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ABSTRACT

Increasingly youths are becoming the focus of attention in international development discourses. This growing focus is the result of the recognition that youths are often overlooked as potential agents of development. Consequently there is currently an advocacy for participatory development approaches that enable people to take active roles in the decisions and actions pertaining to the development of their societies. The United Nations (UN) is one of several development agencies advocating and facilitating the use of these approaches, alongside the concept empowerment, for youth. This study analyses key UN documents and projects developed for youth, governments and development practitioners. The findings of the study suggest that some of the ways through which the UN seeks to mobilize youth to participate in development leads to the formation of identities that inform but, sometimes distort their experiences. Finally the study recommends more critical analysis of social participation and empowerment frameworks.
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**LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS**

<table>
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<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
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<tbody>
<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>GUIC PNG</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDR</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSU</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCM</td>
<td>Making Commitments Matter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRSPs</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN</td>
<td>United Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNA-C</td>
<td>United Nations Association Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>United Nations Development Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNECA</td>
<td>United Nations Economic Commission for Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNESCO</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNPY</td>
<td>United Nations Programme on Youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPT</td>
<td>Tackling Poverty Together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YPM</td>
<td>Youth Participation Manual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YPFM</td>
<td>Youth Policy Formational Manual</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

Introduction

Youth empowerment through participation is a theme that is being actively explored by governments, policy makers, and international development agencies. For governments and policymakers, achieving full youth participation begins with social policies related to youth. As Pittman et al. (2002) argue, “social policy should prominently feature the voices and actions of young people themselves as agents of positive change” (Pittman et al. 2002: 155). It has also been argued that including adolescents in the construction of the social policies that affects their lives will result in the construction of better societies (Saraswarthi & Larson, 2002; Pittman et al. 2002). Examples of these ideas in practice are especially evident in the approaches taken to young people in development by the United Nations (UN). The UN’s World Programme of Action for Youth, created in 1995, was developed under the premise that governments, policy makers and organizations should work to provide young people with the opportunities to participate fully in their societies. This programme has informed many development-centred programmes in practice today. Though it has been recognized that making youth active participants in the development process presents many challenges (UN, 2003:282), the UN stands firm on its stance that providing young people with opportunities to participate in their societies will significantly improve their situations and thereby increase their quality of life (United Nations, 1996). However, there has been very little, if any, scholarly examination of what is claimed and what is enacted in these UN-based approaches to youth and development.
My interest in this topic has grown out of my observation that there is limited research on the impact of participatory development interventions on young people. I have found that much of the UN literature on youth and development centres on the need to provide youth with the opportunities to lead successful lives, particularly in a globalizing world. Much of this literature advocates the use of participatory approaches in youth centred programs and policy development, but does not take a critical stance on what the implications of these approaches might be for the identities and existence of young people. In short, these participation-oriented programmes, their effects, and the concepts behind their inception present a real opportunity for further study.

The purpose of this study is to examine the effects of UN led strategies that seek to integrate youth\(^1\) in developing and underdeveloped countries in development processes. In doing so, this study will explore the ways young people are being mobilized through participation, as guided by the goal of empowerment in UN discourses and UN poverty alleviation strategies. Using the theoretical frame of governmentality, this project will examine the types of practices used in development discourses that facilitate and rationalize the governing of young people. This study will be based on an analysis of key UN documents, including Training Manuals and case studies, on young people’s participation. These documents provide the contexts through which the concepts of participation, empowerment and governance can be gauged.

There is wide recognition that developing countries face many adversities (UN 1996, 2003; Escobar, 1995). These adversities centre in large part on poverty and its

\(^1\)Though the concept of ‘youth’ is highly malleable and hence open to varying definitions, the term as used in this project will carry the UN definition which states that youth are those individuals between the ages of 15 and 24. (UN World Youth Report 2005)
wider impacts. Current discussions about social progress are often linked to the alleviation of dismal social and economic conditions present within these societies. According to the United Nations, the extent to which a country can be distinguished as developed or developing is dependent on that country's level of "human development" (UN Human Development Report, 2006). Stressing that human development deals more with increasing freedoms leading to capabilities other than income, the UN argues that "the most basic capabilities for human development are to lead long and healthy lives, to be knowledgeable, to have access to the resources needed for a decent standard of living and to be able to participate in the life of the community" (UN HDR, 2006).

Unfortunately, many countries do not possess these desired conditions for their citizens. Indeed, many people living in developing countries, particularly young people, face a bleak future. Key areas of concern for youth, according to the UN, include: youth in the global economy, which encompasses hunger, poverty, education, globalization and information technology; youth in civil society, comprising mainly of issues related to the environment, leisure, participation and intergenerational concerns; and youth at risk, which focuses on the areas of health, HIV/AIDS, youth delinquency and drug abuse (United Nations World Youth Report, 2005). The UN has argued that these issues result in the overall instability of many countries and pose dire consequences for young people and their communities, especially since the adversities and successes youth face become reflected on their societies (United Nations, 2005).

As is evident from the above discussion, the UN has taken strong interest in young people, especially within the development context. Discussions about youth are usually centred on the view that young people have "roles" to play in their societies.
Historically viewed as a dependent group, discussions in recent decades have taken the position that young people can play meaningful and active roles in their societies. It is important to note, however, that the present day notions of youth have not always existed. Generally speaking, concepts surrounding the meaning of youth are based on the social, political and cultural circumstances of young people’s societies (Wyn & White, 1997). As such, concepts of youth change alongside the transformation of the societies in which they live. The earliest notions of youth were centred on the scientific analysis of youth as a group, with the focus on the physiological impacts of young people’s bodies on their lives (Kett, 1971). The “modern” notion of adolescence is attributed to G. Stanley Hall, who viewed adolescence as a second birth describing it as a period marked by a sudden rise of “moral idealism, chivalry, and religious enthusiasm” (Kett, 1971: 283). This depiction laid the foundations for later scholarship that would render youth as a particular type of being to be examined (Kett, 1971). These “types of beings” include their later portrayal as victimized, dependent, delinquent and dangerous individuals (Pittman et al. 2002).

Though some of these views still operate today, current discourses on youth have indicated an overwhelming shift towards the position that young people can and should play greater roles in their societies. This perspective has especially been actively explored by governments, policy makers, and development agencies. Today, many of the claims about youth and development are juxtaposed with the ways in which successful development of developing countries can be achieved. The argument has been made that the current social environments in which youth live do not afford them the opportunities to effectively develop as individuals, which in turn has implications for their abilities to
contribute to the effective development of their societies (United Nations, 1996; 2003; 2005). As well, it has been argued that young people worldwide have not been utilized as the valuable tools for advocacy and change that they can be in the development of their societies (Irby et al. 2001). These concerns justify the increased focus on youth within the development context (United Nations, 2003; 2004). As well, they justify the need to relate the positions of young people with development interventions, especially those related to poverty reduction. Today, poverty alleviation initiatives traditionally situated within the context of adulthood are now being viewed as dependent on the actions of young people as well (World Bank, 2005: 11-12; Lentz, 1995: 396; Knowles et al. 2003).

For those seeking to increase the participation of youth in development initiatives, it is imperative that the issues facing young people receive immediate attention in order to curtail any effects they may have on young people’s societies (United Nations, 2005). Additionally, it is encouraged that these solutions speak to and facilitate the belief that young people can be agents of positive societal change (Irby et al. 2001; Checkoway et al. 1998). In all, the above assertions lead to the claim that any courses of action taken to improve the situation of young people in society must also incorporate young people in the process. The UN captured this essence well when it stated that, “the imagination, ideals and energies of young women and men are vital for the continuing development of the societies in which they live” (United Nations, 2005).

The UN-based approaches discussed above are largely informed by the concepts of empowerment and participation. The focus on young people’s positions within society is based on the idea that “action” leads to empowerment, which invariably leads to “development”. Though a contentious concept, empowerment is generally defined as a
multidimensional process that allows people to gain control of their own lives (Page & Czuba, 1999). It is argued that when people become empowered, they are more inclined to take effective roles in their lives and hence in their societies (Mehra, 1997).

As well, empowerment within international development initiatives is said to involve the acknowledgement of multiple layers of power – social, political, and psychological – all viewed as encompassing the lives of individuals in the developing world (Friedmann, 1992; Singh & Titi 1995). Here, social power refers to people’s participation in social organizations as well as their ability to access various kinds of knowledge. Political power refers to individuals’ accessibility to the political decisions that affect their lives while psychological power refers to individuals’ sense of power largely resulting from their active participation in the political processes that impact their existence (Friedmann, 1992; Singh & Titi 1995). From this perspective, each of these layers of power informs people’s action and/ or inaction within their societies. This focus on action is significantly linked to approaches to participation in development studies, which is now viewed as a prominent feature in development discourses (Botchway, 2000).

Participation in development is described as a process that increases people’s contributions in the matters that directly affect their lives (Jennings, 2000). This process is aimed at giving a voice to the marginalized by facilitating their involvement in the design, and implementation of interventions and programs (Kesby, 2005). At present, participatory approaches are widely used and idealized in development discourses (Platteau & Abraham, 2002). Among the reasons for this idealization is the notion that those facing dire situations are most motivated to move out of them (Narayan, 2005), a view which further reinforces the focus on people’s participation at many levels. As such,
the perspective that youth can and should take meaningful roles in their societies is not a far stretch from the general discourse of participation currently being purported in development studies.

What then are we to make of young people’s participation in development? I believe that taking a critical standpoint to this approach is warranted if it is to be fully understood. My approach in this study is to draw from the theoretical insights of the governmentality literature, and especially the work of Mitchell Dean (1999). In this research the discourse on the role of youth in development is analysed as a site with particular forms of visibility, forms of thought, and technologies of governing. As outlined in the following chapter, this conceptual framework is significant for revealing the ways in which youth people are being mobilized by and for development. The goal of this analysis is to shed light on the types of identities young people are encouraged to adopt through their mobilization and the resulting effects of such identities for both youth and development as a whole.

A Note on Method

A critical discourse analysis of the governance of youth by the UN is utilized for this project. Critical discourse analysis is a methodological approach centered on the examination of power relations within language (Fairclough, 1995; Blommaert & Bulcaen 2000; Janks, 1997). A major feature of critical discourse analysis is its ability to make transparent relations of power and dominance said to be masked in everyday discourse (Blommaert & Bulcaen, 2000; Van Dijk, 1993). More specifically, discourse analysis “challenges us to move from seeing language as abstract to seeing our words as
having meaning in a particular historical, social, and political condition” (McGregor, 2003).

Accordingly, this approach is employed for the purpose of examining and understanding the ways in which UN discourses on youth participation encompasses power relations. I establish the UN’s position on youth participation as a site of power which speaks to the complex relationships between international organizations and ‘young people’.

The documents analysed for the purposes of examining UN discourses on youth and development can be grouped into two chapters. Chapter three focuses on a critical analysis of UN manuals. The key manuals analyzed are:


Chapter Four encompasses the second group of documents analyzed for this project, which are actual case studies which draw ideas and practices from UN manuals. The documents pertaining to the case studies analysed are:

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.


The documents and texts listed above are ideal for this project because they are directed towards youth, governments and policy makers, and are specific policy documents used to inform these groups about the roles youth are to play development.

I approached these texts by first doing an initial read through of their content. Using the dimensions of government highlighted by Dean (1999) as a template, I examined the various sections of each text for instances of governing. Though the initial read through provided some data, a significant amount of the findings of this research stem from numerous re-examinations of the texts. It is in this manner that I was able to begin to see and make connections otherwise not obvious in my initial survey of the texts. I believe that these subsequent examinations were vital in my attempts to determine the messages being projected in the texts. The examinations performed also affirmed the
importance of questioning and challenging ideas being projected as knowledge. In taking a critical, governmental approach to the documents, I was able to see the various forms of language present in a single body of text could take which established “data” for my analysis.

**Plan of Study**

The plan of this study is as follows. In the following chapter, Chapter two, I begin by briefly charting the changing approaches to development since the inception of the United Nations in 1948. In this context I examine several development theories—modernization theory, dependency theory and the more recent alternative development theories. Next, the concepts of power, empowerment and participation are discussed, as they are central to discussions of alternative development. Following this discussion some critiques of participation are elaborated, which also serves to introduce the governmentality perspective utilized in this study.

In Chapter Three: Youth Manuals as Technologies of Government, I apply Mitchell Dean’s four dimensions of government to the UN discourse on youth and development as presented in the manuals listed above. I begin with an analysis of the fields of visibility of government. Following this analysis is an examination of the technologies of government, and an examination of the truth claims made in the documents. Finally the implications of these documents are evaluated through an exploration of the various ways the identities of youth are informed by the UN manuals.

Chapter Four: Governing Youth: Two UN Case Studies, begins with an examination of UNESCO’s Growing Up in Cities project (GUIC). This section of the chapter employs three of Dean’s dimensions of government—technologies of
government; truth claims; and identity formations through modes of governance—to trace the various ways youth, governments, development practitioners, policy makers and youth advocates are addressed regarding young people’s role in community development and their related implications. Following this is an analysis of the collaborative UN Program on Youth (UNPY) and the National Council of Swedish Youth (LSU) project, Tackling Poverty Together (TPT). Here the fields of visibility, technologies of government and identities formations through governance are [again] engaged. This section particularly focuses on the project’s various workshops, in an attempt to gain a better understanding of how practitioners and youth are being trained to adopt particular ideas about youth. Following this discussion is an analysis of the technologies of government, and truth claims operationalized in the project. Finally, I examine the implications of these case studies for the identities of youth and for their governance.

