PALGRAVE POLITICS OF IDENTITY & CITIZENSHIP SERIES

Lived Citizenship on the Edge of Society

Rights, Belonging, Intimate Life and Spatiality

Edited by Hanne Warming and Kristian Fahnøe

Palgrave Politics of Identity and Citizenship Series

The politics of identity and citizenship has assumed increasing importance as our polities have become significantly more culturally, ethnically and religiously diverse. Different types of scholars, including philosophers, sociologists, political scientists and historians make contributions to this field and this series showcases a variety of innovative contributions to it. Focusing on a range of different countries, and utilizing the insights of different disciplines, the series helps to illuminate an increasingly controversial area of research and titles in it will be of interest to a number of audiences including scholars, students and other interested individuals.

More information about this series at
http://www.springer.com/series/14670

Hanne Warming · Kristian Fahnøe
Editors

Lived Citizenship on the Edge of Society

Rights, Belonging, Intimate Life and Spatiality

palgrave
macmillan

Editors
Hanne Warming
Department of Social Sciences and Business
Roskilde University
Roskilde, Denmark

Kristian Fahnøe
Department of Social Work
Metropolitan University College
Copenhagen, Denmark

Palgrave Politics of Identity and Citizenship Series
ISBN 978-3-319-55067-1 ISBN 978-3-319-55068-8 (eBook)
DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-55068-8

Library of Congress Control Number: 2017936888

Cover illustration: © Adam Burton/Alamy Stock Photo

Printed on acid-free paper

This Palgrave Macmillan imprint is published by Springer Nature
The registered company is Springer International Publishing AG
The registered company address is: Gewerbestrasse 11, 6330 Cham, Switzerland

Acknowledgements

First and foremost, we would like to thank all those who participated as informants in the research presented in this book. Their willingness to participate in interviews and observations made the book possible. We would also like to thank the contributing authors and the Danish Research Council, which funded the research project 'Citizenship on the Edge of Society', thereby enabling us to work on this anthology. We are grateful to the research group 'Social dynamics and Change' at Roskilde University, whose members gave us valuable comments on early drafts of project descriptions and papers throughout the process of writing this book. We would also like to acknowledge the work carried out on the manuscript by student assistants Sara Romme Rasmussen and Rosa Haumark Carlsen, as well as research assistant Emil Søbjerg Falster at Roskilde University. Finally, we would like to thank Sharla Plant and Amelia Derkatsch at Palgrave Macmillan for their helpfulness.

January 2017

Hanne Warming
Kristian Fahnøe

Contents

About the Editors

Hanne Warming is Professor of Sociology, Childhood and Social Work, and head of the research group 'Social dynamics and Change', at the Department of Social Sciences and Business, Roskilde University.

Professor Warming has published extensively in the fields of social work with children and young people, lived citizenship and trust, and children's perspectives. In 2005, she received a prize for the Best Project of the Year from The Joint Council for Child Issues in Denmark. In 2008, she was appointed as an EU expert on children's rights, in 2011 as member of the National Council for Children's Affairs by the Minister of Social Affairs, and in 2016 for the European Expert Database of Outstanding Female Academics "Academianet".

Currently, Prof. Warming is the leader of three national research projects, including a project titled 'Citizenship on the Edge', funded by the Danish Council of Independent Research.

Kristian Fahnøe is Senior Lecturer in Social Sciences at the Department of Social Work, Metropolitan University College. He holds a Ph.D. in Social Science from Roskilde University (2013). He primarily teaches at the Bachelor Degree Programme in Social Work with a focus

on social work with adults in marginalized positions, social pedagogy and inclusion. His research is mainly ethnographic and it centres on power, knowledge and identity in relation to social work practices with homeless people and substance and alcohol abusers.

Social Work and Lived Citizenship

Hanne Warming and Kristian Fahnøe

Introduction

This book addresses a core issue in street-level social work, namely the lived citizenship challenges faced by vulnerable groups. Lived citizenship is citizenship as practiced and experienced in everyday life. The concept addresses individuals' relationship to communities at various scales: it is not just about their relationship with a given nation-state. Besides rights and responsibilities, it includes identity dimensions such as belonging, motivation and self–other perceptions. The conceptualisation of citizenship as lived calls for an exploration of how citizenship challenges affect the everyday lives of these vulnerable groups and

H. Warming (✉)
Department of Social Sciences and Business,
Roskilde University, Roskilde, Denmark
e-mail: hannew@ruc.dk

K. Fahnøe
Department of Social Work, Metropolitan University College,
Copenhagen, Denmark

H. Warming and K. Fahnøe (eds.), *Lived Citizenship on the Edge of Society*,
Palgrave Politics of Identity and Citizenship Series, DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-55068-8_1

how conditionalities tied to the enjoyment of citizenship are an intrinsic part of this. By engaging in this inquiry, the book aims to advance the understanding of the role played by social work in lived citizenship from a perspective intended to stimulate reflection about the inclusionary and exclusionary dynamics of citizenship (Dominelli and Moosa-Mitha 2014).

Social work practice plays a vital role in supporting vulnerable people's lived citizenship, as it is through their relationships with vulnerable people that social workers can address individuals' needs and engage in processes that enhance their sense of belonging and thereby also their motivation for engaged participation. The book explores a wide range of social work practices and discourses, and thus it applies a notion of social work that includes social care and social case work, and professional and voluntary work in various settings including schools, social work offices, residential institutions as well as private and public spaces. The book also covers social work carried out by NGOs as well as public and private organisations.

Historically, social work has been caught between discourses and practices of solidarity and empowerment, on the one hand, and disciplining and control, on the other (Parton 2002; Haley 2014). This is still the case, and it may even be accentuated in today's society due to intertwined, mutually reinforcing and contradictory social dynamics stemming from globalisation, risk awareness and management, and new forms of governance (Danso 2009; Kemshall 2010; Warming 2011; Hertz and Johansson 2011; Lees et al. 2013). The book aims to help develop reflective social work practices that recognise the challenges associated with the duality that runs through social work and take vulnerable people's everyday experiences of citizenship seriously. Rather than specifying advantageous methods or approaches as much current literature on social work does, our ambition is to stimulate reflexivity by critically examining dilemmas in social work and investigating what kind of policies and practices are inimical to vulnerable people's lived citizenship and hinder inclusive forms of citizenship. Thus, we want to draw attention to the ambiguous ways in which social work affects people's lived citizenship. However, the book also takes a critical stance towards policies, governmental strategies and managerial strategies that

prevent social workers from reflecting and practising in flexible ways that promote the inclusion of vulnerable people.

Research into the citizenship of vulnerable groups remains scarce (Lister 2007, 53–54), and work on the role played by social work in regard to this is especially rare. Moreover, and related to the disregard of the importance of the physical dimensions of the environment in social work practice (Zapf 2010), we lack empirical studies of spatially contextualised "lived citizenship" and of the cultural, social and political practices that constitute it (Conover et al. 1991; Lister 2007; Pettersson 2012). This book addresses these lacunas in order to advance our understanding of vulnerable groups' citizenship and of how social work practices can undermine or strengthen it. The book offers empirical insights as well as theoretical concepts and frameworks for understanding processes of inclusion and marginalisation, empowerment and domination with a view to promoting more reflexive practices in social work. The vulnerable groups covered in this book include children, homeless people, migrants, ethnic minorities and mentally ill or disabled young people. This selection of vulnerable groups is not intended to be comprehensive. Instead, it offers diverse examples of social work with people "on the edges of society" and of how that social work influences their lived citizenship. In addition, the "selection" of groups is broad enough to enable us to write up general points on the topic in the book's conclusion. Moreover, although each chapter focuses on a specific group, the points drawn from the analysis are not necessary limited to this group. Thus, at the end of each chapter the transferability of the findings to other groups is discussed.

Looking at lived citizenship on the edge enables a more general advancement of our understanding of citizenship. As Mee and Wright (2009, 773) write in relation to belonging, a focus on boundaries—or edges—is a useful way to scrutinise the taken for granted. Such a focus is helpful in showing how citizenship is "messy, uncertain, fragile and shifting" (ibid.). The focus on "edges"—which are an intrinsic part of society and the social order—also enables us to showcase inclusionary and exclusionary citizenship processes. In our understanding, an "edge" can represent the *physical* limits of a place (e.g. the city or the nation-state), of a *social* community, or of a *status* (e.g. as a result of poverty or

discrimination). In line with Lister (1998, 9), we contend that awareness of citizenship's "power as a force for exclusion" is vital in order for social work practice to fulfil its inclusionary potential.

In the remainder of this chapter, we elaborate upon our key concept of "lived citizenship". We introduce four sub-approaches, or supporting concepts, which offer alternative approaches to analysing the role of social work in regard to the lived citizenship of people in vulnerable positions. These sub-approaches are: (1) disciplinary versus inclusive identity shaping; (2) intimate citizenship; (3) space; and (4) community governance. At the end of the chapter, we introduce the structure of the book, including a summary of each chapter.

Lived Citizenship

The lived citizenship approach represents an essential step in unfolding the egalitarian and anti-hierarchical potential of the concept of citizenship (Lister 2007). Thus, this approach moves beyond liberal (e.g. Rawls 1971), including social liberal (e.g. Marshall 1950), civic republican (e.g. Oldfield 1998) and communitarian (e.g. Taylor 1994) models of citizenship towards what Gerard Delanty has termed "radical theories of politics" (Delanty 2000, 46). By connecting the concept of citizenship with theories of radical democracy and inclusion, the lived citizenship approach aims to critically scrutinise the power relations that produce discrimination, domination and exclusion.

The concept of lived citizenship emerged from a gender- and diversity-inspired critique of T.H. Marshall's (1950) influential theory of social citizenship (Lister 2003; Lister et al. 2007; Kabeer 2005; Siim 2009). Marshall was preoccupied with the rights of the working class. Thus, he conceptualised citizenship in terms of rights connected to the nation-state and added social rights to the (political and civil) rights enshrined in traditional liberal theories of citizenship. Marshall conceptualised citizenship as a status bestowed upon all full members of a society and thus as a matter of the formal relationship between the individual and the state. The key argument underpinning this critique, seen from a gender and diversity perspective, is that the notion of universal

social rights contains a false universalism where the norm for a "citizen" is a white, heterosexual, non-disabled adult male—a norm that cannot address different needs (Lister 2003; Lister et al. 2007; Bell and Binnie 2000; Sabsay 2012) and contributions (Moosa-Mitha 2005). While women, children and various minority groups may have been granted formal citizenship, their "substantive" citizenship is fragile due to various intersecting constraints (e.g. illness, disability, discrimination, and poverty) on their ability to act as citizens (Lister 1998; Cohen 2005; Yuval-Davis 2007; Hart 2009; Warming 2011, 2013, 2016; Wall 2014). In order to take such differences into account, citizenship needs to be understood in terms of everyday practices, and "the citizen" should be recognised as a concrete embodied individual rather than an abstract category (Pettersson 2012). The lived citizenship approach aims to do exactly that. From this perspective, citizenship (understood in terms of rights, duties, participation and identity): that is, who is and feels included, excluded or not least on the edges, emerges from the multiple everyday interactions between people in which they perform, learn and experience citizenship as a self–other relationship (Hobson and Lister 2002). Seen through this lens, the concept of citizenship is not an either–or status, but is rather an ongoing produced effect of practices. The concept thus opens up for analyses of groups, such as illegal immigrants or people under guardianship (such as children), which do not hold the formal position of (full) citizens (Christensen 2016; Cherubini 2011; Moran-Ellis and Suenker 2013; Suenker 2009; Warming 2016). It can, furthermore, address the challenges faced by citizenship models in practice, as well as offering alternatives to theoretical models that attach citizenship to the nation-state, such as those put forward by Kymlicka (1995), Soysal (1994), Delanty (1996), Yuval-Davis (1997) and Beck (2002) which take account of globalisation and migration.

The lived citizenship perspective requires a processual focus on citizenship in terms of positioning and identity shaping, rather than regarding citizenship as a state or status, and on subjective experiences, difference and symbolic power relations (Stasiulis 2002; Moosa-Mitha 2005). Thus, this approach addresses the interplay between agency and structure which is at the core of contemporary citizenship dynamics,

including the role played by social policy and social work practices. By adopting this focus, the lived citizenship approach can help to elucidate the processes and structures that characterise the everyday conditions and endeavours of people in vulnerable positions. It also allows for explorations which take into account the contradictions and messiness inherent to practices and experiences of citizenship. Furthermore, the focus on everyday interactions and processes means that clients' citizenship is regarded as a—sometimes intentional and sometimes unintentional—more or less successful outcome of social (and other) policies and social work practices, rather than merely as a fixed status and condition for entitlement to social work assistance.

Surprisingly, despite this potential for critical analysis and reflexive social work, the lived citizenship approach has not yet really filtered into social work research, although there are a few exceptions which all focus on a certain target group rather than on social work practices per se, e.g. Lister (1998) on people living in poverty; and Hall and Coffey (2007), Pettersson (2012) and Kallio et al. (2015) on young people. Although the lived citizenship approach is well suited for carrying out critical analyses of different target groups' living situations, many themes and dilemmas related to the role played by social work in the lived citizenship of different target groups cut across these, e.g. the core theme of inclusion and solidarity versus exclusion and discipline. In particular, the sub-approach of citizenship as an inclusive or disciplining identity-shaping process has the potential to enable critical exploration of how inclusion and exclusion are shaped in everyday social work.

Disciplinary Versus Inclusive Identity Shaping

As already indicated, the processual perspective inherent in the lived citizenship approach entails paying attention to the ways in which social work and social policy may promote either inclusion or exclusion, not only on a "factual" level, but also in terms of how they are experienced (Lister 2007). Delanty (2003) suggests the concept of citizenship as a learning process in order to grasp the subjective dimension of the processes of inclusion and exclusion. He explains that citizenship

learning takes place in everyday life and is not only about awareness of rights and duties, but about identity. It is a self and self–other learning process that involves affective and emotional dimensions, such as the feeling of (not) belonging and (not) being valued, (lacking) motivation for participation, and competences. This learning can either take the form of a disciplinary and exclusionary process or an inclusive and identity-shaping one. Disciplinary identity shaping is based on certain norms that define the "right citizen" or "the right participation", and discriminate between people who live up to these norms and those who do not (Delanty 2003, 599). Thus, disciplinary citizenship is shaped by symbolic power relations that produce a double exclusion based on discrimination and self-exclusion. Inclusive identity shaping, on the other hand, refers to "the right to participate differently in the social institutions and culture of the society", and to have one's participation and contribution recognised (Moosa-Mitha 2005; Warming 2011, 2013). As a result, inclusive citizenship enhances the individual's sense of belonging and thereby also promotes engaged participation among those who deviate from the dominant norms. The distinction between disciplinary and inclusive citizenship captures the exclusionary aspects of citizenship as well as its conditionality. Chapters "'They Know Everything About us'—Exploring Spaces of Surveillance and Citizenship Learning Opportunities in a 24-hour Care Institution", "The Role of Social Work Practice and Policy in the Lived and Intimate Citizenship of Young People With Psychological Disorders", "Exploring Norms About Citizenship in Stories of Young People With "Psychological Vulnerabilities"", "Towards a Pragmatic Approach to Children's Citizenship: The Case of School Social Work in France" and "Theorizing Children's Welfare Citizenship: Lived Citizenship, Social Recognition and Generations" elaborate on this distinction.

Space

Our second sub-approach to the role of social work in regard to the lived citizenship of people in vulnerable positions is a spatial perspective. Pettersson (2012) writes that the lived citizenship approach's

emphasis on concrete and embodied citizens is inseparable from attentiveness to the spaces where citizenship is practiced and experienced. Similarly, Kallio et al. (2015) stress the spatial aspect of lived citizenship with reference to Massey's (1992) claim that space "is one of the axes along which we experience and conceptualise the world".

From a socio-spatial perspective, space is not only a place where "things happen", but rather a "social action situation" in which material (including bodily) and discursive relations are interwoven (Simonsen 2001, 35). As such, it involves the co-constitution of human and non-human actants, a co-constitution fundamental to experiences of being "out of place" (Cresswell 1996) and to the feeling of belonging (Wright 2015). This relational understanding of space challenges the dualisms of local/global, concrete/abstract, place/space. Following Massey (2005, 184), a socio-spatial perspective implies that "The 'lived reality of our lives' is utterly dispersed, unlocalised, in its sources and in its repercussions". This means that everyday social work practices are not simply equated with the local (Massey 2005). As such, space is understood as relational and always under construction, i.e. space is not given. Thus negotiations about space become vital if we want to understand the complexities of social work practices.

Thanks to its socio-spatial perspective, this book contributes to advancing "the spatial turn" in social work literature. By adopting this perspective, we aim to promote reflexivity based on increased sensitivity to complexities related to space, including the interconnectedness of space, practices and identities. Zapf acknowledges that "not all social work authors left the physical environment completely behind", and mentions Lehmann and Coady (2001) as an example of the few authors who "declared the physical environment to be an integral component of their worldview and foundation for practice" (Zapf 2010). Zapf, however, argues that the general picture was that attention to space was more of a declaration than something which actually influenced assessment tools and practice models. Nevertheless, he identifies some exceptions that are "instances in the literature of determined attempts to place environmental issues at the core of social work theory and practice", e.g. Germain (1981) who argued that the physical environment should be understood in terms of both the natural world and

the built world, further textured by the rhythms of time and considerations about spatial location. In line with these observations, Akesson et al. (2017) note that attention to space is a way to maintain the "person in environment" approach which has traditionally been an integral part of social work, but is under pressure due to the individualisation of social work. Paying attention to space can potentially highlight the interplay between people and places, and thus also the importance of the environment. Akesson et al. (2017) suggest a reformulation of the phrase "person in environment" as person *and* environment in order to advance our understanding of the ways in which social work may hinder or favour the inclusion of people in vulnerable positions. Jeyasingham (2014) has also pointed to the "fairly limited attention to space in social work literature", although this seems to be changing (Kemp 2011; Jeyasingham 2012; Balestrery 2016).

Related to the socio-spatial perspective, lived citizenship is framed by ongoing changes and challenges to the public-private divide which are central to experiences of feeling "out of place" and of belonging (see chapters "Citizenship on the Edge: Homeless Outreach and the City" and "From Objects of Care to Citizens—Young Carers' Citizenship"). Such changes include risk management through extended surveillance, the colonisation of public spaces by more affluent segments of the population, outreach social work and social interventions in people's private lives. This book offers new perspectives on the public-private divide and the related ongoing changes, building on insights from feminist studies and social geography. These perspectives address how social work is practised in the contested borderland between what is thought of as "public" and "private", respectively, and in so doing, they enable reflections about the consequences of the definitions (in social policy and social work practice) of what is public and private, and how norms tied to specific spaces and spatial practices affect the positions of vulnerable groups and inform social work. Chapters "Citizenship on the Edge: Homeless Outreach and the City", "'They Know Everything About us'—Exploring Spaces of Surveillance and Citizenship Learning Opportunities in a 24-hour Care Institution", "The Role of Social Work Practice and Policy in the Lived and Intimate Citizenship of Young People With Psychological Disorders",

"Exploring Norms About Citizenship in Stories of Young People With "Psychological Vulnerabilities"", "Social Repair of Relationships: Rights and Belonging in Outreach Work With Homeless People", "Towards a Pragmatic Approach to Children's Citizenship: The Case of School Social Work in France", "From Objects of Care to Citizens—Young Carers' Citizenship", "Migrant Women's Intimate Struggles and Lived Citizenship. Experiences From Southern Europe" and "Geo-politics and Citizenship: Why Geography Matters in Defining the Social Citizenship Rights of Canadian Muslim Youth" include space as an analytical theme, although they use different concepts to approach it and not all chapters address space to the same extent.

Intimate Citizenship

Our third sub-approach in this volume is based on the concept of *intimate citizenship* (Plummer 2001 and Plummer 2003), which thematises the public-private divide from another angle, based on critiques of traditional models of citizenship by feminists, transsexual, transgender, lesbian, gay and queer studies which assert that the latter cannot grasp the discrimination of women and sexual minorities (Plummer 2001; Cherubini 2011; Roseneil 2010; Ricardson 2000; Ricardson and Turner 2001). Thus, our rethinking of the concept of "intimate citizenship" may be regarded as a further step towards a difference-centred and inclusive conceptualisation that can realise more of the egalitarian and anti-hierarchical potential of the concept of citizenship.

The concept addresses how even the most private decisions and practices, e.g. how to be a friend, a parent or a love partner, or how to treat one's body, have become inextricably linked with public institutions, law, and state polices (Plummer 2001 and Plummer 2003; Payne 2013). The inclusion of "intimacy" in the concept resonates not only with the political nature of private decisions, but also with issues which are generally recognised as intertwined with our innermost emotional life: the longing for love, fear of being left alone and uncared for, feelings of self-worth and inner desires. Intimate citizenship can, as Payne (2013) suggests, be considered an additional (fourth) right to Marshall's three

(civil, political and social) rights (Marshall 1950). However, seen from the perspective of our lived citizenship approach, besides rights, intimate citizenship also includes duties (e.g. to live a healthy life), identity and belonging, which should be taken into account in analysing inclusive and disciplinary/excluding dynamics.

In the context of social work, the concept can be used as a tool for critical examination of the role of social policies and social work practices in ensuring (or countering) full citizenship for people on the edge of society. Plummer emphasises that intimate citizenship is not limited to local practices or national policies, but is "engaged in a wider scale and ha[s] much broader social ramifications" (Plummer 2003, 16), and Payne points to how practices of intimate citizenship are tied up with other characteristically late modern technological advancements, ranging from new reproductive technologies to new Information and Communication Technologies (Payne 2013), to which we might also add developments in diagnostics and medication, for instance. Chapters "From Objects of Care to Citizens—Young Carers' Citizenship" and "Migrant Women's Intimate Struggles and Lived Citizenship. Experiences From Southern Europe" focus specifically on this dimension of lived citizenship; and chapters "'They Know Everything About us'—Exploring Spaces of Surveillance and Citizenship Learning Opportunities in a 24-hour Care Institution", "The Role of Social Work Practice and Policy in the Lived and Intimate Citizenship of Young People With Psychological Disorders", "Exploring Norms About Citizenship in Stories of Young People With "Psychological Vulnerabilities"" and "Social Repair of Relationships: Rights and Belonging in Outreach Work With Homeless People" also draw on the concept in analysing social work practice.

Community Governance and the Scaling of the Spaces of Lived Citizenship

Related to intimate citizenship as well as to other dimensions of lived citizenship (rights, duties, identity and the spatial dimension), another important source of inspiration for our conceptualisation of space is

Rose's notion of community as a new territory for the administration of individual and collective existence. Thus, community governance constitutes our fourth sub-approach to the role played by social work in the lived citizenship of people in vulnerable positions.

Rose is inspired by, and has developed, Foucault's governmentality perspective. According to Rose, communities may be place-bound or based on the identification and problematisation of certain groups. The point is that they are made amenable to authoritative action by virtue of their features, "strengths, cultures and pathologies" (Rose 1996, 331). We regard social work as an example of such administration. Others have drawn on Rose's and Foucault's perspectives when analysing social work. Examples of this include Gilbert et al. (2005), who explore how people with learning disabilities are managed in specialised spaces in communities; Landhäußer and Ziegler (2005), who discuss quality of life as a point of reference for social work; and Flint (2002), who examines the governance by social housing agencies of anti-social behaviour through community building initiatives. Still, none of these focuses on the consequences for people's lived citizenship.

Desforges et al. (2005) argue that this type of community governance has scaled down the spaces of lived citizenship to the local level; however, spaces of lived citizenship are also, due to globalisation, increasingly constituted through spatial flows of information and communication (Simonsen 2001; Payne 2013). Examples of the latter are professional knowledge, policies, ideas and information, which may serve the purposes of governing as well as being constitutive of resistance within communities (Mitchell 2000).

These dynamics call for a focus on how governing through social work practices shapes the lived citizenship of community members, and on how spatial flows and "relationally constituted communities of attachment and resistance" influence this process (Amin 2004, 41). In this way, a spatial perspective on citizenship invites exploration of how local, institutionalised social work practices and the negotiation of rights, responsibilities, participation and identity are shaped by specific social and material settings, and is at the same time related to wider symbolic power relations (Desforges et al. 2005). Thus, in this book, we explore the interactions that shape the lived citizenship—including

intimate citizenship—of people in vulnerable positions as spatially contextualised in intertwined local, national and global meaning-making patterns and power relations. We elaborate on this point in the concluding chapter (chapter "Conclusion"); however, it is also touched upon in chapters "The Role of Social Work Practice and Policy in the Lived and Intimate Citizenship of Young People With Psychological Disorders", "Exploring Norms About Citizenship in Stories of Young People With "Psychological Vulnerabilities"", "From Objects of Care to Citizens—Young Carers' Citizenship", "Migrant Women's Intimate Struggles and Lived Citizenship. Experiences From Southern Europe" and "Geo-politics and Citizenship: Why Geography Matters in Defining the Social Citizenship Rights of Canadian Muslim Youth".

Structure of the Book

All the chapters in this anthology develop the conceptualisation of lived citizenship, unfolding and analysing the essential dimensions of lived citizenship, namely disciplining versus including citizenship, space, public-private, belonging, intimate citizenship and conditionality. The methodological approaches in the chapters range from ethnographic studies to more theoretical discussions, and hence, this volume presents a variety of entry points into explorations of lived citizenship. The book is structured around the theme of geographical scale, moving from a focus on the local scale to the national and global scale. However, in line with our socio-spatial perspective, we consider the hierarchical separation of scales as a construct. As illustrated in several of the chapters (e.g. chapters "From Objects of Care to Citizens—Young Carers' Citizenship", "Migrant Women's Intimate Struggles and Lived Citizenship. Experiences From Southern Europe" and "Geo-politics and Citizenship: Why Geography Matters in Defining the Social Citizenship Rights of Canadian Muslim Youth"), such scales are interconnected and mutually constituted (Massey 2005).

Thus the chapter which follows this introduction, chapter "Citizenship on the Edge: Homeless Outreach and the City": Citizenship on the Edge: Homeless Outreach and the City, by Tom

Hall, examines the lived citizenship of homeless people on a very local scale, namely in the city. The chapter places lived citizenship both within a historical and geographical frame. Using this frame, Hall examines various themes relating to homeless people's lived citizenship that also feature in other chapters dealing with groups on the edges of society. These themes include care, space, negotiations, changing forms of exclusionary elements of citizenship, and not least the public-private divide.

Chapter "'They Know Everything About us'—Exploring Spaces of Surveillance and Citizenship Learning Opportunities in a 24-hour Care Institution": 'They Know Everything About us'—Exploring Spaces of Surveillance and Citizenship Learning Opportunities in a 24-hour Care Institution, by Michael Christensen, is the first of three chapters exploring the shaping of citizenship on the edges through social work practices at residential homes, i.e. the analysis still centres very much on the local scale, but focuses on an institutional environment. The chapter uses a Lefebvre-inspired spatial approach to examine how staff practices shape children and young people's lived citizenship. Christensen focuses on how the young people struggle for private space in otherwise dominated spaces.

In chapter "The Role of Social Work Practice and Policy in the Lived and Intimate Citizenship of Young People With Psychological Disorders": The Role of Social Work Practice and Policy in the Lived and Intimate Citizenship of Young People With Psychological Disorders, Hanne Warming explores how young people's realisation of their citizenship as a lived practice and experience unfolds on the edges of citizenship, where they struggle to elude the complexities of social work practices and constructions of non-citizenship. Warming draws on a weak theory approach that embraces contested, ambiguous and multidimensional outcomes in analysing the effects of social work practices. Like the previous chapter, the focus is on everyday practices; however, the political context (of managerialism) is also addressed.

Chapter "Exploring Norms About Citizenship in Stories of Young People With "Psychological Vulnerabilities"": Exploring Norms About Citizenship in Stories of Young People With "Psychological Vulnerabilities", by Manon Lavaud, combines a narrative approach with

positioning theory to analyse the role played by norms about good citizenship in shaping identities as well as social work practices. Like the two previous chapters, the analysis unfolds at an institutional, everyday life level; however, it also addresses the impact of general societal/cultural norms and policy, linking these to the young people's intimate lives.

Chapter "Social Repair of Relationships: Rights and Belonging in Outreach Work With Homeless People": Social Repair of Relationships: Rights and Belonging in Outreach Work With Homeless People, by Kristian Fahnøe, explores how street outreach workers' efforts influence the lived citizenship of homeless people in Copenhagen city in terms of rights and belonging. The analysis in this chapter (as in the previous five chapters) takes place on a local level; however, through the concept of "social repair", the chapter grasps the multiple ways in which the outreach workers assist homeless people in restoring or establishing beneficial social relations with welfare state organisations, mainstream organisations, friends and family, and local communities, thus also encompassing a less local scale.

Chapter "Towards a Pragmatic Approach to Children's Citizenship: The Case of School Social Work in France": Towards a pragmatic approach to children's citizenship: the case of school social work in France, by Pascale Garnier, analyses citizenship as a practice on the local scale, but also relates this to the welfare state. The objective is to analyse the tensions between the formal (governmental), French conception of nation-related citizenship and the lived citizenship of children in vulnerable positions. The chapter focuses on the mediating and inclusive practices of school social workers working with the children.

In chapter "Theorizing Children's Welfare Citizenship: Lived Citizenship, Social Recognition and Generations": Theorizing Children's Welfare Citizenship: Lived Citizenship, Social Recognition and Generations, by Tom Cockburn, we move to lived citizenship at the national scale. The focus is on children as a group of people on the edges of citizenship. Specifically, the chapter explores children's national welfare citizenship, placing children at the heart of analysis rather than at the margins which is the tendency in much literature on this topic to date.

Chapter "From Objects of Care to Citizens—Young Carers' Citizenship": From Objects of Care to Citizens—Young Carers' Citizenship, by Anne Wihstutz, focuses on children's citizenship on several scales. The chapter deploys a lived citizenship perspective to explore how children's care practices in the Global North and Global South are conditioned by welfare policies and local social work practices which mesh with discourses on childhood, care and citizenship. In this way, the chapter addresses how local, national and transnational/global dynamics intertwine to shape social work practices; as well as the ways in which these practices shape the lived citizenship of young carers.

Chapter "Migrant Women's Intimate Struggles and Lived Citizenship. Experiences From Southern Europe": Migrant Women's Intimate Struggles and Lived Citizenship. Experiences From Southern Europe, by Daniela Cherubini, deals with the "lived" and "intimate" citizenship of migrant women involved in grassroots collectives in a Southern European context. It provides an empirically grounded analysis of citizenship as experienced and practised in relation to everyday and intimate life, by subjects who are located in, and act from, the edges and/or the margins of the gendered, racialised and classed structure of the local and transnational networks they inhabit.

Chapter "Geo-politics and Citizenship: Why Geography Matters in Defining the Social Citizenship Rights of Canadian Muslim Youth": Geo-politics and Citizenship: Why Geography Matters in Defining the Social Citizenship Rights of Canadian Muslim Youth, by Mehmoona Moosa-Mitha, presents a theoretical socio-spatial analysis of the lived citizenship of Canadian Muslim youth by examining globalisation, identity and care. The spatial analysis of globalisation unsettles taken-for-granted assumptions about nation-states as natural and recasts social citizenship as transnational in nature. Thus, the chapter's analysis collapses hierarchical notions of scale by treating space as relational and showing how lived citizenship undercuts borders that are often assumed to have a natural existence within hierarchical notions of space.

Chapter "Conclusion": Conclusion, by Kristian Fahnøe and Hanne Warming, brings together the findings of the previous chapters and develops the book's key concepts. It focuses on how the practices and sense-making that constitute lived citizenship are interwoven with

norms, policies, space and materiality. The conclusion also reflects on how social work practices involve various negotiations that produce processes of inclusion and exclusion which are, at times, inseparable. The conclusion relates the findings to other fields of social work than those represented in the book's chapters. In doing so, the chapter promotes a reflexive approach to social work that aims to strengthen the reader's understanding of processes of inclusion and exclusion, identity and space in social work practice.

References

Akesson, B., V. Burns, and S.R. Hordyk. 2017. The Place of Place in Social Work: Rethinking the Person-in-Environment Model in Social Work Education and Practice. *Journal of Social Work Education* 1–12.

Amin, A. 2004. Regions Unbound: Towards a New Politics of Place. *Geografiska Annaler* 86 (1): 33–44.

Balestrery, J.E. 2016. Social Work Education Without Walls: Ethnography as a Lens for Transformative Learning. *Social Work Education* 35 (6): 615–631.

Beck, U. 2002. The Cosmopolitan Society and its Enemies. *Theory, Culture & Society* 19 (1–2): 17–44.

Bell, D., and J. Binnie. 2000. *The Sexual Citizen. Queer Politics and Beyond*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Cherubini, D. 2011. Intersectionality and the Study of Lived Citizenship: A Case Study of Migrant Women's Experiences in Andalusia. *Graduate Journal of Social Science* 8 (2): 114–136.

Christensen, E.B. 2016. The Constantly Contingent Sense of Belonging of the 1.5 Generation Undocumented Youth: An Everyday Perspective. PhD dissertation, Copenhagen Business School.

Cohen, E. 2005. Neither Seen Nor Heard: Children's Citizenship in Contemporary Democracies. *Citizenship Studies* 9 (2): 221–240.

Conover, P.J., I.M. Crewe, and D.D. Searing. 1991. The Nature of Citizenship in the United States and Great Britain: Empirical Comments on Theoretical Themes. *Journal of Politics* 53 (3): 800–832.

Cresswell, T. 1996. *In Place/Out of Place: Geography, Ideology, and Transgression*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Danso, R. 2009. Emancipating and Empowering De-Valued Skilled Immigrants: What Hope Does Anti-Oppressive Social Work Practice Offer? *British Journal of Social Work* 39 (3): 539–555.

Delanty, G. 1996. Beyond the Nation-State: National Identity and Citizenship in a Multicultural Society—A Response to Rex. *Sociological Research Online* 1 (3).

Delanty, G. 2000. *Citizenship in the Global Age: Culture, Society and Politics*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Delanty, G. 2003. Citizenship as a Learning Process: Disciplinary Citizenship Versus Cultural Citizenship. *Lifelong Education* 22 (6): 597–605.

Desforges, L., R. Jones, and N. Woods. 2005. New Geographies of Citizenship. *Citizenship Studies* 9 (5): 439–451.

Dominelli, L., and M. Moosa-Mitha. 2014. Introduction. In *Reconfiguring Citizenship. Social Exclusion and Diversity Within Inclusive Citizenship Practices*, ed. L. Dominelli and M. Moosa-Mitha, 1–10. Farnham: Ashgate Publishing Limited.

Flint, J. 2002. Social Housing Agencies and the Governance of Anti-social Behaviour. *Housing Studies* 17 (4): 619–637.

Germain, C.B. 1981. The Physical Environment and Social Work Practice. In *Promoting Competence in Clients: A New/Old Approach to Social Work Practice*, ed. A.N. Maluccio, 103–124. New York: Free Press.

Gilbert, T., A. Cochrane, and S. Greenwell. 2005. Citizenship: Locating People with Learning Disabilities. *International Journal of Social Welfare* 14 (4): 287–296.

Haley, K. 2014. *Social Work Theories in Context: Creating Frameworks for Practice*, 2nd ed. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Hall, T.A., and A.J. Coffey. 2007. Learning Selves and Citizenship: Gender and Youth Transitions. *Journal of Social Policy* 36 (2): 279–296.

Hart, S. 2009. The 'Problem' with Youth: Young People, Citizenship and the Community. *Citizenship Studies* 13 (6): 641–657.

Herz, M., and T. Johansson. 2011. Critical Social Work—Considerations and Suggestions. *Critical Social Work* 12 (1): 28–45.

Hobson, B., and R. Lister. 2002. Citizenship. In *Contested Concepts in Gender and Social Politics*, ed. B. Hobson, J. Lewis, and B. Siim, 23–54. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Jeyasingham, D.J. 2012. *Geographers of Small Things. A Study of the Production of Space in Children's Social Work*. Birmingham: University of Birmingham.

Jeyasingham, D. 2014. The Production of Space in Children's Social Work: Insights from Henri Lefebvre's Spatial Dialectics. *British Journal of Social Work* 44 (7): 1879–1894.

Kabeer, N. 2005. *Inclusive Citizenship: Meanings and Expressions*. London: Zed Books.

Kallio, K.P., J. Häkli, and P. Bäcklund. 2015. Lived Citizenship as the Locus of Political Agency in Participatory Policy. *Citizenship Studies* 19 (1): 101–119.

Kemp, S.P. 2011. Recentering Environment in Social Work Practice: Necessity, Opportunity, Challenge. *British Journal of Social Work* 41 (6): 1198–1210.

Kemshall, H. 2010. Risk Rationalities in Contemporary Social Work Policy and Practice. *British Journal of Social Work* 40 (4): 1247–1262.

Kymlicka, W. 1995. *Multicultural Citizenship*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Landhäußer, S., and H. Ziegler. 2005. Social Work and the Quality of Life Politics—A Critical Assessment. *Social Work & Society* 3 (1): 30–58.

Lees, A., E. Meyer, and J. Rafferty. 2013. From Menzies Lyth to Munro: The Problem of Managerialism. *British Journal of Social Work* 43 (3): 542–558.

Lehmann, P., and N. Coady. 2001. *Theoretical Perspectives for Direct Social Work Practice: A Generalist-Eclectic Approach*. New York: Springer.

Lister, R. 1998. Citizenship on the Margins: Citizenship, Social Work and Social Action. *European Journal of Social Work* 1 (1): 5–18.

Lister, R. 2003. *Citizenship: Feminist Perspectives*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Lister, R. 2007. Inclusive Citizenship: Realizing the Potential. *Citizenship Studies* 11 (1): 49–61.

Lister, R., F. Williams, A. Anttonen, J. Bussemaker, J. Heinin, A. Gavana, S. Johansson, A. Leira, U. Gerhard, and C. Tobio. 2007. *Gendering Citizenship in Western Europe. New Challenges for Citizenship Research in a Cross-National Context*. Bristol: Policy Press.

Marshall, T.H. 1950. *Citizenship, Social Class and Other Essays*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Massey, D. 1992. Politics and Space/Time. *New Left Review* 196: 65–84.

Massey, D. 2005. *For Space*. London: Sage.

Mee, K., and S. Wright. 2009. Geographies of Belonging. Why Belonging? Why Geography? *Environment and Planning A* 41 (4): 772–779.

Mitchell, D. 2000. *Cultural Geography: A Critical Introduction*. Maiden: Blackwell.

Moosa-Mitha, M. 2005. A Difference-centred Alternative to Theorization of Children's Citizenship Rights. *Citizenship Studies* 9 (4): 369–388.

Moran-Ellis, J., and H. Suenker. 2013. Adult Trust and Children's Democratic Participation. In *Citizenship, Participation and Trust in Children's Lives*, ed. H. Warming, 32–51. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Oldfield, G. 1998. Citizenship and Community: Civic Republicanism and the Modern World. In *The Citizenship Debates*, ed. G. Shafir. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Parton, N. 2002. Social Theory, Social Change and Social Work: An Introduction. In *Social Theory, Social Change and Social Work*, 2nd ed., ed. N. Parton, 4–18. London: Routledge.

Payne, J.G. 2013. Transgendering Mother's Day: Blogging as Citizens' Media, Reproductive Rights and Intimate Citizenship. *Citizenship Studies* 17 (8): 928–941.

Pettersson, H.J. 2012. *Creating Social Citizenship: Young People, Ethnicity and Participation in a Swedish Local Context*. Väjxö: Linnaeus University.

Plummer, K. 2001. The Square of Intimate Citizenship: Some Preliminary Proposals. *Citizenship Studies* 5 (3): 237–253.

Plummer, K. 2003. *Intimate Citizenship*: *Private Decisions and Public Dialogue*. Seattle: University of Washington Press.

Rawls, J. 1971. *A Theory of Justice*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Ricardson, D. 2000. Constructing Sexual Citizenship: Theorizing Sexual Rights. *Critical Social Policy* 20 (1): 105–135.

Ricardson, E.H., and B.S. Turner. 2001. Sexual, Intimate or Reproductive Citizenship? *Citizenship Studies* 5 (3): 329–338.

Rose, N. 1996. The Death of the Social? Refiguring the Territory of Government. *Economy and Society* 25 (3): 327–356.

Roseneil, S. 2010. Intimate Citizenship: A Pragmatic, yet Radical, Proposal for a Politics of Personal Life. *European Journal of Women's Studies* 17 (1): 77–82.

Sabsay, L. 2012. The Emergence of the Other Sexual Citizen: Orientalism and the Modernisation of Sexuality. *Citizenship Studies* 16 (5–6): 605–623.

Siim, B. 2009. Citizenship, Diversity and Gender Equality: Intersections of Gender With Ethnicity and Religion. Paper presented at ECPR Joint Session of Workshops: Workshop 12: Governing Religious Differences at the Intersection of Gender and Ethnicity, Lisbon, Portugal.

Simonsen, K. 2001. Rum, sted, krop og køn—dimensioner af en geografi om social praksis. In *Praksis, Rum og Mobilitet*, ed. K. Simonsen, 17–48. Frederiksberg: Roskilde Universitetsforlag.

Soysal, Y.N. 1994. *Limits of Citizenship. Migrants and Postnational Membership in Europe*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Stasiulis, D. 2002. The Active Child-Citizen: Lessons From Canadian Policy and the Children's Movement. *Citizenship Studies* 6 (4): 507–538.

Suenker, H. 2009. Democratic Education—Educating for Democracy. In *International Conversations on Curriculum Studies: Subject, Society and Curriculum*, ed. E. Ropo and T. Autio, 89–108. Rotterdam, Boston and Taipei: Sense Publishers.

Taylor, C. 1994. The Politics of Recognition. In *Multiculturalism: Examining the Politics of Recognition*, ed. D. Gutman, 25–73. Princeton.

Wall, J. 2014. Democratizing Democracy: The Road from Women's to Children's Suffrage. *International Journal of Human Rights* 18 (6): 646–659.

Warming, H. 2011. Children's Participation and Citizenship in a Global age: Empowerment, Tokenism or Discriminatory Disciplining? *Social Work & Society* 9 (1): 119–134.

Warming, H. 2013. Theorizing Trust—Citizenship Dynamics. In *Participation, Citizenship and Trust in Children's Lives*, ed. H. Warming, 10–31. London and New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Warming, H. 2016. Trust and Power Dynamics in the Shaping of Children's Lived Citizenship and Participation in Globalized Societies. *Social Sciences Journal* (forthcoming).

Wright, S. 2015. More-Than-Human, Emergent Belongings: A Weak Theory Approach. *Progress in Human Geography* 39 (4): 391–411.

Yuval-Davis, N. 1997. *Gender and Nation*. London: Sage.

Yuval-Davis, N. 2007. Intersectionality, Citizenship and Contemporary Politics of Belonging. *Critical Review of International Social and Political Philosophy* 10 (4): 561–574.

Zapf, M.K. 2010. Social Work and the Environment: Understanding People and Place. *Critical Social Work* 11 (3). http://www1.uwindsor.ca/critical-socialwork/social-work-and-the-environment-understanding-people-and-place.

Authors' Biography

Hanne Warming is Professor of Sociology, Childhood and Social Work, and head of the research group 'Social dynamics and Change', at the Department of Social Sciences and Business, Roskilde University.

Professor Warming has published extensively in the fields of social work with children and young people, lived citizenship and trust, and children's perspectives. In 2005 she received a prize for the Best Project of the Year from The Joint Council for Child Issues in Denmark. In 2008 she was appointed as an EU-expert on children's rights; in 2011 as member of the National Council for Children's Affairs by the Minister of Social Affairs, and in 2016 for the European Expert Database of Outstanding Female Academics "Academianet".

Currently, Professor Warming is the leader of three national research projects, including a project titled 'Citizenship on the Edge', funded by the Danish Council of Independent Research.

Kristian Fahnøe is Senior lecturer in Social Sciences at the Department of Social Work, Metropolitan University College. He holds a Ph.D. in Social Science from Roskilde University (2013). He primarily teaches at the Bachelor Degree Programme in Social Work with a focus on social work with adults in marginalized positions, social pedagogy and inclusion. His research is mainly ethnographic and it centres on power, knowledge and identity in relation to social work practices with homeless people and substance and alcohol abusers.

Citizenship on the Edge: Homeless Outreach and the City

Tom Hall

In this chapter, I want to consider the edge along which citizenship runs in the city. I do so on the basis of extended fieldwork spent in the company of welfare professionals working on the streets of Cardiff, the capital city of Wales, UK. I take as my starting point the idea that the work of welfare, social work in particular, and more particularly still outreach work with the street homeless, can be considered as taking place at or across a boundary; also, that encounters between outreach workers and their clients are, among other things, border transactions. As at any border, transactions conducted can take many forms, but they are given their edge by the border itself, never more so than when what is at stake are the movements of identity and belonging which occur when we move not only goods and services but ourselves from one side to the other—across, over. Ethnographer Michael Rowe (1999), to whose work I will turn in a moment, suggests that one of the possibilities at stake in such border transactions is citizenship itself.

T. Hall (✉)
Cardiff University's School of Social Sciences, Cardiff, UK
e-mail: hallta@cardiff.ac.uk

H. Warming and K. Fahnøe (eds.), *Lived Citizenship on the Edge of Society*,
Palgrave Politics of Identity and Citizenship Series, DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-55068-8_2

We are familiar enough with the idea that citizenship finds its limits at borders, at and along which movements and crossings assume a particular significance; this is the very stuff of, for example, international travel. At passport control we step up to a line and pause, waiting—anxiously—while identity and credentials are examined and verified. Our status as citizens is likely to be the crux of the matter. Waved across, we step into the territory beyond. We might do so in a number of ways, perhaps as a first-time visitor, or else as an experienced traveller, possibly as a home-comer, wearily pleased to be back where we feel we belong (perhaps curious as to how things might have changed in our absence). The sharp edge of citizenship is seldom so clearly marked out as when an immigration official invites you to step up to and across a line (Jenkins 2014). Elsewhere the edge of citizenship is harder to see. Yet questions of belonging and membership, identity, entitlement and expectation are everywhere, as are the lines and edges across which such questions are explored and tested. They are certainly a part of the fabric of any city. In what follows, I examine only one of the ways in which the edge of citizenship is traced out in and around one city in particular: Cardiff. I hope to consider some of the work this involves and the issues at stake. Some introductory remarks will help frame and provide context to the account I will develop.

The City and the Edge, and Citizenship

It is no accident of language that the words citizenship and city can be found close together in a dictionary, and side by side in at least one encyclopaedia of social science (Kuper and Kuper 1996). Historically, the words are twinned, citizenship denoting belonging and rights and duties owed in respect of the city. To be a citizen was once to be so as a member of a city state or polis,[1] the very edge of which might well have been marked concretely, by a wall. To enter the city you had to cross over or pass through. Doing so was at the same time a matter of gaining admittance to a territory within which citizenship held good for those so designated. To stand in the middle of the city looking out and across the cityscape was also to look out and across a domain of citizenship and to the territory beyond it. And the line dividing the two

marked the limits of each: an edge, within which was the city and citizenship (at least for some), beyond which was neither. So: the city and citizenship, each of these ringed by the same edge. If the question is, or was, along what edge does citizenship run, then there was a time when to trace that line was at the same time to trace the edge that encircled the city. Not anymore. The idea that one might surround and demarcate the city—thereby signalling and accomplishing a division between those inside and those without—seems quaint and unlikely today, to say the least, and would do almost anywhere in the world. Most modern cities have never been so encircled. City walls today more commonly hold up the roofs of buildings than ring the city, but this has by no means prevented city life from being marked by very definite lines of difference and division.

Sociologist Richard Sennett is one of a number of sociological commentators to have reflected on the ways in which the geography of the modern city can signal inclusion, exclusion and status without the need for walls. Reflecting on such urban divisions he draws on his own biography, having grown up in a US public housing project—Cabrini Green in Chicago, to which he moved with his mother in 1946, aged three. Sennett recalls Cabrini Green as located in a locally understood and keenly experienced geography of inequality, standing and stigma. 'To the west of the project' writes Sennett, 'space meant more': suburban developments, houses with garages and private lawns, 'signs a family was rising into the lower middle class' (Sennett 2004, 9). Nothing so evident or absolute as a wall marked the distinction and transition; even so, stuck where space meant less, residents of Cabrini Green could appreciate the difference, and suffer from it.

Sennett recollects his city upbringing so as to introduce a theme: respect. His account of life in Cabrini Green supplies the opening chapter to his book *Respect: The Formation of Character in an Age of Inequality* (2004), a good part of which is given over to dilemmas of dependency and assistance and different methods of care, including those practised by social workers (his mother was a social worker). Puzzling out some of the dilemmas of assistance, respect and dependency, Sennett suggests that social work can be considered a task that involves practitioners in the crossing of a 'boundary of inequality'

(Sennett 2004, 20), and it is this idea that care and attention paid to others in need, in the context of social work practice broadly conceived, might involve the crossing of a boundary, that I aim to consider here. Note that we have moved already from walls around the city to something not at all so certain and concrete, to a graduated social geography spread across the cityscape—appreciated and understood by local inhabitants, if not marked out as a sharp edge—and, from there, to something more abstract or notional still, a boundary of inequality, implying and requiring no physical, tactual geography at all—but all the same an edge, across which society might extend itself (and find its limit) in responding to the needs of others.

Everyday Borders and Homeless Encounters

Border crossings can signify a great deal or (seemingly) not very much at all, but not a day goes by that we don't undertake a good few; borders are ubiquitous, a persistent and repeated feature of the organisation of everyday life. Michael Rowe makes this very point in the closing pages to his study of encounters between homeless people and outreach workers in the USA. He writes: '[w]e cross a foggy border of sleep to find our waking selves. An hour later our working selves greet us at the office. We encounter boundaries of self and other, of task and situation. We create and use borders as starting and stopping points for thought' (Rowe 1999, 156). This understanding of borders repeatedly made and used in the round of daily life is available to anyone, not only ethnographers and sociologists. If borders supply an everyday architecture of thought and action, then we might expect any number of others to appreciate this, including architects themselves. And indeed they do. Simon Unwin, for one, invites us to consider the pervasive powers of the doorway, an elementary element in the architectural organisation of space, passing through which 'affects our states of being; who we think we are as well as where we find ourselves' (Unwin 2007, 3). To arrive somewhere and step up to and across a line, through to the other side, is to experience a transition in state of being:

> [y]ou move away from being a 'person outside' into a 'person inside', from being a 'person at large' to being a 'person at home', from being a 'person lost' into a 'person who knows where they are'. The catalyst of this transformation is the doorway. And when you are on one side or the other, the doorway gives you a view into another place … the doorway divides your world, and in doing so, provokes a sense of 'otherness'. (Unwin 2007, 12)

Stepping through a doorway is no more than a minor accomplishment, repeated countless times in the course of a single day. But even as we do so there is the potential always for transformation, for some affirmation or denial of the self—as someone inside and reliably located, or outside, at large and perhaps lost. The sense of otherness implied by any border or division (unattributed to any person or category of person in particular, by Unwin) is exactly that which Michael Rowe suggests might organise our understanding of homelessness. He writes:

> Homelessness is, in part, a bureaucratic and political category. Its divisions by time served, demographics, disability, or the sheer bad luck of its occupants are abstractions that give order to our thinking and help us allocate scarce resources for unlimited human needs. The otherness of homelessness has its special stigmata, derived from history, from observation of homeless persons, and from our pity, disgust, and fears. We mentally place homeless individuals at our symbolic border and see them as living apart from us, perhaps because of our uncomfortable feeling of closeness to them. (Rowe 1999, 156)

For Rowe, the border between ourselves and others makes homelessness what it is. Clearly we have moved some distance from the everyday—the implication is that the reader belongs to the category 'us' not the category 'other'. Even so, Simon Unwin's comments on everyday architecture supply a ready vocabulary with which to understand the extremity of need that the term homelessness can signal, someone outside, at large and perhaps lost.[2] And what is more than this, Rowe suggests that the border at and beyond which the homeless stand, is a border marking the limit or edge to social obligation and belonging, and, as such, a

border across which citizenship may be offered, established, accepted or declined.

At this point, it will help to say a little more about Rowe's exemplary study of homeless outreach encounters, as a precursor to my own comments, based as these are on observations of this same practice in the city of Cardiff. Rowe's ethnography *Crossing the Border* provides a close account of the interactions between a team of mental health outreach workers and their possible clients: homeless people living out of doors and on the streets in the city of New Haven, Connecticut. The book details the work of encounter and interaction in which outreach workers engage as they attempt to identify and approach clients—on the street, where they may be found—and enrol them in relations of assistance and intervention; also the delicate negotiations that ensue as homeless people themselves deliberate over whether or not to accept such identifications and approaches and offers of assistance and intervention in their lives. *Crossing the Border* has a great many strengths, not least of which is Rowe's insistence that outreach encounters:

> do not stand alone. They require homeless individuals to be rescued and outreach workers to be dispatched… they will lack substance if we fail to consider both homeless persons' experience of homelessness and the seductions and dangers that come for outreach workers who wander far from the centers of institutional life. (Rowe 1999, 3)

Commendably, Rowe's study does not treat the homeless as passive recipients of services extended to them by workers dispatched to their aid. Instead he is concerned to explore outreach encounters as transactional. Each party to the outreach transaction—workers on the one hand and homeless people on the other—has a part to play and a stake in what might (or might very well not) be accomplished. And if outreach encounters are a two-way process, involving various moves and stakes—risks, refusals, confirmations of status, affirmations of role, promises—as Rowe depicts them, then the essential stake is citizenship. This is so in at least two senses, each related to the other. Whatever other and intermediate services outreach workers might have to offer, they are always working towards the wider possibility that the marginal

and excluded individuals they encounter might accept the offer of assistance in the making of a return to citizenship and the social mainstream (the seeming puzzle that anyone might need persuading of this is something I return to below). Put another way, outreach encounters take place at a perimeter and involve border crossings. Outreach workers must step away from office-based welfare work (and its conventional trappings) in order to locate and approach possible clients on the streets; those homeless people who respond to the outreach offer must weigh up whether they want help in stepping back across a line of inequality and exclusion behind which they may have assembled coping strategies and compensations fitted to a circumstance they know full well to be subject to negative societal judgement. Each side has to make a move, or at least consider the possibility of doing so. How far are outreach workers prepared to go in attempts to engage a possible client? What will it cost a homeless person to admit their need and respond to kindly assistance, committing to a movement back across a line they had begun to think of as crossed for good? Any movement either way brings opportunity and anxiety combined; there are risks and ambiguous shifts in status. And the line or edge along which the work is practised is a line of citizenship. Rowe is quite clear on this:

> to talk about borders and crossings is to say there is a line to cross and that homeless persons and outreach workers stand on either side of it … *border* will refer in part to the point at which mainstream society loses its hold and in part to perceptions of borders and the routes by which perception becomes reality. (Rowe 1999, 2; italics in original)

This is an edge that defines both homelessness and outreach, and marks the extent of citizenship; and it runs through the city, not around it, threading together various locations in which outreach workers find it best to practise.

I am now in a position to turn to my own research and observations, similarly ethnographic and similarly directed to the work of urban outreach with the street homeless. In doing so, I hope to keep up the movement I have already established, back and forth, between the physical geography and shape of the city on the one hand and the

boundaries of inequality and citizenship along and across which outreach practitioners patrol.

Centre and Margin on Callaghan Square, Cardiff

Cardiff was once a walled city, surrounded by a substantial defensive structure six feet thick in places, the early construction of which dates back to mediaeval times. The wall has long since disappeared—the last substantial section was demolished in 1901; a very few surviving fragments can still be found, at a couple of locations in what is now the city centre, no longer its limit. But lines of difference and inequality, citizenship too, are as much a part of the fabric of Cardiff as they ever were.

