that American dream. If you don't, then you're considered, like, unsuccessful. (Margaret)

However, many participants agree that going to college should not be seen as a requirement. Amy, who went to a community college after high school, discusses this perspective with Lara, who went to a small private college.

> Amy: So society, like, looks down upon people that don't go to college.…. I just think there's an involved presumption that, like, "Oh, you're a failure or something if you don't go." Like, it's, like, the path that everyone's told they have to go on.
>
> Lara: Which is kind of sad, I think, in my opinion, because some kids really don't…it's not for them. And like they're considered like bad kids or whatever because they didn't go to college. And maybe they went to, like, a technical school or the trade or something, which I think is…like, if that's what they want to do with their lives, like, I'm all for doing what makes them happy because why

> would you go to college or put yourself through more education if you know that the system doesn't work for you. … Why would you do that to yourself just so that people can…like because otherwise people will look down on you. And, like I know, people ask me all the time, "What are your plans for next year, like, where are you going to college?" If I told them I'm not going to college, they would look at me like I had eight heads. So, like, if it wasn't for me, why should I go to college? But there's so much pressure to, like, do that, like, there's no other alternative.

These students recognize that some individuals will receive vocational training and have satisfying careers that do not require higher education, even when the societal expectations focus on obtaining a college degree.

Although their neighborhood might not always make these hopes clear, "in the school community, most of the teachers expect maybe that we get to pass or whatever, so I guess they want me to succeed in life." (Roni) On the other hand, some communities do not have expectations of success; as Samuel notes, "[m]y community probably expects me to fail, not succeed." Therefore, education for success to a degree encourages and motivates, but also interacts with the neighborhoods to produce those deemed failures, individuals who cannot get into college or obtain a good job.

The notion of success is related to one's material earnings, yet many students criticize this perspective. Amelia, who often critiques her education as not preparing her for different life experiences, except for passing the exams, notes that aside from the expectations to go to college, have successful career, and be wealthy, there are "no real expectations of getting involved in the community or being happy." She describes her initiatives of getting involved in different projects outside the United States, also acknowledging that she had those opportunities through her parents' financial support. Amelia's concern for self-satisfaction in life is evident even in class. An excerpt from Ms. Thomas class's discussion on religion as a social institution provides more insight on Amelia's position.

> A general discussion moved to the question of religion providing purpose in one's life. As students did not respond to this statement, Ms. Thomas asked who has

applied for the National Honor Society (NHS). Quite a number of students raised their hands.

Ms. Thomas: Why did you apply for NHS?

S[5]: Seems good.

S: Looks good, helps with college.

S: Achieve some goals.

Ms. Thomas: Why do you care?

S: I want to have a career, be successful.

Ms. Thomas: What is success?

Amelia: Be happy with what I want to do.

S: Finish college, have a career, family.

S: Achieve goals.

Ms. Thomas: What is success?

Amelia: Happiness.

While the participants were somewhat critical of the emphasis on material success, many talk about their own focus on doing well in school, which will ultimately help them enter their preferred college. The "drive of the students" (Juliann), and often their parents, to show achievement through rigorous academic choices, leads to a high demand for honors or advanced placement (AP) classes. While these participants also indicate that it seems that students in the college preparation (CP) classes do not care about the subject unlike AP students, they also believe that CP standards have been lowered to accommodate an increased need for honors classes based on parental requests. The "stigma attached to honors classes" (Laurie) is viewed as impacting the level of involvement of those who are not in honors classes. Therefore, students' and parents' drive to strengthen one's scholastic portfolio places more weight on academic achievement than on meaningful involvement in the activities students desire.

The focus on "impressing colleges" with academic accomplishments and "putting together a great application" (Al) leaves little time to engage in the activities that are meaningful to them. Al, who is active in several school clubs and is an EMT, reflects on

[5] Some students in this class discussion were in the interviews as well; however, since the majority of respondents were only in class observations, no references to their names were made here. All are identified simply with "S," which stands for "student."

his schedule that on top of everything includes preparation for SAT exam during this academic year:

> Like, literally SATs, like, literally some days I am here from 7:30 in the morning to, like, 10 at night, and it's just horrible. And it's just kind of hard to be … a citizen because you have school occupying so much of that time.

Many participants question the efficacy of their time in school versus their free time for engagement. They often participate in clubs and activities and spend long hours in classes or waiting for class. Reviewing everything that needs to be done in junior and senior year, Al comments: "What colleges expect? We can do everything?"

The stress on academic achievement and community engagement for college applications among suburban participants is also viewed as a characteristic of the area where they live. Many students note that life in the tristate area[6] is very fast, "focused on reaching goals, constantly doing something, and being successful" (Laurie). Students feel this pace is a part of their lifestyles and agree that "[w]e have to be doing something constantly." (Amy) The increased level of competition in sports, clubs, or even to do better on exams than others who might be applying to the same colleges can be seen as a form of preparation for success. Many young people acknowledge developing an attitude of competition and achievement and becoming citizens with success-oriented values and attitudes.

> **American dream: The opportunities to succeed in the American nation.**
> I guess, this is kind of cliché, but I definitely like the freedoms that we have … being able to say what I want to say…. I think it's definitely good. And I feel like I have a lot of opportunities. (Lara)

Education for success is being described as a characteristic of the value system present in the American nation. Despite some critique of their nation, including the American focus on oneself and "everything big", and general disinterest in news outside the country, the majority of participants share their national pride.

---

[6] The tristate area includes New Jersey, New York (and primarily New York City), and Connecticut.

> I guess, America has been always caught up as a free nation, but it does have this, it's hidden – how'd you say it? – it does have everything. It's not as great as people think it is. (short pause) I like it. (Nico)

The characteristic that stands out among many participants' perspectives is the notion of opportunity, to be someone or do something. As Nico commented, "America is a very, well, one of wealthiest nation[s]. It offers a lot of opportunities. It's not perfect but does offer opportunities." One way this idea is expressed is through an individual's rights and ability to be whatever one wants.

Participants also discuss opportunities only offered in America. Jack reflects on how his grandparents made their success in socio-economic status and moved up from poor young immigrants into a wealthy American family. He adds,

> I may be one of those, like, American idealist[s], but I really don't think there is anywhere else in the world.... I am huge fan of the whole idea of self-reliance and sort of having the ability to do what you want with the world – because, I know this is my point and some people might disagree with that – but I really think you have more opportunities in our county to do what you want with your life than you really do in any other place in the world.

Many people want to immigrate to the United States for these additional life chances; however, one has to find one's opportunities.

> [T]here [are] more opportunities here in America to grasp, but there's always, like, [a] loophole here…. Like, especially, now like, the economy is bad, and it's really hard to find a job. And a lot of people, [a] lot of families are suffering. That's what I see everyday. That is the bad side of it. The good side, um, there are opportunities, but you gotta do [a] search. (Samuel)

This notion of opportunity is seen as a part of the American dream, in which all can become who they desire. This opportunity is ultimately translated into opportunity for success, or the notion that the nation offers unique situations in which an individual will be able to succeed. However, a few participants criticize the American dream with respect to the 2008 financial crisis. Anthony believes that the "American dream has been played out. [The] American dream's where you're respected; you have a nice house, and a steady job. And you have kids, and you're just successful in every aspect of your life."

Yet, after the crisis, "you have to sell yourself [to keep a job], and along [those] lines you'll just lose your morals, and you'll hate yourself, and so you won't be successful anymore." (Anthony) This perspective represents one of a few that reflects on the conflict between an individual's morals and the focus on success, especially in business; in essence, it represents a conflict between being a moral citizen and being successful.

Opportunity in America is neither offered to everyone, nor equally among those who have access to it. Few students reflect on the opportunity to even be an American in terms of holding "papers" from this country and the advantages of legal status.

> People are born in America. But, like, you don't have to be a middle class, and you can afford to do a lot of things, and you can afford to visit other country, to come back.... You can do that, ... but being born here, we have papers, we have papers, right?(asks Tanya; smiles) We have papers; we have birth certificates; we have, like, documents that ... (pause) I'm just saying that we have a really big advantage being able to go around the world as a, um, [members of] a powerful country, and as a established country. I think that's it. (Amira)

However, several urban students state that access to opportunities to succeed depends on one's background or location, which is closely related to one's social networks. As Roni summarizes, "it all depends [on] where you are, depends [on] how you feel about this country, where you came from. You know, it's about how your life is in this country."

Youth view success in terms of their education in schools and their communities and specifically, how they learn to be contributing members of their communities. The drive for success leads to the production of a "successful citizen" – a person expected to go to college and find a good paying job. These narrow expectations juxtaposed with youths' roles in their schools and communities raise questions about the impact of this dominant perspective on youths' citizenship agency.

Shaping Youths' Citizenship Agency

Informed by the three interlinking countertopographies, this section delves into the processes that shapes youths' citizenship agency. It first addresses how teaching for citizenship contributes to their agency, as well as the role of youths' reported learning for

citizenship. The main interest of this section is placed on the ways youths self-identify as citizens, view the possibilities of their agency, or exert it.

Teaching and learning for citizenship during the age of high-stakes testing. Youths' citizenship identity is developed within individual struggles to balance social expectations of citizens, defined through success, and one's motivation to engage opportunities presented. The rhetoric of "individualization" or individual choice (Apple, 2006) within teaching and learning about democracy places the focus of outcomes on individual achievement, rather than on what that achievement means in communities or how it can be applied.

Balancing the expectation of success and developing productive relationships with their communities are challenges for today's youth. Within this equilibrium lies their citizenship agency, or their perception of having knowledge, skills, and abilities to effect a change in their communities. This section discusses the process of teaching citizenship as well as youths' own actions to use their learning for citizenship.

Teaching for exams versus citizenship. The teaching process in the four observed classrooms used two distinct methods: teaching for exams (or the final products) and teaching for citizenship. In essence, these approaches either enable students to learn facts and build a knowledge base around major subjects or practice applying the information shared in the classroom to their life experiences.

In the observed classes, the focus is on producing an end result, such as the Regents exam or creating a final project. Many students note that teaching for the Regents or AP exams "doesn't leave time for learning current events," (Juliann) which they also think they need to know. However, Ms. Davis, who teaches a Regents prep course, points out that she would like to address other topics and prompt students to do other assignments; but the course is to prepare students to do well on the exam, her primary goal. Another teacher, Ms. Miller, shared that she is able to adjust her lessons in advanced classes to allow a deeper focus on particular topics, though not in her regular classes.

Four teachers in the observed classes also employ creative pedagogies that have encouraged students to meaningfully apply knowledge to relevant issues. In her Regents prep class, Ms. Davis uses various pedagogical approaches. For example, her assignment on the industrial revolution includes an option to create a political cartoon about factory workers, a letter home to parents about life as a worker, or a poem about the revolution's effects. Ms. Thomas's class uses small groups to develop a survey on a social issue relevant to students and distribute it in school; they also learn how to work with the data and interpret the results. Additionally, teachers from the urban school invited students to attend a teachers' union protest after a school day; no classes were missed in this voluntary activity. I have joined this trip and observed student interactions with their teachers, people on the subway (while holding signs for the protest), and interactions with other teachers at the event. While learning about teachers' unions and issues that affect their instructors and schools, these students showed increased enthusiasm by supporting the event. However, by 4:30 p.m., many students left the event abruptly, around the time when they usually head home and parents return from work. Their interests in contributing to the event immediately ceased.