This project concludes with some critical arguments about the use of participatory approaches to development for youth. Implications and recommendations are discussed and some suggestions for future study are highlighted. In all, I anticipate adding to the knowledge-base on participation, youth and international development, and opening up the possibility of developing new approaches which challenge and address the standardized notions of youth empowerment and participation present in contemporary development discourses.
CHAPTER II: CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK & LITERATURE REVIEW

Conceptual Framework and Literature Review

Changing Approaches to Development: A brief history

International development strategies have taken various forms. The United Nations (UN), the focal point of this research, has actively participated in, utilized and shaped many of these approaches over the years. A brief history of the UN’s approaches to development shows a changing substantive focus in development thinking and practice. This history begins with what has been considered the founding period of UN development thinking and practice in the 1940s and 1950s (Emmerij, 2006). During this post-war period the main paradigm for development was economic growth derived from Western models of modernization. This focus is largely attributed to the struggle for the development of post-war Europe (Jolly et al. 2004). In addition, this period marked the start of many countries gaining national independence. Among the concerns for these newly independent nations was economic development (Jolly et al. 2004) and, as such, economics became a central issue for the UN, especially at the international level. According to Jolly et al. (2004), the UN focus during this period was largely interventionist, and centred on ways to accelerate the development process by stimulating economic growth.

The 1960s, dubbed the “Development Decade”, saw a marked shift in UN thinking and practice in development. The term ‘Development Decade’ was used to describe the idealized Western thinking that underdevelopment of developing countries (with the right efforts) can be eradicated by the decade’s end (Irvine, 1970). Globally, the focus was on mobilizing development planning. The UN played a key role in this
endeavour. During this period concerted efforts were made in all branches of the UN towards analysing and assessing world economy trends (Jolly et al. 2004). These analyses, consisting of data collection, evaluation and dissemination, were all part of the UN task of attaining the planning goals of the Development Decade (Jolly et al. 2004). Though the Development Decade attained a few of its goals such as establishing growth yielding industries in developing countries—namely, Taiwan, Korea and Thailand (Irvine, 1970), the outcomes of the decade were largely met by disappointment (Kuhnen, 1987).

The decade immediately following saw a shift from the UN discourse on economics towards a concern for equity, poverty, and employment (Jolly et al. 2004). More specifically, equity was emphasized between socioeconomic groups -- between the North and South, between generations, and between women and men (Jolly et al. 2004). These ideas became reflected in terms such as ‘basic human needs’ and ‘employment-oriented’ as well as throughout UN development policies during the 1970s (Jolly, et al. 2004: 113). Unfortunately, these strategies were largely undermined in the 1980’s – the economic liberalization era – which is commonly referred to as the ‘lost’ decade.

Limited industrial growth, resulting in a debt crisis faced by developing countries, was the primary catalytic force for economic liberalization. The main principle behind this new idea was that poverty reduction and economic growth can be effectively achieved if the role of the state is restricted, and the role of markets and private enterprises are scaled-up (Saidane, 2002). These neoliberal ideas permeated the World Bank and the IMF whom, upon adoption of such thinking, initiated many economic liberalization and adjustment programs to the detriment of developing nations (Bello, 2004). As such, the UN’s work during this period was primarily dedicated to pushing for
more favourable and equitable structural adjustment policies that reflected its ideas about poverty reduction and human development (Jolly et al. 2004).

Finally, the UN’s position on development in the last decade of the twentieth-century saw an almost exclusive focus on human development. Two key themes influencing the UN’s position and efforts during the 1990’s were human rights and good governance. According to Hamm (2001), the UN played a leadership role in integrating human development with human rights. Although a key objective of this synthesis was to encourage the conditions that support the development of human capabilities necessary for human development, it also encouraged greater accountability on the part of institutions’ roles in this endeavour (Jolly et al. 2004).

The changing UN discourses on development traced in this brief history are not exclusive to the UN. In fact, the UN’s changing approaches to development have paralleled widely-held perceptions of poverty and general development of the developing world. These perceptions, which significantly inform development theories, must be examined in any attempts made to understand UN development thinking. Theories such as the modernization model and dependency theory not only underpin UN approaches to development of the past, but also lay the ground work for the UN’s various positions on development today.

Traditionally, the modernization model was utilized as a means of curtailing poverty through development. The modernization model is centred on the notion that linear and evolutionary capitalist growth can enhance the economic positions of developing countries (Billet, 1993: 4). More specifically, modernization holds that advanced technology can be a catalytic force for development. (Billet, 1993; Mansoor,
1994). For Escobar (1995), modernization is especially characteristic of development efforts that utilize the promises of technology as a route to development. Within this framework, technology is the marker of civilization and the catalyst for progress -- both socially and economically. This technology pervades what can be construed as the two most important underlying tenets of modernization theory: first, that the process of development entails progress from traditional to modern societies, and second, that it is the duty of industrialized countries to lead developing countries to acquire the characteristics of the more modern, progress-laden society that (it is assumed) they long to become (Escobar, 1995; Nabudere, 1997). As such, numerous and wide-spread attempts have been made to develop countries using modernization theory-based strategies (Billet, 1993).

An off-shoot of modernization theory is the strategy of accelerating development through foreign aid and/or assistance. Defined as the lending of monies and other resources by developed nations to underdeveloped and developing countries (Wilson, 2001), the rationale for this strategy is primarily the promotion of economic stability via foreign investment (Wilson, 2001). Like proponents of general modernization strategies, supporters of foreign aid believed that many developing countries could achieve sustainable development if they were given the opportunities to spearhead their economies through capital investment (Chakravarti, 2005: 5). It is important to acknowledge that this paternalistic perspective also assumed that developing nations required the assistance of the Western world primarily through the allocation of funds for investment (Chakravarti, 2005; Palmer et al. 2002).
Wary of modernization theory, academics from the South identified dependency as a major roadblock for development. Largely developed as a response to the ineffectiveness of modernization theory, the dependency school centred its analyses on the relationship between the industrialized west and developing countries (Bosch, 1998). This was usually achieved by examining the relationship between countries at the core and periphery levels, with the core representing industrialized nations, and the periphery developing nations. However, dependency theory itself has been taken up in a wide variety of ways. Scholars have agreed that there are two major perspectives in dependency theory. There is the structuralist view, developed primarily by Andre Gunder Frank and E. Wallerstein, which views capitalism as a 'world system', whereby the outcomes in one system logically influence the outcomes in another (Kapoor, 2002). This idea is best captured by Frank's assertion that, “economic development and underdevelopment are two sides of the same coin” (Frank, 1967: 9). A second perspective in dependency theory is attributed to the contributions of Enzo Faletto and Fernando Henrique Cardoso. These scholars contend that dependency is not simply the external and internal of 'sides' of a single coin, but a complex outcome of varying capitalist relations (Kapoor, 2002: 649). What Faletto and Cardoso argue is that dependency is the result of varying class and social struggles at the international and local levels (Kapoor, 2002: 649). Despite these variations it is argued that there are several principles that almost all differing proponents of dependency theory would support. First, that a major contributing factor to dependency lies in the inability of peripheral nations to develop autonomous technological innovations, and secondly that contrary to what is believed in the west, foreign capital cannot eradicate this issue of dependence because
western control of technology means that developing countries cannot effectively partake in the processes that encourage technological development (Vernengo, 2004). In short, most dependency theorists would agree that developing countries should reject the market influences of industrialized nations and instead focus on establishing their own market bases (Uche, 1994; Vernengo, 2004).

Critics of these approaches have identified a number of reasons for their repeated failure. First, it is argued that traditional approaches to development adopt Eurocentric views of development where traditional societies are viewed as underdeveloped and in dire need of the 'westerners' assistance for development (Hobart 1993). The major implication of this Eurocentric ideology is that it produces development strategies that fail to take into account the knowledge base of those receiving assistance (Sillitoe et al. 1998:233; Shrestha, 1995). Another argument against the use of modernization approaches to development is that the cultural traditions and contexts of the societies being developed are often not taken into account when devising development policies (Valdes 2002; Dei, 1998). These arguments assert that culture is too often treated as an obstacle to be overcome in the development process rather than as an efficient and appropriate source of local knowledge (Odhiambo, 2002). As for dependency theory, many of its critics address the theory's over-reliance on the social in the place of capitalism to explain dependency, and its inability to explain the successful development of some countries located in the periphery (Vernengo, 2004). As such, critics argue that development interventions being developed today must take different approaches than their predecessors. This search for more relevant and effective approaches has been
loosely dubbed ‘alternative approaches to development’ (Escobar, 1995; Friedmann, 1992).

There are varying perspectives on the meaning of alternative development and the role if any, it is to play in international development. One view holds that alternative development refers not to traditional, prescriptive ideals of development characteristic of many development models, but rather to a moral ideology (Friedmann, 1992). This moral ideology entails the idea that all people have a right to development. However that right is not to be infringed upon through modes of domination often characteristic of traditional notions of development, whereby people have little influence over the ways in which their societies are to be developed and the ways they are to benefit from the subsequent development (Friedmann, 1992:8). There is also the assertion that the search for “alternative development” calls for a rejection of the “development” concept altogether (Escobar in Crush 1995). For these proponents, the concept of development is a threat which has been more detrimental than beneficial to developing nations (Escobar in Crush, 1995; Sachs, 1992).

Research has also criticized the notion of alternative development itself. Here, alternative development as representative of alternative paradigms to development is challenged. Not only is the application of paradigms in social science questioned but the assertion that alternative development can be distinguished from mainstream development is refuted by some (Pieterse, 2000). It is argued that the ambiguous nature of the term “alternative” speaks to current, mainstream methods utilized today; largely people-centred development and/or participatory development (Pieterse, 2000). In short,
alternative development faces the threat of becoming a modern day “traditional” approach it largely operates to condemn: prescriptive and non-inclusive.

These varying perspectives aside, today’s global environment clearly calls for approaches which challenge modernization as the dominant approach to development. One such approach centers on the inclusion and capacity-building of individuals as a means to achieving empowerment (Melkote et al. 2001). Here empowerment, and subsequently development, may be achieved through the ‘full’ participation of individuals because their participation will transform social and political relations (Mohan & Stokke, 2001). It is within this context that youth are seen to have the potential to become agents of development.

**Power and Empowerment**

Since the beginning of its use in development discourse, empowerment has provided the context for rich debates in development studies. As a term, empowerment carries different meanings to different people (Moore, 2001; Melkote et al. 2001). For the purposes of this project, empowerment will be viewed as a process that gives people power and control over the situations that affect their lives (Moore, 2001; Rappaport, 1981). However, how empowerment is applied, achieved and analysed by others varies significantly.

The most basic debate centres on whether the term should be utilized or rejected. In the former argument, empowerment is viewed as useful in achieving and sustaining social change. It is argued that empowerment “privileges multiple voices and perspectives” by providing people with the skills, confidence and “countervailing power” necessary to foster change (Melkote et al. 2001: 365). Arguments supporting the latter
view have derived primarily from feminists who encourage the dismissal of the term on the basis that it has been depoliticized by its sheer overuse by different actors (Aithal, 1999). Between these polarized positions, there is a profuse literature on empowerment as it relates to development issues.

It has been argued, for example, that for empowerment to be achieved, especially within the context of development, it must address the social, political and psychological power needs of people (Friedmann, 1992: 33). Friedmann argues that these three forms of power follow a sequence, whereby social power (which, following this view, gives people access to various processes within institutional organizations) is a precursor of political power, which gives people access to the decisions that affect their lives (Friedmann, 1992). As for psychological power, Friedmann argues that it may be both a precursor and result of successful action in the social and political domains of life (Friedmann, 1992). Together these three forms of power are said to provide the backdrop to peoples' ability to take control of their lives.

However, the argument has also been made that social power should be linked and examined through its relationship to social institutions (Hill, 2003). This perspective speaks to the assertion that social power is operationalized through institutional power. Here institutional power is claimed to perpetuate inequalities in people's opportunities to attain control of their lives (Hill, 2003). Conversely, there is also the perspective that institutions can be a positive force for empowerment. In this argument, people are not independent from the institutions that operate within their societies (Moore, 2001). Proponents of this view argue that poor people's successes in achieving empowerment are significantly related to the political environments in which they live (Moore, 2001).
For such individuals, institutional policies are among the primary facilitators of modes of mobilization and hence empowerment. In general, then, a call has been made for the analysis of institutions and the institutional powers present in processes leading to empowerment, irrespective of the outcomes of such analyses (Hill, 2003).

The argument above is not a far stretch from the way power is depicted by some key development agencies. According to the World Bank, power is present at many levels in the development context. For the World Bank, power can be examined in terms of the political entities that hold it and also in terms of people’s ability to assert their own power (World Bank, 2000/2001). In the former, the Bank believes that poverty reduction (and subsequently development) begins with states’ abilities to use their various powers to effectively redistribute resources in ways that will benefit the poor (2000/2001). As well, the Bank takes a firm stance on its position that government powers that facilitate state corruption be challenged. The argument is made that institutions are most effective when they provide people with the opportunities and knowledge-bases that allow them to “activate their rights...and redefine and reshape inequitable laws and practices” (World Bank, 2000/2001:105). Similarly, according to the United Nations Development Programme, Human Development Report 2000, expanding human capabilities and securing human rights can empower people to move out of poverty (UNDP HDR, 2002). This report also advocates the support of actions taken by state and non-state actors to provide people with civil and political liberties—which UNDP contends empower people and encourage development at all levels (UNDP HDR, 2002: 87). From this perspective, power is directly related to achieving specific end goals, mainly poverty reduction and development.
Another approach to empowerment takes the position that empowerment possesses both theoretical and tangible dimensions. Here, empowerment is encouraged as a multidimensional, multifaceted process that involves the mobilization of resources and people's abilities towards lasting development (Singh et al. 1995). This assertion is part of the standpoint which stipulates that empowerment be taken beyond its theoretical parameters and, instead, be utilized as a tool for development. It is argued that a practical framework for empowerment needs to be developed if successes in development are to be achieved (Narayan, 2005). This type of framework is believed to be necessary for addressing the ambiguous nature of the term, which the argument has been made places constraints on attempts to understand the conditions that facilitate and/or limit people's abilities to improve their societies (Narayan, 2005). One body of literature touts four building blocks of a conceptual framework of empowerment—institutional climate; social and political structures; poor people's individual assets and capabilities; and poor people's collective assets and capabilities (Narayan, 2005: 5). What directly follows this perspective is the need to measure empowerment. Accordingly, this requirement, now part of a growing discourse on the evaluation and assessment of empowerment as it is used in development, also provides the context through which other empowerment frameworks are developed. Many of these frameworks are comprised of the same elements—identifying constraints to action; assessing developments in people's agency; and assessments of opportunity structures (Mosedale, 2005; Petesch, 2005). In general most, if not all, of these frameworks illustrate a structured and audit-based approach to empowerment.
The above discussions shed an analytical light on the various types of power to consider when examining the term empowerment within the development context. However these discussions have generally placed empowerment outside the realm of power itself. The argument has been made that empowerment, if it is to be truly understood, must be examined as a relation of power (Cruickshank, 1999; Kesby, 2005). This analysis must begin with the acknowledgment of Michel Foucault’s argument that power is related to an economy of discourse which is situated in social and institutional practices (Foucault, 1980). It is within this ‘discourse’ that empowerment becomes taken up in development studies.

