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Abstract

This thesis explores how youth participation was socially constructed and conceptualized during an internationally dominated reconstruction of Haiti following the earthquake of 2010. Grounded within critical, constructivist, and post-colonial theoretical perspectives, this research uses mixed methods to analyze youth programs and conceptualizations of participation within them. Among its frameworks is a theoretical lens of social spaces for participation that juxtaposes binary qualities such as international and local origins, market and social orientations, and invited and claimed spaces for participation.

In the first phase this research uses conceptual mapping and cluster analysis techniques to survey and plot the landscape of youth programs operating in Haiti after the earthquake. Of the programs surveyed, a relatively equal distribution emerged between those with local and those with international origins. However, a comparatively large group of those programs with local origins also had a curriculum with a primary social orientation.

In the second phase it draws on qualitative and ethnographic methods to examine social constructions of participation in three case study programs with activities ranging
from rural farming and entrepreneurship, to democratic education and debate
competitions, to human rights and radio broadcasting. The findings suggest that
geography and language have a bearing on *who* participated, that programs naturally
provide different facets for *what* youth could actually participate in, and that important
distinctions exist between the perspectives of program recipients and those of
practitioners on *why* youth participate.

In the third phase the research employs a vertical case study analysis to explicate
and compare conceptualizations of participation along four levels of the international aid
chains associated with each case study program. These findings reveal that funders and
policy makers were inclined to conceptualize participation as motivated by the individual
agency of Haitians, while youth in these programs tended to focus on the need for social
structures to enable their participation in Haiti.

This research has implications for how and why citizen participation is embedded
as a value and a learning outcome in international education that are relevant for the
fields of comparative and international education, youth and democratic learning, and
citizen participation in the Global South.
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Chapter One:
Youth Participation in Programs of the Haitian Reconstruction

The principle of participation is a promising, normative ideal that is commonly invoked in education and international development discourses. Yet despite its broad appeal, there is little evidence as to how it is constructed in these realms, how it is interpreted in recipient communities, or what actually constitutes citizen participation. The focus of this thesis is to better understand how youth participation is socially constructed and conceptualized in a specific context: a post-disaster reconstruction setting in a fragile state. More precisely, this thesis looks at youth participation in three non-governmental organization (NGO) programs in Haiti that were supported by international resources after the earthquake of 2010.

The presentation of this research begins with an investigation of the broader landscape of reconstruction-era youth programming in Haiti, then it zeroes-in on specific constructions and conceptualizations of participation—primarily between youth recipients of international aid and those planning the participatory programs in Haiti. To focus on these specific interpretations, I select three internationally supported programs whose central aim was to enable youth participation. The first of these programs, a livelihood-oriented program, provided training in agricultural and entrepreneurial skills for youth; the second, a democracy-focussed program, organized debate clubs and competitions throughout the country; and the third, a media training program, conducted workshops on radio broadcasting for youth affected by the earthquake.

These three programs are used as case studies to examine how youth participation was socially constructed during the reconstruction, but also as venues to solicit
conceptualizations of participation through the vantage points of actors along a four-level, vertical aid chain through which each program was funded, generated, implemented, and received. These conceptualizations were analyzed according to the ways that the social spaces for participation were envisioned, and compared horizontally (among the three cases) and vertically (along the four-level aid chain).

**The Haitian Earthquake and Ensuing Reconstruction**

On January 12, 2010, an earthquake registering 7.3 on the Richter scale struck Haiti’s primary urban centre, directly affecting the lives of three million people (approximately a third of the national population), causing the deaths of an estimated 200,000 people (Muggah & Kolbe, 2011). The earthquake itself lasted for 35 seconds, producing immediate and widespread evidence of destruction. The international airport was shut down for several days, roads were impassable, communications were cut off, and almost 300,000 homes were destroyed. Some 1.5 million Haitians were left without homes, and over 600,000 citizens were required to find refuge with friends, family, or in temporary camps for internally displaced persons (IDPs). In the days, weeks, and months that followed, an internationally-dominated reconstruction ensued in which up to 10,000

1 Deaths from the earthquake remains unconfirmed, with official (government and INGO) figures placing the number at 200,000 or above, whereas on-the-ground anthropological research suggests 65,000 casualties or less. Weaknesses in existing formal census data, and much internal migration and data collection challenges after the earthquake compounded the difficulty of accurately assessing the total number of victims (Muggah & Athena, 2012; Schuller, 2012; Schwartz 2012).
NGOs and over two billion U.S. dollars in aid money and resources contributed to the rebuilding of Haiti’s physical and social landscape (Carr et al., forthcoming).

This term, *reconstruction*, was the most common descriptor of the broad array of activities in Haiti following the earthquake, and included everything from post-disaster response, emergency reconstruction, and social and physical recovery. Colloquially in Haiti, reconstruction has been frequently used to refer to the three-year period in which international support was received to repair physical infrastructure destroyed in the earthquake (UNOPS, 2012). However, this thesis challenges this mainstream interpretation in several ways. First, it reflects the position that many Haitians did not seek to “reconstruct” their society to its previous state, but instead, envisioned and sought to develop a new reality for Haiti. As Michèle D. Pierre-Louis (2011) proposed “the construction—and I mean construction—of another Haiti will only happen through a paradigm shift” (translated from French2, p. 12). The next shift away from the central narrative of reconstruction is that rather than a focus on (re)-constructing the *physical* environment in Haiti, this thesis concentrates on how youth were mobilized for a *social* reconstruction of Haiti. For example, rather than emphasizing the re-building of roads, schools, hospitals and homes, this research examined how social institutions such as democracy, education, and citizenship were reconceptualised after the earthquake. The third point of departure from the mainstream notion of reconstructing Haiti builds on a strong argument from within the country that any reconstruction process would require  

__________________________

2 All translations from French and Kreyòl are my own unless otherwise indicated.
the full participation of Haitian citizens. Soon after the earthquake, for example, prominent Haitian academics Jean Casimir and Laurent Dubois (2010) appealed for the participation of Haitians to ensure a successful and relevant reconstruction:

How can we assure that Haiti can rebuild both as quickly and as effectively as possible? Whatever the approaches taken, whether they are channelled through the Haitian state or through NGOs, they will only be successful in the long term if they are predicated upon the empowerment of the Haitian people to reconstruct their world in ways that promise to respond to their pressing and long-deferred aspirations. (p. 132)

The centrality of Haitian participation in the reconstruction was not only advanced from within. In assessing the international response to the earthquake in the context of the military and humanitarian intervention of recent decades to Haiti, psychiatric anthropologist Erica James (2010) emphasized the need for Haitians of all social standings to participate in the reconstruction:

Some people have characterized the earthquake tragedy as an opportunity for Haiti’s transformation, as long as Haitians remain partners in deciding how plans for their county’s redevelopment and reconstruction are to take place. … What remains crucial is that Haitians from all social classes and geographic locations participate in such plans. Regardless of the material or infrastructural disparities in power between Haiti and other members of the international community, Haitians must be imbued with equal (if not greater) power than international, national, and local interveners in deciding the course of reconstruction efforts in their country. (p. xxii, emphasis added)

In large numbers, the foreign aid community also prioritized the participation of Haitians as a guiding principle in the international humanitarian response. “Promote participation, not dependence”, advised World Vision Canada’s Dave Toycen (2011) in
a newspaper analysis promoting strategic approaches to the reconstruction. One of Plan Canada’s four key areas of support for the re-building of Haiti included working “with the Haitian government to promote full social *participation* for Haitian girls” (3 years after, 2013). Other aid agencies and international NGOs (INGOs) declared similar priorities and policies, constructing their programs around the participatory development frameworks that have been prominent in international development since the 1960s (Chambers, 1986; Cohen & Uphoff, 1980; Midgley, 1986; Mosse, 2003).

However, as shall be discussed in more detail in Chapter Three, the level of involvement of Haitians in their own reconstruction has been as subject of much debate, often linked to the ways that participation was variably mobilized during the reconstruction. These inconsistencies in the ways that “participation” is constructed, conceptualized, and referenced are the starting points for this research. Perhaps, as will be explored, if the notion of participation has distinctive meanings to different groups who are implicated in the reconstruction, disparate conclusions might be drawn as to whether or not Haitian citizens actually participated in the reconstruction. The primary intent of this thesis to explicate meanings of participation by examining in detail the key social spaces in the aid arena in which youth participated—and learned to participate—in internationally supported programs of the reconstruction.

**Research Design and Questions**

The first task in this thesis was to investigate youth programs operating in Haiti during the time of the reconstruction, and analyze their positions from a normative perspective, examining their approaches as tending towards market- or social-orientations, and their origins as predominantly international or local. These frameworks,
to be taken up in more details in Chapter Two, are the basis for the first research question:

Research Question #1: What youth programs are operating in Haiti that target and involve youth as participants in their national reconstruction, and how do they differ in terms of their origins and orientation?

This question involved the undertaking of a process of locating the youth programs that were implanted in Haiti during the three-year period of reconstruction, analyzing them according to their origins and orientations, and constructing a visual representation of this social arena through a conceptual map (Paulston, 1993). From this pool I strategically chose three case study programs to observe the ways in which youth participation unfolded during the idea-generating, planning, and implementation phases of each. This research addressed the second research question:

Research Question #2: How is youth participation socially constructed during the formation and implementation of the three selected case study programs of the Haitian reconstruction?

Soliciting and extracting conceptualizations of participation from selected youth, practitioners, and policy documents affiliated with these three programs, I then analyzed these perspectives in order to respond to the remaining research questions:

Research Question #3: How is participation conceptualized by the various actors at each of the four levels of the vertical aid chain within the three selected case study programs?

Research Question #4: How do these conceptualizations of participation compare and contrast with one another among the programs (horizontally), along the levels of the aid chain (vertically), and how can any differences be explained?
The research design employed for the latter Research Questions draws broadly on research methodologies in comparative education proposed by comparativists such as Mark Bray, Bob Adamson, and Mark Mason (2007) and specifically on Frances Vavrus and Lesley Bartlett’s (2009) vertical case study methodology that seeks to deconstruct international education policy and its interpretations through the channels of foreign aid. The actors and data sources used for the aid chain of this research were separated into four levels to represent distinct standpoints on the youth program delivery. The conceptualizations of participation were analyzed by using a critical discourse analysis of the interview transcripts and documents collected for this research (Hart, 2010; Nelson & Hardy, 2002).

**Case Study Programs**

The three selected case study programs each stated distinct normative positions on youth participation. The first was a program called Farming for Education (or *Farming*, for short), a program of Bangladesh-based BRAC and funded by the Digicel Haiti Foundation, the charitable wing of the Caribbean’s largest mobile phone network. The second program was Debate Competitions (*Debates*), an initiative of the prominent Haitian organization Fondasyon Konesans Ak Libète (FOKAL), funded in part by the then Montreal-based International Center for Rights and Democracy (Rights & Democracy). The third program was Rights through Radio (*Radio*), a program executed by the locally governed NGO Panos Caribbean and funded by the United Nations.

---

3 Not an acronym; see full list of acronyms and abbreviations in the front matter for more details.
Children’s Fund (UNICEF). Each of the program names are pseudonyms, used in part to obscure the identities of the youth program participants and NGO practitioners in this study as a measure of ambiguity for the ethical consideration of anonymity of research participants as a pre-condition for this research. These pseudonyms are also intended to ease the connection between the focus of each program and their name, used for convenience to more quickly associate them with their central activities during the reading of this thesis.

**The Centrality of Participation as the Focus of This Research**

Assumptions made about the intrinsic benefits associated with participation are common, often allowing its inclusion in program policy as a guiding principle that goes untested. Participation is a frequently stated pre-requisite for enhancing citizenship, deepening democracy, and developing a just and equitable society. As many researchers of citizen participation have argued, whereas a simple redistribution of wealth will not result in equal or just outcomes for the poor and marginalized, participation enables individuals and communities with distinct experiences, cultures, and identities to provide input, initiative, and other forms of expression to ensure a relevant and impactful development process (Donais & Knorr, 2013; Etheart, 1995; Gaventa & Barrett, 2010; Hart, 1992; Kabeer, 2005; Mansbridge, 1995; Putnam, 2000; Rose, 2003). However, the idea that participation necessarily produces better citizens and a healthy, functioning society is not a universally accepted tenant. Cooke & Kothari (2001), for example, suggest that, “tyranny is both a real and a potential consequence of participatory development, counter-intuitive and contrary to its rhetoric of empowerment though this may be” (p. 3). For many, invoking participation as a component of foreign aid can be
oppressive, tokenizing, manipulative, and colonizing (Rahnema, 2010; Stiefel & Wolfe, 1994; White, 1996).

A key problem in ascribing virtue to participation is its infinitely broad connotation. Researchers of participation in international aid have described it as a “seductive ideal”, a “catchall notion”, and “essentially anything that involves people” (Cornwall, 2008; Rahnema, 2010; Edwards & Klees, 2012). In the current era it is mobilized in mainstream and radical positions of the political right (as in popular participation such as the Tea Party movement in the U.S.) and left (such as the participation in deliberative democracy initiatives across Latin and North America). It is invoked, practiced, and documented at community levels across the Global South, the North, and, in the high level discourses of global and international institutions. In development discourses, participation could refer either to sectors of society (i.e. civil society); groups of citizens (such as participation in voting or other social institutions); or segments of citizens (such as youth, as is the focus of this research). Purposes of and spaces for youth participation, as well as their depth, also vary considerably. For example, a girl who saves her money to purchase a cell phone; a 15-year old who paints a mural; an adolescent boy who receives a box of vegetable seeds from an NGO; a teenager who attends school for one semester or camps out in protest on the steps of the presidential palace are all cases that could fit under the umbrella of participation—or not, depending on the perspective and analysis. Youth participation varies considerably in form and interpretation.

It is precisely this elusive quality of participation that renders the notion problematic. Just as participation may lead to outcomes that strengthen individuals and
societies, it also has been used to manipulate, co-opt, and tyrannize. As White (1996) reminds us, “it is in the ambiguity of participation, as both concept and practice, that the scope for its colonization lies” (p. 8). This need for context and specificity in framing participation is taken up in detail in Chapter Two, which outlines the theories underlying, approaches to, and analytical frameworks of this research. However the origins of the mandate for participation and the overarching orientations that inform the framing of participation are the two central binaries that ground this research.

**Origins and Orientations of Participation**

The vision for and execution of youth participation transpires in social spaces with innumerable characteristics including both the origins and orientations of these spaces. The constructions and conceptualizations of these spaces for participation (Cornwall, 2002, 2003, 2004, 2008) provide both opportunities for research and analysis due to the complex combination of cultures, contexts, histories, and power that form the dynamic of these spaces. Cornwall (2004) considers these factors in advancing this metaphor:

> Spaces are bounded in time as well as dimension. A space can be emptied or filled, permeable or sealed; it can be an opening, an invitation to speak or act. Spaces can also be clamped shut, voided of meaning, or depopulated as people turn their attention elsewhere. Thinking about participation as a spatial practice highlights the relations of power and constructions of citizenship that permeate any site for public engagement. (p. 1)

In this research the spaces for youth participation in Haiti are considered in light of their origins and their orientations. The program origins are framed between a spectrum of international and local locations, based on elements such as the geography,
citizenship, language and curriculum of the program. As theorized in Chapter Two, programs with international origins may bear characteristics of invited spaces for participation, in which external actors invite local beneficiaries to participate the structures constructed by the former. By comparison, programs with local origins may be examples of and conceptualized as claimed spaces of participation that are formed through the agency of citizens and youth at the local level in Haiti. The spectrum between international and local origins may also be theoretically linked to the orientations of youth participation as either market or social, respectively. These two binaries were used for this research to interpret how youth participation was both generally and specifically constructed and conceptualized in the reconstruction.

**Participation Conceptualizations Within the Development Aid Chain**

The specific spaces for participation selected for this research are bounded within the development aid chain of each case study program. The aid chain for each program ranged from the international donors and policy makers that enabled the implementation of the programs to the Haitian youth who were the recipients of this aid. The aid chain, purports Hootsman (2008), is a visual representation of the dynamics of power along a vertical hierarchy of an aid relationship. Wallace et al. (2006) define the aid chain as the sequence of actors associated with “moving funds from their initial institutional source to be spent on behalf of the targeted beneficiaries in the recipient area, and the associated processes of accounting to donors for the use of these funds.” Although in theory it is represented as a direct, linear chain of the distribution of funds from international to local actors, in reality aid rarely follows such a straight line. Instead, it flows along a chain from providers to recipients through many middle sources and intermediaries. Such was
the case in this research. Matters of aid distribution are further compounded when one examines the aid chain itself. There typically exists a complex line of culturally diverse actors between the top and the bottom of the chain. For example, intermediaries involved in aid distribution may be local Haitian, dual citizens, or internationally based. The identity each actor assumes is conditioned by his or her respective circumstances such as their residences, their cultural references, language fluencies, and social circles.

Thus, the vertical aid chain usually comprises many individuals and levels of hierarchy but is generalized in small, finite number of levels. In this thesis the aid chain is synthesized as four levels that are typical to INGO structures and logic framework analyses in aid planning, monitoring, and evaluation (PME). These levels are described throughout this thesis as the Youth Recipient Level (Level 1), the Program Implementation Level (Level 2), the Country Director Level (Level 3), and the International Policy and Funding Level (Level 4).

Beyond the movement of funds, this research examines the transfer of policy, power, and ideas by participants and practitioners along the aid chain. While Wallace et al. (2006) describe above the bidirectional travel of funds moving downwards and accountability moving upwards, the focus in this thesis is the differences in actors’ conceptualizations at the four discrete stages of the aid chain described above. As shall be described in the methodology of this research (Chapter Four), the concentration of this thesis is on youth constructions and conceptualizations of participation, analyzing “the lowest level of the implementation process”, and then backing up “through the structure of the implementing agencies” (Elmore, 1979, p. 604).
The prevailing theory underpinning the aid chain, most evident in the logical framework approach adopted by many donor institutions and their implementing agencies in the West, is that a carefully thought-out plan generated at the top of the chain will be carried through as it works its way down the chain, ultimately benefiting the development recipients for whom the plan was intended. Research in the past decade has shown that this is frequently not the case, with plans derailed and disrupted at the Country Director, Program Implementation, and Youth Recipient levels (Eschenbacher, 2012; Hootsman, 2008). These plans are usurped because oftentimes the benefits to the program recipients are not equally valued at the bottom as they are at the top of the chain. Whether the policy and program priority of participation is also subject to such disruptions along the aid chain is also unclear. A central objective in this thesis, thus, is to travel length of the aid chain, soliciting conceptualizations of exactly what constitutes citizen participation at each level.

**Youth as the Primary Target Group**
A focus on youth participation is prevalent throughout this thesis. This centrality of youth was chosen due to the frequently cited potential of youth to transform the world, or as the hope for the future. “Youth can change the world” (McCarney, 2012), suggest leaders of international organizations such as Babatunde Osotimehin (the United Nations Population Fund; UNFPA) and Plan Canada’s Rosemary McCarney (Osotimehin, 2012). But while youth are often change-makers they are also in an important life phase in which they are changing physically, emotionally and intellectually, developing a deeper level of consciousness, and transitioning into adulthood. These important dynamics that characterize youth are expounded upon in Chapter Two.
Significance of the Research

Due to the complexity and multiple vantage points of participation, this research has engaged in numerous bodies of literature that embrace numerous theoretical and empirical perspectives. The subject of participation is a primary concern for many disciplines within the social sciences, particularly as they relate to fields of development, education, and those that examine the interplay of power between subjects. For example, some schools of international aid research focus on the roles of Western (i.e. liberal and democratic) institutions in enabling the participation of margined groups through international aid and transnational coalitions (Chatterjee, 2011; Gaventa & Mayo, 2009), and as it relates to education specifically, many have examined participation in comparative and international perspective (Klees, 2009; Mundy et al., 2007; Rose, 1995). Citizen participation is highlighted in various branches of critical international development studies such as development policy and management (Chambers, 1986; Cooke & Kothari, 2001), research that investigates pro-poor and citizen-centric development (Kabeer, 2002, 2005; Robins & von Lieres, 2004) and the connections between citizen participation and better development outcomes (Gaventa & Barrett, 2010). Participation is also investigated insofar as its relationship with democracy, including the processes of democratic dialogue, participatory governance (Baiocchi, 2001; Fung & Wright, 2001; Schugurensky, 2009), the social fabric of democratic societies (MacPherson, 1973; Mansbridge, 1995; Patemen, 1970), and the participation of youth as a form of democratic education (Hart, 1992; Westheimer & Kahne, 1998).

This thesis focuses on participation and its intersections with development, foreign aid, fragility, NGOs, non-formal education, and youth. As such, I centre my
research on development and reconstruction discourses that probe an assessment of participation as somewhere between “a rosy ring of inclusion” (Cornwall, 2004) and “the new tyranny” (Cooke & Kothari, 2001) to contribute to the dialogue of citizen participation in the Global South. In the field of comparative education I locate this research within debates that question and analyze the unique role of NGOs in enabling citizen participation through international aid (Klees, 2009; Mundy et al., 2009); in youth studies and democratic education I examine curricular questions regarding what types of citizens we produce through youth programs that highlight the importance of democracy citizen participation (Westheimer & Kahne, 2004).

In the increasing large body of literature on citizen participation in Haiti—notably that since the earthquake of 2010—there are some gaps that this research intends to fill. Most significantly, this thesis teases out conceptualizations of participation, primarily amongst youth in Haiti, but also in comparative analysis in the process of foreign aid. It examines how conceptualizations of participation alter along the aid chain, how participation was socially constructed in specifically selected case study programs, and how participation is constructed in the broader arena of youth programs in the reconstruction.

**What Brought Me to This Research**

With a stated critical, qualitative, and constructivist research design, I maintain that one’s social and structural position, bias, and background are crucial to understanding the epistemological, methodological, and analytical processes of this research (Mehra, 2002). I therefore provide a brief backdrop of the life experiences and my personal history that have informed my path to this research.
For much of my life I have been interested in how people participate in group decisions: the widespread appeal of participation for educators and development practitioners, the invisible operations of power in program curriculum and design, and the endless theoretical and practical innovations that enable participation as a means to a better society. Facilitating participatory learning experiences, for example, has been an integral element of my background in education, and as a development practitioner, a teacher, and a youth worker I was fascinated by the potential for participation to both empower and manipulate. In the late 1990s during my work with INGOs in rural community programs in Guyana and Vanuatu I frequently convened with community leaders, developed community surveys, and facilitated local strategic visioning sessions. Every one of these tasks, although meant to ensure citizen participation, increased my awareness of their underlying limitations, internal power dynamics, and—however subtle—manifestations of colonization. Similarly, as a public school teacher in Canada I experimented with the possibilities and boundaries of my students’ participation in the school curriculum, and wondered how equitably and democratically my students were participating, given the limits in the construction of formal education, the norms and expectations of our school and education system, and my own known and hidden boundaries for sharing power and control. As I was designing and implementing programs for youth to develop skills in leadership, entrepreneurship, and global citizenship, I frequently returned to two central questions: “What type of citizens are these programs creating?”, and “How exactly are these youth learning to participate in society?” This present research, an exploration into the particular experiences of Haitian youth, addresses the specific tensions with participation in the context of the post-
earthquake reconstruction, but it is also more broadly informed by the questions and concerns I have deliberated over many years and experiences about participation in international education.

**Organization of This Thesis**

This thesis is organized into eleven chapters. **Chapter Two** begins by locating participation against other conceptual constructs such as citizenship and democracy, market- and social-orientations to participation, invited and claimed spaces for participation and the intersections between these conceptualizations. It then examines issues of participation in the international development sphere, specifically in relation to foreign aid and youth programming. Finally, it turns to the fundamental problem of defining participation, addressing this concern by responding to the need for context and specificity. This heuristic described focuses on describing an overall meaning of participation and answering three key questions that will be used throughout this thesis to deconstruct social constructions and conceptualizations of participation. These questions are *Who* participates?, in *What* do they participate?, and *Why* do they choose to participate?

Building on the premise that participation is necessarily conceptualized with respect to the motives of the actors, the socio-political context of the nation, the identities of marginalized citizens, and the nature of its spaces, **Chapter Three** delves into a history of Haiti and considers how various interpretations of participation may have become shaped in Haiti today. It maintains the importance of returning to the conditions of the original colonization by Columbus to recount various perspectives on citizenship, democracy, and participation during that initial period of occupation—first by Spanish,
then by French colonizers. Chapter Three continues through this period of slavery and then highlights the significance of the Haitian revolution of 1791 to 1804 in the shaping of Haitian identity and contextualizing contemporary citizen participation. It then examines post-independence Haiti, through its periods of U.S. occupation, the Haitian renaissance, the Duvalier dictatorships, the influx of foreign aid and investment, the rise and fall of Aristide, and finally, the period of instability leading up to the earthquake. This historical section culminates with an account of the earthquake itself and the dynamics of the international reconstruction that followed, before highlighting the current situation in Haiti. In its summary it examines how Haiti’s history has shaped present cultural norms that govern who participates, what they participate in, and why they participate.

**Chapter Four** outlines the overall methodology for this research, beginning with a general philosophy, ontology, and epistemology for this qualitative research. It then describes the specific set of methods for the two parts of this research: the mapping of the full sector youth programs in Haiti (Research Question #1), followed by the examination and comparative analysis of the notion participation through the three case study programs (Research Question #2, 3 and 4). This chapter concludes with a recount of the issues and challenges arising as a result of the research methods, and the ethical procedures put in place to attend to these issues.

**Chapter Five** address the first research question: *What youth programs are operating in Haiti that target and involve youth as participants in their national reconstruction, and how do they differ in terms of their origins and orientation?* This chapter begins by providing a context for the presence and involvement of non-formal
youth programs in Haiti, then uses as a general framework for market- versus socially-oriented programs. It continues with a comprehensive review of the programs surveyed in this research, accompanied by the specific rationale for how they have been classified as predominantly *international* or *local* origins, and *market* or *social* in their orientation. Finally, this chapter concludes with the presentation and description of six clusters into which the surveyed programs fall.

**Chapters Six, Seven** and **Eight** focus on Research Question #2: *How is youth participation socially constructed during the formation and implementation of the three selected case study programs of the Haitian reconstruction?* Each of these chapters provide a separate synopsises each of the three case study programs, beginning with Farming for Education (Chapter Six), then Debate Competitions (Chapter Seven), and finally, Rights through Radio (Chapter Eight). The experiences are described from the very outset of their program cycle (the program conception, proposal, and funding) to their point of completion. The first part of each chapter focuses on an overview of the program cycle described above, and the second part presents an analysis of the youths’ participation in each program, summarizing *who* participates, in *what*, and *why*. The three programs selected as case studies emerge from three separate clusters produced in the analysis of Research Question #1. Thus, each program described in Chapters Six through Eight occupies distinct, normative positions in their international-local / social-market location.

**Chapter Nine** responds to Research Question #3: *How is participation conceptualized by the various actors at each of the four levels of the vertical aid chain within the three selected case study programs?* In this chapter, conceptualizations of
participation are summarized for the smallest units of analysis of this research—the sub-group of actors for each program at each level. For each of the programs—Farming, Debates, and Radio—I separate conceptualizations solicited from Youth Recipients (Level 1), Program Implementers (Level 2), Country Directors (Level 3), and Funders and Policy makers (Level 4), twelve units in total. For each unit I then provide a summary of each aspect of their conceptualization of participation by distilling how each level of the aid chain views who should participate, what these youth should be participate in, and why they should participate, in the context of each case study youth program.

Chapter Ten examines Research Question #4: How do these conceptualizations of participation compare and contrast with one another among the programs (horizontally), along the levels of the aid chain (vertically), and how can any differences be explained? In this analytical chapter, distinctive themes that emerge when comparing conceptualizations between programs and levels are highlighted and described. Horizontal comparisons highlighted central differences with respect to their orientation and the dynamics of language in each program. Vertical comparisons underscored how participation was variably conceptualized by Level 1 youth as something to be permitted by social structures and by Level 4 funders and policy-makers as something to be claimed through the agency of local youth, and how the ways that middle level practitioners negotiated between these conceptualizations.

The conclusion to this thesis (Chapter Eleven) re-iterates and summarizes the findings of each of the four research questions. It presents the implications and relevance of the research for bodies of literature such as comparative, international and
development education; youth and democratic education; and citizen participation in the Global South. This chapter concludes with the continuing changing of conditions in Haiti, a proposition of the significance of this research, and the ongoing importance of youth and participation in development contexts.
Chapter Two:
Theorizing Youth Participation

In Chapter One the problem of participation was described in terms of its imprecision and nebulosity, thus allowing a wide variety of activities to be subsumed under the heading of “participation”, and equally, a wide range of both favourable and unfavourable outcomes for youth participation. This chapter focuses on locating participation within other discourses, articulating the array of meanings associated with participation, and proposing boundaries for framing these interpretations within a manageable conceptual scope. It does so by making connections with other constructs, practices, and approaches. The chapter draws from the expansive literature on participation to extract relevant theories as frameworks for this research. It begins by outlining the importance of investigating participation through connecting it with broader constructs of democracy and citizenship, and with typologies of international or local origins and market or social orientations to the political and economic organization of society. In the second part of this chapter, participation is located in the realm of international youth programming, wherein it is a frequent imperative. This chapter concludes by providing a concrete analytical framework for participation, firstly by overviewing common meanings and experiences of participation, and then underlining the need for specificity in analysis by questioning who participates, in what, and why.

Intersections with Other Normative Constructions

The type of citizen to which one aspires heavily informs how one envisions her participation as that citizen. Likewise, participation and citizenship are closely linked to
the nature of the society one hopes for themselves and his community; in many cases this is expressed as a democracy. These important connections between participation and democracy and participation and citizenship will be deconstructed here to illustrate one spectrum of meanings associated with participation.

**Participation and Democracy**

Democracy is a term that is widely used, often contested, and broadly defined. Cook and Westheimer (2009) submit that “despite millennial debates over the meaning and potential for democracy, most philosophers, political theorists, and educators agree that citizens of a democracy engage in decisions that affect their lives” (p. 348). Fung and Wright (2003) use the term *democratic* to describe systems that “elicit the energy and influence of ordinary people” (p. 5). A broad definition of democracy such as this goes well beyond notions of democracy as “freedom for the people”, or the confines of formal political spheres such as voting and elections, a domain that contemporary critical pedagogues have characterized as “thin” (Carr, 2008). Instead, broader visions of democracy incorporate issues of equity, justice, and critical literacy where youth participate actively in their education, where earthquake victims have a say in their IDP camp structures and services, and where aid beneficiaries have a voice in the construction and implementation of the youth programs of NGOs.

A central connection between participation and democracy dates back to John Dewey’s (1938) theories on education for democracy. The basic presumption suggests that if a democracy requires the participation of its citizens, then learning to participate is essential in a democracy. According to Dewey, imparting knowledge and skills for democracy involves both teaching democratic content and providing opportunities for
participation. Dewey, a pioneer in democratic education theory, proposed that learning environments that are more democratic ultimately lead to the greater participation of those learners in society. For Dewey, learners achieve intelligent meaning by incorporating democratic elements in education, such as social environments, communication, interaction, and experience (1938). Central to Dewey’s argument is that “if citizens are to secure a democratic way of life, then they must have opportunities to learn what that means and how it would be enacted” (Beane & Apple, 1995, p. 7).

Indeed, James Beane and Michael Apple (1995) focus on the importance of youth, noting that “democracy extends to all people, even the young” (p. 7). Drawing on the work of Immanuel Kant, they propose that a democratic society is developed through education practices that teach the values of democracy and that among the best ways to enable youth to participate is to allow them to participate in their learning experiences: “the idea that the democratic way of life is built is upon opportunities to learn what it is about and how to lead it” (p. 7). Thus, as is a central aim of thesis, the ways that youth engage in participation in various programs ultimately shapes how they conceptualize participation and democracy in Haiti.

There has been a growing acceptance of a democratic deficit in nations around the world, and propositions that experiments with participation can lead to deeper democracies. Gaventa (2001) notes the growing distance between people and the state and proposes that citizens find new ways to construct “relationships between ordinary people and the institution—especially those of government—which affect their lives” (p. 1). Gaventa elaborates that this requires “rethinking about the ways in which citizens' voices are articulated and represented in the political process, and a reconceptualization
of the meanings of participation and citizenship in relationship to local governance” (p.1). As Gaventa suggests, this problem requires a greater emphasis on active forms of citizenship, and new expressions of citizen and community participation beyond traditional civil society and state-established mechanisms.

However, participation and democracy are heavily dependent on an understanding of the local context in which participation takes place. As Schugurensky (2009) notes, “Whether citizen participation contributes to nurturing a more democratic society or not depends on the particular characteristics of that participation and the specific context in which it takes place” (p. 50). Context as a foundation of participation is broad, so numerous facets are delineated in this thesis to create types of this aspect of participation. As shall be examined in Chapter Three, there is often a marked difference between Haiti and other countries, societies, most notably, high-income donor nations.

**Participation and Citizenship**

In citizenship discourses the argument is made that one’s citizenship is dependent on her participation in society. However, methodological barriers to substantiate such correlations makes empirical verification problematic. “Participation does make better citizens”, suggests Jane Mansbridge (1995). “I believe it, but I can’t prove it. And neither can anyone else” (p. 1). For one, the type of citizen that a certain type of participation facilitates is just as variable as the definitions of participation itself. Similar to concepts of democracy, meanings of citizenship are dynamic, contextual, contested, and multidimensional. Accordingly, the varieties of youth programs that promote participation ultimately envision very different modes of citizenship.
In Joel Westheimer and Joseph Kahne’s analysis of youth citizenship types, three categories of citizens are promoted as archetypes in extra-curricular school service projects (Kahne & Westheimer 2006a, 2006b; Westheimer 2005, 2008; Westheimer & Kahne, 1998, 2004). They distinguish between three types of citizens that are promoted as exemplars for youth through democratic education programs. First is the “personally responsible citizen” whose participation emphasizes hard work, honesty, and integrity and self-discipline with the goal of developing character, compassion, and personal responsibility. A second prototype is the “participatory citizen” who understands the formal mechanisms in society that enable participation such as state structures, NGOs, religious institutions, and seek to organize broader community efforts for the needy. A third type is the “social justice-oriented citizen” that focuses on ways to effect systemic change by exploring root causes of inequities, critical analyzes these social issues, and acts on their findings by addressing the political, economic, and social structures at the heart of these injustices. While these three approaches have in common the intent to better society through social interventions, they differ in the extent to which their work is individually or collectively pursued, and, most importantly, their fundamental socio-economic philosophy and the theory of change underpinning their approaches.

Westheimer and Kahne (2004) distil the relationship between citizenship learning and democratic education by juxtaposing a singular binary that focuses on participation in society with aspects of the personally responsible citizen and the participatory citizen against modes of learning democracy that emphasize the pursuit of justice.

In other works on citizenship, Daniel Schugurensky (2005) isolates four types of citizenship categories that include a focus on status, identity, civic virtues, and agency. In
Schugurensky’s typology, mainstream notions of citizenship also articulated. For example, in everyday language, citizenship is often understood as the *identity* one feels with belonging to one’s society, or the *status* afforded to one who has formal allegiance to the state. In these meanings, citizenship reveals its fundamental exclusive nature.

Similar to the ways that power is unequally distributed in societies, this construct of citizenship was originally developed as a means to privilege the participation of some at the explicit expense of others. These types of citizenship enable ties between individuals and their society, benefit formal citizens the rights afforded by the state, support the participation in formal state activities such as political elections, and encourage loyalty, honesty and compassion, similar to Westheimer and Kahne’s “personally responsible citizen”.

However, much like the “participatory citizen”, Schugurensky (2005) also refers to citizenship as the acquisition of *civic virtues* that are often associated with being a “good citizen”. Evidently, depending on each citizen’s context, these traits could vary considerably based on the social norms of one’s society. Naila Kabeer (2010), for example, proposes that ordinary citizens in Bangladesh can deepen democracy through “habits of the heart”, such as social participation, activism, lobbying, and engaging in representative democracy. Archon Fung (2003) disaggregates civic virtues as respect for others, tolerance, respect for the rule of law, willingness to participate in public life, and self-confidence as necessary components. Schugurensky (2009) notes that participatory democracy develops when citizens are informed, critical, tolerant, and concerned for the common good.
Collectively, these civic virtues, traits and habits are theorized to build the “good society” (Schugurensky, 2005). Robert Putnam (2000) describes this communal feature as social capital⁴, the “connections among individuals—[the] social networks and the norms of reciprocity and trustworthiness that arise from them” (p. 19). Putnam (2000) suggests that social capital is constructed through the active participation of citizens in public life; norms of reciprocity in which individuals contribute to others (or society) with a specific or general expectation that they will eventually be repaid; and trustworthiness, in which social life is “lubricated” by efficiencies incurred when threats of cheating, corruption, and dishonesty are minimized. Gaventa and Barrett (2010) have also noted how a central outcome of citizen participation is social cohesion.

Finally, in parallel to Westheimer and Kahne’s “justice-oriented citizen”, citizenship can be construed as the agency of the individual to change society, and to work against the oppressive and unjust structures of society that marginalize and discriminate against some and privilege others. As agency, citizenship involves individuals and groups participating to recognize power, address human rights, or tackle social injustices. As Schugurensky (2005) explains “citizenship as agency, then, has to do with the willingness to ask difficult questions, with the confidence that one’s agency can influence changes (political efficacy) and with the collective capacity to address injustices and build a better society” (p. 5). In this sense of the term, citizenship

---

⁴ Putnam’s notion of social capital has two aspects: bonding and bridging social capital. Each of these aspects has relations to conceptualizing participation; bonding, to citizenship as identity, and bridging to democracy.
highlights the agency upon which individuals exert power to invoke change (Carr et al., 2014a). Democracy as promoted through a lens of citizenship as agency would have less to do with the construction of institutions, and more with the contestation and struggle of citizens to ensure voice, rights-claiming, and meaningful participation in their own development (Gaventa, 2006). This notion of democratic development requires the active engagement of its citizens in ongoing decisions, including opportunities for expression, dissent, and deliberation of its constituents (Edwards & Klees, 2012). Such democratic outcomes require both an embracing of citizenship as agency, as well as the opportunities and spaces to practice these habits.

Table 2.1. Constructions of Youth Participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constructions of citizenship (Schugurensky, 2005)</td>
<td>Status, Identity</td>
<td>Civic virtues</td>
<td>Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theories of distributive justice (Sen, 1988, Nussbaum, 1993)</td>
<td>Human capital</td>
<td>Human capabilities</td>
<td>Human rights</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The three perspectives of participation synopsised by Westheimer and Kahne (2004) and Schugurensky (2005) demonstrate a range in the ways that citizens participate in their society. The centrality of participation in achieving citizenship depends fundamentally on the specific meaning of citizenship used in each connection. Youth learning to be personally responsible citizens might focus on personal characteristics of integrity and caring. Education for participatory citizens would focus on participation in pre-existing social constructs such as the state or NGOs (Carr et al., 2014a). And learning to be justice-oriented citizens would focus on participation as contestations in society,
viewing citizenship as agency to recognize, contextualize and deconstruct injustices and power imbalances in Haiti, and work towards a more just society (Schugurensky, 2009).

As shall be highlighted in this thesis, even though a youth program might focus on participation, these programs can produce very different types of citizens.

**Typologies of Youth Participation**

As noted in Chapter One, theoretical spectrums are used to frame the findings of this research. In what follows are two central poles used for this thesis. First are the locations in which the programs for youth participation originated as either international or local. These origins are further connected to invited and claimed spaces for participation, societal structures or individual agency as influences on youth participation. The second binary described here is the ideology underlying participation as either a market-orientation or a social-orientation.

**Origins for Youth to Participate**

The increased presence of the international community in Haiti after the earthquake was evident to anyone living in Haiti during that period. These international organizations lie in contrast to locally-originating programs, initiated by Haitians, and typically having operated in Haiti for some time. As explored here, programs with international origins will be linked with both Cornwall’s (2004) framework of invited spaces for youth participation and Durkheim’s (1897/1952) focus on structures as a key influence on youth participation. By contrast, programs with local origins are linked to the framework of claimed spaces for youth participation and a focus on individual agency as a central influence on youth participation.
Types of spaces for participation.

“Citizen participation is a categorical term for citizen power”, suggests Arnstein (1969) in her landmark article that has shaped the discourses of participation for almost a half-century (p. 216). This is a useful connection in understanding participation because theories of power from parallel literatures can inform theories of participation. As human relations are imbued within power dynamics (Foucault, 1982), possibilities for participation are incessant yet are seized unevenly. Countless expressions of power are at play in society that determining how people participate; most are invisible or incalculable to those involved. Yet, upon deconstruction, these manifestations can be scrutinized to better understand the dynamics of citizen participation. These analyses require bounds, however, and one way to frame these bounds is through the conceptual notion of social spaces (Cornwall, 2004).

Andrea Cornwall proposes two distinguishing categories for understanding participation: invited spaces and claimed spaces. Cornwall (2004b) juxtaposes “invited spaces” as government-provided arenas (that might arise due to donor, policy, or popular pressures) and “claimed spaces” as conquered arenas where citizens come together through their own initiative (that could be for the purposes of protest, production of services, or solidarity). These distinct spaces provide a useful framework for conceptualizing participation in relation to internationally supported youth programs promoting youth participation in Haiti.

Invited spaces.

In the literature on citizenship and development, the notion of invited spaces originates through the work of John Gaventa (2004), Andrea Cornwall (2002) and Karen
Brock (with Gaventa & Cornwall, 2001). Invited spaces are often scrutinized for their real benefits because of the nature of their originating conditions. For invited spaces, the opening of space, rather than the creation of space, is generally an act from those with power to those without; those in authority to those who are not; those setting to the agenda to those who are not (Cornwall, 2002). Many of Haiti’s spaces are occupied, controlled or created by external organizations; power resides at the international location and Haitian citizens are invited to participate at the level of operationalization. In the cases of youth programming, when facets such as program policies, design, funding, and pedagogy are under the purview of foreign leaders, the program would tend to be classified as an invited space. The very fact that the programs in my study are set in motion through the impetus of international organizations already indicates a locus of power in the hands of the funders, policy-writers and program designers, placing limitations on the depth of participation of local actors. The risk with the implementation of invited spaces is that social, political, and historical complexities of citizenship are not taken into account. By this, the fundamental problem of citizen participation becomes clearer, as in when Haitians are “invited to participate” in their own reconstruction. The fact that the spaces for participation in this study are essentially ensured by the international community may in fact prohibit participation of deep quality or authenticity.

Claimed spaces.

By contrast are claimed spaces for participation, spaces that come together organically and are created and owned by those who are motivated to come together for a cause. Spaces claimed by citizens who come together through their own initiative are often organic, in arenas created internally and owned by those motivated to come
together for a cause. In these claimed spaces, citizens can organize, form bonds, develop trust, and work towards a common, democratic or development goal. Claimed spaces in civil society, for example, have been seen to play an important role in deepening democracy in fragile contexts through promoting public education (Mundy et al., 2008) and building citizenship (Pearce, 2007). While claimed spaces, as they play-out in practice, are rarely the panacea laid out in theory, they do benefit from the certain qualities of ownership, motivation, genuineness, and trust. Cornwall argues that the difference between invited and claimed spaces has vast implications for understanding how participation might contribute to democratic development. In practice, invited spaces have very different dynamics than those social spaces claimed by Haitian citizens, including external incentives, language, structures of formality, and varieties of compensation.

**Influences on youth participation.**

Youth require some amount of capital to be able to express their participation. A long-standing debate exists on the subject of what most influences human behaviour; either structures established in society to facilitate participation or the agency of individuals to draw on their capacity to participate. This section examines these perspectives with respect to youth participation.

**Structures.**

Theories of Emile Durkheim (1897/1952), Pierre Bourdieu (1977), Anthony Giddens (1984) and other sociologists suggested that invisible yet powerful structures held much influence on the individual in society. They argued that social structures and
the conditions of society predispose an individual to a certain fate, or at least exert a strong influence on social action. The action of the individual rests primarily on the structure in which he or she is part of. As Durkheim (1912/1915) posits, “a person is not merely a single subject distinguished from all the others. It is a being to which is attributed a relative autonomy in relation to the environment with which it is most immediately in contact” (p. 305). In the context of participation, the primacy of structures suggests that institutions are necessary to participate. However, these structures can refer to both invisible and visible structures. For example, the invisible structures related to one’s identity that influence power and privilege in relationships—such as race, class, language, geography and gender—are important in considering how youth participation unfolds in reality. However, the structures that wield power in society can also include the societal institutions that are visible, concealed, or invisible to citizens operating in that society. Examples of these institutions might include anything from foreign aid to education, or INGOS and the state. The visibility of these institutions may vary based on one’s perspective. For example, where the presence of foreign aid is commonplace its operations and influence may be less visible; by contrast, aid, development, or reconstruction organizations in high-income nations would be highly visible due to a presence that would be exceptional in that society. Likewise, the presence of the state is imperceptible to many in a “developed” nation. Evidence of this can be found empirically but also anecdotally; citizens in developed nations routinely overlook the multitude of features that are constructed as a result of the state. Conversely, the absence of the state is highly notable to those who live in a fragile state.
Agency.

The corollary to structural perspective is individual agency. While on one hand one might conceptualize participation as an endeavour whereby societal institutions influence the individual, proponents of human agency suggest that it is the individual that has more influence on the structure.

Individual agency focuses on the youth’s capacity to make changes, noting that choices are guided strictly by the individual’s abilities, desires, and wishes. Charles Taylor (1995) for example, accentuates the role of language acquisition in developing agency describing how “we become full human agents, capable of understanding ourselves, and hence of defining our identity, through our acquisition of rich human languages of expression” (p. 230). Participation as agency is seen as something that citizens do out of their own free will through their individual initiative.

Overarching Ideologies for Youth Participation

Just as citizenship and democracy are linked to participation, a key undercutting theme is their intersection with overarching theories informing the model upon which society is constructed, resources are distributed, and decisions are made. In other words, macro theories from the fields such as political-economics and comparative education are also necessary to underpin the fundamental motives supporting participation. Edwards and Klees (2012), for example, theorize the intent of participation using a conventional western political spectrum. This model proposes three broad normative perspectives on participation: neoliberalism, liberalism, and progressiveness. Neo-liberalism, characterized by privatization, market-based solutions, parental choice, user fees, and decentralization would envision citizen participation through market mechanisms and
community leadership on bodies such as school councils, for example. Liberalism follows the enlightened tradition of participation through representation to the state with voting as a major expression of participation, but also participation in programs created by the state or state-sponsored organizations (i.e.: IOs, NGOs, etc.). The progressive perspective is a critical response to the first two perspectives, viewing the current structures of market and state as problematic and part of a broader system of oppression. As such, participation is viewed as a means of empowerment, transformation, meaningful decision-making, and alternative forms of development.