Learning about and learning for citizenship. Many participants note that interactive learning is not common. Classes focus on facts, rather than applying knowledge to relevant issues. As Amanda points out, "we learn a lot, but we don't know how to *do* that much." Furthermore, Amelia argues that if they do not learn "how to apply the knowledge to benefit your community, then you are useless," suggesting that learning life skills through activities such as Interact would be useful to all youth.

However, "[w]e can't learn by just reading the books!" states Juliann, referring to the fictional Harry Potter's learning experience, where students were told they need to stay in the safe environment of a classroom and learn theory, rather than use it in practice. Students in that interview group react affirmatively to this statement and Juliann's argument that school should not be about learning within a "safe environment" but needs to include "challenges, and real-life and practical experiences." Teaching for exams to ensure students' performance on standardized tests leaves little time for other lessons. Juliann suggests that "[w]e need to move away from just learning to get a good score. So

it shouldn't be learning just to score well for HSPA[7], for No Child Left Behind, but to prepare us as students." These students recognize that learning for citizenship occurs only when teachers can shape their courses to include creative pedagogies, or are skilled or comfortable in engaging these methods in their classes.

Referring specifically to learning for citizenship, Lara's comment of "Am I allowed to say 'not much'?" summarizes many participants' shared experiences. In school, Laurie says, "I've learned what [citizenship] should be, not necessarily the realistic part of it"; specifically, these youth are learning

> facts about history. [Teachers are] giving us the same knowledge. But we're learning from our parents what the good and bad is and how to help community, how to be a good citizen. So education is *not* teaching us a bit about citizenship. (Juliann)

Overall, many participants agree with the statement, "I don't really think we're learning a lot about citizenship, just about history." (Kim) Several students also note that they do not learn about issues outside America. Juliann shares an example of associating Germany only with the Nazi period because she has not learned about the country today. Students say it is also important to learn about domestic issues, as right now, "the only focus is on superficial things, but not difficult questions, issues." (Margaret)

On the other hand, students in UP and GK have different experiences of learning for citizenship. Their curriculum and activities seem to assist this form of learning. "You're learning how to be a part of community" (Jennifer), and "you learn a lot about your rights as citizens, and then … you learn how precious those rights are." (Amira) However, Amira acknowledges that even in these programs, there is room for expansion, as "[w]e don't really go to the roots of the rights in the US." Nevertheless, Max believes that he has received good citizenship education:

> I've got a pretty good citizenship education from my school just because you know it's gotten me to see things in a whole bunch of different ways. Um, I've taken out a lot from the UP and learning about situations not just in [our] county area, or the New Jersey area, but, like, across the United States and across the

[7] NJ High School Proficiency Assessment (HSPA); offered in the main subject areas.

> world, so I think I've learned a lot, being with the national and global citizens especially.

The experiences of learning for citizenship affect their civic identity, which is shaped predominantly by personal experiences outside school as well as by family members, by special curricular and co-curricular programs (i.e., UP and GK), or by the overall high-school experience. However, aside from the special programs, many participants note the lack of effective learning for citizenship in their classrooms.

Youths' roles, voices, and power. This section provides more in-depth analysis of youths' perspectives about their roles in communities, being able to express themselves and be heard, or exert some power in their decisions or actions. In essence, this section moves from understanding how their citizenship is shaped by the three constructions of citizenship and processes of teaching and learning for citizenship to viewing areas where youths' voices and power lie.

Being younger members of their communities, youths recognize their positions in relation to adults. Many participants claim that their status as a younger person, who needs protection or still needs to prove oneself to the community, is evident in their communication with adults. First, many note that youths "are rarely asked for our opinion or our expectations." (Laurie) Instead, parents speak for them in interactions with other adults. "[M]y parents will instinctively jump in and answer for me" (Laurie). Parents set expectations of what their children are supposed to do or become, or get involved in student projects as advisers. In essence, in the process of literally speaking for their children, the elders are viewed as silencing them.

Administrators also silence youth, as a few urban students note administrators' failure to acknowledge their voices in school. Commenting on an initiative undertaken by his grade, Anthony states:

> In ninth grade, the kids, they started a petition saying we don't want a uniform anymore. So they had a whole entire grade's names on it, and the principal, he said, "This really made little difference, because it's something that has to happen. We have to have this." So that's just, like, also cemented that we don't really have that much of a voice.

Even when these youth act, as in this initiative, their voices are not heard, and they are left feeling voiceless and powerless in their school community.

Additionally, "ageism," in the participants' words, is viewed by many as affecting adults' perspectives of their ability to make informed decisions. Roni and Samuel discuss this generational gap:

> Roni: That's all right. They think that just because we don't know what we're talking about, like, say we want to do this and that, and they're like, "No you shouldn't do that, you don't know what's gonna happen." And you're, like, "But it's ok, I know how to handle myself," but they will believe you can't.
>
> Samuel: We're from a more recent generation, and … we know more than our parents, even though our parents like other elders have more experience than us. …. [But we know] what's going on now.

A few students also note that "older generations are afraid of youth; they consider us hooligans." (Amanda) They explain this as due to new technology that youth use frequently and elders less so, and "they're not sure how will that change the way people act in society." (Amanda)

Adults' ageism also impacts youths' perspectives about their own ability to engage. "People often see you as, like, in the state of apathy, like, not do[ing] anything, ... and even if you don't fit in that [role], that's how they see you." (India) Adults are described as seeing youth as irresponsible; "responsibility is attached to a certain age, like, 20" (Laurie), and youths are not given an opportunity to prove themselves.

> I think most, like, teens around the world, I think that they're not given the chance to be responsible.… they might assume that we can't do it, or (pause) or, like, maybe they don't assume that we can't do it 'cause they [were] once our age, but the option is just not given to us. Like, maybe we can be responsible, but we're just not given the option, or we're not, or might not be ready for it, maybe. (Samuel)
>
> It gives you such a feeling of just, like, helplessness that you don't feel you have to participate or be in your community, because the older people will handle it. Like, you don't have to worry about it. It's not your problem, because they'll take care of it, because we're too young to understand. (Juliann)

This form of ageism creates youths' attitude of if "no one's going to listen to me, so we just might as well, just not bother" (Juliann). Laurie explains: "I always think there's so many things I want to do, but, like, because I'm 16, I know I won't get listened to. So, I'm just like, 'Oh, well hopefully someone else will do it.'" However, they receive a sense of responsibility in high school since that is "a community of [people] 14–18 years of age" (Laurie), where their teachers offer more trust. Nevertheless, participants also recognize that "some kids wouldn't care" (Laurie) and would not get involved even if ageism did not exist. Some youth accept that they are not heard and not expected to do things and therefore do not even attempt engagement.

As a result of not being engaged in some activities due to their age, youth is "not given enough credit and not enough say" (Amelia) in society. During the process of growing up, expectations of their work and results change, but not of them as individuals.

> [T]o be effective, you need to be of age, you know.... If I'm really trying to do [something now], you know, and say, "Excuse me, can I?" … (stern) "No." (smiles) You know, they just brush you off, and you just sort of accept it. You know, you're really expected to be, um, seen, you feel sort of like minimal … my intentions are good, but, … people aren't really acknowledging my intentions, you know, or trying to support me in my actions. But you know, you're [an] adult. You just sort of go out there and they're like, "Oh, ok, I'll give you a minute or so," (smiles) you know. So I guess, the expectations of the result, you know of the outcome will change, but not necessarily what you do. I'm gonna continue to ask people to vote and to take part and be active citizens, but you know, hopefully as I get older, you'll actually listen to me and take some things into consideration. (Whitney)

As young people approach age 18, their expectations as citizens change. Although this change is potentially a result of individual's maturation on the notion of citizenship, the age has been singled out as having an impact on their voices and community membership, primarily through the ability to vote. Several students relate voting to the ability to exercise citizenship and in that way have a say in the community: "voting enables you to be a better citizen" (Amanda). However, due to their age, they do not view themselves as citizens, yet.

> I don't see myself as a member of the nation yet, because I'm not 18 so I can't vote. I can't go out and get a big job and can't help nobody. I can't help no family, 'cause I'm not 18 yet. And until when you're, like, 18 in this country, all you have to do is live under your parents or guardians. (Dustin)

Holding a job is also considered a component of citizenship, but "I can't get certain jobs. I want to work, but I'm not 16. And there is no really a place I can work; [I] can't find a job till I'm 16. So, I'm not a citizen." (India)

Young people are not viewed as members and "not expected to act as citizens till the age of 18 or 21" (Amira), and due to this lack of status, they lack voices, power, and influence as citizens.

> [W]e can't vote and all that kind of stuff, so we can't really be part of that society. Well, not part of the society, part of the nation because as young and youth, they say, "Oh, if we scream loud enough our voices will be heard" and whatever, but sometimes people can't hear or don't care. (Roni)
>
> I think that as a teen, we're not really part of a community and nation 'cause we're not heard if we try to talk about something. They'll say, "You're not even 18. You don't know nothing." The only way that we can be part of our community is by, the way I see it, is going to the Army, at my age right now. (Dustin)

"I don't have any power at all," states Nico when talking about an 18-year-old who is a mayor of a small town in the Unites States. The potential to change communal decisions is viewed as an important characteristic of a citizen, one they all lack due to their age. As Dustin, Samuel, and Anthony discuss ideas about changes in education, they limit them with a comment about the restrictions they face:

> Dustin: I'm, I'll mainly wish that we at least could, or at least we would give [an] idea to the governor of New York, saying how we don't like the public-school system, or the things that we should change about [it]. But since we're [not] 18, we can't vote about stuff like that.
>
> JJ: You could send a letter though.

> Dustin: Yeah, but I'm not 18. It won't matter. To like what you said (pointing to Anthony), maybe the only way that I'm going to matter is going to the army and going to Iraq.

However, turning 18 and voting does not solve all problems; Max notes that there are "differences in power and influence among people" and that "age brings power and influence" (Max) as a by-product of social expectations and material status of adults who receive income. Yet, "[e]ven when you turn 18, ... you are in a sense disenfranchised because you don't have the same authority" (Max) as adults. Even then "adults do not necessarily take you seriously as they might [of] someone who has a lot of years of experience." (Jennifer) Therefore, it is "just our power and role" (Nico) that affect what they do and can do. Nico argues that they can carry out some actions and refers to his letter to his congressman requesting harsher punishment for human trafficking. Nico comments, "[Y]ou don't get to vote, make decisions, but can share what you think is right. If we start looking after change now, it will help us make a change in the future."

