DOCTORAL THESIS

Perceiving and practicing citizenship: a study on youth activists' experience in social movement in Hong Kong

Lam, Lai Ling

Date of Award:
2019

HONG KONG BAPTIST UNIVERSITY

Doctor of Philosophy

THESIS ACCEPTANCE

DATE: December 18, 2019

STUDENT'S NAME: LAM Lai Ling

THESIS TITLE: Perceiving and Practicing Citizenship: A Study on Youth Activists' Experience in Social Movement in Hong Kong

This is to certify that the above student's thesis has been examined by the following panel members and has received full approval for acceptance in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Chairman:	Prof Li Sandy S C Professor, Department of Education Studies, HKBU (Designated by the Dean of Faculty of Social Sciences)
Internal Members:	Prof Ng Petrus Y N Professor, Department of Social Work, HKBU
	Dr Young Daniel Associate Professor, Department of Social Work, HKBU
External Examiners:	Prof Wyn Johanna Redmond Barry Distinguished Emeritus Professor Youth Research Centre, Graduate School of Education The University of Melbourne
	Prof To Siu Ming Associate Professor Department of Social Work The Chinese University of Hong Kong
In-attendance:	Prof Wong Victor C W Professor, Department of Social Work, HKBU

Issued by Graduate School, HKBU

Perceiving and Practicing Citizenship:
A Study on Youth Activists' Experience in Social Movement in Hong Kong

LAM Lai Ling

A thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Principal Supervisor:
Prof WONG Victor C W (Hong Kong Baptist University)

December 2019

DECLARATION

I hereby declare that this thesis represents my own work which has been done after registration for the degree of PhD at Hong Kong Baptist University, and has not been previously included in a thesis or dissertation submitted to this or other institution for a degree, diploma or other qualification.

I have read the University's current research ethics guidelines, and accept responsibility for the conduct of the procedures in accordance with the University's Research Ethics Committee (REC). I have attempted to identify all the risks related to this research that may arise in conducting this research, obtained the relevant ethical and/or safety approval (where applicable), and acknowledged my obligations and the rights of the participants.

Signature: _____

Date: December, 2019

ABSTRACT

This study investigates how youth activists in Hong Kong make sense of citizenship and practice citizenship by participating in different kinds of social movements. Informed by the work of Faulk (2000) and Isin (2008, 2009), citizenship is conceptualised as a framework as well as a practice where the definitions are developed and constructed accordingly.

A qualitative method is adopted in this research in which in-depth interviews are conducted with 16 youth activists between 18-29 years old and a thematic analysis is carried out for analysis purposes. The major findings suggest that youth activists, even though they are at the forefront of the citizenship movement, find citizenship to be both a familiar and an alien concept. Nevertheless, participation in social movements raise their concerns about citizenship and has compelled some of them to explore a local identity and strive to develop a Hong Kong citizenship from the bottom up. By taking part in social movements, the youth activists build and accumulate experience in citizenship movements, and create diverse and multiple meanings of citizenship.

Three types of citizenship acts are found in this study: responsive acts which are emotionally-driven, confrontational and adversarial. The related practices reproduce a market-oriented and exclusionary type of citizenship. Then there are resilient acts of citizenship which are driven by ideology, and emphasise the importance of connecting citizens in the community to collectively advocate for the realisation of citizenship. These citizenship practices tend to produce an open and inclusive type of citizenship. Finally, there are reinvented acts of citizenship, which emphasise autonomous everyday life practices in the community. These are driven by the reflexive practices that are applied in daily life, which tend to inspire a communitarian type of citizenship.

The findings of this study also suggest that the authoritarian-neoliberal regime in Hong Kong has a dominant influence over the construction of citizenship. This has been a major force that dictates the direction of youth activism towards exclusionary practices, downplays equal citizenship and causes solo actions in

social movements. This citizenship practice reduces the capacity of youth activism from advancing towards activist citizenship, and leads to speculative citizenship characterised by uncertainty and precarity.