Callaghan Square in central Cardiff is as good a place to start as any; it is the heart of Cardiff's business district, adjacent to the main shopping and retail streets and transport hub. The square is rather dominated by traffic and office developments and lacks an organic character, with the result that its central concourse is a little under-used. If you were to take a seat here—there are concrete benches, some urban planting, pools and modern fountains—you might very well find yourself alone. But the location is instructive, so we will rest here briefly. Sat on a bench on Callaghan Square, facing west, one finds oneself positioned along an axis dividing two sides to city life—in Cardiff, perhaps elsewhere too by imaginative extension. To one's right, along one side of the square, a large office complex houses the local headquarters of the international law firm Eversheds. Further along there are the office headquarters of the professional services firm Deloitte (consultancy and corporate finance) and also British Gas (this building reportedly sold to overseas investors a few months ago, in a deal worth more than £32 million). Beyond these office premises, further ahead and rightwards, there is Cardiff's central train station and behind that the national sports stadium of Wales—the Millennium Stadium (currently, for sponsorship purposes, the Principality Stadium). Between the station and the stadium, the skyline bristles with construction cranes busily at work on a major redevelopment of Cardiff's Central Square, set to become

'a proud new Gateway to the Capital of Wales … [reflecting] Cardiff's ambition to be amongst Europe's most successful cities'.[3]

To the left, things look more than a little different. Along the left-hand side of Callaghan Square, behind a galvanised steel security fence, is a large, vacant plot of land, awaiting development: nondescript and scrubby—mud, grass, a few plastic bags and drinks cans. Behind this plot is a large hostel for single homeless people, including those with drug, alcohol or mental health problems, run by the Salvation Army. A few hundred yards further on, still leftwards, is another hostel, this one run by the local authority. And next to that, a complex of municipal office buildings housing a range of support services for homeless people; the local authority's *Housing Options* advisory service is located here, so too its *City Centre Team*, tasked to work with vulnerable adults, particularly those finding themselves homeless or otherwise in need out of doors and on the streets, in the centre of the city. This is the team of practitioners whose work has particularly interested me in recent years and whose practice I will draw on exclusively in the second half of this chapter.

There is no visible seam or fault running down the middle of Callaghan Square, marking the divide between these two sides to the city, no painted line, or wall; but the contrast is stark, or can be made to seem so when set out as I have done so above, for effect. On the one side a corporate city and aspiring European Capital. On the other side something less seemly, although just as much a part of the life of any city: need and vulnerability, neglect, and various charitable and statutory responses to these—assistance, intervention, provision, protection. Perhaps each side could be said to keep to its own half of the city, at least in the sense that you would be unlikely to find a resident at the Salvation Army hostel holding down a day job as a lawyer; no more likely than you might expect to find a corporate finance consultant eating lunch in the *Housing Options* canteen. But elsewhere and throughout the city, out of doors and on the streets, in the parks and concourses—on Callaghan Square even, were it not so often empty—these two sides to city life muddle together somehow as they must do, as must also happen with any and all differences that a city might host and contain. This muddling together is not without its patterns and

striations, however; urban divisions are not lost to the crowd. Rather, those divisions repeatedly reveal themselves, sometimes in uncomfortable juxtaposition. Lines of inequality and belonging, of need and obligation, of citizenship, run tangled through the city.

One final observation from Callaghan Square, having looked first right and then left. If one were to shift around and look backwards and behind, over one's shoulder, what more might be seen? Answer: another vacant plot, awaiting redevelopment, and behind that an office building, only recently constructed and as yet unoccupied. But in front of both of these, and concealing each to a degree, is a wall of advertising hoardings, one of these digital, featuring a scrolling sequence of electronic notices and promotions. The scrolling images are conventional and commercial save for one, which jars with the rest: a missing persons ad, asking for help and information from anyone who might have seen an elderly woman (photograph and description supplied) much missed by her family who are worried about her and want her found, hopefully safe and well; someone who has been lost and may, for all anyone knows, be out of doors.

Outreach Work in Central Cardiff: Missing People

Not everyone who goes missing is found again, sadly. What is more, not everyone who goes missing is even missed. Some absences go unreported; some people disappear without anyone having noticed. These, the unmissed, are not necessarily too hard to find, or even too far away. Their absence is unadvertised. Among them are the homeless. Men and women who have lost contact with the some of the routines and responsibilities, also the reassurances, of work and housing, of regular hours, of family and support networks, and whose personal and financial circumstances expose them to the risk of moving 'out' and beyond the point at which society is able and willing to fully recognise and support them. The sorts of provision I have mentioned above as running along one side of Callaghan Square in Cardiff—the hostels, accommodation

projects and services—represent a last resort in this context: emergency accommodations meeting minimal requirements for those who have reached the end of the line, have lost their own means of support and drifted out to the very fringe of entitlement, with nowhere else to go. Residents at the Salvation Army and local authority hostels could be described as having secured for themselves a place at the edge of entitlement, and perhaps a sort of second-class citizenship—but a citizenship all the same, a measure of recognition and inclusion. To move any further out, past these fringe entitlements, would be to move to the very edge of social membership and into the otherness of homelessness, on the streets of the city.

A number of individuals sleep at night on the streets of Cardiff and somehow manage their daily lives out of doors in the centre of the city (no more in number than in other UK cities; Cardiff is not unusual in this). Those who are 'out' in this way are at the sharp end of homelessness, and in a number of cases, the accommodation difficulties they experience come tangled up with other severe disadvantages and difficulties. In the language of UK policy, the label that comes closest to describing this circumstance is Multiple Exclusion Homelessness (MEH), which can be defined as follows:

> People have experienced MEH if they have been '*homeless*' (including experience of temporary/unsuitable accommodation as well as sleeping rough) *and* have also experienced one or more of the following other domains of 'deep social exclusion': '*institutional care*' (prison, local authority care, mental health hospitals or wards); '*substance misuse*' (drug, alcohol, solvent or gas misuse); or participation in 'street culture activities' (begging, street drinking, 'survival' shoplifting or sex work). (Fitzpatrick et al. 2012, 1; italics in original)

To be this sort of homeless is to lack or have lost quite probably a number of things, more than just a place of one's own. Some might be said to have lost any expectation of assistance, or much interest in making any sort of change.

The outreach work that I will now describe is addressed, principally, to this condition; it is work with those whose needs have pushed them

far enough 'out' from the familiar centres of life for mainstream society, as Rowe has it, to have begun to lose its hold. The local authority in Cardiff employs a multidisciplinary team (housed in offices off to one side of Callaghan Square) including health, care and social work professionals, whose job it is to work with vulnerable adults whose needs manifest, in some way or other, in public space—street homelessness is a major area of work, but also drug use and addiction, and sex work. Clients of the team are not only those who stand in some sort of visible need of health, housing and support services but also and especially those who appear to be struggling to access those services independently. Team members are tasked to engage with and support such individuals, supplying immediate assistance where possible, assessing needs and negotiating entry to appropriate mainstream and specialist provision. This team is known locally (to those who need to know of its existence) as the City Centre Team. Essential members of the City Centre Team include a small sub-team of outreach workers, whose particular job it is to make first contact with potential clients and to work and negotiate with them up until such a point as they can be persuaded to engage with other team members—social work staff, for example—and access the services to which the City Centre Team acts as gatekeeper. Getting through to new clients, and persuading them to accept assistance and take steps to address their current needs and circumstances can be a challenge; it is one of two key challenges that define outreach work.

Why would anyone in such an extremity of circumstance need persuading to accept help and services? Answers are suggested by the MEH definition supplied above. Individuals captured by this definition are sometimes also described as 'entrenched' or 'hard-to-reach'. The challenge to which these phrasings refer is something indirect, not homelessness itself as a material circumstance, but, rather, the inevitable accommodations and adjustments made by those who *have* to get by, somehow or other, within that circumstance. The hard-to-reach homeless include those whose reworked priorities, habituated behaviours, circuits of practice and association make them difficult and unreliable clients: suspicious of offers of help, sometimes in denial (or something close to it) about the damage in their own lives, negative and fatalistic in

their outlook, sometimes angry or disorientated or evasive, some of them firmly embedded in networks of practice and outlook—glossed as 'street culture' in the MEH definition—of the sort that make sense enough in situ, but which invariably further entangle. This is the essential challenge of outreach work: to reach out and across such difficulties—the difficulties of homelessness itself, but also the evasions and refusals and suspicions which can come enmeshed with that same material circumstance. Outreach workers are not only there to help, but also, in some instances—by no means all, but a good few—to persuade those in need that help is what they want. *What are you doing here? Why should I trust you? Why can't you just leave me alone?* These can be harder questions for an outreach worker to answer persuasively than might at first seem to be the case. And every such suspicion or refusal of assistance, every continuing self-destructive action, helps inscribe a line at which societal response and citizenship might begin to falter, as has begun already for a number of Cardiff's street homeless, whose mistrust of mainstream housing and welfare services is matched by an unwillingness on the part of at least some of the professionals working in those fields to prioritise their needs. Caring for the street homeless is hard work, and hard work is not always its own reward: '[c]are providers do not always make a full effort for these people, particularly when they are not motivated or avoid help. What care providers need themselves—the reward that clients follow up instructions, attend appointments, express their gratitude—is not forthcoming' (Schout et al. 2011, 670). Under such circumstances care, avoidance and institutional disinclination can amplify each other, scoring the line more heavily still.

Outreach Work in Central Cardiff: Patrolling the Edge

I have suggested that two key challenges define homeless outreach work in Cardiff. The first has to do with outreach clients being hard to enrol as clients in the first place, and, as such, hard to bring back onside and across the line, into contact with the services and local provision that

constitutes something of what citizenship might count for. Richard Sennett suggests that the task of somehow managing offers of care and support made across a boundary of inequality—perhaps citizenship too—is a challenge faced by all welfare workers.[4] What needs managing is the respect with which such offers are made, such that an offer of assistance does not undermine or shame those in their need. Ideally, there is reciprocity of a sort, and mutual recognition; those in receipt of assistance are positioned as something other than passive beneficiaries. Rowe's notion of a symbolic border, across which the work of outreach gets done signals something of the inherently reciprocal nature of outreach work—passivity will not do here as it is the very receipt of welfare services, not yet stably established, that outreach workers hope to accomplish. The first challenge of outreach proceeds from the uncomfortable fact that those at the sharpest end of homelessness, whose lives are hard enough already, have good reason, some of them, to cleave to a known if numbing existence (Rowe 1999, 106–107) rather than risk the uncertainty of opening their lives up to change and, beyond that, what may prove to be no more no more than a second class citizenship.[5] The second challenge, however, has rather less to do with any symbolic or notional border, of citizenship or inequality; and less to do with the various moves—exploratory, transactional, concessionary, movements of identity and status—made back and forth across such borders in the context of the work of care. Instead, the challenge is to find the clients in the first place; to locate them physically, wherever it is they might be. This might seem a rather less interesting challenge, but my aim in what remains of this chapter is to suggest that it is not at all uninteresting and to submit also that attention paid to this aspect of outreach work might signal an important aspect of citizenship in the city.

Outreach workers in Cardiff are office-based, as I have already indicated; their work premises is off to one side of Callaghan Square, close to the train station and city centre retail and business precincts. But their practice is not one that keeps them indoors. Their clients are, by definition, unlikely to present themselves in person, looking for assistance; they do not reliably make or keep appointments, and are not sat in the reception to the *Housing Options* advisory service or similar offices, dutifully waiting to be 'seen'. Instead the city's homeless are 'out'

there, somewhere. By no means out of reach if that were taken to mean far away—beyond the city limits—but in any case out, and not coming in, just yet.

Where exactly? Not too far away is one sort of answer. For reasons which I will assume to be apparent to most readers, homelessness of the sort that I am writing about in the city of Cardiff, as in other cities around the world, tends to show itself in central space and is less of a visible 'problem' elsewhere—in the suburbs, for example. But just where *exactly*? It is hard to be precise, because the circumstance in question is one that has to do with lacking a location, a home, an address, to call one's own. Cardiff's street homeless may very well be close to hand, not too very far from Callaghan Square; but they are not always so very visible, and not reliably *anywhere*. They know very well where they are themselves, or may do (depending on sobriety and state of mind), but others do not. And they are in that sense missing, or—again—hard-to-reach; only this time being hard-to-reach presents a spatial rather than a social and psychological challenge. And before any welfare work can even begin, they have to be found. This is a job in itself, and not a small one; it takes a good deal of outreach time, every day. Indeed, looking *for* clients defines the work, for those that do it, almost as much as does the close interactive business of working *with* clients, once they have been located That this is so bears directly on my theme, and (in my own reworking of it) the wider theme of this collection: citizenship and the edge along which it runs.

How then do outreach workers move? What gets them going and where do they go? These questions deserve a number of answers, more than I can supply here; readers can turn to my own ethnography of outreach work (Hall 2016) for a fuller treatment. What I want to do here is no more than to draw a distinction between only two ways in which outreach workers set about finding those they hope to encounter and engage. On occasion, outreach workers step out across Callaghan Square and into the city centre in pursuit of a *particular individual*—a missing person, as it were—perhaps because they have received a call from a concerned member of the public, or the police, or a retail manager, about someone in difficulties—drunk, distressed, collapsed, disorientated; either that or, in receipt of some new piece of relevant

information, perhaps news of a toxic batch of heroin recently surfaced in the city, they will chase after known and particular clients to whom this news must be conveyed. (They may also set out to locate individual clients not presumed to be in any immediate difficulty but *due somewhere* today, in consequence of arrangements made in the days preceding—a drugs counselling session, a doctor's appointment, a job interview.) Such individual forays, in search of this or that person in particular are part of the fabric of almost any working day, but they do not in themselves constitute the essential spatial practice of outreach. Outreach workers also move in order to find and reach out to those they don't yet know they are looking for. That is, they explore—nowhere new, but instead a territory they know intimately—making repeated daily circuits of the city centre in order to turn up the day's work, updating their practitioner knowledge of who is 'out' and where exactly and in what sort of circumstances. I am going to call this second spatial practice, in which outreach workers move around the city, not destination orientated, not looking for anyone in particular but wholly attentive to whatever they might come across, *patrol*. Every working day for the City Centre Team is bookended by two such patrols, one in the early morning, the other in the early evening, each lasting a good couple of hours and sometimes more. A general description will allow me to move to a concluding discussion.

An evening's outreach patrol in the centre of Cardiff has no set route, nor any exact schedule and timetable—though it is in another sense routine, performed every working day, without fail. At or around the end of office hours, members of the outreach team will set aside other tasks and gather together to head out across the city on group patrol. They carry phones and notebooks, advice leaflets and minimal first aid, little else—perhaps a few blankets or items of food to distribute; they will be dressed for the outdoors and in standard issue workwear or its close approximation (including 'safety' footwear suited to uneven ground and offering protection from the shards of glass, rusted cans and brambles that litter and trail across the sorts of ground that outreach sometimes covers). Over the course of the next 2 or 3 h, they will wend their way through the centre of the city, never more than a mile

at most from where they started out, on a course that, were it traced across a map, would look not unlike the course of someone who was unsure of their location, or lost—full of backtrackings, diversions, circumnavigations. Or if not lost, then looking for something—which is rather closer to the truth. The path traced out across the city results not from any uncertainty about the local territory but, quite the opposite, from expertise and experience, a professionally tuned understanding of the ways in which appropriate movement across the city might turn up the sorts of need to which the work of outreach is addressed. Outreach workers know what they are about as they move around the city, but this is not exactly the same as knowing where they are going at any one point along the way. Outreach patrol does not run on rails; it is an ad hoc spatial practice liable to be overtaken at any point by whatever it might be that outreach workers glimpse or come across. Thus, setting out across Callaghan Square, the team may have it in mind to look in at a small number of established sites: locations they know to be in use, or at which they can be half-way confident of coming across someone or something of interest. But there will be no firm commitment to any of this. Along the way they may fall into conversation with a client who lets slip that a couple, new in town, have made a space for themselves in the far corner of municipal gardens. Walking past a tired-looking office building, recently vacated and awaiting redevelopment, outreach workers may spy a half open window and move in closer to investigate. Straddling a wall, they shift around the side of a footbridge to the scrubby grass beyond, wedged between the rear of a hotel and the train tracks. On a whim they may branch off to check somewhere they haven't been in a while—the rear garden of an empty residential property, 5 min' walk from the river bridge—if only to confirm what they suspected: no one there.

In this manner, any one evening's patrol is likely to string together a collection of quite disparate though proximate locations (and the gaps in between) sharing, all of them, possible affordances for shelter, occupancy, respite and the offer of assistance. These locations might include some of the set-piece public spaces of the city, the main pedestrian streets and concourses—though these are less likely to reward

attention, as the homeless struggle to gain a hold in such settings and are repeatedly moved on (Hall and Smith 2013)—but also, and more often, certain corners and particularly *edges*, indistinct margins in the middle of the city, indeterminate spaces where ownership might seem moot or stalled somehow, and which escape ordinary attention: roadside verges, building perimeters and fire exit stairwells, underpasses, neglected niche spaces and what urban planners sometimes call *lost space*: 'the no-man's-lands along the edges of freeways that nobody cares about maintaining, much less using … abandoned waterfronts, train yards … vacant blight-clearance sites … residual areas between districts … deteriorated parks' (Trancik 2007, 64).[6]

All of which is to say that outreach as a spatial practice traces a line of moot and available—public?—space in the centre of the city, keeping to the edge of things but always in the middle. Outreach workers on patrol in Cardiff never leave the city centre and would not see the sense in doing so. Their work belongs only where the homeless already are—which is along the edge of, and in the gaps in between, available city centre space.

Edgework in the City

My purpose has been to consider the edge of citizenship as it is made manifest in empirical work with which I am familiar, having spent time with practitioners over a number of years whose job it is to reach out to the street homeless in central Cardiff. If the line or edge of citizenship no longer runs like a ring around the city, demarking city limits and a border of belonging—set in stone (it never did so exclusively; citizenship has always muddled along with other positions and status roles within the city walls), then today the same line is perhaps best described as 'diffused and dispersed within the city' (Borden 2000, 22). And if so, then outreach workers can be described as tasked to trace out this dispersed and rather more tangled line of belonging. They do so as workers dispatched to the social margins to test the limits of societal responsibility, but also in a material city scape which they must need to navigate.

If the line of citizenship in the city is no longer set in stone it nonetheless runs through a concrete cityscape, and the spatial practice of outreach workers is, in this way, coupled with a working knowledge of a series of material urban affordances: those (dwindling) locations in which the homeless can find space for themselves in the city.

Are such spaces lost? Perhaps they are, in the terminology of urban planning. More than this, however, we are losing them. In the centre of Cardiff, as in a great many UK cities, the sorts of residual site and deteriorated setting that the term 'lost space' was coined to capture are in retreat, as those cities busily reconfigure their economies in keeping with a contemporary common sense of 'competitiveness and boosterism' (Hooper 2006, 12) of the sort that is driving the redevelopment of Cardiff's Central Square. To have followed the work of homeless outreach services in the centre of Cardiff as I have done for close to 10 years is not only to have observed a running battle between the city's homeless and the changing cityscape—space found, lost, found again; space secured, breached, abandoned, rediscovered—but also, over time, a rather more one-sided engagement, in the course of which opportunities to make a small corner for yourself, in which to be left alone with your need—and perhaps in due course discovered by an outreach worker—have decidedly shrunk. It is, in this sense, harder to be homeless in the middle of Cardiff today than it was 10 years ago. Harder too to be an outreach worker.

Thinking about how to respond to the changing face of a city centre—brighter, busier, cleaner, smarter, livelier; all the things that Cardiff aims to be and is becoming—and to those ways in which such changes might inflect and impact upon citizenship as experienced in that space, involves treading yet another line or edge: between a surely unhelpful nostalgia for older unredeemed city space—dirtier and unlicensed, but somehow more real and accommodating—and an uncritical enthusiasm for the many surface pleasures and benefits of a regenerated cityscape. Among the many issues at stake, is the question of citizenship: of who belongs in the centre of the city, of who can find a place and be found there. This is a question to which outreach work with the city centre homeless—edgework of a sort—is directly addressed.[7]

Notes

1. As David Harvey notes, 'the term "city" has an iconic and symbolic history that is deeply embedded in the pursuit of political meanings' (2013: xvi).
2. Kevin Lynch, in his classic study *The Image of the City*, suggests: '[t]he very word "lost" in our language means much more than simple geographical uncertainty; it carries overtones of utter disaster' (1960, 4).
3. See centralsquarecardiff.co.uk.
4. Sennett is clear that while citizenship and inequality are in tension with one another, they are not in contradiction; he directs readers back to the work of T.H. Marshall, whose model of (social) citizenship did not promise an end to inequality but rather a means by which to address those inequalities that can be avoided or ameliorated, thereby providing a foundation for those that cannot (see Sennett 2004, 261–262; also Bulmer and Rees 1996).
5. Which is where passivity (re)enters the equation. Whatever the give and take in the initial negotiation of relations of trust and assistance between worker and client, the unpalatable truth that 'haunts both parties' (Rowe 1999, 113) to the outreach encounter is that those persuaded to make a return to the social mainstream may face a very marginal existence there—marginal *as* included: 'the idea that homeless persons are returning to any niche that society has kept open for them may be fanciful … after arriving at the mainland, the homeless person's status as a poor immigrant becomes most apparent. The barrenness of the landscape that stretches before him cannot be ignored'.
6. Anne Lovell describes a similar territory, writing about outreach services and street homelessness in New York: 'outreach workers cruise city parks and transportation terminals, comb drop-in centres, and occupy empty storefronts … the less visible recesses of the urban infrastructures … in and out of anonymous urban spaces.' (1997, 357).
7. The term 'edgework' is already established in the sociological literature, and refers to voluntary risk taking (see Lyng 1990), although even this definition can encompass various sorts of risky employment, particularly those involving the deployment of flexible and on-the-spot strategies for responding to circumstance and situation. At a stretch

this would hold good for outreach work. Edgework is certainly what outreach workers are all about, both as operators across boundaries of difference and inequality, and in their convoluted spatial practice (Lyng 1990).

References

Borden, I. 2000. Boundaries. In *City A–Z*, ed. S. Pile and N. Thrift. London: Routledge.

Bulmer, M., and A.M. Rees. 1996. *Citizenship Today: The Contemporary Relevance of T. H. Marshall*. London: UCL Press.

Fitzpatrick, S., G. Bramley, and S. Johnsen. 2012. *Multiple Exclusion Homelessness in the UK: An Overview of Key Findings* (Briefing Paper No. 1). Edinburgh: Briefing Papers.

Hall, T. 2016. *Footwork: Urban Outreach and Hidden Lives*. London: Pluto Press.

Hall, T., and R.J. Smith. 2013. Stop and Go: A Field Study of Pedestrian Practice, Immobility and Urban Outreach Work. *Mobilities* 8 (2): 272–292.

Harvey, D. 2013. *Rebel Cities: From the Right to the City to the Urban Revolution*. London: Verso.

Hooper, A. 2006. Introduction. In *Capital Cardiff 1975–2020: Regeneration, Competitiveness and the Urban Environment*, ed. A. Hooper and J. Punter. Cardiff: University of Wales Press.

Jenkins, R. 2014. *Social Identity*, 4th ed. London: Routledge.

Kuper, A., and J. Kuper. 1996. *The Social Science Encyclopedia*, 2nd ed. London: Routledge.

Lovell, A.M. 1997. "The City is My Mother": Narratives of Schizophrenia and Homelessness. *American Anthropologist* 99 (2): 355–368.

Lynch, K. 1960. *The Image of the City*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Lyng, S. 1990. Edgework: A Social Psychological Analysis of Voluntary Risk Taking. *American Journal of Sociology* 95 (4): 851–886.

Rowe, M. 1999. *Crossing the Border: Encounters Between Homeless People and Outreach Workers*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Schout, G., G. de Jong, and J. Zeelen. 2011. Beyond Care Avoidance and Care Paralysis: Theorizing Public Mental Health Care. *Sociology* 45 (4): 665–681.

Sennett, R. 2004. *Respect: The Formation of Character in an Age of Inequality*. London: Penguin Books.
Trancik, R. 2007. What is Lost Space? In *Urban Design Reader*, ed. M. Carmona and S. Tiesdell. Oxford: Architectural Press.
Unwin, S. 2007. *Doorway*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Author Biography

Tom Hall teaches sociology and ethnography at Cardiff University's School of Social Sciences; his background and training are in anthropology. His most recent book, *Footwork*, provides an embedded and observational account of the work of street-based outreach with the city-centre homeless.

'They Know *Everything* About Us'—Exploring Spaces of Surveillance and Citizenship Learning Opportunities in a 24-Hour Care Institution

Michael Christensen

Introduction

This is the first of three chapters exploring how citizenship on the edge is shaped by social work practices at residential homes. Our focus is on very local practices of citizenship. This chapter examines the impact of social work practices on children's and young people's lived citizenship at a 24 h care institution, using a spatial approach.

During the past decades, much research has studied the placement of children and youth living in 24 h care institutions. Although there is clearly a growing interest in children's own experiences of their placements, this type of research still calls for further elaboration and, not least, a careful revision of concepts and explanatory forces (Egelund and Hestbæk 2003; Stokholm 2003; Spyrou 2016). One of the strengths of such research is that it provides valuable insights into how social worker

M. Christensen (✉)
Roskilde University, Roskilde, Denmark
e-mail: michach@ruc.dk

H. Warming and K. Fahnøe (eds.), *Lived Citizenship on the Edge of Society*,
Palgrave Politics of Identity and Citizenship Series, DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-55068-8_3

practices are perceived by those who are supposed to benefit from them. The complexity of children's and young people's experiences of their own lives cannot be comprehended without involving these groups in the research (Egelund and Hestbæk 2003; Laws and Mann 2003; Mann and Tolfree 2002). This endeavor to involve children and young people in research is closely linked to a growing body of scholarship that questions the status, quality and character of children's and young people's active participation in their own social cases specifically, and in their citizenship in general (e.g., Bendiksen and Haugli 2014; Baraldi and Iervese 2012; Gaskell 2010; Cockburn 2007; Moosa-Mitha 2005; Dalrymple 2003; Prout and Hallett 2003). From this perspective—and although successful efforts have been made to ensure that children and young people in vulnerable positions are genuinely and sincerely listened to[1]—a comprehensive body of research highlights how children and young people are still met with "know-it-all" attitudes, are categorized in fixed positions and experience mistrust and failure on the part of adults to respond to their needs and opinions (McLeod 2007; Croussée et al. 2009; Gaskell 2010; Warming and Christensen 2016). Much research taking the latter approach has been *about* children's citizenship and has focused largely on conceptualizing children's citizenship in terms of formal rights (Warming 2011; Cockburn 2005). Not much research has conceptualized citizenship as lived and thus as a constructive learning process (Moosa-Mitha 2005; Warming 2011, 2012). Still fewer scholars have conceptualized citizenship as an embodied phenomenon. Jeyasingham (2014) has, moreover, shown that while the concept of space has been highly influential in social and cultural geography, the concept and conceptualization of space (and place, we might add) have been remarkably absent in social work research in general and in children's social work research in particular. Further, Atkinson et al. (2011) identify the lack of a conceptual linkage between care, space and body work. There is, thus, a need for a more elaborate understanding of how space is constructed in children's and young people's relationships with social workers and system representatives.

This chapter explores young people's everyday life experiences with social workers' practices. It highlights how spaces of intended care risk being perceived as institutionalized mistrust (Luhmann 2005) when

the surrounding environment and social worker practices are characterized by omniscient surveillance disguised as visibility and transparency. Notably, it does not matter whether this disguise is consciously or unconsciously deployed by the social workers. The effect of these poorly disguised surveillance techniques is that the residents of an institution spend most of their time devising elaborate tactics to resist and divert the social worker's surveillance and turn it to their own advantage. As a result, the children and youth are deprived of experiences of positive, inclusive citizenship learning processes and are instead subjected to disciplining citizenship experiences. The two different approaches to citizenship learning processes are described by Delanty (2002, 2003). For Delanty, citizenship must be comprehended in terms of contingent cultural experiences and learning processes. From that perspective, citizenship is understood by (and emerges from) everyday interactions between individuals and institutions at all levels of society. In this chapter, interactions are understood as daily interactions between children and young people, and between social workers and residents (individuals and as a group). As such, Delanty's approach differs from more traditional citizenship approaches focusing on equality and rights (Delanty 2003, 598), and resonates with the above-mentioned critique of current childhood sociology. Delanty distinguishes primarily between two kinds of citizenship learning processes: inclusive and disciplinary (Delanty 2003). Whereas disciplinary citizenship learning processes are rooted in certain norms for "correct" or acceptable behavior and thus discriminate between those who live up to the norms and those who do not, inclusive citizenship embraces difference and individuals' sense of belonging. Thus, positive citizenship learning is about performances, feelings and a sense of belonging more than it is about formal right and obligations, although these are also important.[2]

This chapter is based on an empirical, ethnographic and partly participatory study (Bailey 1996; Burgess 1984; Spradley 1980) of young people's everyday life in a Danish 24 h care institution. The observations were combined with informal talks, i.e., "*talking with people*" or "*friendly conversations*" (Spradley 1979, 58ff) which give the researcher insight into complexities, practice, power relations (DeVault and McCoy 2002) and other interesting or dubious issues that emerge

during the observations. The observation period lasted for 6 months (including breaks and more formal structured interviews). The young people living in the residential institution were aged 11–18. Their names and gender have been altered in this chapter. The young people whose everyday life is described in the examples no longer live in the residential institution. This is due to age and behavioral developments which have altered their need for care. The fact that the young people do not live in the residential institution any more mitigates the risk that they might be identified by the social workers employed there. The institution hosted seven young people: four girls and three boys. They had all been diagnosed with either ADHD or ADD disorders, and they had all been in conflict with the police due to criminal activities, mainly vandalism involving cars and shop windows. A couple of them had also been in conflict with the law, having been arrested for street robbery.

This chapter consists of two main sections and addresses three empirical examples. The first section discusses the connection between dominant spaces and visibility, and the second section is concerned with tactical resistance and citizenship learning processes. The examples facilitate these discussions. The first example illustrates how particular practices risk reducing young people to victims and treating them as passive objects of asymmetrical power relations. The second and third examples demonstrate how young people learn—or are disciplined into enacting—tactics of resistance, instead of being in a position that enables positive spirals of recognition and citizenship learning processes (Warming and Christensen 2016). This chapter begins with a description of an everyday situation, observed by the researcher, in which the social workers give a detailed account of a holiday trip for the young people. Based on this description, this chapter takes an empirical (though theoretically inspired) approach to exploring the construction of space and place. A multi-faceted theoretical framework is deployed to capture notions of space and its production. This theoretical lens is primarily guided by Lefebvre's spatial triad perspective (Lefebvre 1991) and de Certeau's distinction between strategically defined spaces and tactical behavior (de Certeau 1984), which together help to explain how dominant spatial practices can potentially be transformed into particular forms of resistance—at least for a short period of time. In this

theoretical outline, Foucault's notion of heterotopic spaces is briefly touched upon (Foucault 1986). The overall argument of the chapter is that the construction of space and place takes the form of a dialectic process consisting of the social workers' discursive practices and actions as well as the young people's resistances and struggles for the construction of private spheres and spaces, mental as well as physical. These efforts take the form of various tactical behaviors that aim to construct heterotopic spaces that the children and young people control and belong to. In this way, space and place are perceived as context bound and thus situational in their construction. The conclusion emphasizes the need to carefully think through how surveillance techniques are applied, and to be aware of the counterproductive effects of efforts to make private and intimate knowledge public in the name of care. It also highlights ways in which heterotopic spaces of privacy may be physically "real" as well as mental.

Dominant Spaces and Visibility

As mentioned above, this chapter opens with a short description of a typical situation at the 24 h care institution:

> The young people are returning from school. As is usual, everybody meets in the living room where messages are distributed, the afternoon schedule is outlined, etc. At the meeting, two social workers are present, as is the manager of the institution. The presence of the manager is unusual, but today is the first day after the winter holidays and five of the young people have been on a skiing trip with the manager and two other social workers. The manager tells the other residents and social workers about the trip. This is done in a seemingly caring and loving manner. The manager tells stories about the young people: "Then Annette [a 14-year-old girl] did this and that, then Mark [a 15-year-old boy] did this, and Laura [a 16-year-old girl] couldn't ski on the easy slope." During the description, the manager laughs and the social workers ask about the children's and young people's well-being—but they do so in the third person and direct their questions to the manager, not to the children and young people. None of the children participate in the stories about the ski trip.

> They just sit on the couch in silence. When the manager has finished telling the story of the skiing trip, it is the other social workers' turn to describe what happened in the institution while the others were away. The social workers relate "funny" incidents about who behaved well, who didn't, and the social workers note that "there're still problems with getting Sofie [a 12-year-old girl] out the bed in the morning."

Before we delve into a spatial analysis of this example, a closer look at some potential spatial perspectives is pertinent. Simonsen (2005, 43–44), along with Massey (1994, 154–155), argues that the specificity of place is not entirely bound up with the fabric of history, but is linked to specific articulations of social practices and social relations as well as the users and residents of a given place (Simonsen 2005, 44). As such, the construction of space and sense-making about specific place characteristics are linked to power and to the articulation of relations of dominance (de Certeau 1984). Seen from this perspective, the concept of time cannot be extrapolated from the concept of space, hence the creation of space and the assignment of characteristics to places is a process that is, to some extent, fixed in time, but is at the same time linked to historical processes of power. Lefebvre argues that space can be grasped in an abstract triadic lens in which history, power relations and lived life are closely intertwined. For Lefebvre, all practices are dialectically produced in space and simultaneously produce space (Lefebvre 1991, 31–32). As such, space consists of three coherent yet analytical separate moments: *representations of space*, *representational space* and *spatial practice* (Lefebvre 1991, 33).

Representations of space are practices that articulate and constitute space (Jeyasingham 2014, 1886). At the societal level, representations of space consist of the dominant modes of production, the dominant knowledge and the representation of dominant ideologies which may be represented in physical form or as dominant discursive formations. Representations of space are, thus, the concept "without life" (Lefebvre 1991, 37f). They are the material manifestations of society's order. Examples of this in a Danish social work context might include the prevailing emphasis on "what works," "standardization," cost-effectiveness and the quest for evidence-based methods in social work practices

(Christensen 2013). These phenomena are, of course, not exclusive to Denmark. In many Western countries, this performative discourse has been the dominant mode of social work (e.g., Howe 1992; Webb 2001; Garrett 2002). Either way, and regardless of the context, *representations of space* is always a reductive concept in that it seeks to determine which characteristics and modes of production should be articulated and which should not (Jeyasingham 2014, 1887).

Representational spaces denote lived space, i.e., spaces where people live and experience life through the body. The concept also captures how flows, creativity and symbols (verbal as well as nonverbal) are transformed into meaning, thus transcending physical space (representations of space). In social work, this may manifest as social workers attempting to change dominant modes of behavior or to apply alternative sense-making processes in their work than those approved by the municipality. It is in this respect that we conceptualize lived citizenship as performed, embodied and created in everyday interactions, as outlined above. We will return to this concept later.

Spatial practice addresses the production and reproduction of space, and captures how place-bound characteristics are articulated in each social formation. Spatial practice thus represents the individual's collection of experiences of space in which coherence between lived life and daily routines constitutes practice.

In sum, in this Lefebvrian perspective, space and place are constructed through historical power relations as well as by ongoing struggles about how the modus of space and the characteristics of place should be articulated. In the above-mentioned example from an everyday situation in the 24 h care institution, the space belongs entirely to the adults. The exclusion of the residents in this example is total, and they are powerless to prevent the social workers and manager from giving detailed accounts of their intimate, personal details. The intention behind the account of the skiing trip may be seen either as an attempt to make the life at the institution more "family-like" (although the effect is the opposite), or as an attempt to impose more "traditional" family structures where the parents (here the social workers) have the final word. Regardless of which of the two interpretations is chosen, the point is that this practice does not facilitate the children's and young

people's sense of belonging to the institution as equals. As the social workers list the various episodes of the preceding weeks, they disclose private and intimate details in the public realm, and the children and young people become visible against their will.[3] In other words, the more visible the children and young people become in the social workers' accounts, the more invisible they feel, and they are powerless to change this practice since it is tied to a broader institutional practice and is thus hegemonic. As such, they become detached from the institution and do not feel that it is their home. A similar example has to do with the "public diary"—a communication tool used by the social workers on a daily basis. The diary is kept in the living room of the institution and is accessible to everybody on a daily basis. The diary is used to record the social workers' main observations every day. They write reports over the course of each day to ensure that the next shift can quickly get up to speed about what has happened so far. We may think of this practice in terms of the strategies and tactical actions defined by de Certeau (1984): i.e., as the ability to separate spaces by the manipulation of power relationships and the rationalization of space: "*The division of space makes possible a panoptic practice proceeding from a place whence the eye can transform foreign forces into objects that can be observed and measured, and thus control and'include' them within its scope of vision*" (de Certeau 1984, 36).

In the above-mentioned example, this omnipotent narrative practice can be comprehended in terms of the social workers' knowledge about the ski trip and their articulation of this knowledge. As it is an institutionalized practice, the children and young people cannot do much about the situation and are thus subordinated to the dominant practice. On the other hand, de Certeau also talks about tactical behavior. This is a form of practice that relates to subjects who move and live within strategically dominated spaces. Tactical behavior is the dominated subject's opportunity to act freely in confined and dominated spaces. However, such tactical practices can only persist for so long, since if the practices endure and become accepted they will dislocate the dominant structure and begin to operate as new strategies of domination (Colebrook 2001, 547). "*It* [the tactical behavior] *operates in isolated actions, blow by blow. It takes advantage of'opportunities' and depends on them, being*

without any base where it could stockpile its winnings, build up its own position, and plan raids. What it wins it cannot keep." (de Certeau 1984, 37). What this citation suggests is that tactical practices are connected to situations and context, given that tactical behavior is tied up with the possibilities of the moment and occurs out of reach of the gaze of the dominant actors, e.g., social workers. In this respect, citizenship—understood as an active, participatory process—seems completely absent given that dominant institutional practices disregard the children's and young people's privacy and thus erode any sense of belonging they might have had to the institution.

Out of Sight—And the Construction of Heterotopic Spaces

We have now briefly touched upon the mental aspects of the construction of space and place. Following de Certeau (1984), the distinction between dominated spaces and places of tactical behavior becomes crucial in understanding how children and young people may be regarded as objects dominated by institutional practices, and why they do not feel a genuine sense of belonging to the institution. However, in order to grasp the mental dimensions of the creation of private spaces we now turn to Foucault's notion of heterotopic spaces—or sites of resistance. First of all, we look at an empirical example of tactical behavior:

> "One day, Mark (a 15 year old boy) invited me up to his room. When I went in, Mark offered me a chair. The computer screen was on and he was watching a movie. I sat down, and Mark asked me to touch a button on the screen. The picture switched instantly to a split-screen that simultaneously showed the living room, the staircase and the social workers' meeting room in the institution. I turned—admittedly genuinely surprised—to Mark who looked pleased with my reaction." He said: "They know everything about me, so I want to know everything about them."

Mark's covert surveillance system is an example of a highly sophisticated tactical action. At the institution, residents are allowed to have their

own computer in their room. But the Internet connection is controlled by the social workers, who can switch it off at night or whenever they feel like it. At the same time, the institution requires that all residents must clean their rooms once a week, with the social workers supervising both during and after the cleaning routine. These small rules and institutional practices invade the residents' private space and occupy and organize them within an institutional schema instead of allowing them free, private spaces. Mark's tactical behavior can be understood as an act of resistance toward this omnipotent surveillance. The installation of counter surveillance cameras at the institution constitutes a private mental space within the dominated space. In this way, Mark can claw back some kind of privacy. Arguably, though, it is not the same kind of privacy as that he has lost. His hard-won privacy has more to do with privacy *in spite of* the dominant structures, rather than privacy enabled by the institutional practices. All in all, Mark is able to reshape the institution's practices to his own advantage. With the room cleaning routine, the social workers are ostensibly complying with hygiene requirements but at the same time seeking to prevent any "contraband" from finding its way into the institution. However, this practice simultaneously enables Mark's covert surveillance cameras on his computer, simply because the social workers' imagination is limited. As long as his cameras remain concealed and the social workers do not check his computer (this is prohibited by law) Mark is able to monitor the social workers at his leisure.

Foucault writes about "critical" and "diverted" heterotopias, defined as: "*effectively enacted spaces in which real sites, all the other real sites that can be found within the culture, are simultaneously represented, contested, and inverted*" (Foucault 1986, 24). Whereas critical heterotopias primarily occur in primitive societies in the form of "mythical" and "dangerous" places, diverted heterotopias are more common in modern societies, notably in total institutions due to the assumed need to escape control, structure and surveillance. One of the main characteristics of diverted heterotopias is the ability to represent several modes of practice at the same time. One example of this at the institution in question is the residents' use of the forest at night. The children and young people often spend the night in the forest. As Jackie said: "Here [in the forest] we have the power. Here there are no adults to tell me what to do

and we can talk privately." Needless to say, the social workers did not know that the children and young people escaped from the institution at night. The heterotopia represents a physical place outside the institution but at the same time it constitutes a mental space in which the young people are dominant and define the practices that occur there. This example shows that in Foucault's vocabulary, diverted heterotopias can be either real places that signify alternatives to the dominated world; or mental places that are "real" to those who experience them, and which are inscribed with, and represent, specific symbolic features. Thus, there are similarities between de Certeau's notion of tactical behavior and Foucault's notion of diverted heterotopias. Besides differences in the theoretical positions they represent, the concepts differ in one key respect: the relationship between physicality and time. Whereas de Certeau's concept of resistance is short-lived, Foucault's sites of resistance may endure far longer and can coexist with other uses of the same space. This is not to say, however, that Foucault is clear on the subject of exactly how long heterotopias can persist (Johnson 2006).

In the following section, I present an example that illustrates the need to link de Certeau's tactical behavior concept with Foucault's concept of heterotopias. The example has to do with one boy's 2 month-long tactical communication of his need for soccer boots (although what he really wanted was soccer fan gear).

Creativity—The Struggle for Private Space and Own Will

One of the boys at the institution, Martin, was a much devoted fan of a particular soccer team. He owned lots of fan gear: jerseys, flags, stickers, posters and so on. He had so much stuff that the social workers had decided that he was not allowed to buy anymore. Obviously, Martin did not agree with this decision and he missed no opportunity to make his dissatisfaction known to the social workers. However, after having protested for approximately 1 month to no avail, he stopped arguing. Instead, he began to talk about whether or not he should attend soccer practice. After 3 weeks of constant arguments, the social workers

told him that if he was that into soccer he ought to get some football boots. Martin told them he had been looking at some boots that cost 70 Euros. That was way too much money to spend on soccer boots, replied the social workers, but Martin did not give up. The next few weeks went by and every time he saw a social worker, he talked about the boots, and about how much he was looking forward to playing soccer. Finally, the social workers caved in and allowed Martin to buy the expensive boots. Martin invited me to go into town with him to buy the boots and when we were just about to buy them he asked the social worker if he could be alone with me, so the two of us could make the purchase together. When the social worker had left us, Martin turned to me and said: "I don't even want to play soccer—but I'm going to buy boots that only cost 25 Euros, that way I can spend the difference on football gear." I told him that I thought the social workers would expect him to play soccer, and he replied: "Well, if I play for a few months then I can say I gave it a shot but that it isn't my thing."

In this example, Martin both makes use of tactical maneuvers and carves out a heterotopic space that represents his own interests within the space of the soccer practice sessions, although the latter space is intended for other purposes, namely as a place where people show up with an interest in playing soccer. In another respect, Martin manages to create a space in which he is able to make his own decisions about how to spend his money.

Concluding Remarks—Spatial Dialectic Resistance and Including Citizenship Learning Processes

This chapter analyzes the struggles and tactical behaviors of young people in vulnerable positions to create private spaces in a 24 h care residence for children and youth where various surveillance techniques are deployed in social work.

Drawing on a variety of empirical examples, this chapter illustrates how children and youth devote a lot of energy in daily life to developing

and enacting tactical behaviors, and to the creation of heterotopic spaces. They do this instead of concentrating, e.g., on schoolwork, social life, sports and other trust-oriented practices.

Even though my approach may be criticized for being too eclectic, the combination of Lefebvre's dynamic triad, de Certeau's distinction between strategies and tactics, and Foucault's notion of heterotopias arguably holds theoretical potential for conceptualizing inclusive citizenship practices with regard to spatial dialectics. The dialectical dynamics of dominator/dominated, and the Lefebvrian triad of representations of space, spaces of representation and spatial practice, open up a theoretical approach in which the struggle for private spaces is possible. Situated as they are in highly dominated spaces, children and young people in vulnerable positions may have no other option than to create spaces of resistance in order to establish some kind of sense of belonging. The creation of spaces of resistance is grounded in the spatial dynamics of what we may think of as "institutionalized mistrust" (Luhmann 2005). Luhmann argues that any mistrust-oriented defensive action is much harder psychologically than a trust-oriented action. This is because when one is oriented toward, or met with, mistrust one is compelled to handle and calculate every possible outcome of one's actions. As no one ever possesses complete knowledge, complexity grows with one's every action, which puts enormous pressure on individuals. But if one is oriented toward or met with trust, this can reduce complexity since people feel safe in the knowledge that no one wants to harm them. In this respect, trust provides openings for positive citizenship learning processes simply because when it is present, people do not constantly have to be in a state of alert.

In this chapter, the children and young people thus succeed in creating alternative spaces when they manage to develop tactics that circumvent the social workers' schema and the institutional surveillance, positioning themselves outside the institution's framework. In turn, this means that when the children and young people escape the gaze of the social workers and the institution, and create their own spaces of resistance, a sense of belonging may emerge. The sense of belonging in this case has to do with feeling secure and safe at home (Wood and Waite

2011), and not least the desire for some kind of attachment (Yuval-Davis 2006; Jackson 2016) to the place and space they live in.

Thus, social workers must be very careful when they deploy surveillance techniques and practices—even if their individual practice is thoroughly grounded in professional considerations. The sheer volume of surveillance techniques combined with the social workers' public accounts of the children's behavior produces antagonistic relations, mistrust, misrecognition and "know-it-all" attitudes (Leeson 2007; McLeod 2007; Warming 2013). The risk of such an omnipotent "know-it-all" attitude when combined with a surveillance-heavy environment is that the children and youth spend most of their time developing tactical maneuvers to elude surveillance, and twisting the social workers' practices so as to claim and construct private spaces and rights of their own. Therefore, their citizenship learning processes are, to a large extent, shaped by an environment featuring resistance, mistrust and misrecognition. In this respect, their learning possibilities would seem to be characterized much more by disciplinary citizenship processes than by inclusive mutual trustful spirals of responsive citizenship learning.

In conclusion, we must ask ourselves what kind of citizenship learning processes and opportunities are facilitated in cases where social workers work with some of society's most vulnerable people and deploy surveillance techniques which risk being interpreted as forms of institutionalized mistrust instead of care? These processes are much more likely to trigger resistance, marginalization and feelings of non-belonging rather than feelings of competence, motivation to participate, trust and recognition.

Notes

1. Lee (1999) addresses the seemingly paradoxical situation where both views coexist, i.e. efforts and the will to enforce children's and young people's participation in their own social cases on the one hand, and a striking lack of any ambition to do this in practice, on the other. Lee expresses this paradox in terms of the differentiation between an understanding of children as *becomings* (in which children are viewed as

passive not-yet-capable agents who are subjects to adults' perspectives) or *beings* in which children and young people are regarded and recognized as being competent agents with rights of their own. Lee thus argues that while the latter is the intention, the former approach in which children and young people are viewed as being in need of care and protection dominates and is almost a cultural default response.

2. A well-argued example of this kind of approach can be found in Moosa-Mitha's 'A Difference-Centred Alternative to Theorization of Children's Citizenship Rights' (2005) in which she argues for a recognition of children's individual strategies and ways of making themselves heard and voiced.
3. This interpretation is based on a variety of indications, e.g. their facial expressions: they look down, do not participate actively in the meeting and try to make themselves 'invisible' by pulling their jersey hoods over their head. Also, during various interviews, the children and young people stated that the meeting "(…) is the adults' meeting, not ours" (Jackie, 14 years old).

References

Atkinson, S., V. Lawson, and J. Wiles. 2011. Care of the Body: Spaces of Practice. *Social and Cultural Geography* 12 (6): 563–572.

Bailey, C.A. 1996. *A Guide to Field Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.

Baraldi, C., and V. Iervese. 2012. *Participation, Facilitation and Mediation*. London: Routledge.

Bendiksen, L.L., and T. Haugli. 2014. The Child's or Child Perspective in Legal Research: How Norwegian Scholars Define the Child Perspective. *International Family Law, Policy and Practice* 1 (1): 41–48.

Burgess, R.G. 1984. *In the Field: An Introduction to Field Research*. Allen & Unwin.

Christensen, M. 2013. Trust, Social Work and Care Ethics: An Exploration of the Luhmannian Concept of Trust and Social Work with Children at Risk. In *Participation, Citizenship and Trust in Children's Lives*, ed. H. Warming. London: Palgrave Macmillian.

Cockburn, T. 2005. Children as Participative Citizens: A Radical Pluralist Case for 'Child-Friendly' Public Communication. *Journal of Social Science* 9: 19–29.

Cockburn, T. 2007. Partners in Power: A Radically Pluralistic Form of Participative Democracy for Children and Young People. *Children and Society* 21: 446–457.

Colebrook, C. 2001. Certeau and Foucault: Tactics and Strategic Essentialism. *The South Atlantic Quarterly*. *Spring* 100 (2): 543–574.

Croussée, F., M. Roets, and M. De Bie. 2009. Empowering the Powerful: Challenging Hidden Processes of Marginalization in Youth Work Policy and Practice in Belgium. *Critical Social Policy*, 29 (3): 421–442.

Dalrymple, J. 2003. Professional Advocacy as a Force for Resistance. *Child Welfare*. *British Journal of Social Work* 33 (8): 1043–1062.

De Certeau, M. 1984. *The Practice of Everyday Life*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Delanty, G. 2002. Two Conceptions of Cultural Citizenship: A Review of Recent Literature on Culture and Citizenship. *The Global Review of Ethnopolitics* 1 (3): 60–66.

Delanty, G. 2003. Citizenship as a Learning Process: Disciplinary Citizenship vs. Cultural Citizenship. *International Journal of Lifelong Education* 22 (6): 597–605.

DeVault, M.L., and L. McCoy. 2002. Institutional Ethnography. Using Interviews to Investigate Ruling Relations. In *Handbook of Interview Research. Context and Method*, ed. J.F. Gubrium and J.A. Holstein. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Egelund, T., and A.-D. Hestbæk. 2003. *Anbringelse af børn og unge uden for hjemmet: en forskningsoversigt.* København: Social for sknings instituttet 03:04.

Foucault, M. 1986. Of Other Spaces. *Diacritics* 16 (1): 22–27.

Garrett, P.M. 2002. Yes Minister: Reviewing the "Looking After Children" Experience and Identifying the Messages for Social Work Research. *British Journal of Social Work* 32: 831–846.

Gaskell, C. 2010. If the Social Worker had Called at Least it Would Show they Cared: Young Care Leavers' Perspectives on the Importance of Care. *Children and Society* 24: 136–147.

Howe, D. 1992. Child Abuse and the Bureaucratization of Social Work. *The Sociological Review*: 491–508.

Jackson, L. 2016. Intimate Citizenship? Rethinking the Politics and Experience of Citizenship as Emotional in Wales and Singapore. *Gender, Place & Culture* 23 (6): 817–833.

Jeyasingham, D. 2014. The Production of Space in Children's Social Work: Insights from Henri Lefebvre's Spatial Dialectics. *British Journal of Social Work* 44: 1879–1894.

Johnson, P. 2006. Unravelling Foucault's Different Spaces. *History of Human Sciences* 19(4): 75–90.

Laws, S., and G. Mann. 2003. *So You Want to Involve Children in Research?* Stockholm: Save the Children.

Lee, N. 1999. The Challenge of Childhood Distributions of Childhood's Ambiguity in Adult Institutions. *Childhood* 6 (4): 455–474.

Leeson, C. 2007. My Life in Care: Experiences of Non-Participation in Decision-Making Processes. *Child and Family Social Work* 12: 268–277.

Lefebvre, H. 1991. *The Production of Space*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Luhmann, N. 2005/1968. *Tillid—en mekanisme til reduktion af social kompleksitet*. København: Hans Reitzels Forlag.

Mann, G., and D. Tolfree. 2002. *Children's Participation in Research: Reflections from the Care and Protection of Separated Children in Emergencies Project*. Stockholm: Save the Children.

Massey, D. 1994. *Space, Place and Gender*. Oxford: Polity Press.

McLeod, A. 2007. Whose Agenda? Issues of Power and Relationship When Listening to Looked-After Young People. *Child and Family Social Work* 12: 278–286.

Moosa-Mitha, M. 2005. A Difference-Centred Alternative to Theorization of Children's Citizenship Rights. *Citizenship Studies* 9 (4): 388–396.

Prout, A., and C. Hallett. 2003. Introduction. In *Hearing the Voices of Children*, ed. A. Prout and C. Hallett. London: Routledge.

Simonsen, K. 2005. *Byens mange ansigter—konstruktion af byen I praksis og fortælling*. Frederiksberg: Roskilde Universitetsforlag.

Spradley, J. 1979. *The Ethnographic Interview Wadsworth, Cengage Learning*.

Spradley, J.P. 1980. *Participant Observation*. USA: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Spyrou, S. 2016. Researching Children's Silences: Exploring the Fullness of Voice in Childhood Research. *Childhood* 26 (1): 7–21.

Stokholm, A. 2003. *Anbragte børn og døgninstitutionskultur: teoretiske perspektiver og præsentation af et forskningsprojekt*. Aalborg: Forlaget PUC.

Warming, H. 2011. Children's Participation and Citizenship in a Global Age. *Social Work & Society* 9 (1): 119–134.

Warming, H. 2012. Theorizing (Adults Facilitation of) Children's Participation. In *Participation, Facilitation and Mediation*, ed. C. Baraldi and V.L. Iervese. London: Routledge.

Warming, H. 2013. *Participation, Citizenship and Trust in Children's Lives*. London: Palgrave Macmillian.

Warming, H., and M. Christensen. 2016. *Tillid i socialt og pædagogisk arbejde med børn og unge*. København: Akademisk Forlag.

Webb, S. 2001. Some Considerations on the Validity of Evidence-based Practice in Social Work. *British Journal of Social Work* 31: 57–79.

Wood, N., and L. Waite. 2011. Editorial: Scales of Belonging. *Emotion, Space and Society* 4 (4): 201–202.

Yuval-Davis, N. 2006. Belonging and the Politics of Belonging. *Patterns of Prejudice* 40 (3): 197–214.

The Role of Social Work Practice and Policy in the Lived and Intimate Citizenship of Young People with Psychological Disorders

Hanne Warming

This chapter explores the role of social work practices and policies in shaping the lived citizenship of young people living at a residence for young people with psychological disorders. While the formal status of these young people is that of citizens, I argue that their citizenship as a lived practice and experience unfolds on the edge of citizenship, where they struggle to elude what Tonkiss and Bloom (2015, 837) have termed "the complexities of practices and constructions of non-citizenship." This argument might seem self-evident, since living with a psychological disorder in itself complicates the realization of citizenship. Think, for instance, of how symptoms such as anxiety, paranoia and hallucinations might influence a person's participation, social integration and feeling of belonging.

Recognition of the lived citizenship challenges faced by such young people due to their psychological disorders, and the will to cope with

H. Warming (✉)
Department of Social Sciences and Business,
Roskilde University, Roskilde, Denmark
e-mail: hannew@ruc.dk

H. Warming and K. Fahnøe (eds.), *Lived Citizenship on the Edge of Society*,
Palgrave Politics of Identity and Citizenship Series, DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-55068-8_4

these challenges, is at the heart of social work, not least at the residence analyzed in this chapter. Nevertheless, I shall argue that although the challenges that these young people face are related to their psychological disorders, they cannot be reduced to them. They are also related to (and reshaped by) the same social work practices and policies that aim (to some extent successfully) to empower the young people. Thus, the analysis in this chapter shows that social work and social policies are social interventions with contested and multidimensional (action-related, emotional, affective, positioning-related, etc.) outcomes. In theoretical terms, this suggests that a dichotomous conceptualization of lived practices and experiences as either citizenship or non-citizenship is inadequate and that it is therefore not plausible to locate the co-shaping of these practices and experiences by social work practices and policies on a continuum between these dichotomies. Instead, we need theorizing that allows both for contradictions and inconsistencies, and for conceptualizations that embrace contested, ambiguous and multidimensional outcomes. Here, inspired by Wright's (2015), Wilson's (2010) and Sedgwick's (1997) re-reading of Silvan Tomkins (1963), I propose that weak theory is a fruitful means to deepen understandings of citizenship practices and experiences.