According to Kesby (2005), empowerment and power are effects of the same practices and discourses that produce both power and empowerment. It is maintained that these effects are the result of the unaccountable exercise of the power relationship present between experts and the individuals they are seeking to empower (Cruickshank, 1999). That empowerment challenges power holders is also offered as justification for the assertion that the concept is in fact a relation of power. This challenge of power, as faced by those who hold it, is said to have encouraged power holders to incorporate “empowerment” language into their discourses. The resulting effect is that power becomes “managed”, and the threatening implications of empowerment are thereby significantly reduced (Tandon, 1995).

A specifically Foucauldian critique of the use of empowerment for development is that empowerment informs the identities and actions of people, while encouraging and directing their agency (Rose, 1999). It is argued that development projects based on empowerment seek to encourage self-governance and responsible citizenship.
(Triantafillou et al. 2001). In practice the application of ‘strategies’ for empowerment is claimed to be based on facilitative processes through which people are directed under specific and strategic development rationalities (Rankin, 2001; Triantafillou et al, 2001; Cruikshank, 1999). This critique raises many important questions about the use of empowerment in development discourse and practice today, and will be more fully elaborated later in this chapter.

Participation

Participation, as it is utilized in development studies, carries various meanings, many of which are linked to the term empowerment. Although these meanings are dependent on the contexts in which they are applied, it is claimed that there is a general consensus on what constitutes “authentic” participation (Jennings, 2000). Authentic participation in development, according to Jennings, is the “involvement of local populations in the creation, content and conduct of a program or policy designed to change their lives” (Jennings, 2000: 1).

Like the term empowerment, participation has witnessed wide use in development circles in recent decades. Some scholars attribute the popularity of the term to the recognition of the failures of traditional development approaches (Chambers, 2001; Botchway, 2000). It is argued by scholars that dissatisfaction with imposed top-down models of development, concerns about the cost-effectiveness of programmes, and the preoccupation with sustainability have all contributed to the increasing use of the term ‘participation’ (Chambers, 2001). These concerns also speak to the call for ‘alternatives’ to current development strategies (Escobar, 1995; Pieterse, 2000).
A central argument for participation in development is that it tends to lead to empowerment and thereby encourage successful development. This argument is especially purported by development agencies, institutions and practitioners. For them, participation is a process that allows people to take control of their societies. When this occurs, people are given power over their lives and the chances of attaining successful development are significantly increased (Parpart, 2002; World Bank, 2000/2001). The case has also been made that achieving empowerment through participation is dependent on its ability to build the capacity and skills of people. It is thought that, if people receive training in “usefully transferable skills”, then empowerment will develop at the personal, project, and community levels (Lyons et al. 2001: 1249). Attaining empowerment at these levels is not only vital for success at the project level, but also for society as a whole (Lyons et al. 2001). A similar argument addresses the ability to reproduce empowerment in everyday life (Kesby, 2005). Here, it is argued that participatory development strategies facilitate empowerment when they can be applied outside of the participatory project context. Therefore, it is suggested that participation be “scaled-up” to governmental, non-governmental and community levels so as to encompass empowerment throughout all aspects of life (Kesby, 2005: 2059).

Focus on the results of participation also calls into question the ways in which it is applied. As such a key aspect of participation is evaluation. From the practitioner standpoint, evaluation is vital to achieving successes in development through participation. Participatory evaluation is described by proponents as, “a process of self-assessment, collective knowledge production, and cooperative action in which the stakeholders, …participate substantively in the identification of the evaluation issues...
design collection and analysis of data" (Jackson & Kassam, 1998: 3). What makes participation evaluation vital is the focus on shared knowledge between all involved and at all levels. As well, it is argued that participatory evaluation creates more in-depth and accurate knowledge of the impacts of development interventions (Jackson & Kassam, 1998). Practitioners in this area argue that though there are complexities associated with participatory evaluation, it is ultimately a facilitator of democracy in development research (Freedman, 1998).

The literature on participation also extends to young people. In the literature young people’s participation is linked to the impacts of adverse social conditions they face, and the roles they are to play in their societies. According to the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), young people perceive themselves as “capable of assuming responsible, determining roles in society” and as such wish to participate fully (UNESCO, 2002). The United Nations also argues that precedence should be given to young people’s participation in decision making processes (United Nations, 2006). For the UN, involving young people in the decisions that affect their lives is beneficial from both policy-making and youth development perspectives (United Nations, 2006). As such, there is a widespread demand to include young people in the development of social policies. Also behind this insistence is the position that social policies significantly influence the positioning of a society. Where young people are excluded, the consequences for society are feared to be dire and severe (Saraswarthi et al. 2002; Pittman et al. 2002).

Discussions of the limitations of participatory development are many in the development literature. It has been criticized at many levels and from many standpoints.
Some literature addresses what academics call the ‘management’ of participation. It is argued that participation in development activities have become management strategies through which procedures and techniques become actively deployed (Cleaver, 2001). For some, the consequences of this approach are bleak. It is claimed that participatory methods that focus on techniques, procedures and results look mainly towards problem-solving, rather than problematization (Cleaver, 2001). The result is this focus displaces central issues surrounding people’s participation and development. Issues identified include the overwhelming focus on efficiency and outputs, and a limited focus on the role of local community initiatives in development (Cleaver, 2001). Therefore, participation becomes a theory or representation oriented towards external concerns rather than the concerns of youth (Mosse, 2001).

Critiques of participatory development strategies have also addressed the roles of and approaches taken towards power and empowerment. It is argued that participatory methods are in danger of encouraging the reassertion of power and control over people targeted to be “included” (Kothari, 2001). Here, the inclusive nature of participatory methods to development is said to displace concern about the power laden aspect present in many of these approaches. As these powers become skewed and/ or unrecognizable, people are less prone to challenging them (Kothari, 2001), and become subjugated to reassertions of power and control (Kothari, 2001).

Participatory development strategies are also criticized for failing to acknowledge power differentials occurring between community members. It is argued that these methods, being overwhelmingly utilized in developing countries, do not address the social climates of these regions (Mompati et al. 2000). This argument speaks particularly
to ethnic tensions that are said to sometimes place a hindrance on development. According to critics, the idea that participation allows the voices of ‘all’ to be heard severely limits its successes in practice (Mompati et al. 2000). Rather it is suggested that participatory approaches acknowledge and incorporate ethnicity in its effort to be truly inclusive. Similar arguments have been made about the political landscapes of developing countries. Stokkes and Mohan (2000) argue that too often the localization of knowledge characteristic of participatory interventions downgrade the role of politics in development. They assert that the local and the political are not two separate entities, and advocate examining the politicisation of the local in participatory development interventions (Stokkes & Mohan, 2000). The common view in the aforementioned arguments is that participatory development interventions must attempt to address the potential socio-political tensions present within the approach (Chhotray, 2004; Stokkes & Mohan, 2000; Mompati et al. 2000). These very socio-political tensions reflect many of the issues surrounding young people’s participation in development, mainly the homogenous manner in which it is approached by development agencies and the generalized assumptions made regarding youth participation. A way to determine what these influential assumptions are and the ways in which they flourish in practice is to examine critically the discourses and conditions that facilitate their existence. Governmentality provides an ideal lens for this type of inquiry.

*Governmentality*

From a governmentality perspective, understanding the UN’s approach to youth as participants in development processes requires investigation of the potential governing effects of implementing this approach. Governmentality provides the necessary tools for
analysing the underlying implications and reasons behind programmes, policies, and actions exercised by the development agencies to promote the participation and empowerment of youth in development. A governmentality approach allows one to ask what is meant by the participation and empowerment of citizens, who is making such claims, and why?

According to Michel Foucault (Burchell et al. 1991), government is a broad concept referring not only to state bureaucracies but also to a range of institutions and authorities involved in the 'conduct of conduct'. The 'conduct of conduct' refers to any deliberate attempt to shape the behaviours of individuals in accordance with certain sets of norms for the purpose of particular goals (Dean, 1999:10). 'Government' in this literature entails all authorities and agencies fashioned to guide the actions of individuals through various techniques. When speaking of government as authorities guiding conduct it is equally important to delineate that we are speaking not only of political actors, agencies and institutions, but also of social authorities guiding actions (Rose, 1999:135-136). These social authorities are present in the relationships people have with each other, and also in the ways people come to govern themselves. Self governance then, refers to the idea that people are capable of governing their own lives but with guidance from other entities (Rose, 1999; Dean, 1999).

There are two major assumptions behind this concept of government. First, that human conduct can be and is directed, and second that government is rational, i.e., that there is a certain form of thinking that takes place within government based on clear and systematic processes aimed at the way things are and the way things ought to be (Dean, 1999). Some scholars have argued that governments serve largely to delineate concepts,
create problems through their mere identification, and present solutions to those problems, while in turn providing justifications for their modes of governance (Lemke, 2001). Understanding the position of governments and the types of governance acting on conduct, then, presents itself as something necessary to understanding society.

Specifically, governmentality -- a conceptual relation of governance -- deals with the way people think through government and the various mentalities that governments possess (Dean, 1999:16). In governmentality studies the focus in analysis is more often than not on thought as it becomes enshrined in the technical means for reshaping the conduct of individuals (Dean, 1999). The purpose of this type of analysis, better known as an analytics of government, is to examine the complex and varying ways the practices of governments produce and endorse “truths” which go on to permeate the political, social, and cultural spheres of society (Dean, 1999; Rankin, 2001).

Four key dimensions of governmentality can be identified (Dean, 1999). The first dimension calls for an examination of the characteristic forms of visibility (ways of seeing and being); the second dimension places an emphasis on identifying the distinctive ways of thinking and questioning used in the creation of truths; the third dimension concerns examining the technologies and techniques that influence the ways people act, and the ways they are directed; while the final dimension concerns an examination of the characteristic ways ‘subjects, selves, persons, and actors or agents’ are formed (Dean, 1999: 23). Specifically, an examination of this latter dimension involves looking at the ways in which people’s identities become shaped and guided through governing. I understand identities as being the specific subjectivities people possess, and in the case of this research, the subjectivities being produced and endorsed by governing authorities.
Space also plays a role in governmentality. According to Nikolas Rose, space in governmentality should be examined territorially. There are territorializations of national spaces, transnational spaces, as well as small-scale spaces such as cities, zones, hospitals and schools (Rose, 1999: 35). For Rose each space is situated and governed in its own way (Rose, 1999). The ways in which each site is to be governed can be understood through an examination of the very laws and conditions that become central tenets of society (Rose, 1999: 39), or in other words, the conditions that reflect and represent governmental thought. In the case of the UN, governmental thought is present at national and transnational spaces. For example, as the UN works in conjunction with member-states at the national level, much of their development training is done transnationally, whereby knowledge gained from training sites become reproduced at the national level. The literature on governmentality then, encourages the exploration and examination of both actions and ideas as they are situated within specific territorialized contexts.

Within development discourse, governmentality has only recently become viewed as applicable to international development. As a concept, governmentality has largely been focused on the political, economic and social aspects of nation-states (Lamer & Walters, 2004:1). The reasons for this limited application of governmentality in international development and global studies range from the ‘disciplinary locations of scholars’, to fears of participating in and facilitating grand theorizations (Lamer & Walters, 2004:5). Notwithstanding these fears, some academics have found value in utilizing governmentality in development studies. One piece of literature suggests that governmentality can assist in understanding modern capitalism as it exists today. According to this argument there is a disconnection between the post-modern reality of
nations and the modern reality of capitalism (Watts, 2003). According to Watts, a result of this disconnection is that the effects of capitalism on the development of many countries become obscured and unapparent. Governmentality provides the opportunity to examine the possible opportunities that allow this divide to continue to flourish—thereby facilitating a greater understanding of development (Watts, 2003). Other research has looked to governmentality to gain a better understanding of development interventions and strategies. For example it is suggested that development aid establishes a relation of power between donors and recipients. Here, aid is claimed to be a powerful instrument of global government (Rajos, 2004: 111). According to this argument, aid, when dispersed in the manner it is (under conditionalities), becomes a tool of power through which the West is the primary wielder (Rajos, 2004: 110). Governmentality, therefore, allows analysts to examine the ways in which power becomes enshrined in strategies meant to assist the poor. In short, what all of these authors show is that the ‘critical capacity’ often attributed to governmentality analyses of nation-states, can benefit discussions on international development (Rankin, 2001: 33; Watts, 2003).

If governmentality fosters the examination of underlying, hidden actions and agendas of institutions, actors, and concepts, what value does it offer to a critical analysis (or an analytics) of youth participation in development? A brief answer to this question is that governmentality has the potential to facilitate discussions of the ways in which “empowerment” via the active participation of youth in development takes shape through governing. This type of research can be considered an analytics of the governance of youth in development.
As it has been highlighted, empowerment and participation within the development context have received wide attention from varying perspectives. However, these discussions have not extended to the influences these concepts may have on the roles and positions of youth in relation to the development of their societies. In the chapters to follow I provide an analysis of five key UN manuals and texts on youth participation in development. Using Mitchell Dean’s four dimensions of government, I engage the concepts of participation and empowerment as they are utilized in the manuals. Following this, I examine two UN initiated poverty reduction projects for youth. These projects serve as case studies through which the UN’s discourse on youth participation can be examined as they occur in practice. Similar to the approach taken with the UN manuals, I apply Dean’s dimensions of government to each case study. Overall, the purpose of these analyses is to add a critical lens to the sociological literature on participation, empowerment, and youth in development studies.
CHAPTER III: ANALYSIS I

Youth Manuals as Technologies of Government

According to Mitchell Dean (1999), an analysis of government requires the examination of the technical means utilized in both the creation and reshaping of the conduct of individuals. This type of examination is one that can be exercised on official documents and in this case, we examine documents produced by the UN which relate to youth and development. Specifically, an analysis of government will be done on the manuals developed by the UN to address the issue of youth participation in development interventions and strategies.