Notwithstanding the structural constraints, it is found that alternative practices still exist, and the reflexive capacity of youth activism should not be underestimated. It is argued that different acts of citizenship practiced by different groups of activists are not mutually destructive but rather, feed each another in their controversies and debates, and through communication, thus inspiring alternative acts that erode the dominant conception of citizenship, answer to justice as well as inspire activist citizenship.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

And we know that all things work together for good to them that love God, to them who are the called according to His purpose. (Romans 8:28)

The completion of this study has been a long and challenging journey. Without the love, grace and hope from God and His angels around me, I would not have been able to persevere. For this, I feel truly humbled and grateful.

First and foremost, I would like to express my immense gratitude to my principle supervisor, Professor Victor Wong. I cannot thank him enough for his openness, intellectual inspiration, timely and insightful feedbacks as well as his encouragement. All of these have been indispensable to me in completing my studies and thesis.

In addition, I am blessed that I have received so much support from so many amazing friends: Hui-yin, Mandy, Michael, Elena, Ming, Yee-may and Hin. Thank you for your intellectual and emotional support along the way. Also, I am thankful to the staff members and fellow Ph.D. students in the Social Work department. Special thanks go to Kaki, Caroline and Renee for offering a warm helping hand and your encouragement when I was in need.

I am indebted to the respondents of this study. Their passion, insights and acts have touched and inspired me. I am grateful for their willingness to share their thoughts and experiences with me. Hopefully, we can continue our dialogue at sites of citizenship enactment.

My love and thanks go to my parents and sister for their unwavering care, and acceptance during my Ph.D. study. I am also very grateful to my beloved husband Daniel for his unfaltering love, support and patience when I was devoting all of my time and efforts to my study. Without my family, it would not have been possible to survive the many difficult challenges during this academic journey.

Last but by no means least, I wish to express my deepest gratitude to the Department of Social Work, my alma mater, for nurturing and educating me from my Bachelor's degree to my Master until the completion of my Ph.D. degree. The social work education process has been a life transforming experience for me, and given me solid knowledge and skills, reinforced my beliefs, as well as the courage to strive for equality and social justice. I would like to express my deepest respect and thanks to the social work educators who have left their imprint on me. They are my mentors and role models who have enlightened me in both my professional and academic lives. The belief and values of social work education have made a significant impression on me and continue to guide me in anticipation of future challenges.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

ABBREVIATIONS

HKSAR	Hong Kong Special Administration Region
NENT	Northeast New Territories Urban Development
NPM	New Preservation Movement
OCLP	Occupy Central with Love and Peace
PRC	People's Republic of China
SCNPC	Standing Committee of the National People's Congress
UM	Umbrella Movement
XRL	Express Rail Link

Introduction

Study Background

For many people in Hong Kong and globally, 2014 was an unforgettable year. On a warm autumn night in September 2014, the city exploded into fierce protest. Tens of thousands of Hong Kong people, largely young people, occupied the streets starting in the district of Admiralty, then spreading to Mongkok and Causeway Bay to protest against the decision of the Standing Committee of the National People's Congress (SCNPC) who reneged on their promise to allow universal suffrage in the election of the Chief Executive of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region (HKSAR). This was the Umbrella Movement (UM; sometimes also called the Occupy Movement) which lasted for 79 days. For some people, the UM transformed the image of Hong Kong from an international financial centre into a conflict zone (Kaiman, 2014). For others, it was a turning point in which the principle of "one country, two systems" was no longer a given right. In any case, the UM greatly troubled many Hong Kong people especially youths on the fate of democracy in Hong Kong. The event has also, unsurprisingly, caused many people to self-reflect, including myself, on the definition of a Hong Kong citizen and the future of young people in Hong Kong. As a Hong Konger, I share the anxiety of many others around the uncertainty of Hong Kong's future, as well as feelings of uneasiness around the ambiguity of Hong Kong citizenship. As a community worker, organiser and an active participant in social movements, I have experienced first-hand the sense of powerlessness and vulnerability in promoting citizen participation and organising people and events for