This chapter starts with an introduction to weak theory and to ways in which it can inform theorizing about the dynamics of lived and intimate citizenship. This will form the theoretical foundation for my analysis of the role of social work practices and policies in shaping the lived citizenship of young people with psychological disorders. The analysis, which follows the theoretical section and a brief introduction to the empirical data, takes its point of departure in the microlevel. Thus, I present and analyze some extracts from my field notes, focusing on how identities, emotions, and trust–power relations are negotiated between the young people and social workers in everyday life at the residence. However, using a thick analysis to capture those interactions at the microlevel also requires recognizing that they are conditioned by state, municipal and local institutional policies, discourses about professionalism, and materiality, inter alia, so these dimensions are also included in the analysis. Finally, in the conclusion I discuss how a weak theory analysis can contribute to social work practice.

Weak Theory

The grand old man of the weak theory concept, Silvan Tomkins, was a psychologist. He used the concept of "theory" to address the ways in which people organize affective experiences and cope with the traffic of affective events (Wilson 2010, 3). Strong theories encourage a rigid coping strategy that defends "itself against surprise by anticipating negative affect in a way that can be both reifying and totalizing." In contrast, weak theory allows for a flexible attitude of attending and attuning to what actually happens. "Rather than closing down, categorizing, judging, modeling and getting things 'right', weak theory is open to possibilities, to surprises" (Wright 2015, 392). Although Tomkins' object of research was the affective responses and coping strategies of individuals in the face of affective events, drawing on inspiration from his early work in computation and cybernetics, he found that his theorization reached beyond psychology to encompass the very science of knowledge, as "there is no essential difference between the affect theory of an individual and theory building in the sciences" (Wilson 2010, 4):

> The co-ordinations of percepts, ideas and actions which are prompted by even the most transitory affects are of the same general order as those involved in science in the coordination of empirical evidence and theory… [in both cases this involves] the interpretation of empirical evidence, the extrapolation into the future, the evaluation of both interpretation and extrapolation, and the application of knowledge to strategy. (Tomkins 1963, 369, after Wilson 2010, 4)

In this chapter, the concept of "weak theory" is used as an epistemological concept which addresses a scientific mode of thought that regards things as open, entangled, connected and in flux. This means, first of all, that rather than striving for comprehensiveness, exclusivity and grand claims, the analysis is open to partial understandings and multiplicity, and allows both for contradictions and inconsistencies (Wright 2015, 392). Second, it implies paying critical attention to dualities such as affect–rationality, emotion–reason, nature–culture, human–non-human as social constructions rather than as one-to-one mirrorings of

reality. Thus, these dualities are regarded as potentially interrelated, and as coming into existence as dualities through cuts and reductions. The weak theory approach is, therefore, open to seeing practices, experiences and agents not in either/or terms, but as *both/and*.

A Weak Theory Approach to Lived Citizenship

Using a weak theory approach has several implications for theorizing citizenship practices and experiences. The approach is very much in line with the concepts of "lived citizenship" and "intimate citizenship," but requires particular attention to selected issues as well as a radical openness. As explained in the introduction to this book, the lived citizenship approach emphasizes the contextualized meaning and power (re-) producing practices through which people understand and negotiate their rights, responsibilities, participation and identity, including a sense of belonging, in and through their everyday interactions (Lister 2007; see also chapter "Social Work and Lived Citizenship"). Following the weak theory approach, to "understand and negotiate" is not only about cognition, rationality and reason, but also has to do with affections and emotions, not necessarily as separate components, although that is also possible.Weak theory also draws attention to how belonging is constituted by and through emotional attachments as well as through a myriad of more-than-human processes of attunement and attachment to people, animals, things, sounds, odors, rhythms, places, etc. "Belonging in these accounts is multiple and multiscalar—it is personal and structural, lived and contested, discursive and material. It is imbued with powerful (but contested) sexist, racist and exclusionary logics at the same time as it is used to generate inclusive ways of being in the world" (Wright 2015, 393). Likewise, it is imbued with power constructions and exclusionary logics from the generational order and images of maturity and normality that discriminate as well as privilege children, young people and others identified as childish or immature.

As introduced in chapter "Social Work and Lived Citizenship", the English sociologist, Gerald Delanty, offers a theoretical framework for analyzing such dynamics of inclusion and exclusion that go beyond formal citizenship and are open to a weak theory reading. Thus, he

suggests that citizenship practices and experiences can be regarded as a continuous everyday learning or identity shaping process, in which the individual learns about him/herself and his/her relationship to the community. Delanty makes a distinction between disciplining citizenship learning processes and inclusive citizenship learning processes. The former create alienation, exclusion and suffering, whereas the latter create an experience of belonging that results in satisfaction and commitment. Thus, discrimination and exclusion are dynamic processes in which the individual or group, through the everyday flux of (predominantly discriminative) experiences, is not only excluded, but in connection with that exclusion also distances him/her/itself, leading to a negative spiral of misrecognition and distancing (Delanty 2003; Warming and Christensen 2016). Reinterpreted in the light of the weak theory approach, the very same practices may involve disciplining as well as inclusive learning processes, just as learning processes can combine disciplining and inclusive elements. Thus reinterpreted, this identification of, and attention to, the spiral dynamic is fruitful as a normative ground for critical analyses aimed at shedding light on the discursive, structural conditioning of the contradictory dynamics of citizenship and non-citizenship, belonging and non-belonging.

Inclusive learning processes are shaped by recognizing discourses and practices that give voice to the individual as well as to collective experiences of hardship, impoverishment and lack of respect (Delanty 2003). Inclusive processes involve two-way learning processes in which both the individual and the society or institution changes. The harmed person or group of persons—in this case the young people at the residence—learn that they have the right to be heard and recognized as equal and valued members, which motivates participation and commitment; whereas the community (be it comprised of the other young residents, the staff at the residence, the social authorities or society as such) is open to criticism and change based on their input. Conversely, disciplinary learning processes are shaped by narrow norms for participation, the right way to be a young person at the residence, and norms for who can be recognized.

As indicated above, according to Delanty (2003), citizenship learning is about interrelated self and self–other learning. Here, Delanty draws

on Axel Honneth's theory of recognition (Honneth 1996) to emphasize the flux of the learning process, delivering an implicit criticism of the notion of an autonomous self that interacts as an independent unit with other people and with society. Instead, he regards the self as socially conditioned.The notion of social conditioning can be further developed using Plummer's concept of intimate citizenship. This concept addresses how the most private decisions and practices, e.g., how to be a friend and how to treat one's body, are inextricably linked with public institutions, law and state polices (Plummer 2001; see also chapters "Exploring Norms About Citizenship in Stories of Young People with "Psychological Vulnerabilities"", "From Objects of Care to Citizens—Young Carers' Citizenship" and "Migrant Women's Intimate Struggles and Lived Citizenship: Experiences from Southern Europe"). The concept of intimate citizenship immediately brings to mind governmental strategies such as health propaganda or the direct governance of intimate life through the regulation of migration and formal citizenship (Cherubini 2011; see also chapter "Migrant Women's Intimate Struggles and Lived Citizenship: Experiences from Southern Europe"). However, a weak theory perspective draws attention to myriads of more-than-human processes of attunement and attachment to people, animals, things, sounds, odors, rhythms, places etc., thereby widening the scope of relevant public policies and practices so that it extends far beyond what we normally think of as governmental strategies to regulate citizenship.

After a brief introduction to my data and the site of the ethnographic fieldwork, I deploy a weak theory rereading of Delanty's distinction between inclusive and disciplinary citizenship learning processes and of Plummer's concept of intimate citizenship in an analysis of selected excerpts from my field notes.

Data and Site for My Ethnographic Fieldwork

The residence where I conducted my fieldwork houses up to 24 young people with psychological disorders. The fieldwork was carried out in 2014–2015, as part of a broader project on "Citizenship on the edge" (Warming et al. 2017). Thus, during the first half of 2014, I "hung

out" at the residence for 4–12 h three to four times a week at different times of the day; sometimes participating (helping to prepare food, accompanying the young people around town, etc.); sometimes more as an observer watching interactions between staff and the young people or staff meetings and supervision sessions. As part of my field work, I "small-talked" and carried out mini-interviews both with the young people and the staff. Some of the young people also wrote me emails and Facebook messages about their experiences and thoughts during the period when I was visiting the residence.

Most of the young people living at the residence were between 15 and 23 years; a few were slightly older. Despite the common feature that they all suffered from some kind of psychological disorder, their attitudes and challenges appeared to be very diverse: some appeared introvert and to be afflicted with social difficulties; others were quite the opposite. Some were categorized as having low intelligence levels or brain damage, whereas others scored very high in intelligence tests; some were self-harming, and others were regarded as potentially dangerous to other people. Most of them had one or multiple psy-diagnoses; a few were still under psychiatric evaluation. The residence provided them with care, protection from self-harm and empowerment (learning to manage on their own). A few residents were there as the final phase in, or follow-up to, serving a prison sentence.

The residence is located in an old house in the city center in one of Denmark's biggest cities. Each resident had his/her own bedroom, but shared a bathroom, kitchen facilities and a living room with 3–4 other young people. On the ground floor of the building, one finds the offices of the staff and manager, usually with an open door. When the door was open, the young people were welcome to drop in whenever they wanted—and many of them did so quite often. Thus, the staff office especially was a quite lively room. There is also a meeting room, a big kitchen and a dining room. In the basement are another kitchen, a café/bar room with an espresso machine, and a living room with a book shelf, a big TV screen, a computer and wireless Internet access, a Wii with games, and several board games.

The staff members had different educational backgrounds, e.g., nurse, social pedagogue (social worker), social case worker, occupational

therapist, and psychotherapist. The manager explained that this diversity, which also applies to age, gender, and personality, was a conscious management choice, as it enhanced the residence's ability to meet the young people's diverse needs. She described the pedagogical approach of the residence as based on relational work with an emphasis on trust and recognition, and explained that the staff strove to support the individual young people on their own premises, and to respect their autonomy. The staff held brief meetings every 4 h to ensure that every young person felt "seen," and the latter were offered at least one talk or activity with a staff member every day. However, they also respected if the young person declined the talk/activity or had other plans. The young people had their own keys and were free to come and go from the residence, as they pleased. The manager was very keen on letting me carry out field work at the residence, as she believed that my focus on lived citizenship and dilemmas in social work in regard to empowerment of young people was at the heart of their work.

When I asked the young people what they thought of living at the residential home, most told me that it was the best place they had ever lived in and that their stay there had helped them a lot. Nevertheless, everyday life was rife with dilemmas and frustrations on the part of staff members as well as the young people, and although the staff helped to promote the empowerment of the young people, they also unwittingly contributed to its opposite, i.e., to experiences of exclusion and discrimination. Thus, the everyday experiences of the young people turned out to be more ambiguous than their first statements suggested, and viewed from the outside, some of the social work practices were quite difficult to categorize as either inclusive or disciplinary. Acknowledging this, I turned to a weak theory approach and revisited my initial theoretical concepts drawn from Lister, Delanty and Plummer.

Critical Voices Within the Overall Assessment: "This Is the Best Residence"

Some of the young people who had been at the residence for several years told me they had experienced a change over time from a very responsive to a stricter approach. They reported a shift away from a

pedagogical approach with an emphasis on relational work in which some young people's preference for certain staff members was regarded as "okay" and the starting point for the pedagogical work. Today, they detected a more instrumental, educational and clinical approach. This was expressed in the following quotes, among others:

> The nurses have taken over.
>
> They have become more problem-oriented. They focus on what we have to learn and how we should change.
>
> They now tell us that we have to learn to be satisfied with the staff who are at work and who have time, rather than focusing on what actually works for us, what makes us feel better and able to act.
>
> They used to prioritize relationships—now we just have to adjust to their work organization.

The statement that "the nurses have taken over" is a short formulation of a narrative that is frequently repeated among the young people concerning the reorientation of the pedagogical approach toward diagnosis and treatment at the expense of empathy, as well as expert assessments of "the right thing to do," and a focus on problems (as in the second citation, above) which is related to demands for change, goal setting and evaluation, strict rule orientation, etc.

The Nurses Have Taken Over: Ambiguous Effects on the Young People's Lived and Intimate Citizenship

At first glance, it seems logical to regard this change as a result of the residence's conscious strategy of hiring staff with different educational background rather than primarily employing social pedagogues supplemented by perhaps one case worker and one nurse, which would be the traditional staffing pattern at a residence such as this one. There are now more nurses than there used to be—and the nurses' practices do reflect

the above-mentioned attitudes, although this is not unambiguous. The nurses can also show empathy, and in some cases they use their professional, medical background to back up the viewpoint of the young people in arguments with the social authorities, sometimes to very powerful effect precisely by virtue of their educational background. For instance, in the case of some diagnoses, the nurses are able to present a very good case for why the disciplining demands imposed by the social authorities should be renegotiated in order to make them more appropriate in regard to what the young person is able to achieve, and better tailored to assuring the conditions which—from the young person's perspective—are essential for her/his life quality and survival. Moreover, the young people themselves sometimes seek knowledge and advice regarding medicine, diets and diseases, and ask the nurses to accompany them to meetings with psychiatrists and social case workers to explain their symptoms, challenges and experiences.

The nurses' authoritarian knowledge (and to some extent attitude) can be a double-edged sword in regard to the young people's lived and intimate citizenship. On the one hand, their knowledge and diagnosis-oriented approach constitute a powerful base to argue for privileges and compromises in the face of certain demands, and as a kind of secure base: somebody with authority can tell you what is right and wrong, why you feel as you do, etc. Many of the young people long for a secure base like this; however, the very same authoritarian attitude and diagnosis-focused approach also makes them feel "out of place," alienated, not listened to, and not recognized as a sane person. Furthermore, it is very clear in the data that the staff who predominantly act "nurse-like" are not the most popular. They are not part of the subgroup of staff members with whom the young people most often develop strong relationships, characterized by trust and recognition, which comfort them when they are sad, and in whom they confide or seek help when they need to discuss sensitive topics.

The expression "the nurses have taken over" is also an expression of the fact that diagnosis has (once again) become part of the professional discourse at the residence, compared to before when the predominant therapeutic discourse was highly skeptical of diagnosis. Diagnoses are, moreover, themselves double-edged: "It can be a relief to have a label

for your demons," as one of the young people put it, both in regard to yourself and others, who are more tolerant of your deviant behavior if you have a diagnosis. Moreover, if you have a diagnosis, you know that other people struggle with the same things you do, as well as opening doors to medication, therapy, social benefits, etc. However, the diagnosis also stigmatizes you as different in a negative manner, it locks you into an identity as sick and deviant. Furthermore, other people interpret what you do and say in the light of your diagnosis; they see you as the incarnation of the diagnosis rather than as a person. Some diagnoses in particular have the effect that what you say is not really taken seriously, or that you are met with suspicion. The young people at the residence told me about all these issues, but they also became very clear through my observations. The perception that people with a diagnosis are manipulative is reflected—and probably informed—by scientific scholarship: see for instance Mandal and Kocur (2013) and Jimenez (2013) in regard to people with a borderline diagnosis, and Schwartz et al. (2007) in regard to Antisocial Personality Disorder and schizophrenia where sufferers are regarded as manipulative, and are therefore met with extra suspicion and less empathy (Warming et al. forthcoming).

Nurses—Or a More General Change Due to Managerialism?

Whereas the nurses represent a particular field of knowledge which some of the young people use and are both empowered and disciplined by, it is not only the nurses who represent the other features of the "nurse-attitude." Rather, this attitude is present across the staff and represents a general change, but there is also a dividing line in staff members' attitudes between those the young people call "hardliners" and "softliners." This division is evident at almost every staff meeting, in discussions over the extent to which account must be taken of the young people's emotions and affections, e.g., attachment to certain staff members or negative reactions to other people's table manners.

The difference between hardliners and softliners became very clear at a meeting where staff were discussing a new tool for documenting

their work with the young people. The tool is a form which they have to fill out every time they have spent time with one of the young people. In it, they must write what they did and how this activity/talk contributed to meeting the development goals defined for the young person in question. Some staff members claimed that they found the tool very helpful for prioritizing their time and documenting their work with the young people, whereas others described it as absurd. One of them said:

> I find it very problematic, because what about activities, that we know are essential for a certain young person—for example my weekly coffee chat with Sarah, which we all know that she looks forward to all week—this coffee chat can help her get through the day and avoid cutting herself or being admitted to the closed psychiatric ward. But how can I write about our coffee chat in relation to the development goals? It just doesn't make sense. So should I stop drinking coffee with her, or should I be very creative and invent something that could legitimize our coffee time?

The introduction of this tool is the latest "step" in the implementation and professionalization of a documentation program at the residence. It is related to changes in the social policies that govern the relationship between the residence and the municipalities that pay for the young people's stay, and which are increasingly oriented toward performance measurement, which is a global trend in social work (Tilbury 2004).

Hardliners and Softliners

Above, I describe the staff members as either hardliners or softliners. Although this distinction is plausible and is connected in some ways to educational background, a closer look into staff practices reveals exceptions to the "rule" of who belongs in the hardliner and softliner camps. Moreover, some staff members turn into hardliners when it comes to particular issues or residents, and likewise for softliners.

Kirsten, who is a qualified nurse, tells me that she chose to work at the residence because she couldn't stand the disciplining approach at the

psychiatric hospitals where she formerly worked. Nevertheless, at the staff meetings she is clearly one of the hardliners and is also identified as such by most of the young people. One of the young girls told me that she couldn't talk to Kirsten at all. Kirsten knows how the girl feels about her. Nevertheless, she quite often volunteers to talk with her and care for her. She claims that the girl gets too much staff attention, and needs to learn to make the most of talking with whoever has the time for it—not only her favorite staff members. She is also a hardliner in relation to the kitchen and rules about food. Thus, she thinks that two of the young people, Tobias and Amanda, who are a couple, should not be allowed to go to the kitchen and make coffee for themselves whenever they feel like it—they should buy their own coffee. Likewise, she strictly enforces the rule that the residents have to sign up if they want to join in the communal dinner.

However, Kirsten makes one exception to her tough approach: a young man named Johnny. Johnny is described by the other staff members as someone who really needs strict rules and who is very evasive in his relations with the staff. They also claim that he sneaks around in the kitchen, begging for or stealing food, which seems to irritate them a lot and which sours their relationship with him. But Johnny seems to have quite the opposite effect on Kirsten. With him, she softens and relaxes her principles and the residence rules. For instance, when Kirsten is in the kitchen and sees Johnny, she greets him with a smile and an inviting comment such as:

> Are you hungry—wouldn't it be nice it we put a bit of cream in the sauce. If you go and get it for me in Netto [a supermarket], I could make a much tastier sauce. Will you join us for dinner?
>
> Johnny answers: I haven't signed up.
>
> Kirsten: "Well, I think we can make an exception, just hurry up; go and sign up".

This is just one example; she also quite often offers to save some food for him so he can take it to his room later. Over time, Johnny reacts by acting less evasively toward her than the other staff. Although he doesn't

let her into his room (or any of the staff for that matter), he frequently seeks her out when she is at work. His demeanor also changes over time; instead of sidling past (the Danish expression "creeping along the wall"), seeking to draw as little attention to himself as possible, he becomes more relaxed and convivial. He also increasingly complies with the residence rules, e.g., dropping by the office to notify staff when he leaves the residence. Thus, it seems that Kirsten's preferential treatment of him and her way of bending some of the rules to accommodate him have strengthened Johnny's sense of belonging, as well as enabled a kind of disciplining process.

It is interesting that while at staff meetings and in many everyday life situations Kirsten takes a hardliner position, refusing to make allowances for the young people's staff preferences or to bend the rules for those who, for different reasons, have trouble complying with them, she makes several exceptions for this particular young man. Some of the staff think that he is manipulating her. However, I argue that he did not deliberately seek to make Kirsten more softhearted toward him. In fact, at the beginning, he also tried to avoid her—he basically didn't want to be at the residence at all.

So why did Kirsten make an exception?

I believe that this may have to do with affection: Johnny had a softening effect on her, perhaps exactly because of his marginal position at the residence which resembled her own position somewhat, and that this dynamic contributed to his inclusive process of learning to belong at the residence. However, this was no seamless process. As mentioned earlier, his kitchen exploits and Kirsten's special regard for him were not looked upon kindly by the other staff members, who would ask him to leave the kitchen or who thought that, especially in Johnny's case, one had to lay down the law. To some extent, these two contradictory attitudes toward Johnny mutually reinforced each other; however, the tension between them eventually eased.

I will now report on another incident from my field work in which the affective and emotional dimensions of the staff-resident relationship came to a head in the form of a major conflict and great frustration, this time involving staff members and a young girl named Nanna.

The episode is not intended to be representative of everyday life at the residence, but as an example of an event that the young girl concerned identified as a critical moment in her experience of self and self–other relationships, and of identity, rights and sense of belonging, i.e., of lived citizenship. It is also an example of an event where the staff are in a quandary and cannot agree among themselves about how they should respond. Thus, my selection strategy is what Flyvbjerg has termed "information oriented" rather than random or representational, as this particular case may be characterized as extreme and critical. Extreme cases are unusual cases "which can be especially problematic or especially good in a more closely defined sense" (Flyvbjerg 2006, 230), and "well-suited for getting a point across in an especially dramatic way" (ibid., 229). I have chosen my cases to convey the point that social work strategies (those deployed both by staff and residents) are not necessarily either emotional or rational, but can be both, although they are typically identified as, and responded to, as either one or the other. The case is also chosen to illustrate that although the drama seems to play out between people and to be about emotions and power relations, more-than-human agents are also involved. The case therefore also constitutes a critical case which is characterized by "strategic importance in relation to the general problem," and allowing for "logical deductions of the type 'if this is (not) valid for this case, then it applies to all (no) cases'" (ibid., 229–230).

"Why Can't You Give Me a Hug?"

Nanna, one of the young residents, has two big favorites among the staff. She checks out their work schedules daily to find out if and when they will be at work. Today, one of her favorites, Lotte is scheduled to be at work during the daytime. However, one of the other staff members has told Nanna that Lotte won't be able to spend any time with her. So Nanna decides to lie in wait for Lotte in front of the residence to grab a hug and a chat before Lotte's working day begins. Lotte arrives at the last minute, says a quick "hi" to Nanna and hurries to a staff meeting. Nanna reacts by shouting:

Why won't you give me a hug?—I've been waiting here for you!

She knocks hard on the door to the meeting room:

Lotte, Lotte—why won't you give me a hug—are you mad at me?

Another staff member intervenes:

Lotte isn't mad at you—she's just busy right now, you'll have to wait.

But she won't have time afterwards.

Nanna starts knocking on the door very hard again. The staff try to calm her down, but Nanna responds testily:

Leave me alone!—I want to talk to Lotte.

Back in the meeting room, Lotte looks upset and unsure how to handle the situation. One of the other staff members says:

Don't go to her—she is manipulating you!

Lotte replies:

Well, I don't know: I can't stand that she waits for me—that I can't even make it through the door before she's all over me. But if I go to her, she'll probably calm down very quickly, and I know she's having a very hard time these days.

Don't—that's what she wants.

The meeting starts, and meanwhile, Nanna is crying and shouting behind the closed door. After a while she stops, but a few seconds later the doorbell starts ringing very loudly, sounding like an alarm. Nanna has found an effective way to draw the staff's attention to her dissatisfaction and frustration. The meeting is totally disrupted, and the staff express frustration and anger.

Later, Lotte has a talk with Nanna and asks her not to check out the staff's work schedules, or make plans involving them (meaning Lotte) without asking them directly. She also asks Nanna not to wait outside for her in the mornings. Nanna explains:

> But I'd missed you so much, and I get so disappointed when you don't have time for me. What do you want me to do? Now you're angry with me–everybody's angry with me—Will you kick me out?

The last sentence is uttered tearfully. Nanna is lying on the floor in a fetal position. Lotte assures her that nobody is angry with her. But from my point of view as an observer, at least half the staff members seem quite irritated and angry. This becomes clear at the "overlap" meeting (a kind of meeting held every 4 h), where the general mood is that "Nanna is just too much," and some argue that stricter rules ought to be applied in her case. Some staff members also point out that the manager needs to think about whether Nanna should be allowed to stay at the residence or asked to move to another place. They argue that Nanna has made some of the other young people feel bad (higher levels of anxiety, self-injury such as cutting, etc.)—because of her shouting, crying and the loudly ringing bell.

The day after, Nanna (who is soon going on holiday) asks the manager:

> Are you angry with me? I'm afraid of going on holiday, I'm worried you will 'vote me out' like in Robinson and Survivor, while I'm on holiday.

The manager smiles and gives her a hug, reassuring her that:

> We don't do that here, you know.

Some weeks later, the staff discuss the episode at a supervision session. The supervisor (an external psychologist who supervise the staff) interprets the episode as mirroring by Lotte of Nanna's disorder, which he identifies as a lack of personal boundaries and balance, and an inability to get in touch with her own feelings. He advises Lotte's colleagues to support her in not going along with Nanna's wishes: i.e., in not letting Nanna wrap her around her little finger.

Emotions, Affection and Reason

On the face of it, this story seems very emotional and intense, not least for Nanna, who screams, cries, curls up in a fetal position, etc. Nevertheless, the staff at the meeting interpret Nanna's behavior as calculative and manipulative. In so doing, they usher into existence a Nanna who is a rational person who uses emotional outbursts to get her own way with Lotte. Conversely, Lotte is framed as governed by her emotions—a victim of Nanna's manipulative strategies, which are effective precisely because they move Lotte at an emotional and affective level. The staff's interpretation thus suggests that reason and rationality—rather than authentic emotions and affection—are at the root of Nanna's behavior. And that emotions and affections steer Lotte's reactions at the expense of rationality and reason. Meanwhile, the other staff members' own interpretations are presented as purely rational, distant analyses of what is happening. However, from the observer's point of view (mine), they actually appeared to be quite emotionally affected by the episode.

The other staff members' interpretation is afterward emphatically confirmed, but is also nuanced by the supervisor when he advises Lotte's colleagues to support her in resisting Nanna's manipulation. Although he shares the staff's assessment of Lotte's reaction as irrational and inappropriate, even going so far as to declare that Lotte is mirroring Nanna's disorder (which is tantamount to saying that Lotte's reactions are immature or a sign that she is unwell herself), he challenges the construction of Nanna as purely rational. In his view, she is governed by her disorder, irrational impulses, affection and emotions. The supervisor doesn't comment on the affections and emotions of the other staff members at all, even though these again became very apparent during Lotte's account of the episode—at least that was how I interpreted it based on watching their faces and listening to changes in their voices as they supplemented or commented on Lotte's story. By ignoring this, the supervisor categorizes the other staff members' affective and emotional ways of relating to the episode as irrelevant.

But are they?

The staff members are clearly very disturbed by the loud doorbell, perhaps because of the noise itself; perhaps because they worry that it

will affect the other residents and color the atmosphere for the rest of the day. It is emotionally challenging to work with young people who are having a really hard time, who self-injure and can become violent. The loudly ringing doorbell might well have triggered their latent fears about "what might happen today," thereby also sparking a more rigid response to Nanna than a purely rational analysis of the situation might have produced. Indeed, some of the staff members had earlier declared that they were "fed up with Nanna." They often told stories about she had succeeded in dividing the staff how at another residence, and they described her as using manipulative and divisive strategies.

The point I wish to make here is not that the staff's response is affective and emotional rather than rational. Rather, I will argue that these are two sides of the same coin, but also that there are other issues at play which are not just about how the doorbell incident (or rather how it is framed in relation to Nanna) might affect the other young people's emotions for the rest of the day. One issue has to do with power (we will return to this below). Another touches on attachment and rejection: not only does Nanna express attachment to Lotte, she thereby also rejects the other staff as people worth relating to. This might hurt them at a personal level, and they may experience it as a devaluation of their social work qualifications, especially in the light of the fact that: (a) the official pedagogical approach adopted by the residence is "relational work," (b) some of the staff members are more or less systematically rejected by all the young people: they are nobody's favorite. Although the person who was rejected did not express such feelings, other staff members did. Several times, I observed how young people were blamed for making staff members feel rejected.

Likewise, I will argue that both Nanna's and Lotte's responses are characterized by emotions, affection and reason. As an outside observer, I was quite convinced by Nanna's expressions of emotion as authentically felt by her; however, I also realized that they were quite effective in getting under Lotte's skin and persuading her to accommodate her own plans to Nanna's wishes, and I was not at all in doubt that that was exactly what Nanna wanted. Moreover, I found Nanna's very emotional and expressive response quite rational, though not in a calculating sense. It is not hard to empathize with Nanna based on how she

describes the event: her response seems both rational and emotional. She missed Lotte and accepted that Lotte had other things to do than to spend time with her, but she still tried to squeeze in a few minutes of contact despite Lotte's tight schedule by meeting her in front of the residence. When Lotte rushes right past her to the meeting, and her strategy fails, she is overwhelmed by disappointment, and perhaps also feelings of neglect and being let down. Nanna's struggle to get a few minutes of contact would appear to be quite rational—these few minutes seem terribly important to her and could even be decisive for how the rest of her day turns out. So perhaps what we are dealing with here is a rational act based on emotional meaning and triggered by affective impulses. The act itself cannot be defined either as emotional or rational: it is both. Moreover, Nanna experiences this incident as a very serious case of neglect precisely because she expects more from Lotte. Thus, in this particular situation, Nanna's experience of neglect, and her non-citizenship learning process, manifest in her "on the edge" existence at the residence when it comes to being seen, heard and recognized, depending on which staff members are at work and on their schedules. Nanna longs for an exclusive relationship with Lotte, and for a safe mode of belonging to the residence which can put to rest her fear of being "voted out."

Intimate Citizenship and More-Than-Human Agents

The manager assures Nanna that she won't be voted out, but in actual fact several staff members do try to do this. They describe Nanna's presence at the residence as very stressful both for staff members and the other young residents, and they have tried more than once to persuade the manager and management team to find another residence for Nanna.

Nanna's presence is depicted as stressful first of all because she demands exclusive emotional relationships which go beyond what is commonly construed as professional and which are seen as encroaching

upon the private sphere. Lotte says as much when she exclaims: "I can't even get in the door before she is all over me," explaining that once she has crossed the residence threshold she dons a professional, 'ready' staff persona, but that before she actually enters the residence on her way to work she is not yet fully prepared. Thus, the discourse that relational exclusivity does not constitute wholly professional behavior governs how Lotte can be a legitimate friend to Nanna: to constitute a legitimate friendship in that context, their relationship must be dominated by reason rather than emotions and affection; it must be confined in time and space to Lotte's working hours and to the residence premises; and it must be scheduled so that it won't conflict with other working tasks. If Lotte doesn't stick to these unwritten rules, she is deemed unprofessional and even suspected of mirroring the residents' purportedly immature and unhealthy behaviors. Nanna must also comply with these tacit rules; otherwise, she risks being categorized as out of place, and being voted out as a result.

Second, Nanna's presence is experienced as stressful because of her habit of externalizing her problems. Notably, she interacts very physically with more-than-human agents. Rather than going to her room and crying quietly, Nanna rings the doorbell loudly, bangs on the door to the meeting room and curls up in a fetal position crying and screaming on the floor in the staff office. Her frustration is very intrusive and hard to escape, not least because of the physical construction of the doorbell and the house as such. The doorbell is audible on all floors, and the house is not well sound-proofed. This makes it very hard both for staff members and residents to remain oblivious to Nanna's frustration. Thus, the physical construction of the house—which affects everybody, not just Nanna—makes it all the more important to curb one's emotions. This was something that I observed in regard to many of the young residents. These episodes reveal the importance of more-than-human agents in the construction of intimate citizenship, as well as in the residents' experiences of belonging and non-belonging. These more-than-human agents—which trigger emotions through sounds, sights and smells—contribute to the positioning of the young people as belonging or out of place, by other residents, staff members and themselves.

Concluding Discussion: Weak Theory Analysis and so What?

In this chapter, I applied a weak theory approach to the analysis of social work practices and their capacity to empower vulnerable people's lived and intimate citizenship. Stronger theories are unable to grasping social work and social policies as social interventions with contested and multidimensional outcomes (action-related, emotional, affective, positioning-related, etc.). The analysis reveals that although, at a first glance, the young people describe their stay at the residence as empowering, they also have experience discrimination and exclusion and, for most of them, their time there unfolds as a risky dance on the edges of non-citizenship, where they are positioned as—or feel—out of place. It also reveals how certain social policies (such as managerialism and performance measurement) and (hardliner) practices primarily contribute negatively to citizenship learning processes—although this is not unambiguous. Indeed, emotions, affections and more-than-human agents intertwine with rational actions by human agents.

An analysis of this kind will not produce clear and unambiguous answers or instructions for best practices for how to empower those concerned. Neither does it seek to evaluate the practice in question as either good or bad. Rather, it raises new questions and reveals that what at first glance seems quite straightforward—in this case that the residence succeeds in empowering the young people—is complex and contested. So, can an analysis like this support social work practice?

I contend that this approach can contribute to constructive reflections on dilemmas in empowerment-motivated social work with such groups, rather than waiving aside these dilemmas, as often occurs both in everyday practice because of the need to just make things work and get things done; and in more traditional research and evaluation approaches.

Thus, for instance, my analysis of the episode with Nanna and Lotte, which I presented at a seminar for the staff, helped both them and the management to realize that what they regarded as support for Lotte in setting boundaries for Nanna (including the supervisors' responses), were

not purely supportive but also placed demands on Lotte and sometimes even led to her being judged negatively. They realized how instead of supporting her in her challenging relationship with Nanna, they were actually making things even more difficult for Lotte and contributing to Nanna's non-citizenship and positioning as out of place. They also saw that for Nanna, the episode was not so much about power games or manipulation. Rather, from the outset she had lowered her expectations and needs to an absolute minimum, more or less accepting the way in which personal relationships between staff and residents were regulated. Thus, they also acquired a more nuanced understanding of what had happened, and about Nanna's personality, which is likely to improve their ability to recognize her for who she really is. Although that was how the staff themselves expressed it, the analysis also showed them how challenging this would be, as Lotte's behavior affected them on an emotional level. They also discussed how they could support Lotte better by acknowledging her assessment of the situation and her ability to have a relationship to Nanna, rather than blaming her for being a softliner and victim of Nanna's manipulation. Moreover, they became much more aware of the influence of more-than-human agents in regard to Nanna as well as the other residents, an aspect that they had previously been more or less oblivious to. Before, they had mostly paid attention to—and tried to change—the young people's values, knowledge, and attitudes. Now they had become aware of the impact of the material construction of the house, including its sound-proofing, the doorbell construction and much more.

Furthermore, the statement that "the nurses have taken over," and the—albeit blurred and contested—dividing line between hardliners and softliners, inspired reflections about affective, emotional and rational triggers for acting one way or another, and about how the changes the young people experienced were related to managerialism and performance measurement. A critical discussion ensued about what this meant for the young people's citizenship learning and sense of belonging to the residence. And whereas the staff themselves had previously typically positioned themselves as either hardliners or softliners, they now became aware that all actors at the residence took on both roles—sometimes by habit and sometimes breaking with their habits for

affective, emotional or cognitive reasons. This enabled a more constructive discussion of pedagogical strategies and a more inclusive approach to difference on the part of staff members as well as residents—something they thought they already practiced but which the analysis revealed that they did not.

References

Cherubini, D. 2011. Intersectionality and the Study of Lived Citizenship: A Case Study on Migrant Women's Experiences in Andalusia. *Graduate Journal of Social Science* 8 (2): 114–136.

Delanty, G. 2003. Citizenship as a Learning Process: Disciplinary Citizenship Versus Cultural Citizenship. *Lifelong Education* 22 (6): 597–605.

Flyvbjerg, B. 2006. Five Misunderstandings About Case-Study Research. *Qualitative Inquiry* 12 (2): 219–245.

Honneth, A. 1996. *The Struggle for Recognition. The Moral Grammar of Social Conflicts*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Jimenez, X.F. 2013. Patients with Borderline Personality Disorder Who are Chronically Suicidal: Therapeutic Alliance and Therapeutic Limits. *American Journal of Psychotherapy* 67 (2): 185–201.

Lister, R. 2007. Inclusive Citizenship: Realizing the Potential. *Citizenship Studies* 11 (1): 49–61.

Mandal, E., and D. Kocur. 2013. Psychological Masculinity, Femininity and Tactics of Manipulation in Patients with Borderline Personality Disorder. *Archives of Psychiatry and Psychotherapy* 15 (1): 45–53.

Plummer, K. 2001. The Square of Intimate Citizenship: Some Preliminary Proposals. *Citizenship Studies* 5 (3): 237–253.

Schwartz, R.C., S.D. Smith, and B. Chopko. 2007. Psychotherapists' Countertransference Reactions Toward Clients with Antisocial Personality Disorder and Schizophrenia: An Empirical Test of Theory. *American Journal of Psychotherapy* 61 (4): 375–393.

Sedgewick, E. 1997. Paranoid Reading and Reparative Reading: Or, You're so Paranoid, You Probably Think This Introduction is About You. In *Novel Gazing: Queer Readings in Fiction*, ed. E. Sedgewick, 1–40. Durham: Duke University Press.

Tilbury, C. 2004. The Influence of Performance Measurement on Child Welfare Policy and Practice. *British Journal of Social Work* 34 (2): 225–245.

Tomkins, S. 1963. *Affect, Imagery, Consciousness. In Vol II: The Negative Affects.* New York: Springer.
Tonkiss, K., and T. Bloom. 2015. Theorising Noncitizenship: Concepts, Debates and Challenges. *Citizenship Studies* 19 (8): 837–852.
Warming, H., and M. Christensen. 2016. *Tillid i socialt og pædagogisk arbejde med børn og unge*. København: Akademisk Forlag.
Warming, H., M. Christensen, and K. Fahnø. 2017. Citizenship on the Edge. http://citizenship-on-the-edge.ruc.dk/. Accessed 18 Jan 2017.
Wilson, E.A. 2010. *Weak Affect Theories.* Durham: Duke University. http://english.duke.edu/uploads/assets/weakaffecttheory.pdf.
Wrights, S. 2015. More-Than-Human, Emergent Belongings: A Weak Theory Approach. *Progress in Human Geography* 39 (4): 391–411.

Author Biography

Hanne Warming is Professor of Sociology, Childhood and Social Work, and head of the research group 'Social dynamics and Change', at the Department of Social Sciences and Business, Roskilde University.

Professor Warming has published extensively in the fields of social work with children and young people, lived citizenship and trust, and children's perspectives. In 2005 she received a prize for the Best Project of the Year from The Joint Council for Child Issues in Denmark. In 2008 she was appointed as an EU-expert on children's rights; in 2011 as member of the National Council for Children's Affairs by the Minister of Social Affairs, and in 2016 for the European Expert Database of Outstanding Female Academics "Academianet".

Currently, Professor Warming is the leader of three national research projects, including a project titled 'Citizenship on the Edge', funded by the Danish Council of Independent Research.

Exploring Norms About Citizenship in Stories of Young People with "Psychological Vulnerabilities"

Manon Alice Lavaud

Introduction

This chapter explores how norms about good citizenship come into play in social work practices at a residence for young people with "psychological vulnerabilities" in Denmark. The chapter applies a difference-centered approach (Moosa-Mitha 2005) to reveal how the expectations that the young people are met with are shaped by ideas of difference connected to "good citizen" norms. Looking at stories and positionings expressed both by the young people in question and the staff members around them, the chapter thus takes a closer look at identity and sense of belonging as they unfold in the young people's everyday life experiences, which constitute their lived citizenship (Lister 2007).

The chapter is based on a qualitative research project[1] exploring how notions of normality and difference are constructed and challenged in

M.A. Lavaud (✉)
Roskilde University, Roskilde, Denmark
e-mail: manon@ruc.dk

H. Warming and K. Fahnøe (eds.), *Lived Citizenship on the Edge of Society*,
Palgrave Politics of Identity and Citizenship Series, DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-55068-8_5

social work with children and youth in Denmark. The research project consisted of interviews and observations repeated two to three times over the course of 1 year with 13 children and young people and with various professionals working with each of them.[2] The children and young people in the study were facing a variety of situations: living with a foster family, in residential care, or at a residence for young people with "psychological vulnerabilities." Because these situations represent quite different contexts, the chapter will draw solely upon empirical data from the latter residence. It is not a psychiatric treatment institution, but functions as a residence for around 14 young people, who are between 18 and 25 years old, are not enrolled in any education, and are out of work. The young people living there are diverse, but all qualify as "psychologically vulnerable" according to the residence's umbrella definition. Most have been diagnosed with Asperger's syndrome,[3] autism, ADHD or similar conditions, and are following an individualized "educational program for youth with special needs."[4] Besides participating in daily meals and cleaning, the young people can take Danish, English and mathematics lessons, as well as engage in physical or more creative activities that vary throughout the year. The young people typically stay at the residence for at least 10 months, but often remain for between 2 and 4 years. The residence is a private institution; however, following a common practice in the Danish welfare system, a municipal case worker is in charge of referring each young person to the residence and funding the social work services offered. For each young person, a case worker writes a plan of action in collaboration with the residence and the young person, pointing out which issues to address and which goals to achieve, as well as the time frame for their stay at the residence. Around 15 staff members with different educational backgrounds are employed at the residence; most are qualified social educators or teachers. They participate in all the daily activities and are in close contact with one to three of the young people.

The empirical material underpinning this chapter consists of interviews conducted at the residence with four young people and seven of the staff members, and focuses on narratives by, or about, these young people and their perceived strengths and challenges. The interviews were combined with participant observation during four 2- to 4-day visits at the residence, where I took notes about the interactions and stories told during daily activities, such as preparing meals, eating, hanging out and staff meetings.

The first part of the chapter outlines the theoretical framework consisting of a difference-centered approach (Moosa-Mitha 2005) and an understanding of citizenship as formed by everyday life experiences and a sense of belonging (Lister 2007; Werbner and Yuval-Davis 1999). Moreover, the chapter draws on a narrative approach (Gubrium and Holstein 2009) and positioning theory (Davies and Harré 1990), arguing that the self–other perceptions evoked in the narratives by the young people and the staff members form part of the social work practices at the residence. The main body of the chapter is structured around two of the themes identified in the data gathered at the residence: namely, the importance of "getting up in the morning," and the need for the young people to improve their social skills which was related to the metaphor of "being square." These two themes were present across the data, but particularly in stories by and about two of the young people, whom we will call Peter and Jack.[5] As we develop the empirical examples, we will see how the stories elicited in interviews and in everyday interactions continuously seem to refer to specific ideals about adulthood or citizenship. The young people are continuously positioned, or position themselves, in relation to these ideals. Finally, the chapter raises questions about whether these norms are ever challenged and about the possible consequences of being continuously defined as deviating from these particular ideals.

Theoretical Framework

A Difference-Centered Approach

Citizenship debates and struggles are characterized by an inherent tension between inclusion and exclusion, and between forces of normalization and differentiation (Werbner and Yuval-Davis 1999, 3). According to some scholars, citizenship is Janus-faced: it can be progressive and liberating, but it can also be exclusionary, disciplining and essentializing (Werbner and Yuval-Davis 1999, 28; Lister 2003a, 5). The same can be said for social work, where helping vulnerable children and youth can entail both empowering and "normalizing" them—and it is not always easy to distinguish between the two.

In an attempt to transcend these intertwined inclusionary and exclusionary dynamics, in this article I will apply a difference-centered approach to citizenship, as suggested by Mehmoona Moosa-Mitha (2005). In her article from 2005, Moosa-Mitha presents an alternative approach to the theorization of children's citizenship, inspired by feminist and anti-racist theories gathered under the term of "difference-centered." These theories include works by Ruth Lister as well as Pnina Werbner and Nira Yuval-Davis (Lister 2003a; Werbner and Yuval-Davis 1999). In line with feminist critiques of the normative ideals that have traditionally defined citizenship, Moosa-Mitha reviews liberal and civic republican models of citizenship and criticizes their conceptualization of liberty and equality, through which children are constructed as "not-yet-citizens" or "not-yet-adults" and therefore marginalized as second-class citizens (Moosa-Mitha 2005, 371). According to Moosa-Mitha, this marginalization is due to three elements in particular: (1) A notion of the independent and rational individual claimed to be universal but actually based on a gendered and adultist citizen norm; (2) Normative ideals of participation that only take into account certain activities in the public sphere, such as working on the labor market, and which ignore other ways of participating; (3) Citizenship rights based on sameness, where difference "is marginalized, considered a deviation, or inferiorized for being less than equal" (Moosa-Mitha 2005, 377). Based on this critique, she posits the need for a difference-centered approach to children's citizenship rights that acknowledges their different lived realities. While this approach is centered around children, the same arguments can be applied to young people, who in public discourses are often depicted as not-yet-adults or "not-good-enough citizens" (Hart 2009; Smith et al. 2005). When adding the label "psychologically vulnerable," the risk of being marginalized according to the three elements outlined above is even greater.

Arguing for a difference-centered approach, Moosa-Mitha suggests the concept of being "differently equal," which expresses "the right to participate differently in the social institutions and culture of society" (Moosa-Mitha 2005, 386). This concept is inspired by Yuval-Davis and is difference-centered because it takes differences as its starting point, instead of linking equality to sameness. However, when focusing on

the right to be different, we have to consider the risk of essentializing groups of people, for instance women, children or "vulnerable youth," and thereby overlooking the multiple differences within single groups:

> […] the difficulty, of course, is how to recognize and respect "difference" without reifying "it" as perpetual, closed and unchanging. (Werbner and Yuval-Davis 1999, 9)

According to Lister, a difference-centered approach also implies acknowledging that a person can be both dependent *and* independent, different *and* equal (Lister 2003a).

This approach is inherently normative, striving to transform exclusionary societal processes and structures. At an analytical level, it can be used to explore and highlight the norms and ideals at play. Here, I use the difference-centered approach to illustrate how social workers' expectations in regard to the young people in question seem shaped by ideas of difference related to norms about good citizenship. I thereby take my point of departure in the different lived realities of each individual young person, instead of automatically seeing difference as deviation (Moosa-Mitha 2005). More specifically, a difference-centered approach is useful to question the assumptions underlying the categorizations of challenges and vulnerabilities faced by the young people.

Everyday Life Experiences of Citizenship

The difference-centered approach aims toward a more inclusive understanding of citizenship. In a similar vein, Lister argues for a conceptualization of citizenship that goes beyond formal rights. She suggests that we take into account the everyday life experiences of people, including the dimensions of participation, identity and sense of belonging (Lister 2007). Lister refers to Werbner and Yuval-Davis' definition of citizenship as:

> […] a more total relationship, inflected by identity, social positioning, cultural assumptions, institutional practices and a sense of belonging. (Werbner and Yuval-Davis 1999, 4 in Lister 2007, 51)

This inclusive understanding of citizenship is not limited to rights and responsibilities in the relationship between individuals and the state. It builds upon feminist perspectives that criticize the division between the public and private spheres, and challenge the restriction of citizenship to the public sphere (Lister 2007, 55–56). As Lister explains, beyond the public-private dichotomy, lived citizenship also involves the personal lives of people. This idea is closely related to the concept of intimate citizenship formulated by Ken Plummer (Lister 2007, 55–56; Plummer 2003). While Plummer's concept of intimate citizenship is usually associated with sexuality and gender, it can also be used in a broader sense to analyze the intertwinement between the public and private spheres and to study "a plurality of public discourses and stories about how to live the personal life" (Plummer 2001, 238 in Lister 2007, 56).

Looking at Stories and Positionings

Using these definitions of a difference-centered, lived citizenship, how can we explore identity and sense of belonging, and the dynamics of exclusion and inclusion? I propose in the following that one way to do this is to use a narrative approach (Gubrium and Holstein 2009) combined with positioning theory (Davies and Harré 1990).

In line with a constructivist and interactionist narrative approach, as formulated by Jaber F. Gubrium and James A. Holstein (2009), I understand narratives as dynamic and complex. This means that the same events, situations and characteristics can be experienced and storied differently (Squire et al. 2008). From this perspective, narratives are not windows onto authentic selves and events, but are constructed in the process of being told in specific situations, and thus both shape, and are shaped by, social interactions. This approach therefore focuses on "narrative truths," the different voices and meanings being conveyed, and on how this all forms part of the social context within which the participants position themselves (Gubrium and Holstein 2009).

The concept of positioning was coined by Bronwyn Davies and Rom Harré in 1990 to highlight the dynamic character of interactions, as an alternative to the concept of role which was criticized for emphasizing

fixed and ritual dimensions of social interactions (Davies 2000, 87). The theory is formulated from a poststructuralist perspective, which posits that discursive practices are both continuously constituting and constituted by people (Davies 2000, 88). In interactions and conversations, specific subject positions come into play, in relation to which people position themselves and are positioned by others:

> With positioning, the focus is on the way in which the discursive practices constitute the speakers and hearers in certain ways and yet at the same time are resources through which speakers and hearers can attempt to negotiate new positions. (Davies 2000, 105)

Like the plural narrative truths mentioned earlier, Davies and Harré highlight the construction of "multiple selves" of one person, which vary according to the positions appearing through the stories told in a specific situation and the discourses underpinning those stories (Davies 2000, 89). While one's positioning must be coherent within a conversation, these positions do not belong to a "linear noncontradictory autobiography […] but rather are the cumulative fragments of a lived autobiography" (Davies 2000, 92). Positioning theory helps to explore how, for instance, the meaning of being an adult is constructed using well-known narratives mixed with personal experiences of that position. In other words, how stories told in a situation about specific persons and events are linked to previous stories as well as to broader cultural narratives and discourses (Davies 2000, 95). These broader narratives can also be defined as storylines, which Dorte-Marie Søndergaard, in line with Davies, explains as follows:

> What we are talking about is the line in a story, one in which the positions of specific actors are revealed and made available to the subject as potential identifications. The storylines are a set of sequences of actions and positions saturated with cultural meaning and therefore offering potential interpretations linked to characters and practices. So storylines are collective. But they are realized and created/changed in the more or less fragmented ways they are taken up by subjects as they develop their own narratives. (Søndergaard 2002, 191)

The dynamic aspect of positioning theory subsequently centers our attention not only on how narratives constitute people, but also on how people try to negotiate alternative positions by bringing other narratives into play or twisting existing ones (Davies 2000, 105). Positioning theory is useful when exploring experiences of lived citizenship, because it allows us to focus on how identity and selves are continuously shaped and negotiated in everyday interactions. Furthermore, looking at the ways in which the young people are positioned by the staff members, and how they position themselves, offers a way to study their sense of belonging and thus to gain insight into a key dimension of their lived citizenship. Finally, exploring positioning dynamics can help to reveal the processes of exclusion and inclusion at stake.

As mentioned earlier, the research project explored how notions of normality and difference come into play in stories by, and about, vulnerable children and young people. The analysis consisted of, on the one hand, seeking to identify the positions evoked and unraveling the norms and ideals they referred to; and, on the other, focusing on the positionings of the young people in relation to those positions and storylines. The difference-centered approach involved identifying the norms and dominant storylines at play, but also paying attention to elements in the data that pointed in different directions, such as alternative stories and positions. In other words, unraveling the available storylines and unfolding how the young people—and staff—negotiate their positionings and stories in relation to these (Søndergaard 2002, 194). The observations enabled me to personally witness some of the stories told among staff at meetings and in daily interactions between them and the young people. The stories elicited in the interviews gave me the opportunity to explore more explicitly how staff members positioned the young people, how the young people positioned themselves, and how these positionings referred to certain norms and ideals about the right goals to achieve, good behavior, or the good life, either by reinforcing or challenging them.

The following section analyzes the theme of "getting up in the morning" and the metaphor of "being square and becoming rounded" that caught my attention in the interviews and observations at the residence. As mentioned earlier, the examples will mainly be illustrated using stories told by, and about, two young men at the residence: Peter and Jack.

"Getting Up in the Morning"

Arriving for my first visit at the residence, I was informed that every morning on weekdays, staff members and the young people would meet for breakfast at nine o'clock, followed by a short gathering and a morning walk. However, during the mornings I was there, only a handful of the young people got up in time to participate in the morning activities. Although I was told that the level of attendance varied, this seemed to be something that both the staff and the young people focused on a lot, either as a milestone for the young person to achieve or in the form of ironic comments and jokes, such as a staff member proclaiming "what a turn-out" during a breakfast attended by just three or four young people.

When I met Peter, a young man in his twenties diagnosed with Asperger's syndrome, he had been living at the residence for 2 years. When I asked what a typical day was like for him, he answered:

> So, apart from the last three weeks it's been a lot better. Before then, I had such a, what should I call it, depression? I don't know exactly. I didn't really get up in the morning. So nothing really happened at all. But now it's starting to go way better. I have – like out of the blue - turned around my night and day cycle and participated again and stuff. (Peter)[6]

When I later asked one of the staff members to tell me what he thought of Peter, the issue about getting up in the morning was once again brought up. Seven months earlier, Peter had moved into one of the halfway apartments near the residence. In the halfway apartments, the young people are supposed to have breakfast on their own, shop for their own groceries, keep their apartment clean and so on. During the interview, the staff member mentioned that they were considering moving Peter out of the halfway apartment and back into the main residence, because they thought things had been going downhill for him: He wasn't getting up in the morning or participating in the activities. He explained that this was sometimes because Peter played on his computer all night long and simply couldn't pull himself together to do anything.

> […] it wasn't that we sat down and produced a script for what the requirements should be, but we definitively expected that he should get up by himself in the mornings. (Staff member 1)

Later during the same conversation, he explained that Peter had a very specific professional dream:

> It is clearly our task in this connection – it was like we said 'ok, what does it take to become a professional like that?' Then you have to go to the adult education center and take some courses, and so on… And it also means that you have to get up in the morning and so on.' That was how we worked, setting milestones on the ladder towards the goal, and figuring out where to start. So I think, that's fine, that you want to work in this profession. But first you have to start getting up in the morning, that's what it takes. (Staff member 1)

Here, being able to get up in the morning and participate in the activities at the residence becomes an expression of independence, linked to the ability to take care of oneself, live on one's own, and get a job or education. It can even be seen as a prerequisite for becoming independent. Interviewed about Jack—who then was around 20 years old, suffered from Asperger's syndrome, and had been living at the residence for 2 years—another staff member referred to what he called "the basics":

> […] to be able to live on your own and get your daily life up and running, and being able to get up every day. That's certainly something that is really, really difficult for many [of the other young people at the residence]. (Staff member 2)

Jack—who at our first interview had recently moved into one of the halfway apartments—also presented this as a luxury, and added:

> […] well there are a few of us who have become so independent that we can, or we have to buy our own food and things like that.

This recurring focus on becoming independent and getting up in the morning does not seem to be a coincidence. In Danish legislation, under

the "Educational Program For Youth With Special Needs" that most of the young people at the residence are following, the overall purpose is that they should "[…] acquire personal, social and professional skills for independent and active participation in adult life and, if possible, for further education and employment."[7] Likewise, one of the main goals stated on the residence website is that the young people will learn "how to live an independent adult life." This educational aim is translated into a range of abilities and skills, such as keeping a household and training social skills, but also a focus on the daily rhythm and achieving independence: "… practicing having a stable daily rhythm, where you get up in the morning and go to bed at night" or receiving "support for greater autonomy-you are practicing becoming adult and taking responsibility for your own life."