As younger community members who still need to learn or prove themselves as citizens, these young people acknowledge the lack of opportunities to express their voices, or more often, the issue of their voices not being heard. Ageism positions them as not responsible enough or unable to make informed decisions. Therefore, being viewed as inexperienced, irresponsible, or voiceless community members, youth neither believes that it is taken seriously when interacting with adults, nor that it holds influence due to a lack of financial or material means.

Making a difference. When talking about citizens in abstract terms, many participants describe them as individuals who "wanna make a difference" (Laurie) in their community or the world. Moreover, in talking about their engagement and plans for the future, many express a desire to "make a difference," often followed with the goal of achieving personal happiness. Amanda shares this wish to have an impact but also notes that the impact needs to be meaningful.

> I do want to make a difference, but I'm not one of those like "make a difference" people. I'm not, like, "I'm gonna to build a house for all the homeless people and give them free iPods". Like, that's dumb. I think part of being … citizen and

> doing what you can is making sure that, not like in a selfish way, but making sure that like you are happy and you're contributing to your community in a way that makes you happy…. I think part of it is making sure you're happy with you[r] role. Like, you find your role in society, whatever that is, you do it to the best of your ability.

Youth in this study engages in various forms of activities, and several students are very articulate about their goals in being involved. Nico shares that his work in GK as a peer educator makes him well known in the community: he "educates people about global health issues and makes [a] difference in that way." In short, he does "community-based global work" as it has the potential to impact other areas of the world. Even though his work is based in his community, he says, "I can make a difference, and I do in my community." He also points to other smaller actions that his peers or teachers have undertaken (e.g., raising money for different causes in Africa or writing a letter to a congressman regarding human trafficking). Acting together is identified as important in reaching this goal, and Nico adds, "[I]t's good that people are [rising] up to make a difference; I think it's … we as people can make a difference, not by ourselves, but together." Roni also talks about the objectives of individual youth: "all of us here in this room in the school, [we can] do something that can actually change the world, but it depends on if we decide to, 'cause it's about us." Making a difference seems to require one's interest, dedication, and a willingness to work with others until the goal is achieved. Determination can create results, as "young people are the ones who can create and carry a change," notes Laurie in reference to the "college revolution" during Obama's presidential campaign and young people's role in that election.

Lastly, this desire to make a difference and achieve happiness is expressed in youths' discussion about their general future. However, this goal is often not realized due to social or financial constraints, or due to ageism. Even when they overcome ageism and engage, they are not heard or are discouraged through peer pressure; particularly, the drive for success dominates their engagement and shapes their desire to have an impact on the world.

Chapter V:
Bridging Together Youths' Citizenship and Citizenship Education Programs: Theoretical and Practical Implications

> We are part of the discourses that are enmeshed in the complexities of our society. When we map certain practices and discourses through our witnessed accounts, we have an obligation to note our own locations in that mapping" (Ropers-Huilman, 1999, p. 29).

Developing a critical understanding of youths' citizenship involves not only identifying the dominant constructions shaping it or the institutional social relations and social processes involved in its making. It also requires the researcher's reflection on the process of making meaning from the data, as well as positioning the study's findings alongside previous studies, seeking the areas of convergence, and more importantly, areas that require further examination. In this chapter, I interpret the findings through the process of "translation," through which a researcher "can translate herself rather than focus on translating the students" (Cook-Sather, 2007, p. 397). The practice requires attending to the "complexities of [youths'] identities and voices" (p. 396), while identifying the areas within the various levels of youths' communities, primarily their schools and educational experiences, which need to be more inclusive of the voices of youth.

The chapter first problematizes several key issues that mold youths' citizenship. Relying on the existing literature about citizenship education, these salient points are analyzed for contributions to deeper understanding of youths' experiences as citizens. The next section discusses the implications of these issues in practice, namely for teachers, administrators, and policy makers. Finally, new directions for future research in this immediate or in the wider arena of citizenship education are discussed, followed by the limitations of the findings.

A Deeper Look into the Key Issues of Youths' Citizenship

The study shows that young people view themselves as citizens of their school and local communities and have an abstract notion of membership in a global community. However, it also reveals constrained belonging to their communities, particularly through the lack of belonging to a national community. While constructing and experiencing their citizenship, these young people identify two additional processes related to being and becoming a citizen. The peer pressure serves as a dichotomous process that inhibits and encourages engagement. Additionally, educational experiences produce social stratification by creating "successful citizens" – those who will succeed in school and in life, and others who will become failures. Finally, the availability and nature of opportunities in youths' communities interact with all three processes and mediates their citizenship – it shapes their belonging, impacts the nature of peer pressure and contributes to their engagement, and produces social stratification of citizens.

This section seeks a deeper understanding of these four key issues, reflecting on the current literature and identifying the areas where this research contributes to citizenship education literature.

Not-belonging to a national community: A missing link in youths' multiple citizenship identities. Through their experiences in the multiple levels of communities, youth creates various identities, which are constantly negotiated through relations with those communities. In particular, their identities as citizens are based in the notion of membership, which is often explained through the feeling of belonging to a community. (Lister et al, 2003; Torney-Purta et al, 2001)

The youths in this study have the strongest sense of belonging to their school communities. This phenomenon can be attributed to a school representing a community that provides them opportunities for engagement and leadership, expressing their voices, or having learning experiences that are missing in their town or neighborhood communities. These young people create their immediate and perhaps most powerful identities in school communities. Other studies of citizenship in European countries have also noted that "belonging to a community, the essence of citizenship, is experienced

primarily at local level through horizontal relationships with equals." (Osler & Starkey, 2001, p. 295)

Although Banks (2007) has argued that within complex multicultural societies, youth likely has a strong local-cultural and national identity with a weak or nonexistent global identity, the youth in this study express different positions. The majority speaks of belonging and identities within their schools or local communities, and to a degree to global communities. They acknowledge the abstractness of their global identification, but often recognize their place in the globalized world and their engagement in various activities that have an impact on various international issues. However, unlike Banks's proposal, they hold a unique sense of national identity that is further defined through the lack of belonging to a national community.

Explaining their not belonging to their national community, the youths identify their inability to express their position at that level, particularly to effect any change. Not being able to impact the national community shapes youths' notion of belonging to national community, while at the same time they have pride and love for the nation and the rights and opportunities it provides. Examining the role of citizenship education in France and England on developing notions of citizenship, Osler and Starkey (2001) argue that the concept in itself does not have to be linked to one's nationality, but is more connected to one's notion of belonging to a community. Therefore, this study reveals how youths' learning about their rights and responsibilities as citizens in a nation full of opportunities does not necessarily create a link to the national community. Youths' inability to engage in constructive activities that would create a sense of membership and influence leaves them excluded from the national community.

The youth in study highlights schools as places and spaces where they acquire the strongest sense of belonging, and by implication of citizenship identity. Therefore, school represent the sites that need to be better understood as complex spaces with intersecting processes that mold citizens, rather than just an institution with the goal of executing mandatory curriculum and helping students pass standardized tests. However, the lack of belonging to a national community despite having some form of national identity raises questions about the relationship between youths' citizenship identities and their nation. If they have strong pride, should not they also have a sense of belonging to

that community? On the other hand, if they do not have a sense of belonging, what is their national pride rooted in and how flexible is it? What does it mean for citizenship education curriculum and teaching? And how do we remove the constraints to their belonging to national community and enable youth engage in activities allowing them feel a part of it?

Westheimer and Kahne (2004a) note that citizenship education in U.S. schools promotes service learning and community service, hence "embracing a vision of citizenship devoid of politics" (p. 243). In essence, the emphasis on "personal responsibility, volunteerism, and character education" (p. 244) is important in the broader societal context but does not necessarily contribute to democratic citizenship (i.e., youths' engagement in national politics, voting, interacting with various government bodies). Learning that the most important role they can take is to help others, "youth seem to be 'learning' that citizenship does not require government, politics, or even collective endeavors" (p. 244). Therefore, learning for citizenship results in apolitical notions of citizenship, where service takes center stage, and engaging in political processes or activities that effect larger changes or disrupt relationships in their broader communities are not considered or encouraged by the curriculum.

Informed by this finding from Westheimer and Kahne's work, I ask whether providing meaningful engagement in the national community through educational experiences leads to youths' belonging to the national community, or is this relationship more complex than addressed in the citizenship education programs? Further study on how meaningful engagement in the national community affects youths' feeling of belonging to it, and how they bridge this feeling as they transition into adulthood, could provide more insight into youths' national citizenship identity.

Peer pressure: Encouraging and inhibiting engagement. Participants see community engagement as a fundamental piece of their citizenship. However, aside from accessible opportunities in those communities, and from their relationships with adults, who are considered as the most powerful community members, youths in this study reveal their peers' role in shaping their engagement. It seems natural that peers act as a supporting factor or even a role model in young people's initial or ongoing engagement

activities. However, peer pressure, whether it encourages or more importantly inhibits engagement, is rarely addressed in citizenship education literature, particularly in the United States.

Peer pressure is an important phenomenon when considering young people's social development especially in schools, as places of education. As their emotional growth takes place from birth until their early twenties, what peers think is considered even in places of higher education for understanding students' various behavioral decisions. Although the significance of this pressure has been studied as related to young people's engagement in communities, it has not been attributed to the shaping of citizenship identities. However, youths' citizenship needs to be understood in relation to others (Lister, 2007), as they have "collective rather than individualistic notion of …agency." (Flanagan, 2004, p. 729)

This study reveals important roles of peers. These youths are encouraged or motivated by their friends' and peer engagement. Another component is their search for friends whose behaviors align with those they prefer, or in other words, how different circles of friends impact their engagement. The most intriguing, yet least addressed component is peers' negative influence on engagement, especially outside school and with communities in which youth already do not have the strongest sense of belonging. Lastly, in light of competition for academic achievement in the U.S. educational environment, young people face possible alienation from the people who might have "greater" engagement than their own; hence, the competition for the best college application portfolio might discourage youth to cooperate with some peers.

While the role of peer pressure in shaping youths' citizenship is rarely examined in the United States, it is most often discussed in U.K. educational programs. Particularly, peer pressure has been addressed regarding various learning objectives within Personal, Social, Health and Citizenship (PSHC) education in the U.K. curriculum. Additionally, some earlier studies have briefly discussed the role of peers in one's citizenship. Studying teachers' perspective of the factors affecting citizenship, Davies, Gregory, and Riley (1999) point out that "teachers perceive [peers,] those people with whom we come in contact as critical influences in the development of citizenship, both in positive and negative terms." (p. 69) Considering both types of peer pressure,

teachers rank it at the same level as negative role models and family conflict, indicating their concern "that these elements are a real danger to the development of the qualities of good citizenship." (p. 71). Other studies (see Osler & Starkey, 1998) suggest that peer pressure along with cultural forces may also bind together and lead to reduced access to education by certain groups of students; hence, some cultural groups may have limited engagement in school and perhaps in overall learning for citizenship due to peer pressure on those already on the outskirts of educational communities.

Further studies to understand the overall role of peers on youths' citizenship are needed in the U.S. context as well. As today's youth already feel stressed by the social expectation of becoming a "successful citizen," examining their relations with their equals who shape their strongest sense of belonging would provide more insight on how youths' citizenship identities are molded and remolded.