Before delving into the content of these documents, it is important to address the audience for which the manuals are intended. As is expressed in the manuals, the documents to be analysed in this study are intended for governments, development practitioners, policy makers, youth advocates and youth themselves (UNESCO, 2002a; 2002b; UNESCAP, 1999a; 1999b; United Nations, 2004). Though each manual is about and concerns youth, there are some marked differences in the extent to which each is actually meant for youth. These conditions will be readily apparent as the analysis in this chapter progresses.

(CBCCY) is a manual developed from the various findings of the United Nations Economical and Social Organizations (UNESCO) Growing Up In Cities project. Created to increase young people’s participation in community development, the program takes place at several different cities worldwide. The Youth Participation Manual (YPM) and Youth Policy Formulation Manual (YPFM) both derive from the United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (UNESCAP) efforts to increase young people’s participation in their societies. Making Commitments Matter: A Toolkit for Young People to Evaluate National Youth Policy (MCM) is a toolkit developed to assist young people in assessing their countries’ national youth policies to ensure that they meet the provisions for improving the situations of young people as stipulated by the UN. Finally, Navigating International Meetings: A Pocketbook Guide to Effective Youth Participation is a document developed to improve young people’s understanding of international meetings. I believe that each text provides the necessary data for a systematic examination of UN strategies for youth and development.

To start we may begin with the titles of these texts. Here, an examination of the titles indicates that each text carries a connotation of guiding conduct. In other words, in being called toolkits, guides, and manuals the documents depict ‘ways of doing’. However, an effective understanding of the ways in which youth are being created through modes of mobilization in the name of development must go beyond a mere examination of what one is readily able to see in the discourse. As Dean (1999: 23) stipulates, an analysis of the ways in which people’s identities become created requires three forms of analysis: an examination of the characteristic forms of visibility; an examination of the creation of truths through distinctive ways of thinking and questioning;
and lastly an examination of technologies and techniques that inform the ways people come to act. Each of these modes of government will be taken up in the following analysis.

**Fields of Visibility of Government**

According to Dean (1999), forms of visibility- which are necessary for regimes of government to flourish are comprised of the “kind of light it [government] illuminates” (Dean, 1999: 30), alongside that which becomes defined, made present and/ or obscured. These visualized characteristics are evident in diagrams of power and authority. As such, characteristic features of numerous UN documents on youth participation include charts, maps and diagrams from which much information about youth participation in development can be obtained.

The self-evaluation of the “your city” worksheet in the text *Creating Better Cities with Children and Youth: A Manual for Participation* (2002a) includes a diagram which demonstrates Dean’s point about visibility of governance (See Appendix A). Here, the problems to be evaluated by young people are delineated. The eight areas to be evaluated are social integration; gathering places and activity settings; safety and freedom of movement; access to nature; community image and identity; land tenure; basic goods and services; and local power and control. These areas depict what should be ‘areas of priority’ for young people in community development. Additionally each of the points of evaluation contains questions that young people are advised to ask in their self-evaluations of their communities. For example the ‘local power and control’ assessment indicator asks young people, “Does the local community have a sense of control over its own destiny? Are young people involved in the decision making process? Do they have
hope about the future?” (UNESCO, 2002a: 29). In this example young people are shown the problems they are to examine and evaluate. Hence a key premise of the GUIC project through which the CBCCY manual is based, is that when doing self-evaluations of their communities, young people should do so in ways predetermined and stipulated in the project worksheet.

The connections and relationships between various agents are also presented in visualized forms in this manual. The “Dimensions of Young People’s Participation” (See Appendix B) of the CBCCY manual presents a “conceptual framework for thinking about young people’s participation in community development” (UNESCO, 2002a: 40). The diagram, which places different forms of young people’s participation on a spectrum, simultaneously presents the kinds of participation most favoured in community development. In the diagram, shared decision making is placed higher on the spectrum than any of the other forms of young people’s participation, and more importantly, it is positioned above the ‘children in charge’ form of participation (which is ultimately young people’s participation at the highest level). What is made visible then is that the preferred mode of young people’s participation involves a shared interconnectedness among various agents within societies. Such visibilities raise questions about the power relations in operation in community development projects created to increase young people’s participation. For example, while shared decision making may be desirable, what are the potential implications of its use in projects such as the GIUC that are guided by the UN’s ideals of youth as active and primary participants in the strategies that directly impact their lives? How will the projects fit with the objectives of the UN’s work with youth? And how will the experiences of youth become distorted by these visual fields?
Techniques of Government

What may also be gained from an evaluation of manuals, guides and toolkits are the various techniques utilized by the UN in its effort to enhance the participation of young people in development. As mentioned briefly earlier, the production of manuals, guides and toolkits to inform youth participation for development is in itself a mode of technology in operation.

The Youth Policy Formulation Manual provides an example of this type of technology at work. The manual is devised to inform governments and policy makers of the ways to create effective national youth policy. Explicit forms of guidance are present in several chapters of this document, rendering the manual a technology. For example, in the second chapter pertaining directly to the national youth policy formulation process, the claim is made that the national youth policy formulation process is a systematic procedure (United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific, 1999b: 13). The message conveyed here is that there are specific ways in which national youth policy is to be created. This idea is further perpetuated with the provision of a list containing the “requirements of the policy formulation process” said to be developed at key youth conferences and forums (UNESCAP, 1999b: 14). The notion of requirements of a ‘policy formulation process’ significantly calls into question who the key stakeholders are in national youth policy. Though the manual is proclaimed to be for the benefit and enhancement of the lives of youth, devising a methodology from which policy developers are to work leads one to ask: Are the needs of youth actually being addressed?
The YPFM also contains a chapter citing the key elements of a national youth policy. The chapter begins by stating that "there is no prescriptive formula" (UNESCAP, 1999b: 27) to follow when developing the substantive components of national youth policy. Furthermore, it is iterated that national youth policies should reflect the social, cultural and political environment of the country in question (UNESCAP, 1999b). However following these statements is a list of 'general guidelines' entitled "Features common to many national youth policies" from which national youth policy can be based (UNESCAP, 1999b:27). Though the case is made that these features are nothing more than guidelines, the question to ask becomes: what impact might citing features--which are noted to be commonly found in other countries' youth policies--have in the independent development of national youth policy? The case can be made then that in following these guidelines within the context of each country, these features may become more akin to "best practises" that set standards for conduct.

Similar to the compilation of processual lists and elements of national youth policy, "indicators" also feature prominently in several manuals. The Youth Participation Manual is one such document. The document denotes youth participation indicators (YPIs) from which programs are encouraged to be based. Specifically, the indicators are claimed to allow for the effective attainment and evaluation of youth participation (UNESCAP, 1999a:21). The significance of highlighting these indicators in this analysis is that they are encouraged to be based on the input of the real and lived experiences of youth (UNESCAP, 1999a: 26). However, as is evidenced, the indicators to be utilized by have already been developed and categorized by the UN. Furthermore, being developed and categorized by the UN raises questions about the extent to which those indicators are
actually representative of young people's situations. Answers to these questions can be explored by examining the ways in which the indicators may distort and/or conduct the experiences and activities of youth in specific circumstances, a task which is undertaken further in this chapter. For our purposes here, we should note that indicators are said to have been developed, according to this manual, to facilitate the analysis and promotion of youth participation and to ensure that project objectives and activities are "realistic and feasible" (UNESCAP, 1999a: 21). These facilitative indicators are: analysing needs and setting objectives; information and communication; decision-making; administration; design and implementation of activities; advocacy; service, support and education personnel; employees; and monitoring and evaluation (UNESCAP, 1999a: 34-36). Each indicator contains a ranking scheme from 0-4, with "0" representing no youth involvement in the indicator area, and "4" representing the highest level of youth participation (UNESCAP, 1999a: 35-36). Governing of young people's activities and experiences is evident in the phrasing of the third and fourth ranking levels. Participation at the third level is described as being present when young people take significant roles directly alongside adults in the various indicator areas. At the fourth level, young people's involvement is described as "possibly aided by adult experts" (UNESCAP, 1999a:36). While the fourth level is supposed to be the highest form of youth participation whereby youth are to have full leadership in the indicative areas, it is still marked as involving the input of adults. There is no real difference then between the third and fourth levels, as one affirms adult contributions to youth participation, while the other simply insinuates their input. The message to policy makers and subsequently young people is that adults should have a role to play at the project level of young
people's "participation". Overall, while the YPIs are presented as instruments devised to
benefit youth, they inform young people's experiences in participatory projects by
placing adult participation in projects and strategies as a significant ingredient of the most
desired levels of youth participation.

While the UN provides guidelines for policy makers through lists and indicators,
it also provides youth with the resources necessary to evaluate both policies and their
participation in various venues. The document Navigating International Meetings: A
Pocket Guide to Effective Youth Participation, said to be compiled by youth themselves,
is purported to be a guide developed to inform youth (through their own requests) of the
ways to participate effectively at international meetings (UNA-Canada, 2002). Attention
can be drawn to sections of the documents where youth are instructed on the positions
they are to hold at international meetings. For example, aside from being depicted as
vital to successful participatory development, young people are also encouraged to take-
up lobbying as part of their agenda for participation. In the sectioned titled "How to be an
effective lobbyist", young people are instructed on drafting documents, establishing
partnerships and contacts, and "building support" for their positions (UNA-Canada, 2002:
26). These recommendations not only connote that lobbying is a precursor for successful
participation, but also they illustrate to youth that there are specific ways from which
successful lobbying can be accomplished. Alternative forms of building support which
might be rooted in youth cultures, rather than existing lobbying strategies in traditional
western political systems, are not discussed.
Truth Claims

Governmentality studies assert that forms of governance are derived from and created by certain types of knowledge that render the governing justifiable (Dean, 1999; Larner & Walters, 2004). These “truths”, often informed by experts, allow governing conduct to flourish in development interventions (Rojas, 2004).

A common theme in the documents analysed in this project is the notion that youth participation can foster development and/or lead to social progress. For example, in the GUIC’s Creating Better Cities with Children and Youth: A Manual for Participation, young people’s participation in community development is described as “a powerful tool for social transformation” (UNESCO, 2002a:23). The Youth Participation Manual makes similar claims, citing that the progress of societies is based on “each society’s capacity to involve young women and men in building and designing the future” (UNESCAP, 1999a: 1). This sentiment is further developed in the Youth Policy Formulation Manual, a manual purported as a tool to help inform stakeholders of the ways to develop youth policies effectively to enhance the situation of youth and their societies. The authors conclude the document by asserting that the future progress of the Asian and the Pacific regions is dependent on the “energy and commitment of youth” (UNESCAP, 1999b: 72). For them, the energies of youth should be reflected in their participation at both the policy formulation and policy execution levels. These examples demonstrate that participation as a “facilitator” of social development features prominently in the UN’s approach to youth and development and, as such, can be rightly dubbed a truth claim in operation.
Finally, the very nature of these documents also reflect the position that traditional and past development strategies have largely failed to obtain the desired outcome of social development in developing countries. Manuals, guides and toolkits, are created as a response to the need to achieve development that interventions of the past have been unsuccessful in attaining. For example, the CBCCY manual is introduced as a response to "what works and doesn’t work" in planning initiatives leading to better cities (UNESCO, 2002a: 13). In general, the mere existence of these manuals and their subsequent proclamations provide enough support for and rationalize their "obvious" need.

As the aforementioned documents situate participation as a catalyst for social development, they also depict participation as a catalyst of empowerment. In the Youth Participation Manual section titled ‘Youth Participation: A Process of Empowerment’, the authors assert that participation ‘should effectively’ lead to empowerment (UNESCAP, 1999a: 18). This claim is also made more explicitly in the document where it is stated that: “the best route to understanding youth is to give them a voice through the facilitation of their active participation, hence empowerment” (UNESCAP, 1999a:3). The idea that participation leads to empowerment is further communicated in the Manuals’ conclusion where participation is identified as “the key to youth empowerment” (UNESCAP, 1999a: 42). In another document the claim is made that ‘real participation’ produces power (UNESCO, 2002a: 40). While empowerment is encouraged through various kinds of participation at various levels, the type most often communicated in these manuals is participation towards empowerment at the decision making level. As the Making Commitments Matter Toolkit states, “empowering young
people means allowing them the opportunity to make the decisions that affect their lives” (United Nations, 2004: 89). Therefore it is evident that participation, and in particular youth participation, is seen as the strategy for empowerment.

Empowerment is an issue that has received wide recognition and focus in recent years, and the term itself has become implicated in truth claims about the future. Though a contentious issue within the literature, empowerment has been recognized as a desired output of many development interventions (Triantafillou et al. 2001; Hill, 2003). As such, its utilization in the manuals is not surprising, and is loosely “justified” within today’s social environment. A key question to ask however includes: What effect does empowerment, as outlined in these documents, have for how young people are informed of the ways in which to “participate” in development?

This question is partially addressed in the truth claim that young people want to participate and be empowered. The statement that, young people “aspire to full participation in the life of society”, is one of several statements made to reinforce the ‘reality’ that youths have to participate in the world (UNESCAP, 1999a: 7). Furthermore, in explaining the rationale for national youth policy, the YPM claims that young people “actively” seek to be integrated into their societies (UNESCAP, 1999a: 11). According to the manual, this goal is to be achieved through their unguided participation in their societies (UNESCAP, 1999: 42). A similar connotation of young people’s desire to participate fully in their societies is evident in other manuals utilized and analyzed in this study (e.g., Making Commitments Matter, 2004; CBCCY, 2002).

Suggestions that youth aspire to be ‘involved’ works to rationalize the very creation of the texts developed to inform readers about participation. When it appears
that young people "want" to participate and become empowered, the importance of the participation strategies utilized to communicate and inform their participation and empowerment becomes secondary. In other words, the contradictions present in utilizing kits, guides, and manuals (all processes of management) to inform us about "participation," becomes muted by the greater condition that young people have "communicated" their needs to participate and be empowered.