In empirical studies, ideological categories are often conflated to a linear dimension of approaches to participation. For example, Kabeer et al. (2010) propose that NGOs can be placed along a continuum on the basis of their visions and strategies. At one end of the continuum are the market-oriented organisations specialising in the delivery of financial services—the minimalist microfinance organisations, while at the other end are the social movement-oriented ones that focus primarily on social mobilisation. Occupying an intermediate position are NGOs, which combine microfinance with social services, awareness raising or legal training. (p. 14)

This research adopts a similar strategy of creating a binary between market-orientated and social-oriented approaches to participation that will be outlined in Chapter Four. To enable traction, clarity, and simplicity in this research, the continuum is constructed to distinguish market motives of participation (i.e. participation for market entry) from social motives of participation (i.e. participation for social-mobilization).
**Market orientation to participation.**

A market orientation focuses on youth participation through garnering resources. The goal in this approach is to bolster the ability of youth to be able to participate in markets. This approach is especially salient in Haiti because many social goods and services even such as basic education require at least a nominal fee (see Chapter Three).

The premise for this orientation to participation is that with a means of generating even a simple income, basic goods and services can be purchased which will enable fuller participation in society. Basic education is a central example for youth. Through earning an income, youth will have the funds necessary for school fees, and through the completion of school, possibilities to participate in more facets of society become greater through such things as a graduation certificate, increased literacy and social capital. This orientation draws from numerous approaches above: the neoliberal approaches participation in education (Edwards & Klees, 2012) and citizens as consumers, as framed by Gaventa (2012).

**Social orientation to youth participation.**

In this orientation, participation is enabled through stimulating awareness amongst youth that they have rights, opportunities, and abilities to participate in their own societies. Because of major societal and structural barriers in Haiti to access to basic institutions and basic human rights, an elementary awareness that youth can participate at any level in their societies is heavily obscured to many of the country’s youth. This orientation is drawn from the progressive perspective of Edwards and Klees (2012) and
the citizen-led approaches of Gaventa (2012). These practical differences of these two are synthesized Table 2.2.

Table 2.2. A Summary of Market and Social Orientations to Youth Participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Market-oriented</th>
<th>Social-oriented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key Concepts</strong></td>
<td>Income-generation, purchase-power, self-dependency, clients &amp; customers</td>
<td>Democracy, citizenship, equity, justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Types of rights</strong></td>
<td>Economic rights, economic freedoms</td>
<td>Basic human rights, far-reaching rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Focus</strong></td>
<td>Individual-focus; poverty reduction</td>
<td>Social-focus; resolving inequality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Literacies</strong></td>
<td>Financial, economic</td>
<td>Critical, sociological, political</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Approaches</strong></td>
<td>Business philosophy, competitive environment efficiency</td>
<td>Social welfare, social justice, cooperative approaches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employment</strong></td>
<td>Jobs for income</td>
<td>Livelihood for a better life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relationship to Environment</strong></td>
<td>Cultivation, industry</td>
<td>Sustainability</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The differences between these orientations are illustrated well in relation to the outcomes they inspire. Specifically, central differences exist in key concepts, rights orientations, literacies, priorities, approaches, employment perspective, and relationship to the environment. However, while participation is routinely classified as either market-oriented or socially-oriented throughout this thesis, these motives are rarely mutually exclusive. Classic examples of the duality of these motives are initiatives to expand the capabilities of youth to participate in their societies. Amartya Sen (1988) developed the capability approach in part to respond to linear development theories that increasingly measured development success in terms of economic gain, either at the level of the individual or of the state. Sen’s critique of this measure was that it addressed only the
means of development—and a singular one at that—the monetary worth of a unit. Instead, argued Sen, development should be viewed in broader terms that signify the greater impacts resulting from the means, namely freedoms, opportunities, and capabilities. Sen notes that the evaluative component of the development of the individual inquires into “how an individual’s overall advantage is to be assessed” (2009, p. 231). In response to this problem, Sen proposes that it should be “judged in the capability approach by a person’s capability to do things he or she has reason to value”. Thus, through increasing one’s individual advantage, citizens—and youth—will be able to participate more fully in society.

**Connections Between Conceptualizations of Participation**

Several links can be made between the typologies of participation described above. In the context of Haiti, international often implies high-income, Western nations that have been prominent sites of historical intervention such as France, the U.S., and Canada. International organizations from these origins provide structures within which Haitians are *invited* to participate—INGO programs for youth, internationally-monitored elections, multi-national corporations employing Haitian workers. Characteristics of invited spaces for participation often tend toward a market orientation of participation. This linkage is especially salient when the invited space originates from the West where neoliberal ideologies have increasingly formed the foundation of international aid approaches. Kamat (2004), for example, examines how NGOs are increasingly adapting to sector-wide development policies (such as structural adjustment or the comprehensive development paradigm promoted by the World Bank) that are more characteristic of the economically liberal donor societies than recipient nations, often more socialist-leaning
by comparison. These views, that the dominant characteristics of contemporary international development policy endorse neoliberal approaches to democracy, citizenship and participation, are reported by others (Davies & Bansel, 2007; Kamat, 2002; Klees, 2009; Mosse, 2006; Owusu, 2003; Stiglitz, 2002; Thérien, 2003), despite claims that the aid regime is moving to a post-neoliberal paradigm (Murray & Overton, 2011). Thus, international origins of youth programs might be theoretically linked to invited spaces for participation, the necessity of structures to influence youth participation, and a market orientation of participation. As follows, they would be inclined towards neoliberal approaches to citizen participation (Edwards & Klees, 2012; Gaventa, 2012), thin perspectives of democracy (Carr, 2008), and education for personally responsible citizens (Westheimer & Kahne, 2004). Hence, in this research it is theorized that perspectives at the top of the aid chain—the national directors and international funders and policy-makers of Levels 3 and 4—would be most likely to think of their work as creating invited spaces that foster participation.

The opposing argument follows the contrasting logic: Programs with local origins would encourage on the agency of youth to claim these spaces for participation, and to have a greater propensity for social-orientations rather than market orientations. Thus, claimed spaces would connect with either education for participatory citizens (Westheimer & Kahne, 2004) and civic virtues (Schugurensky, 2005), and/or education for justice-oriented citizens (Westheimer & Kahne, 2004) through encouraging individual agency (Schugurensky, 2005) and citizen-led approaches of participation (Gaventa, 2012). These theories are summarized and their connections proposed in Table 2.3. Hence, in this research it is theorized that those at the bottom of the aid chain—the
youth and programmers at Levels 1 and 2—would more likely to favour an approach to citizenship that is linked to their capacity to claim spaces for participation.

Table 2.3. Theorized Connections between Typologies of Participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Origins of participation</th>
<th>International</th>
<th>Local</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spaces for participation (Cornwall, 2004)</td>
<td>Invited</td>
<td>Claimed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideologies underpinning participation (Edwards &amp; Klees, 2012; Kabeer, 2010)</td>
<td>Market</td>
<td>Social</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influences on participation (Durkheim, 1897/1952; Bourdieu, 1977)</td>
<td>Structures</td>
<td>Agency</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overlapping themes between perspectives of democracy and citizenship also overarch ideologies rationalizing youth participation. Rationales for participation have been framed from research in the field of citizenship, participation, and democracy. Gaventa (2012), for example, proposes four guiding ideologies for citizen participation: a neoliberal market approach in which citizens participate as consumers and customers; a state-based approach where citizens participate as users and clients; third, a thin democracy approach where citizens participate as voters; and fourth, a citizen-led approach where citizens participate as actors in mobilizing change. Characteristic of the latter school is that the constructs of participation and democracy are built on citizens perspectives, garnered through extensive on-the-ground research that has inquired into the ways, meanings and expressions in which citizens—rather than scholars or policy makers—frame citizenship. This approach has been described as “putting citizens at the heart of development and democracy” (Benequista, 2010). All of these approaches have a
direct bearing on how participation—and especially, enabling future participation—is conceived. For example, based on how the function that citizens play in our society is perceived, facilitating future participation of Haitian youth would concentrate either on skills and knowledge to participate in the market, the state, elections, or in change, depending on whether citizens are viewed as customers, clients, voters, or actors, according to this model.

**Participation and International Youth Development Programs**

In foreign aid and development practice, participation has long been a stated goal for international practitioners. As Marshall Wolfe articulated for the UN in 1981, the response of the development community to the minimum criterion of enhancement of the capacity of the society to function over the long term for the well-being of all its members requires far-reaching changes in the ways in which people relate to each other and to the wider society, represented by the state. Ideally, these changes should be in the direction of a more open, better integrated society with freer choices and opportunities for voluntary associational ties and voice of all in the composition and policy guidance of local as well as national authorities. (p. 131, emphasis added)

Meta-analyses on the effectiveness of international aid since its emergence as a significant institution in the 1960s have been decisively inconclusive. In over a half century of directly transferring funds, capital, and skills from a relatively small group of wealthy nations to an equally relative large number of low income nations, few definitive results can be traced to that aid, at least any outcomes approaching the degree of inputs of the aid (Klees, 2008). In fact, much analysis during this era has demonstrated that the
approaches to aid have largely contributed to widening the gap between rich and poor nations, opposite to what was intended.

The Importance of Participation in Foreign Aid Delivery

These analyses and critiques of aid and the post-colonial response to the international development agenda of the last century in particular suggest that aid is so ineffective precisely because all of its facets are managed and controlled by donors, with relatively very little input from its recipients. While these problems are extremely complex and embroiled in the institution of aid, a common thread amongst the critics of aid is that the participation of aid recipients in aid processes might serve to strengthen the benefits of development programs. Thus, in the development sphere, participatory approaches have been argued to lead to more effective problem solving (Fung & Wright, 2001) and fairer, more equitable outcomes. At least, the act of citizen participation has been used to legitimize decisions as coming from the community. For example, correlations have been drawn between various indicators of ‘ownership’ with program outcomes (Hudock, 2000); where ownership was high, projects achieved good results and where it was low, programmes were ineffective (World Bank, 1992).

The line of reasoning is that the relationship between participation and development is causal in the sense that participation leads to better development. For example, better development may comprise growth, justice, and progress, but it also denotes improvements to society and technology that are relevant to the people in that society. In this way that participation connects with development: when power is authentically in the hands of people, outcomes for those people will be of most and of sustained relevance. To be sure, development is and can be about much more than the
limited list proposed above, and thus all of these terms within and including development are, as with “participation”, heavily contested.

However, the tension between rhetoric and reality is recognized widely in these forums as well. Despite the normative inclusion of participation principles in the invited spaces of development organization policies, the host of issues of power, history and culture are especially present in these relationships. Oakley explains:

Participation cannot merely be proclaimed or wished upon rural people in the Third World; it must begin by recognizing the powerful, multidimensional and, in many instances, anti-participatory forces that dominate the lives of rural people. Centuries of domination and subservience will not disappear overnight just because we have ‘discovered’ the concept of participation. (Oakley, 1995, p. 4)

Thus, participation takes on an especially complex and unique role in the sphere of foreign aid.

**Participation in the context of foreign aid.**

The role of participation is unique in foreign aid arrangements for several reasons. As described above, the inherent international eminence of aid tends to characterize these spaces as invited, no matter how participatory they might be. By definition, the hierarchical nature of the aid chain—described in Chapter One as a linear, top-bottom flow of both policy and funds—limits the ability of these spaces to be characterized as claimed. However, as noted, these spaces are malleable and overlapping, and the opening, transformation, and conquering of spaces for youth participation can enable opportunities for participation and citizenship learning. This thesis presents
findings illustrating the ways that spaces are deliberately shaped by specific actors along the aid chains of youth program delivery in Haiti.

The invited spaces for participation in foreign aid also have tendencies along the market-social continuum. As described above, the dominant international development agenda emphasizing neoliberal approaches favours program activities with economic priorities above social imperatives. In some cases, even when local participation is centred amongst program objectives, program beneficiaries do not realize the purported gains of participation. For example, in development practice, the mainstreaming of local participation is used to justify agendas that are potentially harmful to local citizens such as structural adjustment or Eurocentric solutions to local problems (Mohan & Stokke, 2000).

**Youth Participation and International Programs**

The primacy of the participation of youth in aid and reconstruction has become a central principle in development agenda. In Roger Hart’s (1982) seminal piece on child and youth participation in development, participation of youth is recognized as an essential component to ensure better outcomes in youth programs. Youth participation in programs frequently follows the logic of Dewey (1938) and Apple and Beane (1995) for the promotion of democracy through learning skills to participate. There are many example of youth participation in international programs emerging around the world today. Youth participation occurs quite commonly in organizational mandates, and major institutions such as the World Bank and the MasterCard Foundation have youth as a guiding target group.
**Who are recognized as youth?**

Defining the term “youth” is important in development, aid, and research with youth on participation because of an increasing necessity to isolate this group as a particular target demographic. For this purpose most organizations bind youth quantitatively within an age range, but considerable deviations exist across agencies. Statistics Canada denotes a bracket of 15 to 24 years as youth for policy purposes in Canada as do the World Bank and the UN General Assembly. This similar range has been used in other research in the Caribbean, such as Saxon et al.’s study of attitudes of Jamaican youth on their future prospects, which used a sample of 14-24 year olds. The European Union (2009) uses the ages 15-29, while Hoskins et al. (2011) examined civic competences of youth across the European Union by using IEA data gathered from 14-year old students. Further deviations exist. YMCA Haiti, for example, focuses their programming on 18-25-year olds, unlike Foreign Affairs and International Trade Canada, which focus on 18-35-year olds. Taking all of these examples into account, youth would be defined between an ungainly range of 14 and 35. In this research, by comparison, all of the youth participants were aged between 14 and 21 at the time of the study.

**Importance of youth as a focal point.**

Asaf Bayat, who describes the quality of “youthfulness” amongst revolutionaries that stimulated the Arab Spring of 2012-2013, defines youth as the subgroup of the disenfranchised subaltern characterized by their creativity, imagination, and fun. This distinction is important in the context of the democratization and participation processes of the Arab Spring because youth became engaged precisely because these characteristics were threatened in the revolt. These perspectives of youth are equally salient in Haiti, as
youth have historically played a significant role in shaping their nation. In 1964 a group of 13 young men popularly known as *Jeune Haiti* (Haiti Youth) led a failed revolution to oust the then President Francois Duvalier. Nonetheless, Duvalier’s son, Jean-Claude Duvalier, later became president for life when he was only 19. Other Haitian leaders have been notoriously young: Jean-Bertrand Aristide was 36 when he won in a landslide election in 1990; current Haitian Prime Minister Laurent Lamothe was sworn into office in his thirties. These examples demonstrate the precedence and importance given youth in Haiti in the development of their country.

But youth is also the stage of life correlated with a “coming of age”. It is a period of transformation, characterized by intellectual curiosity, emotional transformation, and physical openness to discomfort. In literature emanating from the International Network for Education-in-Emergencies (INEE), the phase of youth is defined as “having reached the stage in life where they have left behind childhood but have not yet assumed the responsibilities of adulthood” (Zeus, 2010, p. 5). The precise ways that these transitions unfold depends heavily on context, including societal constructions of gender, perceptions of maturity, influences of peer groups, the impacts of history, and cultural norms. In a country such as Haiti, for example—a post-colonial, fragile state with major issues of access to education—youth have different norms and responsibilities from youth coming of age in Canada. However, youth might be broadly characterized as a period in which individuals choose to embrace mainstream norms or resist them; a stage of struggle in which childhood is relinquished in an effort to reach maturity.

Thus, youth are both change makers who initiate their own participation and candidates to learn about participation. In the context of participatory programs in Haiti’s
reconstruction, youth have collective potential to (re)construct forthcoming societies in Haiti but are also seen as having a readiness to learn. “Youth have energy and insight that many other sectors of society do not”, suggests Westheimer (2005), but “they also possess relatively little experience and expertise.” In international development programs, youth are often presumed to be malleable and willing to transform. This is an important point of assumption, as experiences and knowledge that youth gain from learning about participation today will affect how they perceive participation in future.

**Meanings of participation in international youth programming.**

Like the varieties of constructions of participation in broader development discourses, connotations of youth participation in development programs are similarly stretched. On one hand, youth participation is in much part framed in market orientations, in which youth are perceived in terms of their contribution to a national or global economy as income earners, neoliberal market citizens, human capital, and job searchers. In this vein, youth as a target group are receiving much attention internationally in relation to their lack of employment. The International Labour Organization (ILO) has warned of a “scarred” generation of young workers facing a dangerous mix of high unemployment, increased inactivity, and precarious work in developed countries, as well as persistently high-working poverty in the developing world. They report that “the world is facing a worsening youth employment crisis: young people are three times more likely to be unemployed than adults, and over 75 million youth worldwide are looking for work.” This bleak picture is especially evident in Haiti where unemployment has been soaring, access to education has been highly constrictive, and youth have been increasingly turning to high-risk livelihood activities because of limited opportunities.
On the other hand, many youth programs focus on social outcomes for their participants. These programs focus on values of civic virtues and agency, developing participatory and justice-oriented citizens. This may be particularly true for youth programs in national, local, or community arenas—all of which could be construed as claimed spaces for participation—however, there is evidence of socially-oriented programs in invited spaces too. A central part of this research will unearth the relations between invited and claimed spaces for youth participation in Haiti, and their orientations towards market or social ideologies of participation.

Analyzing Participation

To connect the various theories of participation and the context of their specific application in international youth programs with the subject of this thesis, a conceptual framework was developed to enable useful analyses for this research with youth in Haiti. This conceptual framework first draws on overlapping meanings of participation and then deconstructs these meanings through pivotal questions of who participates, in what, and why. This final section provides background for each of these analytical frames.

Meanings, Interpretations, and Realities of Participation

The myriad of meanings ascribed to participation has been the topic of a great deal of research across related fields. Early typologies of participation focused on normative measurements that assessed how a certain type of participation might be classified in relation to who was in control. These typologies were generally represented by a singular axis ranging from “good” (control by citizens) to “bad” (i.e. control by authorities) ways to enable youth participation. A framework widely seen as the concept’s pioneering rubric (Arnstein, 1969) came from the field of urban planning, but
practitioners from various fields have often since borrowed this tool. For children’s and youth’s participation, Roger Hart (1992) devised a similar rung-like model to examine young people’s participation; for participatory development Sheldon Shaeffer (1994) modified Arnstein’s ladder to frame development rhetoric such as decentralization, accountability, and empowerment; and in international education Pauline Rose (2003) analyzed aid to education in Malawi that dichotomized genuine and pseudo-participation through a rubric that evaluates degrees of participation. Each of these terms provides an example of a meaning ascribed to participation that will be used as a reference point for analyses provided later in this thesis. An illustration of different ways that normative “rungs” of participation have been understood is summarized in Table 2.4.

**Table 2.4. Ladders of Participation: Meanings and Experiences for Recipients of Participation-Focussed Programs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Shared decision-making</td>
<td>Self-mobilization</td>
<td>Self-initiation</td>
<td>Strategic involvement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegated power</td>
<td>Initiating</td>
<td>Interactive participation</td>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>Supporting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A partnership</td>
<td>Following</td>
<td>Functional participation</td>
<td>Skill-development</td>
<td>Generating</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placation</td>
<td>Consultation</td>
<td>Bought participation</td>
<td>Negotiation</td>
<td>Engaging</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation</td>
<td>Assigned</td>
<td>Consultation</td>
<td>Invited</td>
<td>Helping</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being informed</td>
<td>Tokenization</td>
<td>Passive participation</td>
<td>Prescribed</td>
<td>Reacting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therapy</td>
<td>Decoration</td>
<td>Assigned</td>
<td>Responding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manipulation</td>
<td>Manipulation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The ways that participation is conceptualized in these models also bears resemblance at the framing of spaces for participation as either invited or claimed. Meanings and experiences at the bottom of these ladders of participation such as consultation, tokenization, or even manipulation are more likely to occur in invited spaces for participation. Indeed, Rowell (2000) even uses the term “invited” to describe a lower rung of the ladder. By contrast, meanings and experiences at the top of these ladders of participation, such as delegated power, initiation, and self-mobilization are much more closely linked to the notion of claimed spaces for participation. However, these ladders also point to the actuality of mixed control in these spaces, a reality that emerged in the findings of this research.

Beyond these models, greater detail is necessary to gain further insight into the spaces for participation. To gain traction in the analyses of participation within youth programs, I draw on the work of several pioneering scholars whose models have been used widely in the analysis of youth participation, public participation, and participatory rural appraisal. Chambers (1986) notes the necessity to ensure specificity in any analysis of participation. To gain this specificity, Chambers proposes that participation can be analyzed in three ways: “by examining who participates, what institutions are involved, and what objectives it has” (p. 165). Similarly, Cohen and Uphoff (1980) assert its deconstruction through questions of “what kinds of participation?”, “who participates?”, and “how is participation occurring?” Likewise, Cornwall (2008) advises analyzing who participates in which activities, and White (1996) suggests the central questions of who participates and at what levels of the program are they participating. To ensure the most relevance to the precise context of this present study—while preserving the basic
integrity of the frameworks provided by these scholars—I adapt these questions to three points of analysis to understand the central issues of participation for each case study. In what follows I will unpack these questions, discuss further details, and ground them in relevant literature.

**Who? Which youth participate in programs of the reconstruction?**

The question of “who participates” in each program of this research encapsulates two central considerations. The first involves which youth were able to access these programs. How is it that a particular group of beneficiaries were designated, chosen, or accepted to be part of the program, and what does this group have in common compared to other youth who are not participating in this program? The second consideration is the issue of benefit. When examining program outcomes, who has benefited most from their participation? What do these youth have in common that enabled them to incur the most value from the program, and what precluded favourable outcomes for other youth? As becomes clear upon deconstruction, the broader question of who participates necessitates categorization and description. For example, the U.S.-based Lamp for Haiti in its report to the UN (2011) focused on who was participating—and who was not participating—in the reconstruction:

Stakeholders should be allowed to fully participate in the rebuilding process, and to facilitate this, information about aid must be transparent and the population routinely consulted — both in providing input on project design and in ensuring necessary modifications to the projects to maximize the realization of human rights. Meaningful participation is only possible if information about relief and rebuilding is transparent and easily accessible to the community in a language known to them – something that has been lacking in the international relief and rebuilding efforts. Special efforts should be made to ensure that groups
that have been historically excluded from the political process and have not had access to basic services – such as women, disabled persons, IDPs, and poor communities — are given an opportunity to participate. (Summary Submission, p. 3)

In conceptual terms, the question of who participates probes how diversity is envisioned in Haiti, and what groups are in most need of being targeted by youth programs. The issue of identity is paramount: how identity is constructed in Haiti; how issues of discrimination, segregation, vulnerability and marginalization affect participation; how actors in this research view identity; and which identities—and to what degree—are emphasized when each sub-group of research participants speaks about participation. Among the most vital considerations in societies around the world include those marginalized according to age, sex, family status (i.e. non-household head), education level, cultural minorities (i.e. religion, language, ethnicity), dimensions of wealth (employment, class, income, and land tenure), and length of tenure in the community (Cohen & Uphoff, 1980, 228). Thus, in conceptualizing participation, the aspect of identity is an important consideration when uncovering who ought to be privileged in youth program, considering who might otherwise be marginalized. This research is concerned with how identity affects who participates and who does not, and which marginalized groups within Haiti are targeted by donors to enhance their participation.

*In what are youth participating?*

The question of *in what* are youth participating essentially examines the underlying ideologies and constructions of citizenship and democracy that inform the activities in youth programs. Program components will have a tendency towards market-
oriented and personally responsible citizenship education approaches, or a social focus and justice-oriented citizenship education approach. The question of in what do youth participate examines these inclinations and also tracks the political-economic and other contextual factors informing these tendencies, such as local or domestic issues that inform what youth participate in, compared to factors of foreign and international intervention.

However, the question of in what may also analyze whether youth have control over the key decisions in the program. As Schugurensky (2009) notes:

Participation should include the notions of contribution, influencing, sharing, or redistributing power and of control, resources, benefits, knowledge and skills to be gained through beneficiary involvement in decision-making. (p. 6)

The question invites us to look at what decisions youth participate in, what aspects and stages of the program they are involved in, and what power the youth hold relative to other actors. For example, do youth participate in the creation of the space? Do they make key decisions in the space? In what ways do youth have control over space? The overall meanings for describing participation garnered from Arnstein and others’ ladders of participation are a helpful benchmark for understand in what youth participate.

Why do youth participate?

There are two aspects to the question of why. First, what motivates a particular youth to want to be involved in the program above anything else they could be doing at the time? Second, what underlies the impetus of the program to have participation as a
focal point its mandate? As Saxena notes, “beneficiaries are likely to participate where the benefits outweigh their costs” (p. 111), and likewise, NGOs would “foster beneficiary participation when the benefits of doing so outstrip the costs to the agency” (p. 112).

The theory presented in this chapter suggests that both youth and organizations profit immediately and directly from the participation of the youth in the program. In other words, both youth and organizations act, to varying degrees, out of self-interest. While there may be greater and stated motives for youth participation, there are also immediate and/or tangible benefits for youth and organizations for which participation is included as a central value.

In the case of youth there are some central questions to ask in regards to why they participate. Does their participation in the program enable further access to institutions or resources? Does it satisfy a social or psychological need? Are they simply invested for the longer-term motive of participation? The role of “commonality of interest” (Saxena, 1998) may be a determining factor for the youth’s decision to come to the program. For example, whether they have previous connections, living proximity to each other, similar cultural backgrounds, language, age-range, popular interests, and so on.

As for the institutional understanding of why, one might ask what does youth participation contribute to the organization? Does it strengthen the organization, and if so, how? What does it enable for the organization’s staff and practitioners?

The central goal in this research is to examine as closely as possible how participation is being socially constructed and how it is conceptualized. First, what meanings are provided for participation in the context of youth programs of the Haitian reconstruction? Second, who is involved in these programs, and who benefits from the
spaces for participation? Third, what exactly are youth participating in (and what are they not participating in)? Finally, why are the youth really involved in the program, and, why do the programs want youth to learn to participate?
Chapter Three: Haiti’s history and contemporary conceptualizations of participation

The history of Haiti is lined with events informing how today’s youth may conceptualize their participation. These events stem from both international and local origins, and are rationalized through market and social orientations. The spaces created for Haitians to participate have acculturated a variety of approaches to citizenship, and this chapter aims to illustrate how these perspectives have developed over time. This chapter also seeks to foreshadow the conceptualizations of participation expressed by youth and program practitioners in this present research.

Haiti’s history exemplifies a continuing trajectory of contestations for citizenship, democracy, and participation in society. Through pre-independence Haiti, the formal participation expressed by the majority of Haitians was largely through a market orientation under international colonizers invested in a global economy, unconcerned with citizen rights of indigenous and African originating Haitians. Participation as a social orientation was confined to local arenas through the cultures developed by slave families and communities. The pre-eminence of a formal expression of participation as a social orientation emerged during the Haitian rebellion, its early days as an independent colony, and the resurgence of African cultures, in which a Haitian identity developed to embolden this particular sense of citizenship. Yet the U.S. occupation, the rise of foreign investment, and the influx of humanitarian assistance before and after the earthquake promoted a resurfacing of the international presence and a market orientation, but also heightened the response for citizenship expressed in Haitian terms and an emphasis on justice and human rights. This chapter presents these periods in greater detail to illustrate
the influences on contemporary conceptualizations of participation, culminating in a historical synthesis of Haitian participation, and who has participated, in what, and why.

There is some debate on how far back one need to go to help understand the construction of the notion of citizen participation in Haiti. Many point to the arrival of the UN Peacekeeping forces in Haiti in 2004, others to the Duvalier dictatorships lasting for several decades, yet others to the remarkable circumstances of Haiti’s achievement of independence. This chapter begins with the initial international intervention in Haiti—Columbus’s first New World settlement on the north coast of present-day Haiti—suggesting that conceptualizations of participation in Haiti have developed at least since this time.

Pre-Independence Haiti

Since Columbus’ trans-Atlantic voyages in 1492, the tensions between democracy, colonization, and citizen participation have laid the foundation for centuries of unequal distribution of power and privilege in Haitian society. Columbus’ first New World settlement in La Navidad on the north coast of present-day Haiti came after a brief stop in Cuba, a territory he (in)famously mistook and chronicled as Japan, part of a broader theme of misrepresentations of the colonizing project. At the time of Columbus’ arrival, an estimated five hundred thousand members of Haiti’s first peoples, the Taino

5 La Navidad, for example, was named for its establishment on Christmas Day. Hispaniola, derived from “La Isla Española”, was the name given to the entire island now shared by Haiti and the Dominican Republic, ignoring the name that the Taino had already given to the island to mean “the mountainous country”, “Haiti”.
nation, populated the island. With Spanish colonization and military rule came economic exploitation by slavery, a key feature of European imperialist approaches to overseas colonies. A new social fabric was evolving as villages were broken up, chiefs killed, and Taíno used as *encomienda* (slaves) for the excavation of large deposits of gold in Hispaniola.

**The First Haitians**

In response to these harsh conditions, the Taíno began to perish by the thousand, many committing suicide (Arthur & Dash, 1999), and, as elsewhere in the new world, many died through disease brought from overseas by the colonialists. Farmer (2006) describes how the number of Taíno on Hispaniola declined each century, from eight million in the fifteenth to 50,000 in the early sixteenth; from barely over 100 by the middle of the sixteenth, and perishing completely by the seventeenth. The Taíno became “sickened and died at a rate that appalled even the Europeans”, contends Farmer (2006, p. 54). A lasting implication of the genocide of the Taíno on citizenship and identity is that today there is no *mestizo* population in Haiti, unlike in much of Latin America (Watkins, 2012).

**Colonization**

Columbus’ arrival marks the first foreign intervention in Haiti and the beginning of a long line of colonizers who have used various but similarly atrocious means to harness, control, and exploit the population. As Casimir (1992) has noted, “since Christopher Columbus landed in the Caribbean, the peoples of these lands have seen their dreams of freedom and respect for human rights generally fade” (p. 12). Indeed, Columbus’ arrival began a dubious legacy of international involvement that invariably
resulted in genocide for the Taíno, and oppression for the African peoples that would be imported as slaves.

**Slavery**

The eventual extermination of the Taíno would set the stage for the importation of Africans as slaves to fill the labour shortage. By 1501, the Spanish had brought in the first slaves from Africa, who would soon be used for cheap, expendable, and exploitable labour throughout the colony. Harold Courlander (1960) describes how slaves from numerous and unrelated ethnic groups arrived in Saint Domingue, “Shoulder to shoulder in the plantation fields were Bambarras, Anagos, Takwas, and Bumbas, … peoples with different backgrounds, different languages, different legends, and different traditions” (p. 5). The plurality of ethnicities, languages, and traditions would ultimately form the basis of a distinct Haitian identity based on a multiplicity of African heritages.

The institution of slavery for the purposes of sustaining a flourishing economy (largely through sugar plantations, which produced three quarters of the global supply of sugar to French colonizers) would flourish under the rule of the French, who assumed control from the Spanish through the Treaty of Ryswick in 1697. In the wake of this Treaty, Saint Domingue became increasingly populated with Africans brought to Haiti as enslaved workers, soon accounting for 90 percent of the local population. With colonists having purchased upwards of 800,000 slaves, the island received far more than the rest of

---

6 Saint Domingue was name that the French assigned to their colony on the island of Hispaniola (Santo Domingo in Spanish). During French rule the size of the colony varied between the whole island of Hispaniola and the western portion, with similar borders as today.
North America combined. As the Saint-Domingue society developed to incorporate the economies of mining as well as agriculture, the state ruled with increasing military harshness.

**The Revolution and its Impacts on Citizen Participation**

By the end of the 18th century, after almost three centuries of slavery, the slaves of Saint-Domingue mobilized in large numbers to reclaim their freedom from the king of France. This uprising, the first and only successful slave revolution the world has seen, is perhaps one of the most telling and successful examples of democratic participation of the Haitian people in their storied history. The long and taxing war would eventually culminate in an independent country called “Haiti”, the Taíno word meaning “land with mountains”, the first and only nation born through the unfettered resistance and mobilization of enslaved peoples. Up until Haiti’s independence in 1804, individuals of African heritage were not recognized as citizens whereas immediately upon Haiti’s declaration as sovereign, the rights associated with citizenship were granted to all individuals living in Haiti. C.L.R. James proposes that this historical moment was immeasurably significant in the development of a regional identity: “West Indians first became aware of themselves as a people in the Haitian Revolution” (p. 391).

---

7 This type of citizen might be classified as “citizenship as status” by Schugurensky (2005).
Haitian Independence

Not to be overlooked, the cost of independence for Haitian citizens was equally daunting. Cities, towns, plantations, and economies were destroyed and as many as 100,000 citizens died in the fighting (Casimir & Dubois, 2010). Haiti’s immense challenge was to build “a new order on the ashes of a plantation system” in immensely unfavourable socio-economic conditions, even though “they inherited the legacies of massive and violent labour extraction without inheriting any of the capital that this extraction had produced” (p. 118). Constraints imposed by the international community in response to the revolution had further crippling effects on the way citizens would participate in Haiti. Total reparations to France for the “inconvenience” of independence were 150 million francs—this compared to an annual average Haitian budget of approximately twenty million francs. Relations closer to home were little better. It took the United States fifty-eight years to recognize the independence of Haiti, thirty-seven more than France (Acacia, 2006). Just as the international community was able to contain Haiti from within, they too were able to oppress the nation through ostracization and isolation.

The United States Occupation

However, colonial domination would come again to Haiti after the arrival of the U.S. Marines during the First World War. Foreign investment had been outlawed since its enshrinement in the original Haitian constitution of 1804 as a deliberate measure by the first president, Jean Jacques Dessalines. Although some exceptions were made, for a period of over 115 years foreign ownership had been curtailed in Haiti. However, during the American occupation of 1915-1934, a constitutional plebiscite was coordinated to allow foreign ownership within Haiti. This could be seen as an early example in which
Haitians were invited to participate by an international institution; however the shortcomings are clearer due to the advantage of history. Under a widely characterized repressive and racist regime, the manipulative plebiscite enabled the conditions for new forms of containment under a subversive rhetoric of democracy. This legal amendment would open the door for an increasing onslaught of foreign corporations to locate in Haiti, ones that would, to this day, reap economic benefits of situating in a country with weak institutions, workers rights, and environmental regulations.

The occupation, generally, and the constitutional plebiscite, specifically, dramatically changed the way that Haitians’ viewed their relationship with the United States and their understanding of means for manipulation through the mechanics of government. For one, it became clear how quite easily the U.S. could wield direct influence over the Haitian citizenry with very little say by Haitian citizens as individuals or through organized groups. As Acacia (2006) describes, “When the American occupation (1915-1934) began, the era of decentralization confirmed the substitution the French influence by American influence” (p.22).

For Haitians, this time in history is a reminder of the threat of an international state to overpower and subjugate a populace both overtly and subversively through state structures. Historians have argued that the implications of the amendment itself in allowing foreign ownership in Haiti was one of the greatest nation-changing events of the past century. That it happened through an unfair, manipulated system governed by foreign interests allows an appreciation that Haitian citizens might view their participation in foreign ‘democratic’ systems (specifically American in this case) and possibly domestic state affairs (depending on how the role of Haitian politicians at the
time is interpreted) with scepticism. The guise of a democratic process to placate a population ultimately displayed that a democratic process may actually weaken citizens’ resolve to participate.

The Resurgence of African Identity

As the U.S. occupation came to infuriate the citizens of Haiti, movements to reclaim Haitian tradition, culture, and pride sprouted in various forms. In 1928, Jean-Price-Mars published his ethnological book *Ainsi Parla L’Oncle*. This novel would set the stage for the embracing of negritude, as one Haiti’s foremost and persuasive accounts of the importance of not just the contribution of the African components of folklore, history, and language to Haitian culture, but of that of religion as well. Haitian ethnographers continue to debate the influence that *Ainsi Parla L’Oncle* has had on Haitian identity (Byron, 2012). Prior to its publication, popular culture glorified French aspects of Haitian society: the most valuable facets of society French elements, the less appreciated, their African roots. After its publication by contrast, a continuing re-appreciation for not just African heritage, but the distinct facets of Haitian folklore, Vodou, and culture emerged. “He appealed to them instead to act ‘as Haitians’ who should appraise the values of their historical traditions and societal heritage realistically and who as elites should instruct all of their countrymen to be proud of their indigenous cultures” (Shannon, 1983, p. xi).

Participation in Haitian Culture

Not only did the emergence of *Ainsi Parla L’Oncle* solidify the popularity and predominance of Price-Mars, it introduced more largely a respect for the role of the artist in Haiti. By way of the author-ethnographer, vocations such as visual artists, filmmakers,
poets, and scholars of ethnology are part of revered segments of Haitian society. The solidification of these domains in Haiti speaks to the broader ways in which citizens have come participate in their society through the arts, expression, and voice, and how participation in one’s family was legitimized through an increased pride in local heritage. But as the enthusiasm for the philosophies of indigénisme empowered a renaissance for African heritage and folklore, Vodou and Kreyòl⁸, it also permitted the rise to power of François Duvalier, an advocate and champion of negritude. Over a thirty-year span, Duvalier transformed from rural doctor to dictator-for-life of Haiti.

**International Aid, Multinational Corporations, and Multilateral Agencies**

Corralling anti-imperialist popular energy, the brutal Duvalier dictatorships (1957-86) that followed have been described as the ‘salvadorization of Haiti’ (Massing, 1988, cited in Farmer, 2006, p. 421); these regimes relied on direct and structural violence to maintain order. The resulting dysfunction was directly due to the erosion of social programs, civil society, reasonable wealth distribution, individual freedoms, and citizen participation (Wilentz, 1990). During the capitalist-leaning Duvalierist reign, a foreign-friendly economic climate opened doors to international corporations to establish manufacturing plants, aimed, in part, at stimulating local employment. In tandem, the swine flu outbreak of the 1980s led to the USAID decision to exterminate the entire

---

⁸ Terms used in this thesis that are specific to Haiti—such as the Kreyòl language and the Vodou religion—are written according to their local spelling to avoid confusion with generic or regional connotations and to legitimize these often devalued aspects of Haitian culture.
species of Creole pigs. This controversial decision severely deteriorated the attainment of sustainable farming practices and for rural dwellers achievement of food security. In response, Haiti saw a large exodus of rural dwellers to urban areas, largely to Port-au-Prince, in search of a better livelihood within the promise of factory work. This “premature urbanization”, a term coined by UN-Habitat (Smith et al., 2013), would have disastrous consequences for Haiti’s population. As Haiti’s reputation for security did not improve under the brutal Duvalier dictatorships, many of these companies proved unviable. Their eventual pull-out from the country left thousands of citizens stranded in the urban bidonvilles (slums) such as Cité Soleil and Cité Simone in overcrowded, un(der)serviced and insecure communities without sustainable income.

The Rise and Fall of Aristide

As in previous eras in Haiti, the brutality of Duvalierism (both father and son as well as subsequent leaders of similar ideology and practice) and its repression of citizen participation incited a dramatic change in politics in Haiti. The change was found in Jean-Bertrand Aristide, a complex and controversial figure throughout his storied rise to power, leadership, ousting, exile, and recent return to Haiti. For many Haitians, the solution to their history of non-participation appeared to be answered in 1990 through Aristide, their first democratically elected president.

A Catholic priest since 1982—expelled in 1988 in part for his overtly political and radical messages—Aristide delivered provoking sermons at Saint Bosco parish prior to his entry into politics. These homilies happened in a context in which popular energy was still jubilant from the downfall of the Duvalier dictatorships of 1963-1986, which laid the foundation for Aristide’s sweeping electoral victory of 1990. Nikolas Barry-
Shaw and Dru Oja Jay note that “prior to Aristide’s election, the Kreyòl-speaking, predominantly rural poor majority, some 80% of the population, were excluded from the political life and wealth of the nation” (p. 114).

During his tenure as priest, Aristide would reach many from his pulpit through his linking theological ideals with political realities. His central message that a political and religious cleansing was necessary for Haitian renewal was heard by thousands of citizens. Popular messages among them were to invoke the anti-slavery principle enshrined in Haiti’s inaugural constitution: Tout moun se moun (every man is a man).

Reflecting on Aristides’s sermons, Laënnec Hurbon (1996) summarizes that what Aristide is invoking here is the “necessity of the tangible universality of the fundamental human right of participation of Haitians, without exception, in political life” (translated from French, emphasis added).

**Political Coups**

Aristide was well known for his distinct political style and his dramatic reforms as president. He routinely hosted meals at the Presidential Palace as a gesture of inclusion and a move to embolden a sense of citizenship as identity. His reforms focused on the rights of Haitian citizens in terms of food security, fairer income distribution, and halting corruption within the elite and the military. His tenure as president was short-lived, however, as revolts from those whose privilege was threatened resulted in a military coup in 1991. Aristide was eventually re-instated through pressure by Haitian Americans on then-President Bill Clinton to facilitate a return to power, and Aristide fulfilled his term between 1994 and 1996. Elected president again in 2001, one of Aristide’s central policy positions was the reinstatement of the 19th century reparations to
France, what he saw as the leading cause of the country’s original collapse. Met with resistance by much of the West, the 2003 Ottawa Initiative on Haiti—a conference to deliberate Haiti’s future in which in which not a single Haitian citizen’s attended—determined that regime change in Haiti was necessary; “Aristide should go” (Hallward, 2007, p. 91). Aristide’s second tenure then also terminated through a coup d'état in 2004, this time amidst great instability and unrest throughout the country.

**International Peacekeeping**

To respond to the increasing fragility in Haiti, a UN peacekeeping mission was deployed to maintain peace and security in the region (Peacekeeping Operations, 2014) two months after the coup of 2004. The resolution for the United Nations Stabilization Mission in Haiti enabled the entry of 6 700 troops, personnel of mostly Latin American or South Asian citizenship, and a Brazilian as permanent commander. The activities of the mission vary between general policing duties, humanitarian assistance, enforcing rule in Cité Soleil, security during political elections, and patrolling drug crime (Facts and Figures, 2012). The original mandate for MINUSTAH was until 2010, but the force continues to be a permanent fixture in Haiti despite increasing calls by Haitians to terminate the mission.

---

*Known as MINUSTAH, the French acronym for la Mission des Nations Unies pour la stabilisation en Haïti mission.*
The Fallout of the Earthquake

At the time of the earthquake, the most affected areas were the densely populated areas of the bidonvilles and the hillside villages of Port-au-Prince. Large mountainside communities crumbled in landslides into the valleys, trapping citizens in the avalanche. In many cases, it became apparent that only some sectors of the mountains, those with dense populations and ill-constructed homes were badly affected; the earthquake was much more forgiving to wealthy communities with homes constructed to code. The bidonvilles were neglected in the mainstream reconstruction. Given their reputation as unsafe and informally governed, few aid agencies and resources (at least initially) entered these areas in the emergency response, alienating further the most vulnerable peoples who suffered among the worst consequences of the quake.

When the earth settled, rubble, soot, and evidence of the destruction were everywhere. The effects of the earthquake and its toll were immediately apparent. Roads were impassable and the airport was unusable. Almost all electronic and telecommunications were cut off. Survivors sought other survivors, their families and friends, walking through towns, calling out names of loved ones. An estimated 3.5 million people were directly or indirectly affected; 1.5 million people immediately became homeless. Sixty percent of government buildings and 4 000 schools were destroyed, and one quarter of all public service employees in Port-au-Prince died.
Disproportionate Harm of the Earthquake

Questions remained, however, as to how the earthquake could be so devastating to so many people in Haiti. Michèle D. Pierre-Louis (2011) wonders “if the earthquake has not chosen its targets, it seems that even in its blindness it would have hit the most vulnerable living in densely populated areas. It was in these areas that we saw the most deaths” (translated from French, p. 6-7). Other Haitian analysts have connected Haiti’s history of colonization with its domestic political weaknesses, underscoring a dearth in democracy that created such circumstances of extreme vulnerability. Paul Farmer (2011) describes the earthquake as an “acute-on-chronic” crisis, using this medical analogy to signify the massive trauma inflicted upon an ongoing condition of vulnerability caused by five centuries of colonization, slavery, ostracism, socio-political conflicts, and
dependency. Doucet & Dublin (2012) also connect Haiti’s socio-political volatility with the inability of its societal structures to cope with the consequences of the earthquake on its most vulnerable citizens:

The earthquake that devastated Haiti’s capital and surrounding areas in January 2010 is one among many catastrophic events… These disasters remind us unequivocally of our collective vulnerability. In nation-states already compromised by political and economic fragility, the unnatural consequences of natural disasters deepen their impact and heighten the urgency of response. Haiti’s case represents a critical example of this, with the desolation of the earthquake compounded by hurricanes, an outbreak of cholera, and a fraught political landscape. … Many questions remain unanswered for Haiti’s people, and in particular her most vulnerable populations—children and women living in poverty, displaced in tent cities their most basic needs for clean water, food, and protection are not being met. (p. 4)

As Haitian historians and analysts of the earthquake argue, the socio-structural foundation in Haiti that permitted such devastation resulted from decades of decisions (or non decisions) that ultimately undermined its most vulnerable citizens. Indeed, while the inequalities in Haiti have always been well known, it was the aftermath of the earthquake vividly illustrated their extent.

The International Response

The rush of the international community to aid the Haitian earthquake victims was unprecedented in the era of institutionalized disaster response. While this aid was routed through traditional sources of international non-profit organizations, the fertility of the neoliberal political economy enabled much for-profit transnational activity as well. In February, 2010, Kenneth Merten relayed that companies teeming into Haiti saw the earthquake as a “gold rush” for reconstruction contracts (Hertz & Ives, 2011). During
this international response it became increasingly apparent that aid was being channelled largely through foreign organizations, sidelining both state institutions and local and community-based organizations in Haiti. Less than one percent of the total aid to Haiti was fed into state institutions; Haitian NGOs and civil society organizations barely register on an overall proportion (UN Office, 2012). The weakening of the state due to the influx of NGOs was the central reason for the ineptitude to adequately reconstruct, argues François Pierre-Louis (2011), as well as the lasting effects of the 19th & 20th century boycott of the nation’s government and the ongoing internal struggle amongst the elite for power (Carr et al., 2014).

**Figure 2. Recipients of humanitarian aid relief to Haiti**

![Pie chart showing aid recipients in Haiti](image)

Note: Most NGOs which received support are international. Percentages in this chart are for the $2.43 billion committed or disbursed as of March 2011. By December 2011, donors had disbursed 52.9 percent of the $4.3 billion pledged for programme support. Source: Office of the UN Special Envoy for Haiti, "Has Aid Changed?" Report, 13.


The sidelining of local organizations has compounded costs. In a comparative analysis of Oxfam’s work in risk reduction after natural disasters, Pelling (2011) reports that success is most contingent on government support, long standing partnerships, and an integration of international and local technologies, the latter as a means to also promote local participation. In the countries in this analysis—Haiti, Guyana, and the
Dominican Republic—Pelling found that effective risk planning was limited by a visionary perspective to address the realities of environmental factors, political contexts, and the root causes of vulnerability. Further research examines the nature of the limitations to aid of NGOs. Lucchi (2012) documents how the response of French NGO Médecins Sans Frontières targeted urban populations affected by violence, neglect, and marginalization, but faced operational challenges such as developing appropriate assessments, useful vulnerability indicators, relevant operational strategies, pertinent security measures, and a responsible exit strategy. Zanotti (2010) argued that the ways that the international community sought to use NGOs as service providers in Haiti severely weakened Haiti's state institutions. Those that were able to provide sustainable employment, social capital, and other critically needed services such as Partners in Health and Fonkoze where characterized by having internationally connections, financially stability, a long-term focus, and a needs-based approach.