One morning I talked with another young man, who had got up early that day, attended breakfast and was now on the morning walk together with me. I asked him why so few other young people were there, and he replied that the best hours of the day for him were between 2 and 3 am. and that he needed 9 h of sleep. But then he added: "that doesn't work in the real world." Even though this remark did not come from Peter, it reveals something about the norms at play in the stories of and about Peter—and the other young people and staff members at the residence. Linked to the educational aims stated above, achieving a specific daily rhythm becomes a sign of independence and even adulthood and is an indicator of the ability to enter the labor market and to participate in the "real" world. All this echoes the normative assumptions outlined in the theoretical framework about citizens as independent individuals who participate in specific ways. Moreover, the importance of employment—and hereby economic independence—has to be understood in relation to a shift in political focus from citizenship rights to responsibilities, implemented through activation-oriented social policies (Lister 2003b; Hohnen 2004). In the "workfare state," citizens fulfill their duties by participating in the labor market and, as Lister has argued: "It is the future *worker*-citizen more than *democratic*-citizen who is the prime asset of the social-investment state", and children become "citizen-*workers* of the future" (Lister 2003b, 433). Conversely, the young people at the residence who, like Peter, do not manage to get up in the morning are hereby positioned as not being real adults or citizens.

In many ways, the residence appeared to function as a rehearsal for proper adult life, where autonomy is a central characteristic, and where getting up in the morning is a symbol of independence and adulthood. If you cannot act as an independent adult, does this then mean that you do not belong in adult life or in society?

Training Social Skills and Softening Edges

Another recurrent focus point, particularly in stories told by staff members, was training the social skills of the young people living at the residence. The residence website presents the young people living there as facing very different challenges, but as overall being "psychologically vulnerable," with social difficulties. In the staff members' stories, both those elicited in interviews and observed during staff meetings, one particular metaphor was repeatedly used to describe the challenges faced by Peter, Jack and others—namely the problem that they were "square" and were working toward becoming more "rounded." In Danish, it is quite common to use the adjective "square" to describe someone as rigid, crude or simplistic, and this is also how the term was used by some staff members. Depending on which young person it was being used to describe, the metaphor referred to particular behaviors that were always somehow linked to the young people's social skills. The first time I heard the term was during an interview with a staff member, who was talking about Jack. Jack was described as a quite "edgy young man" who had had "obvious idiosyncrasies" when he arrived at the residence, doing his own thing and getting angry if someone sat in his usual seat at dinner, for instance. According to the staff member, Jack had changed in the 2 years he had been at the residence, becoming more "rounded":

> [Someone] described it as if he had become more "rounded", and I actually think it is a good expression, because, gradually, he no longer bumped into things all the time, and he has become more like "okay, maybe I could actually sit somewhere else than I usually do", and "maybe I can accept that other people do things differently than I would". […] So in general, I see a young man who has become much more mature, and much more rounded, and much more tolerant. (Staff member 3)

The problem with being square, the staff members explained, is that the young people easily clash with their surroundings. This can be subtle, like not quite fitting in; but it can also lead to hurting other people's feelings, and consequently becoming unpopular or feeling rejected. These stories echo research on people with Asperger's syndrome as "not quite fitting in" or struggling with misunderstandings (Portway and Johnson 2005; Robinson 2016). Concerning Peter, one staff member explained his "squareness" in terms of stubbornness and an alternative mindset, which became an obstacle in his daily life and interaction with others.

In telling their own stories, Peter and Jack did not use the metaphor of being square or rounded, but they did talk about social skills, positioning themselves as more or less anti-social. For instance, during the first interview, Jack described himself as both anti-social and talkative:

> Anti-social because I am very introverted and just don't like to be together with other people for more than a few minutes or hours at a time. And talkative because when there's something I know a lot about or that I find very interesting, then I just talk. (Jack)

However, he also explained that his unsociable behavior was due to his not being able to make or keep good friends. Apart from with his family, he told me that he felt no need to be social. This theme also occurs in some of the staff members' stories. Although Peter knew that others sometimes described him as anti-social, he did not totally agree with this label himself:

> Well a lot of people would say that I'm anti-social. But it's not completely true, because I sit a lot at my computer and talk to other people, which is also a way of being sociable, but nobody sees that. So I wouldn't say that I am extremely anti-social. I am not completely non-talkative. But I do have some anti-social traits. (Peter)

Both Jack and Peter also described how they use a lot of sarcasm and therefore often end up hurting or annoying the other young people at the residence; and Peter remarked that he sometimes had a hard time understanding others' perspectives and taking them seriously. In both

Peter and Jack's stories, developing great social skills does not seem to be their first priority. Their accounts also challenge accepted notions of what constitutes "social skills"—such as being sociable on the Internet, and questioning whether being sociable is necessarily a prerequisite for a good life. Nevertheless, Peter explained that the goal of the residence was to develop their skills so they could live by themselves and behave sociably. And that this was hard work for him:

> Well… it's very difficult to change the behavior and the characteristics that you've had for the last 20 years, in my case. So it's very difficult to suddenly turn yourself into somebody completely different from who you're used to being. If, like, what you do irritates other people, or they don't want that kind of employee or something. It's very normal to be able to switch personality according to whom you're around. (Peter)

The concerns expressed here seem to be twofold: the risk of not being liked by others but also of undermining one's chances of getting a job. Remarkably, Peter positions himself as different to "normal" people who are capable of changing and adapting to different situations. In the stories told by staff members, becoming "rounded" meant showing consideration to others and adapting to the situation. Pursuing the metaphor of being square and becoming rounded, the social work practices at the residence that target social skills might be said to "soften the edges" of the young people. Training social skills is considered important to prevent the young people from becoming isolated and lonely. But it is also considered a challenge because a lack of social skills can affect their ability to complete an education or to get a job. As the staff member interviewed about Jack explained, the staff try to respect that he may not want to spend time with others. However, they also know that in order for him to get an education he has to learn how to relate to others. So they train this during daily activities:

> So we train, for example, when we sit and eat. If, for instance, he starts saying something that's completely beside the point, then we say "That wasn't what we were talking about Jack. We are talking about this and that. Do you have something to add?" And we try to say it as naturally

> as possible. Sometimes I try to get the others around the table into his topics…but it's a challenge because he has such special interests… (Staff member 3)

The "being square" metaphor is invariably used to highlight the purported lack of social skills of many of the young people at the residence. But it is also evokes a process of maturing, signaling once again that the aim of the residence is to help the young people to "become adult." These stories of, and about, Peter and Jack raise the question of whether this is, in fact, an ideal about the "good life" imposed by others. That notwithstanding, social skills clearly do not unfold in a vacuum, but in social interactions. After describing the difficulty of incorporating Jack's "special interests" into the conversation, the staff member described how Jack engaged in long conversations with other young people who shared his interests. What if the problem was that so-called normal conversations were simply not interesting enough to him? What if the problem was not only that the young people needed to adapt and "soften their edges," but that the surroundings were too "square" and exclusionary? Even though the young people at the residence sometimes clashed with each other, they also displayed a degree of tolerance and understanding toward each others' particular challenges or peculiarities. In that way, they created an environment that was softer and less "square" than that represented by the societal demands embodied in expectations held by potential employers or by the municipal caseworkers who determined the framework and goals for the young people's stay at the residence.

Striving to Meet the Norm and Challenging the System's Expectations

In Denmark, changing the life situation of different groups in society is an explicit public sector political goal, and funding is available for this. In the case of young people with "psychological vulnerabilities," this manifests in decisions taken by municipal caseworkers. As mentioned earlier, the caseworkers are in charge of referring the young people to the residence and writing the action plans that determine the time

frame for their stay and the focus of the daily social work practices. The social work practices thus become the link between public policies—that convey societal norms—and the personal lives of the young people at the residence.

To sum up, the ability to get up in the morning, and not be too "square," were criteria used by staff members to position the young people as more or less mature and independent. That becoming independent and motivating oneself are considered important goals at the residence is not surprising. However, it is remarkable that such a concrete detail like getting up in the morning can become a symbol of independence and motivation that is linked to assessments of the young people's ability to live on their own, take an education or fulfill their professional ambitions. Yet although the staff members strive to get the residents to comply with the norm of getting up in the morning and becoming independent, they also seem to challenge it to some degree. For instance, some of them implicitly and explicitly talked about exercising a lot of patience in their work. While not questioning the ultimate goals of being able to get up in the morning and become independent, or the endeavor to train social skills, they tried to let the young people move at their own pace. One staff member mentioned this as a way of resisting the requirements of the "system" and of municipal case workers who wanted to see quicker results. For example, one of the milestones and requirements stipulated by the municipality in Peter's plan of action was that he would move into the halfway-apartment as a step toward finalizing his stay at the residence. At that time, the staff members thought Peter was not ready and, half a year later, the municipal caseworker agreed to let Peter move back into the main residence and prolong his stay.

However, the young people also position themselves in relation to these goals or norms. For instance, Peter told me that he wanted to move away from his parents and get his own place, but his case worker at the municipality thought he needed some support or training first, which is why he came to the residence in the first place. The staff members also explained that Peter really wanted his own apartment and that he seemed sad and upset because on the one hand he had the abilities and resources to take care of himself but on the other he was struggling to pull himself together to get up and get started with things.

It may seem silly to question the insistence on getting up in the morning, since this is normally taken for granted if one is to take an education or get a job. Nevertheless, the intense focus on getting up in the morning recalls a daily rhythm rooted in industrial societies, which to a certain extent is still reflected in the educational system, but which in many ways no longer reflects the more fluid working hours in many jobs in today's society. Likewise, the idea that "switching personalities" is a normal ability, as Peter explained earlier, resonates with the ideal of a flexible and adaptive workforce, in line with that depicted by Richard Sennett (2006). While one can hardly dispute the advantages of having "social skills" and of being "rounded," in stories about Peter and Jack being "square" is also depicted as the source of will power and structure needed to achieve a stable daily rhythm. On the one hand, not getting up in the morning or lacking social skills can be regarded as challenges that the young people face. Challenges that they want and need help to overcome, because they represent the vulnerabilities they experience, or because they prevent them from achieving their own wishes and dreams. In this case, helping and supporting the young people at their own pace into a stable daily rhythm, greater independence and social skills can be considered as empowering. On the other hand, these so-called challenges can also be an expression of other priorities and ways of living, where the only problem—so to speak—is that society, municipal case workers or staff members do not acknowledge alternative ways of participating and conducting one's life. In this way, a normative understanding of adulthood is reproduced that marginalizes other possible storylines and ways of being an "adult" and a "good citizen."

Conclusion

The concepts of lived and intimate citizenship are helpful in trying to understand the link between social work practices and the citizenship of vulnerable groups such as young people with "psychological vulnerabilities." In social work, especially when the target group lives and stays at a residence for longer periods of time, practices are often centered on intimate and lived elements of citizenship. The social work required and

practiced at this residence can, in broad terms, be described as working with "life skills" and centered on how to conduct oneself, how to tackle daily life situations, and how to interact with others. All this can, of course, simply be regarded as an attempt to improve the life quality and options of the young people concerned. Yet these life skills are continuously and explicitly linked to their ability to complete an education, enter the labor market, and take care of themselves as independently as possible. In other words, working with these life skills is intended to enhance their ability to become ideal citizens and meet societal expectations. In the stories from this residence, the ideal citizen that emerges is an autonomous individual who is able to structure his/her daily life and get up in the morning to go to school or work; who knows how to adapt to different situations, who avoids conflicts, can talk about topics that others find interesting, and who shows consideration for others' needs and feelings.

However, the stories also showed how the young people are continuously positioned or position themselves as different and as people who do not comply with norms about what is expected of a good, autonomous citizen, potentially undermining their sense of belonging to "real society." One key question is what possible positions are left for young people like Peter or Jack if they are continuously positioned as different from a citizenship ideal that is associated with adulthood. Will they remain positioned in a waiting position as not-yet-adults? That notwithstanding, some of the practices and stories recounted here can also be seen as attempts to challenge the prevailing norms and draw on alternative storylines.

The use of a difference-centered approach combined with a focus on storylines and positionings that I proposed in this chapter aimed to unravel how normative assumptions about citizenship are linked to the notion of adulthood and come into play in stories of, and about, young people in vulnerable positions. It also revealed alternative storylines and positionings that might challenge these normative assumptions. Acknowledging the importance of these many different stories in social work practices, and the ways in which they are infused with norms, gives us the opportunity to reflect upon the intertwined exclusionary and inclusionary dynamics and norms at play.

Notes

1. The project is part of the broader project "Deviation as a potential resource" and is funded by The Obel Family Foundation (see www.saerlig.ruc.dk).
2. The data production took place from spring 2015 to summer 2016. All together, 30 interviews were conducted with 13 children and young people (aged 10–25) and 41 interviews were conducted with 32 different adults or professionals: foster parents, educators, family case advisers, municipal case workers or even biological parents.
3. Asperger's syndrome is often described as a type of autism, but, as in the case of many psychological diagnoses, the definition, symptoms and causes of the condition are widely debated. Especially when it comes to differentiate Asperger's syndrome from autism, and to assess when it is a disability and not merely a case of "eccentric normality" (Portway and Johnson 2005, 74).
4. The educational program—in Danish called "Særlig Tilrettelagt Ungdomsuddannelse" (STU)—is regulated under Danish legislation: "STU-loven, LBK nr 783 af 15/06/2015". Accessible online: https://www.retsinformation.dk/Forms/R0710.aspx?id=172900.
5. Peter and Jack are pseudonyms, just like all other names and details have been changed for the sake of anonymity.
6. All interviews and empirical data are in Danish, and therefore all the quotes are my translations from Danish to English.
7. My translation from Danish. "STU-loven, LBK nr 783 af 15/06/2015". Accessible online: https://www.retsinformation.dk/Forms/R0710.aspx?id=172900.

References

Davies, B. 2000. *A Body of Writing, 1990–1999*. Walnut Creek: AltaMira Press.

Davies, B., and R. Harré. 1990. Positioning: The Discursive Production of Selves. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour* 20 (1): 43–63.

Gubrium, J.F., and J.A. Holstein. 2009. *Analyzing Narrative Reality*. London: Sage.

Hart, S. 2009. The 'Problem' with Youth: Young People, Citizenship and the Community. *Citizenship Studies* 13 (6): 641–657. doi:10.1080/13621020903309656.

Hohnen, P. 2004. Experiences of Participation Citizenship: A Bottom-up Analysis of the Social Rights and Obligations of Work-Disabled Employees in Denmark and the Netherlands. *European Journal of Social Security* 6 (3): 205–228.

Lister, R. 2003a. *Citizenship: Feminist Perspectives*, 2nd ed. New York: New York University Press.

Lister, R. 2003b. Investing in the Citizen-Workers of the Future: Transformations in Citizenship and the State Under New Labour. *Social Policy and Administration* 37 (5): 427–443. doi:10.1111/1467-9515.00350.

Lister, R. 2007. Inclusive Citizenship: Realizing the Potential. *Citizenship Studies* 11 (1): 49–61. doi:10.1080/13621020601099856.

Moosa-Mitha, M. 2005. A Difference-Centred Alternative to Theorization of Children's Citizenship. *Citizenship Studies* 9 (4): 369–388.

Plummer, K. 2003. *Intimate Citizenship: Private Decisions and Public Dialogues*. Seattle: University of Washington Press.

Portway, S.M., and B. Johnson. 2005. Do You Know I Have Asperger's Syndrome? Risks of a Non-Obvious Disability. *Health, Risk & Society* 7 (1): 73–83. doi:10.1080/09500830500042086.

Robinson, J. 2016. Data Analysis in Participatory Research with Adults with Asperger's Syndrome. In *Innovations in Social Work Research. Using Methods Creatively*, ed. L. Hardwick, R. Smith, and A. Worsley, 241–258. London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.

Sennett, R. 2006. *The Culture of the New Capitalism*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Smith, N., R. Lister, S. Middleton, and L. Cox. 2005. Young People as Real Citizens: Towards an Inclusionary Understanding of Citizenship. *Journal of Youth Studies* 8 (4): 425–443. doi:10.1080/13676260500431743.

Søndergaard, D.M. 2002. Poststructuralist Approaches to Empirical Analysis. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education* 15 (2): 187–204. doi:10.1080/09518390110111910.

Squire, C., M. Andrews, and M. Tamboukou. 2008. Introduction: What Is Narrative Research? In *Doing Narrative Research*, ed. M. Andrews, C. Squire, and M. Tamboukou, 1–26. London: Sage.

Werbner, P., and N. Yuval-Davis. 1999. Introduction: Women and the New Discourse of Citizenship. In *Women, Citizenship and Difference*, ed. P. Werbner and N. Yuval-Davis, 1–38. London: Zed Books.

Author Biography

Manon Alice Lavaud holds a Master in Social Science and Cultural Encounters from Roskilde University, Denmark. She is currently a Ph.D. fellow at the Department of Social Sciences and Business at the same university, writing a thesis about how normality and deviance are constructed and challenged in the stories of and about children and young people in vulnerable positions. Her Ph.D. project is part of a larger research and developmental project entitled "Deviance as a potential resource", funded by The Obel Family Foundation. Her main interests include social work, children and youth, and different qualitative and narrative methods.

Social Repair of Relationships: Rights and Belonging in Outreach Work with Homeless People

Kristian Fahnøe

In this chapter, I explore how street outreach workers' interventions influence the lived citizenship of homeless people in Copenhagen city. The chapter addresses lived citizenship at the local scale, linking it to the welfare state and thus also to a national scale. I draw on Hall and Smith's (2015) concept of "social repair" in order to grasp the multiple ways in which outreach workers help homeless people to restore or establish beneficial social relationships with welfare and mainstream organizations, friends and family, and local communities. I understand these social relations as a matter of rights and belonging and as the foundation of citizenship as it is experienced and practiced.

By exploring outreach work with homeless people, I shed light on how the lived citizenship of a particular group of socio-spatially marginalized people is affected by a specific form of social work that aims to establish contact with marginalized people in their "physical and

K. Fahnøe (✉)
Department of Social Work, Metropolitan University College, Copenhagen, Denmark
e-mail: krfa@phmetropol.dk

H. Warming and K. Fahnøe (eds.), *Lived Citizenship on the Edge of Society*,
Palgrave Politics of Identity and Citizenship Series, DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-55068-8_6

social environment" (Gibson 2011, 80) by leaving the offices and buildings where social work usually takes place. In the case of the municipal outreach team in Copenhagen which I studied, these environments include parks, streets, train stations, squares, drop-in centers and night shelters. The team's target group is so-called "hard to reach" homeless people who are considered to be in need of some sort of help, but who for whatever reason do not make use of existing support systems. Andersson (2011, 7) states that establishing contact with these "hard to reach" people is one step toward the goal of connecting them with welfare organizations. In Copenhagen, outreach workers help to establish such connections by referring, guiding, transporting, accompanying, and making calls on behalf of the homeless people. Besides these efforts, the outreach workers try to connect homeless people to mainstream organizations such as banks or healthcare services. During their encounters, the outreach workers offer the homeless people advice about how to deal with their everyday troubles and personal lives, and by extension also with their social relationships with other individuals and groups.

Outreach encounters, as Rowe (1999) calls the face-to-face interactions between outreach workers and homeless people, are events where services and identities are negotiated. Rowe describes outreach encounters as involving "mutual perception, negotiated understandings about behavior and identity, and the transfer of goods" (Rowe 1999,1). These negotiations influence many different relationships, not only those related to housing. The outreach encounters are situated in specific contexts, in this case urban Copenhagen and the Danish social democratic welfare state, with its high level of social security. The analysis addresses two significant aspects of this context. First, gentrification which has made its mark on the housing market in Copenhagen, leading to a lack of adequate and affordable housing which has, in turn, resulted in long waiting lists both for social housing apartments (Benjaminsen et al. 2009, 44) and beds at homeless shelters. Second, active labor market policies shape the living conditions of the homeless people in the study, none of whom had regular employment. These active labor market policies, which aim to combat welfare dependency and promote independence and self-reliance, emphasize citizens' obligations (Torfing 1999). These obligations are an integral part of the policies' instruments, which

include mandatory activation programs, reduced social benefits, and reduced access to disability benefits which entitle citizens to higher benefits as well as exempting them from the requirement to participate in activation. This chapter explores how street outreach workers' interventions influence the lived citizenship of homeless people, scrutinizing the specific ways in which outreach encounters in this context influence the homeless people's social relations with other individuals, groups and organizations.

The Empirical Study

This chapter is based on 6 months of ethnographic fieldwork.[1] The primary method was participant observation, which I conducted by accompanying outreach workers around Copenhagen city. Consequently, the fieldwork was conducted in the homeless people's own environments (described above), as well as in social services offices, banks, court rooms and hotels. Accompanying the outreach workers enabled me to gain access to the practices involved in outreach encounters as well as to the outreach workers' reflections on the encounters that I observed; however, I was only privy to the homeless people's own reflections on a few occasions. Alongside the participant observation, I conducted informal interviews on site with outreach workers as well as homeless people. These interviews were conducted in the form of "conversations with a purpose" which involve "a series of friendly exchanges in order to find out about people's lives" (Burgess 1984, 102). The interviews were loosely structured around the participants' understandings and experiences of being housed and unhoused, contacts between social services and clients, and the use of public space. The interviews were not audio recorded but they were documented subsequently in my field notes. I jotted down notes on the go between encounters and wrote up comprehensive field notes after my rounds with the outreach workers.

The team's primary task is to help reduce homelessness in Copenhagen, but there is also a strong element of harm reduction in their daily work on the streets. Given that the outreach workers on the team are all social work professionals, this harm reduction is as much about social

circumstances as it is about health care. The outreach workers do not have a mandate to offer social housing or to grant social services, substance abuse treatment or social benefits; instead, they help with applications for such services or mediate contacts with the appropriate authorities.

The homeless people in this chapter are primarily individuals who have accepted the outreach workers' help and support. In that sense, they are no longer "hard to reach" for the outreach worker since contact has already been established; they have accepted a social work "client" role (Kloppenburg and Hendriks 2012, 609), and they desire some sort of help from, or contact with, the outreach workers. The outreach workers try to connect them with various organizations and parties that, in one way or another, may trigger social change processes for the homeless client. The majority of homeless clients in this chapter had had long and often complicated relationships with the authorities, and in some cases the outreach workers had worked extremely hard to establish contact with them. However, a few had had no long-lasting contact with the social services. Another important attribute is that all the homeless clients studied here are Danish citizens. I chose to study outreach work with this group, rather than with migrants without these citizenship rights, in order to examine how the social work conducted by outreach and social services can actively support or undermine marginalized people's citizenship.

Social Repair and Lived Citizenship

In order to explore how social work affects homeless clients' citizenship, I suggest reframing the concept of social repair[2] developed by Hall and Smith (2015) and linking it to lived citizenship.

Hall and Smith's formulation of social repair draws on Thrift's writings about maintenance and urban repair (Graham and Thrift 2007; Thrift 2005). For Thrift, repair consists of practices that restore what is broken down and keep "societies going" (Graham and Thrift 2007, 1). While Thrift primarily writes about the repair of the physical features of the city, Hall and Smith (2015, 5) are preoccupied with repairs of social features. Thrift touches upon social repairs but only in terms of

what goes on between friends and family. Hall and Smith, however, extend the concept to professional work, including outreach work. Their understanding of social repair has a broad scope as it includes providing homeless people with goods such as sleeping bags and needle exchange packs, as well as connecting them with other welfare services (Hall and Smith 2015, 11). Following Anderssons' claim that outreach work is about connecting homeless people to the wider community and its social services, I narrow down the concept of social repair to denote the repair of relationships. These relations include relations to individuals, communities and organizations. In this understanding, social repair is not just repair of broken down relations; instead, it could include relations that have not been established, but somehow is expected to be "working."

According to Hall and Smith (2015, 6), social repair is both routine and improvisational. Thanks to improvisation, repairs may continue despite difficulties and a lack of standard solutions. Social repair may, thus, involve a series of attempts to restore what is broke down. Thrift notes that repair requires an array of different forms of knowledge (Thrift 2005, 136) that have to be continually modified. Social repair should not be defined in terms of its ability to produce perfect restorations of objects, but rather its ability to enable them to continue to work (Graham and Thrift 2007, 6). Thus, social repair may make a given object work better or worse or even quite differently.

Hall and Smith (2015, 17) remind us that Goffman's (1991) considerations about repairs in "the medical version of the tinkering-service model" are valuable when trying to understand the practice of social repair. Goffman demonstrates that repairs, where the object concerned is a person and his relationships, are a different matter than repairs of, e.g., cars or tools. He highlights that interactions between "the servicer" and "the object-client" involve ongoing negotiations and sometimes conflicts about what is in the client's best interests (Goffman 1991, 296) and hence what kind of social repair is needed. Social repair should, then, be understood as imbued with power as it shapes identities and possibilities for action. Further, Goffman (1991, 301) shows that community interests play a part in such negotiations and conflicts. Goffman's work shows that social repair is political, and Hall and Smith

(2015, 13) argue that politics is an integral part of social repair. The political takes shape through practical responses to questions such as: which relationships are in need of repair? How should those relationships be repaired? Who should decide this? And on top of that, the relationships in question are products of policies, e.g., active labor market or housing policies. This political dimension has implications for the client's lived citizenship, as the analysis demonstrates.

Lived Citizenship

Lister writes that lived citizenship "is about how individuals understand and negotiate the key elements of citizenship: rights and responsibilities, belonging and participation" (Lister et al. 2007, 168). Drawing on this definition, I view lived citizenship a matter of practice and identities and as emerging from numerous social relations (Hobson and Lister 2002, 23) through which individuals enjoy rights and responsibilities, belong and participate. I understand the key elements of lived citizenship as dimensions of these social relations in the sense that a specific social relationship may have implications for more than one dimension. I want to address how the dimensions of rights and responsibilities, and belonging, are affected by the social repairs carried out during outreach work. This enables me to illustrate the interplay between these two dimensions. It should be mentioned that the notion of citizenship as lived entails that it is neither static, linear nor clear. It is dynamic, multivalent, contradictory and messy. This also goes for the interplay between the dimensions. This is in line with the weak theory approach presented by Warming in the previous chapter.

The rights and obligations that I am concerned with here include legal rights tied to policies that influence the homeless people's everyday life, as well as the right to belong. In an attempt to propose an understanding of citizenship as both a status and a practice, Lister (1998, 7) makes a distinction between: *to be a citizen* which refers to the status of having "the rights necessary for agency and social and political participation," and *to act as a citizen* which is the practice that accomplishes "the full potential of the status" and thus addresses people's lived

citizenship. This distinction is significant because different groups have different preconditions for acting as citizens which have implications for the rights that they can enjoy. Thus, an understanding of rights as comprising both status and practices acknowledges the inherently exclusionary elements of citizenship and permits a critical view of the latter (Dominelli 2014, 259). Moreover, Lister uses the distinction to advance an understanding of marginalized groups as active rather than passive agents, while still being attentive to discrimination. I use the distinction to explore how outreach workers try to help homeless people to act as citizens by supporting them in their efforts to exercise their rights and fulfill the related obligations.

Belonging represents the subjective and affective aspects of citizenship (Christensen 2009, 37), and Moosa-Mitha (2014, 28) argues that individuals' belonging reflects their experiences of citizenship. Belonging is about "being legally, morally or socially recognized as belonging (or not)" (Wright 2014, 1) and involves a self-identification and identification of others in relation to various "objects of attachment" (Yuval-Davis 2006). Yuval-Davis argues that "people can "belong" in many different ways and to many different objects of attachment" (Yuval-Davis 2006, 199). These objects of attachment may be both abstract and concrete and include places, communities, humans and non-humans, e.g., dogs or things. Consequently, belonging is relational and operates on many different scales (Wright 2014, 4).

Wright explains belonging as "at once a feeling, a sense, and a set of practices" (Wright 2014, 1). This means that belonging is not predetermined but is continuously constituted through affective encounters. Outreach, as well as encounters with other social work professionals or other homeless people, are examples of such affective encounters. The notion of affective encounters should be seen in the light of the affective aspect of belonging which reminds us that belonging is not just about being, but also longing. Belonging involves "desire for attachment" and thus "wanting to belong, wanting to become" (Probyn 1996, 19). But, as Wrights points out, this affective side of belonging is often ambiguous (Wright 2014).

Just as people can belong in multiple ways, they can also "not-belong," both formally and informally, in various ways. According to Wright,

non-belonging occurs if closeness and desire for attachment create "a sense of unassailable, unconnectable difference, a lack of sameness with what is on the other side" (Wright 2014, 9). This non-belonging may take the form of exclusion, isolation, disconnection or marginalization.

How people belong and "non-belong" is linked to a multitude of social processes. However, I shall focus on how the homeless people's various belongings are connected to the politics of social repair and thereby the interpersonal politics of outreach encounters and formal politics. I do this to show how outreach workers' social work practices and political decisions about unemployment services and housing markets are experienced through everyday interactions (Mee and Wright 2009, 775) and affect the homeless people's "belongings."

In the following analysis, I show how rights and belonging are shaped by the social repair of relationships, and how these are interwoven. I do so by scrutinizing three types of social repair which are at the heart of the outreach encounters I studied, and which have considerable bearing on the homeless people's rights and belonging.

"They Make the Mistakes"

One type of social repair is intended to restore relationships with welfare and mainstream organizations. These social repairs help homeless people to act as citizens by exercising various formal rights. The welfare organizations in question include both the social services department whose case workers have the authority to grant services, e.g., substance abuse treatment, or approve non-recurrent expenditures and healthcare services like hospitals, general practitioners and health clinics for the homeless—all of which are covered by national health insurance for people who have formal Danish citizenship. Mainstream organizations include court houses where, for example, debt settlements are reached; and banks, where accounts are opened and withdrawals are validated. For the outreach workers, repair work ranges from making phone calls for the homeless people and lending them phones, to giving them advice and instructions, accompanying, advocating and vouching for them, and acting as their lay representative.

The most significant social repairs of this kind are those that target the homeless people's relations with the municipal employment centers that administer employment policies. Caseworkers at the centers award social benefits, initiate activation programs, and enforce obligations and their related economic penalties. Based on how frequently the homeless clients ask for help in dealing with these centers, these relationships appear to be those most in need of repair. This may be because such relationships frequently break down, but it may also be because of the serious economic consequences that the homeless people face if the relationship collapses or becomes problematic. Examples of this are losses of social benefits or reductions in benefits payouts if one does not show up for meetings at the employment centers, or fails to participate in activation programs.

Assisting clients with applying for social benefits constitutes one fundamental repair of the relationship with employment centers. It is also a major reason to engage in outreach encounters for homeless people, like Malik, who insist that outreach workers like Nina should just help him to get benefits and then he will be able to manage the rest himself. Another way that the outreach workers repair relationships with the centers is to make excuses and advocate for the clients when they are at risk of losing their social benefits or incurring economic penalties. An example of such an excuse was Lisa's intervention on behalf of Simon when she called the employment center to inform them that he had not received their notification about a meeting because he had no address and she could not get hold of him because his phone was dead.

Avoiding economic hardship—thanks to such repairs—is important for the homeless people's capacity to practice belonging to one of the local communities of other homeless people and others—often lodged in precarious housing—who meet on a daily basis in public spaces such as town squares or parking lots. These communities have appropriated one particular place that serves as a kind of public living room or pub with makeshift furniture where the members of a community spend time together talking, borrowing things or money from each other. For most community members, the time spent together involves consumption of alcohol or marijuana or both. The practice of belonging to such a community involves continued participation in activities that take

place in appropriated places. Even people who have been housed keep returning to the place where their community meets. The practice of belonging to one of these communities depends on having money to spend. As Peter told me shortly after losing his benefits, "I don't show up [at the square] if I have no money." He explained that it is no fun to go to the square if you have no money to spend on beer or something else to drink, so he would rather stay away.

However, while the social repair of relationships with employment centers enables a sense of belonging to a community at a local scale, it does not create belonging at the wider scale of the "imagined community" (Anderson 1983) of the Danish Welfare State, despite the fact that social benefits are ensured by the welfare state which is represented by the employment centers in the everyday lives of the homeless people. Many of the homeless people expressed a sense of disconnection from, and misrecognition by, the employment centers even though they received social benefits. This manifested in experiences of being dealt with half-heartedly, of disregard for physical disorders and of being subjected to pointless obligations. Benny, a white male born in Denmark, described this kind of experience to me. He did so one morning when Ann (an outreach worker) and I talked with him and his friend Jacob about their experiences of interacting with the social services. Benny said: "They [the caseworkers at the employment centers] make mistakes and even when they admit it, I'm the one who suffers the consequences." He told us that deductions were made in his social benefits if he failed to live up to his obligations. Although he complained that some caseworkers were not doing their job properly, he noted that Ann had helped him on more than one occasion. "It's different with Ann. She wants to understand. She has a thing or two between her ears." Later, when talking about being a client"in the system," he mentioned the economic penalties once again, and went on to say that he wanted to be awarded disability benefit as this would exempt him from activation programs and their associated obligations and sanctions. After describing the physical disorders that he suffered from, including an artificial knee implant that is not functioning well, and a bad back and hand, he exclaimed: "Just award me that damn disability benefit. But they won't," adding "the African women with headscarves, they get disability benefit even though there's nothing wrong with them."

To Benny, the fact that Ann has helped him out several times does not give him a sense of belonging to "the system" of the welfare state. Instead of supporting this kind of belonging, repairs of relationships with employment centers generate a sense of non-belonging if they require that the homeless people subject themselves to the authority of the caseworkers. Simon described experiences of being humiliated by being obliged to participate repeatedly in the same training activities and medical checkups without the faintest chance of getting a job. Benny's sense of non-belonging was exacerbated by his belief that "African women with headscarves" were getting what he longed for: the security that disability benefits could provide as well as being legally, morally and socially recognized as belonging.

In the case of Benny and others, social repairs of their relationship with the employment centers are "partial successes" when it comes to their practices and experiences of citizenship. On the one hand, repairs carried out by the outreach workers negate the disciplinary element of the economic sanctions inscribed in employment policies, and help the homeless people to use their formal rights to obtain social benefits, giving them the economic resources necessary to engage in practices of belonging in their local communities. On the other hand, the repairs restore relationships that are characterized by experiences of misrecognition and humiliation, creating a sense of non-belonging at welfare state level.

"How would you feel about moving to another city?"

Another kind of social repair of relationships with organizations has to do with the channels for obtaining housing. The homeless people's relations with social housing associations, the municipal housing allocation unit and homeless shelters are the main objects of these repairs. At the practical level, these relationship repairs are carried out in a similar fashion to repairs with other organizations, but giving *advice* about where to find housing constitutes a distinctive kind of repair work. These repairs help homeless people to exercise their right to housing.

The nature of housing provision impacts the homeless people's ability to practice belonging, and this plays a crucial role in determining how the homeless people and the outreach workers cooperate in attempts to secure proper housing. For Mike, who explained that he wanted a steady place to live because he needed stability in order to return to his job as a lorry driver, the longing for an attachment to work inspired him to collaborate with Diana, an outreach worker, in applying for an apartment through the municipal housing allocation unit. Conversely, for Jack, the prospect of moving into a homeless shelter that had no vacant bedsits where pets were allowed, represented an obstacle for him to be together with his dog, Goldie. Jack therefore rejected Ann's suggestion to search for a bedsit at the homeless shelters, explaining that he would rather sleep rough than leave Goldie in the care of others. In this way, he practiced belonging vis-à-vis Goldie.

The form that repair work by outreach workers takes varies when it comes to the way they address the homeless people's sense of belonging. This diversity was evident in a conversation between Tom, an outreach worker, and Malik, a homeless person, whom Tom had contacted because he had asked for help to get off the streets. During their conversation, Tom alternated between two different approaches to getting Malik into housing. Malik presented a plan for his future which included being housed, getting an education as poultry farmer, and later running a poultry farm "maybe in Greenland" where he was born. After a while, Tom asked Malik: "How would you feel about moving to another city?," adding "Where it is easier to get an apartment" Malik, who had recently moved to Copenhagen from a small town, explained how he felt people looked down on him in that town and that he only knew people in Copenhagen and would be lonely elsewhere. Tom stressed that Malik was welcome to stay, but that Copenhagen probably did not offer the best chance of housing or working with poultry or getting an education in that field.

The above-mentioned practice of seeking accommodation in other parts of the country if the homeless person agrees to move is common among the outreach workers. This kind of repair is linked to the lack of adequate and affordable housing caused by the gentrification of Copenhagen, and when outreach workers suggest to the homeless

people that they should leave the city they are, in fact, supporting the gentrification process at street level by cleaning up after housing policies that exclude low-income people. Still, the element of care in outreach workers' repair work should not be ignored, for instance when Hannah told Dennis that he needed to "get inside" soon because he would not survive another winter sleeping rough.

When the outreach workers suggest that a homeless person could move away from the city, they disregard the fact that the person has settled in Copenhagen and is practicing belonging in the city. This reflects insensitivity to the importance of the city as a space for homeless people's practices and sense of belonging to their communities and friends. Access to the city space is an important factor in homeless people's decisions about where they want to live. As Dennis put it: "I don't want to move out of reach of the S-train [inter-urban rail network] line" because he wanted to be able to visit his friends and go to the town square where he normally hung out in the daytime. The outreach workers' insensitivity to these issues could also be seen as neglect of the homeless people's rights to the city: "The freedom to make and remake our cities and ourselves…" (Harvey 2008, 23).

However, as is clear from Tom's sensitivity to Malik's feelings and insistence on his right to stay in the city, the outreach workers do not encourage the homeless people to leave the city without a sense of ambivalence, which is evident in the frequent comment "if you want" that they append to their exhortations to leave the city. I see this ambivalence as evidence of the outreach workers' awareness that belonging is a vital part of the homeless people's lives—as is the fact that the outreach workers work hard to secure "a roof over the heads" of their clients in Copenhagen city. They also take their clients' desires for, and practices of, belonging into account in their attempts to come up with solutions. This is clear as Tom and Malik's conversation developed, and Tom adopted a new approach which took Malik's wish for a job in the farming sector seriously. As he was talking, Tom suddenly remembered a homeless shelter in Jutland where the residents carried out various tasks, including farming jobs. He explained that he did not know whether they had poultry, but that their aim was for the residents "to work and to learn." He added that drinking was forbidden [which suited Malik].

Tom explained that he did not know exactly how things were run there, but that there most likely were some residents who "smoke some [marijuana] … maybe in the fields." Malik had already revealed that he smoked marijuana. Malik thought the place sounded great. Tom offered to call the shelter to find out whether there were any vacancies. Malik agreed. Tom called the shelter and asked about the daily routines, and whether there were any vacant rooms. After he hung up he told Malik a bit more about the shelter: they had different kinds of livestock, including some poultry, although not enough for large-scale production. Malik said he was very interested in going.

In this part of the conversation, Tom acknowledges Malik's expressions of belonging by offering him the chance to pursue a career within the poultry farming business. Tom also understands that Malik might want to keep smoking marijuana while avoiding places where alcohol drinking is widespread. Tom's approach demonstrates a responsiveness and inclusiveness that permeates outreach work, although this is not unequivocal, as the following section shows. Tom's approach also exemplifies a common feature of repairs related to housing issues, namely the immediate prioritization of types of belonging that lead to homeless people being ushered out of the city, thus overriding belonging that are tied to the city. This prioritization may, however, be inverted depending on how the homeless person responds. Tom and Malik's conversation and the previous examples also illustrate that the ways in which the repair of relationships in the field of housing are handled affect multiple belongings for homeless people. Thus, the same repair may have positive effects on one kind of belonging but negative effects on other kinds.

"Take care of yourself"

In the previous sections, I explored social repairs of relationships to organizations. The following section addresses attempts to repair personal relationships such as relations with family members, friends and groups such as the above-mentioned local communities. These repairs cover both help to re-establish relationships as well as to maintain or strengthen them. In practical terms, the repairs include assistance to get in touch with family and friends as well as giving advice on how to deal

with or understand personal relationships, like when Louise told Freddy that it would be a good idea to call his mother to tell her where he was and that he was alright.

However, there is another side to outreach workers' engagement in homeless people's personal relationships: namely when they caution them about dubious personal relationships. One example of this was when Ann she told Christina to be careful not to be exploited by her kids, who Christina said always visited her with the pretext of getting money. This attention to problematic aspects of personal relationships is also evident in the outreach workers' unequivocal attempts to loosen or even sever personal relationships, as when Irene and I met up with Sophie—an ethnic Greenlander—who slept in a tent camp with her Romanian boyfriend, Milan and a group of other Romanians. Sophie was pregnant and Irene had told me that she had advised Sophie to move into a homeless shelter without Milan because she thought it was bad for Sophie to sleep in the tent camp and she risked that the authorities would place her child in care when it was born. But Sophie had rejected Irene's advice because she wanted to be with Milan and did not like the shelter in question either. During Sophie's conversation with Irene, Milan texted her, telling her that police had told them to move their camp and that he was packing their things. Sophie told Irene about the text. An hour later, when the meeting ended, they talked about where Sophie would stay for the night, and once again Irene suggested that Sophie should move into the homeless shelter. Sophie declined yet again. They talked briefly about Sophie's health, which was getting worse, and that she was having trouble getting enough sleep. Irene told Sophie that she should let her know whether living like that became too much for her. Irene added that Sophie could spend a night or two by herself at a regular hostel or hotel. Sophie answered that she would give it some thought.

Irene persisted in trying to persuade Sophie to abandon the tent camp and find a place without Milan. Regardless of Sophie's obvious attachment to Milan, Irene attempts to loosen the bond between Milan and Sophie. She does this because she considers that the way they live together—sleeping rough—is bad for Sophie. In this case, the outreach worker's attempts to disassemble a personal relationship and thus

contest the homeless person's belonging to certain objects of attachment are directed at a personal relationship that the outreach workers assess as harmful to the client. Although such initiatives are sometimes triggered by the homeless person expressing a desire to move on or get away from certain individuals or groups, they are clearly underpinned by a politics that establishes a distinction between harmful relations and helpful relations. This reflects an implicit assumption that belonging may be either good or bad. Whether or not a personal relationship is considered harmful or helpful depends on how its effects on different aspects of the homeless person's situation are evaluated. In Sophie's case, her relationship to Malik is regarded as having negative effects on her health, safety, housing situation and prospects of motherhood.

Often, negative effects on health and safety are linked to alleged exploitation, be it sexual, economic or emotional. Health and safety issues may also involve attempts to mitigate self-destruction: indeed, some relationships are seen as a way to counter these tendencies. Ann, for instance, tried to persuade Christina to appreciate her boyfriend and his care for her. Ann explained to me that he was calm and not as wild as Christina who got into trouble and did not take care of herself. Other aspects of a homeless person's situation that are taken into account when a relation is assessed as good or bad include alcohol and substance abuse. Louise tried to convince Freddy to visit his family in order to strengthen his relationship with them and to show him alternatives to the life he led among drug users and alcoholics in Copenhagen and which she feared would engulf him.

The politics of these interventions of repair and disassembly of personal relationships go beyond being housed and attaining self-sufficiency: They have to do with how the homeless people live their personal lives, and thus reach into what Plummer has termed "intimate citizenship" which refers to rights and obligations concerning "… what we do with our bodies, our feelings, our identities, our relationships, our genders, our eroticisms and our representations" (Plummer 1995, 17). Such rights and obligations are clearly linked to issues of belonging. The notion of intimate citizenship addresses struggles over the practices of intimate lives (Smyth 2008) which are intertwined with public institutions and policies (Oleksey 2009). When outreach workers assist

homeless people in navigating their personal relationships, their interventions form such intertwinements as they seek to transform the intimate lives of the homeless people by getting them to alter their personal relationships. This involves masked moralizing in the sense that the outreach workers' assistance is based on tacit perceptions of how different personal relationships influence the homeless people's intimate life practices such as exploitation, self-destruction, safety or substance use. This masked moralization means that even when the outreach workers do not explicitly take a moral stance toward the homeless people, the latter are still targets of moral pressure concerning their belonging and rights and obligations related to their intimate lives.

Concluding Remarks

This chapter shows that social repairs carried out by outreach workers have an ambiguous effect on the lived citizenship of homeless people, both when it comes to the exercise of rights and obligations and to belonging. Further, this chapter shows that the exercise of rights and obligations is interwoven with belonging, but not in a straightforward way where the enjoyment of legal rights leads to belonging on all levels.

The homeless people's exercise of their legal rights to social benefit and housing appears to be the primary concern in the social repairs carried out by the outreach workers. The repairs ensure that the clients receive social benefits, enabling them to practice belonging to one of the local communities of people who spend time together in appropriated public spaces in the city. This belonging at a local scale is vital to many. Although social benefits are allocated by welfare state organizations, the related repairs do not stimulate a sense of belonging to the imagined community of the Danish welfare state. Rather, there is a widespread sense of non-belonging which is tied to the way the repairs tackle the disciplinary elements of active labor market policies. On the one hand, the outreach workers enact an inclusive approach when they make excuses on behalf of their clients so that they avoid economic sanctions, thus mitigating this disciplinary element. On the other hand, the repairs help to uphold another disciplinary element which is tied to

the obligations that clients must fulfill, e.g., participating in activation programs. These obligations, which generate a sense of non-belonging, illustrate the conditionalities of disciplinary citizenship (Delanty 2003, 599) which frames the good citizen as one who strives toward self-reliance regardless of his/her capabilities or notion of "a meaningful life."

The repairs related to the exercise of housing rights are marked by a tendency to overlook the fact that place matters to the clients' belonging. Although this tendency is accompanied by experiences of ambivalence for the outreach workers when they advise clients to move away from the city, and although the outreach workers display an inclusive approach and sensitivity toward clients' expressions of connectedness to the city, in practice the ways in which outreach workers seek to provide housing disregard that the city is a vital space for their clients' senses and practices of belonging to communities and friends. Thus, it seems as if housing is just viewed as a matter of a place to stay and not as a place that enables certain kinds of belonging and challenges others. Besides neglecting their clients' rights to the city, this understanding of housing also affects rights regarding their intimate lives.

The clients' intimate lives and their "intimate citizenship" are also affected by the ways in which the outreach workers deal with the homeless people's personal relationships, and consequently their belonging. The outreach workers' repairs and disassemblies of the homeless people's personal relationships express a politics founded on a distinction between harmful and helpful kinds of belonging. The outreach workers' evaluations of which kinds of belonging are harmful and which are helpful are based on how such belongings affect the homeless people's housing situation, health and safety. These evaluations remain tacit and constitute a disciplinary approach that unfolds as masked moralization that puts moral pressure on the homeless people concerning their sense of belonging and rights and obligations related to their intimate lives.

The paper shows that a substantial number of the relationships targeted in repairs are products of active labor market policies or housing policies. These policies constitute a set of possibilities and constraints for social repairs, for instance by providing appropriate housing in Copenhagen or obligations tied to the rights to social benefits. The outreach workers navigate within these possibilities and constraints,

seeking to alleviate the negative consequences of these policies on their clients' lived citizenship. But they do not overcome the negative consequences, as becomes clear when they uphold disciplinary elements or neglect the importance of place for homeless people's belonging. Seen in this light, the social repairs seem two-faced, as the alleviation of some of the negative consequences also serves to repair flawed policies that install disciplinary citizenship and push those who either do not live up to its norms or cannot afford housing, toward the edge of society.

Notes

1. The study was part of the research project "Lived citizenship at the edge of society," funded by the Danish Council for Independent Research.
2. The concept of social repair is also used to denote social processes of community rebuilding after violent conflicts, crisis or wars (Fletcher and Weinstein 2002).

References

Andersson, Benedict. 1983. Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism. London: Verso.

Andersson, B. 2011. Finding Ways to the Hard to Reach—Considerations on the Content and Concept of Outreach Work. *European Journal of Social Work* 16 (2): 171–186.

Benjaminsen, L., E. Dyb, and E. O'Sullivan. 2009. The Governance of Homelessness in Liberal and Social Democratic Welfare Regimes: National Strategies and Models of Intervention. *European Journal of Homelessness* 3: 23–51.

Burgess, R.G. 1984. *In the Field: An Introduction to Field Research*. London: Allen and Unwin.

Christensen, A.D. 2009. Belonging and Unbelonging from an Intersectional Perspective. *Gender, Technology and Development* 13 (1): 21–41.

Delanty. 2003. Citizenship as a Learning Process: Disciplinary Citizenship Versus Inclusive Citizenship. *International Journal of Life Long Education* 22 (6): 597–605.

Dominelli, L. 2014. Critical Theories: Reflecting on Citizenship Status and Practices. In *Reconfiguring Citizenship. Social Exclusion and Diversity within Inclusive Citizenship Practices*, ed. L. Dominelli and M. Moosa-Mitha. Farnham: Ashgate Publishing Limited.

Fletcher, L.E., and H.M. Weinstein. 2002. Violence and Social Repair: Rethinking the Contribution of Justice to Reconciliation. *Human Rights Quaterly* 24: 573–639.

Gibson, K.E. 2011. *Street Kids. Homeless Youth, Outreach, and Policing New York's Streets*. New York: New York University Press.

Goffman, E. 1991. *Asylums. Essays on the Social Situation of Mental Patients and Other Inmates*. London: Penguin Books.

Graham, S., and N. Thrift. 2007. Out of Order. *Theory, Culture & Society* 24 (3): 1–25.

Hall, T., and R. Smith. 2015. Care and Repair and the Politics of Urban Kindness. *Sociology* 49 (1): 3–18.

Harvey, D. 2008. Right to the City. *New Left Review* 53: 23–42.

Hobson, B., and E. Lister. 2002. Citizenship. In *Contested Concepts in Gender and Social Politics*, ed. B Hobson, J. Lewis, and B. Siim. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Kloppenburg, R., and P. Hendriks. 2012. Outreach Approaches in the Private Domain: An International Study. *European Journal of Social Work* 16 (5): 1–15.

Lister, R. 1998. Citizenship on the Margins: Citizenship, Social Work and Social action. *European Journal of Social Work* 1 (1): 5–18.

Lister, R., F. Williams, A. Anttonen, J. Bussemaker, J. Heinen, A. Gavanas, S. Johansson, A. Leira, U. Gerhard, and C. Tobio. 2007. *Gendering Citizenship in Western Europe. New Challenges for Citizenship Research in a Cross-National Context*. Bristol: Policy Press.

Mee, K., and S. Wright. 2009. Geographies of belonging. Why belonging? Why geography? *Environment and Planning A* 41 (4): 772–779.

Moosa-Mitha, M. 2014. Exclusionary and Inclusionary Citizenship Practices Around Faith-Based Communities. In *Reconfiguring Citizenship. Social Exclusion and Diversity within Inclusive Citizenship Practices*, ed. L. Dominelli and M. Moosa-Mitha. Farnham: Ashgate Publishing Limited.

Oleksy, E. 2009. Citizenship Revisited. In *Intimate Citizenships: Gender, Sexualities, Politics*, ed. E. Oleksy. London: Routledge.

Plummer, K. 1995. *Telling Sexual Stories: Power, Change, and Social Worlds*. London: Routledge.

Probyn, E. 1996. Outside Belonging. London: Routledge.
Rowe, M. 1999. *Crossing the Border. Encounters Between Homeless People and Outreach Worker*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
Smyth, L. 2008. Gendered Spaces and Intimate Citizenship. The Case of Breastfeeding. In *European Journal of Women's Studies* 15 (2): 83–99.
Thrift, N. 2005. But Malice Aforethought: Cities and the Natural History of Hatred. *Transaction Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 30 (2): 133–150.
Torfing, J. 1999. Workfare With Welfare: Recent Reforms of the Danish Welfare State. *Journal of European Social Policy* 9 (1): 5–28.
Wright, S. 2014. More-Than-Human, Emergent Belongings: A Weak Theory Approach. *Progress in Human Geography* 39 (4): 391–411.
Yuval-Davis, N. 2006. Belonging and the Politics of Belonging. *Patterns of Prejudice* 40 (3): 197–214.

Author Biography

Kristian Fahnøe is Senior lecturer in Social Sciences at the Department of Social Work, Metropolitan University College. He holds a Ph.D. in Social Science from Roskilde University (2013). He primarily teaches at the Bachelor Degree Programme in Social Work with a focus on social work with adults in marginalized positions, social pedagogy and inclusion. His research is mainly ethnographic and it centres on power, knowledge and identity in relation to social work practices with homeless people and substance and alcohol abusers.

Towards a Pragmatic Approach to Children's Citizenship: The Case of School Social Work in France

Pascale Garnier

This chapter adopts a reflexive stance towards a research study on social workers' practices in French schools (Garnier 1997), situating citizenship as a local-scale practice related to the welfare state. The objective is to analyse the tension between the French formal definition of institutional citizenship, and children's "lived citizenship" (Lister 2007) in vulnerable situations. Specifically, the chapter represents a "more holistic study of citizenship, which combines analysis of citizenship regimes "from above" with the study of the cultural, social and political practices that constitute lived citizenship 'from below'" (Lister et al. 2007, 168). My empirical inquiry into professional social work practices with children in French schools shows the constitution of children's citizenship both "from below" and "from above", and links their life worlds to institutions and social structures.

P. Garnier (✉)
Laboratoire EXPERICE, Sorbonne Paris Cité, University Paris 13, Villetaneuse, France
e-mail: pascale.garnier@univ-paris13.fr

H. Warming and K. Fahnøe (eds.), *Lived Citizenship on the Edge of Society*,
Palgrave Politics of Identity and Citizenship Series, DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-55068-8_7

Some research within the lived citizenship framework takes for granted that children are citizens, and shows how they enact citizenship. In this approach, the researcher gives voice directly to the children and presents children's demands for the recognition of their actions and acts of citizenship (Larkins 2014). Here, I present a pragmatic sociological approachto children's citizenship which analyses how, and in what kind of social situations and institutional conditions, adults give voice to children and present them as active subjects of rights (Garnier 2014). This pragmatic approach (Boltanski and Thévenot 2006) seeks to study the political conditions and real activities undertaken by adults—here social work practices—that may put in test and help the child to "create self" in a social recognition process. Seen from this perspective, citizenship is not only a status or a personal activity but also an act which must be performed and recognised both by the children themselves and by the adults in their daily lives. Instead of defending children's citizenship, the aim of the sociologist is thus to show empirically how adults' practices with children lead to situations where they are able to enact lived citizenship.

The chapter starts with a presentation of the difference between the exclusion of children from French formal citizenship and lived citizenship, respectively. This difference constitutes the dual framework in which school social workers carry out their professional activities. Then, in order to show how the social workers give voice to the children and try to present them as active subjects of rights, I describe their specific strategy of positioning themselves between families and schools. I explore their everyday work through the empirical analysis of different situations involving "vulnerable" children, focusing on three girls from low-income and migration backgrounds. In these cases, the main challenge for the social workers is to enhance each girl's individual agency in their families and/or school life, and to create a space for their own voice and capacity for choice. In so doing, the professionals managed to dovetail the children's right to be protected with their right to express themselves, by establishing subjectivities in everyday life, a practice which lies at the heart of citizenship.

From French Republican Citizenship to Intimate Citizenship

The French educational system is closely linked to the concept of "republican" citizenship, i.e. an individual and universal definition of citizenship conditioned by the principle of "the human subject as universal" (Jennings 2000). Directly linking the individual to the nation, this definition goes hand in hand with a strong division between "public" and "private" life. For example, in accordance with the political principle of *laïcité*, religion is a purely private matter. Citizenship also means being detached from community allegiances. The notion of "community" still carries strong negative connotations in France and is often considered an obstacle to republican citizenship. Despite the recent emergence of "multiculturalist" republicanism as an alternative to "traditionalist" or "modernising" republicanism (Duchesne 2005), France is far from recognising the diversity of cultural communities as a political right.

As a public space organised by the state, schools have to respect republican laws. Furthermore, schools promote an ideal of formal equality between people and a traditional vision of children as "not-yet" or future citizens, rather than as "being-citizens". Seen from this perspective, only adults are endowed with rationality, maturity and independence, which are the cornerstones of the French republican definition of citizenship. The weakness of children calls for the authority of adults, according to traditional educational tenets. Children need education to learn to master their emotions, acquire knowledge, and develop rational competences and critical thinking so that they can promote the common good (*bien commun*) instead of their self-interest. In principle, academic knowledge is part and parcel of the political and moral learning of citizenship (*éducation à la citoyenneté*). Both the primary and secondary school national curricula include "civic instruction" (*instruction civique*), i.e. formal lessons about French political institutions, rights and rules. Even during leisure activities, such as secular scout groups, children are mainly regarded as future republican citizens: "Citizenship as an indigenous resource is not mobilised in any innovative or 'new' form. It sticks to a mere orthodox (conservative) understanding: conventional political

participation and dedication to a consensual conception of the collectivity and common good" (Vanhoenacker 2011, 1047).