"Successful citizen": Producing individual success. Along with the original purpose of public education to produce functioning members of a state, education today is viewed as an avenue for success. In particular, "education as a means to succeeding in a globalized world is now given great importance, even to the extent of exaggerating its potential to create wealth" (Stromquist, 2002, p. xiv) through one's ability to obtain good compensation in a career. This view of education has been translated into young people's views of the expectations attached to citizens. In discussions of societal expectations of youth, as well as adults as citizens, the participants heavily focus on the concept of success.

Success as addressed by study participants can be understood through the neoliberal focus on individual choice, responsibility, and role within a "thin" democracy where market policies dominate and all activities are geared toward ensuring the well-being of the economy (through the monetary success of individuals) and the state (as explained through one's political engagement), rather than on individuals' well-being and satisfaction as citizens in their communities. Individual citizens are viewed as the means of sustaining that order. Moreover, education serves as an institution and a process: it carries the reproduction of the institutional relations that initiate the focus on success and the production of "successful citizens" able to sustain the system.

Levinson and Holland (1996) argue that modern schools have complex roles in the formation of young people. On one hand, education can provide certain levels of freedoms and opportunities due to obtained knowledge, while on the other hand, it provides a sense of power rooted in being knowledgeable, or even creates a sense of failure in life due to lack of that competence. However, education can also reinforce the social position of the individuals due to their backgrounds. These complex roles and products of educating young people were also noted by youth in this study. These youth talk about school producing them into individuals ready to go to college, but also leaving some behind due to social stratification occurring in their education and communities. Additionally, they claim that the knowledge is power, but also mention that some students fail in school or later in life due to the inadequate set of knowledge and skills obtained in school.

Grounded in the findings from this study, I argue that institutionalized relations of education, evident in the resources and opportunities for students in their communities as well as the social processes of teaching and learning, are making youth as citizens expected to be materially successful. The expectation of success in school and in life is integrated into the processes shaping youths' connections with their communities. This narrow path toward "successful" futures juxtaposed with youths' roles and engagement in their schools and communities raises questions about the impact of the dominant perspective and teaching about success on their citizenship identity. As the institutional relations within the school and local communities and the processes of teaching and learning for citizenship make youths think of themselves as successes or failures, they do not see deep and meaningful engagement in their learning for citizenship. This dynamic between the dominant perspective of education for success and the results determined by the level of success is problematic in several ways, most importantly in how it shapes citizenship identity, as well as the perspectives of and motivations for engagement.

In the United States, there is a strong push to assist young Americans in reaching higher academic achievement. This initiative is partially fueled by the argument for the need to increase U.S. competitiveness through having well-performing citizens able to compete against their peers in other parts of the world. In this process, good students are encouraged to perform even better, and numerous programs help underachieving students

improve or stay in the educational system. Through this larger national movement, education serves its original purpose to reproduce the social order and produce citizens able of sustaining it. Moreover, the concern for reaching high academic achievement produces a culture of competition, which could be encouraging if designed to benefit every student. However, it becomes exclusionary when resources and opportunities are distributed inequitably; it forsakes those who do not "try hard enough" and those who do not have access to resources or a support system to "try" and stay in the system. Therefore, the culture of competition, grounded in the notion of the nation's success, produces youth as a success or a failure. In other words, it produces, or depending on shifting political-economic relations, reproduces social stratification among its young citizens.

The production of success and failure in education has been addressed in other studies. In their seminal work *Successful Failure: The School America Builds*, Varenne and McDermott (1998) address the so-called "success/failure" system in the American education. As the policy makers, researchers, educators, and families focus on understanding how to achieve success in education, Varenne and McDermott point out that,

> The problem, of course, is that not all individuals in the United States get to go where some others go: Everyone can race; only one can win. The problem of relative success is most powerfully etched when we wonder about the fate of … many others who never move to something their teachers celebrate. Who is responsible for identified failures? The child? The parents, teachers, social workers, and therapists who have responsibility for the child? Or the peculiar constructions that have been built over the past 350 years in what has become "America"?… Success … is not problematic. Only failure is…. The first are dependent on the latter. Success and failure are the products of the same America. (p. 4)

Moving away from identifying particular factors to account for specific results in American education, Varenne and McDermott focus on cultural analysis of the institutionalized discourses and social processes that lead to creating the conditions in- and out- of schools that produce certain results in education, such as success and failure.

Furthermore, they problematize the constructions of success and failure shaped within the American culture as "inescapable" (p. 216) to the American children who will score above or below average, and often used as a determination of one's capacity and even identity in a society. Similar to what Dustin from the urban school suggested (see Chapter 4, p. 94), American educational system and the culture within which the system exists stratify the youth into the categories of success and failure. Yet, Varenne and McDermott argue that isolating only several factors in determining why these youth succeed or fail does not assist in making a meaningful change in educational experiences of young people; rather, there is a cultural structure that needs to be understood in order to shape educational programs, including citizenship education programs, that enable students to learn and become meaningful members of their various communities.

Researching the educational experiences of high-school students from a wealthy neighborhood in the United States, Demerath (2009) provides an extensive anthropological account of education for success through what he calls "the culture of personal advancement." The students he followed for four years exude many examples of the "drive of the students" and parents, peer pressure on engagement, and describe the overall relations of communities with schools that are focused on producing successful citizens who will enroll in the best colleges; participants in this study mention all of those points as well. While Demerath's study focused on understanding the culture within which the production of success occurs, this study's emphasis is on understanding how the educational processes that develop expectations of successful citizens shape youths' citizenship identity and agency. The processes of teaching and learning for citizenship are intertwined with the overall educational production of success, and these expectations become translated into expectations of becoming successful citizens. Demerath's argument for thoughtful approaches encouraging students primarily to learn while in school and produce a strong portfolio for college applications along that learning needs to be extended to teachers and administrators implementing a citizenship education curriculum. The students in this study have also, in their own words, called for moving away from learning how to get an A to learning about and being a citizen: "It isn't what you are taught in the classroom, but [through] the interaction with others and learning from them that we learn about citizenship." (Juliann)

In this discussion I do not wish to diminish the benefits created or enabled by one's academic success, but rather critique a side effect of education for success that U.S. educators are not acknowledging. In teaching students to become citizens, this idea of success becomes an almost integral component of one's life experiences. For example, an educational initiative by the Coalition for Community Schools (CCS) in Washington, D.C., designed to provide a creative and alternative educational approach through developing community-based educational programs has also called for students to achieve success, which "includes living productive lives, engaging in lifelong learning, finding gainful employment, and contributing to civic life" (Melavile, Berg & Blank, 2006, p. 3). As this classification of success depicts, education for success does not teach youths about satisfaction with their lives as community members, understanding their and others positions in these spaces, or questioning either one.

Westheimer and Kahne (2004) indicated in their work that citizenship education programs will produce different types of "good" citizens depending on the program's purpose. Even the sample definition from CCS indicates that education for success does not necessarily assist every young person in becoming a citizen; some fail. Yet, if success is an assumption, has education failed those students who do not succeed or is this failure a result of an individual choice? What type of community members will they become? How can we account for variances in community resources and opportunities to reduce or eliminate their impact on this process of producing success? Or can we imagine education through different means and different vocabularies that do not create sharp distinctions between citizens?

Perhaps broadening the conception of success will allow greater number of students to feel successful. Moving away from the culture of competition for academic achievement and reshaping the expectations about tertiary education could remove the pressure from youth and assist them focus on their role as citizens in communities rather than just their drive to succeed. However, as some students have expressed, successes and failures are not only created through these expectations of success, but also through the interaction of institutional social relations with the spaces of their experiences; the structural limitations in the form of limited resources and opportunities represent an important component in shaping youths' citizenship identity and agency. Changing the

vocabularies and practices within education to broaden the notion of success could provide some needed results in shaping youth as citizen. However, additional effort on changing the structural dynamics within spaces where youths' citizenship is being made is even more important in order to start discussion on a possibility of producing equal citizens.

Opportunities within communities: Can citizenship be produced equally?

The two educational places of this study offer differing resources and opportunities to their students. I argue that this difference contributes to all three issues isolated for this discussion: it shapes youths' relations or belonging to their communities, enables engagement through the existence or nonexistence of the engagement opportunities, and dictates expectations peers have of these youth. More importantly, the participants are aware of these differences and their impact on individual's ability to succeed; these youth talk about social stratification through the distribution of resources and arrangement of social networks in their communities. Therefore, the resources and availability of opportunities in the communities mediate youths' citizenship and shape their citizenship identities through awareness of this inequality among their peers.

In this section I address a few ways in which the resources and opportunities within the communities stood out the most to me during the study. As the discussion on the study's context points out, the two places of education have varying resources and opportunities for learning about citizenship and engaging in the school and local community. The level of poverty and crime in the urban community was explained through youths' concerns about their safety and the expectations of the community for youth to fail (hence fit within it). The reactions of social institutions to the level of crime and concern for increasing the safety within urban schools through the use of security check point at the school entrance creates a dynamic that shapes youths' perspective about belonging to that community, as well as about their relations with the educational processes. While passing through a security check is an everyday routine for urban students, it does not belong in the suburban educational institutions and experience. It can be assumed that the notion of safety in an educational place is not part of the suburban students' worldview, and that they take for granted that the educational

environment is always safe. They do not have to think otherwise. However, the dichotomy of focus on this matter based on location triggers the question of what impact such a widely accepted procedure has on shaping urban students' view of education, access to education, and their ease in entering institutions of learning and relating to them; hence, what impact does this procedure have on their belonging and engaging in their communities?

Another structural component of school resources is apparent in the library's availability. While students in the suburban school had a well-stocked library with access to online resources, the urban students had to seek these resources outside school. This condition should be considered in relation to the notion of preparation for success, as at the time of the study, these young people were getting ready to enter college. Although urban students did not center their discussion on the lack of this important resource, merely acknowledging that they do not have a library, it is important to question how this experience affects their perspectives about education as a process of preparation for life in a particular community, and about their membership in their schools and local communities.

Additionally, the opportunities for engagement and resources supporting that involvement are different, and the students from the suburban school receive more than those in urban school. While students participating in the study are more active than most other students at their schools, they acknowledge this breakdown of opportunities in their respective communities and what is offered to peers in other schools. Once again, through this discussion, participants recognize the impact of such conditions on the social stratification of youth as citizens.

While this study was not on a quest to understand the complexities of educational places or the overall spaces of learning and shaping citizenship, it became clear that the participants' social place, which affects their social status, is being created through the process of learning for citizenship. Through the social inequalities evident in the community's resources, opportunities, and relations with youth, these young people are learning about becoming a success or a failure in their own spaces of existence. In her work on understanding youths' citizenship through urban geographies of education in the United Kingdom, Pykett (2009) summarizes that "the spatial contexts of schooling [have

an] impact on pupils' conditions of citizenship. Their relationships with others, expectations of themselves and others, aspirations and behaviours at school are shaped by these geographies." (p. 34) Similar to Pykett's work, this study reveals that youths' position in and relations with their schools and communities strongly shape their belonging, engagement, and even notions of being a citizen, who navigates a stratified spaces, in their community and society.