One theme of the reconstruction was the restoration of democratic participation of Haitian citizens. However, in Haiti the type of democracy prioritized in the reconstruction fit the “status” definition of citizenship. Former Canadian Minister of Foreign Affairs Lawrence Cannon has described the focus of Canadian aid as reconstructing institutions for electoral processes and justice (rule of law, property rights). Democratic priorities of the reconstruction under this conceptualization have recently involved electoral monitoring, funding to reconstruct the Supreme Court of Haiti, and promoting a secure, stable environment through police training and prison constructions, the central priority of Canadian aid to Haiti (Oda, 2009).
Media Portrayals of the Disaster

To explain the decisions of the international community to largely neglect Haitian channels in the involvement and control over their own reconstruction, many analysts attributed the impact of the media portrayal of Haiti in and around the time of the earthquake as a legitimizing source of exclusion. For example, media analyses following the earthquake attributed the legitimization of the exclusion of vulnerable Haitians to the media’s portrayal of Haiti, depicting victims of the earthquake through a “colonial gaze”, consistent with the longstanding project of “othering” (Pressley-Sanon, 2011). Balaji (2011) argues that media responses to the earthquake characterized Haiti as “dysfunctional, childlike, and dependent”, permitting benevolent donors to respond with pity on the “dark world” of Haiti. Clitandre (2011) notes that Haiti was represented in ways that exemplified its “exceptionalism” as a grotesque, incomprehensible quagmire of a country, re-enforcing apocalyptic stereotypes of the nation. Schuller (2012), adding that Haiti was described as the “black sheep” of the Caribbean, “the most dangerous place on earth”, argues that negative portrayal has positively served to disenfranchise Haitian civil society and privilege international civil society. Clitandre concurs, that instead of excluding Haitian actors, the aid industry should be “creating alliances and exposing commonalities” (p. 151-152).

Tiers of Citizens Exposed Through the Remnants of the Humanitarian Response

The lack of involvement of domestic channels necessarily put at risk the distribution of aid to the most vulnerable. The trend of the allotment and distribution of humanitarian aid to urban centres created a dangerous, self-perpetuating cycle. These trends were not just seen in the wake of the 2010 earthquake, but also during aid
disbursement following hurricanes affecting Haiti, such as 2004’s Hurricane Jeanne (over 300,000 dead or displaced), 2008’s Hurricane Gustav (affecting 15,000 families) and 2010’s Hurricane Tomas (exacerbating the recent cholera epidemic). As discussed above, Port-au-Prince was an already overpopulated centre. However, as with these previous natural disasters in Haiti, vulnerable citizens from other jurisdictions flocked to urban areas to be included in the catchment area for various types of aid (see IDP camps, below). International aid would also discriminate—whether consciously or not—according to language (privileging English and French speaking channels), religion, and class. For example, in research on previous Haitian natural disasters, Rachel Beauvoir-Dominique (2012) shows that during aid distribution by the Red Cross after Hurricane Jeanne in 2004, despite aid policies of allotment according to “need alone”, “regardless of the race, creed, or nationality of the recipients” (p. 17), certain groups were excluded in distribution patterns, particularly practitioners of Vodou, as aid was channelled through established Protestant institutions.

**Cholera**

The presence of MINUSTAH has become increasingly controversial in light of their infringement on Haiti’s sovereignty, reports of assault and violence in IDP camps, and the re-introduction of cholera to Haiti, which has grossly affected already vulnerable communities (HealthRoots, 2011). The latter example is especially salient, as this has been world’s worst cholera epidemic in recent memory. Human infection by the bacteria is generally a result of transmission through water contaminated by feces from an infected person, a high risk in Haiti due to environmental problems associated with water quality in the country. The disease has had excessive effects on the most marginalized
populations, primarily infecting the hundreds of thousands IDPs who live in camps that are ill equipped for potable water. In a political economy in which the state is incapable of providing widespread access to drinking water, safe water must be purchased from for-profit sources. For those who cannot afford these costs, many of whom are living in Haiti’s IDP camps, water sources range from ditches of rain or ground water, used variably for washing, drinking, and cooking. As will be discussed below, services in camps to address sanitation, access to potable water, health and hygiene were limited and variable, depending on provision and distribution by government officials and NGOs.

The introduction of cholera into Haiti has been attributed to of infected members of MINUSTAH living at a base on the Artibonite River—Haiti and Hispaniola’s longest and most important river—north of Port-au-Prince (HealthRoots, 2011). An estimated 6% of Haitians have since contracted cholera, hospitalizing hundreds of thousands, and killing over eight thousand, straining an already vulnerable and deficient institutional social structure, in which, for example, the very hospitals that would be expected to be use to treat earthquake victims were themselves also destroyed by the earthquake. Given the extent of the infringements of what many call the “UN occupation”, there are increasing demands for termination of the role of the UN in Haiti (Edmonds, 2013; Weisbrot, 2011).

**IDP Camps**

Finally, there have been major detrimental outcomes in the establishment of the IDP camps. These camps were set up in the weeks and months following the earthquake, with many associated decisions and consequences. The issues facing residents of these camps are multi-faceted, complex, and hit hardest the most vulnerable. Camps suffer
from overcrowding, to some degree, because of the number of citizens who were homeless after the earthquake, but also in large part due to the patterns of aid distribution described above. With much international attention to resources provided to IDP camps over rural and excluded urban areas, some (approximately three percent of camp residents) saw this as better alternative to live and procure resources (Spraos, 2013). Due to problems with governance in camps, crime, theft and sexual violence are widespread, largely affecting vulnerable individuals, especially women. Horton (2012) argues that the marginalization of women during the earthquake response was within the larger context of gender exclusion in Haiti where women and girls faced barriers to participating in aid programs such as family obligations, violence, exploitation, compounded with further racial and class discrimination. Horton suggests that responding to the vulnerability of women in the reconstruction requires recognizing and supporting women’s capacities over the long term.

The very nature of the IDP camps themselves, including the inflow to and withdrawal from the camps, has been problematic and disruptive to Haiti’s vulnerable groups (Carr et al. 2014). Policies related to humanitarian aid in camps, while they may or may not have been mechanically sound, had a broader effect of dismantling the lakou—the traditional communal-based family structure in Haiti—in favour of a more individualistic, hierarchal Western logic of community set in motion by the international NGO culture (Schuller, 2013). While 278 000 Haitians remain in IDP camps, exit strategies have begun to enable the transfer of some citizens to more permanent residencies (Amnesty International, 2013). However, in an effort to move beyond temporary status of these camps, government efforts to relocate camp residents to
permanent housing elsewhere is fraught with inequitable consequences. These “forced evictions” are impacting “Haiti’s most vulnerable”, reports Kevin Edmonds (2013) for the Canada Haiti Action Network.

**Summary: Haiti’s History and Conceptualizations of Participation**

Haiti’s colourful history illuminates multiple ways in which the participation of its citizens has been enacted, experienced, and framed. In many ways, this history informs the conceptualizations constructed by today’s youth and citizens of Haiti. The norms that have emerged through the evolution of Haitian culture have defined *who* participates, in *what*, and *why*. This summary presents a synthesis of this analysis that will be drawn upon through the findings of this thesis.

**Who Participates?**

In considering participation through the question of *who participates*, the history of Haiti illustrates how society has traditionally been separated along at least numerous lines. Stratification in Haiti today continues according to gender, spoken language, race, class, geography, and religion. Of these, the latter four themes emerge as particularly prominent in the recounting of Haiti’s history.

Racial identities have foregrounded historical analyses of Haitian society. Those pre-independence era publications that distinguished inhabitants according to race contributed to embedding race as a central differentiating construct in Haitian society. Race was a central identity of solidarity during the revolution and was a determining factor for the establishment of new social structures. Historians have argued that these complex historical events have affected continued racialization in Haiti today. In Haiti,
being lighter skinned affords huge privileges in many ways: structurally, formally, and overtly.

Discrimination along lines of class ran in tandem with racial segregation of pre-revolutionary Haiti and the rigid socio-economic boundaries embedded in the structures of slavery. Issues of class continued through independent Haiti, perhaps most prominent again through the class-based revolution of Aristide. Although largely racially homogenous, the poor congregated from various walks of life, including underpaid factory workers, ranks within the policy and military, rural peasants, and urban slum dwellers. Today, economic discrimination continues to heavily influence class identities, but again, also race. The upper two percent of Haitians (largely a combination of French, Arab, White, and Mulatto) control 44% of the wealth. Seventy-five percent of the population are rural peasants, and a further 15% are the urban poor, living in the bidonvilles and temporary IDP camps.

Geographic identities were also entrenched as early as independence as well, as rural traditions were favoured as the essential fabric upon which the nations economy and culture would be constructed. Centralization was a major outcome of the U.S. occupation. This continued during the years of the Duvalier dictatorships where a political and economic emphasis concentrated on Port-au-Prince. During the increase of foreign aid, the focus of distribution was in Port-au-Prince and even its wealthy suburbs such as Petionville, while many communities, rural areas, and bidonvilles remained largely untouched. Today a major divide remains between rural and urban identities.
Finally, Haiti’s history also illustrates the central role of the Vodou religion to
direct and inspire the revolution. The emancipating slave revolution illustrated a
successful path for which lasting social change is possible and the means through which
citizens can organize in community and religious venues. But whereas religion brought
Haitians together in solidarity to form their own country, it became a distinguishing
identifier to discriminate against “uncivilized” Haitians under the U.S. occupation, a
lasting stigma. While the renaissance of indigisme reinvigorated a positive association
with Vodou, its alignment with the dark days of Duvalierism has re-enforced the
continued mainstream marginalization of Vodou against Christian religions. Catholicism, by contrast, is well-established in Haiti, but is also a less privileged identity due to its connection with Duvalier and the religious elite, as well as its connection to the radical liberation theology of Aristide. Aristides’s venue of the Catholic Church demonstrated the entry point of religion for the participation of Haitians in the liberation and justice for its people. As liberation theology was sweeping through Latin America, so did the movement, represented symbolically by Aristide, capture the imagination of a people for a more just and democratic state. Church groups of the day evolved into peasant organizations and then broader-based political unions. Eventually taking its place, the implantation of Protestant, increasingly evangelical, Christianity into Haiti has gained much prominence and is legitimized within the larger hegemonic project of the U.S. presence in Haiti. For example, we saw how much aid even surreptitiously bypassed some Haitian citizens because it was channelled through U.S. religious missions.

**In What?**

In considering *in what* have Haitians participated, political and economic realms were obvious points of reference. As for political, Haiti’s history may lead to a contextualization of participation connected variably to colonial history, domestic politics, or foreign intervention. Foremost, one would expect that the exceptionality of the revolution with its political properties and outcomes would emerge as highly relevant in the way that participation is conceptualized today. More recently, as Haitian citizens negotiate between the extreme political positions from Duvalier to Aristide, conceptualizations would reflect how these political perspectives are reconciled,
especially in context of the international relations to these leaders, and issues of corruption and fragility in the country today.

**Spaces of international origin and market-orientations.**

Many of the spaces in which Haiti’s peoples have been provided to participate have been in the context of colonization by international actors: the U.S. occupation, foreign aid, multinationals, and more recently the surge of INGOs. Haiti’s history presents this ongoing struggle for Haitians to claim spaces amidst an onslaught of foreign intervention. It is replete with instances in which Haitians would become accustomed to outsiders arriving to invite Haitians to participate in their own society. From as early as Columbus’ settlements, to the construction of plantations within (and to serve) the framework of the European economy, historians have argued that the impact of the social structure devised under French rule has cast a negative perspective of the state as an oppressive institution. At least, citizenship would be constructed as a form of status. As Casimir and Dubois (2010) propose:

> The functioning of the colonial state and regimes in post-independence Haitian gave many in the country good reasons to see the state mainly a source of actual or potential exploitation rather than as a source of support or a site of proper representation.” (p. 130)

However, that is not to say that frameworks from other nations may be more inviting. As Casimir (1992) notes, “it must not be assumed that the nation-State—as it is conceived of in the West—must necessarily succeed the type of colonial State which the Caribbean has known” (p. 9). The transformed social, legal, and political landscape under
the U.S. occupation is another considerable experience of Haitians in invited contexts. Today in Haiti it is almost impossible to ignore the presence and framework of participation in international organizations, with the plethora of foreign aid organizations, bilateral and multilateral agencies, NGOs, and all of their programs devoted to Haitians.

Many of these were market-oriented spaces from the 16-18th century plantations or the mass assembly plants of the 2000s. Certainly the era of slavery with the French focus of building a world-dominating sugar industry was constructed on market motives, human capital theory, and the compromise of human rights. Securing employment in the assembly factors and industrial parks of recent decades has also re-enforced the prevalence of the market as a venue for Haitians who wish to participate.

Haiti relies heavily on diplomacy to negotiate international agreements and foreign aid, the latter comprising an estimated 5% of its national income. Thus, Haiti’s historical circumstances involving external pressure and natural disaster have led to the current weakness of the economy, the state and civil society, and, by extension, to the lack of ability of citizens to participate in the affairs most affecting their lives. Yet, Haiti’s domestic political narrative has been much less historically entrenched in neoliberalism than its Western counterparts. Significant influences from the region have also spurred the development of a socialist political-economy.

**Spaces of local origins and social orientations.**

As political and other formal social spaces are saturated with international and government organizations, Haitians have historically sought to claim spaces in spheres much closer to home. Much citizen participation in Haiti has traditionally occurred through local and private domains, such as grass-roots civil society, community
organizations, and extended families. Some Haitian scholars suggest that the importance of the historical production of community and family spheres is best represented through the construct of the *lakou*. The *lakou* is the primary traditional family unit, typically designated along patriarchal lines but inclusive of relatives and close neighbours. It forms the basis for the means of production for the family, working collaboratively to support the food, care and financial needs of the family. These deep-rooted values continue today, as Nicolas et al. argue (2009): “Haitian families are not only extended and flexible (i.e., multi-generational and fluid in members), but more importantly, they also provide the fundamental foundation of Haitian life” (p. 101). The modern-day extension of the *lakou* has a global dimension, they argue, that is “cohesive beyond oceans, borders, and natural disasters. It is incredibly important to Haitian life and should remain at the centre of the discussion on strengths” (p. 101). An understanding of the *lakou* is also useful in understanding forms of participation in the aftermath of the earthquake.

The implications of more than a century of slavery as the reality of life in Haiti may have conditioned not only a perspective that Haitians bring to their participation in local and international markets (i.e. as resource extractors and cultivators), but also in the way that it shaped the development of the role of the family nuclei. Resulting from the writings of Jean Price-Mars and others of the negritude movement, it becomes clearer how Haitians might view citizen participation in relation to their own culture and community, the bounds of civil society, and especially the family unit.

Aristide’s highly publicized direct references to Haitians claiming their own spaces would figure into the consciousness of Haitians in relation to their participation.
Participation in civil society took on different connotations—organizations such as grassroots and peasant organizations played central roles resulting from the influence of Aristide, shaping lasting notions of participation in Haiti.

The momentum of the Lavalas movement as a result of this event, and the ultimate political success of the party, illustrated the power of people through organization, the importance of the community organizations such as the church, and that the state may indeed offer possibilities for citizen participation after all. That it happened during a particular vacuum for the rights of citizens has also had lasting effects. Certainly the success that this movement in bringing together diverse groups of Haitians (military, with peasants, with minimum-wage assembly-line workers, street vendors) showed that it was possible for lower class Haitian citizens to organize and mobilize together.

Among the chief contemporary examples of these spaces include the coming together of citizens immediately following the earthquake. The first activities of the reconstruction were initiated neither by the international community nor the Haitian government. The initial reconstruction was a project of Haitians for Haitians, between families and across communities. As Jean Casimir and Laurent Dubois (2010) describe:

The remarkable social organization demonstrated in the wake of the earthquake suggest one of the impacts of the History of the Haitian state, which is that Haitians have largely become extremely adept at function without its assistance, even in time of catastrophe and crisis. Obviously, it would be better if they did not have to. But the fact that they do, and in some ways prefer to in the existing situation, is telling. (p. 131-132)

Thus, in interrogating what Haitians have participated in, Haiti’s history presents a remarkable tension between the international, predominantly market-oriented spaces to
which Haitians have been invited to participate, and the local response of largely socially-orientated spaces that Haitians claim for themselves.

**Why?**

A central factor in understanding why Haitians might participate is the fragility of Haitian society in the political-economic context, where participation and citizenship in formal institutions may be seen as secondary ideals to instincts of survival. Issues of sovereignty, self-governance and national fortitude in the presence of the international community might appear too idealistic in the face of imminent needs and security concerns. In the context of fragility, pragmatic solutions might trump all other issues. Basic needs to provide for oneself and family take precedence over concerns for citizen participation in programs or involvement in social change, and everyday needs for sustenance might be at the forefront of shaping understandings and articulations of participation.

Certainly, the reasons for and conceptualization of participation take on different meanings across the borders of my research. As Haitian scholar Jean Casimir (1992) proposes, ‘in the Caribbean, the concepts of country, nation and state do not correspond to those held in other regions of the world’ (p. 9). Concepts of liberal and neoliberal, for example, have different meanings in a state with a tradition of non-formal economies, where radical politics are threatened by violence, and where an incredibly weak state means that formal politics and social programs have little real meaning for its citizens. Haiti’s formation as a nation—its political struggles, unique customs and religion, and its distinct forms of occupation—surely influence its people’s understandings of democracy, citizenship and national identity. Notions of citizenship are likely impacted by communal
values associated with the widespread religious influences of Vodou, Rastafarianism, and liberation theology; the traditions passed on from Dahomey and Yoruba, the ancestral origin of Haitian slaves that have transcended generations of cultural teaching; and the regional influences of Indigenism (Price-Mars, 1919), Négritude, twenty-first-century socialism and anti(-US)-imperialist movements. Thus, the relevance of Western models of participation in light of the specific cultural and historical realities of Haitian society will need to be heavily scrutinized against domestic understandings of participation.

What is clear is that citizenship and participation have different meanings in the West than in the South (Kabeer, 2002; Robins et al., 2008). Even the linear relations between participation and its outcomes are challenged. Gaventa & Barrett (2010) propose that change theory—and particularly the link between citizen engagement and deeper democracy—is primarily “an iterative and uneven process” (p. 58). This proposal is an illuminating response to a widespread frustration of the lack of linear progress in the Haitian reconstruction. These authors argue that the role played by local associations is routinely underestimated and that citizen engagement is often increased with citizen backlash to dysfunctional leadership in weak states. Through local organizations and other forms of participation, “citizen engagement can make positive differences even in the least democratic states” (p. 59). Thus, the nuances, possibilities, and understandings of citizen participation in a complex situation such as Haiti are critical considerations for this study. This study aims to unpack some of the complex and differentiated ways in which citizen participation is being socially constructed in post-reconstruction Haiti.
Chapter Four: 
Research Methodology

The primary goal of this research is to better understand how Haitian youth are learning to participate in their own reconstruction through their involvement in non-formal education programs. The first part was to conduct a survey of programs for youth operating in Haiti during the period of the reconstruction. After inspecting these programs, I chose three for in-depth analysis, based on information obtained before and after the conceptual mapping of youth programs in Haiti, and prioritizing the attention these programs afforded to youth participation in their documents. With three programs selected, the second part was to seek meanings of youth participation by observing how participation was socially constructed during the formation and implementation of these programs, and then in the third part, by soliciting conceptualizations of participation from data points along the aid chain and scrutinizing them in comparative analysis.

My objectives for this present chapter are to (a) be as clear as possible on the design of my research and (b) to demonstrate the processes, complexities, and degree of rigour involved in this research. Although it would be completely impractical, my vision in writing this chapter is to present all the processes and issues involved with this research in a manner that another researcher might be able to replicate this study, and under similar conditions and theoretical frameworks arrive at similar conclusions. This in itself might be used as a measure of rigour of this study.

This chapter is laid out as follows. It begins by providing an overview of the design for Research Question #1 and proceeds by describing the three case studies that were selected from the pool of 34 programs surveyed for Research Question #1. It then describes the methodologies for studying the social constructions of participation.
(Research Question #2), the conceptualizations of participation (Research Question #3), and the ensuring comparative analyses (Research Question #4). An overview of these methodologies and their connections with the research questions is provided in Table 4.1, and explained in detail below. The chapter concludes with a discussion on some of the most important issues that surfaced in the process of this research.

**Table 4.1. Research Questions and Conceptual Frameworks**

*Research Question #1:* What youth programs are operating in Haiti that target and involve youth as participants in their national reconstruction, and how do they differ in terms of their origins and orientation?

**Orientations:** Market versus social motives  
**Origins:** Local versus international origins

*Research Question #2:* How is youth participation socially constructed during the formation and implementation of the three selected case study programs of the Haitian reconstruction?

*Research Question #3:* How is participation conceptualized by the various actors at each of the four levels of the vertical aid chain within the three selected case study programs?

**Who** participates?  
**In** *What?*  
**Why?*

*Research Question #4:* How do these conceptualizations of participation compare and contrast with one another among the programs (horizontally), along the levels of the aid chain (vertically), and how can any differences be explained?

**Horizontal** Analysis among programs:  
Farming—Debates—Radio  
**Vertical** Analysis along the aid chain:  
Level 1—Level 2—Level 3—Level 4
Surveying Youth Programs in Haiti

The first question to which thesis attends is “What youth programs are operating in Haiti that target and involve youth as participants in their national reconstruction, and how do they differ in terms of their origins and orientation?” This question focuses on both the youth programs that were in place in Haiti during the first three years of the reconstruction, but also the basic nature of these programs in terms of their origins and orientations. Therefore the methods needed for this research question required five steps. These steps included locating as many youth programs as possible (step 1), collecting basic information regarding each program’s orientation (step 2) and origin (step 3), plotting each program on a conceptual map (step 4), and then separating the programs into useful clusters (step 5) that would ultimately inform the selection of the case study programs to enable the investigation of the subsequent Research Questions #2 through #4.

Conceptual Underpinnings

As the focus of Research Question #1 is to develop a conceptual map to analyze the political, social, and economic landscapes of youth programs in Haiti (from which to then select three case study programs for the subsequent research questions), there is a reliance on this research’s overall conceptual assumptions. The analytic grid that is produced relies on the binaries of program origins and orientations described in Chapter Two. Embedded in the international-local spectrum are suppositions that international programs are largely designed in a manner in which Haitian youth are invited to participate in the structures created for them, whereas programs with local origins represent examples of Haitians claiming spaces for themselves through the agency of the
actors in the youth programs. Tested in this Research Question are the alignments between this spectrum and that of the market-social orientations, as theorized in Chapter Two. Given the dominance of neoliberal and market narratives informing the Western political economy and the foreign aid industry as described in Chapter Two, it may be expected that invited spaces of international programs will lean towards a market orientation. Inversely, given the historical struggle of Haitians citizens for rights, justice and sovereignty as described in Chapter Three, a greater connection between claimed spaces of local origins and a social orientation might be expected.

Steps Involved in Research Question #1
To better understand the social landscape of these youth programs, the first step was to locate programs in Haiti that targeted youth and to document them. In the period between January 2010 and January 2013 I scoured many sources using a snowball technique to unearth youth programs in Haiti’s reconstruction. There were people who told me about them from meetings, interviews, and presentations. I learned about them through personal visits to program sites in Haiti, the 2012 Haiti phone book, internet searches for “Youth” or “Jeune” in combination with “Haiti”, scanning the programs of large, known INGOs and Christian missions operating in Haiti, and examining on-line directories such as the United Nations Office of the Special Envoy for Haiti and the Multilateral Investment Fund of the Inter-American Development Bank’s online Directory of Civil Society Organizations operating in Haiti, and the Ontario Council for International Cooperation’s list of Canadian organizations in Haiti. I recorded information about the programs from all of these sources—including the practitioners, organizations, and funders that mobilize them—to analyze the overarching motives of the
program, and from where, geographically, the impetuses of these programs were driven, to enable step 2.

**Data collection.**

The second step was to collect information about the program mandate to determine the degree to which its approach was market-oriented or socially-oriented, a binary described in Chapter Two. When scanning for market orientations, I looked for evidence of the development of neoliberal approaches to citizenship (Gaventa, 2012) in phrases embedded in the program goals, such as “earning income”, “gaining skills for a trade, job, or career”, “a better livelihood”, “lifting youth out of poverty”, or “increasing market participation”. To identify social orientations, I sought indications of education for participatory or justice-oriented citizens (Westheimer & Kahne, 2004) in program goals with phrases such as “teaching civic virtues”, “developing agency”, “human rights awareness”, “education for social justice, environmental justice or equity”, self-actualization”, or “promoting democracy”.

This information was collected through a discourse analysis of the stated goals for each program. Sections of the statements were coded for their alignment with either market or social motives. For each data bit I assigned a score of -1 for market-orientation characteristics, or +1 for social-orientation characteristics\(^\text{10}\). The goals and objectives for

\(^{10}\) The ascription of positive or negative integers was not intended to be associated with a negative or positive qualities of the program—in relation to either the market-social or international-local spectrums—but rather to assign values that will be useful for constructing a 2 x 2 conceptual map based on these spectrums.
each program—in many cases re-enforced by the organizational mission of the executing agency—were used to represent overarching theories of youth participation for each program. In some cases, where policy documents gave multiple readings of the theories of participation, one orientation was selected, but elements of the opposite orientation were also recognized. The sums of these scores were calculated for each program, and increased by a factor of five to provide a range between -30 and +30 to enable symmetry between each axis.

Information was collected for the third step regarding the origins of each program. In this step I was specifically interested in whether the impetus of the program was concentrated in Haiti (locally) or abroad (internationally). This score was developed through criteria from the locations of each program’s funding base, key partners, and central offices; the nationalities of its board members, international directors, national directors, and front-line staff; the language(s) of operations and program material; and the curricular influences of the program material as expressed through the program technology, the political and ideological influences, and the religion associated with the pedagogy (if any). Again, an integer was assigned for each data bit analyzed, either as a negative point for an international characteristic, or a positive score for a local characteristic. Table 4.2 provides an overview of how these scores were assessed. The sum of these scores was tabulated for each program and again, a range was produced between -30 and +30.
Table 4.2. Criteria for Evaluating Origins of Features of Youth Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score:</th>
<th>-3</th>
<th>-2</th>
<th>-1</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>+1</th>
<th>+2</th>
<th>+3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Office base location:</td>
<td>Global <strong>North</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Global, <strong>South</strong>, Latin America</td>
<td>Caribbean</td>
<td>Haiti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationalities of Key Actors:</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Global <strong>North</strong> or other</td>
<td>Latin American or Global South</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Caribbean</td>
<td>Haitian</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Languages Spoken:</td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>English</strong></td>
<td>other</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>Kreyòl</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Curricular influences:**

| Technology: | - | **foreign high technology**¹¹ | **foreign technology**¹² | n/a | **mix of local, regional and international technology** | **local technology** | - |
| Politics: | - | **international bias**¹⁴ | **international with local interests**¹⁵ | n/a | **mix of local and international** | Haitian and domestic references | - |
| Religion: | - | **evangelical Protestant** | Protestant | n/a | Catholic | Vodouissant | - |

**Note:** Global North generally applies to North America and Europe. Global South refers to low income nations in the southern hemisphere, unless otherwise indicated: A bolded word is what appears in the findings in Appendix C. n/a = information was not available so a score of 0 was assigned. Dashes mean that these scores were not allotted for this category.

¹¹ Technology that is largely inaccessible to most Haitians.
¹² Technology that is generally applicable to Haitians.
¹³ Refers to political and economic structures, schemes, modules and orientations.
¹⁴ Clear international interests: tourism, international business, trade.
¹⁵ Clear local interests: human rights, voting, micro-enterprise.
For each axis, I assigned all scores and theoretical positions based on my own reading, understanding and judgment of the phraseology of each program goal, and I am accountable and responsible for the scoring.

**Conceptual mapping.**

In the fourth step I took the scores for the mandates and for the program origins and plotted them on a conceptual map, structured as a quadrant of the two spectrums outlined in steps 2 and 3. The design of this step was informed by theories in comparative and international education of social cartography. Rolland Paulston proposes a “mapping of paradigms and theories in comparative and international education texts seen as an intellectual field” that continues to be useful in today’s global arena of education (p. 104). Relating broad paradigms to historical periods of epistemological orthodoxy and heterodoxy, Paulston suggests the emergent heterogeneity of knowledge representation is moving to a “new and confused terrain of disputatious yet complementary communities as the use of knowledge becomes more eclectic and reoriented by new ideas and new knowledge methods in, for example, interpretations, simulations, translations, probes, and conceptual mapping” (p. 105). In the complex reality of the international reconstruction in Haiti, such broad theoretical frames are useful for conceptualizing the social, economic, and power centres of youth programs throughout the country. To populate the conceptual map with data related to the two dimensions selected for this research question, I took guidance from similar methodologies that structure, sequence and analyze social data such as the Human Development Index and the CIVICUS Civil Society Index.
With the programs plotted on this graph, a cluster analysis was used to determine how youth programs were concentrated in the geo-political landscape in Haiti based on their origins and orientations. This fifth step involved applying the nearest neighbour technique of cluster analysis (Fraley & Raftery, 1998; Tryfos, 1998) to measure the Euclidian distance between each point on a graph. I began by forming groups of programs that were nearest to each other (including programs with identical origin-orientation coordinates), and then gradually adding other programs that were closest to them on the grid. The formation of distinct clusters was guided by the rule that the distance within each cluster did not exceed the distance between clusters. The several remaining youth programs plotted at outlier positions were added to their nearest cluster. The outcomes of this process are described in Chapter Five.

Selecting Case Study Programs

Research Questions #2 to #4 relied on the selection of, access to, and inquiry into programs that provided a useful example of the ways that youth were learning to participate in the reconstruction of Haiti. As described in Chapter Five, the three programs selected were located in three distinct but large clusters that emerged on the conceptual map. They represented a range of orientations between market and social in order to enable useful comparative analysis of social constructions and conceptualizations of participation. They also each had a significant level of involvement of international support, a necessary criterion for this research that investigates tensions between international and local dynamics in youth programs.

Furthermore, each of these three programs was executed in Haiti after the earthquake. Farming for Education was initiated by BRAC, and BRAC’s initial entry into
Haiti was as a Limb and Brace centre that provided prosthetic and orthotic services to thousands of amputees after the earthquake. BRAC Haiti subsequently expanded its programs into rural Haiti to include microenterprise, house (re)construction, and youth development programs such as Farming for Education. At the Debate Competitions, one of the three central pedagogical components of this program was specific training in risk and disaster management (through its partner, UNESCO). As for Rights through Radio, all the youth selected to participate in this program were displaced after the earthquake and now lived in Haiti’s largest temporary camp, Camp Corail.

Finally, each case study program in this study was specifically selected for its concentrated emphasis on enabling youth to participate in the longer-term reconstruction of their society. Each is based on an overarching normative theory that links youth participation with a foundational tenant of the program: each sees as its goal the deeper participation of youth in the (re)construction of their country, but each program—with different organizational beliefs on development and democracy—sees a different path for youth to more deeply participate. Each of these programs has a distinct theoretical connection to the problem of Haitian participation in the reconstruction.

**Requesting access.**

I secured entry to these three programs by developing a relationship with one key partner at each NGO that enabled my access and involvement. This access relied on the willingness of each NGO to open itself to scrutiny, a relatively exceptional characteristic in the aid environment. The relationships I formed were negotiated to benefit both the researcher and the organization, or, as one partner put it, to represent “*un vrai partenariat*” (a true partnership). Thus, a condition for my access to each program was a
contribution to the program cycle in some way. For the three NGOs with which I aligned, this contribution involved either a direct intervention to the youth program itself (logistical support, coaching the youth with their tasks and objectives); an indirect intervention, delivering a leadership workshop during the program orientation; or a summative intervention, producing an internal monitoring and evaluation report of the program using the data that I collected for this research.

Social Constructions of Participation

Research Question #2 states “How is youth participation socially constructed during the formation and implementation of the three selected case study programs of the Haitian reconstruction?” Because the focus of this question begins with youth for whom participation is “projected-upon”, this work approaches ethnography as both a central set of methods and as an analytical technique. From an ethnographic analytical perspective, my goal was “not only to collect information from the emic or insider’s perspective, but also to make sense of all the data from an etic or external social scientific perspective” (Fettersman, 1989, p. 21). In this sense, my intent was to best portray what was happening on the ground for each of these youth programs in the context of a reconstructing Haiti. While the majority of my own international work and life experiences have not been in this specific setting, it is my hope that work with similar youth programs elsewhere in the Caribbean and the Global South will provide insight and context on those that I am examining in Haiti. I propose, therefore, that my international experience, on-the-ground fieldwork, and external perspective will enable elements of both an emic and etic perspective to this research (Eschenbacher, 2012).
During the focus on each program through its cycle, I sought to emphasize *who* participated in each program, *in what* elements of the program they participated, and *why* they appeared to participate. These findings are presented in Chapters Six, Seven and Eight. In these chapters I provide a narrative to describe each of the three case study programs, with detail, vignettes, and dialogue to capture the processes through which youth are learning to participate. In my attempt to “richly describe” (Cornwall, 2002) the processes of youth participation (in each of the programs and by way of the practitioners in enabling them) what emerges are comprehensive program descriptions for each program, a description of what I perceive as happening in the cross-national processes of enabling youth participation. In my descriptions of each program, my attempt was to portray such factors as the program actors, the interpersonal dynamics, and the interplay of power in order to fully capture these spaces for participation as richly as possible. In these chapters it is apparent that some issues overlap in the three case studies while others are distinct: in some ways the issues presented in each program have uncanny parallels; in other ways they are strikingly unique. My goal was to “show” the themes and issues of the international-local dynamic of each program as they emerged. As I wrote these chapters my goals were clarity of expression, details relevant to youth participation, and authenticity of representation of the events. At the end of each of these chapters I provide a brief analysis, namely a response to the questions *who, in what and why* of participation, as framed in Chapter Two.

In the context of an aid-recipient state with a history of heavy international intervention such as Haiti, the significance of the deepening of citizenship and democracy is in the promise of these constructs to lead to forms of sustainable, self-
determined development. Thus, in this stage of the research I paid particular attention to elements in which observations or document analyses appeared to enable youth to work to strengthen their communities through initiatives and involvement in market economies, through active engagement in existing institutions, or through citizen-led responses to injustice. I was attentive to qualities and habits that the programs might foster, such as those theorized by Putnam (1995); trust, confidence to participate or be vocal, a greater propensity for involvement or volunteerism elsewhere, a likelihood to organize elsewhere, increased skills in articulation or public speaking, propensity to vote, propensity for other public involvement, respect for others, respect for the rule of law and the development of other skills useful for participating in life in Haiti.

Methods for Research Question #2
To collect the data necessary to respond to Research Question #2, I relied primarily on undisguised participant observation (Jackson, 2011) and critical document analysis.

Observation.

My role as observer varied somewhat in each program, varying between passive to moderate participation as an observer (Spradley, 1980). Within Farming for Education, data were collected during two, multiple day trips to Fondwa (in November 2011 and February 2012). I visited the school garden on several occasions, as well as the homes of the nine youth who took me on a tour of their farms to see their gardens and livestock, and answered questions about their work, their produce, and their successes and failures. Travel to the homes was by foot, and the locations of the youths’ homes ranged between a five-minute walk from the school to a three-hour hike deep into the valley of Fondwa.
However with Debates and Radio I assumed a more active role of participant observation. With Debate Competitions I delivered a workshop, so, while very different than the role of youth debaters, it was not that distinct from other practitioners who were participating in the program. With Rights through Radio I supported the program by assisting the youth in writing, transcribing, translating, and practicing their scripts.

I observed all three case studies during their natural program cycle. For Farming, from June 2011 to June 2012; for Debates, from Friday, February 17 to Tuesday, February 21, 2012; and for Radio, Monday, November 7 to Saturday, November 12, 2011. The narratives presented in Chapters Six through Eight can be assumed to have been during these periods in which I observed them, unless otherwise noted.

**Document analysis.**

Analyses of program objectives, policies, and plans were used to ascertain the social constructions participation in each program. Critical document analyses enabled a better understanding of how youth participation was framed, envisioned, and problematized in each circumstance. These analyses concentrated on the following four types of documents: Overarching development frameworks guiding reconstruction were drawn from major actors in the reconstruction for the dominant posturing of reconstruction approaches. Organizational policy documents of the specific NGOs involved in this study were used to understand each of orientations to youth participation. Commentaries and critiques from “reconstruction watch”-type organizations were sought for their assessments of program activities. Finally, public relations and media reports on programs were used to support narratives of each of the programs. Within these documents I searched specifically for sections in which themes such as youth
participation, local involvement, ownership, empowerment or voice were clearly articulated. I analyzed the extent to which these themes were developed, the level of specificity of these themes, and the trends of language and phrasing in these documents and their potential links to social constructions of participation. A full list of documents analyzed for this Research Question is provided in Appendix F.

**Conceptualizations of Participation**

This stage of the research focused on Research Questions #3 and #4 to solicit and compare conceptualizations.

Research Question #3: How is participation conceptualized by the various actors at each of the four levels of the vertical aid chain within the three selected case study programs?

Research Question #4: How do these conceptualizations of participation compare and contrast with one another among the programs (horizontally), along the levels of the aid chain (vertically), and how can any differences be explained?

The research design for these questions was built around qualitative vertical case study analyses (Vavrus & Bartlett, 2009) drawing on ethnographic methods to “backward map” the perceptions of citizen participation. This methodology served first to understand how participation is perceived at each level of the aid chain of the three case study programs, and then to compare and analyze these perspectives with others in vertical and horizontal spheres. The chain of aid for the three cases runs from the local youth recipients of the aid, to the local programmers, the country directors, to the international directors, and, finally, to other international actors who generated policies and strategies and provided the funding for the selected programs.
**Design for Research Questions #3 and #4**

I employed Vavrus and Bartlett’s (2009) critical comparative education methodology of vertical case studies to respond to Research Questions #3 and #4. A vertical analysis facilitates the examination of a phenomenon throughout the entire aid delivery and implementation chain, from the beneficiaries of a policy or program, through its implementers, planners, and funders. According to Vavrus and Bartlett (2009), “the goal of vertical studies is to develop a thorough understanding of the particular at each level and to analyze how these understandings produce similar and different interpretations of the policy, problem, or phenomenon under study” (p. 11). Consistent with the highlighted importance of context, “scholars using qualitative case study approaches should prioritize the pursuit of historical, cultural, linguistic, political, and economic knowledge that comes with in-depth area studies of a region” (p.14). In a vertical study the site cannot be taken in itself without understanding the macro conditions. Therefore, “the ‘local’ cannot be divorced from national and transnational forces but neither can it be conceptualized as determined by these forces” (Piot, 1999, cited in Vavrus & Bartlett, 2009, p. 10).

For purposes of comparison, I divided each case study program into four aid chain levels. The first level is the recipient level, and includes the youth participating in each program. The second level is the implementation level, which involved local programmers, such as trainers, Technicians, facilitators, and teachers who work in the field and implement the programs for or together with the youth. The third level is the country director level, which primarily includes the national managers and organizational directors who worked at the country office in Port-au-Prince or its suburbs and were involved in the planning, fundraising, grant-seeking and proposal-writing specific to the
case study programs. This level of practitioner was most apt to feel responsibility for “balanc[ing] local and global interests when executing programs” (Eschenbacher, 2012). The fourth and final level is the international policy and funding level, which included executives, funders and policy makers of these organizations behind the programs. At this level, policy formation, strategic organizational decisions and funding arrangements were priorities. Stakeholders at this level were useful in providing a rationale, theoretical connections, and comparative examples of the usefulness of the programs being implemented. These informants provided a general perspective on the importance and role of citizen participation in the reconstruction. A model of these levels is presented as Table 4.3.

**Table 4.3. The Vertical Chain: A Theoretical Perspective**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Actors</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Purview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 4</td>
<td>Governance</td>
<td>Funders and policy makers</td>
<td>International</td>
<td>Sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 3</td>
<td>Management</td>
<td>Directors</td>
<td>National (Haiti)</td>
<td>Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>Programmers</td>
<td>Local (Haiti)</td>
<td>Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>Recipient</td>
<td>Youth Participants</td>
<td>Community (Haiti)</td>
<td>Individual</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Backward Mapping**

Richard Elmore’s (1979) methodology of backward mapping was also applicable for the structure of this research. Backward mapping contrasts with the more dominant approach to policy formulation in organizations that begins with objective-setting and follows a process of increasingly specific steps towards implementation, including program monitoring and evaluation processes. This type of policy development might be seen as forward mapping (although rarely termed as such). Backward mapping, by
contrast, begins with the perspectives of those closest to the implementation phase of organizational programs, where

administrative actions intersect private choices. It begins not with a statement of intent, but with a statement of the specific behaviour at the lowest level of the implementation process that generates the need for a policy. Only after the behaviour is described does the analysis presume to state an objective; the objective is first stated as a set of organizational operations and then as a set of effects, or outcomes, that will result from these operations. Having established a relatively precise target at the lowest level of the system, the analysis then backs up through the structure of implementing agencies. (Elmore, 1979, p. 604, emphasis added)

Thus, the choice of entry into this vertical study at the bottom is deliberate. While the three cases in themselves were selected for their specific approaches to enabling youth participation, the entry into the vertical axis of the policy-program chain was at the front-line level. Here, youth conceptualizations of participation were solicited, followed by those of program and organizational practitioners upwards along the aid chain (Pluim, 2012).

The findings for this Research Question produced four levels of comparison between the three programs, resulting in twelve conceptualizations of participation and their expressions as who, in what, and why.

**Interview methods.**

Representative sampling was used to determine suitable candidates to interview at each level of the aid chain (Jackson, 2011). I used partially open-ended questions with youth participants in each program to clarify insights from earlier observations of the program, to understand their perspective of program objectives and motives, and to better
comprehend the knowledge, skills and attitudes they felt they gained through their program. I used semi-structured, individual interviews with program practitioners to understand the rationale of participation in the particular context of the programs, and their perspectives on its implementation in each of the programs. For each group I was clear about the intent of the research, my position, and my biases. The youth and the practitioners had a different interview protocol in order to ensure that interviews are meaningful and engaging, based on their role and context in the program (see Appendix Y). However, there were provocative, sometimes leading questions for both groups to extend the bounds of conceptualizations where possible. With program practitioners, questions about participation were more abstract and related to political and historical contexts in Haiti. These questions also developed somewhat as I gained experience with the interview processes in this context and familiarity with the actors in the programs. I digitally recorded the interviews to ensure that the collection of the perspectives was thorough and complete. A total of 36 interviews were conducted.

**Data analysis.**

As with case study methods, this research aimed to generalize analytically rather than statistically (Yin, 1994). Thus, in my analysis as I synthesized the data from these questions, I looked for themes, patterns, re-emerging ideas, commonalities and differences in conceptualizations of youth participation.

In sorting the data, I used descriptors to tabulate expressions, characteristics, and specific phrases to illustrate the processes and conceptualizations of participation. Using a tree coding method with overarching concepts and their associated subset of codes (parent and child nodes), I used an open model of coding, drawing on the theoretical
constructs of Chapter Two. Prior to coding I relied on interim analyses and memoing to manage my data. During coding I used a priori and inductive codes. Co-occurring codes and factsheet codes were a common occurrence.

As I transcribed, re-read, and coded the data, often I would see conversations in a new light, against thoughts and theories within which I was engaging at the time. At these moments I would jot down my reflections, many of which I returned to later after I systematically analyzed my data as a point of cross-reference and even justification of the interpretation of my findings.

I used NVivo software to help analyze all of the data. I developed nodes in NVivo to categorize data in five areas: (i) descriptions of the physical locations of the various relevant sites of the study; (ii) details of moments observed or recorded for each individual program; (iii) notes on the products, artefacts, and outcomes of each program, (iv) perspectives of, characteristics of and moments involving each individual youth, and, most centrally for the analysis of the research questions, (v) the themes arising in relation to the perspectives, possibilities, and barriers in/for the participation of the youth (and other participants of the study).

**Research Issues**

The reality of my research was that it actually evolved as non-linear, complex, problematic, and ethically challenging. Based on my previous cross-cultural and international development experiences as well as my reading and preparations leading up to my field work, I expected, in large part, these issues to present themselves. However, the specific instances are worth noting for the purpose of transparency and authenticity, but also to illustrate the breadth of considerations for this study. In the remainder of this
chapter I will briefly address certain selected methodological issues that presented themselves over the course of three years of data collection, analyses, and writing. Precisely, I will discuss language issues, issues with participant observation, international research issues, research in a fragile nation, and general ethics.

Language Issues

I collected data in three languages: English, French, and Kreyòl. Conducting the interviews in the first language of each research participant presented some challenges. A minority of interviews were conducted in English but these were often the most effective at probing the research topics and developing a discussion that addressed my central research questions. These interviews were generally restricted to practitioners at the top levels of the aid chain but also included some youth. In the case of interviews in French, my second language, some difficulties surfaced as a result of the conceptual depth of the research topic, the nuances of the language in general, and confusion arising due to the particular dialect and figures of speech of Haitian French. As a precaution, I took much care in speaking and understanding when operating in French, and in preparing for the fieldwork I needed to become well versed in the conceptual language of my research and the conventional usages of the terms that I employed. For the benefit of my research participants, I translated all my English documents into French.

As discussed in the previous chapter, the first language of most Haitians is Kreyòl. Most of the interviews I conducted with the youth were in Kreyòl, but this is noted in Appendix Z. While Kreyòl is widely thought to have developed as a creole by the slave population during the period of French colonization, it is a distinct and official language in Haiti, despite bearing many resemblances to French. In cases in which I
communicated with Kreyòl-speaking research participants, formal translation was necessary.

**Interpreters.**

I used interpreters on an ad-hoc basis. When I needed an interpreter, I recruited someone I had come to know who was in close proximity, willing, and able to facilitate the interpretation. There are typically an abundance of Haitians who speak both French and Kreyòl in professional circles, especially connected to international organizations. So, often I relied on people who were associated with the implementing organization or a partner organization, but not necessarily aligned directly with the program under study. While this may present a problem with the validity of the responses I received from the youth (i.e. sometimes the presence of the NGO staff member may have placed some pressure on them to respond differently than they might have otherwise), there were clear advantages of having an interpreter affiliated with the program, including the comfort with their pre-established relationship, their familiarity with the program activities, culture, and nomenclature, and the reliability and affordability of having an interpreter available for interviews during the opportunities when they would arise.

The French to Kreyòl interpreters were more than competent in terms of command of each language. In particular I would say there were few issues in terms of their comprehension of what the youth expressed in Kreyòl. What varied somewhat was the degree of precision and depth in which a translation was made into French. For example, in a long answer or story about the program, the translation was often summarized, details omitted, and generalizations made. In practically every case, the interpreter referred to the youth in third person. In the odd case, translations were made
into English, but this proved very cumbersome because in these cases it was harder to understand the English used by the interpreter.

For interviews with Kreyòl-speaking research participants, I made some general introductions and opening comments in Kreyòl, and then spoke in French for the heart of the interview (asking questions in French; probing in French; responding in French). The youth generally responded in Kreyòl, but in some cases youth integrated a little French, and in others they replied fully in French (interspersing some popular Kreyòl terms).