This predominance of the French republican definition of citizenship may explain why few studies have explored children's citizenship in France, the main exception being children's councils implemented by some local authorities. Even this device to ensure children's participation is very often depicted as a means for children to *learn* to become citizens, not as a vehicle for them to exercise real authority as citizens. Recognising children as full citizens, i.e. holders of rights, seems to be a challenge both in research and in professional practice (Warming 2012; see also chapter "Theorizing Children's Welfare Citizenship: Lived Citizenship, Social Recognition and Generations" which highlights similar problems in the British context).

So it should come as no surprise that the concept of "lived citizenship" (Lister 2007) remains largely unknown in France. With its roots in feminist critiques, the concept could serve to expand formal French definitions of citizenship, which exclude children. It raises questions about children's capacities and (in)dependence, the private–public divide and the tension between being equal and different. Exploring citizenship in everyday life also enables a focus on "intimate citizenship" (Plummer 2003): "This wide-ranging 'arena of intimacies' encompasses the choices and self-determination of individuals in intimate, sexual, and family life, and the opportunity to decline relations within these fields according to their own cultural orientations and individual preferences" (Cherubini 2011, 117). Here too, the notion of human agency is key. But if citizenship as a right enables people to act as agents (Lister 2007, 695), it must be regarded as inscribed in a social process in relation to adults' behaviour and ways of relating to children (Garnier 2015a). So the question of "self-determination" is not a simple one which can be taken for granted; rather, it is an object of conflicts and negotiations with others and this intersubjective process both involves institutional conventions and the fabric of social relationships.

The Specific Position of School Social Workers

A comprehensive analysis of French child protection must necessarily involve school social workers and take into account that: "The philosophical references to child protection in France are therefore a very

motley set of concepts that oscillate through time between emancipation of the individual and social control" (Gabriel et al. 2013, 216). Interviews carried out with 46 social workers in primary and secondary schools in Paris and its suburbs show that school social workers' role of mediator between schools and families causes them to adopt a specific strategy of aligning themselves with the children.

Even though it is the National Ministry of Education that employs the secondary school social workers, and the latter's offices are situated on the school premises, they retain a critical stance towards the school's norms and values and they keep their professional independence themselves within the school context. Besides French national laws, school social workers refer to the United Nations Convention on Children's Rights, ratified in France in 1990, which overrides national legislation and can be applied to all the situations they face. Especially for the migrant children of France's middle-class North African second generation of immigrants, a tension exists between formal political citizenship and cultural citizenship: "[the] French Republican model denounces race and ethnicity as meaningful categories and stresses the connection among citizens over any other characteristic or categorisation" (Beaman 2015, 38). Furthermore, the ambiguity of children's rights, which both offer protection and promote children's agency, may constitute a resource and offer an opportunity to consider each child in all his/her uniqueness, taking into account her/his concrete situation (Garnier 1995; Fitzgerald et al. 2010; Warming 2013; Wall 2014).

School social workers have specific responsibilities that span a very diverse range of issues, including: child protection; children with disabilities; the prevention of risk behaviours; child abuse; financial help; and discipline, absenteeism and academic difficulties (Roser 2011). Their primary purpose is to cater to the students' needs; other social workers outside schools deal with the students' families, and teachers may consult their own social service. Their role includes mediating between school and family, as well as engaging in broader partnerships with psychological and medical services, the police, and juvenile justice and child protection services. Individual interviews with children, as well as networking with people involved in the same "case", are a fundamental dimension of their activity.

It is also important to underline that social workers in French secondary schools work in difficult conditions: a mere 3000 must cater for more than 4,300,000 children. Social workers also have to create networks with the school staff and externally. And, although they would prefer to work towards collective and long-term prevention programs, they are constantly confronted with specific situations, which require their immediate intervention. Unlike teachers and parents, they lack authority over the children and, most of the time, they cannot directly provide the input needed to improve matters. Yet the social workers' weak or vulnerable position between the family and the school may prove pivotal attenuating children's own weakness. As Sun Tzu (2002) showed a long time ago in his *Art of War*, weakness can enable one to avoid an opponent's strengths and attain victory without fighting by taking into account all the details of the situation. Situated differently than the other adults, the social workers' vulnerable position enables them to develop a trusting relationship with the pupils in which a dialogue can take place.

Young people can talk to school social workers with complete confidentiality. This is pivotal, as professional confidentiality creates and constitutes a space for children's voices that is very different from psychological approaches to tackling children's issues. Lacking power and authority, social workers try to find solutions within the framework of the local context, which the child can endorse as his or her own decision. They are obliged to rely on the children's capabilities as agents, but they must also enable them to act as such. Without the support of the children themselves, school social workers would not have the power to offer solutions to their problems. As intermediaries between the children and the other adults, they are also obliged to legitimate their own voice by conveying the children's voice. Protecting the "vulnerable" child thus involves appointing him/her as a genuine agent of his/her own life, and acknowledging his/her strengths depends on the existence of a space that must be enabled by specific institutional structures. Symbolically, this space is created by a state social service devoted only to children, professionals who work especially for and with them, and rules and legal obligations such as professional confidentiality. This space also takes the physical form of a separate office in the school

where children and social workers can speak together without being disturbed by the school staff. It is, thus, at once a public place located in schools and a private place where children's privacy is protected. This space is, above all, an area for mediation between the children and all the adults around them. I now analyse in detail some concrete situations that can arise during this work.

Working for and with Children Between the Family and the School

After one year dedicated to interviews with 46 social workers in primary and secondary schools, the objective of the second year was to study empirically what the interviewees considered to be "good practices" with children in the course of their concrete professional activities. I chose five social workers based on their professionalism and experience; all five also agreed to me being present during their work. Using ethnographic methods, I observed each social worker during 10 sessions of work in all kinds of situations: interviews with children, parents, school staff, professional meetings inside and outside schools, informal situations in schools such as lunch with teachers. At midterm and at the end of the fieldwork, I organised group interviews in order to discuss the research findings. The inherent tension in social work between social control and emancipation was a key issue which I sought to analyse by including the points of view of the school social workers.

Out of all the different situations in which the social workers dealt with children, I will present three here which highlighted the dialogue between three different school social workers (SSW) and children during my observations, and also how the social workers worked with the adults (parents and school staff) involved in the situations in question. The first case involve a girl named Hagère (16 years old) who was worried about her family life; the second case also concerns a girl, Zina (13 years old) who was referred to the social worker due to school problems; and the third case relates to Jeffica (18 years old) who faced challenges both with her family and at school. The three girls may be

categorised as "vulnerable" children, living as they do in a Maghreb migrant family with low economic status. These cases link the question of intimate citizenship to intersectional identities (Cherubini 2011; see also chapter "Social Work and Lived Citizenship"). The question of gender is implicitly important here as it underpins the cultural and social domination of girls in these families and at school. It also plays into the relationships between girls and school social workers, who are women themselves; as well as the conditions that shaped our empirical research, which were of course limited in time and space, and which permitted fewer observations involving boys.

Working with Hagère

The school social worker was informed by the school headmaster that the police had called him about a fight in Hagère's home the day before. Alerted by the neighbours, the police found the members of the family agitated, so they called a doctor who administered a drug to Hagère to calm her down. After a brief inquiry at the secondary school, the social worker invited the girl to come to her office to discuss what had happened at home and to decide whether the situation required (or not) a report to the juvenile judge or even the immediate withdraw of the girl from the family home. Once at the office, Hagère, who is the eldest of the three children, evoked the domestic violence against her mother, in relation to her father's alcoholism, to protest against being left with him while her mother was away on holiday.

Hagère She (Hagère's mother) wants my father to look after us at home while she goes to Tunisia during the holidays. I told her this morning: if you do that, I will kill myself
SSW 1 No
Hagère But that's the only thing I can do, that's all
SSW 1 That's clever! Listen. Then you're gonna fuck yourself up for parents who have decided to destroy their lives. You will do the same. What do you want?
Hagère When I get up there…

SSW 1 Ha! What you want is for them to feel guilty once and for all. Then they would be responsible

Hagère And their lives would be even more of a nightmare…

SSW 1 The suffering in question, you can do something about it. Rather than killing yourself you could follow my advice. We can consult the children's judge and you can tell him: my mother has gone to Tunisia, I cannot stay with my father, I wish to be placed in a home. (…) I said: you won't change him (your father) if he doesn't want to change. Stop trying to change your parents…

Hagère But can't I use everything he has done to my mother?

SSW 1 You don't need to use your mother's name or to take your mother's place. You can use what has been done to you, to save yourself

During the interview with Hagère, the social worker repeated several times: "*What interests me is you; your parents, I do not care about*". She also highlighted the difference between "*you*" and "*your parents*" in order to emphasise the family members' different positions and roles. In fact, the social worker also cares a lot about Hagère's parents but, as she explained to me afterwards, even though she understood the girl's intention to help her mother and her family as a whole, she wanted to show her that she had a space to make choices about her personal affairs. She understood that the girl's problems were embedded in her family's problems, but she wanted her to think about her own decision: if she was really fed up with her situation, did she want to be removed from her family home and enter a care centre? She also urged the girl to speak for herself, with her own identity, instead of taking on her mother's "name".

After this interview, the social worker began to network inside and outside the school: she met with the head teacher and the social work service assigned to Hagère's family. A few days later, she met Hagère's mother in her office without her daughter, in order to try to understand her view of the situation and to sort out its different facets, i.e. the father's problems, the parents' problems as a couple and the parents' relationships with their daughter. She gave her information about the resources she could use to cope with her husband's alcoholism and

domestic violence, and advised her about how to behave towards her daughter, i.e. that she should not "*get mixed up in your business*". She sought mainly to unravel the family's problems and apportion them to its different members. She urged the parents to assume overall responsibility for the family but, as she said to Hagère's mother, she did not want to know "*who is right and who is wrong*".

What the social worker took for granted in this situation was the affection between the mother and the girl. As she explained later, she questioned everything except the parents' affection for their offspring. Affection may be defined as the possibility of being affected by someone who is closed to you. From the social worker's point of view, affection meant being sure that someone would be attentive and responsive towards Hagère, caring about her and taking care of her at home. Affection is the cornerstone from which parents' responsibilities towards their children springs, and it was thus the basic premise for her own work. Finally, the social worker did not write a report to the juvenile judge, but she explained that this situation required her vigilance in the future and mediation with the social service from the area in which the family's home was located.

Working with Zina

Zina had been called to the social worker's office. Several teachers were fed up with the girl, whom they considered a "*monster*", and they wanted to get rid of her. They complained about her behaviour, as well as about other students who were messing up in their transition section (a special section for students who have a low academic level relative to their age after one year in the secondary school). The school director had been informed of this situation during the teachers' meeting and had already summoned the girl and told her off in his office. I was with the social worker in her office when she called for Zina. The interview was interrupted by the director, who burst into the office angrily without asking for permission, and spoke to the social worker as if Zina and I were not there. Following a tirade against Zina, in which he complained and asked the social worker questions, he left the office and the

interview continued. After this episode, the social worker told me: "*I think that with a sociologist in his school, he wants you and I to know who is boss!*" So my presence in the school also became an element in the conflict between Zina and the school staff.

SSW 2 We cannot consider that you have done nothing wrong, that you are never late, that you are never insolent with your teachers… My job is not to tell you that you are not doing really well, to give you a lesson in morality. There are a lot of other people in the school who can do this very well. We are here to talk about reality: you are not very happy and you are only just starting your schooling (…) I can tell the director: with Zina, it will work out ok. I can say that. But after all it is your job and it is very difficult to do it, I think you understand that well. (…)

The director of the school bursts into the social worker's office uninvited

Director I want a short report about what has been done about her situation. She says all kinds of things -that I want to send her back to Algeria, foolishness… Does she have no parents or what? (…)

After the director leaves

SSW 2 There, you are shaken by the director's visit. Don't worry. Obviously Mr. X (director) would like a report. First, I'm not sure I will write a report, but if I do I won't say anything about your personal life. I will only say what you agree I can tell him. You know I am bound by professional confidentiality, remember? This is not a problem, but I worry because I feel you are not well and perhaps we could meet tomorrow, perhaps at home or in another office where we could discuss your worries. You are at the age when all students have a lot of worries and it would be surprising if you didn't have any seeing as everybody else does (…) Perhaps you'd prefer to talk to someone else than me, we can talk about that. Shall we meet tomorrow or after the holidays?

A few days after this interview, the social worker visited Zina's grandmother at home in order to learn more about her family situation. The grandmother lived in a modest and very small flat, but she felt that she had a strong affective relationship with Zina, and was confident that she could care for Zina despite the fact that her parents were living in Algeria at the time. The social worker then met with the school director to discuss Zina's legal status in France and informed him about the girl's rights under French immigration law. She also spoke to Zina's teachers and passed on some information to them about her situation that she thought they should be aware of, and which could help them to make sense of the girl's troublesome behaviour in the classroom. She considered it essential to give the teachers some insight into Zina's life outside the school, without revealing too much private information. It was important for her to show them that she was engaged in Zina's case and to enhance their understanding of the reasons behind what they regarded as the child's intolerable behaviour. This was her way of endorsing the teachers' professional ability to find their own solutions to students' classroom problems: asking them to be patient and to defuse situations instead of calling for difficult students to be expelled from the school. In summary, in Zina's situation, the social worker both played with the rules in relating to the director, and with the ethics of care and interdependence (Gilligan 1982) in regard to the school staff and Zina's grandmother.

To the social worker, Zina was not a "*monster*" but a girl in "*deep suffering*", who needed help. In this interview, it became clear that the social worker's priority was to show Zina how professional confidentiality could create a space for her "personal" life and enable a closer relationship between her and the social worker. She noted that it would also be possible for such a space to be created with someone else—the important thing was to meet him or her and engage in a dialogue. As a professional, she wanted to show that public rules and rights could offer Zina a legal status and security that were contested by the school's director. It was also important to her to show Zina that she did not have the same view of children's misbehaviour as the school staff and him. Instead of evoking moral categories defining "good" or "bad" school behaviour, she aimed to address "worries" that all students shared at Zina's age. She invited the girl to meet her again. But Zina did not return during

my time carrying out observations at this school, and the girl avoided a talk with the school's professional staff. The social worker explained that she could not keep inviting the girl as this would be counterproductive, since it may have been interpreted by Zina as an abuse of power instead of as the help she sought to provide. She would have preferred it if Zina had called her on her own initiative, but failing that, all she could do was to monitor the girl at school, watching out for signs that Zina wanted to talk. She also told me that she hoped it might be possible to meet the girl and her grandmother together again at home. Some days later, she visited Zina's grandmother at home, telling me afterwards: "I would like Zina's teachers to see her at home". She would have liked to show them how small the flat was and generally how hard Zina's life was, even though her grandmother was taking care of her, so that they were better able to understand the girl's misbehaviour. Unlike teachers, school social workers are allowed to visit children's homes, and if they manage to do this and keep a lot of information to themselves, they can try to give the teachers meaningful insights into the children's lives outside school without invading the children's privacy.

For the social worker, the more fundamental message underlying her meeting with Zina was to communicate to the girl "I am here", and "you can always come to me if you want to". In other words, that she was always available and represented a potential touchstone for Zina in learning to recognise her own personal will. She offered a space of Zina's own choosing. Seen from this perspective, the absence of a real discussion during the meeting can be interpreted as Zina's own decision not to talk to the social worker. It showed Zina's capacity to exercise independent agency, even though it was a refusal of help. The right to be protected has to be considered in the light of the right of not to be protected as an expression of resistance against the power of adults.

Working with Jeffica

Jeffica is a Bachelor student, attending preparatory courses for entry into very selective schools (the French system of "*grandes écoles*"); her father threw her out of home just after her 18th birthday and she was living temporarily in a hotel which was paid for by the Child Protection

Service. She had already been removed from her family home 3 years previously, due to her father's violence. Because of this family problem, the girl was not performing well at school and risked not being allowed to progress to her second year of studies.

The social worker tried to secure a "young adult scholarship" for Jeffica from the Child Protection Service. That is, a "contract" in which the student commits herself to work to achieve academic success and social integration more broadly. In return, she receives money so she can rent a young worker's flat and pay for meals, clothes and so on. The social worker helped Jeffica because such scholarships were few and far between and because the application required a personal letter in which the student had to show that she had a "personal project" and could assume responsibility for her own life.

The girl enters the school social worker's office in the morning.

Jeffica I am in the middle of an important assessment; it's impossible for me to work, I cannot concentrate…
SSW 3 Don't let yourself be disturbed, you stick to your path…
Jeffica That's hard…, there are lots of cockroaches in the hotel…
SSW 3 You cling like crazy, you must try not to see the cockroaches … what counts is your education…
SSW 3 They are doing this to help you (the meeting for the scholarship), but it's up to you to manage your own stuff. This afternoon, you just have to pay attention to one thing. I know you: when you're anxious, you're aggressive, demanding…, relax, don't antagonise them…
SSW 3 You question your father too much
Jeffica My mother, she wants me to come back home
SSW 3 Yes, your mother, she tries to keep everything as it is

The social worker wanted to speak to Jeffica's mother, but at that time she was also experiencing difficulties at work and at home and could not meet the social worker at her office. Significantly, the social worker had already seen her and was confident about the situation: "She wants to reconcile the two cultures, Moroccan and French; she wants to support her children's education and to keep the traditions", she explains.

Here too, what matters is the affection and care between the mother and the daughter and the preservation of cultural ties. She also tried to understand the father's reaction as a complex problem involving intergenerational and reciprocal identification, cultural and gender divides.

Working with the school staff was a priority for the social worker as she was afraid they would not take Jeffica's situation into account and would expel her from school the following year due to low academic achievement. So she immediately met with the head of "school life". She justified Jeffica's past and present difficulties by referring to her father's violence. She underlined the contrast between Jessica's success and the failure of her older brother who was expelled from the secondary school; she stressed the importance of school for Jeffica's identity and future life; she emphasised the girl's strong will, personality and intelligence. In so doing, she constructed Jeffica's situation as a moral case requiring a sense of justice.

The work with Jeffica combined the two facets of her situation: on the one hand, the importance of the cultural factor (linked to gender) as a key to understanding her situation; and, on the other hand, the importance of academic success in improving her future. She advised her to compartmentalise her problems (family/school), gave her concrete help and, more fundamentally, gave her confidence in her support and in the girl's own ability to overcome her challenges.

Conclusion: Children's Protection and Emancipation

At every level (financial, cultural, affective, emotional) children's lives are deeply embedded in adults' lives, particularly in the family sphere (Garnier 2015b). What is "intimate" is not given in the case of children because they are so strongly linked to the family sphere. The definition of the "identity of the child" is a complex process, particularly for "vulnerable" groups, as it involves economic, social and cultural domination in the family context. So the main challenge for the social workers in the cases I observed was to individualise the child as a subject of rights on his/her own account, without disrupting the child's relationship with

her/his family. Social workers must thus work both with and against the adults concerned (parents and/or school staff) in order to create a space where the child's own voice can be heard and claimed as the voice of the child her/himself. This process of creating subjectivities is at the heart of citizenship: it requires a child who performs as a person with individual choices and self-determination, and it also requires that the child's performance and voice are recognised by adults.

This creation of a special space for children's voices can be linked to an "intimate citizenship" related to the subjective and micro-sociological dimensions of their everyday lives. For the school social workers, the first and crucial challenge is to welcome, but also in some cases to stimulate, children's voices—to break their silence. What is private or public is not given, but is defined in each situation and in dialogue with the different people with whom social workers have to collaborate. Of course, such dialogues may be regarded as inscribed in relations of domination or, more precisely, of symbolic violence (Bourdieu 1999). Moreover, giving voice to children always involves a mutual symbolic and social recognition between adults and children (Merleau-Ponty 2010). Producing the self is a process involving social and symbolic violence because it is always inscribed in a "struggle over recognition" (Warming 2015).

Even if children's choices are ostensibly very limited, there is a place for positioning children's attachments, resistances or selflessness in adults' practices. This also means recognising children as subjects of rights in the present (not only in the future as "formal" citizens, as it is the case in the French conception of citizenship) and as genuine agents of their everyday lives. Ethically, this validates the idea of the reversibility of the situations in which children live, and the uncertainty of everyone's identity (Garnier 2014). In summary, social work with children both requires formal rights as well as institutional conventions that go beyond the singularity of people and situations, on the one hand; and, on the other, care in the sense of interdependencies (between vulnerable adults and children) characterised by a morality sensitive to the particularities of each situation. Lived citizenship is not an individual possession, but a co-construction of interdependencies that together build dialectic of rights. It involves not only a tension between the protection

of the vulnerable child and his/her self-expression and agency; it is also a hierarchical process in which the first frame, the protection of the child, may be reversed in the second frame, emancipation. This also means that the process of recognition is at the same time a process of alienation. This conclusion is not only applicable to children. It applies more broadly to the struggles of every unrecognised group of people to achieve equal recognition in the established order. This study of children's citizenship highlights the fact that "Politics cannot be defined on the basis of any pre-existing subject… It is the political relationship that allows one to think the possibility of a political subject(ivity) (*le sujet politique*), not the other way around" (Rancière 2001).

In this chapter, I tried to analyse situated professional practices pertaining to vulnerable children's lived citizenship. More broadly, a pragmatic approach may offer a means to carry out a critical reflexive analysis of research in cases where sociologists give voice to children and seek to help them become independent actors or agents in their own right. Research about children's citizenship should be considered and analysed itself as a situated social practice.

References

Beaman, J. 2015. Boundaries of Frenchness: Cultural Citizenship and France's Middle-Class North African Second-Generation. *Identities: Global Studies in Culture and Power* 22 (1): 36–52.

Boltanski, L., and L. Thevenot. 2006. *On Justification. Economies of Worth*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Bourdieu, P. 1999. *The Weight of the World: Social Suffering in Contemporary Society*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Cherubini, D. 2011. Intersectionality and the Study of Lived Citizenship: A Case Study on Migrant Women's Experiences in Andalusia. *Graduate Journal of Social Science* 8 (2): 114–136.

Duchesne, S. 2005. Identities, Nationalism, Citizenship and Republican Ideology. In *Developments in French Politics 3*, ed. A. Cole, P. Le Gales, and J. Levy, 230–244. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Fitzgerald, R.M., A. Graham, A. Smith, and N. Taylor. 2010. Children's Participation as a Struggle over Recognition: Exploring the Promise of

Dialogue. In *A Handbook of Children and Young People's Participation. Perspectives from Theory and Practice*, ed. B. Percy-Smith and N. Thomas, 293–305. London: Routledge.

Gabriela, T., S. Kellera, F. Bolter, M.-P. Martin-Blachais, and G. Séraphin. 2013. Out of Home Care in France and Switzerland. *Psychosocial Intervention* 22: 215–225.

Garnier, P. 1995. *Ce dont les enfants sont capables*. Paris: Edition A.M. Métailié.

Garnier, P. 1997. *Les assistantes sociales à l'école*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France. https://www.amazon.fr/Assistantes-sociales-à-lécole-ebook/.

Garnier, P. 2014. Childhood as a Question of Critiques and Justifications: Insight into Boltanski's Sociology. *Childhood* 21 (4): 447–460.

Garnier, P. 2015a. L'agency des enfants. Projet politique et scientifique des 'childhood studies. *Education et sociétés* 36: 159–173.

Garnier, P. 2015b. Between Young Children and Adults: Practical Logic in Families Lives. In *Studying Childhood with Bourdieu*, ed. L. Alanen, L. Brooker, and B. Mayall, 57–77. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Gilligan, C. 1982. *In a Different Voice: Psychological Theory and Women's Development.* Harvard: Harvard University Press.

Jennings, J. 2000. Citizenship, Republicanism and Multiculturalism in Contemporary France. *British Journal of Political Sciences* 30: 575–597.

Larkins, C. 2014. Enacting Children's Citizenship: Developing Understanding of How Children Enact Themselves as Citizens Though Actions and Acts of Citizenship. *Childhood* 21 (1): 7–21.

Lister, R. 2007. Why Citizenship: Where When and How Children? *Theoretical Inquiries in Law* 8 (2): 692.

Lister, R., F. Williams, A. Anttonen, J. Bussemaker, J. Heinen, A. Gavanas, S. Johansson, A. Leira, U. Gerhard, and C. Tobio. 2007. *Gendering Citizenship in Western Europe. New Challenges for Citizenship Research in a Cross-National Context*. Bristol: Policy Press.

Merleau-Ponty, M. 2010. *Child Psychology and Pedagogy. The Sorbonne Lectures 1949–1952*. Evanston: Northwestern University Press.

Plummer, K. 2003. *Intimate Citizenship. Private Decisions and Public Dialogues*. Seattle: University of Washington Press.

Rancière, J. 2001. Ten Theses on Politics. *Theory and Event* 5 (1). http://www.after1968.org/app/webroot/uploads/RanciereTHESESONPOLITICS.pdf.

Roser, M. 2011. School Social Work in France. *International Network for School Social Work.* http://internationalnetwork-schoolsocialwork.html-planet.com.

Tzu, S. 2002. *The Art of War*, Trans. J. Minford. New York: Viking.

Vanhoenacker, M. 2011. Education in a French Secular Group of Scouts: A Site for Study Tensions over Citizenship. *Citizenship Studies* 15 (8): 1047–1059.
Wall, J. 2014. Democratizing Democracy: The Road from Women's to Children's Suffrage. *International Journal of Human Rights* 18 (6): 646–659. https://johnwall.camden.rutgers.edu/articles/.
Warming, H. 2012. Theorizing Adult's Facilitation of Children's Participation and Citizenship. In *Participation, Facilitation and Mediation: Children and Young People in Their Social Contexts*, ed. C. Baraldi and V. Iervese, 30–48. London: Routledge.
Warming, H. 2013. Theorizing Trust—Citizenship Dynamics. In *Participation, Citizenship and Trust in Children's Lives*, ed. H. Warming, 10–31. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
Warming, H. 2015. The Life of Children in Care in Denmark: A Struggle over Recognition. *Childhood* 22 (2): 248–262.

Author Biography

Pascale Garnier is sociologist, full professor in education sciences, head of the research team Experice, in Paris 13 University, Sorbonne Paris Cité (France). Within a pragmatic approach of children's life, adults' practices and material culture, her researches consider age categorizations as political and moral orders. She belongs to the networks of sociology of childhood and children of ESA (European Sociological Association) and of AISLF (International Association of French Speaking Sociologists).

Theorizing Children's Welfare Citizenship: Lived Citizenship, Social Recognition and Generations

Tom Cockburn

Introduction

So far, the contributing chapters to this collection have focused on the localized context of 'lived citizenship' and the everyday interactions of children. This chapter begins an exploration of children's national welfare citizenship in order to place children at the heart of analysis, rather than at the margins of children's national welfare that characterizes much of the literature to date. It does so, focussing largely on the UK context, by building on recent ideas developed around 'lived citizenship' (Delanty 2003; Lister et al. 2007), recognition theory (Honneth 1995; Fitzgerald et al. 2010; Thomas 2012) and generational ordering

I would like to acknowledge Dympna Devine, Nigel Thomas, Hanne Warming, Catarina Tomás, Isabelle Danic, Obbbjørg Skjær and Daniel Stoecklin for their work developing the model of combining lived citizenship, generational analysis and recognition theory. The genesis and benefits of the model outlined in this chapter belong to all and the mistakes are entirely mine.

T. Cockburn (✉)
Edge Hill University, Ormskirk, England
e-mail: Tom.Cockburn@edgehill.ac.uk

H. Warming and K. Fahnøe (eds.), *Lived Citizenship on the Edge of Society*,
Palgrave Politics of Identity and Citizenship Series, DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-55068-8_8

(Alanan 2009) that could better capture children's involvement in welfare citizenship and offer an insight into the obstacles and opportunities of social work practice. It is within socio-spatial settings, or, as Tom Hall describes in this collection outlines, the times and places where service provider practice establishes a 'border', where the possibilities of citizenship appear or disappear. Thus children's welfare citizenship is very much on 'the edge', subject to social discipline, misrecognition, dependency, and subject to the increasingly individualistic processes of welfare citizenship that characterizes contemporary neo-liberalism (Harvey 2005). However, at the same time it seeks to offer elements of hope, where children's experiences of citizenship can be ultimately inclusive, their contributions recognized and a more positive reading of generational interconnections and interdependencies can be discerned. The chapter aims to understand social work practices through such a lens.

The chapter begins, as other chapters in this collection, with a discussion of lived citizenship that contrasts with the notion of citizenship that consists merely of a balance of rights and responsibilities, subject to the increasing conditionalities of British social citizenship (Dwyer and Wright 2014). Instead, it conceptualizes citizenship as lived and fluid, embedded in power dynamics (of both production and reproduction), through processes of identity making that raises questions about the spaces and places in which citizenship is 'learned' (Devine 2011). The chapter then examines recognition theory to explore such learning, including important interactions with professionals, where they are recognized as either citizens as bearers of rights or misrecognized as 'objects of concern' and subject to disciplinary practices. The next section includes a discussion of generational structures to highlight interconnections and interdependencies between generations, rather than presenting children as a group solely dependent on adults. The rest of the chapter discusses these insights from the perspective of social work practice. It firstly, in common with other chapters in the book, outlines the obstacles professionals work within that militates against children being recognized as contributing and practising social citizens. Such obstacles include the individualized and marketized approach to welfare support based on conditionality and the creeping proceduralism experienced by social workers. It ends with a positive note on the place of

social workers as important partners in reconceptualising children in a new generational order that engages with children's capabilities as social citizens.

Lived Citizenship

The quotation from Ruth Lister et al. (2007) at the front of this collection draws our attention to the importance of reworking citizenship conceptions towards one that is more egalitarian and less hierarchical and 'as such, they provide tools for marginalized groups struggling for social justice' (Lister et al. 2007, 49). This paper therefore develops a theorization of children's citizenship which eschews the traditional view, such as that pronounced by Marshall (1950/1992), that regards the citizen as an individual being processed within a bundle of rights, responsibilities, entitlements and duties towards one that emphasizes voice, difference and social justice (Delanty 2000). The latter approach implies inclusion of more and more groups, as well as a turn from a pure 'rights' (and duties) approach towards *lived citizenship,* and from which social justice through sameness develops towards an acknowledgement of difference (Lister et al. 2007).

The perspective of lived citizenship presents a more nuanced and process driven focus on citizenship, such as instances of positioning and identity shaping, while being aware of symbolic power relations (Yuval-Davies 1997; Moosa-Mitha 2005). Delanty (2003) in his conceptualization of lived citizenship helpfully distinguishes between disciplinary and inclusive citizenship learning processes; here, citizens develop cognitive, symbolic and social competence through a series of negotiations and positionings in everyday interactions across different institutional contexts. Thus identity shaping is a process, rather than a static given. These learning processes may be *disciplinary,* based on certain norms for the 'right citizen' or 'the deserving recipient' of goods and services. This gives rise to distinctions between those who live up to social norms and those who do not (Delanty 2003, 599; Lister et al. 2007). In direct contrast, learning through *inclusive* citizenship processes enhances the individual's feeling of belonging. Thus, for instance,

receiving welfare, be it social or economic support, education, etc., is seen as something social, inclusive and positive towards fellow citizens, rather than being presented as a burden on society. Moosa-Mitha (2005) builds on this positive and inclusive citizenship to suggest that those, such as children, who deviate from norms of participating in society need to have their contributions recognized equally. In this sense, even those voicing experiences of deprivation and disrespect may change those very institutions of society that places them there in the first instance. Furthermore, lived citizenship and associated learning processes take place in face-to-face interactions in everyday life where inclusive citizenship learning will enhance social trust (Warming 2013).

However, this inclusive conception of citizenship, steeped in equality and social justice, operates increasingly through spatial flows of regulation, information and communication (Desforges et al. 2005). Power is exercised in a capillary like circular fashion, altering and influencing subjectivities in a constant flow of interactions (Foucault 1979). Applied to children, the intersection of power relations across different interactions in different social contexts (e.g. adults and children and different groups of children) will both signify and construct varied practices of citizenship. Of course, this also includes children's relationships and interactions with parents/carers and professionals, as will be discussed later. Citizenship practising is then the outcome of both structured and agentic processes (Devine 2011), and will vary by social and cultural context, according to welfare regimes or through institutions, such as families, housing, educational institutions, communities, health services, as well as by identities related to age, gender, social class, ethnicity and (dis)ability.

Social Recognition of Children

Before continuing, it is necessary to acknowledge the absences (Alderson 2013) of children in citizenship discourses as they are barely acknowledged as agents in their own right. Marshall (1950/1992), for instance, hardly mentions children, other than as recipients of education or as appendages to parents. While citizenship contributions have been recognized for some marginalized social groups, such as women,

(dis)abled adults, ethnic minorities, etc., children continue to be absent. In order to understand and then challenge this absence, the paper draws upon Honneth's (1995) 'recognition theory' (developed for children's purposes by Hanne Warming 2006 and Nigel Thomas 2012).

In Honneth's (1995) theory, mutual recognition, necessary for an inclusive and participatory citizenship, is seen as a critical process in social development, and misrecognition is the occasion for struggle, which is the motor of change. Honneth's theory is distinct from other theories of recognition in its articulation in terms of three 'modes' of recognition: 'love' refers to relationships including sexual, parent–child and friendships, mostly within affective and private relationships and refers to our physical needs and emotions. The mode of recognition termed 'rights' refers to the development of our moral responsibility developed through relations with others. Where love should provide basic self-confidence, the recognition of rights is where an individual learns to see themselves with others as a bearer of equal rights. The denial of rights through social and legal exclusion or though abuse or neglect in primary relationships can threaten one's sense of being a fully active, equal and respected member of society. The final mode of recognition termed 'solidarity' relates to recognition of our traits and abilities and the development of self-esteem to become 'individuals'. This allows for a degree of intersubjective interactions where characteristic differences are expressed but recognized. Ideally these interactions form relationships that encourage the self-confidence that enables the perception of 'autonomy' necessary for public life. In order to do this, Honneth argues one must firstly have the self-confidence, self-respect and a sense of universal dignity and self-reflexive agency in order to have a sense of oneself as a person. This gives rise to the self-esteem necessary for a sense of one's uniqueness and difference which makes a person feel valuable.

Recognition has to be understood historically. The modern transformation of legal recognition is a continuing one with progress consisting of an extension of the classes of people who are recognized as having basic human rights. Here it is necessary for groups of people to perceive each other as equals, as such, but 'subjects reciprocally recognize each other with regard to their status as morally responsible' (Honneth 1995, 110). Thus it is necessary to create a space in which people's

sense of being 'valuable' depends on being recognized for their own accomplishments and 'relations of social esteem are subject to a permanent struggle, in which different groups attempt… to raise the value of the abilities associated with their way of life' (1995, 127). Thus there is an important struggle in terms of valorizing children's subjective experiences and the symbolic power relations of adults. While the reciprocal nature of recognition may extend the status of legal personhood, it also illustrates the under-privileging, shame and inadequacy associated with those who are denied subject status, such as children. Honneth suggests the state should step into respect subjects with their individual particularity and difference as something to be respected in itself (Honneth 1995, 125). Thus Honneth contributes to notions of lived citizenship as he argues that it is the institutional context of social structures which firstly determines how resources are distributed; secondly, analytic attention needs to be applied to non-material social goods, such as respect and recognition; finally, looking at broader systems of representation emphasizes the processed, dynamic and historical nature of social and power relations. It is the experience of disrespect, rather than the distribution of resources, that 'comprises a central principle of social justice' (Honneth 1995, 352).[1] At a wider policy level, children's contributions to family survival (in their interaction with grandparents and parents, as well as siblings) are underplayed and even ignored (Aldridge and Becker 2003). Children's active contribution to voluntary activity within their local communities is also grossly downplayed (Cockburn and Cleaver 2009). Wihstutz, in this collection, shows how children with caring responsibilities are presented as 'children out of place' and as 'social problems'. Despite such forms of children's agency, and increasing recognition of children's rights internationally following the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (UNCRC) processes of recognition of children at a structural level is minimized, marginalized or ignored. However, at a *micro*level there is some evidence that adults and children are working through these structural conditions in positive ways (Alanan 2009); for instance, family members do recognize and value the contributions of their children. Children can repeat patterns of dependence and misrecognition in their lives but at other times they can and do challenge existing relationships.

Generational Structures

The processes of children's citizenship then consist of social practices of identity shaping in the context of a series of struggles in which children strive for social recognition. These struggles are performed in a series of citizenship discourses that may be inclusive, disciplinary but usually with both operating concomitantly. Thus another important perspective in developing a model of children's lived citizenship is to acknowledge Alanan's (2009) development of a 'generational order'. Children exist as a group within themselves but also in relation to other generations that shape their experiences and is therefore important. Furthermore, different generational categories have shared interests within and between themselves and between other groups (Olk 2009). This has been helpful in identifying the skewing of resources in favour of older people in many welfare regimes (Lynch 2006), and a recent report by UNICEF reinforces this view, where in the recent economic downturn 'children are suffering most, and will bear the consequences longest, in countries where the recession has hit hardest' (2014, 2). Generations, for Alanen, are produced and reproduced in interactions between adults and children, whereby adults and children produce the social structures of generations, thereby giving children a degree of active agency in the generational constructing process. That is:

> a system of social ordering that specifically pertains to children as a social category, and circumscribes for them particular social locations from which they act and thereby participate in ongoing social life. Children are thus involved in the daily 'construction' of their own and other people's everyday relationships and life trajectories. (Alanan 2009, 161)

Power is differentially distributed and Alanen explores how adults develop 'standard expectations' of how children behave that can be charted and compared and these have clear implications for processes of recognition discussed above. From a feminist perspective, Alanan (1994) develops her analysis of generation and utilizes the term 'intersectionality' where generations are simultaneously gendered, classed, raced, and so on. Importantly, being 'generationed' forms an important

element to understanding intersectionality and generation can be a legitimate 'lens' through which girls and boys share positioning in terms of age but 'gendering' the lens can show different forms of ordering. Similarly the lens of class or race can develop a fuller conceptual framework.

While it is important to demonstrate how categories of generation are related according to macroeconomic structures (Qvortrup 2009), it is necessary to acknowledge elements of structure that are more cultural and inter-personal. Age, like gender, is 'practice based' in interactions, relations and interdependencies of generations that occur within structured interactions of parents and children, or between professionals and children. The role of parent or carer can only exist if there were children to care for, thus their statuses are symbiotic, although the relationship is not symmetrical but based on asymmetrical structural power. One can also add the professional social worker intervening in familial circumstances has an asymmetrical power relationship with those they work (Warming 2011).

Linking this into concepts of 'lived citizenship' and recognition theory attention needs to be paid to the *everyday* practices of generational (re)structuring: 'through which existing generational categories and their interrelationships are produced and rendered culturally meaningful' (Alanan 2009, 169). Mayall (2009) notes that in contrast to the 'old days' when children passively obeyed their parents, there is an expectation that children can discuss a variety of issues with their parents, and they are better informed and although having less physical autonomy have more intellectual freedom. Mayall acknowledges, as does Wihstutz in this collection, the important contributions from children to housework and caring for family members, thereby keeping the family a relatively healthy organism.

With people living longer welfare states, children, parents and grandparents have to live within kinship spaces far longer than before. This has possibly led to tensions with the state and thereby professional intervention; for instance, the school leaving age has increased in the UK and there are greater demands for nursery and day care provision. Patriarchy too retains a powerful hold over women and children as 'aspects of child-parent relations remain constant: the pivotal role of

women in caring work; the authority and responsibility of parents; the parental teaching role; children's dependency; continuity of care and concern over time' (Mayall 2009, 181). The traditional lack of recognition of caring/love labour (Lynch et al. 2009) carried out mostly by women, is mirrored in the similar lack of recognition of children's contribution and responsibilities to love and care within their families and wider communities (Butler et al. 2005; see also chapter "From Objects of Care to Citizens—Young Carers' Citizenship").

Thus a focus on generations demonstrates the ways in which taking a narrow economic focus, while highlighting structural tendencies, can only be explained in the light of interconnections and interdependencies. By looking at how generations intersect with other structures, such as gender, broader processes of inclusion and exclusion can be discerned. Therefore, by utilizing this approach, a more nuanced set of analytic tools applied to children's citizenship can be brought into play.

Children, Families and the State

It is, of course, important to note that when we are talking about children it is necessary not to subsume them into dyadic ideas of parent–child relations. As Lars Dencik (1995) points out, this is perhaps best seen as a triangular relationship—that there is an association between parents, children and the state. There are interactions and power relations between all three and it is crucial to see children as having voices separate to, and independent of, those of their parents/carers and those professionals who intervene in generational relations. However, as pointed out by Larkins (2014), children's experiences of citizenship are experienced and practised in a number of 'domains'. They exist in children's interactions with the state, in their collectivities, the intermediate spaces between the public and private, as well as in private and individually. Take the example of a child in the looked after sector: this is experienced as a political decision by the state, the deployment of policies, the formation of social institutions, the child's experience of their placements, their interactions with social workers, the other children experiencing state care, the consequences of this to their families

and carers and the child's experiences within these private spaces and their individual thoughts. The configurations of these interactions and domains are enormous but to date, in contrast to the Global South, few in the Global North have thought children to have much agency in intergenerational relations, other than as individuals in institutions or as family members (Wall 2016).

This section raises questions about the interactions between children and their families with social workers, as an example of the triadic nature of generational relations. Of course, this is partial, as 'the state' through professional interventions engage with children in a range of other spheres, notably teachers, medical practitioners, police officers and arguably those in the voluntary sector. The importance of the social workers' perspective has a very long literature (Payne 2005) but historically social work involving children was rooted in the idea that children need loving families. The task of the social worker was to work with communication within families by defusing conflict and violence and enhancing positive interactions (Jordan 2007). However, in the UK interventions have shifted to simply protecting vulnerable children from abuse at the expense of support to parents or mediation between family members. Research shows that the greater proportion of families referred to social services received no help, as attention is focused on those small number of children deemed at risk (Gilbert et al. 2012). This served to further stigmatize users of social services and reinforces the 'vulnerable' label of children receiving such attention leading to social misrecognition. Thus the processes of recognition and misrecognition have a resonance with other citizens on the edge of society, such as their parents. Social workers, as we will see, practise within an ever-tightening net of procedures and policies that have squeezed the ability of individuals to use their own professional intuitions.

A recent, high profile, report on child and family social work in the UK raised critical questions of the technical and managerial methods of social service departments and instead advocated for 'professionally grounded intuitions' of social workers (Munro 2011). The report advocated for a shift away from proceduralism and technical focus to one that endorsed professional expertise and the required changes and

development to training. Where 'a radical reduction in the amount of central prescription to help professionals move from a compliance culture to a learning culture, where they have more freedom to use their expertise in assessing need and providing the right help' (Munro 2011, 7). The advocating of a learning culture should give the signal that social workers would work to mediate between family members, increase professional agency and offer increased help and support children and their families. The model advocated here should be one of mutual interdependence and recognition of intergenerational solidarities where the recognition and development of common interests facilitate a more harmonious future. However, in a similar vain to other services to citizens on the edge of society, the wider context of the Munro Report has side-lined the importance of wider social work support to a reduction in practice to a very narrow concern with child protection. A reduction in welfare support to already vulnerable parents, the context of the individualization of responsibility for 'mistakes' and a context of broader financial cuts to services and resources (Parton 2014) have limited the scope for professional judgement.

The narrowness of social work focus and the culture of individual blame identified in the light of high profile cases in the UK reflect wider processes of individualization in society. This has profound effects on social work practice and the lived citizenship of children, their families and professionals. Beck-Gernsheim (2002) analyses the processes of individualization on families and argues on the one hand traditional bonds, such as the family, community and belief systems have lost some of their power over individuals. She argues that women and perhaps children are less encumbered by 'traditional' social bonds and expectations; instead, space has opened up the prospect for individual people to make decisions for their own lives. On the other hand, she recognizes the increasing regulation, prescription and discipline on individuals from institutions:

> These institutions produce various regulations—demands, instructions, entitlements—that are typically addressed to individuals rather than the family as a whole. (Beck-Gernsheim 2002, ix)

With an overly individualized and marketized approach to welfare and support, there is a danger that such patterns become embedded in disciplinary citizenship processes of conditionality that demarcate those who are of value and deserving of recognition and respect; on the other hand, those like the homeless people discussed by Hall and Fahnøe in this collection are maintained on the margins or edge of recognition and respect. The recognition and respect of 'looked after' children, for example, may be predicated on their assimilation into normative ways of being and doing, that includes the shaping of self and identity in line with the needs of a flexible and mobile economy (Frost and Parton 2009). Within neo-liberal welfare systems, value is attributed conditionally, on success in the education market place where looked after children are continuously trying to play catch up. The retraction in state investment, legitimated through a discourse of individual responsibility and 'character' ensure that what counts is access to resources which enable looked after children to succeed (Stein 2009). However, personalization and 'choice' across welfare systems are predicated on the capacity to make and know what choices are available to individual children, their carers and supporting professionals. Consumption is itself embedded in dynamics of power and control. Such disciplinary regimes may be communicated in the education, social protection and care systems in policies/interventions which focus on the 'right' form of parenting or caring. Lee (2014) identifies the growing momentum (even beyond the care/social protection system) since the 1970s of targeting 'deficient' parenting behaviour. This has implications for the triadic relationship between children, parents/carers and professionals. Parenting is no longer a 'natural' process but needs to have a learned interaction with others to give parents a 'skill set'. Edwards and Gillies (2012) have identified a politics of parenting where parenting practices are linked to the good of society as a whole and deficient parenting is a *sine qua non* of a gamut of social problems from welfare dependency to crime. Creating families as citizens on the edge of society becomes subject to tightening disciplinary discourses.

Professional interventions and social work practice still hold an important key to correct generational injustice. It is vital for social work and public services to provide a framework in which issues can be negotiated openly and with recognition. It is necessary for such professions

to draw from the theoretical model advocated here that children belong to a class of morally responsible persons, thereby rights-bearers and entitled to recognition and respect. Difficult as it is for social workers safeguarding children experiencing the most horrendous life circumstances, it is important to avoid an overuse of the term 'vulnerable' as this illustrates a form of 'symbolic violence' that follows from 'misrecognition' (Bourdieu et al. 1999). It denies children a voice that is listened to, recognized and to develop self-esteem. Recognition of children is key but also recognition of parents and carers. It is necessary for professionals to be wary of processes of normalization; deploying terms such as 'effective parenting' is unrealistic when considering structural constraints that are ignored and instead 'failure' is seen as something that is individual and excludes other, more 'alternative' forms of parenting. Some parents reject state schooling and disagree with the norms that pervade the competitive school curriculum. This could form an important shelter from excessive individualism and competitiveness that characterizes the 'choices' in schools in the UK. Clearly, it is necessary to recognize children in this process. In terms of child protection, in the UK, the state has reacted to infamous cases of child deaths on an individual basis, blaming individual professionals and perpetrators, yet failing to recognize wider processes of injustices (Frost 2011). This neoliberalism leads to an excessive individualism which adversely effects children as they struggle to live up to expectations and suffer from the pressures these expectations entail. Recent reports in the UK such as the Good Childhood Enquiry (Layard and Dunn 2009) and the Joseph Rowntree survey of *Contemporary Social Evils* (Unwin 2009) demonstrate the importance of moving away from the competitive social environment of the last 40 years. Children's well-being has been adversely effected by the pressures of 'excessive individualism' that placed UK children's well-being towards the bottom of the EU (UNICEF 2007).

It is therefore important to draw on the importance of 'lived citizenship', not just because it focuses attention on what children do in the here and now and therefore potentially increasing everyone's, including children's, recognition and contributes to generational solidarity but also because it warns of the 'disciplinary' nature of citizenship. Delanty, drawing on Foucault, warns against the governmentalization of learning

and citizenship where there is 'a discursive coding of citizenship as a cognitive process' (2003, 600) where the individual citizen is inserted. Here we can reflect on a range of passive metaphors deployed in children's social policies drawn from medicine. Words such as 'disease', 'treatment' or 'prevention' pervade safeguarding discourses and have a direct association with the medical model. The image is of a passive body where things are done to the individual. This adds to processes of misrecognition of children and obscures social and structural causes and remedies. We can caution against the dangers of 'surveillance'; the development of children's welfare policies include strategies such as 'contact points' where every child in the UK has an electronic record and information sharing between professionals and organizations is encouraged to create a 'web of information around the child and their family' (Frost and Parton 2009, 48). The 'early interventions' policy for remedying a host of social evils, from educational failure to child abuse, attempts to prevent problems from getting worse. However, interventions can take place before actual problems have emerged and it could be questioned whether such interventions are justifiable or if there is evidence that early interventions around perceived 'risks' work in the first place (O'Mahoney 2009).

Moving the Agenda on: Professionals and Lived Citizenship

Where do the remedies lie for professionals to help in increasing social recognition and making for increased intergenerational solidarity? It is worth noting, as Fahnøe in this collection notes, that the state (and especially professionals working within the state) has limited control over the free market and globalization. That said, the starting point is to learn from young people themselves. The young generation has formed an important process of collective action to counter the effects of austerity, through efforts such as the Occupy Movement, the *indignados* and other resistances by young people in the social media. Professionals should be attentive to the advantages of collective engagement with meeting needs and improving well-being. Professionals should also make themselves more accountable to all communities, rather than their managers and inspectors. Instead of attending to 'social investment'

policies towards economic growth and job creation, more sustainable economic and social futures should be envisaged. Cooperation and improvements in the quality of life would better use the energies of all. It is important for professionals to work with the *capabilities* (Sen 1999; Stoecklin and Bonvin 2014) of individuals and communities and for professionals to adopt an ethos of flexibility, openness and humility to the children, parents and communities they work in. At times, there is also the need to take the side against authority and power and work with those who are recipients of welfare through the whole social context they find themselves in.

At a microlevel, there are examples of good practice, as Garnier in this collection has shown with school social workers. There are attempts by professionals working with looked after children (O'Loughlin and O'Loughlin 2012) utilizing the Professional Capabilities Framework in the UK to recognize children's own capacities. Leeson (2007) in her study shows that innovative and child-centred methods can give a voice and recognition to children in the care system, although also acknowledging the uphill task in obtaining this. Similarly, Pinkney (2013) and Warming (2015) have shown that social workers are capable of gaining and giving trusting relationships to children in their care. These acts of recognition thereby enable children to enact themselves as competent and valued citizens of the present. Social life is not only built on the pursuit of economic self-interest but is embedded in the principles of solidarity in human relations (Amin 2009). A key principle within such solidarity is not only recognizing the vulnerability of others, but also enabling others to live lives which are valued, respected and meaningful (Nussbaum 2000). Such care and recognition are not only possible within the private realm of the family but also within the welfare system (social services, health, education, etc.) and interconnects with the development of capability sets (Sen 1999).

It is especially important to highlight how children themselves can make use of present opportunities and develop their abilities, but also with the aim of co-constructing new relationships between professionals and children. By considering children as *lived citizens* in their own right and of those of their parents and caregivers, it is possible to explore the range of appropriate contexts for the development of children's citizenship capacities. This environment could theoretically feed

into the broader context of welfare policy and provision, practices and recognition and re/distribution across core institutional contexts (places and spaces) in which children live their lives.

The individualistic perspective focusing on personal well-being is probably linked to the dominant welfare approach whereby participation takes place through rather individualized forms of self-realization in social engagement (Lansdown 2009). Currently children's voices as a group are too narrow and consequently their participation in collective decision-making processes in the political arena has still low impact (Percy-Smith and Thomas 2010). This is mainly because it is constrained by top-down and adult-centred priorities and structured channels of consultation such as youth forums or youth councils only grasp only a small part of what children and young people are actually able to do (Tisdall and Davis 2004). The dominant understanding of child participation as an individual participation emphasizes individual choices, ignoring at the same time the structural limits to one's participation either as an individual or as a group. Children individually may well have formal rights, entitlements and able to participate in society. Besides, children's capacities and processes of recognition may heavily depend on the capabilities of others, such as parents, caregivers or professionals (Stoecklin and Bonvin 2014). However, real children have constraints and limitations on their actions. Individuals adopt a *learned process* whereby the socio-cultural representations of normative frameworks are progressively internalized by people who then actively transforms them and expresses them in renewed ways. As Stoecklin and Bonvin (2013) have pointed out in relation to the UNCRC: 'One is not born with the articles of the CRC in mind, one learns how to behave according to the place given by society to these normative standards' (Stoecklin and Bonvin 2013).

Conclusion

The purpose of this chapter has been to reconceptualise children's welfare citizenship from one that views the child as a passive recipient of goods and services based on what they will potentially do in the future

to one where their lived citizenship is in the here and now (James et al. 2011). The concept of lived citizenship discussed in this and other chapters of the collection begins with the *everyday,* as children interact in their daily lives with adults and other children in their homes, nurseries, parks, clubs, amongst their friends, with professionals and as presented in public discourses. These are often struggles against disciplinary learning and discrimination (Warming 2011) but they can also reinforce social solidarities. These everyday interactions are at times struggles for material goods and symbolic recognition, but following Honneth (1995) these struggles for self-reflexive agency are the very motors of social change. They can develop the self-respect that will give children the self-confidence to interact with others, become recognized as rights holding individuals and successfully challenge the social relations on their daily lives. Children interact and negotiate differently from adults and have, following Mayall (2009), developed into a generation who as a rule do have a say in some of the major decisions that affect their lives. Professionals who work with today's children treat them in a qualitatively different manner than they were treated in the past. New generational orders are being reconfigured as you read these words. That said, the chapter has also outlined many of the challenges for children's welfare citizenship: the 'reforms' of welfare states seek for ever-increasing elements of conditionality; professionals endeavour amidst centralized targets and narrow technocratic procedures in which to achieve them; other intersections of discrimination and inequality are layered on children's struggles; and processes of individualization fragment humans from each other and militate against social solidarity. Reconceptualising citizenship to a focus on the everyday, attention to processes of (mis)recognition and generational ordering are important elements to theorize these processes.

Note

1. It is worth noting here that, following Fraser, it is as important to recognise the material elements necessary for redistribution (see Fraser and Honneth 2003).

References

Alanan, L. 1994. Gender and Generation: Feminism and the "Child Question". In *Childhood Matters: Social Theory, Practice and Politics*, ed. J. Qvortrup, 27–42. Aldershot: Avebury.

Alanan, L. 2009. Generational Order. In *The Palgrave Handbook of Childhood Studies*, ed. J. Qvortrup, W. Corsaro, and M.-S. Honig, 159–174. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Aldridge, J., and Becker, S. 2003. *Children Caring for Parents with Mental Illness: Perspectives of Young Carers, Parents and Professionals*. Bristol: The Policy Press.

Alderson, P. 2013. *Childhoods Real and Imagined*. London: Routledge.

Amin, A. 2009. *The Social Economy: International Perspectives on Economic Solidarity*. London: Zed Books.

Beck-Gernsheim, E. 2002. *Reinventing the Family*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bourdieu, P., A. Accardo, G. Balazs, S. Beaud, F. Bonvin, E. Bourdieu, P. Bourgois, S. Broccolichi, P. Champagne, R. Christin, J. Faguer, S. Garcia, R. Lenoir, F. Œvrard, M. Pialoux, L. Pinto, D. Podalydès, A. Sayad, C. Soulié and L. Wacquant. 1999. *The Weight of the World: Social Suffering in Contemporary Society*, trans. P.P. Ferguson, S. Emanuel, J. Johnson, and S.T. Waryn. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Butler, I., M. Robinson, and L. Scanlan. 2005. *Children and Decision Making*. London: National Children's Bureau in association with JRF.

Cockburn, T., and F. Cleaver. 2009. *How Children and Young People Win Friends and Influence Others: Children and Young People's Association, Their Opportunities, Strategies and Obstacles.* A report to inform the inquiry into the Future of Civil Society in the UK and Ireland. Summer 2009. London: Carnegie UK Trust.