In their studies, Avery (2007) and Kahne and Middaugh (2008) point out that U.S. citizenship education programs do not produce equitable outcomes in civic knowledge, skills, and attitudes, due to uneven opportunities and access to education and these programs. Informed by her study indicating unequal preparation of youth as citizens in U.S. classrooms, Pace (2009) argues that "citizenship education research needs to pursue unequal preparation of citizens, and how this perpetuates social and political inequality." (p. 54) However, can and should we discuss citizenship without recognizing the differences in youths' experiences as impacted by community structures (resources and opportunities)? When the school is not producing the presumed outcomes, the community is expected to join the schools and provide greater and stronger learning opportunities for its youth. Yet, can communities compensate for the current state of youths' educational experiences and learning for citizenship? What happens if there is no strong community? And what if the community does not have strong expectations of its members?

Peerce (2002) suggests that citizenship is learned differently based on one's assumed status in society. Therefore, through the social stratification occurring in education and their communities, these youth become aware of the role of this process on their futures and their citizenship. Although this lesson is not explicit in their schooling and experiences, these youth learn that "particular and privileged identities can and have occupied the place of citizenship" (Arnot & Dillanbough, 2000, p. 3). As youth understand their place and role in society, they shape their identities, and hence their social citizenship.

Implications for Schools and Citizenship Education Programs: Potentials of Critical Citizenship

This section includes several implications for teachers and administrators as well as policy makers influencing citizenship education programs. The section focuses on potentials of education for critical citizenship as the form of citizenship that can address the institutional relations in today's complex societies; critical citizenship as the proposed goal for future generations was also discussed in chapter 2 of this thesis.

Depending on youths' goals and interests, interactions with their peers and adults, and available resources, citizenship education programs in a multicultural society have a potential of producing different results; namely, the programs guide youth to develop different sets of skills, values, behaviors, and even knowledge (Westheimer & Kahne, 2004). In addition, the structure of youths' communities and the availability of resources and opportunities have different impacts on youths' notions of belonging and engagement, as well as the idea of success. As education serves as a means of reproducing institutional social relations shaping citizenship and produces functioning members of society, it is important to raise a concern about what kind of citizenry is fostered and whether the reproduction of these relations further contributes to the social stratification of the members of a society.

Neoliberalism's prominent role in education today, which emphasizes measurable results about students as individuals, rather than community members, impacts educational policies and social processes in schools, communities, and families. Through the culture of competition discussed earlier, education's purpose has shifted to learning for high-test scores, becoming the main indicator in ensuring the well-being of the nation. In addition, education for success within the dominant, neoliberal institutional relations is not concerned with the issues of social justice. A successful citizen who is taught to value individual choices is not necessarily concerned with the collective, or with the well-being of communities that do not directly benefit her or his own existence. Therefore, the production of successful citizens reinforces existing social relations and prevents meaningful community relations. However, the participants of this study have expressed some concern about these community relations nurtured by the neoliberal policies, in particular when imagining their meaningful engagement with the communities. They are

disinterested in engaging in the activities that are expected of successful citizens where they do not feel as meaningful members; rather they wish to engage with others that are concerned about the same social issues benefiting their communities and producing a feeling of meaningful membership.

This study has affirmed the finding reported in the Civic Mission of Schools Report (Carnegie Corporation & CIRCLE, 2003), that the focus of citizenship education has been on learning the facts and achieving good scores on the standardized tests. In her research on classroom practices in citizenship education, Pace (2009) engaged with different classes on government in two diverse metropolitan schools. These courses "were all knowledge-based, and ... did not adequately prepare most students to be politically engaged citizens." (p. 12) The courses varied in content, emphasis on critical thinking, concern toward social justice, and student participation, which also led to different learning outcomes. One observed class was preparing for a state-level competition; Pace noted that if the class was less focused on the competition and more on discussion of controversial issues, the students "may have gained more experience in participation and insight into social justice." (p. 45) She comments that the focus on performing well at the competition took away certain types of engagement that otherwise could have been exercised. Similar observations were made in this study as well.

Overall, this study findings position the process of teaching for exams evident in this and other studies in juxtaposition with learning for citizenship. These two processes could be related to producing different outcomes or sets of competences, what Hoskins and Deakin Crick (2010) call "learning to learn competence" and "civic competence" (p. 121). From one perspective, these competencies are dichotomous, as they are "in competition for time and resources" (p.121) within state and national curricula. As such, "learning to learn competence is directed towards economic returns from the knowledge economy in the context of lifelong learning and ... civic competence is orientated towards the social outcomes of active citizenship and social cohesion." (p. 121) Similarly, teaching for exams could be observed as directed toward creating knowledge and skills necessary to perform well academically and eventually become successful and able to materially contribute to the society; learning for citizenship would lead to assisting students in developing attitudes and skills to apply their knowledge and their overall

competencies in their communities. Rather than viewing them as competing, Hoskins and Deakin Crick (2010) urge that these two outcomes as sets of competencies should be understood as complementary. Similarly to these two competencies, the outcomes of teaching for exams and learning for citizenship should be observed and approached as complementary, as the outcomes of "both [are] requirement[s] in relationship to real world tasks"; namely, they address "the need to learn how to learn in the knowledge society and the need to have the voices of citizens" (p. 134) in the communities.

Youths' recommendations for citizenship education include learning outside the classroom and school and moving away from learning how to do well on their exams. Additionally, they suggest providing more services to assist youth in finding community engagement opportunities. Moreover, a number of these youth call for equitable educational experiences that do not stratify students into successes and failures, but create expectations and employ methods leading to becoming "better" community members. In essence, the study shows that youths call for some version of meaningful learning experiences in their education for citizenship. Additionally, as citizenship is shaped in relations to others, engaging youth peers in both, the collective efforts of learning to learn and collective social action could assist youth shape their citizenship in relation to their peers and through these activities in relations to the spaces of their experiences as citizens. Peer pressure represents an important yet hidden dynamic impacting youths' engagement as citizens; this study suggests that schools and communities should consider how to approach and integrate this important process in citizenship education programs.

Bridging together teaching for exams and learning for citizenship to produce young, critical citizens is feasible, but likely requires not only teachers' use of creative and learner-oriented pedagogies as teachers in this study use, but also a larger societal commitment to providing necessary resources and opportunities to all youth. Ensuring that schools as educational places represent an "environment built on trust and respect, which is engaged with wider communities" (Hoskins & Deakin Crick, 2010, p. 134), these processes can together produce critical citizens capable of achieving academic success.

Citizenship education programs could concentrate both on individual success and critical citizenship by helping youths understand their personal responsibilities and

relations to the community while providing them with the educational opportunities to recognize and achieve their potential. As the focus on achievement heavily dominates education today, it is inevitable that youth will be taught about reaching some form of success. While it is necessary to assist young people in striving for larger individual goals and reaching all of their potential, it is also important for the sustainability of society to have all members care about their communities and all people within them. Therefore, in this process of teaching and learning in today's educational system, young people should learn from a critical citizenship framework about approaches to addressing the constraints affecting their and others citizenship.

Critical citizenship education allows for focus to be placed on producing youth as meaningful members of their communities concerned with sustainability of those communities, rather than on teaching youth to become successful citizens concerned primarily with the individual success in the competitive society. In their comparative study of research on critical citizenship, Johnson and Morris (2010) map the working framework for critical citizenship education, which identifies knowledge, skills, values and dispositions that an individual ought to develop in order to exude critical characteristics of citizenship. They note that the critical components within this framework are based on acknowledging the ideological, collective, reflective-subjective, and purposive engagement components of citizenship. In essence, the critical components within this framework suggest association of the terms "politics" and "ideology" in order to align the pedagogical approaches to the needs of a community or society. They also remind that inquiry into social issues ought to occur through a collective dialogue and within communities. Moreover, rather than focusing the learning on the objective truth, critical components within this framework suggest including learning about the individual's relationships with others and understanding one's subjectivity in creating their perspectives. Finally, engaging in the process of reflection and connecting it with the possible action assists in building the sense of agency as meaningful members of communities. This working framework assist in conceptualizing critical citizenship as a constantly evolving collaborative construction within societies and distinct from the participative citizens constructed within the paradigm concerned primarily with the individualistic performance.

DeJaeghere (2008) suggests that critical citizenship education can "help students and teachers understand their personal responsibility and place in society as part of a collective effort" (p. 296) and in such capacities contribute to the social cohesion within communities. Furthermore, critical citizenship education can respond to the needs of multicultural societies by using the knowledge acquired for producing successful citizens to not only benefit an individual citizen but also remove the inequalities produced among various citizens. As "[c]ritical citizenship education allows for the possibility of challenging and changing the way citizenship is experienced in the daily lives of diverse people within a nation-state" (DeJaeghere, 2009, p. 231) this approach to teaching and learning citizenship carries the greatest potential of integrating the wealth of knowledge transmitted to and created by students with their experiences as citizens.

The youth in this study rarely admitted experiencing critical forms of citizenship education; it was primarily mentioned by students attending the special curricular programs (UP or GK program). These youth acknowledge the social issues present in their communities but have rarely talked about engaging in a collective effort to change the relationships among the individuals and social relations (re)producing those issues. However, their imaginations and projections of future citizenship in which they will make a change indicates a strong potential for infusing forms of critical citizenship education into youths' educational experiences.

Finally, envisioning critical citizenship education programs is a task that is before not only teachers and school administrators, but also policy makers and all community members. While designing citizenship education programs for critical citizens, the following questions need to be considered: How can citizenship education facilitate a transition to being a critical citizen through meaningful learning opportunities? If students learn citizenship only in the safe environment of school, how will they function in areas different from their immediate communities? Finally, are we teaching youth different forms of citizenship based on their status and that of their communities?

Future Research

Many studies have explored youths' knowledge, skills, and attitudes toward citizenship or civic education. Future studies could expand several areas of the study's

findings. One possible approach is to see how the three dominant processes – belonging, engagement, and success – relate to youth when their responses are observed in particular demographic groupings based on ethnicity, immigration status, socio-economic position, or gender. The study could be expanded to include youth up to age 21, exploring whether or how their perspectives of belonging, engagement, and success change after high school. Including teachers and further understanding their role in shaping youths' citizenship, or interacting with different groups of students represents one more inquiry. Another proposal could include the researcher's involvement in the observed communities to further understand its effects on a school's locality and interaction with the school and students.

Study Findings Limitations

The study findings face a few limitations. This research focuses on uncovering similar processes that shape youths' citizenship in distinct places; while it makes a reference to the participants' position in their schools or communities, no further delineation is made among participants based on other lines such as gender, ethnicity, immigration status, socio-economic position, language, religion, or political affiliation. Therefore, it does not delve into the complexities of one's socially constructed categories of identity and how these affect citizenship identity. The decision not to include these parameters was guided by the search for uncovering the structures, processes, and how individuals interact with them. However, all of the above categories of identity are imperative for an even deeper understanding of youths' citizenship.