Transcriptions.

In my transcriptions, I first transcribed the French translations of the youths’ responses. I then made a second copy of the transcription, translated everything into English from French. My first pass at translation was using a web 2.0 translating tool. In reading what was produced in English, I compared it to the overall sense of what the interpreter conveyed. I then adjusted the English text to reflect this sense best. I used these English texts in the coding of my data.

After I selected the specific excerpts to use for my dissertation, I went back to my audio data and located the quotations of the youth in Kreyòl. I listened to the Kreyòl version and compared its meaning to what I had transcribed in English. I then adjusted the English translation to best represent what was said in Kreyòl. It is this text in English that I have ultimately used in my dissertation.

Issues with participation observation

Assuming a position of participant observer complicated my role as researcher. While in all cases my goal was to be as non-intrusive as possible, it is hard to imagine that there would not have been any confusion for youth to understand exactly what my
role was. For example, after a week of assisting in the implementation of Rights through Radio, I interviewed each youth participant for the conceptualizations of participation. Just as the youth audio-recorded their interviews with Haitian citizens to be broadcast on the radio, so did I audio-record my interviews with them. However, I had to reassure them several times that my recording was not for national broadcast, but for my research purposes only.

With Debates, I served as a guest speaker, and facilitated activities during the orientation workshops. Yet, as a research observer, I would frequently interrupt our discussions to scribble down important interactions and sequences taking place throughout the training. With Farming, rather than being simply an observer of the program, I also was asked to evaluate the program. In all of these cases, through my choices of language, demeanour, and attitude, I attempted to be as non-disruptive and non-judgmental as possible, yet I would suspect that the very arrival of a foreigner on the training site would provoke curiosity. For example, in one program, even after several introductions and explanations to the group, and interviews with numerous youth and practitioners, a local programmer asked me if I could clarify once again what my role was with the NGO.

Issues with International Research

As a Canadian researcher of non-Haitian origin the ongoing consideration of this research as colonizing endeavour in itself was an ongoing concern for me, as it risked reinforcing the very power relations that it set out to better understand. Because of Haiti’s historical and political complexities involving slavery, foreign occupation, and militarization, this research draws on post-colonial theory ascribed to decolonizing
methodologies (Altbach & Kelly, 1984; Carnoy, 1974; Smith, 1988). While there is a long history of various types of exploitation in Haiti, I am not aware of cases in which mistreatment by researchers have been documented. In my case, structural demographics and conditions such as wealth, race, language, and social and political access, to name a few, would tend to place me in a privileged position relative to my interviewees. I strived to mitigate these issues by conducting my fieldwork on the terms of my research participants as much as possible: in their setting, their language, and their time frame.

In my role as an international practitioner, I frequently reflected on how I was perceived; the positional power due to gender and citizenship that I wield and that I am both aware and unconscious of; forms of resistance to me as a foreign researcher; and my relatively short commitment to communities. I see these risks being offset, however, by the intent of this research: by interrogating youth participation this study sought to give voice to those who might not otherwise have it. I was clear with my participants that the goal of this study is to provide a clearer sense of participation in Haiti, an outcome with intended favourable benefits for my participants.

In reflecting on the issues of this research, it was clear that many circumstances are related to the resulting dynamic of the researcher’s identity and the specific cultural context of Haiti. Specifically, as a foreign researcher without Haitian roots who is examining the international reconstruction in Haiti, I became acutely aware of the irony that my research too is an international intervention. However, by concentrating on the specific issues resulting from my research location and methodology, it is hoped that the challenges and negative consequences of my research intervention might be mitigated by the significance and implications of this research.
**Research in a fragile environment.**

As I discussed in Chapter Three, the conditions of fragility are a reality for contemporary Haiti. The fragility of the public institutions in Haiti may have presented political risks that have been relevant in the undertaking of this research. Because the topic of democracy can be one that is very sensitive in Haiti, there have been very serious and personal consequences for Haitians resulting from political leanings. For instance, there are many examples in which supporters of participatory democracy in Haiti—particularly under the organization of the now-banned Fanmi Lavalas political party—have been threatened or injured, or have simply disappeared, most notably following the coups of 1991 and 2004 (Farmer, 2006; Hallward, 2007). A deepening of democracy in the context of Haiti would require a significant redistribution of the power and property of the small but wealthy elite population, given the enormous wealth gap and high rate of poverty per capita of the country. In the past, such efforts and reforms have been met with rapid, often violent resistance. I considered these risks most salient for program participants who may have prior allegiances unknown to me; who may have an existing structural vulnerability to power and access in Haiti; or who may have less structural (i.e. cultural, social or financial) capital to rely on for protection. The implications of even being seen as being involved in a political process may be risky. In my research I took this potential vulnerability very seriously. Therefore, where it may have implicated my participants, I have kept my study low profile and de-emphasized any political implications throughout the course of my data collection. I ensured that the responses of my individual participants remained confidential and anonymous through use of pseudonyms, codes, and other descriptors. For those who may be personally identifiable
on the basis of these descriptors, I deliberately manipulated identifiers such as age and gender, where possible.

**Ethical Consent and the Rights of My Research Participants**

I dealt with issues of participant rights and consent on a case-by-case situation. I began the consent process by providing my key partner (the national manager) at each of the three NGOs with both a written and an oral background of the study, its purpose, the reason why I requested their participation, and their rights as a participant. I provided an overview of the research via email, and then explained and responded to questions about the research in person, and issued a formal consent form to the parties involved in the study. The national managers were notified in writing and orally that their participation was completely voluntary, and at any time they could opt out of the study. I also explained to national managers that they had the right to go off record at any time during the interview process. This was understood to mean that I would not use the details of the account provided in the research, but the facts provided would enable a richer background and context of the discussion at hand. (In these situations I did not necessarily terminate my audio recording of the interview.) I used a similar approach with international directors and actors in this study, as well as with horizontal interviewees, to the one I used with national managers.

I ensured the consent of the local recipients and programmers in my study by providing similar background information to that which I provided to the managers; however, the processes were adjusted to suit the context. First, I asked NGO managers who regularly work with programmers and youth to communicate the general background of the study, what would be expected of them through their participation,
and the broader benefits of this study. At that point the programmers and youth were to be given time to consider the study and their participation in it, as well as time to return to NGO managers with questions, for clarification, and to give their approval to participate. When I arrived in Haiti to work directly with the local programmers and recipients, I repeated the study details and let all participants know in person that this study was voluntary, anonymous and confidential.

The audiotapes of my interviews remain in my possession after they were used to collect information. The list of codes of participants was kept in a separate location from the actual data. My files were password protected and stored only on my computer. Hard copies of files, including audio recordings, were stored in a locked cabinet in my office.

To strengthen the anonymity of the individual participants in my study, I did not use their names in this dissertation. Instead, I refer to each participant by his or her position in relation to the case study programs, or other organizations with which they are affiliated. For selected youth participants in this study, due to the frequency with which they are cited, I have selected pseudonyms for each. To ensure an arbitrary pseudonym yet one that is common or familiar in Haiti, I have drawn from the names from a list of the most popular names for Haitian boys and girls.

The Office of Research Ethics at the University of Toronto also approved this research. I searched extensively for an equivalent national or regional ethical review office in Haiti or the Caribbean, but found none (Pluim, 2012).
Chapter Five:
The landscape of non-formal reconstruction-era youth programs in Haiti

Many non-formal education programs throughout Haiti during and after the earthquake targeted youth and either directly or implicitly implied the goal of enabling youth participation in Haitian society. Some began shortly after the earthquake, their entry specific to the conditions of Haiti and the circumstances of youth affected by the earthquake. Some were adaptations of existing programs or expansions of organizations already operating in Haiti. Many have since discontinued in the declining momentum of the international intervention. Some—and three in particular that I ultimately select for deeper focus as case studies—held youth participation as paramount in the mandates of the programs which was an essential criterion for further, in-depth investigation.

This chapter focuses on the findings of Research Question #1: What youth programs are operating in Haiti that target and involve youth as participants in their national reconstruction, and how do they differ in terms of their origins and orientation? It begins by contextualizing the social space in which youth programs operate in Haiti, specifically the gap created by a dearth in quality of and access to formal education provision for youth in Haiti. It continues by outlining and analyzing youth programs in Haiti operating during the reconstruction and then plotting them according to their orientations and origins. After analysis reveals seven clusters of youth programs, I describe them and representative activities within each. To conclude this chapter, I
highlight three cases on which I concentrate the remainder of this thesis to more deeply probe the nature of youth participation in an international reconstruction context.

**Educational Context for Non-Formal Youth Programs**

There are important reasons that explain the influx of international and local non-formal education programs for youth in Haiti in recent years. From the supply side, the relative dearth of institutionalized regulations for the entry of external organizations to Haiti has supported a broad inflow of foreign NGOs, including those specifically targeting youth. From the demand side, these youth programs fill a gap in the existing provision of formal education opportunities for youth. Only 20% of educational demands are satisfied by the public system despite a government commitment to education of nine percent of GDP, and a particular pledge by President Martelly to make education a reconstruction priority (UNDAF 2008; UN Special Envoy, 2009). Issues of education quality are frequently cited as a deficiency in education in Haiti. Pedagogical approaches typical focus on rote learning while suitable learning materials and other teaching resources are sparse (UN Special Envoy, 2009). Classes are often overcrowded (over 50 students per class), many teachers poorly trained (approximately half had basic qualifications), and benefits and salaries for teachers are small (UPR, 2011; Wolff, 2008).
Language of Education in Haiti

While the predominant language in Haiti is Kreyòl, the language of formal education is French. A lack of fluency in French amongst teachers and students is one central determinant of the low achievement for youth. The literacy rate for the population over 13 years is 43%. Only 57% of youth pass 9th grade, and few continue to the secondary level (Wolff, 2008).

School Fees

Because 80% of those in school attend private schools, the educational experiences of most youth in Haiti are in the context of private education. School expenditures are on average 40% of the income of a low-income family in Haiti—ranging from $110 to $135 per student a year—thus, a costly investment for each child (UNICEF, 2009; UN Special Envoy, 2009). These barriers affect a low gross enrolment rate of 46% (net enrolment is 22%) for students in public and private schools. Thus, the overall effect of school locations, language, fees, and other barriers has significant influence on which youth attend—and succeed—at school. A compilation of recent data on factors affecting youth participation in formal education in Haiti is presented in Table 5.1, below.
### Table 5.1. Formal Education in Haiti: Selected Statistics Swaying Youth Participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage or Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Literacy rate for population aged 13 +</td>
<td>43%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of over-aged secondary students</td>
<td>78%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage pass rate in 9th grade</td>
<td>57%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross / Net enrolment ratio (public and private schools)</td>
<td>46% / 22%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education budget per child in Haiti (approx. two million children)</td>
<td>US$41*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public spending on education as a percentage of GDP</td>
<td>1.97%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth literacy rate: Number of literate persons aged 15-24 expressed as a percentage of the total population in that age group</td>
<td>76% / 87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of educational demand that public schools cover</td>
<td>20%**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schooling expense as a percentage of income for a low-income family</td>
<td>40%**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schooling expense per family:</td>
<td>US $109^</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education share of the budget</td>
<td>9%^</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of schools affected by the January 2010 earthquake [23]</td>
<td>4,992 (23% of all schools)^</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^ UN special Envoy (http://www.lessonsfromhaiti.org/about-haiti/education/)
* Wolff, 2008
° UNICEF’s State of the World’s Children Report 2009 Statistics

The earthquake only exacerbated the situation of education for youth in Haiti. Almost 5,000 school buildings (23%) were damaged after the earthquake. The destruction of the Ministry of Education (MoE) building and the deaths of teachers, students and other education officials resulted in the suspension of education services from January to April 2010; most schools did not re-open until September 2010. By July, 2010, more than half the students affected by the earthquake were still out of school.
Reconstruction Plan for Education

The reconstruction plan for education in Haiti has focused on transferring privately governed schools to public authority. This US$4.2 billion initiative was administered by a partnership among the MoE, the National Commission of Haiti, and the Inter-American Development Bank (IADB). However, problems with the overall effectiveness of the reconstruction (as was described in more detail in Chapter Three) have seriously limited the extent of programs accessible to youth. As a result, the availability of non-formal education programs for youth—both of local and of international origins—fill a significant gap in Haiti, particularly during the time after the earthquake.

Surveying Youth Programs in Haiti

As described in the previous chapter on research methodology, the findings of Research Question #1 were generated through a five step sequence that included locating youth program of the Haitian reconstruction, analyzing and assigning scores for their orientations and origins, plotting these programs on a quadrant, and performing a cluster analysis adhering to the nearest neighbour principle. For step one, 34 youth programs were identified across Haiti (see Table 5.2 and for more information, Appendix A) between January 2010 and January 2013. These programs were selected because they operated outside the formal system of education in Haiti, they were implemented by NGOs, and they explicitly targeted youth in their program mandate.
Table 5.2. A List of Haitian Youth Programs Surveyed for this Research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Name</th>
<th>Shortened Name</th>
<th>Main and partner organizations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Accompagnement psychologique des jeunes.</td>
<td>APJ</td>
<td>Volontariat pour le développement d’Haïti; UNESCO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 3S Soccer Clubs</td>
<td>3S</td>
<td>GOALS Haiti; Street Football World Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Adopt a Village</td>
<td>Adopt-a-Village</td>
<td>Free the Children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Capoeira</td>
<td>Capoeira</td>
<td>Viva Rio; CIDA; IADB, Gov. of Norway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Cite Soleil Youth Orchestra</td>
<td>Youth Orchestra</td>
<td>Action Chrétienne pour le développement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Community Center for Alternative Peacebuilding</td>
<td>CCAP</td>
<td>Mennonite Central Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Connecter les jeunes à l’entrepreneuriat</td>
<td>L’entrepreneuriat</td>
<td>Le ministère du Commerce et de l’Industrie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Cultural Youth Forum</td>
<td>Youth Forum</td>
<td>Centre de la Francophonie des Ameriques; FOKAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Debate Competitions</td>
<td>Debates</td>
<td>FOKAL; Rights and Democracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Farming for Education</td>
<td>Farming</td>
<td>BRAC; Ecole Communautaire de Fondwa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Goudou Goudou</td>
<td>Goudou</td>
<td>SolidarIT; Reporters without Borders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Haiti Jeunesse</td>
<td>Haiti Jeunesse</td>
<td>UNICEF; Ministère à la Jeunesse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Haiti through teenagers’ eyes</td>
<td>Teenagers Eyes</td>
<td>Plan International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Haiti Youth Development and Education</td>
<td>HYDE</td>
<td>HYDE; Several municipalities in Florida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Haiti Youth Relief Fund</td>
<td>HYRF</td>
<td>Volunteer Center Orange County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Haitian Education Project</td>
<td>HEP</td>
<td>Haitian Education Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 IDEJEN</td>
<td>IDEJEN</td>
<td>IDEJEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Jacob’s Well Youth Camp</td>
<td>Jacob's Well</td>
<td>Valcin Ministry; Frontier Camp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 JAPDE</td>
<td>JAPDE</td>
<td>Let Haiti Live</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 YouthBuild Rebuilding Academy</td>
<td>YouthBuild</td>
<td>YouthBuild; IDEJEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Rights through Radio</td>
<td>Radio</td>
<td>Panos Caribbean; UNICEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Soley Leve</td>
<td>Soley Leve</td>
<td>Future Generations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 The Dream Team</td>
<td>Dream Team</td>
<td>J/P HRO; many partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 The Nouvelle Vie Youth Corps</td>
<td>Nouvelle Vie</td>
<td>International Association for Human Values; UN-FAO, USAID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 The Role of Youth in Haiti’s Future</td>
<td>Haiti’s Future</td>
<td>OAS; Global Movement for Children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Timoun Alez (Comfort for Kids)</td>
<td>Timoun Alez</td>
<td>Mercy Corps; Rizon Media, Peace in Focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Voice of the Voiceless</td>
<td>Voice</td>
<td>OIM; Gov. of Haiti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Voix Timoun Yo</td>
<td>Voix Timoun</td>
<td>Panos Caribbean; UNICEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Yéle Corps Vocational Training</td>
<td>Yéle Corps</td>
<td>Yéle Haiti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Youth Ambassadors</td>
<td>Ambassadors</td>
<td>U.S. Embassy; YMCA Haiti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Youth Art Program</td>
<td>Youth Art</td>
<td>Association for the Promotion of Family Integrated Health; Nurturing Just Alternatives, Other Worlds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 Youth for Haiti</td>
<td>Youth for Haiti</td>
<td>Muslims for Haiti; Helping Hand for Relief and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 Youth Haiti Community Gardening</td>
<td>Gardening</td>
<td>Youth Haiti; Haitian Coalition for the Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 Youth League</td>
<td>Youth League</td>
<td>Aristide Foundation for Democracy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results of data collection

In the next two steps, data were collected for each of the programs from documents and websites made public by each NGO. The origins of each program and their implementing organization were assessed according to their office locations, nationalities of key practitioners, languages of operations, and curricular influences, as described in Chapter Four. The findings of this step, presented as the coded data, are found in Appendix B (for program origins) and Appendix C (for organizational origins).

For step 4, data were assembled from a critical document analysis of program objectives. Extracted from the objectives articulated for each program were phrases deemed as a significant portion of the objective. Each selected phrase was aligned with a value from either a market or social orientation. Each of these components was assigned an integer based on their orientation, and the sum was calculated for each objective. The extracted portions of these statements sorted by the values in their orientation are presented in Appendix D.

Conceptually Mapping the Youth Programs

Each program was then mapped on a quadrant, from -30 to +30 on the vertical axis, and -6 to +6 on the horizontal axis, reflecting these two spectra. Some trends emerged in the distribution of these youth programs once plotted.

Program origins.

First, the scores of these programs ranged between -26 and +26 on the vertical axis, reflecting the programs’ origins. The way the programs were plotted produced an almost equal balance between local and international origins, with 16 programs in the top two quadrants (i.e. predominantly local origins), 17 in the bottom two (predominantly
international origins), and one straddled on the middle line. The wide range between the origins of the programs suggests a great variance of local and international influences on the youth programs, and that some programs tend to have a large proportion of one or the other. Furthermore, it appears that there is not a predominant influence of origins in terms of the number of programs in operation. However, this analysis does not account for the size, capacity, or reach of each program which may account for other trends.

**Program orientations.**

Second, the scores of these programs ranged between -3 and +5 on the horizontal axis reflecting the programs’ orientations. Most of the programs had a social orientation, with 22 programs in the right hemisphere (i.e. a social orientation), eight on the left hemisphere (a market orientation), and four programs plotted directly on the axis. This proclivity toward the right hemisphere and concentration of programs in the social quadrants suggests that the stated objectives of youth programs tend towards qualities of a social orientation. These programs, however, can vary greatly: In many cases these programs are transformative; in some they are therapeutic; in others, religious; and in many they promote the agency of youth. They often bear congruence to the citizen-led approach to citizenship (Gaventa, 2012) or educating for participatory or justice-oriented citizens (Westheimer & Kahne, 2004). Furthermore, this analysis examines normative statements only, and program implementation and outcomes may not reflect these intended program values—or even the intended overall orientation.
Distribution across the conceptual map.

The dissemination of programs across the entire map produced an interesting finding. In the top (local origins) quadrant, there are four programs with primarily market orientations, and 15 with primarily social orientations. In the bottom (international origins) quadrants there are four programs with market orientations, seven with social orientations, and four on the line straddling between the two orientations. That the number of programs with both international origins and market orientations was no greater than local programs with market orientations or international programs with social orientations does not particularly support the theory that, on the whole, IO’s might be particularly inclined to market-orientated approaches in Haiti. However, the corollary was supported, as there was a concentration of locally-originating programs with social orientations. These findings suggest that at least through the programs’ normative accounts, a correlation exists between participation in local or claimed spaces, with an overall social orientation to these spaces.

Cluster Analysis

The final step for the research question was to situate clusters of youth programs based on the distribution of the youth programs on the conceptual map. This was to be done through the nearest neighbour technique (Tryfos, 1998) which begins by locating points in which youth programs were plotted very close to each other, or even, as transpired here, at precisely the same coordinate.

The results of the scoring produced three occasions in which multiple programs had identical coordinates. These programs are Jacob’s Well Youth Camp (Jacob’s Well) and Haiti Jeunesse at point (2,5); Haiti Youth Development and Education (HYDE) and
the Youth Art Program at point (2,8); and Soley Leve and Goudou Goudou at (2, -13).

Three initial clusters were formed on this basis but points (2,5) and (2,8) settled into Cluster 3 by the end of the analysis\(^{16}\); point (2, -13) figured into Cluster 5.

Next, four programs with coordinates that were only one unit away from their nearest neighbour were identified. Those ultimately situated in Cluster 3 were the Cultural Youth Forum (2,4) with Jacob’s Well and Haiti Jeunesse (2,5), and the Youth League (3, 10) with Debate Competitions (3, 11). Voice of the Voiceless (2, -12) connected with neighbours Goudou Goudou and Soley Leve (2, -13) in Cluster 5, and Capoeira (-1,-11) linked with the Haitian Education Project (HEP) (-1, -12) in Cluster 7.

The cluster analysis continued by connecting the next nearest programs to each other and to these three existing clusters, expanding the dimensions of the clusters to a point that the distance between the furthest points in the cluster did not extend beyond the distance to the next closest cluster. At this point, only outliers remained, and they were joined to each other insofar as the distance from the outlier nearest to another cluster was not greater than that outlier to its counterparts within the cluster. This final sub-step resulted in what would be termed Cluster 1 and Cluster 2. The outcome of this process was the creation of seven distinct clusters which is presented in Figure 4.

\(^{16}\) Clusters were assigned numbers and titles only by the end of this step. Numbering began with fully formed clusters in the top left quadrant, and continue clockwise up until Cluster 7 in the bottom left quadrant.
Figure 4. Youth programs operating in Haiti between January 2010 and January 2013
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Clusters of programs operating in Haiti:

There are seven clusters of youth programs were each given a title according to the general programmatic thrust of this group. These titles include: (1) Local livelihood development, (2) Opportunities for expression, (3) Leadership training, (4) Spiritual and psychological outlets, (5) Global best practices, (6) Worldly capabilities, and (7) International business skills. In what follows I will briefly describe the types of programs in the cluster, and draw on one in particular to illustrate its combination of origins and orientations.

Cluster #1: Local livelihood development

Programs in cluster #1 focus on developing livelihoods relevant to the contexts of youth. For the most part, the momentum generated for these programs is locally-driven. The program objectives are oriented towards livelihoods relevant to the Haitian youth in their particular geographic context. These programs are all located in the market hemisphere of the chart and tend to have a human capital orientation of youth participation however there is some divergence according to the attention placed on their beneficiaries. On one hand there are programs that have a primary focus on the individual such as skills trainings and well-being for individual youth. Others place an emphasis on youth within the context of their community. Examples of an individually-oriented program include Connceter les jeunes à l’entrepreneuriat, IDEJEN, Farming for Education, and YouthBuild.

One program in this cluster that represents the individually-focused portion is Farming for Education. Farming was a pilot program implemented by BRAC with the financial support of the Digicel Haiti Foundation. On the ground, the program relied on
local partners Fonkoze, the Asociation Payisan Fondwa (the Peasants Association of Fondwa, or APF) and L’Ecole Communataire de Fondwa (the Fondwa Community School, or ECF), institutions all operating in the host community, Fondwa. BRAC is new in Haiti. Its national head-office is in Tabarre, Port-au-Prince, across from the MINUSTAH compound and just down the road from the American Embassy. All national-level staff including the country director is Bangladeshi in origin, speak Bengali amongst each other informally, while the official language of operations is English. All ex-patriot staff lives at the Port-au-Prince office, as does the international and several local staff at the BRAC office in Fondwa. Several programs are run out of this office, mostly home building programs, but it is also the administrative headquarters for Farming. All staff members working out of this office are Haitian in origin (most are local) except for the office director who is Bangladeshi. The language of operations at this office tends to be Kreyòl. There is only one Farming for Education staff at the BRAC office in Fondwa. He is from Jacmel but lives at the BRAC office.

Digicel, however, is an industry-leading mobile phone network provider in the Caribbean. Its international headquarters are in Kingston, Jamaica, but it has also a national head office is in Turgeau, Port-au-Prince. Farming is international in the sense that over-arching policy-level decisions originate from an international position. However, it is local in the sense that ground-level practitioners are Haitian, the programming is in Kreyòl; there are no other overt external religions or ideologies attached.

This program has a primarily market-orientation of youth participation. The basic philosophy is that youth will be enabled to participate more fully and deeply in their local
community by participating in economic activities that are familiar to local consumers. The youth will also have opportunities to participate more fully in society as they benefit from an education at their local school.

Farming cites a connection that theorizes Haitian citizens having deeper and more meaningful participation in the reconstruction of their society through the development of entrepreneurial skills in Haitian youth. The theoretical link between entrepreneurship and deeper citizen participation might be seen as citizens with entrepreneurial skills—in the most basic sense of individuals inclined to start their own business venture—will be able to participate more deeply in a society structured by economic activities. BRAC Haiti, the primarily facilitating organization of Farming, acts upon this theory by partnering with the Digicel and implementing a program that develops agricultural and business skills amongst rural youth. Thus, the essence of Farming, according to the program proposal, is to move youth “in a direction of empowerment and to develop their sense of ownership and citizenship which will enable them to contribute to their community and country’s economic growth” (Farming program proposal). By enabling youth with skills in entrepreneurship, the longer-term vision is to promote sustainability for a broad base of Haitian youth (without the long term dependence on BRAC).

The focus of the Farming itself centres on teaching farming skills and facilitating farming efforts for local youth in order that the proceeds of their work can be used as school fees and to develop the capacity of the school itself. Farming sets out to address several problems. One is the basic needs of youth—and by extension the community, families, citizens—of Fondwa, through increased production of domestic harvests. The second goal is to reward the individual participants of the program through the payment
of their school fees. This is clearly one of the most tangible outcomes of the Farming program: the guarantee of the program covering students’ costs. Because of the dearth of education funding in Haiti in general, the problem of school fees is an unfortunate reality for children and their families across the country. The way that Farming is structured to compensate for agricultural production achieved by program participants is the central goal of its program design. This goal—of allowing vulnerable students to attend school and progress towards secondary diplomas—is, of course, concurrent to the more direct program outcomes of youth learning agricultural and business skills, and developing the overall capacity of the community. Thus, Farming is illustrative of a youth program in Haiti that has a relatively larger concentration of local qualities than international and a market orientation to youth participation.

Cluster #2: Opportunities for Expression

The second cluster of programs concentrate less on what educators convey to Haitian youth and instead build the programs around what Haitian youth have to express. Because these programs have an inherent focus on the injustices of lived Haitian experiences, they almost all have a human rights orientation to youth participation. Two major sub-categories emerge in this cluster however: programs that have a very strong Haitian initiative, and those that are implemented based on their success in spheres from other parts of the world. Those that are largely Haitian initiated include Rights through Radio and Voix Timoun Yo.

Rights through Radio is a program from this cluster. Radio cites a connection that theorizes Haitian citizens having deeper and more meaningful participation in the reconstruction of their society through the development of human rights awareness in
today’s youth. The theoretical link between rights awareness and deeper citizen participation might be seen as teaching universal rights for all people will enable their participation in a democratic social structure. Panos Caribbean, the primarily facilitating organization of Radio, acts upon this theory by partnering with UNICEF and implementing a program that seeks to raise awareness and understanding of a select group of youth on human rights issues that affect them and their country. Thus, the essence of Radio, according to the program outline, is to enable youth to “become stronger and more effective advocates for children’s rights in their community.” By enabling youth with a deeper awareness of human rights, the longer-term vision is that as youth become aware of rights and express concerns of rights abuses through their own initiative, and eventually they find ways to realize, fight for, and claim their proper rights.

The executing agency for this program was Panos Caribbean, through a partnership with UNICEF. Panos is one of seven regional organizations working within the global network of Panos Institutes. The Panos network was originally established in the UK. Panos Caribbean has offices in Kingston and Port-au-Prince, its central hub being the latter. The Port-au-Prince office moved during the course of my research. It is a one-floor, 6-room concrete building off a ridiculously busy artery in the suburb of Petionville. The staff all speaks French, but consistent with the language norms described in Chapter Three, the predominant language is Kreyòl. UNICEF is a large multi-lateral organization with headquarters in New York but also a very active presence in Haiti. The radio consultant came from New York.
Cluster #3: Leadership training

A third cluster of youth programs focus on imparting leadership skills to Haitian youth. Explicitly or implicitly these programs tend to have a human capabilities focus: their greater goals involve developing greater opportunities, possibilities, and freedoms for youth by enabling functional competencies. These programs tend be weighted heavily by Haitian cultural norms, and two distinct types are evident. The first are intellectually-oriented programs, the second, arts-based. Examples of intellectually-oriented programs include Debate Competitions and the Aristide Youth League. The arts-based (including arts, culture, health, and sports) include the Cultural Youth Forum and the Youth Art Program. Included in this group as well is the religious response to the earthquake, either through new youth mission trips to Haiti or the expansion of existing youth programs to address the distress of the earthquake. These types of youth programs include Jacob’s Well and Youth for Haiti.

As a prototype, Debates cites a connection that theorizes Haitian citizens having deeper and more meaningful participation in the reconstruction of their society through the development of critical thinking in today’s youth. The theoretical link between critical thinking and deeper participation is that critical thinking will be able to participate by ensuring reasoned, reflective debate to determine the best course for their society. FOKAL, the primarily facilitating organization of Debate Competitions, acts upon this theory by partnering with Rights and Democracy and implementing a program that facilitates debate clubs and tournaments for youth from across Haiti. Thus, the essence of Debate Competitions, according to the program’s public announcement, is to “develop the capabilities of critical reflection, argument development and a spirit of...
tolerance among young people”. By enabling youth with skills in critical thinking, the vision is that critical thinking becomes a norm for a significant number of Haitians, thereby enabling a broader society of critical thinkers.

**Cluster #4: Spiritual and psychological outlets**

Fourth are youth programs that address emotional, spiritual, and psychological dimensions as a way of enabling youth to participate in their societies. The traumatic effect of the earthquake was recognized widely in the international response and thus programs with a psychological focus were quite popular. Examples of these include Timoun Alez (“Comfort for Kids”) and the Nouvelle Vie Youth Corps\(^{17}\). Timoun Alez is a good example of such a program. In Timoun Alez, youth create and host episodes of a popular TV show in Haiti, geared for children and other youth. The program is influenced by its international origins, through its parent INGO, the Oregon, US-based Mercy Corps, including its American Board of Directors, founders, and in-country leadership staff. However the show itself is aired in Kreyòl, it involves Haitian youth, and it intends to address concerns of youth, by youth, in Haiti. As Kyle Dietrich, the youth program manager suggests, “too often the images and stories that direct our lives and influence our ideas are constructed by outsiders, elites and older people” (Turning into youth, 2012). The orientation of this program is largely social, with themes such as Haitian history and tradition, culture and creativity, and the environment.

---

\(^{17}\) Accompagnement psychologique des jeunes from Cluster 4 might also factor into this definition.
**Cluster #5: Global best practices**

Many of the programs in this cluster were based on innovations from other parts of the world. They include Goudou Goudou, Haiti Through Teenagers’ Eyes, and Voice of the Voiceless. There were many other expression-oriented programs that I came across, but were not necessarily youth oriented. They include the Citizen Monitoring Blitz, Fosial, Digital Democracy, RANCODHA, and Video Documentaries, and are not included in this survey. Some of these programs took these practices and adapted them to local conditions. Some examples of these locally-fashioned youth livelihood programs include Youth Haiti Community Gardening, Adopt a Village and Soley Leve.

Haiti Through Teenagers’ Eyes was one of several photo-voice programs implemented during the reconstruction. In this rendition several dozen youth were provided cameras to take photographs that would represent their vision of a reconstructed Haiti. The organizing INGO, Plan Canada, is based in Toronto, with Canadian leadership and Board of Directors. According to the program documents, “Plan commissioned Canadian photojournalist Natasha Fillion to train 22 teenagers from Jacmel and Croix-des-Bouquets in photo skills so they could document their lives at home, school and in their neighbourhoods over a two week period.” The importance of youth as photographers was a stated component for Plan, as “most of the images we have seen have been taken by international, adult photographers … [this] project has enabled youth to show people the real Haiti from their perspective” (Haiti through teenager's eyes, 2014). The program itself has a primary social orientation, focusing on families, peers, and the cultures of Haitian youth.
Cluster #6: Worldly capabilities

A distinct cluster of youth programs in Haiti held as their dominant object to engage youth in a global community. These programs included Haiti Youth Ambassadors, and Youth United for Global Action and Awareness (YUGA). Developing social and cultural capital that would be useful in a global community: worldly capabilities, in other words. This cluster shares some features of international business, but it focuses on social and cultural competencies, including English language learning. The Youth Ambassadors program, for example, centred on an exchange between American and Haitian youth, where one of its goals was to enable “participants to form strong friendships, improve their English skills and learn new techniques to become more effective in social and community work.” Funded and facilitated by the US Embassy, much of this program was implemented in New York and Washington D.C. The orientation of this program was geared towards the development of diplomacy, community service, and an appreciation for American culture (Haïti—Social: Fin du programme Youth Ambassadors, 2012).

Cluster #7: International business skills

These programs have a strong international component, located deep in the international hemisphere of the graph. They tend to be initiated internationally with curriculum devised by international sources. Program and organizational offices are located abroad, and the predominant languages used and the nationalities of the majority of the program staff are foreign. This cluster has programs premised on a human capital view of participation. They are focused on the development of business skills for youth, using a traditional business model. Examples of these programs include Capoeira and the
Haitian Education Project. Capoeira was funded by CIDA and implemented by the Brazilian INGO Viva Rio. Under the official title of "Peace and Security in Bel Air", this program involved training in health and alternatives to crime including the Brazilian martial art, Capoeira (Project Profile, 2012). Its origins are largely international, with influences from North and South America, and an orientation towards enabling youth with life and job skills.

Selecting Case Study Programs

Drawing from these results, I chose three case study programs that were representative of these positions, highlighted in the conceptual map (Figure 4) above. Each of the selected programs had a relative balance of international and local origins; each had a strong local initiative but also a significant international presence. Between them they provided perspectives from market (one program) and social (two programs) approaches to youth participation. Yet, each program comes from a separate cluster—three of the four most densely populated clusters in the analysis—the two social programs representing the top right, most occupied quadrant on the map. Adding these results to the base criteria for selection laid out in Chapter Two—that they focused on youth, highlighted participation as a central goal, had some international connection, and agreed to my research conditions—I chose Farming, Debates and Radio as case study programs.
Chapter Six:
Case Study Program #1: Farming for Education

Farming for Education was a one-year pilot program with a vision to become locally sustainable and if demonstrably successful, expand to other communities across the country. The program was initiated by Bangladesh-based BRAC, commonly recognized as the world’s largest NGO. Since BRAC’s inception in 1972 it has branched out to other post-disaster countries such as Sri Lanka (2005), Indonesia (2007) after the Tsunami of 2004, and the conflict zone of Afghanistan in 2002. BRAC came to Haiti very soon after the 2010 earthquake with its Limb and Brace Centre.

Program Cycle of Farming

First established in Dhaka in 2000, the Limb and Brace Centre had been one of BRAC’s most popular exports to its international operations for rehabilitating injured populations. In Haiti this program had proved useful in aftermath of the earthquake, but by the end of 2010 BRAC officials were planning to move beyond emergency relief in health and draw on their more central institutional experience in rural community development, youth programming, education, and micro-finance.

Community Participation in Program Vision

In early 2011 the BRAC Education Manager was charged to develop a program with a longer-term focus in Haiti. The target population would be rural youth, a demographic in line with the pioneering mandate of the organization originally known as the “Bangladesh Rural Advancement Committee”. The recipient community was to be within the disaster radius of the earthquake, and the intent was for the community to
participate in the design and the construction of the program. A village was selected in the mountains north of Port-au-Prince, and the Education Manager visited the community to brainstorm ideas for the program for which she could create a funding proposal to Digicel Haiti Foundation. The Education Manager described how the community participated in the original design of this program:

Initially the idea of the program came from a community that I had met in Kenscoff. They came up with the idea, not me. So that’s the reason why I thought this would be great, because they were willing—the teachers, the schools, the community—they were all willing to pitch in to really get this going, because [in] Kenscoff, they don’t have any challenges with water, the vegetation is there, and they was trying to be able to generate revenue for the schools so they could actually pay their teachers.

She continues:

It was a focus group. We sat down, and the idea generated from the group. I developed the proposal around their concept. Basically I needed to try to come up with a concept for education that we wanted to do here. The problem was that the BRAC, one-classroom-school model is a great concept in Bangladesh, but it wouldn’t be applicable here.

However, before the proposal could be sent off, a prohibitive criterion was recognized: a very poor and unsafe access road to the school that would prevent the frequent trips needed for delivery of supplies, program monitoring visits, and youth training excursions. The idea for the program lived on, however, in a new community in the South department, just 60 kilometers from the earthquake epicentre. BRAC’s Education Manager describes how this evolved in the program set-up:

So when that didn’t work out I had another contact who was doing a lot of work at La Vallée de la Jacmel. … The only issue was finding selecting an appropriate school. … We visited at least five schools there. … When I had visited them prior to procuring the funds I had
helped at the Ecole Communité de Fondwa along with Ecole d’Espoir in Fondwa. I sent off six schools to Digicel hopefully for all of them to get new buildings but it was those particular two schools that they selected.

Fondwa (derived from the original *Fond d’Oie*, meaning the back of the goose) is a rural Haitian community, subject to the conditions of rural communities which were discussed in Chapter Two. The community covers 28 square kilometers straddling National Highway 4. It is roughly equidistant from ocean bays—the Gulf of Gonâve of the Atlantic Ocean to the north, and the Caribbean Sea to the south—at the apex of the hills in the southern peninsular arm of Haiti. Fondwa is in the Léogâne arrondissement (one of 42 arrondisments in Haiti, the rough equivalent in French political administration to districts), which includes the municipality of Léogâne, which gained international recognition as the epicentre of the 7.0 M<sub>W</sub> earthquake of January 12, 2010.

**Community Partnerships**

The popular Haitian expression “mountains beyond mountains” is no better typified than in this area, where stunning vistas obscure the infamous deforestation of the country. The 12 000 residents of Fondwa typically live in modest yet often bright and colourful one or two room homes with large families, with areas for cooking and hygiene outside and adjacent, all kept very neat. According to statistics on display at the local BRAC office, youth outnumber any other group in Fondwa at 41%, compared to 37% children and only 22% adults. While most of the youth in Farming for Education live quite close to the school, five students live several hundred meters down in the valley near the river, walking as much as two hours each way to school, daily. The main
industries of Fondwa are tending livestock and farming; sweet potato, maize, and black bean amongst the major crops.

Long before BRAC came to Fondwa, organizations such as the home-grown APF and Fonkoze contributed to a regional reputation and some national and international attention as a resourceful community. The communal-oriented Fonkoze (from “Fondasyon Kole Zepòl”, meaning Our Shoulders Together Foundation) is a micro-enterprise institution that operates across Haiti, billing itself as “Haiti’s alternative bank for the organized poor”. With pre-established connections to and classifications of the community, Fonkoze was instrumental in the selection of the youth for the program.

Fonkoze was Farming’s organizational partner in Fondwa. It positions itself as a contributor to Haitian democracy through market approaches similar to those described in the theoretical framing of this thesis. Its mission—“building the economic foundations for democracy in Haiti by providing the rural poor with the tools they need to lift themselves out of poverty”—aligns closely with several of its central principles: “All Haitians deserve a chance to participate in the economic development of their country; A political democracy cannot survive without economic democracy” (Fonkoze Blog). Fonkoze was pioneered in Haiti by a Catholic priest who, according to Fonkoze USA president Leigh Carter, envisioned a specific brand of participation for democracy:

Father Philippe’s dream of economic democracy for the poor of Haiti and his dream of a “bank the organized poor could call their own.”
Father Joseph was determined to build a bank national in scope that would provide the poor, especially women entrepreneurs (ti machann, or rural market women), with the financial, educational and development services they required to rebuild their own country and their own lives. (FOKOZE USA: Leigh Carter)
While Carter emphasizes the connections between economic participation, development, and democracy, the tradition of citizen participation in Fondwa also ensured the founding of the community school in 1996. L’Ecole Communitaire Fondwa (The Communitarian School of Fondwa, or ECF) was initiated by the pastor of the local Protestant church who continues to directs the school today and is the partner school for Farming for Education. Named in accordance to the collective tradition of the village, ECF is well attended and centrally located only several hundred meters off the highway. Drawing on the support and resources of the local Protestant church the school principal has remained involved since its inception. As he describes, “before 1996, there was no school in this community. So, the community has now benefited from a small school”. However, by 2012 ECF was just one of the 17 elementary and secondary schools in the community.

Selection of School and Youth Participants

When Digicel selected ECF as the pilot school for Farming not only did they agree to construct a washroom, water tower, and extra wing on the school, but they also funded the entirety of the first-year Farming for Education program expenses. BRAC and Digicel agreed on a base of US$50,000 that was to be distributed in two, six-month instalments, beginning in March 2011.

To strengthen the legitimacy of the Farming for Education program, a partnership was developed through the Ministry of Education. Together with BRAC practitioners,

---

18 In Haiti, the typical term for the administrative leader of a school is “director”. However, to avoid confusion with directors from international aid organizations, I will use the Canadian term “principal”.

---
MoE staff developed a curriculum for the program. According to one program report, “teaching materials, charts, books, and activities materials for participants have been provided. Working drafts of modules for nursery farming, vegetable cultivation and poultry rearing have been developed in Kreyòl” (Quarterly Progress Report #1). These materials took much time to develop through the partnership of the BRAC Education Officer and the director of the Centre for Family Education at the MoE. Additionally, learning materials were reported to be very expensive, especially the unusually high-priced Kreyòl dictionaries.

The core partnership between BRAC and ECF hinged largely on the relationship between BRAC’s Education Manager and the school principal. The school principal sent proposals for six schools to Digicel, hopefully for all of them to get new buildings but it was those particular two schools that they selected. I really enjoyed each time I went to Fondwa and visited these schools … there’s a willingness and a positive attitude that I found in [the school principal in Fondwa] ... the majority of the schools are either affiliated with religious institutions so he’s Pastor of that church but he also started an elementary school.

I’ve presented to him the idea. He was really adamant about getting this going and … took a number of steps to … make sure we were able to … meet all the criteria. There was an obvious need in terms of students and youth in the community … who hadn’t completed their sixth grade education. They … confirmed that they had land available where they could do the sample plotting and have a place for kids to learn how to do and then do the application in their own homes. They were able to find the teacher and he [had a] classroom available and kids were participating in classes.
The support of ECF teachers to the program was also paramount. Those teachers connected to the program received training prior to the program launch, May 20 and 21, 2011. The training areas included items such as institutional capacity, teaching methods, psychosocial and child development, classroom management, and school environment. All of the youth in Farming lived in Fondwa. Fonkoze facilitated selection of the youth through their families. Among Fonkoze’s stated selection policies is the following:

Member families are selected through a careful process called Participatory Wealth Ranking. Fonkoze relies on members of the local community to identify the poorest people in the area. Fonkoze then visits the homes of potential members, in order to verify their eligibility for participation. This participatory process ensures that Fonkoze targets only the ultra-poor who are not eligible for our microfinance program. (Fonkoze Chemen Lavi Miyo Program)

According to the mandate of the program, the students who participated in Farming would not otherwise be able to afford the school fees. Thirty youth were initially selected for the program, however, shortly after the commencement of the program, twenty-five students remained. The reasons for the five withdrawals were all related to pregnancies during the course of the program. The remaining youth in the program were 12 boys and 13 girls aged between 14 and 21. Student attendance in the first quarter of the program averaged 73%, ranging between 20% and 96%. The attendance record between sexes was relatively even (74% for girls and 72% for boys), and attendance was higher for 17-20 year olds than any other single age bracket (14-16, 21). Notably, two individual students had attendance records significantly less than their peers, below 40%.
Program Preparations and Formal Launch

Originally scheduled for a March launch, the program fully got underway by July 2011. It was intended to run until the end of February, 2012, but Digicel granted funds for a three-month extension. Before school began in September, the youth participation involved numerous training sessions to learn the basics of local agriculture and agronomy. These trainings included lectures, discussions, debates, group analyses, and field work, and included six sessions in July (each an average length of 3 ½ hours), five in August, and six in September. The themes ranged from general agricultural know-how, to business fundamentals, market analyses, vegetable cultivation, safe sex, and livestock rearing. According to a field report, “more than 200 learning hours have been completed, which includes time for field training, trips and research activities in Fondwa and Jacmel” (Quarterly Progress Report #2).

The basic resources for the program included the raw materials for farming. Among these raw materials were the procurement of seedlings for plants that will grow into trees, other agricultural resources, and livestock farming (chickens and goats). The resources of the program are shared between BRAC (seeds, livestock, equipment, staff, training resources), the school (adjacent land for teaching farming, the support and administration of the school principal and one teacher), and students (land available at their home, support of rest of family). Students collected local seeds for germination, and livestock were purchased and distributed amongst students. The Education Manager describes how valuable this training was for the youth, as all of this information was new to them:
Sometimes they would see other family members [farming] but have no understand of why or what they were doing. We wanted the youth to not just do something, but understand the reasons behind it. … You could probably go to one of the kids tomorrow and ask them, “So, tell me, why do you have to mix the different types of soils?” I would guarantee 90% of the kids would remember learning the purposes rather than just seeing them.

A milestone of this training was a field trip to Jacmel, a coastal village approximately 30kms south of Fondwa. Home of former Canadian Governor General Michaëlle Jean, Jacmel is one of Haiti’s top tourist sites, home of an annual Carnival celebration, colonial architecture, and innovative artisans. Jacmel is also a productive site for farming and working with local products. One student described his time in Jacmel in the following way:

We went to Jacmel and visited a shop with Bamboo furniture and other crafts made from fruit trees (orange and citrus trees, avocado trees)... We also toured a garden that grew spinach, carrots, cabbages; that’s what we were really interested in. After seeing this, the program taught us how to garden like that. (Michel)

The Education Manager suggests that these contributions of field visits and external trainers were particularly valuable for the youth:

And there’s also I think something special about bringing in people who are experts in the classroom. Or having them work with an agronomist who don’t look different than them, who are maybe just a few years older, but it creates a sense of okay well I can imagine myself doing this tomorrow rather than feeling that this is completely over here and has nothing to do with me and I don’t see the advantage of doing something like this for myself.
The formal launch of the program happened at the start of the school season in September and involved a ceremony and photo opportunity for participating youth, teachers and director; community leaders; officials from local partner organizations Fonkoze and APF; administrators and Technicians contracted locally by BRAC; head-office officials from BRAC Haiti in Port-au-Prince; representatives from Digicel; and members of the national government (President Martelly had been scheduled to come but cancelled). From that point, the participation of youth in the program generally involved the week daily attendance at ECF from 8 a.m. to 2 p.m., and then additional Farming workshops for two hours, on average, per week (usually on Fridays or Saturdays).