Delanty, G. 2000. *Citizenship in a Global Age*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Delanty, G. 2003. Citizenship as a Learning Process: Disciplinary Citizenship versus Cultural Citizenship. *International Journal of Lifelong Education* 22 (6): 597–605.

Dencik, L. 1995. Modern Childhood in the Nordic Countries: 'Dual Socialisation' and Its Implications. In *Growing Up in Europe. Contemporary horizons in Childhood and Youth Studies*, ed. L. Chisolm, P. Buchner, H.-H. Kruger, and M. du-Bois-Reymond, 105–309. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Desforges, L., R. Jones, and M. Woods. 2005. New Geographies of Citizenship. *Citizenship Studies* 9 (5): 439–451.

Devine, D. 2011. *Immigration and Schooling in the Republic of Ireland*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Dwyer, P., and S. Wright. 2014. Universal Credit, Ubiquitous Conditionality and Its Implications for Social Citizenship. *Journal of Poverty and Social Justice* 22 (1): 27–35.

Layard, R., and J. Dunn. 2009. *The Good Childhood Inquiry*. London: Penguin Books.

Edwards, R., and V. Gillies. 2012. Farewell to Family? Notes on an Argument for Retaining the Concept. *Families, Relationships and Societies* 1 (1): 63–69.

Fitzgerald, R., A. Graham, A. Smith, and N. Taylor. 2010. Children's Participation as a Struggle for Recognition. In *A Handbook of Children and Young People's Participation: Perspectives from Theory and Practice*, ed. B. Percy-Smith, and N. Thomas, 293–305. London: Routledge.

Foucault, M. 1979. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. London: Penguin.

Fraser, N., and A. Honneth. 2003. *Redistribution or Recognition? A Political-philosophical Exchange*. London: Verso.

Frost, N. 2011. *Rethinking Children and Families: The Relationship Between Childhood, Families and the State*. London: Continuum.

Frost, N., and N. Parton. 2009. *Understanding Children's Social Care: Politics, Policy and Practice*. London: Sage.

Gilbert, R., J. Fluke, M. O'Donnell, A. Gonzalez-Izquierdo, M. Brownell, P. Gulliver, and P. Sidebotham. 2012. Child Maltreatment: Variation in Trends and Policies in Six Developed Countries. *The Lancet* 379 (9817): 758–772.

Harvey, D. 2005. *A Brief History of Neoliberalism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Honneth, A. 1995. *The Struggle for Recognition: The Moral Grammar of Social Conflicts*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

James, A., P. Curtis, and J. Birch. 2011. Care and Control in the Construction of Children's Citizenship. In *Children and Citizenship*, ed. J. Williams, and A. Invernezzi, 85–96. London: Sage.

Lansdown, G. 2009. The Realisations of Children's Participation Rights—Critical Reflections. In *A Handbook of Children and Young People's Participation—Perspectives from Theory and Practice*, ed. B. Percy-Smith and N. Thomas. London: Routledge.

Jordan, B. 2007. *Social Work and Well-being*. London: Russell House.

Larkins, C. 2014. *Children's Citizenship in Europe: Learning From the Perspectives of Marginalised Children (in Steps to Engaging Young Children in Research Volume 1: The Guide)*, Project Report. Brighton: Bernard van Leer Foundation.

Lee, E. 2014. Experts and Parenting Culture. In *Parenting Culture Studies*, ed. E. Ellie Lee, J. Bristow, C. Faircloth, and J. Macvarish, 51–75. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Leeson, C. 2007. My Life in Care: Experiences of Non-Participation in Decision-Making Processes in Decision-Making Processes. *Child and Family Social Work* 12 (3): 268–277.

Lister, R., F. Williams, A. Anttonen, J. Bussemaker, U. Gerhard, J. Heinen, S. Johansson, A. Leira, B. Siim, C. Tobio, and A. Gavanas. 2007. *Gendering Citizenship in Western Europe: New Challenges for Citizenship Research in a Cross-National Context*. Bristol: Policy Press.

Lynch, J. 2006. *Age in the Welfare State: The Origins of Social Spending on Pensioners, Workers and Children*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lynch, K., J. Baker, and M. Lyons. 2009. *Affective Equality: Love, Care and Injustice*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Marshall, T.H. 1950/1992. *Citizenship and Social Class*. London: Pluto.

Mayall, B. 2009. Generational Relations at Family Level. In *The Palgrave Handbook of Childhood Studies*, ed. J. Qvortrup, W. Corsaro, and M.-S. Honig, 175–187. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Moosa-Mitha, Mehmoona. 2005. A Difference-Centred Alternative to Theorization of Children's Citizenship Rights. *Citizenship Studies* 9 (4): 369–388.

Munro, E. 2011. *The Munro Review of Child Protection: Final Report A Child Centred* System. London: Department of Education.

Nussbaum, M.C. 2000. *Women and Human Development: The Capabilities Approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Olk, T. 2009. Children, Generational Relations and Intergenerational Relations. In *The Palgrave Handbook of Childhood Studies*, ed. J. Qvortrup, W. Corsaro, and M.-S. Honig, 188–201. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

O'Loughlin, M., and S. O'Loughlin. 2012. *Social Work with Children and Families*. London: Sage.

O'Mahony, P. 2009. The Risk Factors Prevention Paradigm and the Causes of Youth Crime: A Deceptively Useful Analysis? *Youth Justice* 9: 99–114.

Parton, N. 2014. *The Politics of Child Protection*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Payne, M. 2005. *The Origins of Social Work; Continuity and Change*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Percy-Smith, B., and N. Thomas. 2010. *A Handbook of Children and Young People's Participation: Perspectives From Theory and Practice*. London: Routledge.

Pinkney, S. 2013. Trust Relationships Between Children, Social Welfare Professionals and the Organisations of Welfare. In *Participation, Citizenship and Trust in Children's Lives*, ed. H. Warming. London: Palgrave MacMillan.

Qvortrup, J. 2009. Are Children Human Beings or Human Becomings? A Critical Assessment of Outcome Thinking. *Rivista Internazionale di Scienze Sociali* XVII: 631–653.

Sen, A. 1999. *Development as Freedom*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Stein, M. 2009. *Quality Matters in Children's Services: Messages from Research*. London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.

Stoecklin, D., and J.-M. Bonvin. 2013. Capability Approach to Children's Rights: An Outline to Assess Child Participation. In *Expanding Children and Youth's Capabilities: Agency and Participation*, ed. B. Babic, M. Biggeri, C. Hart, and C. Sedmans. London: Bloomsbury.

Stoecklin, D., and J.-M. Bonvin. 2014. Children's Rights and the Capability Approach. In *Children's Well-Being: Indicators and Research*, ed. A. Ben-Arieh. Dordrecht: Springer.

Thomas, N. 2012. Using Honneth's Theory of Recognition to Understand Children and Childhood. Jyväskylä: Paper Delivered at European Sociological Association RN04 Mid-term Symposium.

Tisdall, K., and J. Davis. 2004. Making a Difference? Bringing Children's and Young People's Views into Policy-Making. *Children and Society* 18: 131–142.

UNICEF (2007) *Child Poverty in Perspective: An Overview of Child Well-being in Rich Countries*. Innocenti Report Card 7. Florence: UNICEF Innocenti Research Centre.

Unwin, J. 2009. *Contemporary Social Evils*. Bristol: Policy Press.

Wall, J. 2016. *Children's Rights: Today's Global Challenge*. Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield.

Warming, H. 2015. The Life of Children in Care in Denmark—A Struggle Over Recognition? *Childhood* 22 (2): 248–262.

Warming, H. 2013. Theorising Trust. In *Participation, Citizenship and Trust in Children's Lives*, ed. H. Warming. London: Palgrave MacMillan.

Warming, H. 2011. Children's Participation and Citizenship in a Global Age: Empowerment, Tokenism or Discriminatory Disciplining? *Social Work & Society* 9 (1): 119–134.
Warming, H. 2006. 'How Can You Know? You're Not a Foster Child': Dilemmas and Possibilities of Giving Voice to Children in Foster Care. *Children, Youth and Environments* 16 (2): 28–50.
Yuval-Davis, N. 1997. *Gender and Nation*. London: Sage.

Author Biography

Professor Tom Cockburn is currently Head of Department of Social Sciences at Edge Hill, after working at the Universities of Bradford and Manchester Metropolitan University. Over the past twenty years he has undertaken research into children and young people with various charities and government organisations. He has published on a wide variety of issues concerning children and young people. His single authored book for Palgrave MacMillan entitled 'Rethinking Children's Citizenship: Theory, Rights and Interdependence' explored theories of children's citizenship.

From Objects of Care to Citizens—Young Carers' Citizenship

Anne Wihstutz

Introduction

This chapter explores children's care practices in the Global North and Global South as lived citizenship, conditioned by welfare policies and local social work practices, intervening with discourses on childhood, welfare and citizenship.

Hegemonic understanding of childhood has placed children at the lower margins of society. Western Modernity's concept of 'the child' has been exported globally through international developmental aid and supranational organizations, such as the IMF and the World Bank, and in the field of social work and education, figuring the child as a dependent being, vulnerable, not yet finished and in need of socialization, as children are deemed more of nature than culture (Cordero Arce 2015). Boyden (2003, 5) speaks of a 'paradigm of vulnerability and dependence'.

A. Wihstutz (✉)
Protestant University of Applied Sciences, Berlin, Germany
e-mail: Wihstutz@eh-berlin.de

H. Warming and K. Fahnøe (eds.), *Lived Citizenship on the Edge of Society*,
Palgrave Politics of Identity and Citizenship Series, DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-55068-8_9

The conviction that a 'proper' childhood involves being reared by parents within a secure domestic setting and secluded from the dangers of the adult world is underlying, implying childhood as time free of social and economic responsibility, and marked by learning and play, distant from hardship, work and misfortune. It is upon these conditions that children's happiness and fulfilment are seen to depend (Boyden 2003, 5). It is terms such as 'children bereft of their childhood' or 'the right to childhood' for children which refer to this paradigm of vulnerability. In terms of the liberal understanding of citizenship, children are seen as citizens-in-the-making (see chapter "Towards a Pragmatic Approachto Children's Citizenship: The Case of School Social Work in France"). We find a picture of children depicted as 'becomings' rather than 'beings'. This notion of childhood propels children as citizens of the future—citizen workers, parents and military defenders of their nation-state (Mierendorff 2010).

The focus of this paper is on children shouldering responsibility in their family. Care-giving children can be referred to as 'children out of place'. The term not only refers to (urban city) spaces but also to activities performed by children, apparently outside adult supervision, dislocated from the places that are commonly regarded as 'normal' for Western, Modern, middle-class children, like family homes, schools and clubs organized by adults (Connolly and Ennew 1996, 133).[1]

With its focus on intimate care relationships authored by children, the paper's aim is to contribute to the theoretical discussion on 'lived' and 'intimate citizenship' as practised and experienced in everyday life. Care is discussed as a practice through which both children and adults understand and negotiate rights, responsibilities, participation and identity (Lister 2007). (Children's) citizenship is conceptualized as emerging from the multiple everyday interactions of people in their struggle to belong, have their contributions recognized and access society's resources. The paper shares the understanding of citizenship referring to a processual understanding of positioning, identity shaping and subjective experiences. Regarding 'inclusive citizenship', experiences of difference and symbolic power relationships are discussed as crucial for a contextualized understanding of meaning and power (re-)producing practices by care-giving children (Moosa-Mitha 2005).

Citizenship takes place not only in the public, but also in the intimate, in the so-called private, domestic, neighbourhood, etc. The

so-called public–private divide locates children in this field. Feminist scholars have analysed how care work in the so-called private sector is not only conditioned by welfare policies and practices, but, as such, also contributes to society's wealth and value production. I argue for a recognition of care work in the entitlement to social rights. Children as actors and agents, i.e. as subjects of care, are missing in this discourse of care work, as will be discussed in the following.

My argument begins with a brief outline of citizenship conceptualized historically and by liberal theory. My analysis is informed by feminist and post-colonial theory and points to its exclusionary effect for women, non-white men and women, non-economically well-situated people, and children. From this critique, my argument develops further to ask for feminist theoretical approaches to the citizenship debate. One core issue of concern is the dualism created between the public and private, leading to (economic) dependency and marginalization of people and their contributions to society, thereby discriminating against their social, cultural, economic and, in the case of children, their political rights. The term 'intimate citizenship' is employed to emphasize the interconnectedness of the public with the so-called private sector. The term 'care-citizen' highlights the importance of care work to society and calls for a recognition of care as a practice of citizenship. This leads my argument to the question: Who defines needs and what needs are considered right; what is the 'right way to participate'? To focus on 'different ways of participation', on struggles based on experiences of different means, as is implied in the concept of 'inclusive citizenship', raises the question of needs definition and power relationships.

In the second part of this chapter, my theoretical demonstration is discussed with empirical research findings on children giving care (for findings from the Global North, see Metzing 2007; Metzing-Blau and Schrepp 2008; Jones et al. 2002; Evans and Becker 2009; for findings from the Global South, see Payne 2012; Evans and Becker 2009). The offer of social services is examined regarding the potentially disempowering effects on the citizenship of care-giving children parted from their daily lived experience. This leads my argument to moral boundaries and their transgression in the figure of the 'care-giving child'.

Finally, I propose the usefulness of the concept of care as an analytical tool for the theoretical debate on citizenship. Care, as it is understood here, is discussing care relationships as embedded in asymmetrical power relationships, and paying attention to structural inequality. I conclude my argument by observing that vulnerability, independence, rights and responsibilities are societal issues, and care-giving children can be analysed in these terms as citizens struggling for recognition and equal access to resources. The consequences of such an understanding for social work practice with care-giving children and families are referred to.

Citizenship and Exclusion

Citizenship in ancient Greece was, above all, a political ideal, circulating around the idea of political participation as a civil duty and as the highest calling through which the citizen's full potential as a political being was realized. Liberal traditions developed since the seventeenth century conceptualize the citizen as a bearer of both civil and political rights: they are the guarantee of the freedom and formal equality of the individual, who is sovereign (Hobson and Lister 2002, 24). Citizenship meant being recognized as belonging and participating in a group where one is expected to do certain things, fulfil certain obligations, in return for certain rights (Plummer 2003, 65).

Feminist and post-colonialist scholars have contested this understanding of liberal citizenship and have shown it to be exclusive, male-oriented and racialized, and, as such, disembodied, representing the necessary qualities of impartiality, rationality, independence and political agency.

Childhood scholars have contested the very idea of an autonomous and independent rational being and argue for an approach respecting interdependencies, responsiveness and responsibility towards the different 'other' (Moosa-Mitha 2005; Wall 2008; Warming 2011). The debate on citizenship is thereby opened up to include children and their perspectives based on different experiences due to structural social inequality and oppression, such as age (Cockburn 2005a).

> The delineation of public and private spheres into masculine and feminine domains was inscribed in the Enlightenment narratives of the origins of contract and citizenship rights and obligations. Male citizens were accorded rights and duties as rational beings capable of exercising them; women were codified as non-citizens outside the public sphere, set apart by their dependency, their lack of civil rights and political agency, and their relegation to the private world of the family and domestic life. (Hobson et al. 2002, 14)

As Mills (1997) emphasizes, the contract of citizenship rights was not only sexist, but racist from the onset, discriminating against people and securing privileges for only a few, thereby reintroducing social status by birth ('race') (Mills 1997).

Citizenship conceptualized as such does not only discriminates and excludes women, but also men not identified as 'white, heterosexual and able-bodied', such as prisoners, immigrants, the poor and 'black' men. Through lack of resources and the denial of employment and social rights, these groups of men are also excluded from full participation in the community. We can add refugees, asylum seekers and children to the groups of the excluded. The first group is denied full access to society's resources due to their legal status; the latter is excluded by definition of competence based on abstract and adultist age concepts.

'Lack of recognition implies exclusion and marginalization from "full participation" in the community; thus recognition struggles are struggles for participation and influences over the boundaries and meaning of citizenship' (Hobson and Lister 2002, 41). Non-recognition is thus considered a form of oppression.

A central topic in difference-centred theoretical approaches is what could be called the everyday struggle for participation as citizens. Individuals or groups of people are interacting in multiple-complex relationships and thereby share different experiences. Their experiences of exclusion and discrimination also differ depending on their status, respectively, gender, religion, race, class, age, physical and/or mental ability, and sexual orientation. These dimensions are intersecting, impacting on identity-building processes.

It is these multiple relationships and struggles of people to belong that shape their identities and their struggle for equal rights and social participation (Moosa-Mitha 2005). Their understanding and fight for citizenship are, thus, an expression of a multitude of relationships, inflected by identity, social positioning, cultural assumptions, institutional practices and a sense of belonging (see Hobson and Lister 2002, 23). Ignoring the different needs, claims, situations, subjectivities and identities of individuals and groups of people means perpetuating exclusion. Exclusionary pressures embedded in 'universalism' need to be identified as false universalism and contested.

'In focusing on specific contexts and practices, feminist scholars have asked us to consider when difference makes a difference in particular societal contexts' (Hobson and Lister 2002, 48). The way out of the dilemma may be, as Hobson and Lister (2002, 48) argue, in combining integration of universalistic principles with pluralistic perspectives.

Feminist Theoretical Approaches to Citizenship

It has been generations of scholars of feminist theory who have delineated the interconnectedness of the so-called private and public spheres. They have shed light on the family and domestic work to highlight their importance for the calculus of social wealth production. The framing of social rights was extended to include family and domestic rights and responsibilities. Simultaneously, they analysed the exclusionary effects of the public–private divide on the genders and demonstrated how deeply embedded the so-called private sphere lies within a matrix of power relations and its interconnectedness with the public and the political (Plummer 2003). Families and family life are structured through laws and politics; the reproduction of gender and power relations between children and adults are patterned here. While feminist scholars have developed the analysis of gender discrimination strongly, the perspective on discrimination by adults on children falls short in feminist analysis (Taefi 2009).

The interlinkages between patriarchy and generational ordering in capitalist societies of Modernity, indicating its 'exclusionary' effects on children from political, social, cultural and economic processes, were

pointed out early (Elson 1982), leading to children's 'privatization' (Zeiher 1996; Zelizer 1994).

The concept of 'intimate citizenship' (Plummer 2003) emphasizes the interconnectedness between the so-called private and the public and political sphere. The term 'intimate citizenship' deals with this 'messiness of human experience'; it is 'stuffed full with life' (Plummer 2003, 97–98), with a concern to discover how people engage with ceaseless rounds of moral problems in the course of their daily lives. Intimate citizenship as a concept shares a concern for spatial aspects, including the intimate and domestic; thus, conceptually, it also allows a focus on intimate practices such as care (giving and receiving).

The term 'citizen carer' in social policy and welfare state analysis has been developed to emphasize the understanding that citizens are both wage workers and unpaid carers (Leira and Saraceno 2002, 71). The aim is to focus the attention of policies and social rights to address both dimensions, which is again challenging the narrow definition of work as paid work. It is this narrow definition of paid work that underpins dominant discourses on citizenship obligations. Defining citizenship to include care responsibilities broadens the concept of work, i.e. value production to incorporate care work and community service.

Joan Tronto (1993) understands care as all-encompassing human activity, covering 'everything we do to maintain, continue, and repair our "world" so that we can live in it as well as possible. That world includes our bodies, ourselves, and our environment, all of which we seek to interweave in a complex, life-sustaining web' (Tronto 1993, 103). Others have called this an ecological approach in citizenship debates (Hobson and Lister 2002, 36). A core concern in care ethics is how caring responsibilities are best met, taking account of the needs of both care-givers and care-receivers.

A broadened concept of citizenship which includes the most personal or private areas of life, regulations of our bodies, family constellations and sexuality represents a constant stretching and pulling of boundaries. It implies the recognition of multiple, hierarchically layered and contested public spheres and many voices and different conceptual structures (Plummer 2003, 72).

While Plummer has in mind 'communities' of LTGB, transpersons, homosexuals, etc., I will discuss this concept aimed at a specific group of marginalized people: so-called persons of underage, i.e. young people with care responsibility in their families.

Young carers or care-giving children are defined in this paper as people below the age of 18 years, who often take on practical and/or emotional caring responsibilities for a member of their family and kin.[2] They spend time near the person in need of care, to be there for him or her: they give physical help and do household chores, shopping, cleaning and cooking; they may look after younger siblings and provide emotional support (Carers Trust 2016). In this chapter, I discuss young carers and children heading households synonymously, based on the definition of child-headed households (CHHs) offered by Payne (2012), 'in which adults or guardians are either absent or not fully functioning in terms of providing for the material and emotional needs of children' (Payne 2012, 399). In both cases, children are care-givers in an all-encompassing sense.

Vulnerability and Citizenship

'The right of dependent persons to receive care implies that care provision is the responsibility (or right) of somebody else. When it comes to very dependent people, the moral norms of society demand that their needs be met. In this sense, care is an obligation, or a moral responsibility of all members of society' (Leira and Saraceno 2002, 73).

The term 'inclusive citizenship' (Knijn and Kremer 1997) encompasses the right to care not only concerning the right *to give care* or prioritizing care over other activities, but also as *the right to receive care* when in need (Leira and Saraceno 2002, 74). Moosa-Mitha (2005) discusses inclusive citizenship as 'the right to participate differently' in the social institutions and culture of society. The question that needs to be asked is what is the 'right way' to participate, who is in the position to define and who defines needs, how are they defined and who is in the position to define needs of others (Fraser 1989). This question centres politically around the process of 'needs interpretation' at both a collective and individual level (see Lister 1997, 101; Woodhead 1997).[3]

While the character of informal care work within families, its challenges, risks and the empowering effects of (informal) care have been described thoroughly, with a special emphasis on the asymmetrical power relations in which care is embedded, attention to children as care-givers is scarce in care discourse. Children as informal care workers are generally not taken into account in (public) care debates (exception UK; EUROCARERS 2016). Children figure as objects of care and as care-receivers in feminist debates on care work (Winker 2015).[4]

Young Carer's[5] Doings and Thinking

In the following, we will focus on the attitudes and practices of those who have limited access to society's resources, such as care-giving children or CHHs, and analyse their reasoning as 'thinking' and 'doing' (Payne 2012). My analysis is based primarily on the doctoral thesis of Sabine Metzing and her research into young care-giving children and their families in Germany.[6] My discussion also comprises a secondary analysis of the empirical works of Ruth Payne in communities in Zambia on CHHs (Payne 2012). Young carers share similar responsibilities with CHHs, a term often used in the context of families affected by HIV in Southern Africa, concerning their activities and attitudes. When a parent in a household with dependent family members falls ill, not only is the family system affected, but also the neighbourhood and community (Metzing-Blau and Schnepp 2008, npn). Everyday life changes and has to be reorganized. Parent–child activities or shared time is reduced, also due to periods of hospitalization, and financial shortages become a permanent concern.

Care-giving children structure their daily routine, the routine of other family members (e.g. young siblings, ill parents), take decisions on how to spend money (prioritize money spending), interpret and reflect on situations to decide, respectively, and administer medication. They take over active parts in the construction and maintenance of family life. The main objective of assuming responsibility is to keep the family together. Hence, they become involved in all areas of care and housekeeping.

Care-giving children are involved in similar activities and show a similar attitude to adult informal carers: They take over tasks which are left unaccomplished because of the illness. The 'availability of children' (Metzing-Blau and Schnepp 2008) makes them prone to participate in care activities. Children's care-involvement may differ according to the competencies developed and the seriousness of the illness, and also depending upon other potential family or external support and the family's economic situation (Metzing-Blau and Schnepp 2008, npn; Jones et al. 2002; for CHH, see Payne 2012).

Motives and Meanings

The care-giving of children involved in care is an activity and attitude into which they may grow gradually or experience as 'necessary': Their family relies on their responsible contribution.

"My siblings are little, I cannot say, 'I can't stand it any longer' (…), I must be there for them, that's where the power comes from." And she adds: "because it's my family, (…) I want to be there for my family" (14-year-old girl in Metzing-Blau and Schnepp 2008, npn).

Apart from the motive of affection for their ill parent and other family members, their motives for caring evolve from a sense of morality. "That's not what I learned when growing up, to walk out on someone and say: 'Just do your shit alone.'" (18-year-old boy); and a 17-year-old girl responds: 'I would never forgive myself if I wouldn't do it' (Metzing Blau and Schnepp 2008, npn).

Empirical research on care-giving children describes the complexity of care relationships. Children are shown to be aware of the need for care, and they notice the need to intervene and subsequently take care of and assume responsibility for care-giving. At the same time, they are described as care-receivers (Jones et al. 2002; Miller 2005; Metzing 2007).

In other words, their participation is contextual and particular, their moral reasoning 'address[es] specific needs throughout a process of empathy and the "activity of care"' (Lister 1997, 100). Tronto (1993) speaks of four elements comprising an ethic of care: attentiveness, responsibility, competence and responsiveness (Wihstutz and Schiwarov 2016).[7]

The idea of interdependency in care ethics is similar to what has been called 'children-sized-citizenship' (Wall 2013): the idea of broad human interdependence rather than of (adult) individual autonomy as inscribed in liberal concepts of citizenship (Wall 2013). Such a 'childist' theoretical approach has its focal point in the *response-ability* to the lived experiences of differences.

Research findings with children shouldering responsibility as so-called heads of households emphasize children's (and their kin's) ambiguity concerning their everyday life and family responsibilities. Based on her research in urban and rural Zambia, Payne develops a concept of 'everyday agency'. The term 'everyday' is meant to mark a difference to a concept of child agency which is understood in terms of 'crisis agency' based on 'coping' and 'need', suggesting a focus on deficit and, consequently, extraordinary, unusual, 'unnormal' (survival) strategies by children (Payne 2012, 405; see Pantea 2013 for the agency of children with work-migrating parents). Categories such as orphan child, CHH, young carer and refugee reduce children to limited aspects of their life which are based on notions of vulnerability and 'in crisis', and focus on deficits.[8] As Payne and others argue, children perceive their lives as much more complex. They picture themselves as social agents in their everyday life (Payne 2012, 400; Robson et al. 2006). For children, carrying out responsibilities can be a cause of pride because it enables the fulfilment of a sense of duty to the family (Evans and Becker 2009). The CHHs also articulate pride in exerting (adult) responsibilities (Payne 2012). At the same time, children in responsibility when asked, express ambivalence about undertaking responsibility for family members; these are often contradictory feelings. They express the need for help *and* recognition.

Intimidating Social Services?!

Children who shoulder responsibility for their family have been categorized as a 'social problem in which expressions of agency run contrary to the mainstream moral and social order in society' (Payne 2012, 401; see also Pantea 2013).

Since the policy shift towards neo-liberal market orientation in all segments of society, normative expectations on 'good childhood' have had an impact. In economic terms, the focus on children and childhood has increasingly become an issue for human capital development theory. With the expansion of market mechanisms in the Global North and South since the 1980s, neo-liberalism has become a thoroughly political programme, hand in hand with a restructuring of welfare state policy towards an economic orientation in educational and social policy (Scheer 2014, 268).

In tandem with the ongoing economization of social, educational, health, housing policy, and the introduction of the concept of human capital investment policy, as in early education programmes, a shift towards the logic of security (securitization) throughout society is notable: in social services and health services, there is a growing concern about risk minimization, increasing documentation, control and monitoring. Children and childhood are increasingly interpreted in terms of 'risk' (see Hasselhorn et al. 2014, for an overview; Betz 2014, for Germany), with social interventions in families' private lives. Children taking on responsibility for family members are considered both as a risk to themselves and to wider society. Children count, therefore, as highly vulnerable, as children 'at risk' and in need of (social) intervention, i.e. as 'risky children'.

The general addressee of social services and social provision is usually the parental custodian or the services address the family as such.

Payne in her analysis of service provision to so-called CHHs concludes that support programmes run the danger of addressing the issues in under-complex ways, as their primary focus is on the risks rather than on the multifaceted and changing lives of children 'at risk' (Payne 2012, 402). She also points out that children in responsibility or 'at risk' are not a homogeneously disadvantaged group of children. To respect and recognize the specific life experience and perspectives of these children, (not only) service provision would need to take into account the heterogeneity of contexts, situations and biographies of children and their families to be fructuous.

Metzing discovers strategies developed by children and their families to avoid 'help' by social services. The strategy they develop is to

employ a code of silence (Metzing 2007). Families fear to inform others about children's care-giving or head of household responsibility. Pantea (2013), with reference to minors in Rumania with migrating parents, discusses children's strategies as 'slantwise actions' of resistance to institution-provided interference in their everyday life. Rather than a resource for support, social services are seen as potential and threatening danger to their families, an unwanted interference.

While intending to help, meliorate or even to put into practice children's rights for these children, social services, with a deficit orientation and a strong normative orientation on what 'good childhood' should be, may indeed work contradictively to their own onset.

In the following, we will discuss categories such as 'out of place' and 'on the edge' regarding young carers transgressing space and moral boundaries.

Transgression of Space and Lived Citizenship

Transgression implies a physical or imagined border that is overstepped or disrespected. Transgression does not necessarily mean an intended violation of borders or a willing breaking of limits. It could, however, be an effect of passing over or crossing borders, also of moral boundaries. It is in the moral boundaries debate where it is decided who is in or out.

Due to their generational position, children who have responsibility for family members, by definition, collide with the concept of childhood—of being vulnerable and dependent children. They not only transgress moral boundaries through their shouldering of responsibility for their parents and kin. They try, in physical and material terms, to overcome deprivation and hardship by taking charge of their own lives and that of their kin. Rather than being passive victims of circumstances, these children are actively seeking alternatives, i.e. developing strategies 'out-of place' (Connolly and Ennew 1996).

Considered 'a child', they are, however, denied full access to society's resources, effectively increasing their hardship. At the same time, depending on the context and situation, children as carers experience

themselves as invested with power, while their kin are in need of their help (Jones et al. 2002). This, in turn, is also considered a transgression of moral boundaries.

In terms of the citizenship of care-giving children, we can argue with Yuval-Davis (1997) for a multi-tiered construct of citizenship (Hobson and Lister 2002, 41) which acknowledges children in their needs as physically developing beings and as family members with parents missing or unable to care for their children, and as members of their specific communities to which they contribute by sustaining family life. Children, similar to adults, are members in various collectivities (e.g. school, neighbourhood, religious and/or sporting clubs). This recognizes that children (individuals) are not bound by one group identity, and these boundaries of belonging are continually being recast (Hobson and Lister 2002, 41).

The concept of 'intimate citizenship' may prove to be a useful sensitizing tool to raise awareness of the everyday struggles of children who do not fit in 'correctly' and are, therefore, considered 'not-in'. It is through the opening of the concept to spatial aspects that the intimate becomes part of the local, urban, regional and global struggles for citizenship. Such an intimate 'embodied view' of citizenship allows one to focus on the spaces where citizenship is actually expressed (Lister 2007, 55).

This is where care-giving can be discussed in terms of intimate citizenship. To discuss care-giving in such terms is asking to transgress the domain of binary and excluding thinking, as is found in the split of public–private spheres, in binary concepts of autonomy versus dependency, and in the concept of division of work into reproductive work here and productive work there. It is opening the perspective to children's citizenship, transgressing moral concepts of 'good childhood' and 'good adulthood', respectively (Wihstutz 2016).

Care as an Analytical Instrument to Citizenship

To think of care practice in terms of citizenship implies uncovering power relationships as unjustly inscribed in society's structures. Feminist scholars such as Joan Tronto and the activist-research group of '*Precarias*

a la deriva' from Madrid (2004) have developed alternative concepts to liberal citizenship based on a revaluation of care wherein care is conceptualized as life practice (Precarias a la Deriva 2004), as attitude and practice (Tronto 1993). Their focus is set on everyday life struggle understood as a concrete practice and as activities aiming at and generating alternative ways of living, based on an understanding of vulnerability of the human person and his or her need to belong to social communities (Precarias a la Deriva 2004, 114).

The care concept is based on interdependent relationships, inclusive of emotions and covering all life. Concerning care-giving and care-receiving, all people are conceptualized as potentially in both circumstances. Looking at this level of relationships, the concept of citizenship no longer focuses on the individual—state-axis, but on the multitude of relationships in which individuals interact; focusing on care relationships, these are interrelationships of emotional, psychological, social and economical importance.

Through a focus based on care, our perception may be refined to discover tensions and conflicts on a micrological and mesological level: gestures of refusal, rebellious actions and attitudes embedded in care relationships, and in attempts of solidarity and joined activity with others to improve the situation (Precarias a la Deriva 2004).[9]

However, against the context of the social status of children as 'underage' and not equally treated members of society, care arrangements such as with CHH or young carers also need be interrogated in terms of the potential for violence contained within. At the same time, care-giving children's non-conforming agency may be open to analysis and discussed in terms of lived citizenship.

On the Edge?!

Sociological works on generational orderings of society have made important theoretical contributions to children's agency in terms of their active involvement in the shaping of their positioning and influencing their surroundings (Cockburn 2005b; Wall 2014). Both children and adults are discussed as actively (re-)shaping and (re-)producing positions

within the general order of society (Bühler-Niederberger 2005). Bühler-Niederberger coined the term 'child complicity', analysing children's 'acting like' children as beneficiary to children in specific situations (ibid.). Similarly, Plummer (2003, 83) argues there are reasons for identity to be 'a matter not only of ontology but also of a strategy'. Spivak speaks of 'strategic essentialism' (ibid.). This is called a political strategy that is applied at times when it becomes politically necessary, to adopt the position that identities are more fixed, certain and 'essential', knowing that these are not so (Plummer 2003, 83). This leaves us with the question: When is it necessary to emphasize the 'difference' between children and adults? And when is it right to insist on children's universal claims to gain access to full rights and to wholesome citizenship?

Concluding Discussion

In an attempt to theorize citizenship in a way that is inclusive regarding individuals and groups of people living 'at the edge' of society, vulnerable groups, we have shown established concepts of rights, dependence, vulnerability and autonomy to work ambiguously. The precise rights that are 'awarded' to children by adults in which children can participate or be listened to are reproducing their dependence, children's marginalization and infantilization, i.e. they reaffirm the adult's structuring of society. And yet it is this framework within which children and adults live, fight and struggle, i.e. try to work their way.

In this chapter, I have shed light on the everyday practices, institutions and discourses in the empirical contexts of young carers. Such a perspective opens analysis to the ways and means children make use or reinterpret their citizenship in everyday life, or, said differently, how 'the rights in the hands of children, in their disposition', in their making is expressed. It is through the lens of 'lived citizenship' we can look at how 'people understand and negotiate rights and responsibilities, belonging and participation and the meaning that citizenship actually has in people's lives and the ways in which people's social and cultural backgrounds and material circumstances affect their lives as citizens' (Lister 2007, 55). It requires taking into account differences in perspectives due

to asymmetrical power relationships and discriminating life experiences, the need to solidarize across differences, to fight jointly, as has been emphasized by feminist struggles, civil rights movements and working children's movement.

Care working children are confronted with at least three intersecting discriminatory structures: age, the place (the 'private') and the character of their work—care as non-work. Other structural factors, such as poverty ('classism'), long-term illness (ableism) and gender (sexism), all count for most children and families too. Children as carers in family relationships have not gone 'on strike' or marched on the streets. In the Global North, it is self-help organizations of former young carers that have raised awareness regarding the case of young carers and argue for better support structures. In the Global South, working children have begun to mobilize publicly for their rights and citizenship, and to solidarize with other social groups in their social and political struggles (Cordero Arce 2015).[10]

In terms of citizenship, we can refer to their claim as a politics of 'recognition and respect'.[11] In terms of social work, children demand to be listened to, their experiences and strategies of problem-solving to be respected and to be involved on equal terms in decision-making processes (Metzing 2007; Payne 2012; Pantea 2013). This means to have access to information, to have access to counselling and social and material support respecting children's agency. In terms of social support structures, children claim to be included in processes to develop strategies for improvement based on their experience. This includes children's entitlement to social resources.

All attempts to open up citizenship to include everyday practice, to recognize its momentum character, cannot conceal the fact that 'citizenship' is foreclosed on certain ideas, thereby excluding the 'bad guys', those not able to or not willing to fit in (Plummer 2003, 64).[12]

Nancy Fraser argues for a synthesis of needs and right talk, which would allow the translation of justified needs claims into social rights (Hobson and Lister 2002, 28). The question that arises: 'Whose needs should be met?' is situated, thus, in a highly contested arena. Supposed domestic issues or personal dilemmas become political. As I have tried to expound, vulnerability is not one-sided, just as care-giving is not one-directional. In Plummer's terminology, the concept of citizenship

will become more complex or 'messier', once the notions of boundaries, rights and duties, obligations and responsibilities, and identities are problematized and placed in a context of inequalities (Plummer 2003).

The challenge remains to defend universal claims of human rights while respecting difference and differences. With an emphasis on social justice and care ethics, respecting the multiple identities and belongings of children, women and men, it seems timely for a paradigmatic shift to a more wholesome understanding of citizenship, an inclusive citizenship based on the Universal Claims of Human Rights and an ethics of care. The challenge for social work is to develop and to put into practice an attitude of respect and responsiveness to the experience of social inequality and of differences literally embodied by children, the homeless, migrants and refugees, i.e. by all those groups of people and individuals who have been pushed to the edge of society, while, at the same time, to develop strategies against discrimination.

Notes

1. For the discussion of the significance of urban space, homelessness and citizenship see also the contribution by Tom Hall in this book.
2. In Australia, the term 'young carer' includes young people up to the age of 25 years giving care to a relative on a regular basis.
3. It is through the emergence of organisations among the disabled and elderly that a debate has intensified on the divergent needs and interests within caring relationships: between carers and care-recipients (see Leira and Saraceno 2002, 76). Lately, attention has also increased regarding the needs and interests of children involved in care (EUROCARERS 2016).
4. Research into the meaning to children of their care-giving to kin is only awakening (see e.g. for southern Africa and UK, Evans and Becker 2009). With an exception in UK where research started as early as in the late 1980s. In Germany, it is only recently that care-giving children have become an issue for an expert hearing in parliament (Deutscher Bundestag 2014).
5. I use the term care-giving children, care-givers and young carers synonymously in this paper, sharing the critique: children and youth, and

parents have also criticized the term as emphasising only one aspect in a parent-child relationship, discounting other important aspects of care, support, responsibility between parents and children, and between children and other family or household members that remain despite the illness of the parent (Miller 2005; Jones et al. 2002).

6. Metzing's research at the University of Witten Herdecke covers a period of 16 months, in which she held 81 semi-structured interviews with 34 families, including 41 interviews with children aged 4.5 to 19 years, and 41 interviews with their parents and grandparents (Metzing 2007).
7. "An ethics of care involves different moral concepts: responsibilities and relationships rather than rules and rights. Second, it is bound to concrete situations rather than (being) formal and abstract. And thirdly, the ethics of care can be described as moral activity, 'the activity of caring', rather than a set of principles which can be simply followed. The central question in the ethics of care—how to deal with dependency and responsibility—differs radically from that of rights ethics—which are the highest normative principles and rights in the situations of moral conduct" (Sevenhuijsen 1998 in Plummer 2003, 114).
8. This list of 'empirical children' shouldering responsibility can be extended to children travelling alone, unaccompanied minor refugee children, children-left-behind, children acting as language interpreters for their kin, etc.
9. The term used by the Spanish group is *cuidania*, hinting at *ciudania*—the Spanish term for citizenship. A pun originally developed as a concept to deconstruct exclusive and excluding grounds of liberal concepts of citizenship (Precarias a la deriva 2004, 129).
10. It was *les petites bonnes*, domestic workers in Western Africa who called for the first demonstration of child workers and, thus, founded the working children's movement in Africa (Liebel et al. 2008).
11. These have been identified as being shared by a multitude of initiatives, all sharing the standpoint of being excluded (Lister 2007, 50f). Their four basic values are grounded in justice, recognition, self-determination and solidarity.
12. The idea of a momentum hints at a continuous reworking of the citizenship concept in terms of ever unfolding.

References

Betz, T. 2014. Risks in Early Childhood. Reconstructing Notions of Risk in Political Reports on Children and Childhood in Germany. *Child Indicators Research* 7 (4): 769–786. doi:10.1007/s12187-013-9211-9. Accessed 18 Jan 2017.

Boyden, J. 2003. Children Under Fire: Challenging Assumptions About Children's Resilience. *Children, Youth, Environments* 13 (1).

Bühler-Niederberger, D. 2005. *Kindheit und die Ordnung der Verhältnisse: Von der gesellschaftlichen Unschuld und dem kreativen Individuum*. Weinheim: Juventa.

Carers Trust. 2016. What is a Young Carer? https://www.carers.org/what-young-carer. Accessed 18 Jan 2017.

Cockburn, T. 2005a. Children and the Feminist Ethic of Care. *Childhood* 12 (1): 71–89.

Cockburn, T. 2005b. Children as Participative Citizens. *Journal of Social Sciences* 9: 19–29.

Connoly, M., and J. Ennew. 1996. Introduction: Children Out of Place. *Childhood* 3 (2): 131–145.

Cordero Arce, M. 2015. Maturing Children's Rights Theory. From Children, with Children, of Children. *International Journal of Children's Rights* 23 (2): 283–331.

Deutscher Bundestag. 2014. Kinder kranker Eltern brauchen Hilfe. Ausschuss für Familie, Senioren, Frauen und Jugend. http://www.bundestag.de/presse/hib/2014_05/-/280432. Accessed 18 Jan 2017.

Elson, D. 1982. The Differentiation of Children's Labour in the Capitalist Labour Market. *Development and Change* 13 (4): 479–497.

EUROCARERS. 2016. Press Release—Young Carers Across the EU Must Receive Specific Attention. http://www.eurocarers.org/young-carers-across-the-EU-must-receive-specific-attention. Accessed 23 Feb 2016.

Evans, R., and S. Becker. 2009. *Children Caring for Parents with HIV and AIDS. Global Issues and Policy Responses*. Bristol: Policy Press.

Fraser, N. 1989. Women, Welfare and the Politics of Need Interpretation. In *Politics and Social Theory*, ed. P. Lassman, 104–122. London: Routledge.

Hasselhorn, M., S. Andresen, B. Becker, T. Betz, M. Leuzinger-Bohleber, and J. Schmid. 2014. Children at Risk of Poor Educational Outcomes: Theoretical Concepts and Empirical Results [Special Issue]. *Child Indicators Research* 7: 695–697.

Hobson, B., R. Lister, and B. Siim. 2002. Introduction: Contested Concepts in Gender and Social Politics. In *Contested Concepts in Gender and Social Politics*, ed. B. Hobson, J. Lewis, and B. Siim, 1–22. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Hobson, B., and R. Lister. 2002. Citizenship. In *Contested Concepts in Gender and Social Politics*, ed. B. Hobson, J. Lewis, and B. Siim, 23–25. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Jones, A., D. Jeyasingham, and S. Rajasooriya. 2002. *Invisible Families. The Strengths and Needs of Black Families in Which Young People Have Caring Responsibilities*. Bristol: Policy Press.

Knijn, T., and M. Kremer. 1997. Gender and the Caring Dimension of Welfare States: Towards Inclusive Citizenship. *Social Politics* 4 (3): 328–361.

Leira, A., and C. Saraceno. 2002. Care: Actors, Relationships and Contexts. In *Contested Concepts in Gender and Social Politics*, ed. B. Hobson, J. Lewis, and B. Siim, 55–83. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Liebel, M., I. Nnaji, and A. Wihstutz. 2008. *Kinder. Arbeit. Menschenwürde. Internationale Beiträge zu den Rechten arbeitender Kinder*. Frankfurt a. M.: IKO.

Lister, R. 1997. *Citizenship: Feminist Perspectives*. Basingstoke: Macmillan.

Lister, R. 2007. Inclusive Citizenship: Realizing the Potential. *Citizenship Studies* 11 (1): 49–61.

Metzing, S. 2007. *Kinder und Jugendliche als pflegende Angehörige. Erleben und Gestalten familialer Pflege*. Bern: H. Huber.

Metzing-Blau, S., and W. Schnepp. 2008. Young Carers in Germany: To Live on as Normal as Possible—A Grounded Theory Study. *BMC Nursing* 7: 15. http://www.biomedcentral.com/1472-6955/7/15. Accessed 18 Jan 2017.

Mierendorff, J. 2010. *Kindheit und Wohlfahrtsstaat. Entstehung, Wandel und Kontinuität des Musters moderner Kindheit*. Weinheim: Juventa.

Miller, P. 2005. Useful and Priceless Children in Contemporary Welfare States. *Social Politics* 12 (1): 3–41.

Mills, C.W. 1997. *The Racial Contract*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Moosa-Mitha, M. 2005. A Difference Centered Alternative to Theorization of Children's Citizenship Rights. *Citizenship Studies* 9 (4): 369–388.

Pantea, M.-C. 2013. Negotiating Children's Best Interest in the Context of Parental Migration. In *Participation, Citizenship and Trust in Children's Lives*, ed. H. Warming, 154–172. Basingstoke: Palgrave.

Payne, R. 2012. 'Extraordinary Survivors' or 'Ordinary Lives'? Embracing 'Everyday Agency' in Social Interventions with Child-Headed Households in Zambia. *Children's Geographies* 10: 399–411.

Plummer, K. 2003. *Intimate Citizenship. Private Decisions and Public Dialogues*. Seattle: University of Washington Press.

Precarias a la Deriva. 2004. *A la deriva por los circuitos de la precariedad femenina*. Madrid: Traficantes de Sueños.

Robson, E., N. Ansell, U. S. Huber, W. T. S. Gould, and L. van Blerk. 2006. Young Caregivers in the Context of the HIV/AIDS Pandemic in sub-Saharan Africa. In *Population, Space and Place* 12: 93–111.

Scheer, A. 2014. Gesellschaftliche Krisen und ihre Folgen für die Soziale Arbeit. *Österreichische, Zeitschrift für Soziologie* 39 (4): 263–279.

Sevenhuijsen, S. 1998. *Citizenship and the Ethics of Care: Feminist Considerations on Justice, Morality and Politics*. London: Routledge.

Taefi, N. 2009. The Synthesis of Age and Gender: Intersectionality, International Human Rights Law and the Marginalisation of the Girl Child. *International Journal of Children's Rights* 17 (3): 345–376.

Tronto, J. 1993. *Moral Boundaries. A Political Argument for an Ethic of Care*. New York: Routledge.

Wall, J. 2008. Human Rights in Light of Childhood. *International Journal of Children's Rights* 16 (4): 523–543.

Wall, J. 2013. Childism, the Challenge of Childhood to Ethics and the Humanities. In *The Children's Table: Childhood Studies and the Humanities*, ed. Anna M. Duane, 68–84. Athens and London: The University of Georgia Press.

Wall, J. 2014. Why Children and Youth Need the Right to Vote: An Argument for Proxy-claim Suffrage. *Children, Youth and Environments* 24 (1): 108–123.

Warming, H. 2011. Children's Participation and Citizenship in a Global Age: Empowerment, Tokenisms or Discriminatory Disciplining? *Social Work & Society* 9 (1): 119–134.

Wihstutz, A. 2016. Children's Agency: Contributions from Feminist and Ethic of Care Theories to Sociology of Childhood. In *Reconceptualising Agency and Childhood: New Perspectives in Childhood Studies*, ed. F. Esser, S.B. Meike, T. Betz, and B. Hungerland, 61–74. Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.

Wihstutz, A., and J. Schiwarov. 2016. Kinder als Sorgende- Anmerkungen aus kindheitssoziologischer Perspektive. In *Handbuch Kindheits- und Jugendsoziologie*, ed. A. Lange, C. Steiner, S. Schutter, and H. Reiter. Wiesbaden: Springer. http://link.springer.com/referenceworkentry/10.1007/978-3-658-05676-6_23-2.

Winker, G. 2015. *Care Revolution: Schritte in eine solidarische Gesellschaft*. Bielefeld: Transkript.
Woodhead, M. 1997. Psychology and the Cultural Construction of Children's Needs. In *Constructing and Reconstructing Childhood: Contemporary Issues in the Sociological Study of Childhood*, ed. A. James, and A. Prout. New York: Rutdledge Falmer.
Yuval-Davis, N. 1997. *Gender and Nation*. London: Sage.
Zeiher, H. 1996. Kinder in der Gesellschaft und Kindheit in der Soziologie. *Zeitschrift für Sozialisationsforschung und Erziehungssoziologie* 16: 26–46.
Zelizer, V. A. R. 1994. *Pricing the Priceless Child: The Changing Value of Children*, 1985. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press First published in New York by Basic Books.

Author Biography

Anne Wihstutz is Professor of Sociology at Berlin Protestant University of Applied Sciences, Germany, and trained social and youth worker. Her fields of academic research and study cover social inequality theories, citizenship studies, early childhood education and children's agency. She is currently leading a research project on everyday life experiences of young refugee children in collective and emergency accomodation centres in Germany. She has published on young carers, children working and children's agency.

Migrant Women's Intimate Struggles and Lived Citizenship: Experiences from Southern Europe

Daniela Cherubini

Introduction

This chapter deals with the 'lived' and 'intimate' citizenship of migrant women involved in grassroots collectives in a South European context. It provides an empirically grounded analysis of citizenship as experienced and practised in relation to everyday and intimate life, by subjects who are located in, and act from, the edge and/or the margin of the gendered, racialized and classed structure of the local and transnational networks they inhabit.

I place side by side the two terms—'edge' and 'margin'—to convey the complex and shifting position of these subjects and their agency. Living on the edge of society is a condition marked by mechanisms of exclusion and vulnerability that may be difficult to overcome and that need to be addressed by social work, in order to enhance the full

D. Cherubini (✉)
Department of Sociology and Social Research,
University of Milano-Bicocca, Milan, Italy
e-mail: daniela.cherubini@unimib.it

H. Warming and K. Fahnøe (eds.), *Lived Citizenship on the Edge of Society*,
Palgrave Politics of Identity and Citizenship Series, DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-55068-8_10

citizenship of all individuals, as all the contributions in this book show. At the same time, following bell hook (1984, 1989), marginality is not just the space of oppression; it can also be a space of resistance that oppressed subjects can choose to reflexively inhabit, insofar as 'it offers to one the possibility of [a] radical perspective from which to see and create, to imagine alternatives, new worlds' (Hook 1989, 207).

The reflections articulated in these pages are based on the ethnographic research I carried out in Andalusia, Spain, with the migrant women's associations of the region (Cherubini 2013). These are grassroots groups built around the multiple positioning of women as migrants, ethnicized/racialized women, care and domestic workers, or low-paid and precarious workers, and other simultaneous and contextual dimensions. They have emerged since the mid-1990s, to address gendered and intersectional issues in social policies towards the immigrant population, confronting the reductionist and male bias of most of the State agencies, NGOs and migrants' associations operating in this field. These associations are lead by and mostly composed of migrant women, either from the same or from different geographical origins (e.g. Moroccan women's association, Latina's association, intercultural association). They develop community-based social work that encompasses a vast array of social and cultural activities and services directed to their members and the general population, such as self-help and mutual support, information desks, cultural and linguistic mediation, recreational activities and linguistic and professional training, among others. I carried out the research from 2007 to 2010, based on participant observation and narrative interviews with forty activists from 27 associations. Participants came from non-European and new EU-27 Countries (Morocco, Latin America, Ukraine, Equatorial Guinea, Nigeria, Romania). At the time of the interview, they held different legal statuses (temporary or permanent residents, undocumented, Spanish or dual nationality) and they have been living in Spain for between 2 and 25 years. Despite the great heterogeneity of their social, professional and family situation, most of them had a medium to high level of education and were employed as domestic and care workers, cultural mediators and third-sector workers, or in non-paid family

work. The research explored the everyday lived experiences and practices of citizenship enacted by the participants in the associations, in relation to various spheres of life, namely the labour market, the legal domain and immigration policies, institutional politics and civil society, collective action and grassroots' claims, family relations and the sphere of intimate life.

This chapter focuses on the latter of these fields. It takes into consideration the women's family, personal and intimate lives as something that matters for their lived experience of inclusion or exclusion from citizenship. This idea is rooted in the critical revisions of citizenship by feminist, transsexual, transgender, lesbian, gay and queer studies; it finds an insightful synthesis in the concept of 'intimate citizenship' (Plummer 2003; Roseneil 2010; Weeks 1998), which has been presented in the introduction of the book and which will be also developed in this chapter. My work explores how this conceptual tool, which has been elaborated in relation to the social and political experience of autochthonous women and sexual minorities, can be translated and used for illuminating the experiences and struggles of other subjectivities from the edge/margin. It aims at combining different debates, such as the research on the transformations of citizenship in immigration contexts, the analysis of sexual and intimate rights as key issues of contemporary politics, and the sociological analysis of contemporary changes in intimacy. It also aims to equip social workers addressing migrant and ethnic minority women, with new insights around the issue of intimate citizenship. I claim that it is important to take into account experiences and needs related to intimate and personal life; these are not-ancillary issues of substantive citizenship and new dimensions of inequality often emerge around them. Drawing on the in-depth analysis of the individual narratives and the collective practices of the aforementioned group of migrant women, the analysis shows the relevance of pursuing an emic and situated understanding of the contemporary articulations of intimacy and of the heterogeneous intimate struggles developed by subjects at the edge/margin. The analysis presented in this chapter draws on the conceptual proposal of 'lived citizenship' and aims to contribute to this concept's research agenda

(Lister 1998; Lister et al. 2003, 2007). As such, my analysis conceives of citizenship not only as a matter of rights and legal status, but also as a condition related to people's everyday experience and agency in multiple domains: political and civic participation, work, time, use of urban and public space, social relations, family, care, sexuality, the body and other domains. My work also entails a feminist perspective that considers the individual's ability to exercise control over his or her own life, body, and well-being, and his or her ability to choose between different life options—in a word, self-determination—as a key dimension of substantive citizenship (Kabeer 2005; Lister 1997). My work is inserted into the line of inquiry addressing the redefinitions of citizenship emerging from 'below' and from the 'margins' (Caldwell et al. 2009; Isin and Nielsen 2008; Kabeer 2005; Lister et al. 2007; Moosa-Mitha and Dominelli 2016; Neveu et al. 2011; Stasiulis and Bakan 2005). It sees citizenship as a governmental mechanism that categorizes subjects according to normative notions of belonging; but it sees it also as a space of struggles in which different subjects take part, including those who lack the legal and symbolic recognition of their belonging to the community and who do not have full citizenship rights, such as the migrant women involved in the study. In this framework, the focus on self-organized groups and collective action allows different dynamics of inclusion and exclusion experienced by marginal subjects to be taken into account. It enables the analysis of lived citizenship from the margin, as related both to several forms of exclusion from rights and recognition and to everyday individual and collective strategies developed by activists to overcome these exclusionary forces and build a more inclusive citizenship.

In accordance with the 'scalar' logic of this book, the analysis developed in the chapter mostly situates citizenship in relation to the State and welfare, in the context of global mobility and transnational relations. It deals with the relationship between migrant women and the State, looking at the regulatory power of State laws and institutions on the intimate lives of these subjects, as well as looking at the women's responses and struggles in this field. It takes into account both the barriers and opportunities for self-determination that migrant women face in the Spanish immigration context.

Intimate, Sexual and Bodily Citizenship of Migrant Subjects

The concept of intimate citizenship has been elaborated to account for important transformations in the contents and meanings of contemporary citizenship (Plummer 2003; Roseneil 2010; Weeks 1998). It highlights how life choices related to the intimate dimension of existence are increasingly subject to public regulation through state policies, but also through public narratives on identities and other 'moral struggles' that circulate in the media and the political sphere (Plummer 2003, 95–116). The concept also points out to what extent a vast array of intimate struggles, troubles, choices and desires contribute to shape the identities of contemporary subjects and citizens, and play a key role in the current redefinition of the ideal 'citizen'. Intimacy refers here to a broad sphere of life related to sexuality, family relations, affections, friendship, care, personal choices and experiences related to the body, feelings and emotions, love and other emotional and social bonds, gender identity and sexual identity. Intimate citizenship therefore refers to 'a cluster of emerging concerns over the rights to choose what we do with our bodies, our feelings, our identities, our relationships, our genders, our eroticisms and our representations' (Plummer 1995, 17). Sasha Roseneil defines it as 'the freedom and ability to construct and live selfhood and close relationships safely, securely and according to personal choice, in their dynamic, changing forms, with respect, recognition and support from state and civic society' (Roseneil 2010, 82).