social justice. Having said this, however, I have also observed from the first-hand experience in the UM and other conservation movements that many young people are motivated and inspired to take part in social movements in recent years. They are now more emotionally attuned to the future of Hong Kong, and some have even started to (re)imagine and (re)claim the citizenship rights that they feel are worthy of Hong Kong people. I feel that all these instances of youth activism are very important, and deserve to be studied more in-depth through a systematic critical lens in academia. This is fundamentally the reason why I have chosen this research topic. I consider the work in this study to be not only a serious academic endeavour but also an act of citizenship which has motivated me to reflect on the role of a citizen, explore the nuances and discuss the intricacies (Isin, 2009).

Taking the above context into perspective, the focus of this study is to therefore provide a better understanding on how youth activists in Hong Kong make sense of citizenship in the current social and political conditions. The study also seeks to understand how youth activists compose and practice the different meanings of citizenship through their participation in social movements. In the following, I shall discuss the rationale for this research and elucidate on the research themes, objectives as well as the conceptual framework. I shall also highlight the organisation of this study and summarise the main contents of each chapter.

As far as citizenship in Hong Kong is concerned, the UM which is unprecedented in scale and duration demonstrates the different dimensions of conflict (Chen & Szeto, 2015;

Hui & Lau, 2015; Kaeding, 2017; Ortmann, 2015; Veg, 2017). On the one hand, the UM demonstrates the conflict between civil society and the ruling regime in terms of what constitutes the rights and obligations of being a Hong Kong citizen (Hui & Lau, 2015; Ortmann, 2015; Wong & Wan, 2018; Wong & Chu, 2017). On the other hand, the movement also reflects the clash among different if not conflicting political ideologies that are advocated by different social and political groups in society (Chen & Szeto, 2015; Hui & Lau, 2015). Moreover, the UM demonstrates the conflicts within the activist groups in the process of defining the goals, direction and strategies of the movement (Kaeding, 2017; Kwong, 2016). In other words, the UM reveals the various dimensions of latent social and political conflicts evident in the context of Hong Kong, for example, the conflict between the business sector and the working class and that between the so-called pro-establishment/pro-Beijing camp (the "blue-ribbons") and the pro-democrats/advocates of democracy (the "yellow-ribbons"), and to a considerable extent, the generational conflict generally understood as that between young people and adults. Arguably, these differences, and to a considerable extent conflictual ideas, precisely reflect the different understandings of citizenship prevalent in Hong Kong society. From another perspective, this could be considered to be a process whereby different stakeholders compete for power to define the constitution of citizenship in Hong Kong.

The divergence in the understanding of citizenship between the state and civil society has long existed in many societies and also applies to Hong Kong (Ku, 2009). In the past 22 years since its reunification with China, Hong Kong has witnessed a number of social protests and social movements of different scales, in which youths have played

an increasingly active role (Ma, 2009). This has been especially more evident after 2000 as the protests of Generation Y or the Millennials (young people who are born after the 1980s) have caught the attention of the public, which have morphed into the so-called "post-80s movement" (Adorjan & Yau, 2015; Chen & Szeto, 2015; Hui & Lau, 2015; Ortmann, 2015). Apart from participating in democratic movements, related research in Hong Kong shows that Generations X and Y (those who are born in the 90s) are also concerned about issues related to urban development, conservation of culture and heritage, and sustainable growth such as the Guangzhou-Hong Kong Express Rail Link (XRL) in 2010, as well as the protest against the North East New Territories Development Plan (NENT). These movements are known as the "New Preservation Movements" (NPMs; Chen & Szeto, 2015).