Concluding Remarks

The complex spaces of experiences within today's multicultural societies require that citizenship education programs are revisited for their alignment with the needs of these communities. In doing so, the policy makers and practitioners informing this work on shaping the new programs need to take into consideration youths' perspectives about and experiences of citizenship. As revealed in this study, youth shape their understandings of citizenship through the interplay of construction of belonging, engagement, and success within their communities. Young people negotiate their

multiple citizenship identities through the interaction of these three constructions and the institutional social relations predominantly within educational environment. As these identities are complex, citizenships education program need to be able teach youth about developing meaningful membership within all spaces of their experiences and their identities, so that they can not only advance themselves as individuals isolated from the larger society, but also contribute to the well-being of the community and challenge the injustices produced within their communities.

Epilogue

At the beginning of the group interviews, some students expressed that they really wanted to come to these interviews because they want to share their opinions. In the individual interviews many of students expanded on this earlier thought. As I was asking students if we have missed something in the group discussions, many have returned to their wish to participate in the study. They said that they are not asked these questions in- or out- of school, and they appreciated being asked, being able to share their experiences and express their perspectives. As a researcher who attempted to stay concerned with youths' voices (and not move into immediate interpretation, possibly misrepresenting those voices), I was humbled by their comments.

About a year later I was invited to join a state-level taskforce focusing on the civic literacy in the middle and high school state curriculum. The taskforce was asked to start discussion how to possibly reinvigorate the state curriculum – this purpose was rooted in the policy makers concern that the students are not being prepared well enough as citizens, which was evident in the test scores. The group was asked to develop a test that would tell the teachers, administrators and policy makers what is actually wrong with the current civics teaching and learning; a test would be based on the revised curriculum standards. The taskforce started discussions on what is missing in teaching and learning from their teacher or school administration experiences.

As I engaged in discussions, I was stricken by disconnect between theory, research, and practice in the work of this taskforce. I continued asking myself how to effectively apply the findings from my work to this discussion, and overall how to apply this research into practice. Teachers and administrators expressed interest in the study and hearing what the study has uncovered. However, the discussions that followed on what ought to be done continued in the same fashion as before hearing how young people from their state understand their citizenship and how their education relates to shaping their citizenship identities – they continued discussing the knowledge, skills and abilities citizens ought to have. Discussions were devoid of any references to youths' communities as spaces of their experiences, and to different relationships within society that impact their citizenship.

The taskforce moves slowly in her work, and as I continue engaging in the process of understanding youths' citizenship, I hope to continue informing this group about youths' perspectives and experiences; perhaps I become more effective in translating this research work into the practitioner vocabulary, and these practitioners become more willing to include the voices of youth in the new citizenship education programs.

References

Anyon, J. (2009). Introduction: Critical social theory, educational research, and intellectual agency. In Anyon, J. (ed). *Theoretical and educational research: Towards critical social explanations, (pp.1-24).* New York, NY: Routledge..

Apple, M. (2006). *Educating the "right" way: Markets, standards, God and inequality*.(2nd ed). New York, NY: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.

Arnot, M. (2006). Freedom's children: A gender perspective on the education of the learner-citizen. *International Review of Education,* (52), 67-87.

Arnot, M. (2006a). Gender equality, pedagogy and citizenship: Affirmative and transformative approaches in the UK. *Theory and Research in Education*, *4*(2); 131-150.

Arnot, M. (2001). *Reproducing gender?: Essays on educational theory and feminist politics*. New York, NY: RoutledgeFalmer.

Arnot, M. (1997). "Gendered citizenry": New feminist perspectives on education and citizenship. *British Educational Research Journal*, *23*(3), 275-295

Arnot, M., & Dillabough, J. A. (Eds.). (2000). *Challenging democracy: International perspectives on gender, education and citizenship*. New York, NY: RouthledgeFalmer.

Arnot, M., & Reay, D. (2007). A sociology of pedagogic voice: Power, inequality and pupil consultation. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education, 28*(3), 311-325.

Astiz, M. F. (2007). The challenges of education for citizenship: Local, national, and global spaces. *Comparative Education Review, 51*(1), 116-124.

Avery, P. (2007). *Civic education in diverse contexts: Challenges and opportunities*. Paper presented at the "Citizenship education in an age of worldwide migration" conferences in Muenster, Germany.

Banks, J. (2001). Citizenship education and diversity: Implications for teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 52*(1), 5-16.

Banks, J. (2005). Foreword. In A. Osler (Ed.), *Teachers, human rights and diversity: Educating citizens in multicultural societies* (pp. vii-x). Stoke on Trent, UK: Trentham Books.

Banks, J. (2006). Democracy, diversity, and social justice: Educating citizens for the public interests in a global age. In G. Ladson-Billings, & W. Tate (Eds.), *Education*

research in the public interest: Social justice, action, and policy (pp. 158-172). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Banks, J. (2007). *Educating citizens in a multicultural society* (2nd ed.). New York: Teachers College Press.

Banks, J. A. (2008). Diversity, group identity, and citizenship education in a global age. *Educational Researcher, 37*(3), 129-139.

Banks, J., Banks, C., Cortes, C., Hahn, C., Merryfield, M., Moodley, K., et al. (2005). Democracy and diversity: Principles and concepts for educating citizens in a global age. Seattle, WA: Center for Multicultural Education, University of Washington.

Baxter, J. (2002). A juggling act: A feminist poststructural analysis of girls' and boys' talk in the secondary classroom. *Gender and Education, 14*(1), 5-19.

Bonder, G. (2000). Young women in Argentina: Citizenship representations and practices in the context of transition. In Arnot, M. & J-A. Dillabough (Eds), *Challenging Democracy: International perspectives on gender, education and citizenship*. New York: RouthledgeFalmer.

Britzman, D.P. (2000). "The question of belief": Writing poststructural ethnography. In E.A. St. Pierre, & W.S. Pillow. (Eds.), *Working the ruins: Feminist poststructural theory and methods in education,* (pp. 27-40). New York, NY: Routledge.

Carnegie Corporation of New York & CIRCLE. (2003). *The civic mission of schools.* Retrieved on April 9, 2008 from http://civicmissionofschools.org/cmos/site/campaign/cms_report.html

Carspecken, P.F. (1996). *Critical ethnography in educational research: A theoretical and practical guide*.. New York, NY: Routledge.

Cho J. & Trent, A. (2006). Validity in qualitative research. *Qualitative Research, 6*(3), 319-340.

CIRCLE. (2008). About CIRCLE. College Park, MD: Center for Information & Research on Civic Learning and Engagement. Accessed in April, 2008 on http://www.civicyouth.org

Cogan, J. (1997). Multidimensional Citizenship: Educational Policy for the Twenty-first Century (Executive Summary). Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota.

Cook-Sather, A. (2007). Resisting the impositional potential of student voice work: Lessons for liberatory educational research from poststructuralist feminist critiques of critical pedagogy. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education, 28*(3), 389-403.

Cotton, K. (1996). Educating for citizenship. School improvement research series IX. *Portland, OR: Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory,* Retrieved on April 9, 2008.

Davies, I., Gregory, I., & Riley, R. (1999). *Good citizenship and educational provision*. New York, NY: Garland Inc.

Davies, I., Evans, M., & Reid, A. (2005). Globalising citizenship education? A critique of 'global education' and 'citizenship education'. *British Journal of Educational Studies, 53*(1), 66-89.

DeJaeghere, J. (2002). *Citizenship and citizenship education in Australia: New meanings in an era of globalization*. Unpublished dissertation. The University of Minnesota.

DeJaeghere, J. (2007). Intercultural meaning of citizenship in the Australian secondary curriculum: Between critical contestations and minimal constructions. In D. Stevick, & A. Levinson (Eds.), *Reimagining civic education: How diverse societies form democratic citizens* (pp. 293-316). Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

DeJaeghere, J. (2008). Citizenship as privilege and power: Australian educators' lived experience as citizens. *Comparative Education Review, 52(3),* 357-380.

DeJaeghere, J. (2009). Critical citizenship education for multicultural societies. *Interamerican Journal of Education for Democracy, 2(2),* 223-236.

Demarath, P. (2009). *Producing success: The culture of personal advancement in an American high school.* Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Fielding, M. (2007). Beyond "voice": New roles, relations, and contexts in researching with young people. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education, 28*(3), 301-310.

Flanagan, C. (2004). Volunteerism, leadership, political socialization, and civic engagement. In Lerner, R. M. & Steinberg, L. (Eds). *Handbook of adolescent psychology,* (2nd ed.) (pp. 721-745). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons Inc.

Freeman, M., deMarrais, K., Preissle, J., Roulston, K., & St Pierre, E. A. (2007). Standards of evidence in qualitative research: An incitement to discourse. *Educational Researcher, 36*(1), 25-30.

Giroux, H. (1980). Critical theory and rationality in citizenship education. *Curriculum Inquiry, 10*(4), 329-366.

Giroux, H. (2005). The terror of neoliberalism: Rethinking the significance of cultural politics. *College Literature, 32(1),* 1-19.

Hahn, C. (2005). Diversity and human rights learning in England and the United States. In A. Osler (Ed.), *Teachers, human rights and diversity: Educating citizens in multicultural societies* (pp. 23-40). Stoke on Trent, UK; Sterling, VA: Trentham Books.

Hart, R. (1992). Children's participation: From tokenism to citizenship. *Innocenti Essays, Vol.4.* Florence, Italy: UNICEF International Child Development Centre. Retrieved April 16, 2008, from www.unicef-irc.org

Hart, R. (1995). Children as the makers of a new geography. In *Building identities: Gender perspectives on children and urban space,* (pp. 41-47). Amsterdam: Department of Human Geography, University of Amsterdam,

Hobbs, F. & Stoops, N. (2002). *Demographic trends in the 20th century: Census 2000 special report.* U.S. Census Bureau. Retrieved on August 19, 2008, from http://www.census.gov/population/www/cen2000/briefs/index.html

Homana, G., Barber, C. H & Torney-Purta, J. (2006). *Assessing school citizenship education climate: Implications for the social studies.* CIRCLE Working paper 48. University of Maryland: The Center for Information and Research on Civic Learning and Engagement (CIRCLE).

Hoskins, B. & Deakin Crick, R. (2010). Competences for learning to learn and active citizenship: Different currencies or two sides of the same coin? *European Journal of Education. 45*(1,) Part II, 121-137.

IEA Civic Education Study. (2008). Home page. International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement t. Accessed in April, 2008 on http://www.wam.umd.edu/~jtpurta

Johnson, L. & Morris, P. (2010). Towards a framework for critical citizenship education. *Curriculum Journal, 21*(1), 77-96.

Kahne, J. E., & Sporte, S. E. (2008). Developing citizens: The impact of civic learning opportunities on students' commitment to civic participation. *American Educational Research Journal, 45*(3), 738-766.

Kahne, J., & Middaugh, E. (2008). High quality civic education: What is it and who gets it? *Social Education, 72*(1), 34-39.

Katz, C. (2001). Vagabond capitalism and the necessity of social reproduction. *Antipode, 33*(4), 709-728.