It is very clear in the UN's mandates, reports and documents, that young people should participate fully and become active citizens in their societies (United Nations, 2004; 2005). However, the exact nature and level of that participation is an area that requires examination. According to the UN, young people's input becomes meaningful when it is a central component of institutions, processes and social structures (United Nations, 2005: 73). As well, meaningful youth participation is said to be to be a process that acknowledges and fosters strengthened intergenerational relationships (United Nations, 2005: 73). "Strengthened intergenerational relationships" feature in several of the manuals where youth participation is encouraged as a process of shared decision-making between youth and adults. For example in the CBCCY Manual, shared-decision making is encouraged because it is believed to be an ideal method for maximizing young people's participation (UNESCO, 2002a). A similar argument is made in the Youth Participation Manual where young people's participation is said to be primarily about "developing partnerships between young people and adults in all areas of life" (UNESCAP, 1999a: 39). Therefore according to the documents full participation is engaged in when individuals participate in the decision-making processes alongside other members of society. However this call for shared decision-making is indirectly
undermined in several manuals. In the CBCCY manual, discussion on the impact of participation, whereby young people both initiate activities and make decisions based solely on their views and ideas, the authors contend that this type of participation, though a powerful process for youth, may not have the ability to affect change "without support and assistance from well-connected adults" (UNESCO, 2002a: 42). The argument can be made that this type of perspective further reinforces the idea that any real impact to be gained from young people's inputs and abilities in decision-making processes is dependent on the roles adults play in these endeavours. Once again adult input in youth participation is rationalized, and subsequently becomes a truth claim that informs the governing of youth.

The Formation of Identities

Another facet of governmentality studies is its attempt to understand and shed light on the formation of identities as a significant result of governance. According to Dean (1999), though both direct and indirect governance work to inform the identities of individuals, the identity formations produced through indirect governance are often more difficult to identify because they are presented in a manner that is viewed as generally not contributive to people's identities. Identity as approached in this research, goes beyond the ways people see themselves and includes the roles and practices that people take-up. Questions to ask from this perspective of governing include: What kinds of roles are being presented to people as possible? Which roles are they being guided to embrace, and which are the ones being suppressed? Finally, and perhaps the most significant question to ask, involves the implications of utilizing these informed identities for youth.
My examination of UN documents and texts pertaining to youth and international development indicates that the UN has developed certain types of roles for youth to utilize in their efforts to become central components in the development of their societies. This type of identity formation analysis can begin with the examination of a commonly held view and presentation of people from the developing world. Too often, development discourse presents those in the developing world as poor, underprivileged and in need of assistance (Escobar, 1995; Ebeyn et al. 2005). These characterizations correspond with the argument that the poor have become “modeled” (Cruikshank, 1999; Ebyen 2005). According to Cruikshank (1999), the poor become modeled through definitions of their characteristics, capabilities and needs. These types of definitions feature prominently in the manuals under consideration.

According to the Youth Participation Manual, young people face “problems and uncertainties regarding their future” (UNESCAP, 1999a: 42). This sentiment is also present in the Youth Policy Formation Manual where the “problems” faced by young people are identified as among the key challenges of today’s society (UNESCAP, 1999b: 1). Another characterization featured in the varying manuals concerns the vulnerability of youth. Vulnerability, as used in the manuals, is associated with the transition from childhood to adulthood; with societal changes; and with the limited role youth play in the decisions that impact their lives (UNESCAP, 1999a; UNESCAP, 1999b; United Nations, 2004). These assertions set the necessary stage for the mobilization of youth through participation and empowerment. In short, the manuals present a bleak picture of young people’s lives—they are victims—and at the same time, they present and rationalize a solution to the problem: participate and be empowered.
Young people are also depicted as the vital ingredient in the UN's vision of social development throughout the manuals considered in this study. The *Youth Participation Manual* introduces the document by arguing that, "young people are the key to the future and are thus placed at the core of human resources development" (UNESCAP, 1999a:1). Youth are also said to be the "agents of change", and capable of "shaping the world of today and tomorrow" (UNESCAP, 1999a:2). It should also be noted that youth as "agents of change" is of youth also made apparent in the national policy evaluation toolkit, *Making Commitments Matter*. However, in this toolkit, youth are both agents of economic development and technological innovation (United Nations, 2004:2). Young people’s position as leaders in the “technology revolution” (which according to the UN World Youth Report 2005, is the driving force of the knowledge-base of society), is the reason for this insistence that youth be linked with technology alongside economic development (United Nations, 2005: 76). Other instances where youth are dubbed vital to their societies are in the YPM where they are declared the “cornerstone of society” and are said to have a pivotal role in their societies (UNESCAP, 1999a: 14). This role is further perpetuated in the *Youth Policy Formulation Manual*, where youth are recognized as not only positive forces for development, but as “advocates for change and hope” (UNESCAP, 1999b: 11). Significantly, youth are also described as “investments”. In the CBCCY manual, practitioners are instructed that the investments taken in youth issues are among the “best investments we can make towards creating a better future” (UNESCO, 2002a: 22).

The messages in the above examples are very clear from a governmentality perspective. First, youth are vital to their societies and secondly, they have the ability to
foster the change that is needed within their societies. The characteristics attributed to youth in the above analyses should not be taken lightly as they may carry different meanings for youth, governments and practitioners alike. As well, they may also inform the ways in which the issue of youth and development is approached. As such the discussions to follow explore the potential implications of using such characterizations in the manuals.

As an important area of focus in social studies, some have argued in favour of characterizing youth as agents of change and as advocates as a means to achieve social change (Otis, 2006; Welton & Wolfe, 2001). For these proponents these terms speak directly towards participatory development strategies. In recognizing youth as agents of change, vital to their societies (and other similar connotations), youth participation is encouraged. It is argued that as a group of individuals vital to society, the future of society, and key agents of change, then the ideas and values of youth should become central to decisions made regarding many social issues (Saraswathi et al. 2001). As such, the terms employed rationalize, whether directly or indirectly, the need for the active participation of youth—the ultimate goal purported in these manuals.

Aside from having an identity characterized by their vitality and importance, youth have also faced other specific identities being projected at them through the manuals. The role in question is significantly related to notions of citizenship.

Citizenship features prominently in both the **Youth Participation Manual** and the **Youth Policy Formulation Manual**. In the YPM the relationship between youth and citizenship is made very clear as youth participation is described as a “foundation for responsible citizenship” (UNESCAP, 1999a:15). In this section of the document, the
authors contend that the stages at which young people's status moves legally from childhood and adolescence to adulthood are often met by a lack of preparation of youth for taking up their new roles in society. Hence, the manual stipulates that youth participation is useful because it can, help young people “become more responsible adults and citizens by easing the transition from childhood to adulthood” (UNESCAP, 1999a: 15). Similar to the above analysis, these statements provide support for the existence of manuals to assist in fostering youth participation. In this instance the call for participation is justified by the perception that youth are unprepared to take up the roles they are meant to as adults. It is very clear from these few examples that it becomes important to understand the types and meanings of citizenship that the UN hopes to both foster and achieve through youth participation.

This argument is clarified through an analysis of the various bodies of literature cited within the manuals. First, we are told in the Youth Participation Manual that a key function of youth participation is its ability to foster ‘democratic citizenship’ (UNESCAP, 1999a: 14). Democratic citizenship, as is used in this document and cited from de Winter (1995), is said to be instrumental in providing young people the opportunity to develop into, “competent, independent and responsible citizens” (UNESCAP, 1999a:15). This delineation is followed by a brief analysis of the meanings of minimal citizenship (where people’s legal statuses are emphasised) and maximal citizenship (where people become conscious of their societal roles and seek to actively participate within their societies). One concludes from this analysis then that proponents of participatory development would advocate the maximal interpretation of citizenship as it encourages participation.
There is also a specific type of citizenship that is being promoted in these manuals that deserves special attention—namely youth as responsible citizens. It is important to note that though responsible citizenship, as is stated in the manuals, may be viewed as depicting a favourable view towards youth and development (especially from the perspective of practitioners), it may also place an unforeseen burden on youth. For example, in the CBCCY manual, young people’s participation is described as beneficial to youth because it helps them “develop a sense of environmental stewardship and civic responsibility” (UNESCO, 2002a: 35). Also in this manual, it is contended that responsible citizenship is a result of the much desired transformative nature of participatory development. Here responsible citizenship is presented as a valuable catalyst for participation leading to change (UNESCO, 2002a). Similar claims of responsibility are made in the Youth Policy Formulation Manual. Here responsibility is used to define national youth policy. For example national youth policy is depicted as “a blueprint for the status, rights, responsibilities and roles of youth” (UNESCAP, 1999b: 6). Furthermore, young people’s responsibilities are labelled as key components to be reflected in national youth policy.

Similar to the other manuals considered in this chapter, the responsibilities of young people are a rationalization for youth participation in the YPM. Here youth participation is alleged to be a catalyst for the knowledge of the rights necessary for responsible citizenship (UNESCAP, 1999a:1). Furthermore it is stated that the larger society in which youth live will benefit once this knowledge of their rights is gained and youth subsequently become responsible citizens (UNESCAP, 1999a). Elsewhere in the document, responsibility is used to connote specific measures for policies and
programmes. These examples demonstrate that responsible citizenship is encouraged and viewed as a contributing factor to successful participation and development. However, as governmentality and discourse analysis studies affirm, there are often underlying messages being presented in such discourses (Janks, 1997). As such, we need to examine critically the underlying assumption present in the UN’s notion of youth as responsible citizens.

An underlying message in these manuals is the perception that young people can be taught the ways in which to become responsible citizens. In the CBCCY manual young people’s responsibilities are discussed as part of a package to be further developed. At several points within the document, the “responsibilities” of youth are referenced following terms such as ‘knowledge’ and ‘skills’ (UNESCO, 2002a: 22-23). In the Youth Policy Formulation Manual, the objectives of the youth policy of Brunei Darussalam are identified as an example of ‘good’ regional practice. Among the nation’s objectives is the notion that national youth policy be devised to assist youth in obtaining the knowledge and skills necessary to “engage in active and purposeful citizenship” (UNESCAP, 1999b: 40). As well, the argument is made in the YPM that too often nations fail to provide the adequate training needed to help young people “adapt to the responsibilities of adulthood” and, as such, youth participation becomes valuable because it can foster the knowledge vital for the successful transition from childhood to adulthood (UNESCAP, 1999a: 15). Finally, the need to guide and inform youth of the ways in which to become citizens, especially responsible ones, is not more evident than in the section of the Youth Participation Manual where citizenship is discussed. Following the assertion that maximal citizenship be the ideal level of participation for youth, the authors
contend that utilization of the maximal interpretation of citizenship requires training and education to “develop critical and reflective abilities and capacities for self-determination and autonomy” (UNESCAP, 1999a: 16). It is evident in these examples that, though youth responsible citizenship is purported to be attainable through active participation, it is to be achieved primarily through highly informed education and training on the part of youth.

The aforementioned roles and responsibilities of youth are also linked to the concept of ownership in several of the manuals. Use of the term in the YPM is evident where participation is defined. The authors contend that when youth participate in setting priorities and objectives, “a sense of ownership is generated” (UNESCAP, 1999a: 13). For the authors, this generated ownership encourages and fosters youth input which is more in line with what youth say they want. Youth participation in this manual is also defined as “a process whereby young people gradually increase control over their own environment” (UNESCAP, 1999a: 19). As well, this manual conveys the idea that youth participation, in which youth are consulted and directly involved, allows youth to feel that they have influence in their societies and thereby encourages ownership of the conditions that constitute their environments (UNESCAP, 1999a: 19). Reference to ownership in the YPFM is attached to national youth policy where it is acknowledged that policies are “effective” when it provides young people with the opportunity to assume responsibilities and shape their futures (UNESCAP, 1999b:72). Finally, the concept of ownership is linked with project/ programme resources and cost effectiveness (UNESCO, 2002a). Here youth participation is alleged to reduce project maintenance costs because through participation youth will be more inclined to “take care of what they
own” (UNESCO, 2002a: 38). Therefore, ownership as it is applied to the issue of youth and development, refers to promoting in young people the realization that the societies in which they live belong to them, that they are in control of their situations, and that they are to take full responsibility of what they possess.

What then are the implications of policies centred on encouraging and fostering youth participation, youth ownership, and responsible citizenship? The manuals used in this research hold some of the answers to this question. According to the YPM, youth participation, and empowerment encourages young people to be creators rather than “passive consumers of the services provided for them” (UNESCAP, 1999a: 14). This type of statement connotes that young people’s membership in their societies requires that they take ownership of their societies, and take an active role in creating the services meant to foster social change, which they are encouraged to utilize. From the UN’s mandate on key areas of focus for youth, we see that these ‘services’ include the educational, health and economic sectors, as well as services relating to leisure (United Nations, 2005). Furthermore, the argument is made in the YPM that “supportive environments” are necessary in successful participation (UNESCAP, 1999a: 15). According to the manual, creating supportive environments entails assisting “young people in developing skills, confidence and awareness to enable them to take initiatives and tackle issues on their own” (UNESCAP, 1999a: 15). One implication of this statement is that the manuals inform policy makers that youth have a social responsibility to remove themselves from the plights they face. Though some may contend that this statement reaffirms the need for youth participation, it is also important to note the potential for the shifting of responsibilities. Do such statements not work to transfer the
responsibilities and obligations adults have towards creating better societies for youth, directly to youth themselves? Though it is asserted that youth participation should not be a replacement for adult responsibility (UNESCAP, 2002a: 38), we need to look at this question in some detail.