The active participation of young Hong Kongers in social movements does not directly insinuate that they are all inspired and actively championing for social change in Hong Kong. However, their active participation does show the apparent growth of youth activism across Hong Kong and other parts of the world (Sloam, 2014; Todd & Taylor, 2004). Interestingly, the flourishing of youth activism also seems to have a new direction. Instead of purely striving to achieve certain goals such as championing for welfare rights, the younger generation is also advocating for a new culture of social movements that emphasises identity, democracy, and environmental and spatial justice in Hong Kong. Typical examples include anti-XRL and anti-NENT sentiments. (Chen & Szeto, 2015; Ku, 2012) In the process of these protests, it can be observed that Hong Kong youth activists tend to emphasise the importance of equality and direct participation and do not

support the central political leaders in the movements. This exemplifies what Bauman (2000) argued as the lack of trust towards representative democracy and community, in which there is the general belief that political leaders genuinely do not care about their citizens. In the case of Hong Kong where the situation might not completely resonate with the observations of Bauman, there are signs that young activists are attempting to redefine their citizenship, through both the action goals that they intend to pursue as well as the process of the pursuit.

Although the UM did not have the result that the participants had anticipated, nevertheless, a new generation of young activists emerged from the event who are sometimes called the umbrella generation (Chan, 2015; Hui & Lau, 2015). Many of these activists come from different social backgrounds – some have been active in social movements for a period of time while others were politically indifferent in the past but motivated by the movement. Yet all of them are coming together to redefine and claim their citizenship through different actions. It is therefore important to understand how these young activists understand their citizenship and interpret the prospects of citizenship development in Hong Kong. On a related note, it is important to investigate the relationship between their conceptions of citizenship and participation in social movements. By addressing these areas, a better understanding can be derived on how youths today make sense of their own future as well as the future of Hong Kong, at least as far as realising citizenship is concerned. With the above discussion in mind, this study proposes three major objectives.

Research Objectives

The three research objectives are:

1. To explore how young activists understand and define citizenship;

2. To understand the experience of young activists in practising citizenship in social movements; and

3. To investigate the relationship between their interpretation of citizenship and participation in social movements.

Major Research Questions

This research will strive to answer three major questions premised upon the research objectives, as follows:

1. How do youth activists understand citizenship?

2. What are the driving factors for the participation of youths in social movements and what meanings are given to the participation?

3. To what extent does participation in social movements reshape the understanding and practice of citizenship of youths?

Majors Themes/ Concepts of this Study

Guided by the above research questions, I shall highlight three major conceptual themes with the view to establish a conceptual framework for this study. Details of these concepts will be thoroughly discussed in the subsequent chapters.

Citizenship.

Since this research is about citizenship, a critical discussion on this concept is therefore imperative. Basically, citizenship is essentially a contesting concept which carries complex and different meanings in different societies. In this research, I approach citizenship not only as a status but also a practice. In other words, citizenship is a process that involves the ongoing construction of social realities through which its meaning is shaped and reshaped. Thus, the definitions of citizenship are socially constructed and change across time and space. Therefore, instead of offering a single fixed definition, citizenship in this study is considered to be a multitude of concepts with three essential characteristics: the extent (membership), contents (rights and obligations) and depth (participation) (Faulks, 2000).

Moreover, while citizenship is a socially constructed concept, the question of who defines citizenship is crucial. As a political concept, citizenship is shaped by different political ideologies and regarded as a vehicle to translate political beliefs into social and political practices (Dahlgren, 2009, p. 63). As such, contextualising and analysing Hong Kong citizenship would be important groundwork for this study. After reviewing local

studies, it is concluded that the neoliberal and authoritarian notions of citizenship contribute to the primary discourses around citizenship in Hong Kong and its practices. That being said, citizenship is also however practised through social movements and youth activism where alternative meanings are contemplated. This will be elaborated and critically examined in Chapter 5 to 7.

Youth citizenship.