The Youth Participants

Since the program launch, the focus for each youth was the cultivation of their own gardens at home. One of 13 girls in the Farming program, 18-year old Sophia lives in a home nearby ECF with seven other members of her family. She describes that food security has been major issue for her family: “during last week I hardly had any food”. With a 92% attendance record, Sophia had one of the best participation rates for students in the first semester of the program, above the class average of 73%.

At Sophia’s home is a small 10x10 meter garden where, in the last harvest season, she planted two rows of carrots, tens rows of cabbage, two-and-a-half rows of spinach, and four-and-a-half rows of tomatoes. She is very proud of her garden, and explains that she cares for it on a daily basis. Since September she has kept ten chickens, the eggs from which she collects and brings to the school principal on weekdays so he can channel them to local and urban markets to sell.
The value of the program for Sophia’s is clear on various levels. For one, the simple addition of nutritious food is of great support to her and her family, where meals are an ongoing concern. The production of surplus vegetables (that she purchases at a reduced rate through the exchange with the school principal) through the Farming program is one clear benefit to the sustenance of basic needs of the program participants and their families.

Eighteen-years-old Michel is one of the boys in Farming, and one of a majority of Farming participants who lived quite close to the school. Diminutive, Michel is confident, friendly, and vibrant. He lives with his three brothers, four sisters, and two parents but participates in sharing and receiving food and other resources amongst community members. As Michel notes, “the people in the community help me with things; they give me food from time-to-time when I am hungry”.

Michel also maintains a variety of agricultural activities outside his home. He has a tree nursery with over five-hundred seedlings, planned to someday grow into orange, quenepa, and avocado trees. He keeps chickens for egg production and is preparing a small plot of land that his family lets him use to cultivate crops for the next harvest season. Looking to the future, Michel would like to continue working as an agronomist. He explains that he really has come to enjoy keeping nurseries and would like to pursue this livelihood once he completes secondary school.

\[19\] The tropical quenepa tree bears a round fruit with leathery skin and a sweet, juicy pulp.
The backgrounds of Sophia and Michel are representative of the youth in this program for a variety of reasons. They are from large families, they live rurally and with relatively with little attachment to formal state or market structures, and they are both enthusiastic about their involvement in the program.

Program Outputs and Assessment

By November 2011 a total of 1600 eggs had been sold to several area markets, generating income that went back into the operations of the school. Most of the produce was sold at markets in Fondwa and in Port-au-Prince. This harvest was somewhat disappointing, attributed by program officials to the unusually dry weather.

In addition to directing the school during the year, the director committed time to the Farming, reporting that he devotes “approximately ten hours per week for two hours a day” to the program. After six months, the director assed by now, we have earned about 2500 gourdes. This has come in many forms: chicken eggs, root vegetables, fruit trees, and so on. The livestock are still young, so they have not yet reproduced. Once they grow and reproduce, then we will benefit. We will certainly benefit much more.

The Farming for Education program was scheduled to terminate at the end of a one-year period, but funds for a three-month extension were granted due to unexpected weather issues.

20 Forty Haitian gourdes is equivalent to approximately one Canadian dollar.
The skills learned through training were clearly related to the reliability and pedagogies of the program Technician. In my own travels with the Technician, during several hours of hiking to the numerous homes of the students across the valleys of Fondwa, the Technician demonstrated his knowledge of agronomic technologies by pointing out local features such as terraced slopes to prevent erosion and rain basins used to collect overflow waters, both constructed on the farms through the community of Fondwa.

Finally, there are also less stated longer term reasons why youth choose to participate in this program, namely, their own vocations. Looking to the future, Michel would like to continue working as an agronomist. He explains that he really has come to enjoy keeping nurseries and would like to pursue this livelihood once he completes secondary school. The Education Manager echoes these thoughts:

Our concern is to make sure that kids get the knowledge they need to protect themselves and make better decisions in their future. ... Youth development is not just about the academic knowledge and the theoretical issues. It’s giving them a sense of who they are and having them build up their confidence and providing them knowledge to make better decisions for their future.

They really have to understand that they’re investing in themselves. That information … was really conveyed through the program. If you value what you have and you appreciate it and you build it, then it will grow and it will prosper and it’s within yourself…in your community.

Sophia also exemplifies her enthusiasm for the program: “I would ask that all young people be encouraged to become a member of this great program.”
Analysis of Farming’s Social Construction of Participation

This account of Farming allows us an extraction of the key analytical questions of the social construction or participation in this context. The first question, who participates, addresses the problem of access—how is it that a particular group of beneficiaries was designated, chosen, or accepted to be part of the program? And, what does this group have in common compared to other youth who are not participating in this program?—as well as the problem benefits, for example: When examining outcomes, who can we say has benefited the most from the programs? What do these youth have in common that enables them to incur the most benefit from the program, which precludes favourable outcomes for other youth?

Who participated?

In this program there were several characteristics about the youth who participated. First, to be able to participate, youth needed to live in the community of Fondwa, not be able to otherwise afford school, and to be selected by the school principal. In that sense, the school principal decided who would have access to the program. Michel, for example said “that is why the director chose me to participate in the program, because I wouldn’t otherwise have the means to go to school.”

Second, all the youth needed to have access to land to grow crops or to rear the animals. In most cases this land belonged to the parents of the youth; in some it was other relations such as Michel’s brother. Thus, as this program favoured the participation of Fondwa youth with land available to them to farm, it relegated youth from outside the chosen community and school jurisdiction, those without land access, and those for whom formal schooling was not a viable path for learning. This would exclude any youth
in Fondwa who could not attend school but did not have the permission to use land to cultivate although it remained unclear how many or what proportion of youth this would exclude.

[Third, while there were a greater proportion of girls beginning the program, this number diminished with the pregnancies and subsequent withdrawals of two girls during the program cycle. But overall there was a balance between sexes of youth in the program, and participation was elevated for older youth. However, with five of the 30 students no longer in the program—and two students attending less than one third of the activities—almost one quarter of the class ceased participating. However, this might be reasonable given the norms for youth participation in Fondwa, and also considering that attendances figures for three quarters of the class was fifty percent or greater.

**In What?**

This question looks at the decisions in which the youth are involved, and to what degree the youth have control over the elements of the program. Certainly many of the normative statements about the program included references to participation as part of what the youth would do, from Fonkoze’s participatory selection process to the extensive partnerships between ECF, Fonkoze, the APF and BRAC in Fondwa. The original vision process had several participatory features, as community members were involved in focus groups to lay the initial plans for Farming. However, those citizens did not ultimately benefit from the program, as it moved from Kenscoff to Fondwa, and under the revised timeline and the supervision of the school principal, the participation of youth in the program design and set-up was negligible.

Instead, the foremost facet of youth participation in this program was the
production of goods for sale to sustain the program. The youth participated largely through the production of fruits, vegetables, animals and their by-products (i.e. eggs). They contributed land and labour, and through forwarding their produce to the school principal, their output enabled their access to school.

The primacy of this contribution of the youth overshadowed other ways in which the youth might participate. For example, youth did not participate in the design of the program, the selection of crops or livestock, the curriculum components or its delivery, the sale of the items, or the overall management or administration of the program. In terms of decision-making, while youth had autonomy over the ways, how hard and frequency in which they worked, they were limited in other decision making power. The specific crops and farm stock were decided internally by the program, as well as the economics of the sourcing to various markets, pricing and selling, and distribution towards school tuition and other school expenses. In terms of the start-up of the program, while it appeared that one community had a significant participation in the decisions around the details and mechanics of the program, the community of Fondwa played a lesser role, and the youth in particular were not part of that process of decision-making.

Why? (The Youth Perspective)

Finally, why do the youth choose to participate, and why do practitioners prioritize the participation of youth? There were several reasons why youth participated in this program. For Sophia, participation in this program was rationalized on a number of levels. For one, the simple addition of nutritious food is of great support to her and her family, where food security is an issue. “I eat just once a day and sometimes I do not eat anything”, she describes about her home life. The production of surplus vegetables (that
she purchases at a reduced rate through the exchange with the school principal) through
the program is one clear benefit to the sustenance of basic needs of the program
participants and their families.

The individual provision of school fees—approximately 2500 gourdes per year—
emerged as a reason why students chose to participate in Farming. This facet of the
program is consistent with the responses from the wider group of the students involved in
Farming. As Michel expressed, “Now we are benefiting from the program because we
can continue our studies, because the program pays for studies. We can produce eggs,
and the school’s officials can sell them and help us with the school fees.”

Even by the end of the program, Michel is emphatic about this aspect of the
program. However, he also builds on this perceived benefit, noting also the usefulness of
his own learnings. He explains, “Well, first of all I earn money to be able attend school.
Then, there were lots of things I didn’t know before, like growing tomatoes, that will be
useful for me. For example, we had training to learn how to compost. We also had one
workshop on sexuality and how to protect against pregnancy.”

The motivation of the students can be seen in various ways. As noted above, the
average attendance is over 70%, within which over three quarters of the class participates
at a rate of 50% or more. This indicator of student motivation in the program is
reasonable in the local context, especially given the good balance between the
participation of girls and boys, and elevated participation in a highly relevant age group
of 17 to 20 year-olds.

There was a clear link between the youths’ involvement in the program and their
reward of free tuition emerges as a leading reason why youth would choose to be
involved in the program. This rationale is re-enforced as the youth deliberate their conceptualizations of participation, the findings of which I present in Chapter Nine. Their ticket to these structures was to attend and complete school. “With these activities I have the possibility to go to school”, described one youth. In relation to education, another youth described the important component of the program for him. “In earlier years I had to pay my tuition. But now, the school pays the costs.” School, in Haiti, as it is almost universally qualified, is valued highly as a means to better life outcomes. If not education, the rationale given for the attraction of youth to the program is training they received for their intended professions. For some, there were related workshops during the Farming training. For others, the education they received at school would prepare them for their careers. And for others, the training and practice they received in crop cultivation and livestock rearing was suitable for their hopes to be agriculturalists over the long term.

Why? (The Organizational Perspective)

As for the second part of the question of why, one incentive for the program to have youth participate is to have a labour pool to produce goods to sell at the market. While the rationale for Farming is presented differently in practitioner conceptualizations of participation, which will be examined in Chapter Nine, it is clear that the organizational benefits of youth participation lie in the production of goods to sustain the institutions behind the program.
Chapter Seven:
Case Study #2: Debate Competitions

The Foundation for Knowledge and Liberty (Fondasyon Konesans Ak Libète, or FOKAL) has hosted national Debate Competitions in Haiti for over a decade, but after the earthquake the national competitions and local club practices included themes specific to the reconstruction. For example, the club in Jeremie included post-traumatic stress workshops in its training, Club Christ-Roi held a debate on the future of Haiti after the earthquake, and at the 2011 national competitions specific seminars were presented on the nature of and responses to natural disasters. These national competitions, referred to as Debates here, are the second case study investigated in this thesis to better understand how youth participation is socially constructed in an aid and reconstruction setting.

Program Cycle of Debates

Debates consisted of a five-day national championship for selected members of youth debate clubs across Haiti, held between February 17 and 21, 2012. Sixty-two youth attended the program as debaters (23 girls and 39 boys), accompanied by 23 mentors. The group came together to learn and practice debating, competing in elimination rounds towards a final bout on a predetermined topic. According to the original public announcement for the program:

The Debate tournament will be organized on the following resolution: The paper book has become obsolete. A surprise topic is also planned for the tournament and will not be revealed until the competition rounds of the meeting. (National Youth Meeting, 2011)
In partnerships with the International Debate Education Association (IDEA), the Open Society Foundations, the International Centre for Human Rights and Democratic Development (Rights and Democracy), the Haitian Ministry of Youth and Sports, and the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), Haiti’s annual Debate Competitions garners a large turnout. Those serving as facilitators for the program included the program coordinator and two resource staff from FOKAL, two officers from Rights and Democracy in Haiti, a Ministry of Youth and Sports official, and three former youth participants. All of the aforementioned youth leaders are of Haitian origin and participated alternatively by presenting training workshops, assisting with logistics, and judging the competitions. Finally, an Ecuadorian national serving as a program specialist in disaster and risk management for UNESCO in Haiti also served as a workshop presenter at the Debate Competitions. Thus, there were ten youth leaders in total, six men and four women.

Community Debate Clubs
Each club typically carried five competitors and two or three leaders, and eleven unique clubs across the country were represented at the competition. A twelfth club was meant to participate: however internal problems prohibited the club from attending.

The process of selection for the youth to participate in the annual Debate Competitions is determined at the level of each club, and to that end, are structured as open and accessible to all. The program coordinator is clear on this point: “We don’t select. The clubs are open. It’s up to the group leaders to select. We create the conditions for participation. But the group leaders have the responsibility to attract the youth to the clubs.” The coordinator provides this example: “For instance, there were kids from
Kenscoff that came to ask me if they could start clubs themselves. ‘Sure’, I said. ‘I can’t manage them for you, but we can give you all the resources you need to run them. We will support the clubs, and check in with you.’”

A focus on youth.

Debates deliberately target youth, seeing their combination of energy and openness to learn as qualities that heighten their potential gains from the program. As the coordinator explains:

I love working with youth because they are fragile, because they are vulnerable. But they want to learn so much. They are so curious. They are so alive. So much energy! We have to harness that energy. It’s a source of pride for me, to teach these youth, to share with them. I have learned so much from them too. They are enthusiastic. They participate. And when its time for the clubs to select the youth—it’s a battle! They work very hard to be selected. It’s a tough job, to select just four youth.

All of the youth at the Debate Competitions program spoke French well enough to participate in the debate itself, and the all appeared to fall into the age range suggested in FOKAL’s guide to the program: “youth from the second class to the philosophy class.” These grades of the baccalaureate system are roughly equivalent to the first year to the last year of the Canadian secondary school system; the last year of Canadian secondary would be the Année Terminale or Philosophy at the Lycée. Further, FOKAL stipulates that participants must be in secondary school, and not already graduated or have started tertiary education. Thus, participants of the Debate Competitions program would all be within the standard age-range of secondary school, 15 to 19 years old.
Makenley was one of 40 debaters in the Vague du Future national debate conference. He lives in Carrefour, a suburb of Port-au-Prince. His debate club carried 20 members, but for the actual competitions, four youth participated with two mentors. Makenley is 18 years old; a tall, striking young man who dresses in trendy jeans, designer shirt, and a straight-brimmed ball cap. He is focused, articulate, and intense. At home, Makenley speaks Kreyòl with his family, but also some French and English. He has participated in several debates previously, including on the world championships last year in Istanbul. At this competition he expects to do well, and, he describes, if things work out, he would love to win.

In many of these ways, Makenley is similar to his counterparts at Debates. But Makenley was also part of a group of participants who came from the greater Port-au-Prince area, an advantage that rural club representatives noted for its proximity to resources, better instruction at school, and more opportunities to practice debating. As one of the mentors from Cap-Haïtien, Haiti’s northernmost city noted, “The difficulty is in the distances. We can’t come to Port-au-Prince for all the training sessions. Those in Port-au-Prince have all the advantages. The seminars, the trainers, the technology.”

Preparing for the Retreat
The meeting time to travel to the camp is 9:00 a.m. on February 17 outside the FOKAL office. FOKAL is located in downtown Port-au-Prince, very close to the State University of Haiti, and not far from the presidential palace and major monuments and parks which after the earthquake served as the IDP camps for thousands of families. A few youth sit on a cement ledge, ready to go with their duffle bags and sleeping sacks. The coordinator is there too, friendly and enthused, but busy, attending to last-minute
coordinating issues. There are three school buses parked at the side of the bustling city street; gradually more youth arrive, as well as the mentors and program facilitators. The youth display typical characteristics of adolescents as they enter the buses: energetic, fashionable, flirtatious. Many hold a personal sound system playing Haitian pop music. About thirty people board each bus for a crowded drive up to the retreat centre.

The drive up into the mountains is slow moving. After departing Port-au-Prince the drive continues through Petionville and the upper class residential areas in the hills before passing through the rural communities at higher altitudes. Turning off the main highway, only several kilometers remain; however this drive would take another hour. The travel is slow on the dirt roads, and one stop for over thirty minutes was required to negotiate immense mud puddles. At high altitude and well into forest and farmland, we arrive at the retreat centre, an eco-resort.

The centre is a blatant contrast to the populated areas in the valley below. The weather is cool, and the nights are cold. In Port-au-Prince it is rare to come across much greenery—any grassy areas are taken up by tent camps, and other urban areas are concrete and rubble—but green grass surrounds the quarters of the eco-resort, and gardens line the small, stepped incline. Swiss architecture characterized the buildings of the resort. There is a huge soccer field set below the buildings, surrounded by lush vegetation: trees, and orange and red flowers.

It is 11:30 a.m. when we arrive. The youth clamber off the busses and everyone walks over to the soccer field. Most of the youth are in groups. I walk over to chat with Étienne, a youth walking alone. “Where are you from?” I ask him. “Camp Perrin”, Étienne replies, “It is east of Les Cayes.” As it turns out, Les Cayes is hosting Carnival
this year—instead of Port-au-Prince, which usually hosts the annual festival—which is happening over the same period as Debates, the reason for the long weekend. I am surprised that Étienne would come here instead of Carnival, as many Haitian youth prioritize the annual festival. “Why didn’t you stay in Cayes for Carnival?” I ask.

“Because I am in my année terminale, so I chose to come here instead. That way I could learn how to become un vrai diplomat (a ‘professional diplomat’). Étienne would later describe to me in some detail how becoming un vrai diplomat has been his life’s dream.

“Oh!” I responded; that sounded interesting to me. “What sort of work does a vrai diplomat do in Haiti?” He smiled at me and replied, “That’s the point: un vrai diplomat doesn’t have to work.”

Program Orientation

We all arrive on the field and stack our gear on a cement deck outside a long, wooden, A-frame, wall-less meeting hall with tarps rolled up on the side, in case of inclement weather. The meeting hall is large enough for ten picnic tables and has 20-foot high ceilings. The youth begin to mill around. One of the facilitators passes around some handouts, and the youth start looking them over. We all make our way inside the meeting hall and take a seat. Two programmers are wearing the program t-shirts that say in French, Youth Will Determine The Future.

The Debate Competitions coordinator goes to the front and begins by greeting the group. He informs everyone that this is now the sixth annual conference. Someone from the back asks when lunch is. The coordinator introduces all of the programmers and then goes over the schedule with the youth. There will be sports in the morning, and a tour of the eco-resort after lunch. He then provides the room assignments. We are all staying in
well-furnished, Swiss-style cabins with running water and blankets to stay warm. As we get sorted, the coordinator circulates and takes photos.

After getting set up in our accommodations, we break for lunch. Meals are served buffet style in the upstairs of the main building. The wicker chairs, wooden tables, and plaid tablecloths are all Euro-style, but the food is distinctly Haitian.

**Debate Training**

In the afternoon the training begins in the large, gazebo meeting hall. Over the first few days of the camp there were eleven different topics covered in training sessions and workshops, directly related to the tasks at hand, debating. These topics ranged from “Evidence-Based Persuasion” to “Cross-Interrogation”; from “True and False Arguments” to “Non-Verbal Communication Styles.” There were four other workshops related indirectly to debating: “Advocacy”, “Democracy and Voting Systems”, and two sessions on “Management of Natural Disasters”. A glimpse at some of the dynamics of these training sessions will be presented below.

**Improvisation techniques.**

The first workshop is on ‘Improvisation in Public Speaking’, or “Improvisation: That requires preparation!” as the workshop leader joked. “Everything that is important in life needs preparation,” the leader continued. He spends some time going over some general tips, then addresses a specific question. “How do you respond when a journalist asks you a question?” He provides five answers:

One: Listen well. It is very important to listen well to the debate to be able to answer the question properly. Two: Pause for a moment: It is during this time that you can collect your ideas. But not 15 minutes! Just two seconds or so. Three: Introduce the subject: How can you find
some more time? Reformulate the question. For example, “Dear friends, I will give you my point of view on the subject.” We might pose another question. We might share a quotation. Four: Develop your point of view. Use statistics, but not too many statistics—after a while people get bored of statistics. And five: A Conclusion. But in your conclusion, avoid digressions!

The coordinator, unpacking gear over at the side of the hall, pipes in at this point: “That happens often!”

The Improvisation Workshop leader continues with tips: “What if you don’t know anything about the question? Talk about how you would like to learn about it. Connect it to the theme of the conference. I am not talking about the debate specifically—I am talking about general cases of orating,” he contextualizes. “And practice!” he recommends. And finally, “If you don’t know? Bluff. Improvise. Use the strategies above. What is important,” he continues, “is learning the general culture associated with improvising.”

The workshop transitions into some time for the youth practice these skills in demonstration format in front of the group. After an initial illustration, a second example is set up. The volunteer is Esther, a 16-year old girl from the Christ Roi club. Esther wears glasses. The Improvisation Workshop leader gives her the topic: “A woman is an object” versus “A woman is a human being.” Esther thinks for a moment and launches into a passionate oral presentation supporting the latter. She follows the template overviewed by the Improvisation Workshop leader and projects her strong feelings on the topic. Her improvised speech lasts less than a minute, and she concludes with “It is about time for us to change our perception of women.” The hall of youth erupts into a standing ovation. Esther takes a big breath and smiles as she takes a bow.
The Improvisation Workshop leader asks the crowd for feedback. He solicits a point offered by Étienne, and then another who stands up and says, “She remained calm. She was confident about what she wanted to say.” The Improvisation workshop leader agrees and then provides some feedback himself, reading from his notes that he has been taking during her demonstration. He recommends to the youth to “be a little more brief in your introduction. You are a girl, you are elegant.” he continues, without irony. “By the way,” he says and turns back to the group, “When you are up in front of the crowd, all of these qualities are important.” After several other practice rounds the workshop concludes in the mid-afternoon.

**Critical thinking.**

After a short break, the next workshop begins. The leader of this workshop is a long-time volunteer with the Debate Competitions. He is also a public official with the Ministry of Youth and Sports of the departmental government. This topic of this workshop is “Critical Thinking: Differences between Conversations and Debates.” Or, as the youth minister describes, “Popular debates versus scientific debates, and how we understand the difference between them.”

This workshop begins with a historical perspective, the Critical Thinking workshop leader notes that the “industrial revolution showed that social classes were malleable.” After several other lessons from history he makes an overall point about the importance of debating: “If men learn how to debate there will not be a third world war.” There is some discussion amongst the youth about this point, but he continues. “In scientific debate we must understand how. In debating social issues, we try to understand why.” There is much discussion and bantering by the youth at this point. The workshop
leader is interrupted. “Let me finish,” he says. A youth calls out, “He hasn’t finished—let him finish!”

The discussion in this workshop is largely theoretical. The Critical Thinking workshop leader notes that it is often a “question of subjectives.” For example, he asks, “Am I standing upright? Science would tell me yes because of the force exerted.” Esther interjects and tries to clarify his point. The workshop leader continues, “But in philosophy, we explain. Anybody can explain why he or she is not standing upright. There is a scientific explanation and a philosophical explanation. The difference depends on the domain. So, we have a debate,” he concludes. “The ends justify the means. I debate.”

The Critical Thinking workshop leader frequently provided rhetorical examples to serve as a basis to show how critical thinking, logic, and debate can address complex social issues. The examples were also typically rooted in Haitian socio-political context, often related to Haitian history and how the individual and collective Haitian psyche are affected by domestic and international socio-political affairs. His next example has an ethical focus: “If one suggests that all Haitians must be civilized, they can argue that the uncivilized should be killed. Therefore, all who would remain would be the civilized.” The room is captivated. “It is an argument that requires debate. Before Pinochet, Chile was never so prosperous. But was that worth killing nine thousand people?”

A little more theory and then the workshop leader provides another example. “A thesis: Man descended from apes. Argument: Look at me: I look kind of like a monkey, don’t I?” The youth are not quite sure how to react. “But this is *not* a scientific argument!”
One youth asks a question from the floor. “What do you think about the debate on the equality of all humans?” “Value judgments,” says the workshop leader and uses this question as a teaching opportunity to bring in a new concept. “Where do value judgments come from?” he asks. “From school. From church. From the media.” He answers his own question. Another question, this time from Esther. “Great question,” says the Critical Thinking workshop leader. “Well-phrased.”

After the workshop there is a short break, and then groups take turns to participate in mini-debates in front of all of the youth. It is late in the afternoon and we have been going for a while, but the energy of the group still appears to be quite high. The topic of the practice debate is relevant to the youth: Violence in Haiti.

**Disaster preparedness.**

The workshops continue on the second day of the conference. The focus for the morning is risk and disaster preparedness, and the UNESCO expert presents on the topic. Much of her presentation focuses on her analysis of the earthquake in Haiti: “People say that Port-au-Prince was destroyed in 53 seconds. I say it was destroyed over the course of 53 years. There no such thing as a natural disaster.”

Like the other workshops, the UNESCO workshop is conducted in French. At the end of the workshop there is a discussion, and she takes questions in French. One question is posed in Kreyòl, but immediately another youth calls out, “Hey! Why can’t you ask her in French!?” So, the youth re-framed the question in French. The UNESCO expert answered in French, but later reflected on the situation:

It was a bit tense. I felt like I was caught in the middle. I recognized that I was the only one in the room that might not understand the Kreyòl,
and that the question was in French only to accommodate me. I actually felt that I might have been able to understand it in Kreyòl. In fact I would have been happy to take it in Kreyòl and ask for help if I needed it. But I didn’t have a chance to respond. It was assumed that I would want it French. The response could have even been a general statement about this being a forum for French, not Kreyòl.

This tension between French and Kreyòl played out subtly during the implementation of this program. This was one instance in which it rose to the fore and implicitly it suggests the degree to which youth were able to access the discussions and knowledge occurring during the training.

Advocacy.

The only session at the Debates that was facilitated in Kreyòl happened on the Monday morning. It was a presentation by the Haitian Rights and Democracy officer and held in the meeting hall. The presentation was entitled “Awareness and Advocacy” and the focus is on the latter. The presenter begins by giving an overview of his organization. “Rights and Democracy prioritizes human rights, and society’s rights. It focuses on the participation of citizens in their communities and their societies. We encourage harmony between state and civil society, but there are often conflicts between the state and civil society. This conflict can be eased through advocacy.”

It is the third day of the camp and by this time many of the youth have settled in, gotten to know each other, and are comfortable with speaking aloud. This workshop topic resonates heavily with many youth, given Haiti’s distant and recent history of taking up political affairs through violent protest. Twenty minutes into the presentation the discussion is quite heavy. Mario, one of the mentors, makes a strong point and the
other youth are in agreement. “Voila!” says Esther. Because of the noise, it is hard now for anyone to speak. But the Department Official stands up to make a point, and the room gets silent. Esther speaks and forcefully asks a question. The Rights and Democracy officer responds and gives an example, drawing on former president Aristide. More questions ensue: A girl from near the front, a question from the back.

The Rights and Democracy officer can see that this is a sensitive topic. “All I am saying is that democracy is fragile in Haiti,” he offers. He clarifies the role of Rights and Democracy in Haiti: “Rights and Democracy is not an advocacy organization. It is an organization that supports advocacy organizations in Haiti. KONAP\textsuperscript{21}, for example.”

The discussion diverges to the role of advocacy in the Arab Spring. The discussion about the revolution in North Africa continues, and whether it was ultimately a product of social media. “Facebook grows by 80 to 90\% every year,” says a boy at the back of the hall. “What is your source on that!?” retorts Esther, without irony. The debate persists, and order in the room declines. Finally, the Department Official stands up and says three times, over the noise, “S’il vous plait! We must have discipline! We are in the middle of a training session. Please avoid the great theoretical debates!”

Just before 11:00 a.m. the workshop winds down. The focus of the discussion shifts towards the heart of the controversy: Where is the line between revolt and advocacy? The Rights and Democracy officer explains that issues in Haiti are often

\footnote{KONAP (Kòdinasyon Nasyonal k ap Pledè Kòz Fanm yo) is a gender-focus umbrella organization in Haiti, meaning the \textit{National Coordination of Women's Organizations}.}
addressed through revolt, not advocacy. Youth in particular tend to go to the streets to
cause a disturbance, rather than sitting down to peacefully debate. “But advocacy,” one
of the youth argues, “happens in official institutions. And we can’t access these
institutions.” A rise in volume in the room indicates support. The Rights and Democracy
officer waits patiently for silence at the front of the hall, then, to close the workshop, re-
iterates his point.

The Debate Rounds
On Sunday Morning, day three, the debate rounds began. The logistics are
formidable with all of the different activities and people involved. The breadth of
participants is evident through the post-tournament report posted on the Vague du Futur
blog:

The tournament was the central activity of the camp. It pitted 14 teams
from 13 clubs in the network, divided into 4 groups. To replace the
team that couldn’t make it from Jacmel, Club Cap-Haïtien was invited
by the coordinator to bring two teams.

Nine judges were brought in to officiate the matches of the tournament
to avoid a judge/facilitator having to referee his own team. Three
commissioners, selected by the tournament coordinator among the
facilitators, officiated the distribution of the evaluations and discussion
papers to the jury and debaters, the collection of ballot judges, the
calculation points, and the announcements of the results.

Three debates proceed at once in three separate locations, for a total of six teams.
It is a cool, sunny morning and two tables have been set up in the outdoor pavilion. At
9:00 a.m. the rounds begin with a call to order: “Commence!” Their topic for debate was
announced prior to the retreat: “Books, as we know them, will become obsolete.” Again,
another topic that, in the abstract, provided a theoretical basis for debate. But, at the same time, this topic addresses and engages directly in ideas about Haiti’s reconstruction.

**Opening arguments.**

The first debater, a young man wearing a CAP2 toque, gets ups and begins to make the *pro* case, speaking in favour of electronic books. He makes numerous points, such as: “The internet is much more pleasant that traditional books; e-books are more accessible (“they are cheaper”, “you don’t have to walk as far to get them”, etc.); they are more efficient; the academic community is moving toward e-books so it is time for us to modernize. He continues briefly, presents his conclusion, and then states that he is “ready for the counter-argument.” The room is silent for about two minutes while the judges continue to take their notes and then finally they invite the opposition to present their case.

The *con* team takes about three minutes to make their argument, which is followed by an open-fire round that sees two teenaged boys standing side by side, one making points, the other responding, in a quick, heated succession: “There aren’t enough books on-line for us to read!” “Do you need *all* the books to be available on-line!?” is the retort. “Well, there are thousands, but that’s not important,” and so on. The program coordinator is milling around the hall, taking photos of the youth participating in the debates to later use in FOKAL promotions. He moves in close to take a photo of the debate team at their seats and bumps back to back against one of the youth debater. Unruffled, the youth refute each point made by the opposition, one at a time. For example, on the point of accessibility of e-books: “They’re really not that accessible at all. You have to go find somewhere that has Internet. You have to find the website,
download the book, etc.” Finally the first open-fire round is over. There is a long pause as both teams write furiously. The room is silent.

**One-on-one counter debate.**

The next phase is the one-on-one counter debate. A youth from the *pro* team asks questions somewhat aggressively. “How many paper books did you consult before coming here!? How many libraries are there in your area!? How many trees needed to be killed so you could read those books?” The youth frequently talk over and interrupt each other. The debate is heated, but it appears not to bother them.

The *con* team is back up again. Melody counters forcefully. “The internet is accessible!? It’s exactly the opposite! And to modernize? There are many countries that are not adapted to these kinds of methods yet. The book remains irreplaceable. We cannot be a champion of the future if we don’t know how to read!” She finishes her argument just as her allotted five minutes expire.

Then the final open fire round begins. “How many paper books were produced in 2010?” the first debater shoots out. “Restate the question,” his opponent fires back. The first debater turns to the judges to indicate that his question was adequately clear. They agree. His opponent says that she could not say how many there were, so he proceeds to inform her of the exact number, including the number of iBooks produced in that same year. They continue back and forth until it is time for their concluding arguments. A representative for the *pro* team summarizes their points supporting the e-book, and then makes a final appeal to the judges: “I am not saying that we have won this debate; that is for you to see the truth. And so, I leave it to you to make the *right* choice.” He returns to his seat and sits down with the others. They all high five each other. Their team is visibly
at ease. Over the next two minutes, the con team furiously prepares their concluding statements and finally send a representative to make the concluding remarks.

After the debate, the judges confer. The teams relax and chat with each other, and the other youth get up to move around. After about ten minutes, the judges give their responses in great detail. The first judge goes through each argument, enumerating each point, for each section of the round. “Argument #1 was good because…” “You said not all countries can access the internet? Which countries?” “You should have put more emphasis on…” “Nobody in the debate even mentioned…” Each of the three judges spends about five minutes with their feedback, and each selected a winner. The winning team need the support of at least two of the three judges. By 10:20 a.m. this round of debates wraps up and there is a break. All the youth stand up to hang out with each other: A boy runs over and tackles another; girls come over to greet boys with kisses and vice versa.

Language of debates.

Just as language was an issue in the workshop presentations, it was clear in the debate that fluency in French is also a factor in the success of the debating teams. During the rounds of debate, Makenley spoke about the topic of language, offering his opinion on which language the debates should be conducted:

In Kreyòl. No doubt. Yes, it is now in French. But not all the youth in the tournament have perfectly mastered the language. You can see that even when they speak French they have obvious difficulties. I think if this is the case then they really should be focusing more on the logic of their words than on their language. The problem is that many young people have an irrefutable logic, but they have problems expressing themselves. So I think if you really wanted a tournament where you
could, say, capture the all the potential of all of the youth, it would be ideal to do so in Kreyòl. But the problem with Kreyòl is that it does not have all the technical terms available in French, frankly.

This issue of the centrality of French as the language of the program and how it presents itself as a barrier to the many Haitian youth who are much less fluent in French compared to Kreyòl was not lost on the program leaders. One evening meeting of Debate Competitions was dominated by a heated exchange addressing the fact that numerous youth debaters were restricted in their performance due to their lack of command of French. I later spoke about this issue with the program coordinator, who recognized this challenge, and presented the program policy on the issue.

Yes, they must speak French. But we don’t prevent someone who does not speak French from joining the program. Except that when we have a debate, we have the debate exclusively in French. Many youth ask why it is in French. It doesn’t prevent them from debating in Kreyòl, but the resources for the debate are in French. All the guides, training, etc. are in French. The library materials: French. Internet: French. So, we have it in French.

But there’s nothing stopping them from debating in Kreyòl. If they have something that can be better said in Kreyòl, they can say it in Kreyòl. It’s perfectly acceptable.

But remember, at school they learn in French. Reading and writing is in French. Kreyòl is not a written language—it would take them longer to read Kreyòl.

Asked whether a debate competition conducted in Kreyòl would have changed the results of the tournament, the coordinator replied, “I don’t know. I don’t think so. I
would say no. It’s about convincing. To convince, you have to be able to say the words as you’d like.”

**The Final Round**
The Debate Competitions wrap up on the Monday evening with the finals. The events leading up to the finals were described on the Vague du Futur blog in this way:

The team of Cote-Plage was undefeated (they won their five matches played), against very tough competitors. They won the final against a very talented Gros Morne team. The team of Cote-Plage won the trophy as the 2012 national debate champion.

Awards were given to the two debate team finalists, consisting mainly of books, generously donated by FOKAL, others purchased by the coordinator. A special bonus was awarded to the best debater of the tournament.

Makenley went on to be part of the team that won the contest, also winning the title of *Best Debater* based on the points he earned for his individual performances throughout the competitions. He and all the other youth celebrated at a wrap-up dance party that went late into the evening.

**Program Closure**
The next morning everyone is tired but satisfied; they have all packed their bags, eaten breakfast, and gathered in the meeting hall for the program closure. The coordinator greets the group for thank yous and farewells. He thanks everyone for coming, particularly those who came from afar: “Cap[-Haïtien]. Jeremie.” He congratulated the winning teams. The coordinator then goes on to talk about the importance of this program. “It’s important work. And it is work. It is important to share this with others. Not for FOKAL, but for the youth. They are in need of us. It is
important to report [this to others]”. He pauses, and there is silence as the youth are listening attentively. He then continues. “We also ate well!” There is immediate and loud applause. He went on to thank others. “Thanks to the mentors. Thank you to the commissioner for doing all the calculations. Thanks to the judges. Thanks to the youth: Its really tiring!”

**Analysis of Debate’s Social Construction of Participation**

The unfolding of Debates illuminated the nature of youth participation and how youth learned to participate. To analyze these social constructions I return to the questions of who participates, in what, and why.

**Who participated?**

Although Debates frames itself as a program that is open to all Haitians, this investigation showed that certain pre-conditions were necessary for youth to participate. For example, all of the youth attended school somewhere in the country, and related, all of these youth were adequately proficient in French to sufficiently participate in the minimum requirements to debate. As we saw in Chapter Five, the gross enrolment rate for all grades combined is only 46%, and the pass rate of grade nine only 57%. It could be assumed that a much smaller proportion of these youth have a club at their school, have adequate confidence with French, and have other necessary capital to participate in debating.

That said, the formal access the program was decided at the local level through a selection process based on the individual achievements of youth. Étienne described how he was selected in his hometown: “I lost the first game, but the other two I won. I managed to grab the attention of the group leaders first, then the judges. Even my
competitors congratulated me. Everyone told me I did a good presentation.” From a good achievement, the best are selected to present at the national championships. Makenley illustrated his experience: “All students of the school were involved. The best marks are selected to form a team. We have competitions, give away prizes, just to encourage young people to engage in debate.” This is consistent for the world championships. Even though Makenley knows he did well locally, he will need to achieve selection to access his participation at the upcoming world championships.

There is another world championship in Mexico in 2012. I hope to participate, but as it is a selection process that is pretty difficult, I do not know if I’ll be able to go. But I really hope so, because I really enjoyed the last experience I would really like to go again.

Even though over 60% of those who were able to access Debates were boys, once in the competition it appeared that both sexes participated equally in both the training sessions and the debate rounds. However, the teams that were successful had a higher proportion of boys. These teams were also from the urban areas of Port-au-Prince, an issue that was pointed out in this chapter by team members from the club in Cap-Haïtien.

**In What?**

The youth participated largely in two types of activities. Training activities comprised the first part of Debates and involved a range of topics from debating techniques (improvisation, critical thinking) to debate outcomes (advocacy, democracy building) to earthquake-related issues (disaster and risk management). The role of the youth during the training was largely as recipient of pre-determined curriculum, but they generally partook actively in the large group discussions.
The second series of activities were the debates themselves in which the youth actively prepare and deliberated upon some relevant topics. However, while the structure and content of the argument was solely up to the youth, the topic of the debate was pre-allocated. In that sense the youth were “invited to participate” in a debate on an issue that was chosen, framed, and assigned to the youth.

*Why? (The Youth Perspective)*

For youth in Debate Competitions, the central reason for their participation that they expressed was to increase their knowledge. For some, the central point was a love of learning. I spoke with Anaise shortly after her team was eliminated from the competitions. After she lamented her teams’ early elimination, she expressed her rationale for participating in Debates:

I must say that I love to debate because I learned a lot during this tournament. And they always say in the debate there are no losers. It’s that everybody learns. We have new experiences, even if one is very cautious one is a great debater. But there are some things you lack and so in every tournament it’s time to learn all these notions and to become better. So I must say I learned many things. There were workshops on rights and democracy, advocacy, all of these things. I learned many things.

For the youth, the value of learning, the thrill of the competition, and the enjoyment of the social experience were all major reasons for their participation.

*Why? (The Organizational Perspective)*

From the organizational perspective, the youth’s participation was rationalized at a much broader level. Many of the practitioners focused on the societal benefits of a culture of citizens with skills in debating. The Youth and Sport official, for example,
suggested that learning to debate could avert a world war. Others focused on the ability of debate to create a tolerant, rational and democratic society. The coordinator assessed the outcomes of the program in this way:

If we were to evaluate the immediate benefits, that’s impossible. We don’t see it right away. What we hope is about communication. Respect of differences. That they will be more responsible. To their country, community, and to each other.

In sum, these perspectives all appear to engender a social orientation to participation. Even in light of the reach of the international partnerships for Debates, there were few, if any, instances where participation appeared to be framed as a market-oriented endeavour. However, there were striking differences between perspectives coming from youth and those from the organizational levels. Those from youth described participation in individual terms with personal gains, whereas those higher up the aid chain focused on the societal benefits of participation. These findings will be elaborated upon in Chapters Nine and Ten.
Chapter Eight:
Case Study #3: Rights through Radio

Rights through Radio was developed out of a concept paper written by the fundraising, monitoring and, evaluation consultant (or the “FME Consultant”) for Panos Caribbean not long after the earthquake. Although the proposal was specifically intended for the sizeable pool of international relief funding, Radio was similar to previous programs executed by Panos in Haiti. The consultant drew on this institutional knowledge in the proposal that he drafted from Ontario, Canada.22

Program Cycle of Radio

A central objective for this program was to include the voices of youth in the reconstruction plans in Haiti. As a UNICEF report on the program recounted:

At a time when Haitians are working hard to recover from severe shocks to their country and build a better future, empowering youth to speak up, tell their own stories and be heard is one of the ways UNICEF is working to ensure that every Haitian young person’s rights are upheld and protected. Building the resilience and skills of Haitian young people to promote and defend their own rights is essential. (UNICEF-supported radio training)

Having recently celebrated its 25th year of operations, Panos Caribbean had implemented many programs through partnerships with UNICEF in Haiti. The Regional

---

22 I first met the consultant at a 2010 York University Disaster and Emergency Management seminar organized to debrief the international response to the Haitian earthquake and have stayed in contact since, as by coincidence, we both live in the same city in Ontario.
Director speaks favourably about the strength of the relationship that they developed over many years. “UNICEF, for example, I like working with them. We are in a better partner relationship if everyone contributes something. This time they gave us a facilitator—that’s good too.” Renewing their partnership with UNICEF for Radio in the wake of the earthquake had many advantages, specifically in terms of building on their existing foundation to address new, reconstruction-related issues relating to human rights, citizenship, and youth participation: these being priorities for both agencies.

**Program Inception**

The program proposal was structured to include components of instruction on human rights; technical training on radio equipment; time to generate ideas for broadcasting topics; a visit to an IDP camp; interviews with human rights experts; time to finalize script writing and editing; and a period to record and produce the scripts for the broadcasts. Evidently, the intended curriculum for this five-day program would require a focused and on-track delivery.

The partnership between UNICEF and Panos Caribbean on Rights through Radio initially envisioned a program scale twice the size of what was ultimately executed. The initial budget was projected at $27,775, but the final figures “came in quite lower than that”, as noted by the Regional Director. Originally intended as a ten-day initiative, the actual program began on a Monday morning, November 7, 2011 and the broadcasts were finalized on Saturday afternoon, November 12. On Sunday, November 20—the 22nd anniversary of the United Nations Convention of the Rights of the Child (CRC); and the 52nd anniversary of the Declaration of the Rights of the Child—the broadcasts were aired in Kreyòl on five radio stations across Haiti.
Importance of Radio and Youth

The choice of radio as the medium for the program was not haphazard. Radios are ubiquitous in Haiti, particularly in rural areas, but also in the urban homes, shops, and vehicles in Port-au-Prince and throughout the country. In most towns there are dozens of radio stations that often focus on religious, political, or local broadcasting. Some are in French, but most are in Kreyòl, or even more so Freyòl, a common Haitian dialect that meanders between French and Kreyòl. These stations also play the popular music of Haiti: styles of compass, rara, reggae, and hip-hop. The FME Consultant describes the universality of radio in Haiti:

Haiti has a very oral culture. … There’s a lot of talking and if you take the media landscape for instance, in Haiti there are over 400 radio stations. So there’s a lot of talking. And that’s the channel that we are using to convey the message. When we do the training with the youth to give them voice—to allow them to share their perspectives on the subject that they are going to talk about—we train them, we provide them training on how to use the media, how to use the radio, how to do an interview, because these are the channels that they are going to use. Because a lot of the people in Haiti listen to the media and the radio stations.

As the FME Consultant notes, a key imperative for Rights through Radio—as with all Panos programs—was the centrality of youth voice on issues that are of relevance to them. As such, a crucial feature for the program was that the final radio broadcasts would authentically represent the perspectives of the youth. The Regional Director explains: “Its critical that its in their voice. Exactly in their voice.” Further, it is not haphazard that the program’s focus is children’s rights and the broadcasts were produced by youth who suffer from rights infringements. “Our approach,” continued the
director, “—the reason they tackle the issues that they do—is that we think it’s better if the issue is dealt with by someone who is affected by it herself.”

Program Partners and Participants

The main facilitator of Radio was a freelance reporter contracted by UNICEF who came in from New York City for the week. The facilitator had worked on numerous former human rights assignments both across the U.S. and in fragile and developing nations. But as she described to a colleague at one point during the week, “I normally work as a reporter, doing my own pieces. I do reports. Right now, this week, I’m working for UNICEF. Usually I do my own reports, photos, and some television.” A young Haitian producer who is regularly contracted by Panos for programs like these supported the facilitator. For the first part of the week he was the sole producer of the youth projects, but as the deadline for the broadcasts approached, the producer solicited some help. A friend of his who also had done previous work for Panos volunteered his time as a production assistant.

Programmers.

Two other professionals from UNICEF also joined the group later in the week—a videographer who had been contracted to take photographs and produce a short publicity documentary and a representative from UNICEF Canada who had just arrived in Port-au-Prince for a medium-term contract. The coordination of all of these staff, as well as any support they required, fell mostly to the director who made herself available throughout
the week. All of the Panos practitioners were Haitians living in Haiti, whereas all of the UNICEF practitioners lived in North America and were in Haiti on contract with UNICEF.

The final institutional partner integral to the program was IDEJEN, a USAID-funded secondary school equivalent that trains youth for employment in local trades. IDEJEN is a Haitian-formed and -led organization named from a Kreyòl acronym translating to the Haitian Out-of-School Youth Livelihood Initiative. There are IDEJEN vocational schools in 44 communities, with a reach of over 22,000 youth across Haiti. One of its most recent schools was constructed shortly after the earthquake in Camp Corail, the largest of Haiti’s temporary camps. Panos approached the principal at an IDEJEN school from the Corail temporary camp to select ten youth for Rights through Radio. Both the Regional Director at Panos and the IDEJEN Chief of Party had similar justifications for the local selection of youth:

The main thing is that we work with partners. I don’t get involved in the selection of youth. … We have criteria though: Their needs, their age. For example, they should be ‘youth’. We want a 14 year old, not a 10 year old. They need a certain education level for the type of program that we are running. So we give that criteria to the partner and they choose. (Regional Director)

In line with the program proposal, Panos selected ten youth. All of these youth had been students at IDEJEN, and in recognition of their efforts there, the principal

23 One American-based UNICEF employee, the videographer, was of Haitian origin.
invited them to the Radio program. René, one of the ten youth selected by the IDEJEN principal said that “they chose me to come to the training to learn more, because I am truly intelligent at IDEJEN. That’s my opinion.” René was not in school at the time of the program because his father had lost his job and could no longer pay for René’s tuition. He was the only youth in this program—and of all the three case study programs—who was not attending school at the time of the program.