Kennedy, K. J., Hahn, C. L., & Lee, W. (2008). Constructing citizenship: Comparing the views of students in Australia, Hong Kong, and the United States. *Comparative Education Review, 52*(1), 53-91.

Kincheloe, J.L. & McLaren, P. (2000). Rethinking critical theory and qualitative research. In Denzin, N. & Lincoln, Y. (Eds.) , *Handbook of qualitative research*, 2nd (Eds.), (pp. 279-314). Thousands Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc..

Knight, J. (2003). Updating the definition of internationalization. *International Higher Education, 33*. Retrieved August 10, 2007, from http://www.bc.edu/bc_org/avp/soe/cihe/newsletter/News33/text001.htm

Kymlicka, W. (1995). *Multicultural citizenship: A liberal theory of minority rights*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Kymlicka, W. (2003). Multicultural states and intercultural citizens. *Theory and Research in Education, 1*(2), 147-169.

Kvale, S. (1996). *InterViews: An introduction to qualitative research interviewing.* Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications.

Ladson-Billings, G. (2005). Differing concepts of citizenship: Schools and communities as sites of civic development. In N. Noddings (Ed.), *Educating citizens for global awareness* (pp. 69-80). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Lapayese, Y. V. (2003). Toward a critical global citizenship education. *Comparative Education Review, 47*(4), 493-501.

Levine, P. (2007). *The future of democracy: Developing the next generation of American citizens* Medford, MA: Tufts University Press.

Levinson, B. (2005). Citizenship, identity, democracy: Engaging the political in the anthropology of education. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly, 36*(4), 329-340.

Levinson, B. & Holland, D. (1996). The cultural production of the educated person: An introduction. In Levinson, B. Foley, D., & Holland D. (Eds.), *The cultural production of the educated person: Critical ethnographies of schooling and local practice* (pp. 1-56). Albany, NY: SUNY Pres.

Lister, R. (2007). Why citizenship: Where, when and how children? *Theoretical Inquiries in Law, 8*(2), 693-718.

Lister, R., Smith, N., Middleton, S., & Cox, L. (2003). Young people talk about citizenship: Empirical perspectives on theoretical and political debates. *Citizenship Studies, 7*(2), 235-253.

Madison, D. S. (2005). *Critical ethnography: Method, ethics, and performance.* Sage Publications.

Marshall, C., & Rossman, G. B. (1989). *Designing qualitative research*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Marston, S. (2000). The social construction of scale. *Progress in Human Geography*, 24(2), 219-242.

McIntosh, P. (2005). Gender perspectives on educating for global citizenship. In N. Noddings (Ed.), *Educating citizens for global awareness* (pp. 22-39) Teachers College Press.

McLaughlin, T. H. (1992). Citizenship, diversity and education: A philosophical perspective. *Journal of Moral Education, 21*(3), 235-250.

Melaville, A., Berg, A. C. & Blank, M.J. (2006). Community-Based Learning: Engaging Students for Success and Citizenship. Washington, D.C.: Coalition for Community Schools .

Merriam, S. (2002). Qualitative Research in Practice: Examples for Discussion and Analysis (Editor). Jossey-Bass.

Nussbaum (1994). Patriotism and cosmopolitanism. *Boston Review, 19(5).*

Nygreen, K. (2008). Urban youth and the construction of racialized and classed political identities. In Bixby, J. & Pace, J. (Eds.), *Educating democratic citizens in troubled times: Qualitative studies of current efforts,* (pp. 81-106). Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Ong, A. (1996). Cultural citizenship as subject-making: Immigrants negotiate racial and cultural boundaries in the United States. *Current Anthropology, 37*(5), 737-762.

Osler, A. (2005). Looking into the future: Democracy, diversity and citizenship education. In A. Osler (Ed.), *Teachers, human rights and diversity: Educating citizens in multicultural societies* (pp. 3-22). Stoke on Trent, UK; Sterling, VA: Trentham Books.

Osler, A. & Starkey, H. (2001). Citizenship education and national identities in France and England: Inclusive or exclusive? *Oxford Review of Education, 27*(2), 287-305.

Osler, A., & Starkey, H. (2003). Learning for cosmopolitan citizenship: Theoretical debates and young people's experiences. *Educational Review, 55*(3), 243-254.

Osler, A., & Starkey, H. (2005). Education for democratic citizenship: A review of research, policy and practice 1995–2005. *Research Papers in Education, 21*(4), 433-466.

Pace, J.L. (2008). Teaching for citizenship in 12th grade government classes. In Bixby S.& Pace, J.L. (eds). *Educating democratic citizens in troubled times: Qualitative studies of current efforts,* (pp.25-57)*.* Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Patton, M. Q. (1987). *How to use qualitative methods in evaluation*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications Inc.

Preece, J. (2002). Feminist perspectives on the learning of citizenship and governance. *Compare, 32*(1), 21-33.

Pykett, J. (2009). Making citizens in the classroom: An urban geography of citizenship education? *Urban Studies, 46*(4), 803-823.

Rizvi, F. (2005). Identity, culture and cosmopolitan futures. *Higher Education Policy, 18*(4), 9-18.

Ropers-Huilman, B. (1999). Witnessing: Critical inquiry in a poststructural world. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 12*(1), 21-35.

Ross, A. (2007). Multiple identities and education for active citizenship. *British Journal of Educational Studies, 55*(3), 286-303.

Rubin, H.J. & Rubin, I.S. (2005). *Qualitative interviewing: The art of hearing data* (2nd edition). Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications.

Rust, V. D. (2003). Editorial: Method and methodology in comparative education. *Comparative Education Review, 47*(3), iii-vii.

Satterfield, T. (2004). A few thoughts on combining qualitative and quantitative methods. In C. Ragin, J. Nagel & P. White (Eds.), *Workshop on scientific foundations of qualitative research* (pp. 117-121). National Science Foundation.

Sax, L. J. (2004). Citizenship development and the American college student. *New Directions for Institutional Research, 2004*(122), 65-80.

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.

St. Pierre, E. A. (2000). Poststructural feminism in education: An overview. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 13*(5), 477-515.

St. Pierre, E. A., & Pillow, W. S. (2000). Introduction: Inquiry among the ruins. In E.A. St. Pierre, & W.S. Pillow. (Eds.), *Working the ruins: Feminist poststructural theory and methods in education,(pp.1-24)*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Starkey, H. (2002). *Active citizenship and the lifelong learning agenda*. Paper presented at Danish EU Presidency Conference, Snekkersten, Denmark.

Stevick, D. & A. Levinson (Eds.) (2007). *Reimagining civic education: How diverse societies form democratic citizens*. Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Stromquist, N. P. (2002). *Education in a globalized world: The connectivity of economic power, technology, and knowledge*. Lanham, Md.: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Stromquist, N. P. (2002a). Globalization, the I, and the other. *Current Issues in Comparative Education, 4*(2), 87-94. Teachers College, Columbia University.

Stromquist, N. P. (2006). Women's rights to adult education as a means to citizenship. *International Journal of Educational Development, 26*(2), 140-152.

Stromquist, N. P. (2008). *Theorizing global citizenship.* Paper presented at the Comparative and International Education Society Annual Meeting in New York, NY.

Torney-Purta, J., Lehmann, R, Oswald, H. & W. Schultz. (2001). *Citizenship and education in twenty-eight countries: Civic knowledge and engagement at age fourteen*. Amsterdam: The International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement.

Torney-Purta, J., & Amadeo, J. A. (2003). A cross-national analysis of political and civic involvement among adolescents. *PS: Political Science and Politics, 36*(02), 269-274.

Torney-Purta, J., & Barber, C. H. (2004). *Strengths and weaknesses in US students' knowledge and skills: Analysis from the IEA Civic Education Study.* Fact Sheet. University of Maryland: The Center for Information and Research on Civic Learning and Engagement (CIRCLE).

Torres, C. A. (1998). *Democracy, education, and multiculturalism: Dilemmas of citizenship in a global world*. Lanham, MD.: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

United Nations. (1948). Universal declaration of human rights. Adopted and proclaimed by General Assembly resolution 217 A (III). Retrieved on December 12, 2006, from http://www.unhchr.ch/udhr/

United Nations. (1989). Convention on the rights of the child. Adopted by General Assembly resolution 44/25; entry into force September 2, 1990. Retrieved on August 18, 2008, from http://www.unhchr.ch/html/menu3/b/k2crc.htm

UNICEF (2006). Youth Participation Guide. Retrieved April 16, 2008, from http://www.unicef.org/adolescence/index_38074.html

UN Millennium Project. (2006). *About MDGs.* Retrieved July 7, 2008, from http://www.unmillenniumproject.org/goals/index.htm

UN Programme on Youth. (2008). *Youth and United Nations: Frequently asked questions.* Retrieved November 5, 2008, from http://www.un.org/esa/socdev/unyin/qanda.htm

Varenne, H. & McDermott, R. (1998). *Successful failure: The school America Builds*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Westheimer, J. (2004). Introduction—The politics of civic education. *PS: Political Science and Politics, 37*(02), 231-235.

Westheimer, J., & Kahne, J. (2004). What kind of citizen? The politics of educating for democracy. *American Educational Research Journal, 41*(2), 237-269.

Westheimer J. & Kahne, J. (2004a). Educating the "good" citizen: Political choices and pedagogical goals. *Political Science Online* 38*(2), 241-246.*

Willis, P. (2003). Foot soldiers of modernity: The dialectics of cultural consumption and the 21st-century school. *Harvard Educational Review, 73*(3), 390-415.

Wolcott, H (2001). Writing up qualitative research. 2nd ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Appendix A: IRB Approval Letter

02/19/2009

Jasmina Josic
260 Frankiln Turnpike Apt. 420
Mahwah, NJ 07430

RE: "Critical Understanding of Citizenship in a Multicultural Society: U.S. Youths' Citizenship and its Implications for Citizenship Education Programs in Globalized Times"
IRB Code Number: 0901P57004

Dear Ms. Josic

The Institutional Review Board (IRB) received your response to its stipulations. Since this information satisfies the federal criteria for approval at 45CFR46.111 and the requirements set by the IRB, final approval for the project is noted in our files. Upon receipt of this letter, you may begin your research.

IRB approval of this study includes the consent forms and assent form dated February 16, 2009.

The IRB would like to stress that subjects who go through the consent process are considered enrolled participants and are counted toward the total number of subjects, even if they have no further participation in the study. Please keep this in mind when calculating the number of subjects you request. This study is currently approved for 80 subjects. If you desire an increase in the number of approved subjects, you will need to make a formal request to the IRB.

For your records and for grant certification purposes, the approval date for the referenced project is February 11, 2009 and the Assurance of Compliance number is FWA00000312 (Fairview Health Systems Research FWA00000325, Gillette Children's Specialty Healthcare FWA00004003). Research projects are subject to continuing review and renewal; approval will expire one year from that date. You will receive a report form two months before the expiration date. If you would like us to send certification of approval to a funding agency, please tell us the name and address of your contact person at the agency.