Since the end of the 1990s, several contributions has reflected on the impact of the transformations of intimacy in contemporary society[1] on the discourse of citizenship, giving rise to a cluster of interconnected and sometimes overlapping formulations such as 'sexual', 'bodily', 'reproductive' and 'intimate' citizenship (Bell and Binnie 2000; Evans 1993; Oleksy 2009; Richardson 2000; Richardson and Turner 2001; Roseneil 2010; Roseneil et al. 2013; Weeks 1998). These concepts are rooted in the critical revisions of citizenship advanced by feminisms and by lesbian, gay, bisexual, trans and queer theorists and activists, in different contexts (Halsaa and Roseneil 2012; Santos 2013). As a whole, this literature indicates that mainstream definitions of citizenship

include sexualized as well as gendered norms, so that heteronormativity and other cultural assumptions about 'legitimate' sexuality and socially accepted ways of being in relation to others underpin citizenship models, as much as the institutionalisation of male privilege.

These terms reflect the emergence of new political identities, new citizenship claims and rights (e.g. reproductive and sexual rights, rights to health and bodily integrity, etc.) articulated around matters of life that are commonly understood as 'private'. They further challenge the public/private divide, already exposed as a cornerstone of traditional definitions of citizenship and as a key device for posing outside the space of citizenship all subjects different from the adult, white, middle class, heterosexual male (Lister 1997, 2007b; Moosa-Mitha 2005; Pateman 1988; Saraceno 1988; Walby 1994).

Most of the research in this field applies the idea of sexual, bodily, intimate citizenship to claims, practices and subjectivities that openly challenge the dominant moral norms and the definition of the 'decent' citizen existing in each context. They focus on figures embodying the 'sexual dissident'—e.g. trans, lesbian, gay, queer subjects—as opposed to the common and silent 'good standing' citizens.[2] Although I strongly believe that this research is essential to the theoretical and political endeavour of rethinking citizenship and enlarging rights and recognition, I think that it is not the only possible application of these concepts. Equally relevant is the idea of intimate citizenship as an extension of the bounds of citizenship itself, a new dimension intersecting civic, social and political citizenship. There is the idea that 'it is often through intimacy, sexuality and the body that citizenship is experienced, enacted or rejected' (Santos 2013, 37–38). As such, we can see the enactment and experience of intimate citizenship as something that pertains to all subjects, not just to those who openly transgress the dominant gender, sexual and family models, those who experiment with unconventional forms of relationships and intimate bonds or who are involved in other forms of gender and sexual dissidence and queer politics.

This way of framing the 'intimate citizenship' question resonates well with the narratives collected in my research and suggests an innovative direction of analysis, often disregarded in the mainstream research on international migration and the transformations of citizenship.[3] This debate tends to focus on issues that pertain to the classical understanding

of citizenship as related to the 'public' realm (e.g. migrants' legal status, access to rights, residency and nationality, social and economic inclusion, political participation), while failing to integrate most of the advancements in citizenship studies that have been discussed so far in this section. This gap in the academic debate conflicts with the power and pervasiveness of state regulation and the 'public moral narratives' on the body and the intimate life of migrant men and women that circulate in most of the western contexts receiving international migration—including Spain (Lister et al. 2007, 77–108). Laws on family reunification, local translations of foreign family codes, recognition or denegation of asylum for gender and sexual reasons, ban against the hijab or other religious symbols; these are just a few of the relevant examples of these dynamics. Moreover, recurring public discourses take migrants' behaviour and choices related to reproduction, sexuality, gender relations, the bodily and personal expression, as benchmarks of their acceptability as 'new citizens', their claims towards inclusion and recognition, their ability to integrate into the new society and their representation as desirable or dangerous hosts (Sabsay 2012, 2014): for example, the securitarian discourse that casts male migrants' sexuality as dangerous, the victimization of migrant women as vulnerable to cultural-specific forms of gender violence (honour crimes, polygamy, female genital modifications), the debates on the veil and other ethnic and religious markers, the 'homonationalistic' discourse. These sexualized and racialized narratives should be read through an intersectional approach and suggest a need to readdress the general debate on migration, considering intimate, relational and family life as key dimensions of migrants' experience of citizenship.

In my view, one of the core concepts of this book—the 'lived citizenship' perspective—provides the conceptual and analytical tools for achieving this objective, as I will explain in the next section.

The Lived Citizenship Perspective

The notion of 'lived citizenship' has been proposed by Ruth Lister (1997; Lister et al. 2003) to point out an 'empirical void' in citizenship studies and to pay attention to the subjective meanings and experiences of citizenship for different social actors, in different contexts.

This perspective has marked a micro-sociological and feminist turn in the academic debate on citizenship: it has renovated a research agenda mostly focused on normative and structural dimensions, and it has extended the analysis to aspects of everyday life that are conventionally considered as relating to the private sphere. As Lister points out, the lived citizenship perspective 'involves a challenge to the public-private dichotomy that underpinned the traditional association of citizenship with the public sphere' (Lister 2007a, 55).

Moreover, recent works on the issue establish an insightful connection with the intersectional perspective (Lister et al. 2007; Caldwell et al. 2009; Yuval-Davis 2007). These works show how the intersecting dimensions of gender, class, race, age, national origin, ability and sexual orientation shape both people's legal status and formal entitlements as well as the actual enjoyment and embodiment of rights. In other words, intersectionality allows us to see how the 'everyday lived experiences of citizenship' can vary in correspondence to different social and juridical positions marked by gender, ethnicity, class and so on.

In my view, this perspective is very useful for understanding the complex citizenship configurations emerging in destinations of international migration. This perspective helps us to see how the 'categories' of migrants created by immigration laws are differentiated not only in terms of legal status (type of residency permit, illegalized or legal residents, etc.) but also in relation to their gender and working role, class, ethnicity, family status, sexuality, visibility and so on. Different authors proposed the term 'civic stratification' to describe this emerging structure of layered rights and hierarchical positions, ranging from full citizenship to positions with no recognition nor enjoyment of basic rights (Kofman 2002; Morris 2002). The intersectional approach helps us to understand that this structure emerges in the interplay between the migration regime, the welfare regime, the gender and care regime, the labour regime, the ethnic and national model, and the sexual politics that characterize a particular context (Lister et al. 2007, 2–4).

As we can see, the lived citizenship approach does not focus only on the micro-sociological to the detriment of structural dimensions. It rather tries to address the interplay between agency and structure which lays at the core of contemporary citizenship dynamics. As Lister

explained, this approach pursues: 'A more holistic study of citizenship, which combines analysis of citizenship regimes 'from above' with study of the cultural, social and political practices that constitute lived citizenship 'from below' (Lister et al. 2007, 168).

Drawing on this line of reasoning, the present work entails an analytical framework that connects the macro- and structural analysis of civic stratification with the micro-sociological analysis of the individuals' lived experiences of citizenship. It takes into account both the impact of the institutional and political framework on migrant women's experiences in the intimate sphere, and their strategies to cope with this framework and enlarge their opportunities to self-determine.

Therefore, the empirical analysis developed in the next part of the chapter will be articulated around two main questions. The first one deals with the consequences that inclusion and exclusion from rights have on the family and intimate lives of the subjects involved in the research. An analysis of how these women encounter different resources for or constraints on living their family and affective ties in accordance with their personal projects and wishes will be provided in relation to their different positions in the Spanish and Andalusian structure of civic stratification. The second core analytical question refers to the collective responses elaborated by the women's associations involved in the study.

Migrant Women's Intimate Struggles and Lived Citizenship

Among the most relevant characters shaping the civic stratification system of the research context, a quite restrictive and selective immigration policy is first of all worth mentioning. This regulates entrance into Spain and access to rights, directly by country of origin and indirectly by class and gender (Agrela Romero and Gil Araujo 2005; Lister et al. 2007, 77–108). As for the selection by origin, beside the differentiation between EU citizens and Third Countries nationals, the Spanish legislation includes some 'preference for origin' clauses that explicitly provide easier access to residency and labour permits and, eventually, to Spanish nationality, for citizens from former colonies

(the Philippines, Equatorial Guinea and Latin American countries).[4] Mechanisms of selection by class inform laws ruling the entry and residence of non-European citizens for family reasons and for working, by the establishment of entry quotas for workers filling the needs of specific professional sectors (among them, consistent quotas reserved to care and domestic service). These regulations also entail a gendered character. The Spanish rules governing family reunification in effect at the time of the fieldwork[5] placed restrictions on the right to family unity, subordinating the enjoyment of this internationally recognized right to specific legal and socio-economical requirements. Moreover, in cases of reunification of the spouse, the law produced a state of economic and legal dependency of the reunited person, since it gave him or her a residence permit but not a work permit, at least for the first period of residence. This norm provides a glimpse of the extent to which Spanish immigration policies are rooted in and reflect the gendered divide between the public and private sphere. It implicitly assumes that most of the incoming partners are women and pushes them to enter into irregular or informal work, or to stay out of the labour market. These norms seem to shape relationships within the family in line with the heteronormative single-income nuclear family, in which the two partners are charged with different roles and responsibilities, linked to productive and reproductive work. Migrant women and men involved in a family migration project are cast in different positions within the stratified space of rights, duties and opportunities that characterized the society of residence.

Other key elements describing the structure of rights and opportunities for migrant women in Spain and Andalusia relate to the Mediterranean and familistic welfare and care regime, and with the labour regime (Bettio et al. 2006; Cachón Rodríguez 2009; Da Roit et al. 2013; Pajares et al. 2008; Solé and Parella Rubio 2003). The former is characterized by an imbalance in the distribution of care responsibilities between the State, the family and the market, as well as between genders, generations, socio-economic layers, between natives and migrants, and migrants from different countries. The latter is characterized by the pervasiveness of informal economy, high unemployment rates, and a pronounced professional segregation by gender and ethnicity. As a result, there is a structural demand for a flexible labour

force in the care and domestic sector, which sensitively restricts professional options for migrant women.[6] The effects of these structural forces are in fact evident in the profiles and life stories of the women involved in the study. Except for a few cases, all of them had experienced domestic and care work; most of those who were no longer employed in this sector at the moment of the interview either were able to find professional alternatives thanks to their activity in the third sector, or had exited the labour market for full-time dedication to family or other personal projects.

As a whole, this frame of institutional discrimination (Cachón Rodríguez 2009) resulting from immigration laws and policies, and from the economic and social forces described so far, tends to constrain the women's choices and ability to self-determine also in relation to intimate aspects of their lives. The ethnographic research presented here provides sound evidence of that. It shows how migrant women negotiate their projects and expectations related to family life and their relationships with partners and children, within a field of possibilities whose borders are limited by law.

First of all, the narratives collected provide several examples of the negotiations around the shaping of couple and intimate-partner relationships. In the context of restrictive rules governing the entry and residency in the country, migrant women's choices concerning the form to give to these relationships appear to be bound not only to their personal wishes, but also to the need to acquire a secure legal status and fundamental individual rights (e.g. to residency, mobility, full political rights). Choices such as to divorce, to get married, to simply live together, or to live apart together with the partner, may therefore be made taking administrative factors into account.

For instance, Bibiana[7] is a woman from a Latin American country who moved to Spain to live with her partner. In her narrative of her early time in Spain, the way in which she accounts for the decision to get married, despite wishing simply to live together, stands out:

> In April, I met this man. […] And we carried on, as boyfriend and girlfriend, for a year and a half. […] And then we decided that… either we end it or I would come here [to Spain]. […] So we decided that I would

> come, that we would live together, so we could see how things went. And… we got married. Obviously, because otherwise how could I manage with the documents? […] My idea, of course, was not to sit around with my arms folded, it was to find a job and do something. But since I was not really young, it was '96 I was… if I'm 43 now… well, in short, there was no other way. [Int. 16, 43 years old, from a Latin American country, lives with partner and 1 child]

A condition of legal as well as economic dependency is created, which marks a strong inequality between foreigners and native people. In more detail, while concerns over economic independence are a widespread experience linked to the women's structural disadvantage in the Spanish labour market, the concern for the residency documents is something that marks a distance between migrant and native women. A distance which considerably grows for those women who cannot benefit from 'preferential treatment' by the Spanish state, for example, undocumented, precarious workers, non-European women from countries which lack any bilateral agreement or special provision in the Spanish immigration system. Due to their origin and their legal and economic position, these women cannot opt to escape these legal limitations at a relatively early stage of their life in Spain by acquiring a permanent residency permit or Spanish nationality, and are therefore more vulnerable with respect to the mechanisms described so far.

Moreover, the interviews suggest that the interplay of restrictive migration politics and the segmented labour market tends to drive migrant women to shape their family and couple relationships in ways that approximate the 'traditional' family model, based on marriage and on the gendered division of labour. However, it is important to point out that this is no longer the case when we look at the experience of women who encounter difficulties in reuniting with their partner and, most of all, with their children. Strong constraints are imposed on these women to positively combine their need to provide an income and their wish to live close to their beloved ones. These difficulties are exacerbated for women with irregular status, irregular workers and live-in domestic workers, since they often cannot meet the administrative requirements for reunification. These experiences tell us that when the family as a

space of love and care conflicts with the logics of the Spanish welfare, labour, and care regimes, combined with Spain's demand for full, flexible workers, migrant women may end up being forced to live a disjunction between their affective needs and their economic role. These women must rearticulate the provision of parental care, affection, and intimacy outside the context of shared daily life and physical proximity—all arrangements that are far from the 'traditional' ideal model of family.

The experience of parenting and partnering from a distance reflects the agency of these women and their ability to act strategically from a disadvantaged position, as shown also for other groups at the edge/margin in this book. As the influential literature on 'transnational motherhood' points out, these women reinvent care work from the disadvantaged positions they occupy in the socio-economic structure of the country of origin, of the country of residence, and in the global 'survival circuits' and 'care chains' (Ehrenreich and Hochschild 2003; Parreñas 2001; Sassen 2003). At the same time, the narratives articulated around the experience of distance have negative connotations; a vibrant sense of injustice emerges in relation to what is perceived as a deprivation of affection and the removal of an important aspect of their life and personality. The experience of living far from their children and the infringement of the right to family unity become the concrete measure of their civic exclusion and their partial citizenship status in the national and transnational space they inhabit. It seems that only their economic role as subordinated workers finds legitimation, while their aspirations, needs and capacities related to their family role and intimate life are neglected. A clear dynamic of 'misrecognition' emerges and hinders their acknowledgement as a 'full partner in social interaction' (Fraser 2000, 113) and as a person (Melucci 2000).

In the stories of other women, the excluding dynamics which have emerged so far seem nevertheless to be counterbalanced by the opening of new opportunities for self-fulfilment in the immigration context. In some cases, the increased capacity for self-determination in relation to intimate and family matters derives from the institutional framework of the receiving country. It can be related, for instance, to the legal recognition of plural forms of family (e.g. Spanish equal marriage for same-sex couples and recognition of homosexual parenthood) and to the provision

of childcare welfare services and good public education. At other times, the empowering outcome of migration seems to be more related to the weakening of social and family control over women's and young women's personal projects; to the encounter with different cultural norms and values regulating gender relations, family and sexuality; to the fact of living in a plural cultural context, which allows a good range of intimate life choices and relational arrangements. Some examples regard the experience of women who have decided to postpone children until after the end of their studies, despite living in a couple and despite the pressure coming from their social background; women who enjoy a relationship with a man who shares a similar mentality and appreciation for gender equality; women who can raise their children in autonomy after a separation; women in a same-sex relationship. It is worth pointing out that most of the women who express this kind of narratives are regular residents; they are mostly young, or came to Spain at a young age, with the desire to have new experiences in a foreign country, searching for independence from their family of origin or from a previous relationship.

This part of the analysis shows that the power of the limitation of rights as well as the opportunities emerging in the new social environment differs according to the socio-economic and legal position and the migratory profile of the women. The narratives and experiences presented so far should be understood in the framework of the civic stratification of the context under examination.

The women involved in the study develop individual and collective strategies to counter, overcome, or bypass these constraints and mechanisms of exclusion in their life, and also to support other women in this process. The collective strategies are of special interest here. Most of the associations develop forms of community work and of voluntary social work, which emerge from the intersectional positionality of the activists and their first-hand experience as migrant, working class, not white women, subjected to different forms of legal, material and symbolic exclusion. This leads to an original definition of the problems, needs and objectives to be addressed. It also leads to interesting experiences of self-organization and social intervention from civic society, which relies on the public administration for financial support, but nevertheless represent interesting cases of non-state-driven forms of social work.

Most of the associations offer legal advice, labour advice and training, as well as linguistic and cultural mediation to facilitate access to welfare, health and social services. The main objective of these services is to support women to overcome the multiple forms of discrimination which exist in the public sphere and the problems related to their partial citizenship status. Nevertheless, they also have a relevant impact on intimate rights, freedoms and choices, insofar as they improve women's social position and access to resources.

It is worth mentioning that among the practices developed by the associations, there are also examples of specific services addressing women's well-being and empowerment in the intimate field. For instance, some associations work on sexual and reproductive health, child care and maternal health: they organize workshops and talks on these topics, where women can share their experience and knowledge on the issue, sometimes with the help of an expert guest (e.g. a gynaecologist). The way in which the interventions of external experts is framed during these events is particularly interesting, since it is aimed at overcoming the linguistic and cultural problems that women often face with Spanish social and health services, or with other NGOs. These actors usually do not embed an intersectional view and they often fail to address the specific needs of their audiences (e.g. migrant, Arabic-speaking women), as explained in the next excerpt from the interviews:

> Because [some associations] have education projects, have mediators… For example there is an association here… pro-immigrants… which has a high number of mediators in schools. But mothers say they do not do it very well, or as they should. Because the theory is… theory is often not enough. […] They have mediators, who go there, give their little awareness-raising talk, no matter if it is understood or not… And we, in our discussion gatherings, what do we do? Awareness rising, we speak of educational issues, pediatrics… The next is about motherhood, midwife from the hospital is going to speak. She speaks Spanish, because some of them understand it, but we then translate to dialect. There is always one of us with them, who translates properly, as for they could ask their questions then, and we try by all means that the message gets through. […] We try to explain everything well, explain it in Arabic and in dialect, as well. [Int. 15, 38 years old, president of an association of Moroccan women]

Another relevant example is the interventions against gender-based violence, developed by some of the biggest migrant women's associations of the region, sometimes with the help of local and national public funding. Most of them address the issue of domestic and intimate-partner violence,[8] supporting women involved in abusive relationships and also working on prevention and awareness raising.

Beside these specific projects and interventions, in the everyday routine of all the associations there are informal and less structured activities which respond to the needs related to the reorganization of care, social and affective life in the new context. These might be informal gatherings in the afternoon for '*merendar*' (have a tea) with other women, spaces for the shared care of children, and various other moments where women share daily tasks or spare time with other women, where they cultivate social networks, mutual aid and friendship. 'Trivial' activities to all appearances, which instead appear to have an important meaning for the associations' participants, as we can see from the following quotation:

> Well, I did not know anyone here […] I stayed all the week in this house without seeing anyone, without talking to anyone, alone, always thinking about my country, my home, my parents and all these things… […] I was waiting from Monday to Friday, throughout the week, to leave on these two hour on Saturday and gather with these people. […] It was when I had no one, I had no one not even to talk to, no affections, no support, nothing, nothing. […] I could go on with this life so difficult. […] Look, to me this encounter gave me the strength to go on. [Int. 11, 35 years old, member of a multicultural women's association]

Conclusions

This work has explored the everyday lived experiences of citizenship of migrant women living in a Southern European context and involved in migrant women's grassroots associations. These are subjects who live a condition of vulnerability, due to their structural and symbolic position at the edge of Spanish society, and who develop interesting strategies for

resisting the exclusionary side of citizenship. In line with the key developments in the theoretical debate mapped in the first part of the chapter, the present work has focused on the intimate, relational and family lives of these women, as key dimensions of their accounts of citizenship.

In order to grasp these dynamics, an intersectional and lived citizenship perspective has been used. The analysis has highlighted the ways in which the institutional and normative framework (e.g. immigration laws and policies, citizenship models) shapes migrants' intimate and relational lives, as well as their ability to deal with this context through collective action. The ethnographic analysis of women's narratives and practices has enabled the identification of some of the most salient issues that shape their opportunities for self-determination and recognition in the intimate sphere—at the moment captured in the interviews as well as throughout their life stories. This has paved the way for an emic understanding of how 'intimate citizenship' struggles are articulated and experienced in the specific context and by the social actors addressed in the research. Among the activists and groups involved in the research, we have seen interesting examples of self-organization and mobilization against gender-based violence, and in relation to women's health, care and reproductive rights. At the same time, other less predictable issues have emerged, which escape the typical claims concerning sexual, bodily and intimate citizenship, and the dominant moral narratives around the migrants' intimate choices and behaviour, as addressed both in the academic and public debate.

For instance, one of the most striking struggles relates to the incompatibility between the economic and the family role, affecting the most vulnerable sector of the population involved in the study: the irregular migrants and live-in domestic workers who cannot access the right to family reunification and therefore live their experience as mothers at distance. This could encourage a reframing of the problem of work–life balance—and its reflections on intimate rights—in times of global mobility and under new conditions of vulnerability, in order to integrate experiences and claims which risk being neglected within an agenda primary designed around the needs of native middle-class women.

Another remarkable result refers to the power of the State in binding migrant's choices concerning family and intimate relationships, as side effects of restrictive immigration policies. The burden of the immigration status and, in some cases, the creation of judicial dependence (where individual entitlements depend on the relationship with the spouse or another family member), reintroduce elements of 'indirect' and 'mediated' citizenship for women (Lister 1997; Saraceno 1993; Vogel 1998) that sound obsolete in contemporary western judicial systems. The experiences collected in the research instead suggest that the issue of personal and judicial autonomy and individual rights of migrant women should be readdressed by those working for gender equality and to combat social exclusion and vulnerability: among them, social workers.

Of course, the positive experiences which emerged from the analysis should not be overlooked in our final remarks. Among the narratives collected, there are women who at some point of their immigration story and for immigration reasons, felt compelled towards arrangements in their intimate relationships that do not entirely coincide with their personal preferences, or felt trapped in traditional models of coupledom and family that they did not entirely choose. Beside them, however, there are positive experiences of women for whom migration opened doors to new opportunities of self-fulfilment, freedom and empowerment in the intimate field. In other words, beside some common and pervasive trends described so far, there is also a great variety in the migrant women's experiences of intimate citizenship. This is linked to the extreme heterogeneity of the migrant population living in Spain as well as in other similar contexts, and it is something that should always be taken into account in the planning and implementation of social work addressing different sectors of the migrant population.

The research discussed in these pages suggests that social interventions supporting the enhancement of substantive citizenship for migrants and migrant women in vulnerable positions must pay attention to the recipients' needs and experiences related to intimate life. Both the constraining power of the institutional and structural context on their users' life options, and their individual and collective strategies for dealing with this situation, should be acknowledged by social

workers in their assessment of the level of vulnerability and the possible ways out for the specific targets of their intervention. Social work interventions should recognize the subjective experience of their specific targets; they should avoid preconceived attributions about migrant people's prevalent aspirations and orientations related to sexual and intimate life. As I have said, there is a wide spread repertoire of gendered and racialized discourses, stereotypical representations and 'public moral narratives' on the intimate choices of ethnic minority and migrant men and women. Migrants and ethnic minority people, especially migrant women, tend to be represented as devoted to traditional cultural values; they are often represented as mothers and care-givers who tend to build prolific heterosexual families. This homogenizing imagination should be challenged in order to recognize the variety of personal and intimate experience of differentiated targets of social work. I think that the intersectional and lived citizenship perspective described in this chapter could represent a useful tool for this task.

As shown by influential sociological literature, deep transformations have affected the sphere of intimacy and have led to the diversification of the ways in which family and intimate relationships are experienced, organized and perceived in our contemporary and plural societies. This article would like to suggest the importance of recognizing these transformations both in academic research and in social interventions with migrant populations. We should ask to what extent is the complexity of intimate and personal life in plural societies taken into account in social work when migrant subjects are involved?

The analysis has shown that the frame of institutional discrimination affecting migrants and migrant women in particular, also reflects on and crosses their intimate and private life—their relationships, their bodies, their emotions. It has shown also that the constraints and opportunities they meet with in their attempt to choose and live the (intimate) life they want also depend on their position within the civic stratification. In other words, the intersectional perspective has allowed us to highlight the different outcomes of these mechanisms of exclusion, and the emergence of new forms of inequalities around these issues. On the one hand, the pluralisation of intimacies is a process with positive implications because it broadens people's choices. On the other hand, not all

people are able to choose with the same degree of freedom among various types of families and intimate options, and to see their choices legitimised. Thus, new divisions are created between people who have the material and symbolic resources allowing them to move relatively freely amidst the social and judicial norms regulating family, relational life and intimacy, and others for whom the choice seems more restricted and who are subjected more to these norms and provisions.

There is indeed a gendered, racialized, classed structure in which the legal, material, and symbolic resources necessary to live a desirable life, for emotional and intimate fulfilment and for full citizenship, seem to be unequally distributed. This represents the scenery in which contemporary social work should be inserted.

Notes

1. See, among others: Bauman (2003), Beck and Beck-Gernsheim (1990), Giddens (1992), Jamieson (1998), Hochschild (2003, 2012), Illouz (2007), Roseneil and Budgeon (2004), and Saraceno (2012).
2. Interesting exceptions come from childhood studies, where some works have explored children and young people's sexual and intimate rights, ideas of well-being and ethics of care, in connection with children's citizenship (Cockburn 2013, 192–199; Warming 2003, 2013, 2015). See also the contributions by Mehmoona Moosa-Mitha, Hanne Warming, and Anne Wihstutz, in this book.
3. See, among others: Joppke (2010), Koopmans (2013), Vink (2013).
4. Citizens from these Countries can apply for naturalization after 2 years of legal residence in Spain, while the requirement for other non-EU citizens is 10 years: 4 years for EU citizens and 5 for refugees and asylum seekers. Moreover, bilateral agreements with many Latin American countries establish specific rules for entrance and inclusion in labour market, such as exemption from the entry quota or from the prohibition of professional mobility for the first years of residence.
5. Ley Orgánica 4/2000 (sections from 16 to 18) and Real Decreto 2393/2004 (sections from 38 to 44). According to these laws, the non-EU citizen who applies for the reunification of the spouse, children or parents must have resided legally in Spain for at least one year and have

an independent residence permit of at least another year; she/he must also have adequate housing and income.

6. At the time of the fieldwork, the economic recession was starting to produce its effects. For further analysis of the effects of the crisis on the migrant population and migrant women in Spain, see among others Aysa-Lastra and Cachón (2015).
7. All names are fictional.
8. One of the associations addressed the specific forms of violence involving irregular sex workers.

References

Agrela Romero, B., and S. Gil Araujo. 2005. Constructing Otherness: The Management of Migration and Diversity in the Spanish Context. *Migration: A European Journal of International Migration and Ethnic Relations* 43: 44–45.

Aysa-Lastra, M., and C. Cachón. 2015. *Immigrant Vulnerability and Resilience: Comparative Perspectives on Latin American Immigrants During the Great Recession*. Basilea: Springer.

Bauman, Z. 2003. *Liquid Love: On the Frailty of Human Bonds*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Beck, U., and E. Beck-Gernsheim. 1990. *Das ganz normale Chaos der Liebe*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.

Bell, D., and J. Binnie. 2000. *The Sexual Citizen: Queer Politics and Beyond*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Bettio, F., A. Simonazzi, and P. Villa. 2006. Change in Care Regimes and Female Migration: The 'Care Drain' in the Mediterranean. *Journal of European Social Policy* 16 (3): 271.

Cachón Rodríguez, L. 2009. *La 'España Inmigrante': Marco Discriminatorio, Mercado de Trabajo y Políticas de Integración*. Barcelona: Anthropos.

Caldwell, K., R. Ramirez, K. Coll, T. Fisher, and L. Siu. 2009. *Gendered Citizenships: Transnational Perspectives on Knowledge Production, Political Activism, and Culture*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Cherubini, D. 2013. '*Llegar a Ser Ciudadanas'. Ciudadanía y Prácticas Participativas de las Mujeres Migrantes en Andalucía*. Alcalà de Henares, Madrid: Editorial Ayuntamiento de Alcalá de Henares.

Cockburn, T. 2013. *Rethinking Children's Citizenship*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Da Roit, B., A. González Ferrer, and F.J. Moreno-Fuentes. 2013. The Southern European Migrant-Based Care Model. *European Societies* 15 (4): 577–596.

Ehrenreich, B., and A.R. Hochschild. 2003. *Global Woman: Nannies, Maids, and Sex Workers in the New Economy*. New York: Metropolitan Books.

Evans, D. 1993. *Sexual Citizenship: The Material Construction of Sexualities*. London and New York: Routledge.

Fraser, N. 2000. Rethinking Recongnition. *New Left Review* 3: 107–120.

Giddens, A. 1992. *The Transformation of Intimacy: Sexuality, Love and Eroticism in Modern Societies*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Halsaa, B., and S. Roseneil. 2012. *Remaking Citizenship in Multicultural Europe: Women's Movements, Gender and Diversity*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Hochschild, A.R. 2003. *The Commercialization of Intimate Life: Notes from Home and Work*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Hochschild, A.R. 2012. *The Outsourced Self: Intimate Life in Market Times*. New York: Metropolitan Books.

Hooks, B. 1984. *Feminist Theory from Margin to Center*. Boston: South End Press.

Hooks, B. 1989. Choosing the Margin as Space of Radical Openness. *Framework* 36: 15.

Illouz, E. 2007. *Cold Intimacies: The Making of Emotional Capitalism*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Isin, E., and G. Nielsen. 2008. *Acts of Citizenship*. London and New York: Zed Books.

Jamieson, L. 1998. *Intimacy: Personal Relationships in Modern Societies*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Joppke, C. 2010. *Citizenship and Immigration*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Kabeer, N. 2005. *Inclusive Citizenship: Meanings and Expressions*. London: Zed Books.

Kofman, E. 2002. Contemporary European Migrations, Civic Stratification and Citizenship. *Political Geography* 21 (8): 1035–1054.

Koopmans, R. 2013. Multiculturalism and Immigration: A Contested Field in Cross-National Comparison. *Annual Review of Sociology* 39: 147–169.

Lister, R. 1997. *Citizenship: Feminist Perspectives*. London: MacMillan.

Lister, R. 1998. Citizenship on the Margins: Citizenship, Social Work and Social Action. *European Journal of Social Work* 1 (1): 5–18.

Lister, R. 2007a. Inclusive Citizenship: Realizing the Potential. *Citizenship Studies* 11 (1): 49–61.

Lister, R. 2007b. Unpacking Children's Citizenship. In *Children and Citizenship*, ed. A. Invernizzi and J. Williams, 9–19. London: Sage.

Lister, R., N. Smith, S. Middleton, and L. Cox. 2003. Young People Talking about Citizenship: Empirical Perspectives on Theoretical Debates. *Citizenship Studies* 7 (2): 235–253.

Lister, R., F. Williams, A. Anttonen, J. Bussemaker, J. Heinen, A. Gavanas, S. Johansson, A. Leira, U. Gerhard, and C. Tobio. 2007. *Gendering Citizenship in Western Europe: New Challenges for Citizenship Research in a Cross-National Context*. Bristol: Policy Press.

Melucci, A. 2000. Diventare Persone: Nuove Frontiere per l'Identità e la Cittadinanza. In *Diventare Persone*. *Conflitti e Nuova Cittadinanza in Una Società Planetaria*, ed. A. Melucci, 57–88. Torino: Edizioni Gruppo Abele.

Moosa-Mitha, M. 2005. A Difference-Centred Alternative to Theorization of Children's Citizenship Rights. *Citizenship Studies* 9 (4): 369–388.

Moosa-Mitha, M., and L. Dominelli. 2016. *Reconfiguring Citizenship: Social Exclusion and Diversity within Inclusive Citizenship Practices*. London: Routledge.

Morris, L. 2002. *Managing Migration: Civic Stratification and Migrants' Rights*. London and New York: Routledge.

Neveu, C., J. Clarke, K. Coll, and E. Dagnino. 2011. Introduction: Questioning Citizenships/Questions de Citoyennetés. *Citizenship Studies* 15 (8): 945–964.

Oleksy, E. 2009. *Intimate Citizenships: Gender, Sexualities, Politics*. London: Routledge.

Pajares, M., S. Parella, and L. Cavalcanti. 2008. *Inmigración y Mercado de Trabajo: Informe 2008*. Madrid: Ministerio de Trabajo e Inmigración.

Parreñas, R.S. 2001. *Servants of Globalization: Women, Migration and Domestic Work*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Pateman, C. 1988. *The Sexual Contract*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Plummer, K. 1995. *Telling Sexual Stories: Power, Change, and Social Worlds*. London and New York: Routledge.

Plummer, K. 2003. *Intimate Citizenship: Private Decisions and Public Dialogues*. Seattle and London: University of Washington Press.

Richardson, D. 2000. Constructing Sexual Citizenship: Theorizing Sexual Rights. *Critical Social Policy* 20 (1): 105–135.

Richardson, E., and B. Turner. 2001. Sexual, Intimate or Reproductive Citizenship? *Citizenship Studies* 5 (3): 329–338.

Roseneil, S. 2010. Intimate Citizenship: A Pragmatic, Yet Radical, Proposal for a Politics of Personal Life. *European Journal of Women's Studies* 17 (1): 77–82.

Roseneil, S., and S. Budgeon. 2004. Cultures of Intimacy and Care beyond 'the Family': Personal Life and Social Change in the Early 21st Century. *Current Sociology* 52 (2): 135–159.

Roseneil, S., I. Crowhurst, A.C. Santos, and M. Stoilova. 2013. Reproduction and Citizenship/Reproducing Citizens: Editorial Introduction. *Citizenship Studies* 17 (8): 901–911.

Sabsay, L. 2012. The Emergence of the Other Sexual Citizen: Orientalism and the Modernisation of Sexuality. *Citizenship Studies* 16 (5–6): 605–623.

Sabsay, L. 2014. Sexual Citizenship and Cultural Imperialism. In *Routledge Handbook of Global Citizenship Studies*, ed. P. Neyers and E. Isin, 96–109. London: Routledge.

Santos, A.C. 2013. *Social Movements and Sexual Citizenship in Southern Europe*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Saraceno, C. 1988. La Struttura di Genere della Cittadinanza. *Democrazia E Diritto* 28 (1): 273–295.

Saraceno, C. 1993. La Dipendenza Costruita e l'Interdipendenza Negata. Strutture di Genere della Cittadinanza. In *Il Dilemma della Cittadinanza: Diritti e Doveri delle Donne*, ed. G. Bonacchi and A. Groppi, 166–189. Bari: Laterza.

Saraceno, C. 2012. *Coppie e Famiglie*. Milano: Feltrinelli.

Sassen, S. 2003. *Contrageografías de la Globalizacion: Género y Ciudadanía en los Circuitos Transfronterizos*. Madrid: Traficantes de Sueños.

Solé, C., and S. Parella Rubio. 2003. The Labour Market and Racial Discrimination in Spain. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 29 (1): 121–140.

Stasiulis, D., and A. Bakan. 2005. *Negotiating Citizenship: Migrant Women in Canada and the Global System*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Vink, M.P. 2013. *Migration and Citizenship Attribution: Politics and Policies in Western Europe*. London: Routledge.

Vogel, U. 1998. Is Citizenship Gender-Specific? In *Frontiers of Citizenship*, ed. U. Vogel and M. Moran, 58–85. London: MacMillan.

Walby, S. 1994. Is Citizenship Gendered? *Sociology* 28 (2): 379–395.

Warming, H. 2003. The Quality of Life from a Child's Perspective. *International Journal of Public Administration* 26 (7): 815–829.

Warming, H. 2013. *Participation, Citizenship and Trust in Children's Lives*. New York: Palgrave.

Warming, H. 2015. The Life of Children in Care—A Struggle over Recognition. *Childhood* 22 (2): 248–262.

Weeks, J. 1998. The Sexual Citizen. *Theory, Culture & Society* 15 (3–4): 35–52.
Yuval-Davis, N. 2007. Intersectionality, Citizenship and Contemporary Politics of Belonging. *Critical Review of International Social and Political Philosophy* 10 (4): 561–574.

Author Biography

Daniela Cherubini holds a Ph.D. in Applied sociology and Methodology for social research, and in Women's and Gender studies. She is postdoctoral researcher at the Department of Sociology and Social Research, University of Milano-Bicocca (Italy). She is member of the «Otras. Perspectivas Feministas en Investigación Social» research group, at the University of Granada (Spain).

Geo-politics and Citizenship: Why Geography Matters in Defining Social Citizenship Rights of Canadian-Muslim Youth

Mehmoona Moosa-Mitha

Introduction

Citizenship on edge, the motif running throughout this book implies spatiality. It connotes a view of citizenship that is positioned on a precipice of some sort. It is precisely this spatial aspect that animates notions of citizenship as dynamic, changing and as capable of taking on newer perspectives. Having completed a two-year study with Canadian-Muslim youth engaged in the articulation of their own sense of identity and using other empirical studies on Muslim youth in Europe and North America, I will undertake a theoretical analysis of social citizenship in relation to Canadian-Muslim youth. I will focus on the spatial aspects of the concept of social citizenship as it impinges on their everyday experiences of lived citizenship. Conceptualizations of social citizenship don't tend to center spatial analysis in their theorizations, representing a gap in scholarship that requires particular attention in

M. Moosa-Mitha (✉)
School of Social Work, University of Victoria, Victoria, Canada
e-mail: Mehmoona@uvic.ca

H. Warming and K. Fahnøe (eds.), *Lived Citizenship on the Edge of Society*,
Palgrave Politics of Identity and Citizenship Series, DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-55068-8_11

a globalizing world. Taking material space seriously in theorizations of citizenship politicizes notions of citizenship by challenging the idea of space as terra nullius, briefly defined as the idea of space as empty and void of meaning to lived citizenship. Social citizenship is about belonging and a spatial analysis reveals the sociopolitical relations and processes of exclusion and inclusion that exist in concrete space.

I begin by making a case for the importance of undertaking spatial analysis when theorizing about social citizenship. I then undertake a theoretical spatial analysis of social citizenship by examining globalization, identity and care practices as it relates to the lived citizenship of Canadian-Muslim youth. Spatial analysis of globalization unsettles taken-for-granted assumptions of nation-states as natural and recasts social citizenship as transnational in nature. A spatial analysis of Muslim identities reveals social processes that reverse minority/majority identity formations as a result of global geopolitics. A spatial analysis of care as a concept and a set of practices challenges hierarchical scalar notions of space by centering sociality rather than proximity as the basis of practices of care and social citizenship.

Collapsing hierarchical notions of citizenship does not mean that the concepts of the local, national or international no longer make sense. In this chapter, I center the space of the Canadian national context and the lives of Muslim youth living in Canada in order to make my arguments about the transnational nature of lived citizenship. What makes my discussion transnational, however, is the manner in which it reveals how issues of lived citizenship undercut and traverse (even transgress) borders assumed to have a natural existence within hierarchical notions of space. Thus while the chapters in this book may be organized using a hierarchy of space starting with the local and ending with the global, it does this in order to reflect the entry points that the authors have chosen by which to initiate their discussion and not because it assumes this hierarchy to be real.

Social Citizenship and Geography

Social citizenship, normatively understood, is postulated as an enlightenment project through an evolutionary narrative of rights with the social bringing up the rear of a triumvirate of rights, the other two

being political and civil in nature (Hobson and Lister 2001). Alternative notions of citizenship are less legalistic (rights oriented) and more horizontal in nature. They define social citizenship in terms of the relationship that members in society have with each other and the state rather than the more vertical processes of individual rights claim-making against a singular state (Lister 2004). Alternative views of social citizenship are concerned with the participatory and experiential rights of all members of society to belong as equal, contributing members of one community (Dominelli and Moosa-Mitha 2014). In that sense, social citizenship is about lived citizenship, about understanding how the lived realities of citizens impinge upon and change our understanding of what it means to be a citizen. I use the term social rather than lived citizenship to draw attention to the material structures, such as systems of culture, economics and politics—not just subjective and individual experiences as forming a part of lived reality. I define social to encompass both aspects of lived reality—the individual and the political (see chapter "Theorizing Children's Welfare Citizenship: Lived Citizenship, Social Recognition and Generations"). Social citizenship is valued as a concept across the spectrum of theories as well as by grassroots movements of citizens themselves as an expression of care and concern for the welfare of the polity and for the public good.

Neither liberal nor alternative theories of social citizenship have centered spatial analysis. Overlooking material space in theorizations of social citizenship results in the treatment of space as a given and as having no relevance to practices of social citizenship. Political geographers tell us space is never really empty, it is marked by contestation and competing claims to territory and constitutes the literal ground upon which citizenship is enacted and defined (Blacksell 2004). Critical geographers regard space as a social construct that is the result of social interrelationships marked by power contestations (Harvey 2006, 2008, 2009; Smith 2005; Massey 2005, 2012). Space therefore is constantly in a flux through a complex interplay of a host of actors vying for dominance in non-deterministic ways that leave the future open to possibilities of change (Massey 2005; see also chapter "'They Know Everything About Us'—Exploring Spaces of Surveillance and Citizenship Learning Opportunities in a 24-Hour Care Institution").

In the Canadian context, political geography played a definitive role in the organization and delivery of social welfare services, a legacy that continues to this day. Canada, as part of the British dominion and later as an independent colonial-settler state retaining traces of empire, was deeply influenced and replicated British and later American modernist ideas of social planning and models of social welfare (Chambon 2011; Köngeter 2012). As I discuss in more detail later on in the chapter, the common genesis of the welfare state and Canadian nation-building as a white colonial-settler society has meant that geography, in the sense of where one 'comes from,' has always mattered in the articulation and experiences of social citizenship of its members. Social welfare that defined as concern for the welfare of members in society was historically premised on concern for the white, British descendants of Canada as the normative ideal citizen—who was also the male breadwinner as women were excluded (Procacci 2010). Everyone else to the degree to which they were separated from this ideal experienced differential and lesser social citizenship benefits. Social citizenship rights as they relate to the geopolitical contestation of space as part of nation-building are particularly salient in the case of the Indigenous peoples of Canada. In this case, state violence rather than state welfare characterizes the social citizenship experiences of Indigenous people (Carriere and Thomas 2014).

In the case of Canadian-Muslims the terrain on which their social citizenship experiences are defined has a global geopolitic. As a result of the events of 9/11 where Islamic *jihadists* (extremists) targeted the USA with acts of terrorism, a 'global war on terror' ensued initiated by the USA and its allies. Western countries allied in fighting terrorism by engaging in war with majority Muslim countries like Iraq and Afghanistan. This has resulted in Muslim citizens living in the west to experience the prioritizing of the presumed security needs of the nation-state that target them as potential security threats, over addressing their social welfare needs (Bleich 2009; Madood 2008). For Muslims living in the west, experiences of social citizenship whether in terms of rights, recognition or a set of practices are co-constitutive with global geopolitics and nation-building—underscoring the importance of including spatial analysis.

Globalization, the Nation-State and Social Citizenship Rights of Canadian-Muslims

Globalization, defined as movement of capital, labor, ideas and dominion across nation-state boundaries, has a long history. At least from the seventeenth and eighteenth century onwards, colonization through empire building ensured the presence of a world order that was not easily contained within nation-state boundaries (Appadurai 2006). Modern day globalization with its division of richer, colonial countries of the global north and the poorer (though increasingly emerging as an economic force) post-colonized countries of the global south are historically continuous with earlier forms of globalization that were largely the result of empire building (Kim-Puri et al. 2005). Contemporary globalization reflects the history and legacy of contestations over territory in the making and unmaking of empires and nation-states, with its unequal distribution of power and wealth. It also serves as a reminder of the fact that nation-states are not fixed, natural or given; rather they are created through geopolitical processes that cannot be taken for granted (Appadurai 2006).

Globalization is also transnational in nature, Glick Schiller and Levitt (2006, 5) define it as: '…transnational processes emphasizes the ongoing interconnection or flow of people, ideas, objects, and capital across the borders of nation-states, in contexts in which the state shapes but does not contain such linkages and movements.' Transnationalism reveals the paradox of a post-colonial global world order that is organized into nation-states as bounded and separate spaces that is belied by the presence of global networks, economic, social and cultural, that traverse, transgress and are uncontainable within nation-state boundaries. Globalization does not solely consist of relationships existing between one discrete nation-state to another, nor are they unidirectional in nature but simultaneously exist in multiple localities in a multi-directional fashion (Moosa-Mitha 2014a). Grewal (2005) in her research on transnational identities through an examination of consumerist habits of middle-class Indians purchasing Barbie dolls, found that a significant segment of Indians engaged in these practices identified as being

American without actually having left their country or visited America. Sociocultural networking that these Indians were engaging in were not regulated by the relationship between the two nation-states USA and India, but rather challenged it by blurring national boundaries through an identification as both Indian *and* American. Transnationalism challenges the taken-for-granted notion that movement only occurs through space organized through discrete and autonomous states, or that this movement is unidirectional and that nation-state boundaries are natural and fixed.

The role of nation-states in the present hyper-globalized world, post-colonization, is to increasingly take on the responsibility of socializing its population into a singular national ethos (Blacksell 2004; Appadurai 2006) that makes the nation-state seem like a natural outgrowth of a particular soil. Transnational affiliations particularly in the case of immigrants, such as Canadian-Muslims, are considered to be a barrier to assimilation to this nationalist ethnos. Wimmer and Glick Schiller (2002) term this methodological nationalism. They define methodological nationalism as the taking for granted of the view that the world is divided into discrete and autonomous nation-states, which results in regarding global interconnections and nation-building as contradictory. Canadian history clearly reflects this through its treatment of transnational identities as suspect. For example during the Second World War Canada was an ally in a war against Japan and removed second- and third-generation Japanese-Canadians from their home interring them into camps and labeling them 'enemy aliens.' It continues to be the case with the Indigenous peoples of Canada whose connections and affiliations with their own nations, some of whom cross nation-state boundary lines, is viewed as a matter of suspicion and a threat to national security (Dhamoon and Abu Laban 2009).

Transnational affiliations of Canadian-Muslims, a common identity affiliation for most immigrants, are viewed as a particular site of anxiety and suspicion. The global war on terror and the advent of global jihadi movements that target the west among others to conduct terrorist activities has made global connections within Muslim communities even more anxiety causing. The very small minority of Canadian-Muslim youth joining global jihadi movements reinforces the feelings of

insecurity of the Canadian state, which is already inclined to view loyalty to nation-states other than itself with suspicion.

Insecurities felt by nation-states as they struggle to carve out their role in a new globalized world order gets further exacerbated through the global war on terror and the presence of Canadian-Muslims whose transnational affiliations make them suspect as potential terrorists. In fact transnationalism is a central fact of a globalizing world and very much an aspect of the lives of Canadians generally, not only Muslims or immigrants, whose ties with other countries remain strong through a multi-directional movement of capital, culture, ethnic identification and religious affiliation (Glick Schiller and Levitt 2006; Moosa-Mitha 2014b).

Interestingly research studies show a more nuanced picture of transnational affiliations among Canadian-Muslims youth including Muslim youth living in the west (Mandaville 2011; Shariffy-Funk 2008; Bowen 2004). Some have close global networks that are based on faith-based affiliations; others have global networks that are based on political convictions such as Canadian-Muslims critical of Israeli state policies (Hörschelmann and Refaie 2014). More Canadian-Muslims have global connections on the basis of ethnicity than they do on the basis of religion (Mandaville 2011; Moosa-Mitha 2009, 2014b). Some don't express their identity as transnational at all and see themselves as primarily Canadian and others are simultaneously transnational and Canadian (Bullock and Nesbitt-Larking 2013).

A spatial analysis of social citizenship that takes into account the transnational nature of the everyday lives of Canadian-Muslim youth have a lot to offer in terms of theorizations of social citizenship. It fundamentally questions the nationalist/territorial basis of dominant notions of citizenship, where only those citizens who are adult, passport carrying and closer to the ideal white, able-bodied, secular, productive citizen are granted the full benefits of social citizenship by the state, its policies and practices. Social work practices with immigrant populations are defined by state policies. Glick Schiller and Levitt (2006) in their analysis on transmigration studies came to the conclusion that state immigration and settlement policies and scholarship generally assumes a unidirectional view of migration with the result that state

policies aim to integrate communities to settle into the society they migrate in without regard to their transnational affiliations or the multi-directional moves they are likely to make. The Canadian government is no exception; most of its funding for settlement programs is dedicated to a one-way integration into Canadian society. Canadian social workers are increasingly limited in the kinds of programs that they can offer immigrant communities to those that prioritize economic integration over other priorities (Bhuyan 2014). Canadian state polices and social workers need to acknowledge the diversified world of immigrants and Canadian citizens that is multi-directional and multiply identified through affiliations that extend beyond the Canadian Nation-state (Moosa-Mitha 2014b).

Space and Identity

Identity is spatial in nature, people define themselves in terms of space, deriving their identity from specific tracts of land be it nation-state, house/home or religion (Blacksell 2004). Massey (2005, 10) explains the relationship between space and identity in more detail: '…space too is a product of interrelations. Space does not exist prior to identities/entities and their relations. More generally I would argue that identities/entities, the relations between them and spatiality which is part of them are co-constitutive.' The space of the Canadian nation-state is constructed as white, through a narrative of early colonial settlers as the first 'discoverers' of this land and as a result of contemporary power relations where white Canadians retain dominant status and majority status. Canadian-Muslims, who are overwhelmingly newer immigrants and whose relationship to the land mark them as late arrivals are constituted as a minority on the basis of race, ethnicity and faith. In fact, Muslims living in countries of the global north are commonly identified as minorities on this basis.

Identities by their very nature are not stable categories and part of their fluidity is derived from the changing nature of social relationships in the spaces they occupy. In the case of Canadian-Muslims, the uncertainty that nation-states experience as a result of globalization gains

increasing force due to the perception of their presence as being a threat to the very survival of the country. With the advent of the war on terror, Muslims, not helped by the presence of Islamic extremists among them, become more clearly identified in ways that centralizes their faith over other sources of identity in North America and Europe. The result has been an Islamization of race and a racialization of Islam that collapses multiple identities of minority Muslim along an axis of a singular Islamic identity that is fixed, monolithic and suspect (Ramm 2010; Rigoni 2005; Roggeband and Verloo 2007).

Moreover the 'war on terror'; is a transnational phenomenon on both sides of the equation with western countries allied in their war effort and the Islamic *Jihadist* (extremists) similarly joined globally in conducting terrorism. Transnational space, as I discussed in the earlier section produces anxiety within nation-states by challenging the notions of nation-states as bounded and separate. In relation to Canadian-Muslims, the global 'war on terror' has resulted in a reversal of their identity as a minority group into a majority one through dominant perceptions that treat them as representatives of larger-scale ethnic/faith-based identities. Canadian-Muslims are viewed as a minority that represents a majority—the worldwide Muslim community—and in turn the majority (the white secular non-Muslim Canadians) act as though they are a minority in need of special protection through an array of anti-terrorist legislation and heightened surveillance (Appadurai 2006). Majorities and minorities are social constructs with each needing the other to exist within majority/minority relations (Appadurai 2006). The global war on terror contextualizes the nature of socio-spatial relationships that produce Muslim subjectivities in contemporary times.

The reversal of identity positions entails a fixing of social identities for both the majority Canadians as threatened on the basis of their progressive secularity and their Muslim counterparts as backward due to their religiosity. Aside from the fact that faith is only one source of identity for Muslims in the west (Moosa-Mitha 2009, 2014b), some of whom identify as secular Muslims, it results in the creation of a binary between the Canadian secular self/Muslim other that belies the fact that Muslims are also Canadians. This has serious implications in the everyday lives of Muslims as an array of social policies and citizenry practices

attempt to distinguish 'bad' (not like us) from 'good' (like us) Muslims. It results in identity politics that is based on sameness, where difference, in this case on the basis of faith, is viewed as problematic. It is in fact an attempt by the threatened majority to seek to be exclusively and exhaustively inked to the identity of the nation, to the purity of the national whole (Appadurai 2006).

There is an underlying binary that supports the secular/religious divide through the assumption that religion exists in private space not a public space. There are many problems with this assumption not the least being the grave difficulties associated with distinguishing religious from cultural practices. Cultural practices such as the wearing of the hijab, or turban, listening to certain kinds of music or engaging in particular kinds of activism easily cross secular/religious boundaries. In their research in Muslim-Majority countries, Mills and Gökarıksel (2014, 5) argue that Muslim identities have no stable meaning over varying contexts. They conclude: 'What it means to be Muslim is in fact produced through socio-spatial relations, cultural practices and materialities and political context, as well as religious interpretations, meanings and performances.' It is therefore impossible to dichotomize between cultural expressions that take up public space from religious expression that are somehow meant to exist in some assumed private space. Musical expression in Turkey, for example, blur secular/sacred boundaries as they have a common base and reflect long interethnic relationships in place (Mills and Gökarıksel).

Research studies with Muslim youth living in the west consistently reveal the complex and multi-dimensional constructions of their identity that eschew dichotomies of culture, ethnicity and religion. In a study I conducted with young Canadian-Muslims, when asked about how he perceived his social identity, one young person responded: 'I describe myself as a Pakistani-Sindi-Muslim-Canadian.' His response spoke to national origin, ethnicity, culture, religion and immigrant as dimensions of his identity in one seamless whole (Moosa-Mitha). Other research studies have shown how young Muslims living in the west protest against what they see as a narrowing of representations of their social identity by the majority population (Rigoni 2005; Rizvi 2007; Salvatore 2005; Sahin and Altuntas 2009).

Their everyday experiences of citizenship through the construction of their identities as representative of *jihadi* terrorists occur in the spaces that they frequent daily, such as the schools that they attend. Studies show that the school has increasingly become a site of racial attacks and other forms of racism through a collapsing of their Muslim identity into singular and global terms (Hopkins 2007a, b).

Theorizations of social citizenship that are inclusionary are concerned with recasting social citizenship through a broadening of the concept to include both recognition and redistributive rights of minority groups living in western societies (Isin 2008). It is in the struggle for social justice to belong as equals in society, itself viewed as acts of citizenship, based on the exclusions that minority groups experience due to their ascribed social identity that makes social citizenship such a meaningful concept for minority groups. A spatial analysis of social citizenship, particularly the impact of transnationality on social identity invigorates the concept of social identity to take into account new forms of fluidity. Specifically it introduces the notion of a reversal of identity from a minority to a majority depending on the national or transnational context within which the subject or society views it. Spatial analysis of identity offers insights into the processes by which majority/minority status are formed as a result of geopolitical relations of power and in ways that are fluid and reversible. It also highlights the geopolitical nature of the pressure that is imposed on a minority group to embody sameness through an adoption of western secular lifestyles, values and dress as a condition of citizenship.

Youth are already perceived in society as a threat, particularly when they are in a group (Hart 2009). In the case of Muslim youth, this problem is even more exaggerated as they are identified even more strongly as objects of fear (Pain and Smith 2008). Their everyday experience of citizenship therefore is marked by lack of trust, fear and heightened surveillance, which they themselves in turn have learnt to fear (Pain and Smith). Treating Muslim youth as objects of fear overlooks their own desire to contribute in positive ways to the society in which they live in keeping with their understanding of their obligations as Muslim citizens (Moosa-Mitha 2014b). In the case of some 'radicalized' Muslim youth, these exclusionary experiences result in an affiliation

with a majority worldwide Muslim identity as a way to escape an alienated and devalued minority identity (Appadurai 2006).