**Background of the youth.**

All ten youth lived in Corail. Camp Corail is an 18 000-acre IDP camp located approximately 15 kilometers from the downtown core of Port-au-Prince. Although seemingly a nominal distance for a daily commute to the program, in the context of an urban centre still littered with massive cement stones from earthquake rubble and an increasing number of vehicles of and for international residents, fifteen kilometers along the single, two-lane road leading to the city was a time-consuming investment. The precise route between Corail and the Panos office in Frères followed the only artery into town, heavily populated by international NGO offices. With rush hour traffic inching forward often at only meters per minute, the one-way trip took between one and two hours. As a result, the focus on Corail for international programs was constrained by these transport realities, a detriment for all citizens in this location. This detail was not lost on the director who wanted to ensure that the youth from this large and isolated camp were not further excluded. “This group comes from Corail. It is far! I though it was too far. But then I thought, ‘We can’t penalize them because they live so far, in the camp.’ So, we found a solution. We used the funding for a vehicle to bring them to Panos each day.”
Corail was created as an emergency site, a desperate alternative to ease the pressure off the Port-au-Prince camps after the earthquake. It was built on government-issued land on a dry, dusty plain at the foothills of the interior mountains. Corail is subject to most of the issues for IDP camps described in Chapter Three; only at the time of the Radio program, for example, residents of Corail were just beginning to transfer from their ‘temporary’ tent residents to ‘permanent’ plywood shelters.

The population of Corail hovers around 60,000 residents. It is the largest camp in the country, today making it one of Haiti’s ten largest cities. The Regional Director describes it as “enormous”, adding that “there are problems there: security, abuse, violence.” Julie Schindall of Oxfam America describes Corail as “a ton of people living in a flux state, without safe shelter, who don’t know what the future holds. It’s post-earthquake Haiti in a nutshell” (2011, p. 60).

Early on Monday, November 7, 2011, nine youth\textsuperscript{24} boarded a chartered tap tap\textsuperscript{25} to travel the Panos office. They are all put together well, with dress shoes and nice shirts: The boys are in flannel pants, the girls in dresses, with sparkling accessories of hair clips, bracelets, and earrings. Their comportments defy the stereotype of residents of refugee camps, but as the Regional Director illuminates: “In Haiti, people take care of

\textsuperscript{24}One youth selected to participate did not show up when the program began.

\textsuperscript{25}Tap taps comprise the bulk of the urban transport system in Port-au-Prince and across Haiti. The term is coined for the taping gesture one needs to make when requesting a stop. These mini-vans, small buses, and pick-up trucks are privately owned and compete for business on the city streets. While these transport systems are common across the Caribbean and other centres in the Global South, a distinct feature in Haiti are their flamboyant designs of colourful exteriors and accessories.
themselves. ‘I’m poor, but I can take good care of myself.’ It’s about dignity. Haitians are famous for that. She could be dying of hunger, but she dresses like a princess.”

When the youth arrive at the office in Frères, the Regional Director, facilitator, and producer greet them as they enter the office. They make themselves comfortable in the main room in the tiny Panos office, bantering back and forth in Kreyòl.

**Program Orientation**

After brief introductions, the group gets right to work. Each youth is given a notebook, pen, headphones, and a digital audio recorder. The facilitator, standing in front of the group, synopsises the main focus of the program, including the background to universal human rights, radio equipment usage, and the basic skills of journalism. Next to her stands the producer, ready to assist. The facilitator speaks in English, and the producer translates in Kreyòl for the youth, often contextualizing and embellishing for effect. “Your job as a journalist,” the facilitator begins, “is to draw out the information.” René asks a question about the precise name of each item of equipment, and a discussion ensues amongst the group about what exactly the digital audio recorders are called in Kreyòl.

The overview to the program continues into the afternoon, after the group has broken for lunch. Because of the time needed for explanations, discussion and translation, the program is already considerably behind schedule. The facilitator and the producer discuss this situation amongst themselves at the head of the room, speaking in English. Frustrated with the pace of the lesson and the youths’ limited attention spans, the facilitator tells the producer, “I just want to be able to go over what to do, and what they need to do.”
“If you want,” suggests the producer, “I could just tell them?” The facilitator agrees.

**Interview techniques.**

The producer continues the lesson himself, running through it fluidly from his experiences with previous Panos’ programs. He goes over different interviewing techniques, role-playing best- and worst-practices to the amusement of all the youth. The producer is now fully leading the lesson, but the facilitator is right along side, engaged, and guiding the producer through the curriculum from the prescribed program schedule. The facilitator provides the group some examples of good prompting questions in an interview. The producer translates: “What do you think we should do with garbage in Port-au-Prince?”; “Do you feel safe as a young woman in your community?” “What are your concerns for you and other girls your age regarding sexual violence?” ”Remember,” reminds the facilitator, “When you interview others you need to be conversational.” Holding up the audio recorder, the facilitator asks the group, “What is the first thing you record?” After a brief silence, René responds, “Uh, you say ‘Hi’?”

**Equipment training.**

It is now late in the afternoon on the first day, but there is still much to cover. The facilitator wants to the youth to use their time practicing what they have learned. The producer demonstrates how to use the microphone, and then divides the group into pairs so they can rehearse interviewing each other. The six girls pair up with each other at the main table, while the three boys sit at a separate table in the back, a little removed from the others and playing with the equipment. Because of the late hour, the facilitator
conveys the pressure for productivity. “You won’t have time tomorrow to practice—today only!” However, this practice period is delayed because of more directions, technical explanations, and questions about the radio equipment. The producer goes over this information in more detail, and the youth are interested and engaged.

**Topic selection.**

The Radio youth enjoy this time to practice with each other, and afterwards they begin to listen to their recorded interviews. The first day has been long, and everyone is becoming a bit restless. Although they should all have their topics chosen by now, the programmers realize that some youth (René for example) have not yet chosen a topic. The facilitator and the producer sit with him to help him brainstorm a topic: “You could focus on high school, like what kids do after they’re done school.” The facilitator turns to the producer to ensure that he understands that the topic must be up to René: “It should be something that he’s interested in. That’s most important,” she reminds him. René then suggests an idea. “Sans agen pu ekol pu ti-moun petits”, he proposes to the producer: “The lack of money for school fees for young children.”

It is now 5:00 p.m. and the tap tap is waiting outside of the youth. Although punctuality is hard to ensure with the conditions of the program, there is a general expectation to respect the driver’s schedule. The youth pack up and climb aboard the tap tap for the evening commute. After they leave the facilitator and the producer sit down and follow-up on René’s topic. “Because René is not in school, he could do a personal story,” the facilitator proposes. “He could focus on child rights, education.” The programmers review the topics of the other youth from the sign-up sheet collected by the
producer: Sexual violence in the camps, garbage and litter, access to medications and vaccinations, and financial barriers to education.

Interviews at the IDP Camp

The plan for the second day of the program was to conduct interviews with other youth in Place Boyer, another of Haiti’s IDP camps, but one that is much closer to the Panos office. Place Boyer is a small park in the centre of nearby Petionville that instantaneously became a camp community after the earthquake.

Upon our arrival at Place Boyer the youth disperse in all directions through the camp, seeking out other youth to ask questions about their experiences with various human rights topics they chose. The Radio youth are each furnished with radio equipment and a list of questions they assembled the previous day. Predictably, camp residents are curious about our descent upon their community, especially as we are outfitted with media equipment, an sight that camp dwellers had become used to, as one camp resident later told me. In contrast to my presence—I was the only visible non-Haitian in the IDP camp on that day and received several calls of “blanc”26 and occasional harsh words for my entry to the camp—the youth were largely greeted quite favourably. Overall they were very successful in finding willing candidates to interview regarding their living situations; the boys gravitated to other boys and likewise the girls. Their conversations focused on the topics chosen by the Radio youth and garnered

26 In Haiti, a blanc is generally used as a pejorative for not just white people, but foreigners in general, construing the link between Haiti’s conditions and foreign involvement.
interesting responses from their counterparts in Place Boyer. For example, the following is a sample of clips that were used by the Radio youth in their final radio broadcasts:

In my community there are very few prescription drugs at the local health centre. There are children and adults that are sick that have almost died because they haven’t been able to get the proper medications. These people needed them, but they haven’t been able to find them. (A young woman from Place Boyer in conversation with Tiya).

In my community, garbage is a major problem. It attracts mosquitoes and one of my neighbours was infected with malaria because of it. There’s so much trash that there is no place for kids to play. Sometimes it even stops traffic. People know that littering is not good for the environment and their health, but they have much bigger problems to prioritize. (A response by an orphaned girl in Place Boyer to Elisabeth).

If a kid doesn’t have someone to take care of him, the NGOs have to find a way to take over the care for these kids. Generally I think this problem concerns the government because it’s up to the authorities to take care of kids living without parents. (A young woman from Place Boyer in conversation with Claudette.)

After several hours that morning at Place Boyer, the youth regrouped at our predetermined meeting point at the centre of the park. Exchanging pleasantries with our new acquaintances, we re-embarked the cars and van that brought us here and returned to the Panos office. The audio-recordings that the youth captured at Place Boyer would form the basis of their broadcasts, and a good part of the following day would be spent selecting and transcribing the clips they would use from the interviewees.

**Script Writing**

From the moment of their arrival on day three, the youth work individually with their recordings to choose the best phrases to use in their broadcasts. The room is silent.
There are enough headphones and recorders for all the youth except one, so two girls share with each other. All the youth are listening attentively to their interviews from the previous day and all, except one boy, are taking notes. The youth continue this work for most of the morning. The facilitator is at the front on her phone trying to arrange visits with local experts on the youth’s topics. She finishes the last call and reports that the nearby school will not permit us come to interview them; we will need to find another college.

**Language issues.**

In the afternoon the facilitator begins working one-on-one with the youth to select their clips. By this point in the week, she is conversing in basic French with the youth as it is much more efficient than having another programmer involved to translate. She sits down with Elisabeth to work with her on her topic of garbage in the camps and asks Elisabeth to dictate her script to her. The producer has returned to the room and joins them. Elisabeth begins in French, “In my community, litter is a very big problem”. “Wait,” the producer interjects, “is she supposed to do it in French or Kreyòl!” “Kreyòl!” replies the facilitator. “But I have to translate it in French to understand it first!”

The producer goes to work with another youth, while the facilitator and Elisabeth diligently continue transcribing Elisabeth’s script. After a few minutes the Regional Director comes into the room seeking the two youth who are slated to interview the medical experts at the hospital. “They will need to get ready to go,” she says to the facilitator.
The facilitator, meanwhile, is more concerned about the problems she is having communicating with the youth. “I am having trouble because I don’t have a translator. Can you translate for me real quick?” “Okay,” responds the director. The facilitator conveys to the director that Elisabeth has told her that garbage is a problem, but did not explain why garbage is a specifically problem for her. The director tells Elisabeth in Kreyòl that she needs to explain to the facilitator why it is a problem for her. Elisabeth does so and after they are finished with that issue, the facilitator requests more translation time. “Would you be able to translate for me for fifteen minutes? The producer needs to be in the [production] booth at the back, and we have to get these scripts finished.”

The director agrees, and communicates with the Elisabeth in Kreyòl and French, then translates to the facilitator in English. “People in the government don’t have co-ordinated garbage collection,” she begins and then finishes translating for the facilitator.

After translating the script in English to the facilitator, the facilitator responds. “That is an excellent introduction. I just want to include her [Elisabeth] in this process. Can you just explain to her that you are going to paraphrase?”

The director continues to translate. “They know it is good for the environment, but they don’t care.”

The facilitator paraphrases as she types the script into her laptop, in English: “Littering is not good for the environment and their health, but that is not a priority for the government...”

The director recognizes the inaccuracy of her translation. “I am working with three languages—it is hard!”
The facilitator reflects on Elisabeth’s script, stating to the director, “There, this is great. You and I can make a great script, but I really want to involve her in the process. We really need another translator.”

The director goes back to Elisabeth to discuss her topic a little more, and probes some of the comments she has made. She asks Elisabeth lots of questions in Kreyòl.

The facilitator reflects further, “I need to meet one on one with people. But for the level of nuance and detail, it needs to be in Kreyòl. But I need a translator. There’s so much to be done and I feel like I’m wasting everybody’s time.” She looks up, beyond Elisabeth and the director, and sees that the other youth are getting restless. “Hey, how is it going everyone?” she prods the group, in French.

**Intersections between language, context and youth participation.**

It isn’t much later and the facilitator is sitting with the director and another youth, Guerda, at her laptop. They are listening to Guerda’s recording in which she interviews a youth at Place Boyer about the presence of cholera in the camps. The programmers are trying to identify the interesting segments from Guerda’s interviews to help her weave the script together. The facilitator is intrigued by a section that they come upon and looks to the director for clarification. “Do you know what she means by that?” she asks. The director poses the question to Guerda in Kreyòl, but the facilitator continues with her train of thought, pointing to Guerda’s script in front of her and noting, “Because she already says in the piece elsewhere, ‘I even have a sister that has cholera.’ She already has that.”

The director suggests, “If she has similar information, then we can add that.” The audio continues to play from the laptop in Kreyòl. The director translates as she hears it.
“I have friends as young as 12 years old (that have cholera).” The director explains the semantics of script to Guerda in French: “You have two sentences with the same information. We need two sentences with different information.”

Guerda replies to the director to show that she understands and tries to come up with something different.

The facilitator continues to consider Guerda’s script. “I mean, I could include it...”

The director continues to translate orally as she hears the responses of the interviewee in the audio clip. “These are cases of kids as young as five who are victims.”

The facilitator continues to listen, and on a new train of thought she asks the director, “Can you ask her if she mentioned why the levels rose after January 12. Was it because they were [living] in close quarters?”

The director translates, and Guerda replies in Kreyòl with a detailed explanation.

The director smiles when she hears Guerda’s explanation. “That’s it!” she exclaims, and then translates. “It was because of the coup27. It destabilized everybody, and everybody was on the street.”

“Now how would they say that in her words?” the facilitator asked. “What word would a kid use?”

“She just used it,” the director confirmed.

“Destabilization?” asked the facilitator.

27 Guerda is referring to the 2004 coup d’état of President Aristide, described in Chapter Three.
“No, she doesn’t use this word, destabilization,” says the director, “but she does say coup.”

Guerda, intrigued with this exchange, follows the conversation as she sits between the two practitioners. The director offers some further details about the present conditions in the IDP camps, just so the facilitator more fully understands the context. “People take advantage of kids who are living in the camps when their parents are not here for the moment.”

“When their parents are gone?” affirms the facilitator.

“Yes, and then they can’t explain who did that to them,” finishes the director.

“Did she say...” begins the facilitator and then decides to ask Guerda the question directly herself in French. “So, did she [Guerda’s interviewee] say she has this problem?” The facilitator doesn’t wait for a reply and suggests to the director, “For example she could say, ‘I have friends who are as young as 12 who have experienced sexual violence. I spoke with Mylène28 who went through the same thing.’”

The director clarifies with the facilitator: “Is it okay if I make these sentences for her?”

The facilitator continues her instructions, but at the same time responds to the director. “But I want her voice. Something that she would be comfortable saying.”

28 A pseudonym.
The challenges and possibilities of youth voice.

The facilitator works with one more youth, and then it is time for everyone to go home. The afternoon has sped by and it is now the end of the afternoon. The facilitator and the producer reflect on the work of the day, in particular, the interview that Guerda conducted with the medical expert later that afternoon. The facilitator felt that Guerda received some good responses from the expert, but that there might be a challenge in conveying them in her script. “We essentially need her to tell us this in her own voice,” she explains.

The producer responds to this concern by suggesting, “You could just ask her, ‘What did he tell you about the impact of catastrophes in his own country?’ And she’ll tell you.” He reads over her script. “This is her voice?”

“Everything is her voice,” replies the facilitator. “Except the interviews.”

The producer repeats his solution. “Well, you just need to ask her.”

The facilitator repeats her concern: “I don’t want to tell her what to say. I want it to be in her voice. I try not to change their words.”

The facilitator and the producer continue to look over the scripts of the youth. They get to René’s script, and the facilitator asks for the producer’s advice. “You think all of these quotes are great?”

“Well, we could use any one,” he replies.

“Well, René’s going to have to decide,” re-iterates the facilitator.

The producer reads over a segment of René’s script in English, a part where René has asked another youth in Place Boyer about why he likes school. The youth’s response is read aloud, “Because of school I will be something tomorrow. When I see people who
don’t go to school I feel bad for them because they won’t support themselves tomorrow. They will get in trouble.”

“That’s an amazing quote!” says the facilitator. “That is really intense. Especially for René to hear, because he doesn’t go to school.”

Photos of youth.

Throughout the week there are so many practitioners who come and go from the office that the youth never seem to be surprised or bothered that another adult is in the room and sitting in with them. On day four an official from UNICEF Canada has arrived for reasons that are not initially clear, but then later it is revealed that her immersion in this program is geared to provide her with exposure to UNICEF’s programs in Haiti as she has recently arrived in Port-au-Prince for a medium-term contract. She introduces herself to the group in broken French. The UNICEF officer sits to the side, watching the facilitator and the producer lead the activities and the group work on their scripts. She expresses her discomfort at not being able to contribute in some way, and apologizes for not speaking French and having a more productive input to the program. The officer looks around for obvious ways she could assist, and periodically asks what she can do. At this point the youth are quite task-oriented and especially due to the language issues, it seems hard for anyone to find her a meaningful contribution. Having brought a camera with her, the officer decides to take some photos. She takes a few candid shots and then wants the youth to get in groups to pose for some photos.

She asks the facilitator in French, “It’s good if I take a photo?” Visibly annoyed, the facilitator responds in English. “It would be great for me if you could wait until the end of the day. They are extremely busy...” She tries to explain by re-stating her main
concern. “I am working without a translator”. Nevertheless, the UNICEF officer continues to walk around and take photos.

The youth continue to work on their scripts, some partnered with programmers, some individually. The facilitator finishes reviewing one of last youth’s scripts. The UNICEF officer asks the facilitator again about taking some pictures. “It’s for UNICEF Canada,” she appeals to her. “Okay, whatever you want,” the facilitator concedes. “I haven’t had a translator all day except for that script writing part...”

The youth get ready to leave for the day. Everyone is focused on collecting their belongings and getting out to the tap tap, so it is barely noticed that Elisabeth is writing on the flip chart paper at the front of the room. “I am Elisabeth Préval,” she scrawls in French. “I am proud to be a journalist.”

**Broadcast Production**

By the fifth day of the program everyone is acutely focused on finishing their scripts, and then recording the broadcasts with the help of the producer. The director has set aside her other responsibilities to directly assist the Radio program. As she explained to me later, “In our partnerships at Panos, everybody contributes when necessary.”

One important element for the broadcasts was for the youth to include some details about themselves. The facilitator wants the youth to direct their energies to this autobiographical portion of their scripts and explains to the assistant producer that she would like the youth to take a minute and just write down what they want to be when they grow up. The assistant producer relays this direction to the youth in Kreyòl. There is a lot of rustling and slowly the youth take out their paper and pens. A couple minutes go by, and it is clear that there is confusion about the task at hand. “This is not working”,
admits the facilitator. “It takes so long to explain one simple task!” By now there is a lot of activity in the room, and at least amongst the practitioners, a lot of tension. “We can’t let them go today until everything is recorded,” instructs the facilitator. The director comes into the room and eases the situation by explaining the situation to the youth in Kreyòl. The room is much quieter and there is some degree of order now after she speaks. All the youth are now working individually on their scripts. “I am trying to explain to them what you want,” empathizes the director.

**Youth literacy.**

The director walks through the room and helps the youth on an individual basis, clarifying and explaining as necessary. She reads a sentence from the scripts of one of the boys and then encourages him to write it in more detail. The facilitator is also circulating amongst the youth and stops to read over the notes of another one of the boys. She can see that his notes are very sparse. She looks up and says softly, “I think he’s illiterate.” She pauses for a moment and then continues. “I just figured it out, I think people are falling behind because they can’t write or read. It’s so sad,” she concludes. The facilitator returns to the front of the room, and the boy with the sparse script immediately begins to fill his notebook with more text.

**Finalizing the broadcasts.**

In the afternoon the group assembles in the production booth to listen to the first completed broadcast. This is a chance to give feedback to each other, but also to model a final product and gain some satisfaction for their hard work. The programmers and the youth sit and listen to Simone’s broadcast. “Listen for the level of detail,” encourages the
facilitator. “This is the piece that Simone produced. Simone you should be very proud!”

The director translates the facilitator’s comments at great length and with much enthusiasm. It is apparent that she is adding some of her own comments within the Kreyòl translation. Everyone continues to listen to the clip. By mistake, the facilitator bumps the computer and it cuts out in the middle, but it is a good place to end the broadcast and everyone claps. “Really good work!” says the director, and makes sure that everyone has a clear sense of what they should be doing. “Does everyone understand?” she confirms.

**Program Closure and Perceived Outcomes**

The productions spill over into Saturday morning, but by the end of the program, each youth has produced a script and read from it to create a two-minute broadcast. Each of the nine broadcasts was aired on November 20, 2011 on Haitian and satellite radio stations for a large number of domestic and international listeners.

The Regional Director affirms the rationale she sees for this program. “This radio training program, we have done hundreds like that. They all are like this. They tell kids that you can be anything you want. They let them know that they have rights too.” But the outcomes of the program run deeper than that, she explains. The broader goals are in shaping the consciousness of the next generation of Haitians. “Its an investment into mentality”, she explains. “Everyone in this society knows that they [NGOs in Haiti] can do as many projects as they want, but if the mindset doesn’t change, we don’t accomplish anything.” The importance of transforming the mentality of the youth, specifically by an on-the-ground practitioner, is a significant observation in the case, which translates into a major finding of this research that will be discussed in Chapter Ten.
Analysis of Radio’s Social Construction of Participation

Who participates?

It is clear that those youth who participated in this program had many commonalities. They were all displaced as a result of the earthquake, they all ended up in the same IDP camp (Corail), and they all found themselves going to the same school. These youth were from families of the poor majority in Haiti and were selected in a relatively balanced distribution of girls and boys (the tenth program participant who did not attend was a boy).

Program access.

As described above, the choice as to the specific youth who were chosen was left to the school principal, someone who had a close relationship with them. Elisabeth confirms that “it was the school principal that chose me”, presumably because of their likelihood to perform and benefit from the Radio program. This approach of downloading the selection of youth to a leader closer to the realities of the youth is not unique to Radio. It was common to the selection of youth in Farming with the principal of ECF, and in Debates with the club teams deciding at the composition of the youth attending the national championships at the local level. On one hand, this approach to selection and access of the youth to the programs is an approach that is highly sensitive to the participating communities, including the cultures and the contexts of them. However, there are also some potential contradictions within the aid chain, specifically in relation to the fact that the policy is absolved to other communities—including their own inequities and dynamics of power—at the bottom of the aid chain. Thus, while there might be a stated organizational intent to reach the most marginalized youth, one cannot
be sure that this goal would always be realized because of the processes are absolved from the organizations themselves. One of the clearest examples of this is that when these programs connect themselves in their respective communities, the selection of the youth is contingent on the youth having a connection with a social structure to begin with. In this case, all the youth needed to attend IDEJEN to be able to participate in Radio. If that process had transpired after René needed to withdraw from school, for example, then his participation in Radio would have been precluded.

**In what?**

In considering in what exactly the youth participated—where and how they had control over the program—there were some tensions between how the programmers wished to enable the youth and what they were actually able to relinquish. As all the programmers stated repeatedly, it was essential that the topics and the voices of the youth were authentically theirs. “They make the messages to contribute their point of view,” explained the producer about the youth. “It’s their right to contribute. They have the right to contribute, the right to expression.” However, the structure of the training, the length of the program, the location, the leaders, the curriculum and the pedagogy were put in place by the practitioners of Panos and UNICEF. This was justified by the FME Consultant, noting that “the youth, they are not the decision makers. … We want to organize the program for the youth.” And, while the topics themselves were the responsibility for the youth to chose, this case study revealed that there were often input, suggestions, and prodding by programmers on the types of topics to chose, the audio clips to select, and the manner in which to frame the broadcast. Considering the degree of explicit and hidden influences there are in the processes to youth expressing their own
voice, there are questions about the degree of the authenticity of the voices of some of the youth.

**Why? (The Youth Perspective)**

The reasons why the youth participated might also be framed as why they would *not* participate. The program was engaging, unique, and social. The youth enjoyed being with each other and having an opportunity to meet, learn from, and connect with other youth through their interviews. Joulie, for example noted that by learning to be a reporter, “I got to know how people live in the communities, in the areas with these problems, especially children.” Healthy and hearty meals were provided to the youth each day at lunch, transport was included, and there was an opportunity for youth to be introduced to the workings of several NGOs, their practitioners, and to learn skills that could benefit them in the future. Frantz noted that he “loved” learning how to be a reporter. “I have never had this training, to be a journalist and to report stories; learning how to present, to do an introduction and conclusion. I found it very good.”

**Why? (The Organizational Perspective)**

For practitioners, as youth voice is a central value of the implementing organization, it was important to ensure that participation always remained integral in the processes. For example, a compelling report on the outcomes of Radio embedded commentary from the program facilitator:

The exercise of doing the reporting, of choosing the subject, of putting your own voice on the radio, and saying in your own words what you think the problem is and also asking adults and folks in authority to answer the questions you have about why such problems exist in your community—that in itself can be empowering for youth.
However, the degree to which this is a central mandate seemed to cloud the normative intent of the program with the outcomes proclaimed by practitioners. The importance of ensuring voice and portraying participation in radio, for example, is so pre-eminent that it appeared as a foregone conclusion in observing the youth.

The rhetoric of participation, in the case of youth, disproportionately encourages displaying that participation happens, as opposed to encouraging deeper ways of participation. In other words, there appeared to be an emphasis on finding ways to show and say that youth are participating, to prove that youth are participating, and to convince (themselves and others) that youth are participating. Practitioners assure those on the outside that they are participating—via public relations, media, discourses, prioritizing the normative rather than the empirical. It is assured by taking the word and using it—bending it so that participation can be guaranteed by its meaning in the particular context.

So in this sense it is self-fulfilling because participation in a narrow sense is guaranteed at the output level of the program. But ‘participation’, of youth, in its broader sense, compared to the opportunities for youth participation, occurs much less often than it could.
Chapter Nine: Conceptualizations of Participation Along Aid Chain Levels in Each Program

This chapter examines how the sub-groups along the vertical aid chains of the three case study youth programs conceptualize citizen participation. Through interviews, document analysis, and observation, an overall meaning of participation has been distilled, followed by more nuanced explanations of how participation is conceptualized through perspectives of each sub-groups’ notions of who participates, in what, and why. These findings are presented in order of each program, and arranged by level, beginning with Level 1.

Thus, focusing on conceptualizations of participation, this chapter focuses on Research Question #3: How is participation conceptualized by the various actors at each of the four levels of the vertical aid chain within the three selected case study programs? It begins with the conceptualizations of the aid chain sub-groups from Farming, continues with those from Debates, and then presents those from Radio.

Case Study 1: Farming for Education

Level 1 Conceptualizations of Participation (Farming Youth Recipients):
Participation means having a secondary school degree

At Level 1, to be able to participate meant having a high school degree. Youth realized the value linked to formal education in Haiti; thus, the notion of participation was connected with the capital involved with completing secondary school. In terms of who participates, Level 1 perspectives produced several findings. First, all those who participated had access to land. This association was particularly important for the essence of the BRAC-ECF partnership in that land was necessary for youth to grow
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produce or keep livestock for the Farming program. Further, those who participated relied on family support. Recall from Chapter Six how many participants suggested that their family’s help was instrumental in their success in the program: “My brother helps to fetch water in the creek,” said Michel. “My family helps to fill the bags with soil to grow the saplings,” said Yannick.

As for what youth perceived they were participating in, the findings suggested that the youth largely saw themselves involved in a deal with school. For them, meaningful participation in Haitian society required access to respected institutions, envisioned here as school, but also referenced was the market. Farming youth described their participation in the program like a contract: they will work towards financing the school in exchange for direct benefits that they can incur. Numerous youth referred to this transactionary relationship:

On two days, Saturday and Sunday, I keep the eggs. If the chickens produce eggs on Saturday, they are for us; on Sunday they are for us. But other days, if they produce eggs, we bring them to school. (Michel)

What was implied is that participation will follow their fulfillment of the transaction, in this case, the farming activities and forwarding the produce to the school. Enmeshed in these activities is a hidden learning that societal participation is enabled through striking mutually beneficial deals.

Level 1 respondents largely conceptualized their motives for participation as income for school. This was apparent in both their language and their approach. For youth, motives for participation, the focus was on starting a business. In these cases the youth conveyed the phrases they were introduced to in the program, such as
“entrepreneurship” and “business planning”. They spoke about how their societal participation will manifest over the long run in financial terms and discussed how having a livelihood is necessary because a salary is required to pay for school, now and in the future. These youth felt that without Farming they wouldn’t be able to attend school. Their motives for participation were viewed largely as an economic exchange: They would receive income for which they are able to pay to go to school.

Finally, on a separate theme, the fluctuating weather in Haiti was the central contextual factor that youth described, their participation being contingent on the weather. In particular, Farming youth inferred that the geo-climatic features make Haiti a unique environment, factors that program planners did not always take into account. Commonly cited was the impact of the weather on the success of their crops and the effects of drought on their farming. “This month there was a shortage of water for the production,” explained Michel. “Because nobody had water, the trucks that bring water were sold out; sometimes we could get no water at all.” Similarly, Sophia explained, “We had to buy water. If it wasn’t for [the shortage of water], our production would have been much better this year.” In these cases—and in particular in relation to Haitian youth participating in local agricultural initiatives, and their set-up—it was clear to youth that the contextual factor of weather was of prime importance.

**Level 2 Conceptualizations of Participation (Farming Program Implementers):**

*Participation means establishing a livelihood*

At Level 2 in Farming to be able to participate meant to get a job in the community. Programmers expressed this in the context of a sustainable, community environment. As for who participates, the Level 2 perspectives did not distinguish a need
to target a particular group. Even “the weakest students” will be able to continue, noted the Technician when probed on who benefits most in this program.

At Level 2 in Farming, what youth participation in was conceptualized as enabling youth with vocational skills. Level 2 respondents rationalized that vocational skills are critical for youth because they will facilitate access to other important institutions in Haitian society. While this link is made generally between vocational skills and societal participation, in Fondwa it is more specific as having skills to plant and harvest for sustainable consumption within their families, and lifelong possibilities for exchange for other goods and services, including, most importantly in their current realities, school. The Technician’s comments on this factor of sustainability were that “even when the program finishes they will have had the training and therefore they can continue [farming].”

Training is a central component for youth participation at Level 2, and a clear connection is made between the training and why youth participated. The Education Officer described how this program is intended to benefit society: “As much as we have more youth trained in this country we can have more youth working.”

The Level 2 conceptualizations portray the transfer of invited spaces to claimed spaces, a theme that will be taken up in more depth in Chapter Ten. “Once they’ve finished the program they can keep the enterprise going at home,” described the Education Officer. She described how they could continue to generate income that they would be able to “use it to pay their fees at school, and keep going to school.”
Level 3 Conceptualizations of Participation (Farming Country Directors):
Participation means economic independence

The director level of the aid chain reported a type of societal participation for youth that is best described as economic independence. These perspectives were explained within the context of the fragile economic situation in Haiti conveyed in Chapter Three, and particularly in the context of the rural community in which the program was implemented. Directors viewed youth as citizens who would be able to participate in their society if they were able to develop business and entrepreneurial skills. The school principal reflected this conceptualization of participation when he described his vision for youth: “They learned how to can create a small company and not be dependent on others.” When examining what youth participating are in, Level 3 conceptualizes participation in sustainable farming and relevant, community employment.

The following perspective represented Level 3 conceptualizations on why youth participate: “The program ensures that the youth are motivated, so they give more importance to their lives and at school” (school principal). But at this level, little to no emphasis was placed on the specific identity of who participates. Perhaps, as a program within the context of a relatively small, rural community, the bounds of the economic and cultural realities of the community foster a paradigm that negates the implication of larger political and historical factors in relation to the ways that participation was envisioned. Equally, the assumptions underlying training for market participation in the context of this community might also limit the concern at this level to distinguish youth based on their identity—that equality in access to and benefit of the program would be maintained across the community. Likewise, the space of participation was seen as one
that highlights the agency of the youth: For example, while the director of the school acknowledged his power, he consciously sought to stimulate the youth towards success in the program: “I will say that I play a catalytic role in motivating students for the progress of the program and the school that the school has become a model or sample,” he responded when questioned about his precise role within the program. In line with their goal of wanting youth to ultimately become independent entrepreneurs, the director level of conceptualizations described their primary function in the program as providing impetuses, resources, and structures to enable success for the youth in the program.

According to Level 3 conceptualizations, youth participate so that they will ultimately be able to generate revenue and subsequently gain economic independence to ultimately develop a stable society.

**Level 4 Conceptualizations of Participation (Farming Funding and Policy Makers): Participation means financial literacy**

Level 4 conceptualizations described youth participation as fostering financial literacy. Participation is envisioned as youth having the degree of financial literacy necessary to make broader and strategic decisions to “develop” their community. Insofar as who was envisioned as participating, the main group described was youth who live outside the urban economic grid. *Rural youth* were the focus for Farming, but girls and poor youth were also priorities. As the Education Officer explained:

For BRAC, there are central tenants that made the identity of the participants central to the structuring of the program: both rural, and poor. BRAC is really focused on rural development. Digicel, that’s their priority—they want to build more schools in rural communities.
In what are youth participating? Level 4 conceptualizations described the importance of micro-enterprises and finance initiatives. Financial literacy was intended to enable youth to think more broadly, beyond a paradigm of dependency. This conceptualization of participation would enable youth to consider possibilities to make their communities sustainable. The Education Manager conveys the centrality of financial knowledge in a discussion on the program elements:

We also did a training with the kids on financial literacy. We had Making Sense International come in, they did different activities to learn about financial institutions and banks. At the same time, having kids understand how to save money, how to earn money, and realize that earning money is not just about work. Even when your uncle gives you money that a source of income.

As each youth learn to earn income, their communities will develop economically, the Education Manager infers. These perspectives are expressed within the context of spurring an economy after years of stalled progress, corruption, and dependence. Extending this thought on why youth participate, the Education Manager highlights the main contextual issues of the historical effect of domestic politics on the economy:

There are other conditions that really have caused the degradation of the economy here and they are political, historical and economic. We always have these political debates: “If Duvalier never became president, which direction Haiti would be going?” Then there was hope when Aristide became president, but under Aristide the economy exacerbated [sic], and the embargo just ripped the economy to pieces.
As shall be developed in the following chapters, mid-level perspectives across all three case studies discussed Haiti’s economic problems by highlighting the limitations of the contributions of the national government throughout Haiti’s history.

**Case Study 2: Debate Competitions**

**Level 1 Conceptualizations of Participation (Debate Youth Recipients):**

*Participation means to be able to persuade others*

In Debates at Level 1 to be able to participate meant being able to persuade others. Learning to participate was about gaining knowledge to convince and influence. These youth suggested that skills of persuasion would be useful in a variety of social and practical contexts, from community networks to government chambers. Claude, for example suggested that “these techniques of debate will help young people argue better when they are confronted with situations where debate is required for a concrete solution.” The sense of participation from youth in Debates was aligned with a long-term motive that society would profit from a citizenry with skills to critically engage in conflict in a peaceful manner. Makenley, for example, summed up his view of the program in this way:

> I do not believe that there is a better program [than Debates] to integrate youth to reflect on the Haitian society and the world, the major global problems and how we can resolve them, and what we should do and what we should not do to improve society. I do not think that there is a program that is more suitable than [Debates].

This conceptualization was held against a backdrop of Haiti’s history of colonization. When describing how participation unfolds in Haiti, several youth referred to the significance of the colonizing and eventual independence of Haiti. A key feature
was the impact of French colonization on culture in Haiti today, and specifically the way it affected the language in which people used to participate. Makenley spoke at length about the dynamics of language for youth participation, and it is clear how Debate youths’ awareness of colonial history was relevant for their current context of participation:

I learned French in school, of course. Haiti was a country colonized by the French. So, since the era of colonization there has been a bias by Haitians against speaking the language. It follows that we Haitians grow up and actually do not first speak French. So, we have to learn it at school to be able to master it.

This position on language distinguishes Debates from the other two programs, a comparative theme that will be highlighted in Chapter Ten. However, the major issue cited as a root of marginalization was geographic isolation, a theme that will be also taken up in more depth in Chapter Ten. In recognizing the limits of the benefits of the program, youth described their ideal of the program expanding to remote areas of Haiti. While the targeting of specific identities beyond geography was seen as unnecessary, the outreach to untouched regions of the country was seen as the way to reach the marginalized. Makenley, for example, noted the current limits in access to this program:

“Is Debates accessible to all Haitians?” Well, honestly, I cannot say “yes” because not all Haitians are integrated in debate clubs. You can see that this is a program that still has to expand. … Over time it will grow, maybe one day it will be much more popular and will be everywhere in the country.
Claude agreed with this goal but did not accentuate language to the degree that Mackenley did, affirming that gross differences amongst youth in Haiti would not prohibit participation:

The program should not stop at the 14 clubs that we have. I hope that the program evolves throughout the country—all over the entire country, so that our young are able to properly master topics and ultimately learn the proper ways and best techniques for debate.

As for what they would participate in, the youth described participating in formal, established institutions. The importance of having a structure to participate is a theme that is beginning to recur amongst the youths’ conceptualizations of the spaces for participation. This theme will be expounded upon in Chapter Ten as it is relevant in the consideration of participation for youth in a developing nation and in particular, in a fragile state.

**Level 2 Conceptualizations of Participation (Debate Program Implementers): Participation means sharing ideas peacefully**

At Level 2 of Debates, participation is conceptualized as sharing ideas freely. It is described as the ability to articulate and explain reasoned ideas, and to peacefully respond to those of others. A Level 2 respondent—a program judge—explains it in this way:

When I am in a conversation with a person I am not interested in them, but in their ideas. So that way I can become more tolerant. In this country, if you watch what happens on the streets, on the radio, debates often become an attack of one person on another. On the radio there is debate about a catchphrase, without explaining what the catchphrase means—the idea, with research and logic. So that’s what this program is about. Becoming more rationale, logical: Cartesian. You and I could have an opposing opinion, but we could still be brothers.
When Level 2 program implementers spoke about who participated they recognized the problem of geography, specifically in relation to the centralization of resources in the country. As the program judge noted, “in general, we live in a country that is very centralized. Many youth are obliged to come to Port-au-Prince. That makes it very difficult.” Beyond the recognition of geography, Level 2 perspectives echo the Level 1 inattention to other barriers of access to the program. No other concerns—race, poverty, language, gender or any other of the structural issues noted in Haiti—were articulated concerning the marginalization of youth participation.

The conceptualization of who initiated the spaces for participation at Level 2 are initially invited, with hopes that they would be claimed locally:

I can’t speak for other NGOs, but for this program there is an effort to be pro-active. That means we invite them, but we go to them as well. We go into the schools, to the directors, to explain the importance of this program. So, we contact the schools, we go there, we explain to the admin, we invite the youth, we offer support, and then the school takes over the program. … So, it is the hope that schools will integrate [debating] in their curriculum.

This meshing between spaces is a recurring theme in this thesis and will be particularly evident in the discussion on spaces for participation in Chapter Ten.

The elevation of sharing ideas to address personal differences is a backbone of how program implementers viewed youth participation. In the case of Debates, the forums in Haiti provide opportunities to youth to give and receive ideas in a structured environment. This conceptualization is rooted in the memory of the dictatorships in Haiti, and the lingering impact of colonialism.
The program implementation level conceptualized the rationale for why youth participate as that a peaceful, tolerant society is one in which its citizenry is enabled with critical literacy. “When you debate you need an open spirit, a broad perspective, because sometimes there are controversial issues and you need to interpret them differently,” suggested the logistics coordinator. “You need to be tolerant, to accept others as they are. Even if you don’t agree with the point of view that you are debating.” The judge accepts that there is a process to achieving this result. “At the beginning the youth are aggressive. They’re not used to their ideas being put into question. Over time, we teach them a way to understand others.”

In terms of context, whereas Level 1 perspectives noted the centuries-old historical landmarks of colonization and independence, Level 2 conceptualizations accentuated the only decades-old historical implications of dictatorial rule. The program judge noted how learning to debate to ensure participation must be viewed in this context. “You know, we [Haitians] have passed a lot of time under a dictator. So after ’86, the departure of Duvalier, we have been working on a democracy in Haiti.”

**Level 3 Conceptualizations of Participation (Debate Country Directors):**

*Participation means to organize and advocate*

At Level 3 of Debates, enabling youth to participate was framed as enabling youth with skills to resist domination. Practically this is seen as learning to organize with others and to advocate for just and rational principles. This conceptualization contextualizes the current and historical climate of containment in Haiti. It prioritizes participating in social action for a greater purpose of resisting recurring institutions of subjugation and oppression.
Level 4 Conceptualizations of Participation (Debate Funding and Policy Makers): Participation means to think, reason, communicate and debate

Participation at Level 4 of Debates was seen as building skills in reasoning and the motivation to act. In probing who participates, Level 4 conceptualizations viewed all youth as having equal access, focusing on the individual agency of youth rather than the visible and invisible structures that might serve as barriers for some, and thus requiring the promotion by external programs. This universalist approach to participation envisioned a collaborative interplay between foreign and domestic institutions, organizations, and governments.

As for what youth participate in, Level 4 described a process where youth are centred within the curriculum. As the mission agreement for Debate leaders proposed, “first and foremost, students—not teachers or texts—are the focus of the learning process. When incorporated into a curriculum, speech and debate provide excellent means for involving students in this process.” This learning process, as described by the President of FOKAL, involves teaching “our youth to adopt freer attitudes and to be more open, but at the same time, to reflect on the most controversial issues of our time.” Thus, if participation is conceptualized as involving youth in learning, the central motive is education: “Education, not competition, defines IDEA’s goal. However, structured and friendly debate tournaments offer a unique means to achieve excellence in education” (cite doc). This emphasis on education is explicit at the policy level that suggests that,

democratic societies depend upon the free and open exchange of ideas. Indeed, it may be said that true democracy cannot exist without debate. For democracy to function, the values that debate encourages—reason, tolerance, the careful weighing of evidence, etc.—must be cherished and nurtured. (About Debate)
As for *why* youth participate, Level 4 described the importance of creating a strong civil society. Level 4 conceptualizations from the Open Societies Foundation (OSF) reinforced the motives of participation as engaging in debate to resolve societal conflicts, rather than by uprising. In the wake of a violent, post-coup protest on the property of FOKAL, OSF responded by reiterating their goals for youth participation of learning, not protest.

FOKAL is appalled by the government’s apparent emphasis on teaching young people violence and hatred instead of trying to instil a love of learning and tolerance. The organization … is convinced of the essential role of education and culture in the construction of a free, united, and democratic Haiti. (OSF: Soros Denounces Attacks)

**Case Study 3: Rights through Radio**

**Level 1 Conceptualizations of Participation (Radio Youth Recipients):**

*Participation means to secure access to education*

Level 1 youth conveyed that to participate meant securing access to education and ultimately a job. This conceptualization was grounded in both a practical reality for youth, but also in their exploration of human rights, particularly the right to education.

In the Radio program, when youth conceptualized *who* should participate, they focused on the helpless (“les incapables”)—those who were unable to afford services that in Haiti have costs associated with them, despite being subsumed under the rights discourses as accessible to all. “Haitians need to participate because there are so many that are helpless,” described René: “To help the helpless.” This issue of being “capable”—as essentially having the funds to access or attend rights-affording institutions that, in Haiti, citizens must pay for—came up by many of the youth in
relation to “participating” in society. In some senses, as the case above, the youth did not refer to themselves as either being part of the capables or the incapables. In other cases, as René also described, they did. “My father was not able to pay the tuition for me, so I couldn’t go to school. It made me feel sad, very sad, because I watched all my friends go to school, and we did not have the wealth to go to school. It made me sad.” In general, Radio youth conceptualized their spaces for participation as invited. They referenced state institutions for locations to participate and take up their rights, they focused on school as a site in particular to grant them deeper participation in society, and they contextualized their learning about rights to their participation in the current program, created by the partnership of Panos and UNICEF.

For Radio youth, learning to participate involved learning that possibilities exist to claim rights, and then identifying where they exist in society: which institutions, which spheres, which practices, and which ideals. Every youth participant from Radio shared that learning rights was a major outcome of the program for them: the fact that rights exist, and, that they apply to them as well. For example, as André shared, “Before this I didn’t know that children had rights. Now I know. We have rights to go to school, right to use relief services. Now I know my rights.” Naturally, there are many further questions about how universal rights apply in a specific and very non-universal context such as Haiti, how youth might actually seek them and realize them.

In terms of why youth participate, the underlying motive connects rights awareness with access to institutions. René described, “If the child has no rights, he could not go to school, he could not at the hospital, he could not eat, he could not at the hospital, all. That's it. This is because the child has rights. I love this understanding.” The
youths’ conceptualization of participation is in the realm of the social, centred on societal institutions. Participation, for youth, begins with being able to access institutions. Schooling, in particular, is a highly prized motive for societal participation.

These conceptualizations were made in light of current and past societal realities. The primary point of contextual reference for youth was the socio-political climate of Haiti in the past decade. Born prior to the change of the millennium, these youth experienced the second election of Aristide and his subsequent ousting, the surge in international aid organizations, and the arrival of MINUSTAH to substitute domestic security measures. Fittingly, the youth contextualized participation in reference to their time: Several of their interviews invoked the responsibility of INGOs—rather than the state—to provide medical and health services; Guerda explained to the facilitators the instability resulting from the 2004 coup d’état. Thus, in accordance with their experienced frame of reference, youth drew on contextual factors of their era.

**Level 2 Conceptualizations of Participation (Radio Program Implementers): Participation means to speak out**

At Level 2 of Radio, enabling participation was conceptualized as contributing a point of view and speaking out on rights’ infringements that directly affect youth. The program implementers focused on those who are vulnerable and often overlooked. The producer describes that,

we have them to do this sort of work so it is their voices that are represented. Often in Haiti we speak for the youth, but that doesn’t always work. Instead we have youth that explain her problems; she relates them to her situation. This way there is more relevance. There is more impact, also. We locate youth in their own problems so that they can try to find a solution for them.
As for what youth are to participate in, program implementers describe media and communications training. Such spaces for youth are necessarily envisioned as invited, because training is so central to the mandate: “Everything that we do is training”, said the Regional Director. “We find ways to mobilize their rights, so that they can have their rights respected.” But interestingly, whether this invitation emanates from domestic or international sources appears not to be a central concern at this level. The domestic organization (the “claimed space”, perhaps) is seen as capable:

We at Panos are also self-sufficient for this type of work. But that doesn’t mean from time to time we can’t accept someone coming from abroad to help. They are all welcome to come to help support the greater goal, to help give more information and more capacity to the youth. That’s the objective. Whether the trainer comes from abroad or Haiti, that’s not important. What is important is what the youth receive. That’s the objective: Maximum retention and understanding about their rights.

Program implementers expressed several steps in this process, including learning about the nature and types of rights, making personal connections to rights’ infringements, and speaking out on those human rights issues. The producer of Radio describes this conceptualization in these terms:

First, we give a training for them to know that they have rights. That they can advocate for their rights. We tell them that they have rights, and we tell them what type of rights that they have. We also tell them that they have responsibilities.