As Principal Investigator of this project, you are required by federal regulations to inform the IRB of any proposed changes in your research that will affect human subjects. Changes should not be initiated until written IRB approval is received. Unanticipated problems or serious unexpected adverse events should be reported to the IRB as they occur.

The IRB wishes you success with this research. If you have questions, please call the IRB office at 612-626-5654.

Sincerely,
Felicia Mroczkowski, CIP
Research Compliance Supervisor
FM/egk
CC: Joan Dejaeghere

Appendix B: IRB Forms

STUDENT ASSENT FORM (Interviews)

I would like to ask of your willingness to participate in the research study focusing on the understanding how youth constructs their meaning of citizenship. The study will take place during the period of January 26 – May 8, 2008.

In this research study, I would like to inquire about your perspectives on how you discuss what citizenship means, your experiences as citizens in local communities, on a state or national level, and your views on how citizenship can be exercised on the global level. The goal of this research project is to develop understanding of your constructs of citizenship in today's global multicultural society. In this study, I would like to ask you to discuss what the term citizenship means to you, and not to be discussed as a legal term. If you agree to be in this study, I would ask you to participate in weekly small group interviews (meeting once a week in one of the approved conference rooms at the school), share the perspectives on the group interview via secured online form, and meet individually with me for a follow-up interview at the end of the group interviews. The small group interview will be digitally recorded. If you agree to participate, your opinions of this topic will be known to me, as the researcher. In addition, your opinions, but NOT your name will be used in the researcher's discussion of the overall youths' perspectives on citizenship. However, by participating in this study you will assist me in practicing valuable research skills towards completing the dissertation work, and in enhancing my understanding of youth's perspectives on citizenship. Additionally, you will have someone listen attentively to your opinions on this topic.
The records of this study will be kept private. If any sort of report is published, the reports or papers will not include any information that will make it possible to identify you as a participant, ensuring your anonymity. The research records will be stored securely and the access to the records will be available only to me as the researcher.

Please note that participation in this study is voluntary. Your decision whether or not to participate will not affect your current status at your high school. If you decide to participate, you do not have to answer any question that you do not wish, and you may withdraw at any time without affecting the student status. *And, if* you change your mind during the study, you can always withdraw.
You can ask any questions that you have about this study. If you have a question later that you did not think of now, you can contact me, the researcher (Jasmina Josic) at bisa0013@umn.edu. By signing below you are confirming that you have read this paper or had it read to you and that you are willing to participate in this study. If you do not want to be in this study, do not sign. Remember, being in this study is up to you, and your status at [School's name] will not be affected if you do not sign this or even if you change your mind later.

Signature of participant: _____
Signature of the researcher: _____
Date: _____

PARENT/GUARDIAN CONSENT FORM (Interviews)

Your child is invited to participate in a research study focusing on citizenship education programs for today's youth. Your child was selected as a possible participant because she/he is attending the advanced social studies classes at the [School's name]. Please read this form and ask any questions you may have before agreeing for your child to be in the study.

This is a dissertation research study conducted by Jasmina Josic, Ph.D. Candidate, Department of Educational Policy and Administration at the University of Minnesota. Jasmina Josic has also conducted two small pilot studies on his topic with the students at the NJ Governor's School of International Studies.

Background Information

The purpose of this study is to explore students' perspectives on how they develop the meaning of social citizenship, their experiences as citizens in their communities, on the state or national level, and their views on how citizenship can be exercised on the global level. Understanding youths' perspectives and experiences would provide the background for developing recommendations for citizenship education programs for youth.

Procedures:
The researcher would ask your child to participate in weekly small group interviews (meeting once a week in one of the approved conference rooms at the school), share the comments on the group interview via secured online form, and meet individually with the researcher for a follow-up interview after the end of the group interviews (in one of the school's conference room). The small group interview will be audio recorded.

Risks and Benefits of being in the Study
The study has some minimal risks. Your child's opinions of the topic, but NOT their name, will be made known to the researcher and used in the researcher's discussion of the overall youths' perspectives on citizenship. Also, your child will be asked to give up some of their free time during after-class period.

The benefits to participation are minimal. Your child will have someone listen attentively to their opinions on this topic. Also, during the group interviews, the researcher will provide the students with the snacks. Additionally, your child will assist the researcher in practicing valuable research skills, and enhancing her understanding of youth's perspectives on citizenship.

Confidentiality:
The records of this study will be kept private. In any sort of report the researcher might publish, she will not include any information that will make it possible to identify your child, ensuring the privacy of your child and all students participating in this study. Research records will be stored securely, and only the researcher will have access to the

records. All digital recordings will be deleted after transcribing the discussions, and only the researcher will have access to transcribed records.

Voluntary Nature of the Study:
Participation in this study is voluntary. Your decision whether or not your child will participate will not affect student record at the [School's name] or your child's future relations with the University of Minnesota. If you decide for your child to participate, your child is free to not answer any question or to withdraw at any time without affecting those relationships.

Contacts and Questions:
The researcher conducting this study is Jasmina Josic. You may ask any questions you have. If you have questions later, **you are encouraged** to contact Jasmina Josic at 201-887-5683, bisa0013@umn.edu . You may also contact researcher's adviser, Dr. Joan DeJaeghere at 612-626-8258 or deja0003@umn.edu , or Dr. David Chapman at 612-626-8728 or chapm026@umn.edu.

If you have any questions or concerns regarding this study and would like to talk to someone other than the researcher, **you are encouraged** to contact the Research Subjects' Advocate Line, D528 Mayo, 420 Delaware St. Southeast, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455; (612) 625-1650.

You will be given a copy of this information to keep for your records.

Statement of Consent:

I have read the above information. I have asked questions and have received answers.

*(If you consent for your child to participate, you **do not need to sign this form**; please keep the form for your records).*

By signing below **I DO NOT** consent for my child to participate in the study.

Signature of parent or guardian:

_____ Date: _____
(If minors are involved)

Signature of the researcher: _____

Date: _____

Appendix C: Sample Questions for Small Group Interviews[8]

Interviews started after three weeks of class observations. Students were asked these questions over the period of three to five meetings. The emerging relevant topics were included in the interviews in the form of questions or discussion scenarios.

1. Can you tell me your names and tell me more about yourselves?

2. Can you describe your community (the community where you currently live)? If it is not the same, can you describe the community where you have spent the most of your life so far?
    a. How would you describe your nation?

3. Can you describe how you see yourself as a citizen in your community, in your nation, and in the world? *(to be prompted for each level if needed)*

4. Can you give me some examples of your experience of being a citizen? *(to be prompted for each level)*
    a. Local community context
    b. National context
    c. Global context

5. In which of these community contexts (local-cultural, national, global) are you most active as a citizen? Why?

6. Can you think of some experiences that played an important role in shaping how you think about citizenship?
    a. What stands out in these experiences? Why have they played an important role?

7. Sometimes we have opportunity to observe our friends' experiences as citizens. Can you give me some examples of your friends' experiences as citizens? (*local, national, or global context*)
    a. In what ways do their experiences as citizens affect you, if at all?

8. I would like to focus this question specifically at educational experiences. You are a student of this school. In which class, activity, or a portion of the school day do you feel you most belong to? Why?
    a. Can you explain your feeling of belonging through an example of that activity/class/part of the day?

9. What has been the role of your education in preparing you as a citizen?

---

[8] The interview questions were developed out of the small research study with high school students in July 2007 and were piloted in July 2008. The questions were further expanded with additional questions stemming from the theoretical discussion in the study's literature review section.

   a. Can you think of any experiences during your education to illustrate this role?
   b. How has this program [social studies or extra-curricular] contributed to your sense of and engagement as a citizen? Or how has is not contributed?
   c. If you could then summarize, has your educational experiences contributed, or did not contribute, to your sense of being a citizen?
   d. If you could make these decisions, what would you add in your education to prepare you as a citizen at all three levels: local-cultural, national, and global context?

10. How and when are you not able to act as a citizen?
    a. In which way these experiences hold you back in enacting your citizenship? Why do they occur?

11. What could assist you and better enable you to act as citizen? *(to be prompted for each level)*
    a. Local community context
    b. National context
    c. Global context

12. In your opinion, what are some expectations a community (or a society) has of you as a citizen right now?
    a. What might be the community's (society's) expectations of you as an adult?

13. How would you explain to someone else what does "citizenship" mean?
    a. What are some words that you associate with the term "citizenship"?

14. The term "global citizen" is often used today. How would you describe a "global citizen"?
    a. Is a global citizen the same as a citizen living in a globalized world? Can you explain difference/sameness through some examples?
    b. What are the key characteristics of a citizen that is living in today's globalized world?
    c. What are the key characteristics of a "global citizen"

15. Many researchers talk about different types of citizenship, such as good citizen, active citizen, critical citizen. What do these terms mean to you?
    a. What does good citizenship mean? What does active citizenship mean? What does critical citizen mean?
    b. Can you discus why so many different terms for citizenship?
    c. Is there a difference between these terms? If so what is the difference?
16. What kind of a citizen are you?
17. How do you see your future?
    a. What kind of citizen you wish to be in the future?

18. Is there anything else you would like to add about this topic that I didn't address in the previous questions?

Appendix D: Study Participants

Table 1: Participants

Participants	Gender	Special Program	Background	Interviewing (group [G], individual [I])
MVHS				
Seniors				
Jack	M	UP	Italian American	G+I
Max	M	UP	Caucasian	G+I
Jennifer	F	UP	White	G+I
Anna	F	UP	White	G
Lara	F	UP	Lebanese-Syrian American	G+I
Amy	F	UP	Chinese American	G+I
Margaret	F	UP	Irish American	G+I
Susi	F	UP	White	G
Amelia	F		White	G+I
Juniors				
Kim	F		White	G+I
Al	M		Italian American	G+I
Patricia	F		White	G
Laurie	F		White	G+I
Amanda	F	UP	Irish American	G+I
Juliann	F		White	G+I
Lisa	F		White	G
Darlene	F		White	G
FHHS				
Seniors				
Derek	M		African American	G
Juniors				
Nico	M	GK	DR/Nicaraguan	G+I
Amira	F	GK	African American/Trini/Guyanese	G+I
Stephanie	F		African American/Caribbean	G
Tanya	F	GK	Panamanian/American	G+I
Whitney	F	GK	African American	G+I
India	F		African American	G
Roni	M	GK	Black	G+I
Anthony	M		American/Jamaican	G
Samuel	M		African American/Jamaican/Asian	G
Dustin	M		Black/St. Lucian	G

Table 1 summarizes basic information about the participants. Background information for students is based on their self-identifying; thus some referred to White, others to Italian American, in a sense mixing ethnic heritage with race. For participants who did not provide information on their background, the U.S. census categories are

used. It is important to note that unless students have specifically identified themselves as African American, they are reported as Black due to a fair number of participants having origin from the Caribbean nations. The participants were not asked specifically about their immigrant nor their socio-economic background; unless the participants shared specific personal details or experiences, descriptions of the communities largely provide a picture of participants' immigrant and socio-economic backgrounds.