One response adopted by the Canadian state since 2014, based on similar programs introduced in various countries in Europe such as Denmark and the UK, as well as the USA, is the introduction of deradicalization programs (Zhou 2016). These programs are at a preventive as well as a responsive level. Social workers are at the forefront of running these programs and their main task is to help Muslim youth regain a sense of belonging to the Canadian society by allowing them opportunity to be heard and by counseling them into understanding how extremist groups are engaged in brain washing them into accepting a simplistic and hate-driven message against secular societies. It is too soon to understand the impact of deradicalization programs on Muslim youth. However, having such programs is important as they are addressing issues of identity which in fact constitute the core of the problem of radicalization. Yet it is a limited response to a rather complex issue, it tends to have an individualist approach to radicalization, treating each individual youth as having a problem. The systemic nature of the culture of Islamaphobia is simply not addressed. Social workers are equipped to understand the social, systemic nature of racism and are skilled in working with sectors of the population most affected by exclusionary systems while at the same time working with exclusionary systems to produce social change. Their ability to relate to youth and their particular vantage that allows them to hear their stories need to be used to greater advantage to inform the wider society of some of the ways in which they too contribute to youth radicalization.

Geography of Care

Like identity, care is organized spatially through a construction of space into a private/public binary where the home is understood as the natural place of care giving practices and the market as economic/political practices separated from ties of emotion and affection that are assumed to bind the home (Staeheli 2013). Feminist geographers have argued against the assumption of space as bounded and separate along private/public binaries.

They have drawn attention to the public nature of the family as a social institution which plays a pivotal role in socializing the next generation of citizens (Bondi and Davidson 2004); as well as by analyzing the public nature of care practices that form a part of the global economy where care services are purchased like any other commodity, albeit at a lower value than other market commodities (Dyck 2005).

The place for youth is also constructed within this private/public continuum. Youth are expected to occupy spaces whose primary function is to provide them with care, occupying public space such as street corners results in social perceptions of them as being 'out of place' and therefore as suspect (see chapter "From Objects of Care to Citizens—Young Carers' Citizenship"). Hayes et al. (2012, 54) describe the spatial power dynamic as follows: '…the acceptable geography of a teenage existence is determined by heteronomous institutions such as school, sport, clubs, church and the family. To step outside this bounded existence is to threaten the very fabric of the hetero-normative imperative.' Yet research shows that Muslim youth have taken a very public stance as activists in the anti-war on Iraq movement and in publicly articulating their faith to make it more understandable to their non-Muslim counterparts (Hoerschelmann and Refaie 2014). Activism on the part of Muslim youth is viewed in singular terms as an expression of radicalization. Dominant critique of protest against the war on terror by Muslim youth activists is to interpret these actions as a desire of Muslim activists to center religion in public life. The picture is in fact more complicated, Muslim youth activists are as likely to embrace secularism and political convictions to explain their activism as they are faith-based reasons (Nagel and Staeheli 2011). It is not the space of religion in a western democracy that these youth are challenging; it's the very dichotomy of relations of care being construed into a binary between the public and the private that they are questioning.

The maintenance of the dichotomy between public and private is necessary for the state to maintain control of its role in the socialization of its citizens. The space of the home with its attendant practices of socialization into particular values and lifestyles is presumed to be private precisely because it is assumed to be free of state intervention. In fact, the state intervenes in the 'private' spaces of its citizens directly and

indirectly continuously by managing the socialization of its members to a common set of values that cohere with the smooth functioning of liberal capitalism and nationalism (Brodie 2002; see also chapter "From Objects of Care to Citizens—Young Carers' Citizenship"). This is clear in the Canadian context in relation to the Canadian Indigenous peoples whose differences in lifestyles, values and loyalties continue to be met with direct and disproportionate state intervention in the homes of Indigenous families through the removal or heightened monitoring of Indigenous children and their parents in an effort to impose conformity with assumed Canadian values (Blackstock 2009). Socialization through state intervention is always conducted through notions of care. When the Canadian state intervenes in the lives of Indigenous citizens, it is in the guise of social workers and other care practitioners that it does so. State care practices, albeit organized through 'private,' and increasingly privatized, spaces form a part of state governance practices of these spaces to produce the normative citizen. A spatial analysis of state care practices reveals the controlling nature of these interventions and their very public consequences.

With the advent of contemporary forms of globalization, the state has less control over the management of capital than previously with the result that western welfare state's role is primarily that of socialization of its members into a singular national ethnos (Blacksell 2004). Appadurai makes the point that because a national ethnos is not a natural outgrowth of this or that soil, it requires a great deal of effort on the part of the state to produce a naturalized national identity of its members. One of the ways that states encourage national identifications is by tying state entitlements such as housing and health services to those who are one of 'us' rather than one of 'them.' Not enough research has been conducted on the social citizenship experiences of Canadian-Muslims as they try to access and exercise their social rights. However, an analysis of social policies and services to immigrants makes it clear that white colonial-settler Canadians particularly when part of the labor force are the ones who gain the greatest social benefits within a neo-liberal state that aims to distinguishing the 'real' Canadian from the 'other' through a curtailing of services to immigrants and refugees (Bhuyan 2012; Guru 2010).

The implications for Canadian-Muslims is that perceived differences in their lifestyles and expressions of faith are used to measure their worth as deserving of public care and concern (Siddiqui 2014). For example, curtailment of the civil rights of Canadian-Muslims through racial profiling and discrimination is rationalized on the grounds of Muslim men's treatment of their women in the home (Hakeem et al. 2012). It is the same narrative that is used to rationalize armed intervention in majority Muslim countries. Difference is a public issue in the case of the Canadian-Muslim community even when it's constructed as occurring within a private space. This makes it more difficult for Muslim women to seek services against domestic violence in a state where their male partners are viewed as suspect. The insecurity of the welfare state caused by globalization and the war on terror changes the taken-for-granted relationship between the nation-state and its citizens where role of the state to protect the welfare of its citizens is reversed to one where the state protects itself from its Muslim citizens as though the welfare interests of the two are separate and where the security needs of the Canadian state trumps the welfare rights of Canadian-Muslims (Arat-Koc 2014). Treating the welfare needs of the Canadian state as separate essentializes the identity of what it means to be 'Canadian' as much as it does that of a Muslim. It also reveals the very public consequences of owning a 'different' identity through the introduction of social policies that reflect coercive assimilationist practices. It is not only with Muslim communities that one finds state policies being assimilationist; one of the characteristics of adopting a neo-liberal ideology as most welfare states in the global north have done is the introduction of interventionist social policies that aim to create the assimilative subject who can easily be integrated within a market-based economy (Lister, Lowry 2002). Unfortunately social workers are at the vanguard of this process as gatekeepers whose task it is to enforce assimilationist policies.

A scalar construction of space that assumes a hierarchy of scales from the local, national and the global with, the lower scale bounded and subsumed by the larger scale and so forth akin to a Russian doll, is reflects how state care practices are organized (Marston and Woodward 2005). Care is assumed to operate at a local level, within the intimate space of the home in the first place, then through

neighborhood and local communities and then at the national level through state practices of care. Organizing relations of care in this way center familiarity and intimacy as the basis for care, rendering the stranger who is distant geographically speaking as a body less deserving of care.

Feminist have argued against the idea of carelessness for the geographically distant on grounds of sociality and relationality. Butler (2012) argues that this sociality is a result of the condition of precariousness that all human beings experience in common and it is this commonality that should challenge the idea of care as dependant on relations of proximity. Tronto (2013) argues for a relational ethics of care that is based on a notion of social justice that is global and local and not only on the assumption that care practices are always about relations of proximity and intimacy. However, more fundamentally it is the spatial assumptions about care as scalar that needs further challenging. Care undercuts hierarchy of space depending on the particular relations of care that a person participates in within their specific context. Marston posits an alternative to hierarchical notions of scales by replacing it with relational notions of space that acknowledge that people care for and about things that transcend local, national and international boundaries. It is not just care that is relational but rather space itself is relational and people's lives make clear that a relational notion of space rather than a scalar one is closer to their lived experiences of care.

Critical theories of social citizenship are concerned with equating social citizenship with experiences and practices of belonging to one's society and to the nation-state. One's sense of citizenship is realized through a public expression of equal care and concern for the welfare of all members of society. Thus public practices of care are central to the realization of one's social citizenship and experiences of belonging. A spatial analysis of care nuances the concept of belonging even further. It does so by fundamentally challenging the assumption of care, and therefore of belonging, as a relation of proximity, on a familial, communal or national level. This is so not only in the case of Syrian refugees who are spatially distant, but also in the case of groups whose care we are less concerned about, like the homeless, who similarly occupy the status of the intimate/stranger (see chapter "Citizenship on the

Edge: Homeless Outreach and the City"). By so doing, it challenges the familiarity/stranger dichotomy assumed even in critical theories of social citizenship. Instead it posits an alternative that collapses hierarchical notions of scale which dichotomies of familiar/strange depend on by treating space as relational. As a result, it contends that caring for the distant other is not fundamentally different than caring for the proximate other because in fact 'elsewhere' is also 'here' (Butler 2012). The refugees fleeing the war in Syria is happening elsewhere, but it is also happening here, because we in the west are implicated in the sociopolitical reality of Syria through a history of colonization as well as the war on Iraq and due to the fact that there are Canadians who are also Syrian. But all of these reasons affirm proximity in one way or another. We should care about what is happening with Syrian refugees also because we co-habit the world and therefore cannot out of reasons of sociality based on our common human condition of precariousness live in a world where it is okay for another group to be killed (Butler 2012). By migrating and fleeing to Europe by boat, hundreds of thousands of Syrian refugees are using their bodies to challenge the notions that nation-state boundaries are fixed. Their refusal to accept caring practices organized on the basis of national lines should mirror our refusal to bound care practices on those lines as well.

Research on Muslims youth's affiliation with a transnational identity is diverse, but the war on Iraq and Afghanistan as part of the war on terror has significantly impacted Muslim youth to identify with worldwide Islam (Güney 2010; Mandaville). The basis of which is not always strictly faith-based, it is also political grounded in perceptions of sharing a sense of marginalization that they experience living in the west in common with Muslims worldwide (Mandeville). It is conceived in terms of care and concern about the fate of Muslims irrespective of where they live. It is a form of sociality that collapses and undercuts notions of hierarchical scale through a commonality of experience of marginalization. It does not always translate into the making of a grassroots movement; it can be a sense of solidarity or emotional response to the suffering that Muslims are perceived to be experiencing globally (Hörschelmann and Refaie 2014). What their sense of solidarity has to teach us is their ability to care across nation-state boundaries through

a commitment to social justice. Caring for an international *Umma* is grounded in their sense of citizenship as Canadians and the sense of responsibility that being Muslim entails (Moosa-Mitha 2014b).

Conclusion

Over the course of this chapter, I have undertaken a spatial analysis of the social citizenship practices and experiences of Canadian-Muslim youth who have increasingly been treated as bodies that are less deserving of our care and as strangers in the society that they live in. I have analyzed the geopolitical implications of globalization, identity and social care on the everyday experiences of citizenship of Muslim youth within a dominant world view that centers nation-state boundaries as fixed, identity as essentialized and care as based on relations of proximity.

The arguments I have put forward have particular relevance for marginalized groups other than Muslims. The changing role of the nation-state that gains legitimacy through a heightening of social governance practices in relation to marginalized populations, even while withdrawing from direct services, impacts minority groups in different but increasingly intrusive ways. Similarly the broadening of social identity to include transnationality is not only true of migrant populations but is and has always been part of the geopolitical reality of a global order that is organized around colonial and racialized lines.' Social care that has its basis in the ideal of proximity has particular consequences for Muslim populations residing in the global north but it also has consequences for all marginalized populations as they undergo 'othering' in interventionist welfare states that turns them into 'intimate strangers' that are less deserving of social care on the basis of their difference.

A spatial analysis of lived citizenship has relevance to social work because it is an arm of the welfare state and as nation-states seek to find legitimacy by strengthening social governance practices it will be social workers who will be in the frontline of implementing these. Social workers will also have to broaden their own perspective to include a

transnational lens of analysis and practice—something that most social workers have not been exposed to in their training and education. The ethical implications of caring only for those who are viewed as proximate will effect social workers directly as they come to grips with a social reality that views spatial proximity as a condition of and for social care. The lessons that a spatial analysis of social citizenship of Muslim youth living in the west have to offer are pertinent to social work with minority groups generally and truly represent the edge of a new landscape of citizenship theorizing.

References

Appadurai, A. 2006. *Fear of Small Numbers: An Essay on the Geography of Anger*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Arat-Koc, S. 2014. Power in/Through Speaking of Terror: The Geopolitics and Anti-Politics of Discourses on Violence in Other Places. In *At the Limits of Justice: Women of Colour on Terror*, ed. S. Perera and S. Razack, 356–379. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Bhuyan, R. 2012. Negotiating Citizenship on the Frontlines: How the Devolution of Canadian Immigration Policy Shapes Service Delivery to Women Fleeing Abuse. *Law & Policy* 34 (2): 211–236.

Bhuyan, R. 2014. Unprotected, Unrecognized. Canadian Immigration Policy and Violence Against Women, 2008–2013. http://www.migrantmotherproject.com/wp-content/uploads/2012/10/MMP-Policy-Report-Final-Nov-14-2014.pdf. Accessed 18 Jan 2017.

Blacksell, M. 2004. *Political Geography*. London: Routledge.

Blackstock, C. 2009. The Occasional Evil of Angels: Learning From the Experiences of Aboriginal Peoples and Social Work. *First Peoples Child & Family Review* 4 (1): 28–37.

Bleich, E. 2009. Muslims and the State in the Post-9/11 West: Introduction. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 35 (3): 353–360.

Bondi, L., and J. Davidson. 2004. Situating Gender. In *A Companion to Feminist Geography*, ed. L. Nelsons and J. Seager, 15–31. Hoboken: Wiley-Blackwell.

Bowen, J.R. 2004. Beyond Migration: Islam as a Transnational Public Space. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 30 (5): 879–894.

Brodie, J. 2002. Citizenship and Solidarity: Reflections on the Canadian Way. *Citizenship Studies* 6 (4): 377–394.

Bullock, K., and P. Nesbitt-Larking. 2013. Becoming "Holistically Indigenous": Young Muslims and Political Participation in Canada. *Journal of Muslim Minority Affairs* 33 (2): 185–207.

Butler, J. 2012. Precarious Life, Vulnerability, and the Ethics of Cohabitation. *The Journal of Speculative Philosophy* 26 (2): 134–151.

Carriere, J. and Thomas, R. 2014. Indigenous Children and State Care: The Dark Underside of Citizenship. In *Reconfiguring Citizenship: Social Exclusion and Divresity Within Inclusive Citizenship Practices*, ed. L. Dominelli and M. Moosa-Mitha. Farnham: Ashgate Publishing.

Chambon, A. 2011. The Transnational Circulation of Model Programs for Children in the Early 20th Century in Toronto. *Transnational Social Review* 1 (1): 25–38.

Dhamoon, R., and Y. Abu-Laban. 2009. Dangerous (Internal) Foreigners and Nation-Building: The Case of Canada. *International Political Science Review* 30 (2): 163–183.

Dominelli, L., and M. Moosa-Mitha. 2014. *Reconfiguring Citizenship: Social Exclusion and Diversity within Inclusive Citizenship Practices*. Vermont: Ashgate Publishing.

Dyck, I. 2005. Feminist Geography, the 'Everyday', and Local-Global Relations: Hidden Spaces of Place-Making. *The Canadian Geographer* 49 (3): 233–243.

Grewal, I. 2005. *Transnational America: Feminisms, Diasporas, Neoliberalisms*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Güney, Ü. 2010. 'We See Our People Suffering': The War, the Mass Media and the Reproduction of Muslim Identity Among Youth. *Media, War & Conflict* 3 (2): 168–181.

Guru, S. 2010. Social Work and the 'War on Terror'. *British Journal of Social Work* 40 (1): 272–289. doi:10.1093/bjsw/bcn129.

Hakeem, F.B., M.R. Haberfeld, and A. Verma. 2012. *Policing Muslim Communities: Comparative International Context*. Springer Science & Business Media.

Hart, S. 2009. The 'Problem' with Youth: Young People, Citizenship and the Community. *Citizenship Studies* 13 (6): 641–657.

Harvey, D. 2006. *Spaces of Global Capitalism*. Verso.

Harvey, D. 2008. The Right to the City. *New Left Review* 53 (Sept–Oct). http://newleftreview.org/II/53/david-harvey-the-right-to-the-city.

Harvey, D. 2009. *Reshaping Economic Geography*. Washington, DC: World Bank.

Hayes, S., B.J. Carpenter, and A. Dwyer. 2012. *Sex, Crime and Morality*. Routledge.

Hobson, B., and R. Lister. 2001. Keyword: Citizenship. In *Contested Concepts: Gender and Social Politics*, ed. J. Lewis, B. Hobson, and B. Siim. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing.

Hopkins, P.E. 2007a. Global Events, National Politics, Local Lives: Young Muslim Men in Scotland. *Environment and Planning A* 39 (5): 1119–1133.

Hopkins, P.E. 2007b. Young People, Masculinities, Religion and Race: New Social Geographies. *Progress in Human Geography* 31 (2): 163–177.

Hörschelmann, K., and E.E. Refaie. 2014. Transnational Citizenship, Dissent and the Political Geographies of Youth. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 39 (3): 444–456.

Isin, E.F. 2008. *Recasting the Social in Citizenship*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Kim, H.S., P. Jyoti, and H.J. Kim-Puri. 2005. Conceptualizing Gender-Sexuality-State-Nation: An Introduction. *Gender and Society* 19 (2): 137–159.

Köngeter, S. 2012. Paradoxes of Transnational Production of Knowledge in Social Work. *Transnational Social Support*, 187–210. London: Routledge.

Lister, R. 2004. The Third Way's Social Investment State. *Welfare State Change. Towards a Third Way*, 157–181.

Lowry, M. 2002. Creating Human Insecurity: The National Security Focus in Canada's Immigration System. *Refuge* 21 (1): 28.

Madood, T. 2008. Multiculturalism, Citizenship and National Identity. In *Citizenship Between Past and Future*, ed. E. Isin, P. Nyers, and B. Turner, 113–122. London: Routledge.

Mandaville, P. 2011. Transnational Muslim Solidarities and Everyday Life. *Nations and Nationalism* 17 (1): 7–24.

Marston, S.J., and K. Woodward. 2005. Human Geography without Scale. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geography New Series* 30 (4): 16–32.

Massey, D. 2005. *For Space*. London: Sage.

Massey, D. 2012. Power-Geometry and a Progressive Sense of Place. In *Mapping the Futures: Local Cultures Global Change*, ed. J. Bird, B. Curtis, T. Putnam, and L. Tickner. Routledge.

Mills, A., and B. Gökarıksel. 2014. Provincializing Geographies of Religion: Muslim Identities Beyond the 'West'. *Geography, Compass* 8 (12): 902–914.

Moosa-Mitha, M. 2009. Social Citizenship Rights of Canadian Muslim Youth: Youth Resiliencies and the Claims for Social Inclusion. *Arab Studies Quarterly* 31 (1/2): 121–140.

Moosa-Mitha, M. 2014a. Using Citizenship Theory to Challenge Nationalist Assumptions in the Construction of International Social Work Education. *International Social Work* 57 (3): 201–208.

Moosa-Mitha, M. 2014b. Exclusionary and Inclusionary Citizenship Practices Around Faith-Based Communities. In *Reconfiguring Citizenship: Social Exclusion and Diversity within Inclusive Citizenship Practices*, ed. L. Dominelli and M. Moosa-Mitha. Farnham, England, Burlington, Vermont: Ashgate Publishing.

Nagel, C.R., and L.A. Staeheli. 2011. Muslim Political Activism or Political Activism by Muslims? Secular and Religious Identities Amongst Muslim Arab Activists in the United States and United Kingdom. *Identities: Global Studies in Culture and Power* 18 (5): 437–458.

Pain, R., and S.J. Smith. 2008. Fear, Critical Geopolitics and Everyday Life. In *Fear: Critical Geopolitics and Everyday Life*, ed. R. Pain and S.J. Smith, 1–24. Vermont: Ashgate Publishing.

Procacci, G. 2010. New Challenges to Citizenship. In *Conflict, Citizenship and Civil Society*, ed. P. Baert, S. Koniordos, G. Procacci, and C. Ruzza, 13–21. London: Routledge.

Ramm, C. 2010. The Muslim Makers: How Germany Islamizes Turkish Immigrants. *Interventions* 12 (2): 183–197.

Rigoni, I. 2005. Challenging Notions and Practices: The Muslim Media in Britain and France. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 31 (3): 563–580.

Rizvi, S. 2007. News Cultures, Security and Transnational Belonging: Cross-Generational Perspectives among British Pakistani Women. *European Journal of Cultural Studies* 10 (3): 327–341.

Roggeband, C., and M. Verloo. 2007. Dutch Women are Liberated, Migrant Women are a Problem: The Evolution of Policy Frames on Gender and Migration in the Netherlands, 1995–2005. *Social Policy and Administration* 41 (3): 271–288.

Sahin, B., and N. Altuntas. 2009. Between Enlightened Exclusion and Conscientious Inclusion: Tolerating the Muslims in Germany. *Journal of Muslim Minority Affairs* 29 (1): 27–41.

Salih, R. 2004. The Backward and the New: National, Transnational and Post-National Islam in Europe. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 30 (5): 995–1011.

Salvatore, A. 2005. Making Public Space: Opportunities and Limits of Collective Action Among Muslims in Europe. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 30 (5): 1013–1031.

Schiller, N.G., and P. Levitt. 2006. Haven't We Heard This Somewhere Before? A Substantive Review of Transnational Migration Studies by Way of a Reply to Waldinger and Fitzgerald. Working Paper 06–01, Center for Migration and Development, Princeton University.

Sharify-Funk, M. 2008. *Encountering the Ttransnational: Women, Islam and the Politics of Interpretation.* Farnhun: Ashgate Publishing.

Siddiqui, S. 2014. Canadian-Muslim Youth Need Our Support. *Winnipeg Free Press*, A: 9.

Smith, N. 2005. Neo-Critical Geography, or, the Flat Pluralist World of Business Class. *Antipode* 37 (5): 887–899.

Staeheli, L.A. 2013. The 2011 Antipode AAG lecture. Whose Responsibility Is It? Obligation, Citizenship and Social Welfare. *Antipode* 4 (3): 521–540.

Tronto, J.C. 2013. *Caring Democracy: Markets, Equality, and Justice*. New York: NYU Press.

Wimmer, A., and N. Glick Schiller. 2002. Methodological Nationalism and Beyond: Nation-State Building, Migration and the Social Sciences. *Global Networks* 2 (4): 301–334.

Zhou, S. 2016. Deradicalization is About Much More Than Religious Scriptures. Opinion CBC News. http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/manitoba/muslims-islam-deradicalization-religion-counterterrorism-1.3560026. Accessed 8 Jan 2017.

Author Biography

Mehmoona Moosa-Mitha is an Associate Professor at the School of Social Work, University of Victoria, Canada. Her research interests lie in the area of social citizenship using anti-racist, decolonial, feminist and increasingly transnational analysis of citizenship. She has undertaken extensive research on Global Poverty and citizenship over the last fifteen years.

Conclusion: The Potentials of a Lived Citizenship Perspective for Critical Social Work Research

Kristian Fahnøe and Hanne Warming

The concept of lived citizenship offers a fruitful avenue for investigating the role of social work in the lives of people in vulnerable positions. It offers a framework for theorising and analysing the complexities of social work, not least its inclusionary and exclusionary dynamics. It does so by centring on the everyday practices and experiences through which people practice, negotiate, understand and feel their citizenship, rather than by measuring politically defined desirable effects and outcomes. Thus, citizenship and the outcomes of social work in regard to enhancing the citizenship of people in vulnerable positions are viewed as processual, dynamic, messy and anchored in everyday relations and

K. Fahnøe (✉)
Department of Social Work, Metropolitan University College, Copenhagen, Denmark
e-mail: krfa@phmetropol.dk

H. Warming
Department of Social Sciences and Business, Roskilde University, Roskilde, Denmark
e-mail: hannew@ruc.dk

H. Warming and K. Fahnøe (eds.), *Lived Citizenship on the Edge of Society*,
Palgrave Politics of Identity and Citizenship Series, DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-55068-8_12

interactions involving emotion, affect, rationality, materiality and power. The concept of lived citizenship is, furthermore, viewed as socio-spatially situated: that is, it draws attention to the fact that social work practices and the lives of people in vulnerable positions always unfold in a given place which is characterised by a certain materiality, sense-making and power relations. At the same time, places are not fixed or closed but are constituted through social relations that extend beyond specific localities, linking them to other places. This relational approach resonates with Massey's (2005) notion of space/place. The chapters in this book have illustrated the considerable potential of this perspective for stimulating deeper and more multi-faceted understandings of the everyday struggles of vulnerable groups, and by extension new reflections about social work practice as shaping both the conditions for, and the outcomes of, these struggles. The chapters have also demonstrated the strength of this approach as a basis for critical analyses that acknowledge the complexities and ambiguities of people's lived realities, rather than pursuing clear-cut conclusions that prevent fair and nuanced representation of their situations and which run the risk of being too easily dismantled. Indeed, this perspective, coupled with a conceptual framework that can grasp the reality of the lives of these groups and the role of social work, has proved to be crucial for sound research in this field throughout the chapters and across different target groups and national contexts.

Although all the chapters examine the role of social work in the lives of people at the edges of society from a lived citizenship perspective, each chapter also contributes to developing the concept of lived citizenship by focusing on particular aspects of it, and by creating linkages and elaborating on the aspects in question with a view to contributing to various analytical concepts and debates. Together, this provides a rich source of insights into social work. In this conclusion, we do not intend to present a comprehensive summary of all these different aspects, but rather to connect certain points across the chapters to a number of key themes that can take the field forward, both in relation to social work practices and reflections, and to further research on social work and the lived citizenship of people living at the edges of society. Thus, we are not concluding in the sense of closing down; our aim is, rather, to point to promising avenues for further research.

Enhancing Agency from Disadvantaged Positions

The concept of lived citizenship acknowledges the conditioned agency of vulnerable people and thus offers a way to address the entanglement of agency and structure. The book's chapters illustrate the everyday agency of the various groups as they both intentionally and unwittingly practice and negotiate their rights, obligations, identities and belongings. This understanding of everyday agency is obviously not only applicable to the groups dealt with in this book, but to all social work clients. The chapters show clients' agency can take different forms, such as tactical behaviour, care avoidance, codes of silence, resistance to exclusion and disciplining, and struggles for care and attention when their needs and contributions are not recognised or when they are not offered acceptable alternatives to their situation. By emphasising experiences of citizenship, several chapters show how the agency both of social workers and of their target groups involves emotional and affective dimensions which are intertwined with cognitive rationality in a nonlinear process. Clients' and social workers' actions are not necessarily either emotional or rational, but can be both, sometimes even at the same time, although they are usually categorised as either one or the other. Approaches such as weak theory (see chapter "The Role of Social Work Practice and Policy in the Lived and Intimate Citizenship of Young People with Psychological Disorders" by Warming) that enable analysis of actions as simultaneously affective and strategic can advance our understanding of the ways in which affect, emotion and rationality are integral to all fields of social work and how this is related to socio-spatial places such as social welfare institutions, public places or residences.

Clients' agency is shaped in the interplay with various dynamic structures that condition, and are conditioned by, human practices, and may both be constraining and enabling, sometimes simultaneously. To grasp the impact of social work practices and policies, it is essential to keep an open mind towards the sometimes contradictory dynamics that arise from the structures in question. These structures may be symbolic, i.e. constructions of reality such as policies and discourses about social problems, including classifications and diagnoses; social, including the

economic order, gender order, ethnic order and generational order; and/or material, e.g. buildings, landscapes and bodies. These different types of structure interlock with and thus shape each other.

Given their positions in relation to these structures, the groups at the edges of society depicted in this book enact agency from disadvantaged positions. This topic has already been addressed in critical social work research (see e.g. Dominelli 2002; Dhaske 2016; Lorenzetti 2013), in which the concept of lived citizenship and the related spatial perspective offers a framework for conducting in-depth analysis of, and for reflecting on, how various intersecting structures affect the agency, life possibilities and (lack of) well-being of their clients, as well as how their own practices and experiences are conditioned by such structures. Furthermore, our focus on everyday life offers insights into how these conditioned practices and experiences may differ considerably. This serves to raise awareness of the fact that experiences of social problems such as homelessness or child neglect are not universal, and that they may be the result of various intersecting social orders (e.g. ethnic, class, generation and gender). As demonstrated in chapter "Migrant Women's Intimate Struggles and Lived Citizenship: Experiences from Southern Europe", by Cherubini, an intersectionality approach is one way to promote such awareness in the analysis of 'lived citizenship on the edge'. Positioning theory offers another valuable approach, as illustrated in chapter "Exploring Norms About Citizenship in Stories of Young People with "Psychological Vulnerabilities"" by Lavaud. Both approaches permit a nuanced exploration of the dynamic ways in which agency and symbolic structures interact.

The lived citizenship approach makes it possible to grasp how social workers sometimes recognise their clients' ability to exercise agency and strive to enhance this agency, and at other times they respond to their clients' agency with neglect or disciplinary actions. Analysing social work practice from this perspective showed that social workers are not always aware of how, and when, their actions actually enhance this agency instead of constraining it, or when they do both (chapter "The Role of Social Work Practice and Policy in the Lived and Intimate Citizenship of Young People with Psychological Disorders" by Warming; chapter "'They Know *Everything* About Us'—Exploring Spaces of Surveillance and Citizenship Learning Opportunities in a 24-Hour Care Institution" by Christensen). Enhancing clients' agency entails creating spaces for their

self-determination (chapter "Towards a Pragmatic Approach to Children's Citizenship: The Case of School Social Work in France" by Garnier), as well as building and repairing social relationships that support their inclusion and help clients to act as citizens who can exercise their rights (chapter "Social Repair of Relationships: Rights and Belonging in Outreach Work with Homeless People" by Fahnøe, on social repair). Conversely, as shown in Christensen's chapter (chapter "'They Know *Everything* About Us'—Exploring Spaces of Surveillance and Citizenship Learning Opportunities in a 24-Hour Care Institution"), clients' agency may be harmed when social workers engage in rigorous surveillance and objectification of their clients, thus turning social work spaces into dominated spaces that produce tactical behaviours. As the chapters show, a crucial challenge in relation to enhancing clients' agency arises when their agency is nonconformist in the sense that it runs counter to the dominant moral and social order. This nonconformity triggers social work's fundamental dilemmas of care versus control. Several chapters have shown how this dilemma is managed in ways that result in non-conformist forms of agency being disregarded or even undermined (e.g. chapter "From Objects of Care to Citizens—Young Carers' Citizenship" by Wihstutz; chapter "'They Know *Everything* About Us'—Exploring Spaces of Surveillance and Citizenship Learning Opportunities in a 24-Hour Care Institution" by Christensen; chapter "Exploring Norms About Citizenship in Stories of Young People with "Psychological Vulnerabilities"" by Lavaud; chapter "Geo-politics and Citizenship: Why Geography Matters in Defining Social Citizenship Rights of Canadian Muslim Youth" by Moosa-Mitha; chapter "The Role of Social Work Practice and Policy in the Lived and Intimate Citizenship of Young People with Psychological Disorders" by Warming). Sometimes this happens through explicit assessments of clients as manipulative, weak, self-destructive, unsociable or disloyal to a nation-state, community or institution. At other times, disregard for clients' agency takes the form of practices such as surveillance, restricting clients' actions or masked moralising that manipulates clients into conformity. These practices threaten the clients' everyday exercise of their rights, as well as undermining their sense of belonging and their participation. As the book's chapters show, such experiences of various kinds of misrecognition are an integral part of the lives of the individuals and groups at the edges of society. They also show how exclusion from lived

citizenship is not just about exclusion from full citizen rights (although it may also be about this, as shown by Cockburn in chapter "Theorizing Children's Welfare Citizenship: Lived Citizenship, Social Recognition and Generations", regarding children; and by Cherubini in regard to migrants in chapter "Migrant Women's Intimate Struggles and Lived Citizenship: Experiences from Southern Europe"), but is also at least as much about the exclusion of people with formal citizen rights, which results from the implementation of demands from 'outside' that intertwine with institutional and personal norms (see e.g. chapter "Geo-politics and Citizenship: Why Geography Matters in Defining Social Citizenship Rights of Canadian Muslim Youth" by Moosa-Mitha; chapter "Social Repair of Relationships: Rights and Belonging in Outreach Work with Homeless People" by Fahnøe; chapter "Exploring Norms About Citizenship in Stories of Young People with "Psychological Vulnerabilities"" by Lavaud; chapter "Citizenship on the Edge: Homeless Outreach and the City" by Hall) as well as personal affections and emotions (chapter "The Role of Social Work Practice and Policy in the Lived and Intimate Citizenship of Young People with Psychological Disorders" by Warming).

Throughout the book's chapters, we show how the ways in which social work practices deal with the challenge of enhancing clients' agency cannot be understood without considering how they are linked to policies, laws, and managerial strategies. This link is not straightforward. Rather, the influence of policies, laws and managerial strategies is enacted through the everyday practices of social workers and clients, which include resistance that may moderate the impact of such governance flows; as well as affirmation that may reinforce the intentions of those doing the governing. Some of these governance flows convey citizenship norms, while others influence the conditions in which social work practices take place. One particular theme that recurs across several chapters is the way in which policies, laws and managerial strategies seem to frame social workers' practice in ways that prevent them from promoting inclusive citizenship learning; and how the social workers' and clients' struggles to avoid or mitigate disciplinary elements are tied to such forms of governing. The accounts of the social workers' and clients' practices presented in these chapters show that these are ambiguous, messy and filled with contradictions, and thus comprise both inclusive and exclusive elements.

Lived Citizenship Unfolds in Socio-Spatial Places

Clients' agency, and the challenges associated with it, typically unfolds in concrete physical places, for example a family home, an institutional building or a city square. As already noted, such places must be understood as social spaces that are also characterised by their materiality. Such social spaces are 'the product of interrelations, as constituted through interactions, from the immensity of the global to the intimately tiny' (Massey 2005, 9) which transgress the local, and are at once structuring and symbolically and materially structured. Hence, place plays an important role in how agency unfolds, and more generally in practices and experiences of citizenship. This socio-spatial place perspective opens up for a plurality of avenues through which one can analyse and reflect upon how the embeddedness of social work in local–global (glocal) power relations affects the lived citizenship of people in vulnerable positions. The book offers some examples of these avenues and of the kind of insights that this perspective offers; however, there is much more that remains to be discovered.

Several chapters show how identity and feelings of belonging—or its opposite, feeling out of place—are inextricably linked to socio-spatial places. As Hall shows in chapter "Citizenship on the Edge: Homeless Outreach and the City", the experiences of homeless people in Cardiff are intrinsically linked to the changing material cityscape, which affects their chances of finding places where they can seek refuge from people who might misrecognise them. Hall also shows how the material cityscape affects social workers' attempts to reach out to people on the edges of society. In chapter "'They Know *Everything* About Us'—Exploring Spaces of Surveillance and Citizenship Learning Opportunities in a 24-Hour Care Institution", Christensen analyses how social work practices transform spaces into dominated places that produce mistrust and experiences of non-belonging for clients. Both chapters highlight negotiations centred on the right to places, a theme that is also taken up in other chapters. These negotiations, which shape the spaces of social work, both involve humans and non-humans and have profound implications for processes of inclusion and exclusion. This point is not specific to the groups dealt with

in this book, but is particularly evident when it comes to people with physical disabilities whose identity as disabled is inseparable from the material and symbolic dimensions of spaces (Bonfils and Olsen 2016). Negotiations over spaces cannot be separated from the affective and emotional dimensions of social work, as demonstrated by Warming in chapter "The Role of Social Work Practice and Policy in the Lived and Intimate Citizenship of Young People with Psychological Disorders", which shows that emotions must be understood 'in the context of particular places' because it is 'in this context [that] emotions make sense' (Zembylas 2011, 152). Thus, a socio-spatial perspective is vital in order to grasp emotions in social work, which Ferguson (2010, 1002) has argued is important in order to advance our 'understandings of what social workers can do, the risks and limits to their achievements, and provides for deeper learning about the skilled performances and successes that routinely go on'.

Furthermore, as social work unfolds and is shaped by socio-spatial places, it also (re)produces social spaces and dividing lines between different kinds of spaces, for instance the public–private divide which is both reproduced and challenged through social work practice. The latter due to the fact that social workers intervene for purposes of control and care in what is regarded as people's intimate life belonging to the private sphere, e.g. family relations (chapter "From Objects of Care to Citizens—Young Carers' Citizenship" by Wihstuzt; chapter "Towards a Pragmatic Approach to Children's Citizenship: The Case of School Social Work in France", by Garnier) and love relationships (chapter "Social Repair of Relationships: Rights and Belonging in Outreach Work with Homeless People" by Fahnøe).

Whereas in most of the chapters the focus is on the local and only touches briefly on the related glocal socio-spatial framing of identity and belonging, chapter "Geo-politics and Citizenship: Why Geography Matters in Defining Social Citizenship Rights of Canadian Muslim Youth" by Moosa-Mitha stands out as a thought-provoking exception. Here, the identity of Canadian Muslim youth is analysed as constructed in the interplay of the local interpretive and negotiated implementation of global geopolitics and discourses and counter-discourses in local

and global networks. Geopolitics and discourses position the Canadian Muslim youth in question as (potentially) disloyal to the nation-state due to their belonging to the Muslim religion (thus one dimension of their belonging causes others to position them as out of place in relation to another dimension), whereas the young people position themselves in a more differentiated manner as belonging to the nation-state of Canada and/or ethnic, political or (in more rare cases) religious transnational communities. This analysis showcases the relevance of a glocal socio-spatial perspective for understanding the conditioning of simultaneous feelings of belonging and of being out of place (i.e. not belonging). In our global era, identity and belonging cannot be comprehensively understood without an understanding of glocal socio-spatial dynamics. This insight holds true beyond young Muslims living in Western societies. Community governance (Rose 1996; see also chapter "Social Work and Lived Citizenship") and the related downscaling of spaces of lived citizenship to the local level (Desforges et al. 2005), combined with simultaneous spatial flows of communication, make a glocal socio-spatial perspective indispensable in gaining a comprehensive understanding of the dynamics of identity and belonging for all problematised groups. One identity that comes up in several chapters is that of (not) belonging to/being a self-sufficient worker who contributes positively to the competitiveness of the nation-state. We will return shortly to how this identity is related to norms about the 'good citizen'. Here, we describe how this identity recurred in studies of different national and local social work practices and in different groups, albeit in different manifestations.

The socio-spatial approach offers an analytical framework for understanding such messy patterns of social work in a global and cross-community perspective, paying attention to global flows as well as local agency and to the community- and place-related conditions for such agency. Furthermore, this relational understanding of space enables analysis of situated practices that can encompass social relations that reach beyond the specific place in question. It thus enables an analysis of social work that transgresses the separation between the micro-, meso- and macrolevels.

Citizenship Norms

From a lived citizenship perspective, struggles over clients' agency, identity and belonging revolve around dominant norms about how to participate, and how to be, in various everyday practices and spaces. Some of these norms are closely linked to the rights and obligations pertaining to different individuals and groups, as well as to how social work intervenes in their lives. In that sense, these norms are citizenship norms. Citizenship norms define the ideal citizen, i.e. who should be recognised as a good member of society and who is not good enough; and who should change or develop in order to be recognised as a valued member of the society or community in question. They also define who might potentially become a good member of society, and who is perceived as not even potentially able to become a good member. It is noteworthy that these norms are not universal, i.e. they are neither applicable in all contexts nor to all individuals or groups. Instead, different norms are at play in different communities, and different social identities are met with different norms (McKim 2008). As demonstrated in chapter "From Objects of Care to Citizens—Young Carers' Citizenship" by Wihstutz, the latter becomes critical in the case of children who are constructed as 'opposite' to adults and thus met with almost contrary expectations, but the same point also applies to homeless people, as shown in chapter "Social Repair of Relationships: Rights and Belonging in Outreach Work with Homeless People" by Fahnøe; and chapter "Exploring Norms About Citizenship in Stories of Young People with "Psychological Vulnerabilities"" by Lavaud. Still, there are some dominant norms that are more prevalent than others, a point we will return to below.

These norms and their related interventions are subject to negotiation in various types of relationship. Social workers negotiate these norms with each other: they do not necessarily agree about how to define their clients' social identity and they negotiate about this (chapter "The Role of Social Work Practice and Policy in the Lived and Intimate Citizenship of Young People with Psychological Disorders" by Warming). What is more, social workers contest the citizenship norms presented in e.g. national educational policies (chapter "Towards a Pragmatic Approach

to Children's Citizenship: The Case of School Social Work in France" by Garnier) and municipal actions plans (chapter "Exploring Norms About Citizenship in Stories of Young People with "Psychological Vulnerabilities"" by Lavaud). They do so by deploying their cultural capital in negotiations over the norms in question (chapter "The Role of Social Work Practice and Policy in the Lived and Intimate Citizenship of Young People with Psychological Disorders" by Warming). These norms are also negotiated between social workers and clients (chapter "'They Know *Everything* About Us'—Exploring Spaces of Surveillance and Citizenship Learning Opportunities in a 24-Hour Care Institution" by Christensen; chapter "Social Repair of Relationships: Rights and Belonging in Outreach Work with Homeless People" by Fahnøe). In these negotiations, these norms manifest as notions about the good life, among other things. The chapters show that notions of the good life are, to a large extent, imposed by others on groups at the edges of society as responses to their nonconformity which is framed as harmful to themselves as well as to other individuals or to the community in question. As Moosa-Mitha demonstrates in chapter "Geo-politics and Citizenship: Why Geography Matters in Defining Social Citizenship Rights of Canadian Muslim Youth", social policies and social work practice risk serve to coercively assimilate different identities, thus promoting disciplinary citizenship through their exclusionary dynamics. Such exclusionary dynamics produce feelings of non-belonging, lack of participation and withdrawal from welfare support systems and society more broadly. Individuals who are hard to reach—in an affective, cognitive or physical sense or all at the same time—must be understood in relation to this.

Independence, that is to be an individual who needs no care or economic support, is a dominant citizenship norm. It celebrates the notion of an autonomous individual who is free of constraints, and thus disregards interdependency as a universal human condition (Moosa-Mitha 2005). Furthermore, being independent is framed in quite specific ways. Independence denotes self-sufficiency as well as being rational, adult, and not weak. Self-sufficiency appears to be a goal in social work practices that promote ways of life that echo labour market demands. Likewise, clients' willingness to fulfil obligations tied to employment policies that promote self-sufficiency becomes a condition for enjoying

citizenship rights, such as receiving social benefits, and for recognition. Such practices support the ideal of *the citizen-worker* (Isopahkala-Bouret et al. 2014) who is committed to constant self-regulation in order to be valuable to the labour market. This is testimony to the ways in which *the competition state* (Cerny 1997) reaches into social work practices, demanding that the latter must enable individuals to contribute to the state's competitiveness either here and now, or in the future (especially in regard to children—see chapter "Theorizing Children's Welfare Citizenship: Lived Citizenship, Social Recognition and Generations" by Cockburn), thus suspending social solidarity in favour of social investment and competitive solidarity (Streeck 1999). Thus, a distinction arises between those who are positioned as having the potential to contribute to the state's competitiveness, and those who do not—a distinction which creates a basis for discriminatory and exclusionary social work policies and practices. This distinction based on competitive solidarity runs through various fields of social work and is not in any sense restricted to the people at the edges of society that are the subject of this book, although they may be affected more by the shortcomings of practices that uphold this distinction.

Not being weak and therefore not needing need care constitutes a key norm when it comes to adults, whereas children—who are widely positioned as not-yet citizens (chapter "Theorizing Children's Welfare Citizenship: Lived Citizenship, Social Recognition and Generations" by Cockburn; chapter "From Objects of Care to Citizens—Young Carers' Citizenship" by Wihstutz)—are expected to be care receivers and not caregivers. Running through the norms pertaining to care is a dichotomised understanding of caregiver versus care receiver, and dependent versus autonomous which, as Wihstutz shows, discounts human interdependencies and the complexities of everyday practices and experiences of care in which every person is potentially both care receiver and care giver. Given this dichotomized understanding, care practices and the connotations of care are especially vital to the lived citizenship of individuals at the edge, and are therefore contested. The resulting negotiations in everyday social work practice revolve around questions such as who is in need of what kind of care? Who may give care to whom, and where? How to minimise the need for care (and

enhance independence)? And what does receiving or giving care actually entail? Negotiations over these questions, which ultimately shape social relationships, are imbued with power and characterised by multilayeredness as both the processes and outcomes involve practices, affect, emotion and materiality, as shown by Warming in chapter "The Role of Social Work Practice and Policy in the Lived and Intimate Citizenship of Young People with Psychological Disorders". Several of the chapters illustrate that despite these ongoing negotiations, receiving care often carries a price. This may take the form of loss of self-determination, rights, or the capacity to enjoy rights; or lack of recognition of one's sense and practices of belonging or of one's contributions to a given community or society. Moreover, various chapters show how receiving care is associated with being positioned as weak, irrational, less morally sane than others, manipulative, a victim, or dangerous.

Adherence to the above-mentioned norms supports citizenship conditionalities. These conditionalities are not just about citizenship status (*being a citizen*), or potentially *fulfilling* that status (*acting as a citizen*), if citizenship status is understood merely as a question of rights and obligations. Rather, these conditionalities also apply to recognition: recognition of a person's participation, belongings and identity which, according to Honneth (2003), is crucial for well-being and social integration, and also, following Delanty (2003), for inclusive citizenship learning, i.e. competences and motivation for participation. Today, these conditionalities are becoming more rigid across different local contexts, mediated by reforms of social policy, educational policy, migration policy, workfare and urban development, and are connected to geopolitics in the form of discourses about globalisation, the competition state, the migration crisis and the war on terror. The increasing rigidity of norms about 'good citizens' carries a serious risk of producing exclusionary societies featuring a growing group of people who do not just live on the edges but are being pushed off them—and sometimes even jumping off themselves.

As indicated above, these citizenship norms both make individuals visible as potential clients (distinguishing between those who already live up to good citizen norms and those who have to work on their potential), and render them visible as a certain kind of client (or even

disregard them as clients) through distinctions between people on the edges who are worthy of social investment and those who are not worthy. Thus, clients and potential clients (the target groups of various policies) are made visible to social workers through citizenship norms; however, social workers also make clients visible by negotiating or opposing these same norms. Clients may be made visible as out of place, belonging, in need, hard to reach, at risk or as a risk or an object of fear, for instance. One example of this may be found in chapter "Citizenship on the Edge: Homeless Outreach and the City" by Hall, where social work practice was revealed to be partly about actually finding homeless people on the streets: that is, identifying them and making them visible as objects of social work in situations where they 'hide' among 'ordinary people'. We find another example in chapter "'They Know *Everything* About Us'—Exploring Spaces of Surveillance and Citizenship Learning Opportunities in a 24-Hour Care Institution" by Christensen, where social workers make young people visible by 'misrecognising' them, in this case by talking *about* them rather than *with* them, and by highlighting certain features which rendered them visible in ways that didn't reflect the young people's own points of view. However, the book's chapters also offer examples of how social work can make clients visible in an empowering manner, for instance chapter "Social Repair of Relationships: Rights and Belonging in Outreach Work with Homeless People" by Fahnøe, offers examples of social repair work mediating between the client and the system; and chapter "The Role of Social Work Practice and Policy in the Lived and Intimate Citizenship of Young People with Psychological Disorders" by Warming, describes how a social worker relaxed the institution's strict rules for a young resident who was accused by the other staff of sneaking around the kitchen and stealing food, and was lenient regarding the rules about registering for dinner, instead involving him in cooking dinner and thus making him visible as someone who could participate constructively, both to himself and to the other staff members. Practices such as these, which make clients visible and thus amenable to interventions, go beyond the realm of social work with the target groups included in this book towards social work as such, and they reflect the duality of social work, which both involves social control and social care as clients are made visible either as people who are in need or who are a risk—or both.

Intimate Citizenship, Privacy, Private and Public Space

Intimate citizenship concerns all subjects. As a concept, intimate citizenship acknowledges the intimate sphere as a site for citizenship practices, and it may serve a basis for claims to rights regarding intimate choices and relationships. The concept of intimate citizenship also holds the potential for critical analysis of the ways in which private lives are increasingly made objects of political intervention and governing. In accordance with Plummer, we understand intimate citizenship as a sensitising concept (Blumer 1954) '*which sets about analysing a plurality of public discourses and stories about how to live the personal life in a late modern world where we are confronted by an escalating series of choices and difficulties around intimacies. (..) it examines rights, obligations, recognitions and respect around those most intimate spheres of life*—who to live with, how to raise children, how to handle one's body, how to relate as a gendered being, how to be an erotic person. It tries to sense that such arrangements are bound up with membership of different and complex groups and communities, bringing their own inevitable tensions and splits' (Plummer). Intimate citizenship is not just about sexualities (the focus of Plummer's work), but also about parenting, caring, intergenerational relations, friendship and health issues, for instance. Thus, intimate citizenship has to do with making the right choice about how to live in a broad sense, i.e. choosing where and how to live, and with whom, along with the right to information control (Goffman [1963]1990). The ability to exercise these rights, which are linked to power dynamics, is clearly vital to individuals' identity and sense of belonging.

Throughout the various chapters, this concept has proven its strength in focusing critical attention on the ways in which citizenship norms and other norms about the 'right' way to be and feel, that are implicit in social work practices both in the form of personal norms and political governance, invade the intimate lives of clients. In chapter "Migrant Women's Intimate Struggles and Lived Citizenship: Experiences from Southern Europe" Cherubini exemplifies this in her analysis of how polices and laws shape the intimate lives of migrant women, including

their relationships within the family and their position in relation to the labour market. Cherubini shows how polices and laws create restrictions as well as opportunities in regard to the women's self-determination.

The concept of intimate citizenship also helps to reveal a new role for social work practice, namely helping clients to navigate in this plurality of public discourses and stories about how to live one's personal life in a context where 'life is tough'. Lavaud illustrates this in chapter "Exploring Norms About Citizenship in Stories of Young People with "Psychological Vulnerabilities"" in her analysis of a case where social workers at a residence for young people with 'psychological vulnerabilities' try to teach the young people 'life skills' related to their intimate lives, including how to interact with others in socially acceptable ways and how to make friends. In chapter "Social Repair of Relationships: Rights and Belonging in Outreach Work with Homeless People", Fahnøe shows that advising clients about who to befriend is another way in which social workers help clients to navigate in relation to their intimate lives.

Thus, the concept of intimate citizenship helps us to realise more of the critical potential of the lived citizenship perspective by revealing how intimate aspects of everyday life are also connected with rights and obligations, and represent a key conflict zone when it comes to differentiating between valued and not-valued identities, morally sane and not-morally sane community members. Inclusive intimate citizenship requires recognition and support for the right to decide what to do with one's own body, to manage one's personal relations, and to receive guidance in navigating the growing array of choices and difficulties surrounding intimacy.

Looking Forward—Directions for Future Research into Social Work Practices and Citizenship

The hitherto almost untrodden path of lived citizenship research in the realm of social work that we have begun to explore in this book has proved very fruitful in enabling critical and nuanced analyses that can

stimulate debate and reflections on social work policy and practice. This is, not least, due to its sensitivity to the complexities of social work and its rootedness in an ideal of inclusive rather than disciplinary citizenship. However, we have opened more doors than we have been able to close, and we therefore wish to conclude by calling for more research in the field and pointing out some directions for future research.

First of all, the socio-spatial place perspective and the concept of intimate citizenship certainly call for much more attention, and are promising routes for ground-breaking research in the field of social work and the citizenship of people in vulnerable positions. Together, these approaches can capture how the challenges in intimate and societal life that are experienced by people in vulnerable positions (as well as the contribution of social work to their lived citizenship) are intertwined with geopolitics and global flows of communication and information, even though they are locally situated, experienced and acted upon. Indeed, there is a need for research that raises critical and fundamental questions based on in-depth analysis of the glocal dynamics that shape inclusion, discrimination, disciplining and exclusion. We do not need more contributions to the overwhelming number of so-called evidence-based methods in social work which take citizenship norms for granted.

Likewise, we advocate a weak theory approach which challenges existing knowledge production in the field of social work, including the binary understanding of target groups as either belonging, participating, contributing, enjoying rights and recognition—or not. These groups are, together with the social workers that try to empower and/or discipline them, figuratively speaking dancing the tango on the edges of citizenship, struggling to elude the complexities of practices and constructions of non-citizenship with contested and multidimensional outcomes. Research that explores the outcomes of social work, while remaining open to ambiguities and maintaining an awareness of intersecting material, emotional, affective and cognitive dynamics, will be able to represent social work and its target groups in a much more holistic manner. Furthermore, although such research is unlikely to be able to come up with clear instructions for social work, it will provide insights and understanding of dilemmas and conflicts that are silenced or appear indecipherable when addressed from other perspectives.

Finally, we wish to open up the discussion by suggesting that the book's insights from research on lived citizenship, seen through the prism of the target groups of social work (children, homeless people, immigrants, etc.), reach far beyond these groups and the realm of social work itself. Social work and the lived citizenship of its target groups reflect broader social changes, including inclusionary and disciplinary dynamics; new conflicts and modes of resistance, and new pressures and stress factors (new social pathologies). Thus, a focus on social work and the lived citizenship of its target groups offers a sociological microscope through which we can study the wider social impacts of geopolitics and glocal socio-spatial dynamics.

References

Blumer, H. 1954. What is Wrong with Social Theory. *American Sociological Review* 18: 3–10.

Bonfils, I.S., and L. Olsen. 2016. Handicap: skabes i menneskers møde med omverdenen. In *Socialpolitik*, 4th ed., ed. I. Hornemann Møller and J. Elm Larsen, 347–370. København: Hans Reitzel.

Cerny, P.G. 1997. Paradoxes of the Competition State: The Dynamics of Political Globalization. *Government and Opposition* 32 (2): 251–274.

Desforges, L., R. Jones, and M. Woods. 2005. New Geographies of Citizenship. *Citizenship Studies* 9 (5): 439–451.

Dhaske, G. 2016. Policy Advocacy on Women's Issues in India: Exploring Challenges to Social Work. *Critical Social Work* 17 (1). http://www1.uwindsor.ca/criticalsocialwork/policyadvocacy. Accessed 18 Jan 2017.

Dominelli, L. 2002. *Anti-Oppressive Social Work Theory and Practice*. Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan.

Ferguson, H. 2010. Walks, Home Visits and Atmospheres: Risk and the Everyday Practices and Mobilities of Social Work and Child Protection. *British Journal of Social Work* 40 (4): 1100–1117.

Goffman, E. 1990. *Stigma. Notes on the Management of Spoiled Identity*. London: Penguin Books.

Honneth, A. 2003. *Behovet for anerkendelse*. København: Hans Reitzels Forlag.

Isopahkala-Bouret, U., S. Lappalainen, and E. Lahelma. 2014. Educating Worker-Citizens: Visions and Divisions in Curriculum Texts. *Journal of Education and Work* 27 (1): 92–109.

Lorenzetti, L. 2013. Developing a Cohesive Emancipatory Social Work Identity: Risking an Act of Love. *Critical Social Work* 14 (2). http://www1.uwindsor.ca/criticalsocialwork/cohesive_emancipatory_sw_identity. Accessed 18 Jan 2017.

Massey, D. 2005. *For Space*. London: SAGE Publications.

McKim, A. 2008. 'Getting Gut-Level': Punishment, Gender, and Therapeutic Governance. *Gender & Society* 22 (3): 303–323.

Moosa-Mitha, Mehmoona. 2005. A Difference-Centred Alternative to Theorization of Children's Citizenship Rights. *Citizenship Studies* 9 (4): 369–388.

Rose, Nikolas. 1996. The death of the social? Re-figuring the territory of government. *Economy and Society* 25 (3): 327–356.

Streeck, W. 1999. Competitive Solidarity: Rethinking the 'European Social Model'. MPIfG Working Paper, 1999/8, Max-Planck-Institut fur Gesellschaftsforschung, Cologne.

Zembylas, M. 2011. Investigating the Emotional Geographies of Exclusion at a Multicultural School. *Emotion, Space and Society* 4 (3): 151–159.

Index

H. Warming and K. Fahnøe (eds.), *Lived Citizenship on the Edge of Society*,
Palgrave Politics of Identity and Citizenship Series, DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-55068-8