The vision for participation is that youth are able to blend awareness and the ability to speak to rights’ infringements according to their experiences in Haiti. The producer continues:
We give them the tools necessary for them to mobilize their rights and to have their rights respected. First we explain to them that they have rights, then—through working through a program in their voice—they advocate for their rights.

The reasons why youth should participate are to develop a society in which there are more input, expression, and contributions from youth. “They make the messages to contribute their point of view,” the producer explains. “Therefore, it’s their right to contribute. They have the right to contribute, the right to expression. They have the right to speech.” Thus, Level 2 sees youth participation for greater rights awareness for the youth themselves and for their society at large.

**Level 3 Conceptualizations of Participation (Radio Country Directors):**

*Participation means to see society differently and acting on it*

At Level 3 in Debates, participation meant to see society differently, and then having the will to take action. This conceptualization was founded in the context of a state where liberty has been sacrificed in favour of slavery, occupation, and dictatorship. Thus, enabling the participation of youth is conceptualized as demanding, claiming and insisting on the rights that are enshrined in documents affecting Haiti and discourses made by officials about Haitian society.

The question of who participates reflects directors’ concern for youth who are typically excluded in the mechanisms of aid. Although the inherent constraint in the program design of time—the program was originally designed for ten days, but then shortened to five—the Regional Director sought not to prioritize the same urban youth who because of their proximity have been routinely targeted as aid beneficiaries.
These youth that come, they have no money for the tap tap. They need to eat. I think about how we can make it better for them. If youth don’t eat—that’s part of my job. Even kids who only eat rice and beans, they should know there are more things out there that they can eat. The bag of Pringles that I buy as a snack is more expensive than the meals they eat every day.

With respect to who identifies and speaks on the issues, the Regional Director clearly explains that this must be the role of the youth. “The reason they tackle the issues that they do is that we think it’s better if the issue is dealt with by someone who is affected by it themselves.” This is consistent with policy documents at the third level of the aid chain as well. The Panos Caribbean Brochure states,

We work with poor people and various marginalized groups to build their capacity to communicate their own information and perspectives on development. This is because Panos strongly believes that development issues can only be solved if the directly affected people have a say.

As for what youth should participate in, the consensus is transformative learning. These motives for participation begin with changing the mentality, the mindset of youth. “It’s an investment into mentality,” the Regional Director described in Chapter Eight. She gives an example of how a mentality shift is critical for participation of Haitian citizens, invoking a connection to the Haitian history of slavery, which would also underscore the central aspect of context.

For example, a house is destroyed in the earthquake. You can help them with their house. Or you can help people understand that the house is their responsibility. An NGO can help clean things up. Or it can help educate people that they need to clean their own things up. Becoming autonomous. Becoming free. Not just free, physically, but mentally. Today we are not slaves in Haiti. But invisible chains are worse. We
have to break them. That starts with education. With training. With civic action.

Country directors felt they need to inspire youth to demand better. The Radio’s Regional Director describes rights-claiming as primarily a bottom-up process:

From the bottom we can get the state to be better. For me it’s about working from the bottom because the people are more insistent. The people will demand more. But we need a wake-up of the masses. In Haiti we say that nobody will come to offer you your liberty. You have to work for your liberty.

Thus, the reasons why youth should participate, according to Level 3 conceptualizations, are that their rights and freedoms are absolutely dependent on their participation.

**Level 4 Conceptualizations of Participation (Radio Funding and Policy Makers):**

*Participation means to secure basic needs, means, and rights*

Enabling participation in society at Level 4 in Radio is largely conceptualized as having basic needs, rights, and means satisfied. The FME Consultant for example speaks about the structural responsibility at the national governance level to generate industries and employment to break the cycle of dependency:

For me, the people have to participate. And when I say participate, it’s not only training. It is give them the means. If they want to plant trees, give them the means. Provide them the trees, the land…they will do something, because the community has continued to develop in Haiti a passive situation.

In keeping with the rhetorical approach to understanding participation and its value in Haiti, the perspectives at Level 4 look beyond immediate goals of voice, mid-
term goals of employment, and even long-term goals of unity in Haiti. The UN coordinator ruminates on this point:

What are citizens participating for? ..., Why are they participating? To have a better life? And what is that better life? Maybe now you’ve got a job, your kids go to school. What is that definition [of a better life]? There is greater social cohesion? How would you define that? People have a stronger voice in what their government does? Which means political parties start to actually be political parties which are representational, rather than just being groups of cronies who pay off people or threaten people to vote for them, which is the case now.

So, why participation in a situation where society’s fractured? Again I come back to, “Why are people participating, and with what impact? What effect? What sustainability?

Level 4 perspectives suggest that participation can result in change, although that change needs to be carefully thought through. In keeping with the ways that Level 4 perspectives connected citizens to societal leaders, the question of who participates is equally nuanced. In examining who should have access to various programs, the FME Consultant looked at Panos’ work beyond typical barriers and limitations predetermined by governing bodies:

We do it in a way to show the policy makers and the decision makers that these are the views of the people, and those views should be taken into consideration. Because many experts think that because somebody is not able to read and write, they cannot provide any contribution, which is not really the case based on all the experiences that we’ve been making.

Thus, Level 4 sees spaces for participation circumventing the dysfunctionality of the federal government and opting instead for relationships at the community level.
Given the vulnerability of local populations in a fragile state, Level 4 envisions the best outcomes when inviting youth directly. For example, the UN resident coordinator wonders if “in a situation where governance is weak, where, quite often cohesion at the family, local, community level is often weak, then should we not be interacting at a much more localized level than we are now?” This comment illustrates the heavy attention given by policy and funding level respondents to envisioning opportunities for Haitians to claim their spaces for participation. Chapter Ten will elaborate on this perhaps unexpected finding.

Chapter Summary

In this presentation of the main findings of this research we can see that there are convergences and disparities between the conceptualizations of each sub-group in terms of the overall meanings they associate with participation, summarized in Table 9.1.

**Table 9.1. According to Each Sub-Group, Youth Participation Means...**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Group</th>
<th>Farming</th>
<th>Debates</th>
<th>Radio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy &amp; Funder Level (4)</strong></td>
<td>to be financially literate</td>
<td>to think, reason, and debate</td>
<td>to secure basic needs and rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Director Level (3)</strong></td>
<td>to have economic independence</td>
<td>to organize and advocate</td>
<td>to see society differently and act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program Level (2)</strong></td>
<td>to establish a livelihood</td>
<td>to share ideas freely</td>
<td>to speak out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Youth Level (1)</strong></td>
<td>to have a school degree</td>
<td>to persuade others</td>
<td>to secure access to education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Among the case studies, the overall orientation of participation stands out in a comparative analysis of the programs, with language fluency as an important thread in determining who participates. Along the aid chain, themes of marginalization, contextual references, and the perceived outcomes of participation distinguished conceptualizations between top and bottom levels. In this vertical comparison, the binary of international and local—and in particular their theoretical links with spaces (invited and claimed) and influences on (structures and agency)—is a useful framework for analysis. Chapter Ten is dedicated to further unpacking these comparisons between programs and levels and in turn deconstructing the relationships to gain a deeper awareness of where and how the conceptualizations of youth participation diverge.
Chapter Ten:
Horizontally and Vertical Analyses of Participation

The focal point for this chapter is Research Question #4: How do these conceptualizations of participation compare and contrast with one another among the programs (horizontally), along the levels of the aid chain (vertically), and how can any differences be explained? As we saw in Chapter Nine, a wide variety of conceptualizations of participation emerged among the three programs and their respective aid chain levels. For example, note the contrasting perspectives: participation is seen as economic independence at Level 3 of Farming, as being able to persuade others at Level 1 of Debates, and as speaking out at Level 2 of Radio. In this chapter, these notions will be explored along horizontal and vertical axes, each having produced distinct analyses. These analyses involved the selection of similar themes that emerged in the coding of the data across programs at a particular level, and between levels in individual programs. In this chapter I present these themes, first in the horizontal comparisons and then the vertical comparisons.

A Horizontal Analysis: Themes emerging when comparing between programs

In comparing horizontally between the three programs, the framework of market and social orientations was most pronounced in analyzing the conceptualizations among the case study programs. Market and social sometimes did and sometimes did not align with international and local origins respectively, nor did they necessarily with invited spaces and structure, and claimed spaces and agency.
One of the central themes that emerged in the horizontal comparison was that of language fluency in relation to access to the program and who participates. This component will be highlighted to illustrate the comparisons between the programs. The choice of language used in the spaces for participation of each program was rationalized differently between each program. This central theme emerged as a major factor in determining who exactly participated, in terms of access, confidence, and success in each program. Recall from Chapter Three that Kreyòl is the native language of most Haitians. Ninety percent of Haitians speak Kreyòl; it is used in the homes and as a cultural convention amongst all Haitians. For the most marginalized of Haitians—lower socio-economic classes, rural, etc.—Kreyòl is the language used in daily conversation. Indeed, in the three case study programs of this research, it was clear that Kreyòl was the preferred language of the youth. In each program this was the language that youth spoke in their down time, and the language in which the majority were the most fluent.

For the purposes of clarity and consistency, the comparisons will focus on one aid chain level—Level 2. Drawing on the theoretical frameworks presented in Chapter Two, the comparisons at Level 2 will illustrate the overarching differences in conceptualizing participation between the three case study programs. Conceptualizations at other levels will later be used to support or contrast the analyses at Level 2.

**Farming**

The supposition of this program is the reciprocal relationship between the school and student, who sells his or her produce to the market to generate revenue for the school. Level 2 program implementation conceptualizations conveyed this most clearly. The market orientation encourages enterprise, business techniques, and entrepreneurial
strategies. The dynamics of market encourage individualism, independence, and freedom. “They learned how to can create a small company and not be dependent on others,” explained the Technician. The field trip to Jacmel portrayed the “spirit of entrepreneurship” through a visit to see the bamboo furniture shop.

The Education Manager described this market orientation, as well as depicting the structures in which youth are immersed:

Haiti’s one of the youngest countries in the world. It has one of the largest populations of youth that have not completed their primary education. Two thirds of these youth have not reached sixth grade. So, you see folks in the streets selling stuff; they’re making ends meet because they couldn’t afford to go to school. It’s a problem—it’s an economic problem.

In Farming, the primarily economic motives of BRAC, Digicel, and Fonkoze, and the overall “sprit of entrepreneurship” of Farming are described in Chapter Six. In its underlying motive, Farming had a striking human capital perspective (Sen, 1988), focusing on the importance of youth to stimulate the economy:

If we target the people, 40 year old, 50 years, they can only contribute 20 years maximum. But we target the younger ones. So that thinking, that’s how we’ve been promoting [the program].

Participation meant to establish a livelihood, enabling youth with agency to become entrepreneurs. Farming produced personally responsible citizens (Westheimer & Kahne, 2004), but the efficacy of a market orientation in a low-income nation has limitations. Examining Farming in the broader context of neoliberalism suggests that while it is possible that local markets may be capable of accommodating more produce, Haitian markets are flooded with produce from small-scale agriculture. They are heavily
dominated by local produce, which drives the prices down considerably. Low prices mean low mark-up; therefore, there is little that can be gained. Thus, this approach to youth participation is heavily predisposed to the health of the market, which, due to the economic fragility of Haiti, is vulnerable. The ideas behind this model, however, may spur the growth of the market in Haiti; however, this too is speculative.

However, this does not discredit the ability of Farming to enable participants with the skills to develop sustainable food production for the youth themselves, their present and future families. This is a crucial consideration for the program as the perspectives of youth such as Sophia and Michel testify that going without food is not an uncommon reality in Fondwa. In this respect, Farming’s contribution to food security in the community by enabling youth in the community with lifelong agricultural skills is much more socially-oriented than market-oriented. However a sustainable method to produce and harvest local food does not guarantee a sustainable business or revenue through food production, but it does enable youth with highly relevant, life-long agricultural skills. This program outcome has great potential value for the youth but is described as a secondary benefit by most in this research. The major benefits cited—youth being able to go to school and the program generating funding for the school—related youth participation directly to the reliance on the structure of the institution of school.

**Seeking claimed spaces for participation.**

Farming is a program that was initiated as a space in which youth were invited to participate largely as a result of the formal machinery of various institutions: the broadly conceived ideologies of BRAC, and the organizational structure of BRAC in Haiti including the parallel reconstruction programming in Fondwa such as housing
construction (through BRAC) and micro-credit (through Fonkoze). These invited characteristics extend to an institutional hierarchy external to Fondwa that includes the Technician, the Education Manager, the country director, and a domestic donor responsible for the program start-up resources, supplies, and funding.

However, despite its clear invited origins, there is an overall aim for the program to downsize yet remain locally sustainable for youth development. It is clear that the intended direction is for this space for participation to ultimately be claimed and owned at the local level, primarily the school (ECF), but also the community partners, youth, and their families. The Education Manager spoke simultaneously of mediating and local ownership as she described “the whole idea of how I wanted to do the intervention was to get them to see themselves as owners of this.”

**Structure and agency.**

While the overall tendency for Farming was toward youth agency, there was evidence of a structural focus within the community. One benefit to have located the program in Fondwa was the pre-existence of other market-oriented aid initiatives. At the time of this research, given its size and relative isolation, Fondwa was almost saturated with partnerships with INGOs beyond Fonkoze and BRAC. However, as Farming was distinctly market-focused, it is embedded within an environment that is social and communitarian in its history and tradition. In the analysis of youth interactions through their participation in the program, social features of participation were also evident: a number of youth spoke about how they helped each other or received help from others. Sophia from Farming said, “We help each other. Sometimes I receive the assistance of other students, and sometimes I will help others.” Thus, the dynamics of participation are
complicated when a neoliberal, market approach to poverty reduction is transplanted onto a community with strong communitarian roots.

One thing that was very important for us in this program. Before, we didn’t have anyone to help us connect our ideas. Now, we have someone with us who can help us connect our ideas. Now we work together, and we share our ideas. We sit together and talk about the gardens. We work together at the school garden.

Language fluency issues.

For Farming, on-the-ground program operations were altogether in Kreyòl. The program leaders such as the Technician and school principal spoke primarily Kreyòl, as did the liaising BRAC officials such as the Education Officer. The curriculum was written in Kreyòl, the program was delivered in Kreyòl, and the language of the community of Fondwa is Kreyòl. This pre-eminence of Kreyòl resulted in few visible communication barriers at the local program level. While the presence of French is acknowledged and incorporated in daily life, it is also seen as problematic in the realm of formal education. Sophia for example describes how Kreyòl is the colloquial language, whereas French is the “language of education”:  

The school in Haiti is in French. Books, are in French. It is very rare to find a book in Kreyòl. We almost have none. That’s how it is. The official language is French, but in the street between youth, we speak Kreyòl.

The near ubiquity of Kreyòl in the operations of the Farming program resulted in few visible distinctions in who participated based on language.
Debates

In Debates, participation meant to share ideas freely. These conceptualizations focused on the agency of the youth:

The competences that the director spoke about— it’s not an issue of money, nor of family, nor of race. It has been said that there are races that are disadvantaged, the Marrons, for example. But I say, “No, all races can do that.” It is enough that we only see competencies.

(Étienne)

These conceptualizations were socially-oriented. At Level 2, the judge from Debates focused on the outcomes of a democratic society by fostering an ability amongst youth for critical thinking: “So for me in this program it is about developing a critical perspective. When I am in a conversation with a person I am not interested in them, but in their ideas.”

But the critical thinking and reasoning focus in Debates that challenged Chile’s economic prosperity and evolutionary theory as part of the program orientation described in Chapter Seven was not always considered for the practice of youth participation in the program execution. There is an absence of a critical perspective of the limitations of access when other institutions such as schools are not able to provide access. Essentially, for Debates, there is a feeling that if you take the initiative, you will participate in the program. Thus, citizenship in Debates would be described as youth gaining human capabilities (Sen, 1988), or the creation of participatory citizens (Westheimer & Kahne, 2004).

Seeking a balance of invited and claimed spaces for participation.

Consistent with a universalist perspective, Debates might be seen as jointly invited and claimed. The strong national capacity, ownership, and development of the
program enables practitioners in the middle rungs of the aid chain to view the program as domestically governed and controlled, all the while profiting from the international structures and program curriculum which is adapted and translated for use in Haiti. In this confluence between invited and claimed spaces, the practitioners created spaces with hopes that they will be taken over by schools:

If I implant this program in school X, then after a while the school takes it over. It’s not an expensive program. The key issue is to find coaches. Then after that it is clear to the coaches that it is voluntary, a civic action. But the schools should give the coach a space, a minimum of logistics: a table, chairs, a blackboard, chalk.

**Language and participation.**

Issues of access, identity, and language that surface in relation to youth participation in this program are dealt with by adopting and fitting into a standard that can both be legitimized in the Haitian context and offer participation beyond Haiti into a global sphere. Recall for example in Debates how French was contextualized by youth as a language of the colonizers, yet youth saw the importance of mastering it at school to be able to succeed in Haitian society. Thus, participation conceptualizations in Debates might generally be characterized as spaces that balance both claimed spaces and invited spaces. The claimed element represents a program in which many Haitian current and past participants have been invested and see as distinct in Haiti (i.e. unique compared to other programs in Haiti and dissimilar to debate programs in other countries); the invited element represents a broader, external foundation of IDEA-produced debate curriculum, international network of national debate associations, funding streams through the Soros Foundation, and philosophy rooted in Western-European enlightenment thinking. The
conceptualization of Debates as balancing between claimed and invited goes largely unproblematised and untroubled as different and incompatible spaces.

Radio

Participation conceptualized in Radio also emphasized a social orientation, but also referred to the achievement of human rights through citizen voice. In Radio, participation meant to speak out. Its methodology, however, reflects its origins as a claimed space that seeks an invitation for greater participation.

Seeking invited spaces for participation.

The strong focus on radio broadcasting by Panos within its past programming and its future strategy suggests that the local elements of the organization have claimed this space, and its members benefit from these claimed characteristics of highly perceived relevance, investment, and motivation. However, and perhaps because of the Haitian distinctiveness of the program, there is a movement towards sharing the space with external actors. This movement towards shifting the space towards invited is heavily rationalized for funding purposes but was also linked to human resource support and other capacity-strengthening purposes. Thus, Radio might be seen as a claimed space, with a tendency to include invited resources.

Language and participation.

In Radio, the issue of language on youth participation had its own unique challenges. Appropriately, the language for the national broadcasts prepared by the youth was Kreyòl. This choice was fitting as it is the first language of the participating youth as well as the large majority of the likely radio listeners to the Haitian stations on the
anniversaries of the Convention and Declaration of the Rights of the Child. What was unique about Radio was that the facilitator was English-speaking, and thus there was a constant tension between Kreyòl and English during the program.

The nuances of this tension stemmed from Kreyòl’s distinctness, its relatively lower status, and its primary intent as an oral language. During the program, the involvement of English in addition to Kreyòl (and also French) caused much confusion, as well as many delays and assumptions in the program. These instances were highlighted in Chapter Seven: The Regional Director had to justify the complication of translating between three languages; the Facilitator prematurely inferred René’s illiteracy as the central barrier to script writing; and there was prolonged confusion with Guerda’s script regarding the Kreyòl term for the coup d'état of 2004 as she described the increase in homelessness in Haiti after January 12, as opposed to the more generic notion of destabilization as inferred by the Facilitator. In Radio, the program routinely ran much more smoothly when the Producer and Regional Director addressed the youth in Kreyòl, compared to the restlessness of the youth participants during translation problems. Thus, whereas the use of Kreyòl was rationalized and practiced by virtually all youth, the design and policies for each program resulted in various constructions. While language did not appear to separate youth in Farming, tensions emerged in Debates as a result of the predominance of French, and in Radio with the addition of English.

**Summary of horizontal analysis**

The horizontal analysis suggests that programs generally had a distinct orientation between market and social spectrum, but they are more specific types of market and social. Farming’s market orientation was geared to create personally responsible citizens;
Debate’s social orientation was universalist in nature and focused on human capabilities; and Radios’ social orientation focused on a human rights, enabling justice-orientated citizens. Thus, the ways that spaces for participation were conceptualized varied greatly between each program. Farming participants view invited spaces leading to claimed spaces drawing on entrepreneurial motives; those from Debates saw that differences between invited and claimed spaces were largely inconsequential; and Radio conceptualizations suggested that claimed spaces profit when subsumed by invited spaces. These perspectives are laid out in Table 10.1.

**Table 10.1. Summary of Horizontal Comparisons among Programs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participation means:</th>
<th>Farming</th>
<th>Debates</th>
<th>Radio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to establish a livelihood</td>
<td>to share ideas freely</td>
<td>to speak out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language tensions:</td>
<td>Kreyòl only</td>
<td>French and Kreyòl</td>
<td>English, French and Kreyòl</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus, one might suggest that the approaches to participation of these three case study programs mirrored the approaches to citizenship laid out in Chapter Two. Farming adopted an entrepreneurial approach, Debates embraced a capacities approach, and Radio used a rights approach.
A Vertical Analysis: Themes emerging when comparing between programs

This section examines the themes that emerged in the vertical comparisons and focused specifically on conceptualizations between the lower aid chain levels (i.e., youth at Level 1) with the upper aid chain level (i.e., funders and policy makers at Level 4) within stated case studies. It then describes how the conceptualizations at middle levels of the aid chain—the program implementation and country director Levels, 2 and 3—emerged as having distinct orientations themselves compared to Levels 1 and 4.

To analyze the conceptualizations along the vertical chain, this section uses the international-local binary as a primary framework. It examines the extent to which the lower, local youth recipient levels connected local origins with social orientations, claimed spaces, and emphasizes individual agency. Similarly, this section discusses the degree to which the upper organizational levels of the aid chain bore international qualities and their theoretically associated characteristics of market origins, invited spaces, and an emphasis of structures (see Chapter Two). In fact what I found was more nuanced and in some cases even opposite to what I would have expected.

To begin the comparisons between top and bottom levels, central themes emerged in Chapter Nine that help to illustrate these nuances. When actors’ conceptualizations of participation are compared across the different levels along the aid chain, three central themes emerge around the questions of who, what and why. When the question of who participates is probed, the case of Debates is an interesting example of this vertical comparison. There were differences on how and whether some youth were marginalized. In looking at what the youth were participating in, the case of Farming showed a marked difference in seeing it as a social or an individual pursuit. Finally, when asking why the
youth participated, the case of Radio displayed tensions between international and
domestic contexts for participation. I weave these three themes nuances into this
discussion and then tease apart the international-local binary in the vertical analysis.
These themes will illuminate larger contrasts on the aid chain related to youth
participation and structure and agency.

**Level 1 Youth Conceptualizations of Participation**

**Marginalization as isolation.**

One difference on the aid chain was how “marginalization” was conceptualized.
This was particularly prominent in Debates. When participants were asked *who* should be
involved in programs geared towards youth participation, a very common response was
“the poor”. However, there was a notable difference in the ways that being poor was
described at each level of Debates. When asked about marginalization in Haiti, the youth
(and to some degree program implementers) in Debates focused on youth participation as
the ability to access programs and services in relation to proximity to programs,
neighbourhood of residence, and the urban-rural divide. For youth living outside of Port-
au-Prince, far fewer internationally supported programs were accessible to them. For
those resources that were available to youth in other cities, benefits are inhibited by
problems of transport and other resources. As Mirlande, a youth from Debates remarked:

> You know that the basic problem we have is that we don’t even have
> resources up in Cap-Haitien. We don’t have the documents, the
> meetings don’t happen often. The spirit of the team feels like we are
> forced to do it, but really some encouragement through human
> resources could really encourage us. … It’s all our own means, our own
> experiences, our own volition that we use to make this possible.
These issues relating to which youth are able to participate are exacerbated in even more marginalized contexts such as those in the large sub-urban bidonvilles outside Port-au-Prince and in the IDP camps. As discussed in Chapter Three, the issues of instability associated with these bidonvilles such as Cite Soleil and Cite Simone on the edges of Port-au-Prince made the implications of internationally supported youth programs more rare there. With some exceptions noted in Chapter Five, I found very little evidence of any programs that targeted youth operated specifically in these bidonvilles. Within the temporary camps where tens of thousands of youth have been living since the earthquake, there were also far fewer programs for youth. Often youth from these locations participated in programs outside their temporary communities.

**Emphasis on domestic context.**

Another theme was the relative impact of domestic versus international issues. This was most prominent in Radio. At the local and community levels of the aid chain, the context affecting participation focused on historical and political issues specific to Haiti’s nationhood and relevant to youth. The youth in Radio wove the socio-historic context of their realities into their program experiences in ways that were not immediately obvious to international practitioners. Recall for example the conversation in Chapter Eight in which the Regional Director and the Facilitator learned how Guerda understood issues of youth participation in the context of the destabilization of the country after the coup of 2004.

Youths’ views towards aid would be heavily constructed and influenced by the ubiquitrousness of invited spaces for participation that has existed throughout the lives of youth in Haiti. The oldest youth in this research were born around 1990; most would
have just entered their teens at the time of second ousting of Aristide in 2004, experiencing through their adolescence the subsequent entry of MINUSTAH, increase in foreign aid and involvement, and a radical swing of political leadership. These events would have conditioned youth to understand their society as a relatively stable environment compared to previous generations, but one in which participation was largely framed as spaces in which external—very often international—actors invited (in one way or another—through their conditions of aid, program funding, or direct programming) Haitians to participate.

**Participation as an individual pursuit.**

Another theme was the scale of pursuit for which participation was envisioned. This example is best illustrated through the case of Farming. Local level perspectives—youth participants—generally focused on themselves as individuals for their motive for participation. This usually involved a comment on accessing further institutions, including school, employment, or emigration. For example, in farming as we saw in Chapter Nine, each youth was concerned about how he or she could gain enough income to attend school. They also spoke about how weather patterns effected their individual production. In some cases, the youth connected their participation very directly to the job they hoped to attain. For example, one youth wanted to be a nurse:

> Once I am finished [the program, and school] I think I will be equipped to have the core of learning to become a nurse. … I could use some of the specific workshops from the program precisely to become a nurse.
**Level 4 International Policy-maker Conceptualizations of Participation**

**Marginalization as poverty.**

With Debates at the funder and policy Level 4 there is a focus on the “marginalized” which is not further deconstructed from its policy statement at Level 4. As one of its institutional supporter describes, “working in every part of the world, the Open Society Foundations place a high priority on protecting and improving the lives of people in marginalized communities” (OSF: Mission and Values).

However other conceptualizations characterized marginalization in the context of youth lacking forms of individual economic and cultural capital.

**Emphasis on the international context.**

For perspectives at the national and international levels, participation was conceptualized moreover within the context of Haiti’s position within an international community, focusing sharp attention on its reconstruction. For the FME Consultant, Haitian participation was contextualized through the limitations placed on Haitians by the influx of NGOs. He describes how the emphasis of the international community is on the citizens and institutions of the donor, overlooking the important work of Haitian NGOs:

They have to involve the Haitians and *participation* because they don’t always give the people the impression that they are doing something for them, involve them. … I know sometimes it is a situation of the global market; it is usually the big NGOs, they have students coming out of universities, they need a job, so they send them to this country and give them a lot of money. So there is a big issue there. I’m not saying they shouldn’t send them, but it has to be well managed and I know other countries are in the same situation.
As this statement illustrates, at the upper levels of the aid chain, the international dynamics were invoked more frequently. These perspectives often cited the role of international interventions, including INGOs as disrupting social contexts for youth participation rather than domestic influences as lower aid chain levels did.

**Participation as a social pursuit.**

At national and international levels there was a greater focus on societal motives for participation. Recall in Chapter Six that the Digicel Funding Director explained how the grander goal of youth participation in Farming was to spur a stagnant and fragile economy by mobilizing increasingly large groups of rural youth. This was consistent with upper levels in Radio too. For example, the FME Consultant for Radio spoke about how participation would lead beyond the individual youth to their family, a stronger middle class, and essentially a society with wealth and a social safety net:

> Giving that funding is one thing, but giving them the opportunity to put it into practice is different. One of the ways to break this cycle is to create jobs. … Those jobs need to be created so that they can take care of their family. It’s not going to be very easy, but as long as you have this high rate of employment [the cycle will continue].

At upper levels participation is seen as an overall benefit for society, rather than simply through the lens of the individual benefit of the youth.

**Aid Chain Perspectives of Structure and Agency**

Level 1 perspectives tended to conceptualize participation as an individual pursuit in the context of domestic political-economic issues and the problem of geographic isolation. More significantly, Level 1 perspectives expressed their participation in relation to their ability to access structures that would facilitate their participation. This
was evident from the conceptualizations of participation by youth recipient level responses. In Debates, for example, Makenley described how a foundation needs to exist not only before youth can participate but also before a club can be formed:

Actually, the thing is that you don’t just place a debate club debate in any area. You need a structure that is already there for the foundation of the club. For example, in Côte Plage we use the school. … The BMC club uses the library. Say, for example, what we do is set up a club is situate in a place where there are already youth—a majority of youth—and there we will try to create a debate club. … At my school, for example, there was not a debate club, and we recognized the possibility for a club. There were a lot of youth, so we created a club, and it began functioning the following week.

In this case the structures involved domestic institutions that could be provided by the state. In other cases the meaning referred to structures initiated by the aid regime. In these ways it appeared that local youth perspectives favoured invited spaces for participation. So while Level 1 perspectives of spaces for participation focused on being invited to external spaces, Level 4 conceptualizations often referred to encouraging Haitians to claim new social spaces across Haiti. For example, the UN resident co-ordinator described a vision for enabling Haitians to claim their own spaces rather than INGOs simply providing more invited spaces: “We always bring a mandate, or a result in mind. But that’s one of the problems. You crowd out the Haitian perspective in the noise of your own mandate. How can we back off?”

This trend actually runs counter to what I would have expected which supposed that local level actors would be more likely to favour claimed spaces while actors at higher levels along the aid chain and those working with international funding would have a preference for invited spaces as the vehicle for enhancing youth engagement and
participation in Haitian reconstruction. This link might be best explained by re-examining the context of structure, agency, and fragility in Haiti.

**Structure and agency in a fragile state.**

As was explored in Chapter Three, Haiti’s history has contributed to current impressions of fragility, violence, and insecurity: Haiti received a status level of “critical” on the 2011 Failed State Index, ranking within the top five on measures such as “delegitimization of the state”, “human rights”, and “international intervention”. Ongoing signs and symbols of fragility and violence result in present concerns regarding the re-emergence of conflict. These fears prohibit the realization of full citizenship and participation in various spheres of society.

Moreover, the vacuum created by the dearth in formal structures of the state, compared to aid-nations, which tend to be stable, high-income states, might best characterize fragility in Haiti. While Haitian youth might tend look to structures to spur their participation, donors may see participation as an act of individual agency. Structure and agency take on different dimensions in contexts of fragility compared to those of greater stability. Edwige Danticat (2011), one of Haiti’s foremost authors, attested to the need for structure in Haiti for its citizens to be able to better participate after the earthquake:

They have the will. They have the ability. All they need is the opportunity by those within and outside of those who control the purse strings of Haiti. These men and women need to be able to and want to rebuild their country if they are given the opportunity to do so.
As youth conceptualized participation their meanings were frequently attached to structures such as education (schools), jobs, or the market. This stood in contrast to participation as agency that upper aid chain levels often conceptualized for youth. In fragile state such as Haiti, agency is not a framework that operates similarly to ways in donor nations where existing structures facilitate claiming spaces for participation. Participation must be conceived of differently in fragile states than in stable states.

**Mid-Aid Chain Level Conceptualizations of Participation**

In general, Level 1 perspectives focused on being invited to participate in structures, and Level 4 conceptualizations described participation as developing the potential agency of youth to claim spaces to contribute to Haiti’s reconstruction. The middle levels of the aid chain, however, were more apt to illustrate a nuanced dynamic between invited and claimed spaces and the combination of influences between structures individual agency of youth.

One of the more striking discoveries in this research was the distinctiveness of the perspectives from middle levels of the aid chain compared to those of the outer levels. While there was some variance between programs, middle-level respondents of the aid chain tended to focus on social outcomes, compared to a greater tendency towards market outcomes that were described at Levels 1 and 4. In particular, at the middle levels there were more examples of resistance, transformative education, and alternative visions of participation outside the constructed and bounded policies of the organizations and funders that also appeared to be held by youth. Finally, middle levels also spoke about the reality of the organizational need for resources to enable youth participation.
As outlined in Chapter Two, Gaventa (2001) proposes that strengthening a democracy requires citizens to rethink the ways participation is social constructed and conceptualized in relevant social spaces. Examples of this in the research were most prominent in the middle levels of the aid chain.

**Emphasis on social orientation.**

Whereas the top and bottom levels of the aid chain referred more heavily to market motives of participation such as employment or financial security, middle levels of the aid chain had more social orientations of participation.

The middle levels of the aid chain often altered the approaches taken to citizenship, both from the top and from the bottom. Participation expressed as human agency was widely recognized at Levels 2 and 3 as problematic in a fragile state. Middle levels found ways to express citizenship, democracy, and participation in ways that were more socially-oriented than the top and bottom levels.

The analysis in Chapter Nine illustrates this distinction. At Level 2 across all case study programs, for example, the overarching conceptualization of youth participation had a social focus. In Radio, to participate meant “to speak out”; in Debates, to participate meant “to share ideas freely”; and in Farming, to participate meant “to establish a livelihood”. Similar conceptualizations emerged at Level 3, such as participation as “seeing society differently and acting on it” (Radio), or “to organize and advocate” (Debates). By contrast, at the top and bottom levels of the aid chain the focus was more heavily oriented to pragmatic and economic realities, where at Level 4 participation meant “financial literacy” (Farming) or “securing basic needs” (Radio), and at Level 1, “access to education” (Radio) or “securing a high-school degree” (Farming).
Transformative education.

At the middle levels (Levels 2 and 3) of the aid chain, strategies for enabling youth participation centred on changing youth perspectives on the very notion of participation. In this sense, middle levels would draw on the resources and opportunities of the program to alter the consciousness of the youth. These differences aligned more-or-less with the overall orientations of each program.

In Farming, as a market-oriented program, the change in consciousness was geared towards an investment in the community. As the Education Manager suggested,

The goal was not for people just to give. I wanted to be able to change the sense of dependency that has permeated the Haitian community as a result of twenty, thirty years of NGOs coming in and just continuing on this really awful relationship. And so, I said well “if we can come in, help invest, you and the community invest in certain ways.

In Debates and Radio by contrast, the consciousness change in such social-oriented programs was proposed as a more critical, radical, and even a revolutionary mind shift. The Regional Director at Radio, for example, inferred a new and different focus for the spaces that she saw being created through these youth programs. She described the changes she foresaw in the youths’ outlooks as a result of these spaces:

They will continue to be poor. Many will continue to not go to school. But their outlook on the future will change. It is an investment in the future. Materially, nothing will change in a year or two. But their mentality will change.

Thus, because a key concern for mid-level practitioners is on changing the mindset of the youth, they see value in inviting youth to spaces, rather than having them
claim their own spaces. Transformative learning relies on fundamental shifts in perspective and worldview. Invariably this requires introduction to new ideas, new curriculum. The venue must in some part be invited; thus a consciousness-changing project must be, at least in large part, in an invited space. Therefore, at the middle levels of the aid chain, whereas conceptualizations of participation incorporated more nuanced perspectives of contexts and identities of participation, they rarely accentuated the importance of youth claiming their own spaces, at least in the moment. What does emerge, however, is the notion that invited spaces for youth will lead to their eventual claiming of them.

**Resources for structures for participation.**

Mid-level conceptualizations of participation were also most likely to see invited spaces as a means for local groups to generate income and resources (Eschenbacher, 2012). An organizational imperative for each NGO is that they need to generate income to sustain the program. This ultimately drives the work of the organization, and as we saw in Chapter Six through Eight, attests to why youth participation is often fundamental to each program. In Farming, for example, youth participation was critical to generate the produce that would later be sold for profit. In Radio, youth participation is exhibited to legitimize to funders the core values of the program.

The relationship of the UNICEF facilitator in Radio provided an example of this dynamic. The FME Consultant in Radio recognized the value of a reinforcing effort to build youth capacity, but he placed it within the program necessity for funds to operate:

Look, we could have found a nation expert who could speak Kreyòl, who would do the work with the kids without having to go through this
translation process. But the thing is UNICEF is the one giving you the money, so they have the upper hand. It doesn’t mean that they are dictating you what to do, but they are giving you the money and they are in on some of the processes. And even when this project was being negotiated, that’s the way that they wanted to do it, so we just worked through it. Even though, ultimately our targets were the kids, whatever the process, we had to make sure those kids know that there are people thinking of them, who show them that they have the capacity.

Although, as we have seen through Chapter Eight, the funding tends to be tied to the wishes of the donors. Mid-level conceptualizations do not tend to see this as problematic for youth participation. The partnership between UNICEF and Panos, while approved and supported by the team at Panos, was connected to a consultant coming to do similar work to that Panos might already be able to accomplish. However, despite the language, context or pedagogy problems discussed in the preceding chapters, the involvement of the Facilitator was seen to have been worth it. Finding ways to garner resources to enable these programs was often a key concern for mid-level practitioners, and this often involved linking claimed spaces with invited spaces for participation.
In Chapter One I discussed my passion for pursuing a dissertation that focused on the problem of participation. In international aid, outcomes of development are traditionally assessed in measures of tangible progress, the resulting culture becoming one of production, program delivery, and construction. This culture is reinforced in the psyche of donor nations where, especially during a period of reconstruction, citizens demand visible outcomes for their collective input of aid. My observations as a development practitioner reflected these tensions as well: meaningful participation of aid beneficiaries in their own development was routinely overlooked in favour of donor priorities.

Yet over the past half century, through the advent of participatory theories and practices in development, the importance of citizen participation in aid has been emphasized and debated. In Chapter Two I reviewed the literature that supports the argument that citizen participation has strong outcomes for development and democracy. Participation has been found to legitimize development outcomes, improve citizenship (Mansbridge, 1995), and deepen democracy. However, over time the concept of participation has been expanded, shaped and co-opted to suit the needs of each situation. To address this problem, scholars called on specificity in describing participation to ensure clarity, meaning and useful analysis of participation (Chambers 1986; Cohen & Uphoff, 1980). In this vein, Kabeer (2010), Klees (2008) and others assessed the differences of market compared to social orientations of participation, and Cornwall (2002) proposed the concept of social spaces for participation as a framework for
analysis, and in particular, marked the basic distinction between invited and claimed spaces. These constructs are useful against the backdrop of international aid in Haiti, where as illustrated in Chapter Three, its population has beheld, endured, and reacted to a five-hundred-year history of external intervention under which citizen participation has continuously reflected the tension between international and local origins, invited and claimed spaces, and market and social orientations.

In this thesis, my inquiry focused on the participation of youth in development programs in Haiti during a period of three years following the earthquake of January 12, 2010. My overarching interest was how youth were enabled to participate in the reconstruction of their own society. I examined programs that emerged after the earthquake that targeted youth and in particular those that promoted the centrality of youth participation. Heeding the call for clarity through specificity, my conceptual models probed the spatial distribution of youth programs in terms of their origins and orientations, the social construction of participation in three case study programs, the conceptualizations of participation in each program at each stage of a four-level aid chain, and the similarities and differences among the conceptualizations.

In this chapter I summarize the findings for each of the four research questions, suggest the significance, implications and recommendations related to these findings, and offer some reflections on the importance to focus on youth participation for citizenship, democracy, and development in Haiti.

**Research Questions and Findings**

Research Question #1 asked: “What youth programs are operating in Haiti that target and involve youth as participants in their national reconstruction, and how do they
differ in terms of their origins and orientation?” To answer that question I collected data on youth programs in Haiti by visiting them in person, scanning web sources, interviewing actors involved in Haiti, and reviewing previously compiled documents of programs involving youth. I retrieved a total of 34 programs operating during the three-year period and recorded data based on their origins and orientations. Using this data I charted the programs on a conceptual map, plotting the nature of each program’s international or local characteristics against the program’s market versus social orientation.

The resulting map produced a scatterplot of youth programs in Haiti and through the nearest neighbour cluster analysis method; I sorted the programs into seven distinct groups. These groups portrayed the scope to which Haiti’s youth program were ultimately driven externally or internally, representing the degree to which spaces were constructed as invited or claimed. Overlaid on this spectrum was a further range of the orientations of each program between market motives and social purposes. The predominant types of programs were largely driven by foreign initiatives and most programs had a social orientation. I then isolated three clusters based on the relatively large number of programs in each cluster, the presence of international influence within each, and the representation of market and social orientations to enabling youth participation. I selected from each a case in which the participation of youth was embedded as a central approach and objective: Farming for Education, Debate Competitions, and Rights through Radio.

Research Question #2 asked, “How is youth participation socially constructed during the formation and implementation of the three selected case study programs of the
Haitian reconstruction?” Drawing on the three selected case study organizations, I joined each one as a participant observer through the period of its program cycle. Through experiencing and documenting their proceedings, analyzing program plans, reports and public relations pieces, and interviewing participants, I responded to the key questions established as a conceptual framework for the social construction of youth participation: *Who* participated? in *what?* and *Why?* I found that youth of both genders between the ages of 14 and 21 participated in all of the programs. Their access to each program was determined by an educational leader at each of their respective schools, and for each program, some form of initial capital was required for them to participate (usually school attendance, but in the case of Farming, access to land). The curriculum for each program had the youth producing, creating, expressing, or developing in one form or another in all cases, learning. As for *why*, it appeared that youth participated because they were proud to be selected, because of perceived social opportunities with their peers, because they saw the program as increasing their likelihood of employment, and even because it may give them hope “for a better future.” From the organizational perspective, the participation of youth was seen as a demonstrable way to fulfill their mandate and legitimize their central approach and objective of youth participation. In some cases it appeared that practitioners were thinning meanings of participation in efforts to characterize various youth behaviours as such in order to fulfil their organizational mandates.

While active participation of youth in these programs contributed to both youth and organizational motives, their precise reasons *why* diverged. These meanings were further explicated through the conceptualizations probed in Research Question #4 that
found that youth focused on individual outcomes from their participation (i.e., pride, social opportunities, better preparation for the future), whereas practitioners focused on societal gains from participation\textsuperscript{29}. For example in Farming, youth participation enabled the practitioners to sustain and enrich the school and the youth to attend the school. For Debates, youth participation enabled a strong Haitian contingent of debaters, as well as a socially and intellectually invigorating experience for youth. Equally for Radio, youth participation legitimized the central mandate of the implementing organizations while it also enabled the youth to develop skills related to the program and simply to attend an existing alternative to school for one week. Below in Table 11.1 is a summary of how participation was socially constructed by actors in the three programs from the narratives of Chapters Six, Seven, and Eight.

\textsuperscript{29} Although in this case it was at the level of the institution.
Table 11.1. Summary of Social Constructions of Participation in Three Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Farming</th>
<th>Debates</th>
<th>Radio</th>
<th>All Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Who participated?</strong></td>
<td>• rural youth from Fondwa</td>
<td>• students who attend schools across the country</td>
<td>• nine youth at school in IDP Camp Corail</td>
<td>• youth between 14 and 21 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• those with some access to land</td>
<td>• French speakers</td>
<td>• selected by principal</td>
<td>• some form of existing access required to participate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• greater access of girls, slightly greater retention of boys</td>
<td>• genders equally represented, but greater success for boys</td>
<td></td>
<td>• enrolment decisions made by onsite education leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>In What?</strong></td>
<td>• production of goods</td>
<td>• A competition on a pre-determined topic</td>
<td>• providing content for radio programs</td>
<td>• creating, developing, and producing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>According to Youth:</td>
<td>• to be able to go to school</td>
<td>• pride of selection, socializing opportunities, potential to participate in more debate programs</td>
<td>• excitement, skill development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Why?</strong></td>
<td>According to Practitioners:</td>
<td>• to sustain their institutions</td>
<td>• supports organizational reputation</td>
<td>• congruent with mandate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• to sustain their institutions</td>
<td>• supports organizational reputation</td>
<td>• legitimized central mandate</td>
<td>• legitimized programs therefore sustains operations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The intent of each analytical question is as follows:

Who = Who amongst Haiti’s youth was able to access the program, and within this group, who most benefited?

In what = What was the central way that the youths’ participation contributed to the program?

Why = Against the opportunity of status quo, what was the key driver for youth participation? First from the youths’ perspectives (i.e. why did the youth join the program?), and then from the practitioners’ perspectives (i.e. how does youth participation serve the organization?).

Research Question #3 probed the following: “How is participation conceptualized by the various actors at each of the four levels of the vertical aid chain within the three
selected case study programs?” To answer this question I used Vavrus & Bartlett’s (2009) framework of the vertical aid chain to explore perspectives at each of four levels of the program, policy, and funding hierarchies associated with and between each case study. The vertical analysis revealed that the youth beneficiaries of each program viewed participation largely in terms of a connection to an institution; youth were motivated to find ways to access various structures in society. By contrast, among practitioners, funders, and policy makers, participation was seen as instilling the knowledge, attitudes and competencies that strengthen the individual agency of youth and was motivated by the goal of enabling their individual contribution to society. When comparing these conceptualizations horizontally across programs, youth participation was viewed quite differently: as financial mobilization, learning to reason, and engaging in human rights issues by Farming, Debates and Radio, respectively.

Research Question #4 had three components: “How do these conceptualizations of participation compare and contrast with one another among the programs (horizontally), along the levels of the aid chain (vertically), and how can any differences be explained?”

Youth participated in these three programs and developed skills to further participate in their society. The three programs each had a distinct orientation towards citizenship learning: Farming acculturated a type of citizen who could access and negotiate the local market; Debates fostered citizens who gained universal, social capital through language, communication, and reasoning skills; Radio developed a justice-oriented citizens whose consciousness was altered through their experiences in gaining awareness of human rights.
But these programs were not steadfast to any of their orientations. Through the program, Farming youth solidified family and community relationships and experienced possibilities for food security that align with personally responsible and participatory citizenship. Debates youth spent much of their training, formal debates, and personal communications exploring critical, radical, and justice-oriented approaches to societal change. Radio youth perceived their outcomes, at least in part, as having gained technical skills that would make them more marketable individuals.

In the second, the vertical component of this question, I found, that Level 1 (beneficiary) conceptualizations of participation tended to focus on invited spaces for participation, while conceptualizations higher up the aid chain tended to highlight the importance of claimed spaces for participation. These findings contrasted with what I had expected for this research. To explain these findings (the third component of Research Question #4), I turned to the debates between structure and agency as macro theories of social change and proposed that in a fragile state such as Haiti, participation would be more likely to be construed on the ground as an act involving and requiring the presence of social structures, a reality that may be taken for granted by practitioners, funders, policy makers and aid delivers hailing from stable nations with social institutions that are ample and adequate, thereby fostering a notion of participation that would envision the agency of the individual. Participation conceptualizations from middle aid chain level actors appeared to better recognize this complexity and these practitioners worked within the intersections of invited and claimed spaces to negotiate resources for youth spaces for participation, for consciousness-raising, and for other social purposes.
Significance of this Research and Future Directions

This research connects to three areas related to youth participation: international program strategies for youth participation, teaching participation to youth, and ensuring youth voice in developing citizenship theories of the Global South.