Youth citizenship was a newly emerging concept in the 1980s, which argued that youths are often considered to be the target of social control, and youth citizenship can thus be seen as a governing strategy of the state to exercise its control over young people in order to shape "ideal citizens" based on the ruling ideology. As such, young people are considered to be incomplete citizens (Matthews, 2001) or citizens-in-the-making (Marshall, 1964, p. 81) whose rights are largely denied or neglected. Nevertheless, the transition of youth to adulthood has become more fragmented and prolonged in late modernity (Flanagan, 2008; Furlong & Cartmel, 2007; Manning, 2012). That is, under the influence of globalisation and a neoliberal economic structure, young people are trapped in a precariousness situation (Standing, 2011), and this is particularly the case for youths who are living in marginalised social and economic conditions. However, under neoliberal governing strategies, the government has abandoned the provision of social welfare and enforced free-market principles through the marketisation and privatisation of public services. Under these circumstances, citizen rights have been replaced with customer rights. Moreover, the concept of active citizens which originated from the

republican and communitarian traditions of citizenship is used as political rhetoric to promote self-reliance and personal responsibility. Arguably, youths have become the focus of the top-down active citizenship discourse. By promoting the active involvement and entrepreneurship of young people, the neoliberal notion of citizenship is imposed via social institutions such as education and social services.

Youth activism.

The third conceptual theme of this study is youth activism and its connection with citizenship. As mentioned above, citizenship is not merely a status defined by the state in a top-down manner, but also a practice at the grassroots through which its meanings are created. As opposed to the predominant discourse of "generation deficit" and the top-down promotion of active citizenship by the state, youth activism can be seen as an alternative form of youth participation which challenges conventional politics and redefines the meaning of citizenship. The characteristics of youth activism can be articulated by critically studying local research related to youth activism and social movements. Besides, in light of activist citizenship per Isin (2009), this study perceives youth activists as agents whose participation in social movements can serve to shape and reshape "what is called citizenship" (Isin, 2009). While this concept forms the conceptual basis of this research, the experience of youth activists in social movements, their interpretation of citizenship as well as the relationship between their interpretation and experience will be very important in this study.

Organisation of Thesis

The above conceptual themes will be discussed thoroughly in Chapters 1 and 2. Without overly elaborating on the essential concepts, I shall highlight the organisation of the thesis as follows:

Chapters 1 and 2 establish the theoretical and research framework of this study. Chapter 1 focuses on conceptualising citizenship. Through a comprehensive literature review, this chapter critically examines the concept of citizenship and identifies the approach for operationalising citizenship in this study. In the second half of the chapter, three major modern citizenship theories (republican, liberal and communitarian) are highlighted after a critical discussion of the Marshallian notion of citizenship. This contributes to a more thorough basis for the framework of the study.

Chapter 2 primarily focuses on articulating the concepts of youth citizenship and youth activism and the relationship between youth activism and citizenship. Based on the framework of citizenship articulated in the previous chapter, the concept of youth and its relationship with citizenship are critically discussed through a comprehensive review of the literature related to youth citizenship. In the second part of Chapter 2, the situation of youth citizens is critically examined through three essential characteristics of citizenship: extent, content and depth. In the final part of this chapter, the reaction and resistance of young people towards this dominating constructed citizenship are explored in light of the theory of new social movement and the concept of activist citizenship (Isin, 2008, 2009), and the argument that youth activists are agents who are going beyond the formal political

institutions and adopting alternative ways to practice and redefine citizenship is established to highlight the research focus.

Following the discussions in the first two chapters, I shall turn to focus on the notion of citizenship in Hong Kong in Chapter 3. The aim of this chapter is to elucidate the emergence and development of citizenship under the unique historical and social contexts of Hong Kong. In the first part of this chapter, I shall highlight the development and present situation of citizenship in Hong Kong based on local studies. In the second part, I shall examine the current situation of youth citizenship in Hong Kong, including identity, rights and obligations as well as social and political participation. The third part of this chapter is about social movements with a particular focus on the ways in which youth activists respond to the situation of citizenship after 2000. In the final part of this chapter, two social movements are selected for further discussion.

Chapter 4 presents the methodology and research design of this study. Justification for a youth-centred qualitative research methodology is provided. The data collection method is discussed, and the rationale for selecting the sample and strategy of sampling are also explained in detail in this chapter. In the last part of this chapter, ethical considerations of this research are also elaborated.