The assertion that "supportive environments" should be developed to encourage youth to tackle issues on their own also raises issues around the objectives and nature of youth participation. Each of the manuals analyzed in this research makes a strong case for participation that results in the collaboration and/or partnership between youth and adults. In the Creating Better Cities with Children and Youth Manual, the author proposes that shared-decision making, in which youth take a valued role alongside adults, be the ideal in participatory community development strategies (UNESCO, 2002a: 42). The Making Commitment Matters toolkit takes a slightly different approach to shared participation, citing the need for partnerships between different actors. According to the toolkit, the benefit of partnerships includes the sharing of resources, risks, and competencies, but most of all it includes the ability to "achieve with others, what could [otherwise] not be done alone" (United Nations, 2004: 99). In the Youth Policy Formulation Manual the case is made that national youth policy can create a framework for collective action and cooperation to take place between young people, NGOs and governments (UNESCAP, 1999b). Lastly, the Youth Participation Manual recommends that youth participation should be centred on developing partnerships between young people and adults (UNESCAP, 1999a: 39). However, as is shown in the preceding analysis, youth initiatives for which youth are encouraged to combat issues on their own are openly advocated throughout the manuals. In other words, this view is a clear contradiction to
the principles of youth participation communicated in the manuals. Ownership, as it is applied to youth participation, is also a direct contradiction to the idea of youth participation through collaborations between youth and adults. While shared input from both youth and adults is openly valued within development discourse (UNESCAP, 1999a; UNESCO, 2002a), the message of ownership, both directly and indirectly, raises serious doubts about the objectives for and benefits of collaboration as purported in these manuals.

Finally, an examination of participatory development intervention requires an analysis of the ways project failures are discussed and dealt with. Unfortunately this issue is barely addressed in the manuals. The tone of the manuals suggests that the UN truly believes that empowerment can be attained, and furthermore that youth participation can effectively lead to social development: there is little room for failure. However where it is addressed, one sees that youth are further ‘responsibilized’. For example, in the CBCCY manual, the author refutes the argument made that youth cannot understand the consequences of failed decisions by stating that education is key in participation and, as such, “young people need to understand the potential consequences of their recommendations and actions” (UNESCO, 2002a:38). The message given here is not only that where strategies centred on youth participation fail, young people themselves should deal with the consequences, but that youth should anticipate the possible outcomes of their (in)action, and should act accordingly, i.e., responsibly. It is in this sense that we may say, despite assertions to the contrary; UN activities in youth and development are about transferring the responsibility for society and for the future from development practitioners, governments, and policy makers, to youth.
This chapter has focused on UN manuals and training documents to illustrate the technologies of government in operation surrounding youth and development efforts. The question remains whether and how these technologies have been taken up and implemented in UN based projects throughout the world. In the chapter four, I consider two case studies to show how these discourses on youth participation and development become enacted in the real world.
CHAPTER IV: ANALYSIS II

Governing Youth: Two UN Case Studies

This chapter is organized in two sections. In the first section I examine UNESCO’s Growing Up In Cities project, and in the second section, the UNPY and LSU’s Tackling Poverty Together. Similar to the analysis done in Chapter three, I apply the dimensions of government to the various components of the projects. Key themes examined in this area are: fields of visibility present in project objectives; techniques of governing used in each project workshop; claims of truth; and the influences of the projects on the identities of youth.

Case Study One: Growing Up In Cities Project

Growing Up in Cities (GUIC), developed by UNESCO, is a project designed to incorporate the participation and ideas of children and youth\(^2\) in the development of their communities. This project is significantly related to the wider issue of poverty reduction in developing countries and encourages the participation of young people in the development of their respective communities worldwide. The project is said to be based on the physical, social, economical, political and historical factors that characterize communities, and address the various impacts of these factors on young people’s existence (UNESCO, 2002b). Specifically, the project is aimed at bringing together various stakeholders (children and youth, development practitioners, and policy makers) together in the initiative towards creating better living environments for young people.

\(^2\) The GUIC project addresses equally the viewpoints, and needs of children and youth. One of the several documents utilized in the analysis of this project is the book, Growing Up in an Urbanizing World, which examines the project from the perspective of children and adolescents 10-15 years old.
GUIC is an ideal project for my examination because as this analysis will show, many of the project's activities provide a site through which governing is conducted.

It is important to begin by stating that UNESCO denotes the GUIC project as a "model". This model is described as having two significant goals. Firstly, it is aimed at understanding the ways young people document their local environments and secondly, the ways in which they evaluate their surroundings (UNESCO, 2002b: 23). These assessments provided by young people are then used in the urban planning and development of the environments in which they live. Furthermore, the project is said to have the ability to expose the misconceptions planners and related officials have about the ways their policies affect the lives of young people and their families (UNESCO, 2002b: 23).

My analysis involves an examination of the various fields of visibility operating, or in other words, an examination of who or what is being taken up as objects of governance in the GUIC project. In this analysis, I will be taking a particular focus on the project’s depiction of the environments of young people as sites of visibility in operation. As the basis of the GUIC project, young people’s environments take a vital role in the project. Questions guiding my analysis here include: In what ways have young people's environments been construed by the GUIC project? And, how do these depictions authorize the need to address young people by certain means?

**Fields of Visibility**

According to its creators, GUIC is a response to the world's growing population, the expanding urbanization of cities, and the increasing degradation of the environment—all of which have rendered children and youth to lives of poverty and environmental risk.
Young people's environments are said to be plagued by traffic, barrenness and open waste in public spaces, and limited opportunities for movement (UNESCO, 2002b: 25). The argument is also made that the needs of young people are often overlooked in the policy and planning of their cities. This is especially detrimental to young people because their local environments ultimately serve as "their world" (UNESCO, 2002b). However, the same environments that render bleak futures for young people are also recognized by proponents of the GUIC project as possessing the strong potential to improve the lives of young people and their families. For example, the argument is made that urban cities often provide easier access to education, health care and culture; allow more efficient regulation of environmental laws; and provide varied opportunities for employment in both the formal and informal sectors (UNESCO, 2002b: 220). In the description of the project we are shown that, although the situation of young people in relation to their environments appears dismal, there is still much to be gained from focusing on the development of urban cities. The aforementioned depictions, then present a "valid" case for the creation of this project, and for the techniques to be utilized for creating better cities and better young people, some of which will be examined further in this analysis.

**Techniques of Government**

As mentioned above, the GUIC project consists primarily of activities that are geared towards increasing the participation of children and youth in their societies. Aside from assessments and evaluations of local environments, developing workshops is a key strategy of the project. These workshops conducted at different sites worldwide are primarily focused on the dissemination of techniques and modes for achieving successful
community development with young people, and as such they are exemplary of the types of regimes of government said to justify the governing of individuals. Analyses of the workshops will be drawn primarily from the GUIC site in Papua New Guinea (PNG), with some brief discussions of other GUIC projects (e.g. Argentina).

The background notes of GUIC PNG begin by stating that GUIC workshops provide suggestions, guidelines and tools to help individuals interested in “improving the quality of young people’s lives”, design and implement community development projects involving children and youth (UNESCO, GUIC PNG, 2006). Here one sees that the general descriptor of the workshop is directly parallel to the ideals communicated in the discourses of the manuals analysed in this research. The primary idea is that improving the lives of young people is directly linked with their participation and moreover, that there are tools and frameworks that can help this goal to be attained.

These background notes further state that the objective of the workshop is to "skill" participants to “design and implement projects that give young people a voice” (UNESCO, GUIC PNG, 2006). There are two observations that should be made here. The first observation being that those taking part in the workshops need to be trained on how to develop appropriate projects for youth. The second observation pertains to the voices of youth. The assumption being made in the above statement is that there is a specific manner in which the “voices” of youth can be heard, and more importantly that identifying these voices is largely dependent on the acquisition of the skills necessary to foster the participation of young people. In an era when arguments are made that young people are often overlooked in the development of their societies (Saraswathi et al. 2001),
the need and resulting actions taken to give them a voice that can be heard is thereby “justified”.

**Truth Claims**

The GUIC workshops not only exemplify the types of techniques of governance that may be present in development interventions for young people, but are also exemplary of truth claims in operation in the project. These truth claims are based on the “premises” identified as guiding the GUIC PNG workshops. The first premise—“Young people are the future” speaks directly to the discourses presented in the previous chapter. This premise is explained with the statement that, “investments made in developing young people’s knowledge, skills, and social responsibility are the best investments we can make towards creating a better future” (UNESCO GUIC PNG, 2006). Not only does this statement resonate with the ideas present in UN discourses on youth participation, it is also explicitly stated in the project’s preceding document, the Growing Up in Cities project manual, *Creating Better Cities With Children and Youth: A Manual for Participation*.

There are a number of indications that the truths deployed by the UN directly inform projects and programs developed to increase young people’s participation in the development of their communities. We can take the premise: “Young people should be partners in community development” as an example (UNESCO GUIC PNG, 2006). As it is shown in Chapter three, this “truth” is also prominently featured in the manuals. With this premise, youth are presented as valuable and important members of society and are encouraged to be “legitimate participants” in community development. As well, a similar premise is made that collaboration and partnership become key components of the GUIC
project, as well as other programs developed to increase young people’s participation (UNESCO GUIC PNG, 2006). Though the project encourages young people’s participation in local initiatives to improve their communities, the case is made that this goal can only be attained with the help of adults. In the project’s introduction, the authors contend that it is as much about the processes that can bring together researchers, child advocates, governments, urban planners and designers and families to work with young people, as it is about understanding young people’s perspectives and ideas (UNESCO, 2002b: 19). This claim is reiterated as one of the major components of effective programs for child and youth participation (See Appendix C). As indicated in this figure, “networking” is encouraged as a method for ensuring that young peoples “needs are responded to and some of their ideas implemented” (UNESCO, 2002b: 233). Specifically, we are informed that the realization of the ideas of young people is dependent on adults with authority, influence and resources recognizing the importance of young people’s contributions (UNESCO, 2002b: 234). These types of claims are significant because they typify rationalizations that can be used to govern young people. Young people’s participation is encouraged but only insofar as adult assistance will permit. This message not only solicits the involvement of governments, youth advocates, policy makers and adults in youth centred participation, but also reinforces the idea that the roles and input of adults in these endeavours are vital to the success of “children and youth centred” development initiatives.

Finally, we see truth claims in the workshop objectives themselves. For example it is asserted that young people’s experiences of transforming their societies through participation, is “a powerful exercise for community empowerment” (UNESCO GUIC
PNG, 2006). This statement reiterates similar claims of empowerment present in the UN discourse on participation and development, and may also be a justification for the very existence of projects and programs that promote and encourage young people’s participation.

**The Formation of Identities**

What type of citizens then are youth encouraged to be by the GUIC project? The argument can be made that globally, the GUIC project has served to responsibilize young people. For example in the report on the Boca-Borracas, Buenos Aires GUIC project, readers are informed that the purpose of the development of a community action program for the region is two-fold. First, the project is meant to build the understanding and capacity of young people and their families, and secondly, it is meant to motivate young people to “create solutions to their own problems” (UNESCO, 2002b: 47). The project is also claimed to encourage young people to take action in improving their own environments. Moreover, the project serves as an example to government officials and policy makers of the ways in which they can instil a sense of action and ownership in young people. However this ownership is one that must correspond with the inputs of adult “experts” as the above analysis has shown.

Though described as means to skill individuals interested in improving the situation of young people, the project’s efforts in building the capacities and proficiency of young people themselves also says something about the type of citizen fostered by the GUIC project. “Skilled” youth is a term used widely throughout the project documents, and developing “skilled” youth is a clearly stated objective made by the project’s proponents. This is especially evident when it is stated that the GUIC project
demonstrates that studies in which young people examine their own environments can motivate them “to enthusiastically practice skills of writing, speaking, reading, drawing, measuring, design and calculation through an approach that makes learning more applied and relevant” (UNESCO, 2002b: 239). What do they have in mind in developing such attributes? In this sense, it is interesting that, similar to the manuals analysed in this research, we find proclamations that investments in developing young people’s skills and knowledge are among the most important ways to secure the future (Background Information GUIC PNG, 2006: 3). We can only assume that this “investment” orientation exemplifies the sentiments of governments and other development stakeholders that there are specific expectations of “return” from youth which will bring the societies that have been profiled for development to a particular future.

Case Study Two: Tackling Poverty Together Project

Tackling Poverty Together (TPT) is a project that incorporates the input of youth alongside those of stakeholders in poverty reduction strategies and programs. It is both designed and implemented by the United Nations Programme on Youth (UNPY) and the National Council of Swedish Youth Organizations (LSU). The project, aimed primarily at youth, also has an advisory team consisting of professionals from various UN bodies. The project is comprised of twenty-eight youth participants from Ghana, Kenya, Tanzania, Uganda, Sweden and Zambia, participating in two workshops done over a four-month period. As well each of the participants are said to have committed to working on the project before, between and after the workshops. There are several reasons why this project is ideal for this research. First, it is directed at youth; secondly, it encompasses a major issue in development studies—poverty; and lastly, most of the activities relating to
the project are done in the form of “workshops”, which may ultimately provide a site for actions of governance for this program.

I will begin by briefly examining some of the project’s objectives. In the brief background notes of the project six objectives are identified. These objectives are very much in line with the general discourse of youth participation present in the various UN manuals analysed in the preceding chapter. For example, one objective states that the project is aimed at assisting young people in developing skills in “research and analysis, strategic planning, advocacy, and understanding decision-making processes for the purpose of strengthening their role in development” (TPT Document 1: Fact Sheet—See Appendix D). From this statement we can conclude that the role envisioned for these youths is directly related to the skills they have in more or less structured participation in development matters. Another objective relates that the project is aimed at supporting partnerships and collaborations between youth organizations from different countries (TPT Document 1: Fact Sheet). Though an opinion widely exercised in the manuals, its use here differs slightly in that the collaboration and partnership is said to be between youth organizations rather than simply between youth and adults. This brief discussion of objectives is an example of the type of analysis done on the TPT project.

**Fields of Visibility**

According to Mitchell Dean (1999), fields of visibility allow regimes of governance to flourish. Questions of visibility include what is being illuminated and how. Charts and diagrams are excellent examples of how fields of visibility operate because they both contain and disseminate ideas within very specific frames. This visible form of government is very evident in the TPT framework which is presented as a chart
consisting of two areas—"considerations", and "resulting element in projects framework" (See Appendix E). The two categorizations themselves require some analysis. The "considerations" provide a rationale for the framework to be utilized, which will ultimately guide the project, while the "elements in the project's framework" is a clear example of how illumination operates.