Youth Participation in International Aid Programming

Stated conceptualizations of participation from different vantage points of stakeholders in horizontal vertical positions on the aid chain are a contribution of this research. The main findings that conceptualizations varied considerably between levels is useful when engaging in dialogue about participation in development education: it is important to know that participation is conceptualized and perceived dramatically differently by beneficiaries and program deliverers at various stages of aid delivery. While each aid chain level invoked participation, youth focused on gaining individual capital to access structures; whereas organizational conceptualizations were interested in larger societal benefits or at least in reinforcing their organizational integrity. An awareness of these differences in conceptualizations is important as INGOs frame their approaches to youth participation.

At the same time, IOs and INGOs with a clear definition of participation may not be flexible enough to accommodate unforeseen conceptualizations of spaces for participation. A priority for INGOs should be their solidarity with Haitian citizens and adaptability for when invited spaces are recreated as other types of spaces, perhaps even when they resist and defy the sources of the invited spaces themselves. This research also demonstrates the importance of an awareness that participation is conceptualized differently in cross-cultural contexts and especially in fragile settings and an
understanding of the particular political-historical context in which participation is unfolding.

**Youth and Participation Learning**

Research participants spoke about formal education in Haiti in a variety of ways—recall from Chapters Six through Eight as well as Chapter Nine that virtually all research participants cited the relevance of formal education for youth in Haiti. The importance of this institution as a structure in which youth can develop skills for participation is vital, and research into how to bolster of public education and the Ministry of Youth and Education in Haiti through targeted foreign aid is an important project in comparative and international education. All of those who determined which youth could access each program were educational leaders, either school principals or debate club leaders. Within each of the case studies, youth and practitioners exemplified the ways that their programs filled a gap that was not addressed through the formal schooling system in Haiti. Limited attendance and access of youth to schools together with weak curriculum and pedagogy were described in the contextual backdrop and through the perspectives of research participants in this thesis testifying to the lack of opportunities for youth to learn and practice democratic participation in their home schools. Westheimer (2005) proposes that the value of formal schooling is as a vehicle to reach large numbers of youth:

While everyone seems to agree on the need to address the so-called democratic deficit among youth, the question echoing in the halls of parliament, on the pages of newspapers, and in public conversation is: “How?” Not surprisingly, many see schools as the answer. After all, there is no public institution that has the capacity to reach a greater number of young people in a sustained and meaningful way. (p. 27)
Similarly, there is an importance for Haitian schools to enable youth to learn and practice participation. As Haiti continues to re-build and its educational institutions to develop greater capacity, the incorporation of youth participation as a central goal and pedagogical approach would be beneficial.

Yet teaching youth participation should be the domain of both formal and informal education spheres. Kahne & Westheimer (2006b) remark, “Young people today have too few opportunities to recognize their potential contributions to civic and political life” (p. 294). As this thesis discussed, while there are problems and limits to simply inviting youth to participate, there is also a need for more opportunities for youth to engage in and more broadly conceptualize what it might mean to participate in their society. If youth need more opportunities to express themselves politically, this suggests the need to think creatively and bolster the structures in social spaces. In this sense, this responds to the data from youth in this thesis in which they largely conceptualized invited spaces for participation.

While there is an increasing amount of research that looks at youth learning on democracy, citizenship and participation in northern perspectives (i.e. Carr 2008, Westheimer & Kahne, 2004) gathering these perspectives in the context of the Global South is less developed. While youth in northern, donor countries are, by and large, in privileged settings, youth in the south engage in democratic pedagogies and have lesser access to structures than youth in the north. This reflexive awareness of positionality, privilege, and understanding one's agency within the existing structures of society would be considered differently by youth in a fragile state like Haiti than it would be in
developed and donor nations. This thesis may contribute to a construction of typologies of citizenship models for teaching and learning in Southern nations.

**Youth Perspectives on Participation from the Global South**

Finally, this study makes meaningful contributions to the field of citizen participation in the Global South as well. While the exceptionality of participation in fragile states has been described in some case study analyses such as Angola, this approach, especially in the particular context of post-earthquake Haiti, is unique. The findings of this study illustrated the importance of social and political structures in Haiti for citizen participation emphasizing the degree to which youth participant perspectives valued invited spaces for participation. This reflects a reality that I observed in Haiti: the power of participation was especially notable when institutions and structures were present. For example, the few civil society organizations that operate reliably in Haiti are well known for their effectiveness. Research in this area should continue to look at the role of institutionalized civil society in fragile states against the framework of spaces for participation and build a deeper synthesis of perspectives of democracy, citizenship and participation from a Haitian perspective.

The conceptualizations from this thesis can be added to the existing body of literature that is amassing alternatives to theories of citizenship and participation that emanate from the West and are often projected on citizens of the South. It adds to a growing body of work that privileges the conceptualizations of participation by citizens in aid receiving nations, as opposed to basing these ideals on the normative, theoretical accounts of experts in developed nations. Such bottom-up theoretical approaches to participation are nuanced in this research through the specific methodologies of the
vertical case study analysis whose merit was discussed in the previous paragraph. Most importantly, this study makes its contribution by examining on-the-ground, bottom-up perspectives of participation in a fragile state, an exercise that is scarce in the field. This thesis begins this analysis through by comparing and contrasting these conceptualizations amongst each other and along the vertical aid chain.

The ideas conveyed in this research can also extend from spaces for youth participation to new spaces for NGOs and CSOs. As analyses at powercube.net propose, “As new ‘invited’ spaces emerge, civil society organizations may need other strategies of how to negotiate and collaborate ‘at the table’, which may require shifting from more confrontational advocacy methods” (p. 18). Future work in this area may examine new and unique ways that civil society organizations in Haiti are and can develop the capabilities for youth to participate in their society.

**Final Thoughts**

With the recent passing of the fourth anniversary of the earthquake, commemorated in the winter of 2014, it was obvious that Haiti has lost the world’s attention. Aid to Haiti has been severely depleted in recent years despite increased awareness of the inadequate outcomes from the initial reconstruction aid package. Then Canadian minister of International Cooperation implied his take on Haitian participation when announcing the freezing of aid to Haiti in January, 2013, explaining: “Are we going to take care of their problems forever? They too have to take charge of themselves.” Meanwhile, the ongoing cholera epidemic has been referred to as the worst outbreak in recent history, and legal efforts by the Institute for Justice and Democracy in
Haiti (IJDH) and its partners to connect culpability to its introduction to Haiti have been limited.

Many of those involved in my study have moved on as well. Farming’s Education Officer is now a Funding Director with the program’s donor, Digicel. The Canadian government terminated the operations of Rights and Democracy, Debates’ program partner, when CIDA’s functions transferred to the Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade. The sole research participant who was not in school now attends the IDEJEN program in Camp Corail on account of an initiative by the consultant for Radio to raise funds for his first year’s tuition.

When I began this research I wondered how INGOs were enabling the participation of youth in their own reconstruction by examining the ways that participation was socially constructed and conceptualized at various points in the delivery of international aid programs that target youth. Throughout this journey, I have been amazed at the innumerable facets, meanings, enactments, expressions, perspectives, and conceptualizations of citizen participation that have surfaced by those involved in this research. While this thesis has centred on the perspectives of youth, it is important and apparent that Haitians of all ages are consistently provided ways to participate in their society, and the construction of their own destiny. A continued commitment to understanding these meanings of participation may enable more authentic expressions of citizenship for Haitians, and the development of a better future in Haiti.
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## Appendix A. List of Youth Programs in Haiti

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Name</th>
<th>Alternate Name or Acronym</th>
<th>Main and partner organizations</th>
<th>Website</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 3S Soccer Clubs</td>
<td>3S</td>
<td>GOALS Haiti; Street Football World Network</td>
<td><a href="http://www.freethechildren.com/whatwedo/international/countries/haiti/">http://www.freethechildren.com/whatwedo/international/countries/haiti/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Adopt a Village</td>
<td>Adopt-a-Village</td>
<td>Free the Children</td>
<td><a href="http://www.acdi-cida.gc.ca/acdi-cida/ACDI-CIDA.nsf/eng/NAT-22815552-RKQ">http://www.acdi-cida.gc.ca/acdi-cida/ACDI-CIDA.nsf/eng/NAT-22815552-RKQ</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Capoeira</td>
<td>Capoeira</td>
<td>Viva Rio; CIDA; IADB, Gov. of Norway</td>
<td><a href="http://haiticoramdeo.blogspot.ca/2010/01/haiti-update-january-9-2010.html">http://haiticoramdeo.blogspot.ca/2010/01/haiti-update-january-9-2010.html</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Cite Soleil Youth Orchestra</td>
<td>Youth Orchestra</td>
<td>Action Chrétienne pour le Développement</td>
<td><a href="http://haiticoramdeo.blogspot.ca/2010/01/haiti-update-january-9-2010.html">http://haiticoramdeo.blogspot.ca/2010/01/haiti-update-january-9-2010.html</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Community Center for Alternative Peacebuilding</td>
<td>CCAP</td>
<td>Mennonite Central Committee</td>
<td><a href="http://www.mcc.org/haitiearthquake">http://www.mcc.org/haitiearthquake</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Cultural Youth Forum</td>
<td>Youth Forum</td>
<td>Centre de la Francophonie des Amériques; FOKAL</td>
<td><a href="http://www.cosafh.com/index.php">http://www.cosafh.com/index.php</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Debate Competitions</td>
<td>Debates</td>
<td>FOKAL; Rights and Democracy</td>
<td><a href="http://www.fokal.org/fr/index.php?option=com_content&amp;view=article&amp;id=266%3Avague-du-futur&amp;Itemid=54">http://www.fokal.org/fr/index.php?option=com_content&amp;view=article&amp;id=266%3Avague-du-futur&amp;Itemid=54</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Farming for Education</td>
<td>Farming</td>
<td>BRAC; Ecole Communitaire de Fondwa</td>
<td>Find site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Goudou Goudou</td>
<td>Goudou</td>
<td>SolidarIT; Reporters without Borders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Haiti through teenagers’ eyes</td>
<td>Teenagers Eyes</td>
<td>Plan International</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Haiti Youth Development and Education</td>
<td>HYDE</td>
<td>HYDE; Several municipalities in Florida</td>
<td><a href="http://www.haitiyouth.org">http://www.haitiyouth.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Haiti Youth Relief Fund</td>
<td>HYRF</td>
<td>Volunteer Center Orange County</td>
<td><a href="http://www.haitiyouthrelieffund.org/index.htm">http://www.haitiyouthrelieffund.org/index.htm</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Haitian Education Project</td>
<td>HEP</td>
<td>Haitian Education Project</td>
<td><a href="http://www.facebook.com/pages/Haitian-Education-Project/144147129300">http://www.facebook.com/pages/Haitian-Education-Project/144147129300</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 IDEJEN</td>
<td>IDEJEN</td>
<td>IDEJEN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Jacob's Well Youth Camp</td>
<td>Jacob’s Well</td>
<td>Valcin Ministry; Frontier Camp</td>
<td><a href="http://valcinministry.org/wordpress/?page_id=33">http://valcinministry.org/wordpress/?page_id=33</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>YouthBuild Rebuilding Academy</td>
<td>YouthBuild</td>
<td>YouthBuild; IDEJEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>The Dream Team</td>
<td>Dream Team</td>
<td>J/P HRO; many partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Timoun Alez (Comfort for Kids)</td>
<td>Timoun Alez</td>
<td>Mercy Corps; Rizon Media, Peace in Focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Voix Timoun Yo</td>
<td>Voix Timoun</td>
<td>Panos Caribbean; UNICEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Yéle Corps Vocational Training</td>
<td>Yele Corps</td>
<td>Yéle Haiti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Youth Art Program</td>
<td>Youth Art</td>
<td>Association for the Promotion of Family Integrated Health; Nurturing Just Alternatives, Other Worlds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Youth for Haiti</td>
<td>Youth for Haiti</td>
<td>Muslims for Haiti; Helping Hand for Relief and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Youth Haiti Community Gardening</td>
<td>Gardening</td>
<td>Youth Haiti; Haitian Coalition for the Environment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix B. Haiti Youth Programs: International/Local Criteria, Program Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Office location of main partner</th>
<th>Language of program</th>
<th>Program leader nationality</th>
<th>Program office location</th>
<th>Program location</th>
<th>Curriculum influences</th>
<th>Program politics</th>
<th>Program funder</th>
<th>Funder office location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APJ</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>Haitian</td>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>International-local</td>
<td>UN</td>
<td>North</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3S</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>Kreyòl</td>
<td>Haitian</td>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>Destra</td>
<td>Foreign</td>
<td>Mix</td>
<td>Individual donations</td>
<td>North</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adopt-a-Village</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Haitian</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Mix</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Free the Children</td>
<td>North</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capoeira</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Latin American</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>Bel Air</td>
<td>Foreign</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>CIDA</td>
<td>North</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Orchestra</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Kreyòl</td>
<td>Haitian</td>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>Cite Soleil</td>
<td>Mix</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative Peacebuilding</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Foreign</td>
<td>international-local</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>North</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L’entrepreneuriat</td>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>Kreyòl</td>
<td>Haitian</td>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>PAP</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Mix</td>
<td>Gvt of Haiti</td>
<td>Haiti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Youth Forum</td>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>Haitian</td>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>international-local</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>North</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debates</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>Haitian</td>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>Kenscoff</td>
<td>Mix</td>
<td>Mix</td>
<td>Rights and Democracy</td>
<td>North</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farming</td>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>Kreyòl</td>
<td>Haitian</td>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>Fondwa</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>international-local</td>
<td>Digicel</td>
<td>Caribbean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goudou Goudou</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>Bourdon (PAP)</td>
<td>Foreign High</td>
<td>Mix</td>
<td>Foundation de France</td>
<td>North</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haiti Jeunesse</td>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>PAP</td>
<td>Mix</td>
<td>International-Local</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>North</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haiti through Teenagers Eyes</td>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>PAP</td>
<td>Foreign High</td>
<td>Mix</td>
<td>Plan</td>
<td>North</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HYDE</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Kreyòl</td>
<td>Haitian</td>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Mix</td>
<td>Cities in Florida</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HYRF</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>International</td>
<td>Style 2020</td>
<td>North</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Language</td>
<td>Region</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Area</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Partner</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEP</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>international-local</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>North</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDEJEN</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Kreyòl</td>
<td>Haitian</td>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>Across Haiti</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>international-local</td>
<td>USAID</td>
<td>North</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacob’s Well</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>Kreyòl</td>
<td>Haitian</td>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>Limbe</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Mix</td>
<td>churches, individuals</td>
<td>North</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAPDE</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Kreyòl</td>
<td>Haitian</td>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Haitian</td>
<td>Avaaaz</td>
<td>North</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YouthBuild</td>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>Kreyòl</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Mix</td>
<td>MasterCard Foundation</td>
<td>North</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>PAP</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>mix</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>North</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soley Leve</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>Across Haiti</td>
<td>Mix</td>
<td>Mix</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>North</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dream Team</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>Kreyòl</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>Delmas 32 Camp</td>
<td>Mix</td>
<td>International-local</td>
<td>foundations, individuals, NGOs, etc.</td>
<td>North</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nouvelle Vie Youth Corps</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>Kreyòl</td>
<td>Haitian</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Cap-Haitien</td>
<td>Foreign</td>
<td>International-local</td>
<td>UN-FAO and USAID</td>
<td>North</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth in Haiti’s Future</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>International-local</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>North</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timoun Alez</td>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>Kreyòl</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>PAP</td>
<td>Mix</td>
<td>Mix</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>North</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice of the Voiceless</td>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>PAP</td>
<td>Foreign High</td>
<td>international-local</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>North</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voix Timoun Yo</td>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>Kreyòl</td>
<td>Haitian</td>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Mix</td>
<td>Mix</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Haiti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yele Corps</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>Kreyòl</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>international-local</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>North</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Ambassadors</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>U.S.A.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>international-local</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>North</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Art</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>Kreyòl</td>
<td>Haitian</td>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>Carrefour-Feuilles</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Haitian</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>North</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth League</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>Kreyòl</td>
<td>Haitian</td>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>PAP</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Haitian</td>
<td>Haitian Foundation for Democracy</td>
<td>North</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardening</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>Duchity, Grand Anse</td>
<td>Mix</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Jack and Lucy Rosenberg Foundation</td>
<td>North</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth League</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>Kreyòl</td>
<td>Haitian</td>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>PAP</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Haitian</td>
<td>Haitian Foundation for Democracy</td>
<td>North</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Name</td>
<td>Main executing organization</td>
<td>Organization Headquarters</td>
<td>Country Director Nationality</td>
<td>Nationality of Board Chair</td>
<td>Language of Operations</td>
<td>Public Relations Language</td>
<td>Religion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APJ</td>
<td>Volontariat pour le développement d’Haïti</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Haitian</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3S Soccer Clubs</td>
<td>GOALS Haiti</td>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adopt a Village</td>
<td>Free the Children</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capoeira</td>
<td>Viva Rio</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cite Soleil Youth Orchestra</td>
<td>Action Chretienne pour le Developpement</td>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>Haitian</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Kreyòl</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>Protestant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative Peacebuilding</td>
<td>Mennonite Central Committee</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Protestant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L’entrepreneuriat</td>
<td>Le ministère du Commerce et de l’Industrie</td>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>Haitian</td>
<td>Haitian</td>
<td>Kreyòl</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Youth Forum</td>
<td>Centre de la Francophonie des Ameriques</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debates</td>
<td>FOKAL</td>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>Haitian</td>
<td>Haitian</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farming</td>
<td>BRAC</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goudou Goudou</td>
<td>SolidarIT</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haiti Jeunesse</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haiti through teenagers’ eyes</td>
<td>Plan International</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HYDE</td>
<td>HYDE</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Haitian</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HYRF</td>
<td>Volunteer Center Orange County</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Evangelical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEP</td>
<td>Haitian Education Project</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>Haitian</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Language</td>
<td>Official Language</td>
<td>Religious Identity</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDEJEN</td>
<td>IDEJEN</td>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>Haitian</td>
<td>Kreyòl</td>
<td>Kreyòl</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacob's Well</td>
<td>Valcin Ministry</td>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>Haitian</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>Kreyòl</td>
<td>English Evangelical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAPDE</td>
<td>Let Haiti Live</td>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>Haitian</td>
<td>Kreyòl</td>
<td>English n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YouthBuild</td>
<td>YouthBuild</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>Kreyòl</td>
<td>English n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio</td>
<td>Panos Caribbean</td>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>Haitian</td>
<td>Caribbean</td>
<td>Kreyòl</td>
<td>Kreyòl n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soley Leve</td>
<td>Future Generations</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>English n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dream Team</td>
<td>J/P HRO</td>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nouvelle Vie</td>
<td>International Association for Human Values</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>Haitian</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>Kreyòl</td>
<td>English n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Corps</td>
<td></td>
<td>North</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth in Haiti's</td>
<td>OAS</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>English n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future.</td>
<td></td>
<td>North</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timoun Alez</td>
<td>Mercy Corps</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice of the</td>
<td>IOM</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>English n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voiceless</td>
<td></td>
<td>North</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voix Timoun Yo</td>
<td>Panos</td>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>Haitian</td>
<td>Kreyòl</td>
<td>Kreyòl</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yèlè Corps</td>
<td>Yèlè Haiti</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>English n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Ambassadors</td>
<td>U.S. Embassy</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>French n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Art Program</td>
<td>Association for the Promotion of Family Integrated Health</td>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>Haitian</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>Kreyòl</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth for Haiti</td>
<td>Muslims for Haiti</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Gardening</td>
<td>Youth Haiti</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>English n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth League</td>
<td>Aristide Foundation for Democracy</td>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>Haitian</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Kreyòl</td>
<td>English n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix D. Haiti Youth Programs—Market versus Social Orientation (Program Objective Analysis): Text Extracted from Program Goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Market-Economic Oriented</th>
<th>Social, Civic and Cultural Focus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Better livelihood, lift from poverty</td>
<td>1. Individual skills to build social capital (Putnam)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Gaining Skills for trade, job or career</td>
<td>2. Strengthening society, democracy, citizenship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APJ</td>
<td>Volontariat pour le développement d’Haïti</td>
<td>“...à faire face à l’évènements du 12 jan. 2010.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3S Soccer Clubs</td>
<td>GOALS Haiti</td>
<td>“...to engage youth in community...”</td>
<td>“...develop new leadership.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adopt a Village</td>
<td>Free the Children</td>
<td>“...removing obstacles for quality education...”</td>
<td>“...sustainable future...”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capoeira</td>
<td>Viva Rio</td>
<td>“...improve quality of life...”</td>
<td>“...other possibilities to crime and violence...”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cite Soleil Youth Orchestra</td>
<td>Action Chretienne pour le Developpement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative Peacebuilding</td>
<td>Mennonite Central Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td>“...conflict resolution, human rights, peace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L’entrepreneuriat</td>
<td>Haiti Ministry of Commerce and Industry</td>
<td>“...qui cherchent et attendant encore un travail...”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Youth Forum</td>
<td>Centre de la Francophonie des Ameriques</td>
<td></td>
<td>“...pour une nouvelle societe...”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debates</td>
<td>FOKAL</td>
<td>“...debate skills...”</td>
<td>“...democracy, critical thinking...”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farming</td>
<td>BRAC</td>
<td>“...contribute to their community and country’s economic growth.”</td>
<td>“...equal and equity...”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goudou Goudou</td>
<td>SolidarIT</td>
<td>“...debate on the new ethical issues...”</td>
<td>“...awareness of the web as a tool to spread information...”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haiti Jeunesse</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>“...jeunes dans les mouvements politiques...”</td>
<td>“...une mentalite positive...”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haiti through teenagers’ eyes</td>
<td>Plan International</td>
<td>“...providing life lessons to create a solid citizen...”</td>
<td>“...foster our kids physically and mentally...”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HYDE</td>
<td>HYDE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HYRF</th>
<th>Volunteers of Orange County</th>
<th>“...assist them through life...”</th>
<th>“...provide educational and other lifeskills...”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HEP</td>
<td>Haitian Education Project</td>
<td>“...increase educational opportunities...”</td>
<td>“...raising economic status...”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDEJEN</td>
<td>IDEJEN</td>
<td>“...better livelihoods...”</td>
<td>“...insertion socioeconomique...”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacob's Well</td>
<td>Valcin Ministry</td>
<td>“...strengthening Family unit...”</td>
<td>“...to grow in the Word...”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAPDE</td>
<td>Let Haiti Live</td>
<td>“...environment...”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebuilding Academy</td>
<td>YouthBuild</td>
<td>“...young adults with troubled pasts transform...”</td>
<td>“...transform themselves into productive citizens with viable futures.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio</td>
<td>Panos Caribbean</td>
<td>“...skills to report, write, and produce a radio piece.”</td>
<td>“...initiate dialogue...”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soley Leve</td>
<td>Future Generations</td>
<td>“...enhanced livelihoods”</td>
<td>“...leadership skills...”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dream Team</td>
<td>J/P HRO</td>
<td>“...vocational training...”</td>
<td>“...small business training”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nouvelle Vie Youth Corps</td>
<td>International Association for Human Values</td>
<td>“...education opportunities”</td>
<td>“...business development...”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth in Haiti’s Future</td>
<td>OAS</td>
<td>“...education opportunities”</td>
<td>“...business development...”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timoun Alez</td>
<td>Mercy Corps</td>
<td>“...youth in positions of leadership and storytelling...”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice of the Voiceless</td>
<td>IOM</td>
<td>“...part of their country’s reconstruction...”</td>
<td>“...Haiti's new homeless to have their voices heard...”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voix Timoun Yo</td>
<td>Panos</td>
<td>“Send stories...”</td>
<td>“...so that others can see them...”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yéle Corps</td>
<td>Yéle Haiti</td>
<td>“...economic conditions of Haiti...”</td>
<td>“...education conditions of Haiti...”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Ambassadors</td>
<td>U.S. Embassy</td>
<td>“...form strong friendships...”</td>
<td>“...become more effective in social and community work...”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Art Program</td>
<td>Association for the Promotion of Family Integrated Health</td>
<td>“...elimination of forms of discrimination against women...”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth for Haiti</td>
<td>Muslims for Haiti</td>
<td>“...improve quality of life...”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Gardening</td>
<td>Youth Haiti</td>
<td>“...helping rural people develop sustainable agriculture...”</td>
<td>“...better sanitation, sustainable agriculture; reforestation...”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth League</td>
<td>Aristide Foundation for Democracy</td>
<td>“...practical training for rebuilding...”</td>
<td>“...create a space for debate...”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix E. Values According to International / Local Spectrum and Market / Social Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>International / Haiti Criteria</th>
<th>Market / Social Criteria</th>
<th>Market versus Social focus</th>
<th>Int’l versus Local program origins</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Office base locations</strong></td>
<td>Economic livelihood, inf from poverty earning, skills for trade, job or career earning income, salary market participation in individual skills to build social capital strengthening society, democracy justice, rights, equity, self-actualization, self-betterment</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APJ</td>
<td>3 0 -3 -3 2 2 0 1 0 1 2 0 -1 0 0 0 0 0 0 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3S Soccer Clubs</td>
<td>3 3 -3 -3 2 -2 -2 2 0 -2 -1 0 1 0 0 0 0 1 0 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adopt a Village</td>
<td>-3 -3 0 -3 -2 -2 -2 -2 -2 -2 1 0 0 0 -1 0 0 0 0 1 0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capoicira</td>
<td>1 1 -3 -3 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 0 0 -1 0 0 -1 0 0 0 1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cite Soleil Youth Orchestra</td>
<td>3 3 0 0 2 2 0 2 2 1 1 -1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative Peacebuilding</td>
<td>3 -3 0 -3 -2 -2 -2 -2 0 -2 -1 -1 -1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L’entrepreneuriat</td>
<td>3 3 3 3 2 2 2 2 2 2 1 2 0 1 0 -1 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Youth Forum</td>
<td>3 -3 3 -3 2 0 -2 1 1 1 1 2 0 -1 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debates</td>
<td>3 3 -3 -3 2 2 2 1 1 1 1 0 1 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farming</td>
<td>3 1 3 2 2 -1 -1 2 -2 -2 2 0 -1 -1 -1 -1 1 1 0 1</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goudou Goudou</td>
<td>0 -3 -3 -3 -2 -2 -2 1 1 1 -2 0 1 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haiti Jeunesse</td>
<td>3 3 3 -3 0 -2 -2 1 1 1 1 0 -1 0 0 0 0 1 0 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haiti through teenagers’ eyes</td>
<td>3 -3 3 -3 -2 -2 -2 -2 -2 -2 -2 0 0 0 0 0 0 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HYD</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HYRF</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEP</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDEJEN</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacob’s Well</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAPDE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YouthBuild</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soley Leve</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dream Team</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nouvelle Vie</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Corps</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth in Future</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timoun Alez</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice of the</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voiceless</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voix Timoun</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yéle Corps</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambassadors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Art</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth for Haiti</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardening</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth League</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix F.
Program Documents and Websites used in Vertical Case Study Analysis

Farming for Education

Farming for Education program proposal
BRAC 1st Quarterly Report
BRAC 2nd Quarterly Report
BRAC Monitoring Manuel

Digicel Funding Guidelines
Digicel Annual Report 2011-2012
Annual Report 2010-2011
Changing Lives in Rural Haiti (website story)

APF Newsletter
APF USA
APF Mission

Leigh Carter Website
Fonkoze Blog
http://fonkoze.org/resources/blog/Fonkoze
Fonkoze Haiti Website
Chemen Lavi Miyo Program
http://graduation.cgap.org/pilots/chemen-lavi-miyo/

Debate Competitions

FOKAL Program Guide
Chemen Lavi Miyo Program
(http://graduation.cgap.org/pilots/chemen-lavi-miyo/) http://vaguedufutur.blogspot.ca/
(La rencontre nationale des jeunes: il fallait vivre cette expérience!)
Rights through Radio

Panos Caribbean: Real People - Real Voices" Brochure
Panos Caribbean: Strategic Planning Frameworks 2008-2012
Panos Caribbean, website: Panos Haitian Youths Receive


At a glance: Haiti. UNICEF-supported radio training encourages Haiti's youth to tell their own story.

file:///Volumes/FreeAgent%20GoFlex%20Drive/Program%2030-%20Panos/UNICEF%20-%20At%20a%20glance:%20Haiti%20-%20UNICEF-supported%20radio%20training%20encourages%20Haiti’s%20youth%20to%20tell%20their.webarchive

### Appendix G: List of Research Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Study</th>
<th>Pseudonym</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Radio</td>
<td>Rozalie</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>Kreyòl</td>
<td>Level 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio</td>
<td>Lorianne</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>Kreyòl</td>
<td>Level 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio</td>
<td>Elisabeth</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>Level 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio</td>
<td>Rene</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>Level 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio</td>
<td>Claudette</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>Kreyòl</td>
<td>Level 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio</td>
<td>Frantz</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>Level 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio</td>
<td>Andre</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>Kreyòl</td>
<td>Level 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio</td>
<td>Joulie</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>Kreyòl</td>
<td>Level 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio</td>
<td>Tiya</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>Kreyòl</td>
<td>Level 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio</td>
<td>Producer</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>Level 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio</td>
<td>Regional Director</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>Level 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio</td>
<td>FME Consultant</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Level 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debates</td>
<td>Claude</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>Level 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debates</td>
<td>Makenley</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>Level 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debates</td>
<td>Etienne</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>Level 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debates</td>
<td>Natalie</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>Level 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debates</td>
<td>Anaise</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>Level 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debates</td>
<td>Mirlande</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>Level 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debates</td>
<td>Judge</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>Level 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debates</td>
<td>Group Leader</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>Level 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debates</td>
<td>Logistics Coordinator</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>Level 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debates</td>
<td>National Director</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>Level 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debates</td>
<td>Monitoring Specialist</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>Level 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farming</td>
<td>Sophia</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>Kreyòl</td>
<td>Level 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farming</td>
<td>Michel</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>Kreyòl</td>
<td>Level 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farming</td>
<td>Christophe</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>Kreyòl</td>
<td>Level 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farming</td>
<td>Yannick</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>Kreyòl</td>
<td>Level 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farming</td>
<td>Guerlande</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>Kreyòl</td>
<td>Level 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farming</td>
<td>Nadege</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>Kreyòl</td>
<td>Level 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farming</td>
<td>Marc</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>Kreyòl</td>
<td>Level 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farming</td>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>Kreyòl</td>
<td>Level 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farming</td>
<td>Simeon</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>Kreyòl</td>
<td>Level 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farming</td>
<td>Technician</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>Level 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farming</td>
<td>School Principal</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>Level 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farming</td>
<td>Social Studies Teacher</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>Level 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farming</td>
<td>Education Officer</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>Level 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farming</td>
<td>Country Representative</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Level 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farming</td>
<td>Education Manager</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Level 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix H.
Sample Interview Questions

A. Youth Level
1. What have you enjoyed about this program?
2. In several weeks, or several months, when you look back at this program, what will you remember most?
3. What have you learned in this program? What skills have you gained? Think of one thing that you know now that you did not know before. How will you use these new skills in your life?
4. What did you not expect to have experienced in this program that you did? What surprised you most about this program?
5. Has your opinion on any issue changed as a result of this program?
6. What will you be doing after the end of the program? Is there anything in your life that you will do differently now as a result of your experience in this program? Is there anything that this program has motivated you to do?
7. Why do you think it might be important for Haitians to participate in the reconstruction after the earthquake?

Practitioner Level
1. What does this mean to you, “participation”?
2. The program objectives state the importance of youth participation in the activities. How exactly does this happen?
3. How does this program engage youth to participate in ways that other programs might not?

4. With what new skills, knowledge or attitudes would you say youth come out of this program?

5. How are curricular decisions made regarding this program, for example, such things as the language of instruction, the teaching location, the program staff?

6. Why do you target youth (as opposed to other age groups)?

7. Who exactly should be targeted to participate in this program? Were these youth represented in your program? If it were possible, should all Haitian youth have the opportunity to participate in a program such as this?

8. How do you negotiate the diversities in language, races, classes, genders, and geographies in Haiti when ensuring youth participation?

9. Did this program unfold as you expected it would?

10. Is there any thing that the youth took away from the program that surprised you?

11. What will these youth be doing in 5, 10, 20 years?

12. What benefit might a funder see in the “participation” as an element of your program?

13. Walk me through how this program might ultimately enable youth to better participate in their own society.

14. For which sub-groups is participation most important?
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Lettre et formulaire d'autorisation pour la recherche doctorale sur la participation des jeunes dans des programmes de la reconstruction en Haïti

Je voudrais vous inviter formellement à participer à mes recherches de thèse de doctorat. Je suis un étudiant au doctorat à l'Institut d'Études Pédagogiques de l'Ontario (IEPO) à l'Université de Toronto (UT), Canada. Je tiens à vous fournir des informations sur mon étude de sorte que vous soyez en mesure de prendre une décision éclairée à savoir si oui ou non vous allez participer à ma recherche.

L’objectif principal de ma recherche est de développer une meilleure compréhension de la façon dont la «participation citoyenne» est rationalisée par les praticiens, promulguée en pratique, et vécue par les bénéficiaires des programmes par les ONGs sélectionnées pour cette recherche. Alors de la notion que la participation est l'un des objectifs principaux de beaucoup d’organisations opérantes en Haïti, il est également l'une des critiques principales de la reconstruction. Cette étude vise à mieux comprendre comment il est possible que cet écart existe. Mes recherches sont financées et approuvées par le Conseil de Recherches en Sciences Humaines du Canada.

J'ai l'intention de parler avec les différents acteurs des programmes de quelques ONGs sélectionnées pour acquérir une meilleure compréhension de la façon dont les jeunes sont autorisés à participer à la reconstruction de leur propre pays. J'espère commencer par sonder les expériences des bénéficiaires des programmes créés pour engager les jeunes haïtiens dans la reconstruction sociale. Il s'agira d'une observation d'un programme sélectionné pour mieux comprendre comment il se déploie, des entrevues individuelles avec les participants des programmes des ONGs, et une analyse des produits du programme sélectionné. Je viendrai à Port-au-Prince pour cette étape de la recherche au cours du mois de février, 2012. Durant ce temps j'espère aussi solliciter les points de vue des directeurs de l'ONG qui gère le programme, avec des entrevues individuelles. J'espère aussi procéder à une analyse des documents contextuels de Fokal qui ne sont pas disponibles publiquement.
Je propose que chaque entrevue dure jusqu'à trente minutes pour les jeunes participants, et une heure pour les praticiens des ONG, pour s'assurer qu'il y aura assez de temps pour saisir toute l'ampleur de la perspective de chacun des répondants. L'endroit de chaque entrevue peut être déterminé par la personne interrogée, en fonction de leur convenance et leur confort. J'espère enregistrer tous les entretiens pour m'assurer de l'exactitude des perspectifs.

**La Confidentialité**

Sauf indication contraire, je n'ai pas l'intention d'utiliser les noms des participants impliqués dans cette recherche au cours de cette étude, lors de la collecte de données ou bien dans la version finale écrite de cette thèse. Alors que j'ai l'intention de me référer à la position des praticiens dans cette recherche, je ne vais pas utiliser votre nom directement. Bien que je ne puis pas garantir l'anonymat technique, il peut être possible de déduire l'identité des employés de chacune des ONG à travers la description des programmes, des lieux, et d'autres détails.

Une fois que j'ai terminé cette étude, je vous fournirai un résumé des données transcrites avant de la soumettre à IEPO/UT. Après avoir complété cette recherche, je m'attends à publier mes conclusions en anglais dans un journal universitaire pertinent. J'ai également l'intention de présenter les résultats de cette recherche aux conférences internationales et/ou conférences sur l'éducation. Dans tous ces forums, à moins d'une entente contraire, l'identité des participants ne sera pas divulguée.

**La Manipulation des données**

Les données que j'aurai recueillies lors des entrevues seront accessibles seulement à ma directrice de thèse et à moi. J'assurerai la confidentialité en prenant soin de les garder dans mon ordinateur et dans mon bureau, où je serai le seul à avoir accès.

**La Compensation**

Je n'ai pas l'intention de compenser individuellement mes participants pour leur implication dans cette étude. Cependant, j'espère que mes recherches complètes bénéficieront Fokal ainsi que les efforts de reconstruction en Haïti. Pour les écrivains politiques et les planificateurs de programmes au sein d'organisations impliquées dans la reconstruction en Haïti, cette recherche sera d'informer le type, les objectifs, et l’effet des programmes participatifs de développement. En assurant la transparence dans mes entrevues, j'espère engager les participants dans une discussion qui peut enrichir les compréhensions de la citoyenneté, et une discussion plus profonde de la façon dont la participation à de tels programmes pourraient contribuer à leur propre participation.
démocratique en Haïti. De ces manières et d'autres, j'espère que les Haïtiens et la société civile haïtienne seront parmi les bénéficiaires principaux de ces résultats.

**Les Droits**

Je tiens à être clair que vous et vos participants du programme ont le droit de se retirer de cette recherche à tout moment. Dans ce cas, aucune des données que vous m'avez fournies seront utilisées dans l'analyse de mes recherches. Vous pouvez m’informer à tout moment en personne, par téléphone ou par courriel si vous souhaitez cesser votre participation à cette étude. Vous ne devriez pas avoir de la pression pour fournir des informations ou de contribuer à cette recherche. À tout moment, vous et vos collègues ont le droit de ne pas répondre à toute question que vous ne souhaitez pas répondre. Je comprends et j’apprécie que votre contribution à cette recherche soit à votre propre gré.

**L’Autorisation requise**


Si vous avez des questions soit concernant cette recherche, soit comment-il pourrait avoir un impact sur Fokal, s'il vous plaît me contacter directement par courriel ou par téléphone (voir ci-dessous). Je serai heureux de fournir des informations supplémentaires relatives à cette recherche.

Merci d'avoir pris le temps d'examiner cette demande et de participer à cette recherche importante. Si vous êtes prêts à offrir votre consentement s'il vous plaît signer le formulaire ci-joint. Je vous laisserai une copie de ce formulaire de consentement pour vos dossiers.

Si vous avez des questions concernant cette étude, s'il vous plaît n'hésitez pas à communiquer avec moi ou avec ma directrice de recherche à tout moment. Si vous avez des questions concernant vos droits en tant que participant de recherche, s'il vous plaît n'hésitez pas à communiquer avec le Bureau d'éthique de la recherche à l'Université de Toronto. Toute information de contact est incluse ci-dessous.

Avec remerciements sincères pour votre participation à cette recherche importante.
Gary Pluim  
Candidat au doctorat  
IEPO / Université de Toronto  
gary.pluim@utoronto.ca  
705.817.4971 (Canada)  
3716 8266 (Haiti)

Dr. Karen Mundy  
Directrice de thèse  
IEPO / Université de Toronto  
karen.mundy@utoronto.ca  
416.978.0748 (Canada)

Le Bureau de l'éthique de la recherche 
Université de Toronto 
ethics.review@utoronto.ca  
416.946.3273 (Canada)
Formulaire d'autorisation individuel

Moi, ___________________________, j’ai lu et compris entièrement le document décrivant les objectifs, les motivations et les approches pour la recherche proposée par le candidat au doctorat, Gary Pluim.

Je comprends que l’anonymat des participants est garanti pour toute étape de la recherche, que j’ai le droit de me retirer à tout moment, et qu’il n’y aura pas de compensation pour la participation.

Je consens à participer à la recherche à compter du 17 février, 2012.

Signé: _________________________________________________________________
Position à Fokal: _______________________________________________________
Date: _________________________________________________________________
Formulaire d'autorisation pour l'organisation

Moi, ___________________________, j’ai lu et compris entièrement le document décrivant les objectifs, les motivations et les approches pour la recherche proposée par le candidat au doctorat, Gary Pluim.

Je comprends que Fokal est désigné comme nom dans cette étude, mais que dans l'éventualité de se retirer de cette recherche Fokal ne sera pas cité dans les résultats. Il n'y aura pas de compensation pour la participation de Fokal dans cette étude.

J'accorde l'approbation pour Fokal, y compris les participants de programme de Fokal pour servir comme l'une des organismes sélectionnés dans cette recherche.

Signé: _________________________________________________________________
Position à Fokal: ______________________________________________________
Date: _________________________________________________________________
Ethical parameters, considerations and consent for participation in research on internationally supported youth programs in Haiti

I would like to formally invite you to participate in my PhD thesis research. I am a doctoral student in the department of Curriculum, Teaching and Learning at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (OISE) at the University of Toronto (UT), Canada. I am also a student in the Comparative, International and Development Education program which is aligned closely with the topic of my thesis research. I would like to provide you with information on this study to ensure an informed decision about your participation in this research.

My main objective is to develop a better understanding of how citizen participation is rationalized by practitioners, enacted in practice, and experienced by beneficiaries of programs by several internationally supported NGOs in Haiti. While on one hand the notion of participation is one of the foremost goals of international organizations operating in Haiti, it is also one of the leading critiques in the reconstruction. This study aims to better understand how it is possible for this gap to exist. My research is funded and endorsed by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada.

I am speaking with numerous program participants, practitioners, stakeholders, and other advocates of the reconstruction in Haiti to gain a deeper understanding of how youth are enabled to participate in the reconstruction of their own country. I am soliciting these perspectives through one-on-one interviews between 2011 and 2013. I propose that each interview would last approximately one hour to make sure there is enough time to capture the full breadth of each respondent’s perspective. The location of each interview can be determined by the interviewee, based on their convenience and comfort. I hope to digitally record all of the interviews to ensure the accuracy of the perspectives.
Confidentiality

Unless we discuss otherwise, I do not intend to use the names of any of the participants involved in this research during the course of this study, during the data collection or in the final written version of this thesis. While I plan to refer to the positions of the practitioners in this research, I will not use your name directly. Although I can ensure technical anonymity, it may be possible to deduce certain participants through the details of their position.

I expect to publish my findings in a relevant scholarly journal, and to present the results of this research at forthcoming international and/or education conferences. In all of these forums, unless we agree otherwise, the identity of the participants will not be disclosed.

Handling of Data

The data I collect during the interviews will be accessible only to my thesis supervisor and me. I will ensure privacy by carefully storing it on my computer and in my office where it will be accessible to me only.

Compensation

I am not planning to individually compensate my participants for their involvement in this study. However, I do hope that my completed research will benefit the participating NGOs as well as the overall reconstruction effort in Haiti. For policy writers and program planners in organizations involved in the reconstruction in Haiti, this research will inform the type, objectives, and affects of participatory-based programs in development. By ensuring transparency in my interviews, I hope to engage participants in a discussion that will further research participants’ understandings of citizenship, and a critical interpretation of how participation in such programs might contribute their own democratic involvement in Haiti. In this way and others, I would hope that Haitians and Haitian civil society will be among the foremost beneficiaries of these results.

Rights

I would like to be clear that you have the right to withdraw from this research at any time. In this event, none of the data that you have provided me will be used in the analysis of my research. You may inform me at any time in person, via telephone or over e-mail if you would like to
cease your participation in this study. You should not feel pressure to provide information or contribute to this research. During any interview you have, at all times, the right not to answer any question you do not wish to answer. I understand and appreciate that your contribution to this research is at your own volition.

**Consent Required**
I am seeking your oral consent to conduct an interview with you. If you have any questions regarding this research or how it might impact you, please contact me or my supervisor directly by e-mail or by phone, at any time. I would be happy to provide additional information relating to this research. If you have questions about your rights as a research participant, please feel free to contact the Office of Research Ethics at the University of Toronto. All contact information for is included below.

Thank you for taking the time to review this request and to participate in this important research.

Gary Pluim  
PhD Candidate  
OISE / U of T  
gary.pluim@utoronto.ca  
705.817.4971  

Dr. Karen Mundy  
Department of Adult Education  
OISE / U of T  
karen.mundy@utoronto.ca  
416.978.0748  

The Office of Research Ethics  
University of Toronto  
ethics.review@utoronto.ca  
416.946.3273
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A qui de droit

Ce document atteste que FOKAL accepte d’établir un partenariat avec M. Gary PLUIM, candidat au Doctorat en Education internationale à l’université de Toronto, au Canada.

Le thème de recherche de M. Gary PLUIM est « La participation des jeunes dans la reconstruction sociale d’Haiti ».

A cette fin, FOKAL accepte de fournir à M. PLUIM l’assistance nécessaire dont il a besoin en termes de données pour mener à bien sa recherche.

Ceci pour servir et valoir ce que de droit.

Fait à Port-au-Prince, le 27 février 2012

Jean-Gérard ANIS
Coordinator Youth Initiative Programs
Coordonnateur des Programmes Initiative Jeunes
FOKAL – Open Society Foundations, Haiti
143, Ave. Christophe, P-au-P
Tél: (509) 28 13 16 94 / 25 10 98 14
Cell: (509) 37 30 27 79
jeanis@fokal.org
www.fokal.org
http://vagueaufutur.blogspot.com

Open Society Foundations - Haiti
143, Avenue Christophe (HT6112) · BP. 2720, Port-au-Prince, HAÏTI W.I. · Tél: (509) 25 10 98 14 / 28 13 16 94
ACCORD DE PARTENARIAT

Entre Panos Caraïbes, représenté par sa directrice de Programme « Enfants et Jeunes » Nicole Siméon et Gary Pluim, candidat doctoral de l’Université de Toronto, il est convenu un accord de partenariat dans le cadre d’une recherche sur la participation des citoyens haïtiens dans les efforts de la reconstruction pour la thèse de doctorat de M. Pluim.

Les partenaires ont convenu que cette recherche s’établira sur plusieurs mois. Pendant cette période, Panos s’engage à autoriser M. Pluim à :

1- observer et à participer, quand il y a lieu, dans les activités de Panos sur le terrain ;
2- à analyser ses projets multimédia notamment avec les jeunes ;
3- à mener des entrevues avec des bénéficiaires et leurs communautés ainsi qu’avec les membres d’équipe et les partenaires de Panos ;
4- de mettre à sa disposition tout document (rapport, évaluation) public de Panos pour consultation.

De son coté, M. Pluim s’engage à :
1- tenir informer Panos de la progression du travail pendant toute sa durée ;
2- tenir compte de la position de l’institution dans la finalisation des textes ;
3- attribuer, quand il y a lieu, le crédit à Panos pour sa contribution ;
4- à fournir une copie de la version finale du travail à Panos et à l’autoriser, au besoin, à publier tout ou partie du document.

Tout point supplémentaire pourra être discuté, en toute liberté, entre les deux parties.
Cet accord de partenariat ne comprend aucune contrepartie financière et ne fait pas de M. Plum un affilié de Panos et vice-versa. Par conséquent, Panos s’affranchit de toute responsabilité quant à la personne de Gary Plum lors de ses déplacements sur le terrain.

Les deux parties s’engagent à respecter les termes de cet accord de partenariat tels qu’ils sont mentionnés ci-dessus.

Fait à Haïti, en double original, le 13 juin 2011

Gary Plum, BA, BEd, MA
Candidat doctoral de l’Université de Toronto

Nicole Simeon
Directrice régionale de Programme « Enfants et Jeunes »