What then is being illuminated within the TPT framework? First there is the 'consideration' that the Swedish Council for Youth Organizations (LSU) would like the project to incorporate their membership and "add to their capacity" as a means of strengthening LSU's involvement in international development and the Millennium Development Goals (TPT Interim Progress Report, 2006: 6). The 'resulting element' in the project entails incorporating Swedish participants into the project. Here the Swedish participants are said to add "experience in youth policy and advocacy from a donor perspective" (TPT Interim Progress Report, 2006: 6). These types of assertions beg the question: Who are the key stakeholders of this project? The statement also raises questions about ill-favoured top-down approaches to development. Though definite conclusions cannot be drawn, the need to have policy and advocacy experience from the donor perspective raises questions about the influence of donor agencies in the project. For example whose objectives are utilized and for what purpose?

The consideration is also made that the project builds "upon LSU’s capacity-building of youth led structures in Africa" (TPT Interim Progress Report, 2006: 6). It is argued that in order for this consideration to occur, participants must already possess skills and expertise in poverty reduction. Once again the top-down approach is applied here; however it is applied directly to the youth participants of the project. Despite the
assertion that the project’s aim is to incorporate participants from varied backgrounds, with varied experiences, youth with pre-existing knowledge in poverty reduction are selected as the primary participants. This stipulation justifies our needs to question the supposed “capacity-building of African youth led structures” as proclaimed by the project’s proponents from a governmentality perspective. Questions to ask here include: Are youth being trained to work in and change their wider communities? If so, how might the training which youths receive affect their communities? African youth led structures do not appear to be the only structures being built. Through the involvement of Swedish youth with “experience in advocacy” in these development initiatives one sees that the capacities of the Swedish participants are also being constructed. One may conclude that while the Swedish participants are claimed to be merely assisting their African counterparts in their development endeavours, the way in which the Swedish participants are positioned maintains North-South/top-down relations with youth from developing countries.

Also illuminated in the project’s field of visibility are the TPT’s “skill-building” areas. The six identified areas are: financing for youth development work; policy analysis and research; media and communication; employment as a major issue confronting youth poverty; advocacy and partnership development; and monitoring public funds and evaluating public projects (TPT: Report from the Second Workshop, 2006: 9-11). These areas each represent the kinds of skills the youth participants are hoped to build upon. These areas not only highlight some focal points of TPT, they also emphasize to both the youth and adult participants the ways in which poverty reduction is to be achieved.
Techniques of Government

Similar to the GUIC project, techniques of government are very present in the TPT project. In this analysis “workshops” serve as the primary mode through which techniques of government in the project are present. As the primary strategy of TPT, workshops also serve as the foundation of the project itself. These workshops are a technique of government because they are used as an informative means to achieving a specific end—training youth and incorporating them into poverty reduction strategies, with the goal of reducing poverty. As key components of the project it is important to also consider whether other practices of government might apply to the project’s workshops. My examination will include the procedures used in the workshops, the activities of the workshops, the tactics and strategies being presented in the workshops, and the overall vocabulary in the workshops.

The first workshop, conducted in Ndola, Zambia, is said to be based solely on the objectives created by the UNYP and LSU. These objectives are to be the groundwork for the creation of Action Plans. These plans, claimed to be based on the realities of the youth participants, are said to assist in focusing the efforts of the participants; support their efforts in building stakeholder support; and facilitate monitoring and peer-to-peer learning (TPT: Interim Progress Report, 2006:6). Examples of the goals of several country action plans include, increasing “effective youth participation in tackling poverty”, “building on the strength of youth to engage in poverty reduction processes”, and increasing youth participation by strengthening collaboration between youth organizations (TPT: Interim Progress Report, 2006: 10). In short, there is no contesting that the project is centred on encouraging the participation of youth in poverty reduction
strategies. However, what constitutes as “effective participation” in the eyes of the project’s proponents is an issue that deserves some discussion. As such, the discussions below attempt to shed some light in this area.

The second workshop held in Kampala, Uganda, is claimed to serve as an opportunity for youth participants to report-back on the implementation of their country action plans, discuss areas of importance related to their work, and discuss the project’s future. Interestingly, we are also told that there will be a transfer of leadership roles to the youth participants between the first and second workshops (TPT: Interim Progress Report, 2006:6). However, the fact that the youths are reporting back on the implementation of the project’s action plans in the second workshop tells us that the period between the workshops was spent incorporating the action plans created in the first workshop. This revelation significantly undermines the project’s supposed transferring of leadership. Action plans, which have been identified as one of the main goals of the project, were developed in the first workshop—where the UNPY and LSU were said to have had complete control. The roles that the youth participants are taking then are the ones that were stipulated in the action plans created under the guidance of the project partners. As such, one wonders the extent to which youth have taken on leadership roles in the project, and the ways in which those roles have been informed by non-youth participants.

One also sees in the above technique of government the operation of “techniques within the technique”. This is especially evident in the second workshop’s skill-building sessions. Here specific techniques were disseminated to youth on the six areas of skill-building (TPT: Report from the Second Workshop, 2006: 9-11). In the session on financing youth development work, the participants engage in ways to prepare formal
proposals for sponsorship from institutional donors. Areas discussed include needs assessments; project goals and objectives; methodology and budgeting. At the second session on policy analysis and research, participants discussed ways to present data "effectively". As well, participants engaged in discussions about the ways in which to use data as a justification for investing in youth; why data was necessary; and the ways to generate data. The session on media and communication was centred on the "packaging and delivery" of key messages relating to youth and poverty. The session on employment focused on utilizing policy and programs to inform the development of the country action plans, while the session on advocacy and partnership development focused on increasing collaborations with various stakeholders, as well as developing "strategies for gathering and presenting information to use in convincing others of the need to work and invest in young people" (TPT: Report from the Second Workshop, 2006:11). Finally, the last skill-building session was used to present examples of monitoring and evaluation of projects. All of the above examples depict specific ways of "doing" and "achieving" in youth centred poverty reduction strategies. More importantly these sessions, though claimed to incorporate the views of the participants, are facilitated by representatives from the United Nations Youth Programme, and the United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Africa (UNESCA). These stipulations raise questions about the roles and positions held by the youth participants at the sessions, as well as the possible implications of the UN led skill-building sessions on youth and the roles they are to take up in poverty reduction, which is addressed in further detail below.
Truth Claims

The truths which circulate through regimes of government are said to facilitate and rationalize the need to govern, whether directly or indirectly (Cruikshank, 1999; Dean 1999). Truth claims about young people's vulnerability are very present in the TPT project. The case is made that the transition between dependence and independence places young people in a vulnerable situation. As well, young people are said to be susceptible to exploitation, substance abuse and unstable school attendance—all of which encourage "a propensity towards living in poverty" (TPT: Interim Progress Report, 2006: 4). Therefore investing in youth through a project such as TPT, as it is stated in the TPT documents, can significantly increase the quality of life of young people. It should be acknowledged that the attitudes described above, also reflects the attitudes of some of the participants in the project. When asked to denote the differences between the types of poverty experienced by adults and youth, several of the youth participants indicated that youth were not positioned to improve their lives, and also that young people were more likely than adults to be exploited (TPT: Interim Report, 2005: 3). This example shows that some youth already acknowledge their "vulnerability". As such, truth claims about young people's susceptibility to social-ills must be addressed from the standpoint that they may commence through adult interactions with youth, but also that the claims made perpetuate and reinforce this way of thinking, which ultimately justifies the governing of others.

Another example of a truth claim in TPT is the notion of youth participation in poverty reduction strategies as a promising area for development intervention. For example we are informed that the Poverty Reduction Strategies Papers of many countries,
the Millennium Development Goals, and several existing country national youth policies view youth involvement in development as an area of promise for poverty reduction, and as such, a vital "investment" (TPT: Interim Progress Report, 2006: 4). Here, the claim works to rationalize the need to incorporate youth in development by showing that it is a growing area of focus, desired at international and national levels.

As outlined in a previous section of this chapter, "skills building" is a clear objective of TPT. However its focal point in the TPT project might also render it a truth claim. According to the TPT, strengthening the role of young people in the development and implementation of poverty reduction policies can be achieved through the development of their research, advocacy, strategic planning and decision-making skills (TPT: Interim Progress Report, 2006: 7). This objective was carried out in a three hour skills-building session. However it was later discovered that the allotted time was not sufficient to "effectively" build the skills of the youth participants and as such the skill-building session was developed into an introduction to the various tools and concepts that could assist young people’s initiatives in poverty reduction (TPT: Report from the Second Workshop, 2006: 9). This truth is especially significant because we see that it is a claim taken beyond its abstractness, and is actually enacted through the skill-building sessions.

**The Formation of Identities**

The above assessments lead to the key question guiding this research—what type of citizenship and roles, if any, are youth informed to take in the TPT project? First, there is evidence that the youths themselves recognize that they have a "role" to play, in poverty reduction, despite the nature of that role. When asked how the project had
increased their understanding of youth poverty and poverty reduction strategies, the youth generally stated that the roles they were to take in poverty reduction became more visible to them through their participation in the project. For example youth stated that the project had increased their understanding of youth poverty “vis-à-vis the role of young people in poverty reduction processes”, and by presenting “the strategic role young people could play at national levels of addressing poverty” (Final Programme for Kampala Workshop, 2006: 15-16).

More specifically the project has apparently encouraged youth to be self-sufficient and responsible citizens of their situation. The TPT focus on youth participation and involvement in poverty reduction strategies relating to youth, informs the youth participants that they have a significant role to play in the eradication of the poverty that they face. It should be acknowledged that though the youth are being responsibilized it would appear that there are some contradictions regarding the level of responsibility they are to have. In calling for their incorporation in poverty reductions strategies, TPT also establishes a case for stakeholder involvement. From the documents and reports, TPT stresses the need for collaboration between youth, governments, organizations and other stakeholders within the youths’ communities. For example, the skill-building session on advocacy and partnership in development, openly stressed the need build relationships with others outside of youth organizations (TPT: Report from the Second Workshop, 2006). However this type of mutual responsibility may further be undermined by discussions about project funding and resources, which have played a key role in the project. This is evident from the skill-building session on financing youth development work, in which the participants were trained on preparing formal proposals for
institutional donors, as well as the identification of The World Bank and the IMF as "missing stakeholders" in the project's initiatives. Furthermore, the case was made that future TPT initiatives include "a capacity-building element" in the project to secure needed resources at the national level (TPT: Report from the Second Workshop, 2006: 11). Overall, there are some visible contradiction between the projects goals and objectives, and what is actually enacted. Youth are encouraged to become more active in the situations that effect them but at the same time are informed that their successes in these efforts is related to the roles "key stakeholders" play these endeavours. Perhaps then that efforts made to understand the extent to which youth are responsibilized may be further enhanced with some examinations of the "responsibilities" of adults in youth led poverty reduction programs communicated by the UN.

In the TPT we also see that poverty reduction is presented as relational to economic success. First, we see a link to economics from the projects focus on the Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers. These Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs), centred on the promotion of social and economic development, largely prioritize poverty reduction in conjunction with economic development and growth (Craig et al. 2003). Moreover these PRSPs have also been identified as the basis for which the country actions plans have been developed. Though the case is made in the project's interim progress report that the plans address the need to incorporate youth issues and youth participation in the development of future PRSPs (TPT Interim Progress Report, 2006), several other TPT documents (TPT: Report from the Second Workshop, 2006; TPT Interim Report, 2005) have shown that attention is also given to the situation of young people in relation to economics and more specifically employment. An example is

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
evident from the skill-building session on employment where young people engaged in discussions about specific country employment policies and programs, as well as strengthening PRSPs and job creation avenues for youth. As well, a presentation on current poverty reduction strategies of African countries by the UN Economic Commission for Africa (UNECA) officer drew heavily from the PRSPs position on youth employment. Furthermore, "steps for follow-up" of the UNECA in the TPT project included making youth a focus of upcoming economic reports on Africa (TPT Interim Report, 2005: 9). Hence, one may deduce that a focus on the economic aspects of the PRSPs may inform the youth that their role in poverty reduction relies largely on their relationship with the economic sectors of their communities.

Outside of the skill-building sessions, youth employment as a catalyst for poverty reduction was also reiterated to the youth participants at several meetings with stakeholders and advisors. For example, the Zambian youth participants, upon meeting the Resident UN Representative for Zambia, were provided with several suggestions for Zambia’s action plan. Among the ideas suggested were that youth “recap poverty reduction as employment creation for young people”, and engage in all aspects of development rather than just those relating to youth (TPT: Interim Report, 2005: 18). These employment centred ideas were also restated to the Zambian youth participants during their meeting with the United Nations Population Fund Representative of Zambia. In general it is evident that the TPT project incorporates an economic basis among its aims for increasing the involvement of young people in poverty reduction strategies. From the workshop sessions, to meetings with stakeholders and advisors, youth are informed that their role in poverty reduction is to be juxtaposed with their employability
and the economy. Finally, this argument is further supported by several of the youth participants themselves who, in the project’s evaluation, go on to state that they now see economic issues as pertinent to poverty reduction. “I have come up with new strategies of youth poverty reduction such as unemployment which were well discussed, micro-financing, fundraising etc.” (Final Programme for Kampala Workshop, 2006: 16).

From the TPT project, we see that some specific roles and identities have been developed for the youth participants of the project. As well, we see that the various techniques and strategies utilized in the project have also informed some pre-existing identities of youth. Specifically, this analysis has shown that the various “skills” and economic roles young people can offer to poverty reduction strategies and interventions are among the most “important contributions” they can make to their societies. Overall, the various documents of the project have affirmed a key viewpoint of proponents of youth participation present in both the Manuals and GUIC texts analysed in this research: there is value in promoting young people’s participation in their societies.

The two projects utilized as case studies in this research support the need to examine the way discourses on youth participation in development become enacted in practice. The documents produced on the projects have allowed me to gauge the concepts of empowerment, participation and development from a governmentality perspective. From the use of diagrams, charts, and maps, to the documented techniques utilized, both projects have provided the necessary data required for this type of governmentality analysis. The focus on “workshops” in both projects has proven to be especially useful in this examination. The workshops not only encompassed the framework through which both projects’ objectives were been materialized, but also provided the frame through
which the regimes of governance in both projects were presented. Using the insights gained from the analysis done in this chapter as well as in the previous chapter, I present in the following chapter some key discussions and recommendations about incorporating youth in the development process via participation and empowerment.
CHAPTER V: CONCLUSION

Discussion and Conclusion

In attempting to include youth in development processes, the United Nations, as well as its respective organizational bodies, has informed the identities that youth possess. This mobilization effort has been grounded on the premise that young people’s participation in their societies can effectively lead to development. Among the most influential development agencies in existence today, the UN sets the precedent for the approaches and strategies for development utilized by governments, policy makers, development practitioners and development agencies. Efforts taken to improve the situation of youth have implications not only for youth but also for the directions their societies will take towards the future. In seeking to mobilize youth towards taking an “active” role in their societies, the UN has enlisted several key concepts to assist their work, mainly participation and empowerment. As concepts, participation and empowerment have played significant roles in the issue surrounding young people’s position in the struggle for attaining development in developing countries.

From the analysis provided in this research, participation as a strategy for development must be situated alongside the traditional forms of development it is often professed to challenge. As it has been utilized to encourage young people’s positions in the development of their communities, we see that ‘participation’ in this context can produce many of the same outcomes as its counter approaches. For example the GUIC project requires participants to be well versed in poverty reduction skills and strategies. As well, from the position communicated in the Creating Better Cities with Children and Youth Manual (2002a), success in young people’s attempts to increase their role in
society is largely dependent on the roles adult play in this endeavour. Both instances exemplify the top-down approach favoured in past development interventions. To borrow from Pieterse (2000), it is not enough to label “non-traditional” approaches to development as “alternative”. It must be ensured that the outcomes of any alternative approach must not perpetuate the same ideals it works against.

Empowerment has clearly been the driving force behind the emphasis on participation in youth and development initiatives, and also as a means through which development can be attained. The supposed benefits of empowerment communicated primarily in the manuals used in this research overwhelmingly conceal the assumptions being made about the roles youth can and want to have in development. As it is explained in the manuals, when juxtaposed with the “consequences” of limiting people’s input in their societies, empowerment becomes a favourable objective in development studies. The manuals’ and texts’ overuse of statements such as “young people aspire to full participation in the life of society” (UNESCAP, 1999a:7), or youth “actively” seek to be incorporated (UNESCAP, 1999a), assumes that participation is amidst the priorities of young people. Irrespective of the truth (or the extent of the truth) behind these claims, the major effect of these statements is that they rationalize the current means used to govern young people’s positions in their societies. Here, young people’s needs are “desired” and “real”, so any efforts made to grant these needs are warranted.

Some efforts of the UN parallel the ideas of scholars who argue that empowerment is best served when taken beyond a theoretical debate and represented instead in tangible ways (Singh et al.1995; Narayan, 2005). In this research, proposals made for young people’s participation to governments, development practitioners, policy
workers, and youth themselves incorporated some very tangible and specific techniques and methods. Among the most notable examples were the workshops employed in both the *Growing Up In Cities* and the *Tackling Poverty Together* projects. Within these workshops specific techniques and activities were used to disseminate information to both youth and other stakeholders regarding youth participation. There is something about teaching people how, when, and where to facilitate participation that renders “participation” no longer participation. As well, the idea that participation can be effectively enhanced and facilitated in a “workshop” setting also raises questions about its efficacy. As the preceding chapters have highlighted, the participatory initiatives made at the case study workshops were based on building more effective strategies for attaining more effective outcomes for youth-based participatory development interventions. Unfortunately, as some literature has shown, the consequences of focusing on these external components (featured prominently in this study) are that they seriously undermine the goals of participatory development and empowerment, the guiding concept often behind participation (Mosse, 2001; Cleaver, 2001).

Any discussion of the identities of youth must be situated within the discussions above. Not only are the identities of youth informed by the concepts of participation and empowerment, they are also reflective of the techniques used to communicate and facilitate their input in their societies. The question must be asked: If the UN’s view of young people as the future of society, agents of change, and vital and integral to society were non-existent, would the participatory approach being advocated today still be salient? This query exemplifies the value of using a governmentality perspective to understand development interventions concerning youth. With a governmentality perspective we are
able to see how characterizations influence actions. In the case of this project, the UN’s views on youth are immediately reproduced in the ways they [youth] are approached for development.

One of the major contributions of governmentality to this study has been the influence it has had in showing that youth are being mobilized by UN led projects and manuals into becoming responsibilized owners and citizens of their societies. Applying governmentality’s “critical capacity” (Rankin, 2001: 33) to the manuals and case studies allowed me to see that youth, and key stakeholders in youth issues, were being informed that to overcome the “problems and uncertainties regarding their [youths] future” (UNESCAP, 1999a: 42), young people must take ownership of their situations and “create solutions to their own problems” (UNESCO, 2002b: 47). As well, these stakeholders were also told that a key function of participation is its ability to foster democratic citizenship (UNESCAP, 1999a), and which provides youth with the opportunities to become “competent, independent and responsible citizens” (UNESCAP, 1999a:15). In short, young people’s identities are the result of some of the key tenets of a particular form of democracy, which it is safe to say, is a desired system for the UN in the current context of our world.

In the texts considered for this study, potential stakeholders in youth and development issues were shown that young people’s role as responsible citizens also includes their participation in improving the economic situations of their societies. In the manuals we see references to the ways in which the economic sectors of many societies are related to the development of youth while, in the case studies, we see what appears to be an over reliance on the argument that participation in the economy and related areas
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can often lead to better development. For example, in the TPT project young people's relationship to the economy was among the key “focal areas” of the project. These kinds of examples support scholars who have argued against these types of influences, claiming that they foster a constrained type of existence for the targeted individuals (Cruickshank, 1999; Triantafillou et al. 2001; Rankin, 2001).

Finally, there is clear evidence from this study that the UN discourse on youth participation in development shapes the practices related directly to the issue. I found that the UN manuals served two key purposes. First, they encouraged governments, policy makers, and development practitioners to take a greater interest in youth, and secondly, they provided explicit illustrations of the ways in which effective programs could be developed for youth. As my analysis has shown, there are several instances where parallel statements are made in the case studies and manuals. This was especially the case for the GUIC project, where the suggestions from the Creating Better Cities with Children and Youth were evident in the evaluative companion manual Growing Up In An Urbanizing World, and applied in the project itself. What this finding suggests is that there is power in discourse, which in turn becomes perpetuated in various forms of practice. In this case, power is present in: the ways in which youth and development is addressed by the UN as an ‘issue’; the strategies and techniques used to communicate the concerns in this area to youth and stakeholders; and the ways in which young people’s identities become informed by UN discourses and practices.

Overall, governments, development practitioners, and policy makers must recognize that any will to improve the situations of young people will have implications on young people, regardless of the apparent appeal of the initiatives taken. As such, it is
important to examine these approaches critically, both for their potential benefits to youth and their societies, and for the potential adverse effects. It is not enough to simply accept or reject the concepts of empowerment and participation as alternatives to development. In the case of empowerment, it may best serve its purposes when examined as existing within the realm of power it is meant to challenge. This type of critical examination, when applied to the issue of youth and development, might set the stage for bringing youth into the development of their societies with less detrimental results.

**Limitations of the Study**

This study has been aimed at adding to the knowledge-base surrounding participatory development and empowerment by examining the ways the concepts are used to address the situation of youth in the developing world. As with any body of research there are limitations that must be addressed. There are two limitations to this study. One limitation is that though this research examines the ways in which the UN informs the identities of youth through participation and empowerment, it does not address all the possible implications of the institutions utilization of a homogenous definition of youth in programs that are to be applied within varying contexts.

The second limitation concerns the value of conducting research in the field. As this research was purely a discourse analysis of texts pertinent to the UN, youth, and development, no field research was done from which data could be collected. The potential value in going into the field for the type of issue examined in this study is twofold. First, going into the field will give me a first hand look at the discourses in practice, and secondly, it provides the opportunity to hear the voices of all stakeholders involved in youth-based participatory development initiatives, giving me access to the interfaces
present between development practitioners, policy makers and youth themselves. It is through these interfaces that I may gain valuable insights on the ways each stakeholder views their positions surrounding the issue, and the ways in which their relationships are interconnected. As an important component of youth and development studies, I intend on taking up this methodological technique as part of any future work done on the issues raised in this project.

**Recommendations for Future Research**

There are several areas for future study from this research that I feel will add to the theme of youth participation in international development. First, as this research has examined the identities being created for youth, it may be equally valuable to examine the ones being created for adults. This may be useful for exposing some of the contradictions present in the UN discourse on youth and development (i.e. that they should be active free participants, but that adult presence in their endeavours is necessary for successes in these initiatives), but also for enhancing our knowledge surrounding the opportunities, situations and contexts created to enable youth to take more active roles in their societies. In this area of inquiry then, the roles being presented to adults may have implications for the identities created for youth.

Another area to consider involves an examination of neoliberal approaches to development interventions for youth. This suggestion is based on my findings that youth are being responsibilized for their situations, and juxtaposed with the economic sector of their societies. An in-depth study of the links between neoliberalism and participation may be able to explicate more fully the contemporary positioning of young people, and the implications for youth themselves and for their societies.
Finally, another important area that may benefit from further study involves examining the ways “audit” features in participatory development approaches. From the case studies utilized in this research, “evaluation” appears to be important for the UN’s focus for young people’s participation. An examination into audit and participation might shed some light on other types of rationalities being created for youth (e.g. youth as evaluators), and may further add to the literature on the varying dimensions of “participation”.
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Appendices
Appendix A. Self-evaluation of your city as a place for young people

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive Attributes</th>
<th>Negative Attributes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Integration</strong>&lt;br&gt;Do young people feel welcome throughout the community? Do they interact with other age groups in public places and in formal or informal activities? Do they have sense of belonging and of being valued?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gathering Places and Activity Setting</strong>&lt;br&gt;Are there a variety of places for young people to meet friends, talk, play sports or informal games, shop, be alone, or just ‘hang out’?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Safety and Freedom of Movement</strong>&lt;br&gt;Is there a general sense of safety? Are young people familiar with the local area? Are they able to move around the community freely without fear or concerns about their safety?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access to Nature</strong>&lt;br&gt;Do young people have access to natural settings? Are there trees to climb? Fields for organized sports? Developed parks and play areas? ‘Wild areas’ where they can explore on their own?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Image and Identity</strong>&lt;br&gt;Do residents in general, and young people in particular, have a positive opinion about where they live? Are they aware of its history and proud of its accomplishments? Do they participate in community activities and cultural life?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Tenure</strong>&lt;br&gt;Do residents own the land and structures in which they live? Do they have undisputed legal title? Are there any threats of relocation or displacement from authorities or private developers/landowners?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Basic Goods and Services</strong>&lt;br&gt;Do residents have secure access to food, water, shelter and sanitation?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local Power and Control</strong>&lt;br&gt;Does the local community have a sense of control over its destiny? Do they feel a stake in legal decision-making and have any say in political outcomes? Are young people involved in the decision-making process? Do they have hope about the future?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix B. The dimensions of young people’s participation
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Appendix C. Major Components of Effective Programmes for Child and Youth Participants

**Training** in authentic participation and different methods to achieve it.

**Listening** to young people and their families.

**Systematic research**—qualitative as well as quantitative—when the information gathered is intended to inform policy making.

**Networking** to create alliances of people at local, municipal and national levels who will use their influence to see that children's needs are responded to and some of their ideas as implemented.

**Lobbying** to keep children's rights to participate a salient political issue.

Appendix D. Objectives for the Tackling Poverty Together Project

• Further an understanding of youth poverty by 1) soliciting experiences and views directly from young people; 2) incorporating existing research, and 3) examining the specific gender and intergenerational dimensions of poverty;

• Find out the particular characteristics and needs of young people living in poverty and, in particular, where they differ by gender, and to identify factors that should be considered in developing effective poverty reduction strategies for youth;

• Review some of the current poverty reduction strategies in Africa and their efforts to include youth, drawing out lessons learned and identifying opportunities for further application;

• Assist young people in developing skills in research and analysis, strategic planning, advocacy and understanding decision-making processes for the purpose of strengthening their role in the development and implementation of national poverty reduction policies;

• Support partnerships and collaboration between youth organizations from different countries;

• Create a model for strengthening youth policy development that involves cooperation between the youth organizations, governments and the United Nations.

Appendix E. Some considerations for the framework of the *Tackling Poverty Together* project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Considerations</th>
<th>Resulting element in project’s framework</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• LSU would like the project to add to their capacity and to incorporate their membership in order to strengthen their involvement in international cooperation and mobilization for the Millennium Development Goals.</td>
<td>• There will be participants from Sweden to promote cross-cultural exchange and to add to experience in youth policy and advocacy from a donor country perspective.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| • The project should build upon LSU’s capacity-building of youth-led structures in Africa.  
  • The project will need to recruit youth who have relevant skills and expertise in poverty reduction.  
  • The project should include a diversity of youth organizations- political, grassroots, student-based, and research organizations need to work together to effectively engage in policy processes. | • The selection process will make use of LSU’s existing contacts for recruitment and be based on defined criteria. Gender balance in the country teams will be assured to strengthen the role of young women in policy and advocacy work.  
  • A minimum of four youth representatives from various organizations should be involved in the workshops and additional organizations should be involved on the national level- this will help to incorporate diversity, share ownership, and facilitate networks. |
| • The project should facilitate youth organizations to be regarded as important actors in designing and implementing poverty reduction strategies. | • A principal component of the project will be Action Plans, developed by the participants, which are guided by the realities of their national contexts. Those will serve to focus each country team efforts, support outreach efforts in building broader stakeholder support, and allow for monitoring and peer-to-peer learning. |
| • The project framework must be flexible enough to incorporate changes as it evolves--this will be particularly necessary once participants are recruited and engaged, as the project and its outcomes should be driven by the youth participants as much as possible. | • The Programme on Youth and LSU establish clear objectives for the project and the content for the first workshop. Following this, there should be an increasing transference of leadership to the participants between the first and second workshop. |
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