As far as findings are concerned, this research finds that youth activists generally resist and defy the mainstream orthodox definition of citizenship, and contemplate and practice alternative notions of citizenship through participation in social movements. The

capacity of youth activists in exploring and advancing citizenship, which is developed from the bottom-up, is shown through the pursuit of local consciousness and a Hong Kong identity. The findings of this research suggest that youth activism has derived multiple and diverse meanings of local consciousness and native identity, and the multiplicity of youth activism has also generated different understandings of Hong Kong citizenship. In light of the acts of citizenship proposed by Isin (2009), three different acts of citizenship have been subsequently identified: responsive, resilient, and reinvented citizenship. These three different acts and the conceptions of citizenship that are implied will be discussed in Chapter 5, 6 and 7.

Chapter 5 is the first of the three chapters that examine the acts of citizenship, in which acts of citizenship are discussed through shows of resistance against the perceived intrusion of the Chinese government in the politics, economy and culture of Hong Kong. The acts of responsive are also symbolic of the protection of the interests of Hong Kong people and preservation of a market-oriented citizenship. The contention put forth is that the principle of "One Country, Two Systems" which involves market-oriented citizenship has been precarious. When negotiations become ineffective, Hong Kong has turned to contemplating estrangement from China and championing for autonomy and independence in order to resist the intrusion of China. Thus, when the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region (HKSAR) government and the legislative council are no longer able to protect the identity and interests of Hong Kong people, and when peaceful protests are no longer effective, activists transform into warriors who strive to protect Hong Kong

through clashes and confrontations on the streets. In other words, it appears that the context of activism has moved from the legislature to the streets.

Chapter 6 describes acts of citizenship that demonstrate resilience, or the second type of acts of citizenship identified in this study. These acts of citizenship confront the dominance of an authoritarian-neoliberal citizenship construct, which, to some youth activists, produces and perpetuates inequality and the lack of a holistic citizenship in Hong Kong. The scale of citizenship is to strive for the actualisation of citizenship under the principle of "One Country, Two Systems" and improve its shortcomings. Building on the context of a socially diverse Hong Kong and identifying with universal human values, these acts of citizenship contain multiple understandings of citizenship. Faced with the mainstream undemocratic construction of citizenship, resilient actors are found in the role of community workers and community organisers who organise the community, awaken their citizenship consciousness and promote social and political participation. These resilient actors use civil society as their site of practice. They become deeply entrenched in the community where they connect with individuals and groups with the aim to help build a Hong Kong citizenship identity and enhance the power of the community in order to counterbalance the authoritarian-neoliberal ruling regime.

Chapter 7 discusses reinvented citizenship, which is the third type of acts of citizenship identified in this study. Unlike the other two types of acts of citizenship, reinvented citizenship challenges the imagination and construction of citizenship of the nation state. Reinvented citizenship argues that the scale of citizenship is found in

everyday life practices. Thus, owing to the deep mistrust and disillusion towards the government, reinvented citizenship in this case emphasizes on the locale – where everyday life takes place – as the site of citizenship practice. The actors believe that everyday relationships are imperative for the actualisation of citizenship. In order to realise citizenship, the actors must be able to live what they believe and put their beliefs into practice in everyday life. In this vein, they play the role of the ascetics who lead an alternative lifestyle which conflicts with the capitalist way of life in Hong Kong.

Chapters 8 and 9 both contain discussions. Chapter 8 discusses the understanding of citizenship implied by these three acts of citizenship and examines the extent to which different youth activists and their practices can be developed into activist citizenship which challenges the mainstream orthodox conception of citizenship and offers a new understanding. It is argued that despite the rich and colourful culture of youth activism, the arrival of activist citizenship which devastates the status quo and inspires new meanings and answers for justice (Isin, 2009), is still being restrained due to the dominance of the mainstream orthodox construct of citizenship. Instead, there is the likelihood that the development of citizenship may turn speculative, which is uncertain, ambiguous, decentralised, and deinstitutionalised, in the event that circumstances persist in which the awakening of civic consciousness is not realised.

Chapter 9 then points out that youth activism and citizenship construction are dynamic negotiation processes between an authoritarian-neoliberal structure and youth activists (agents). It is argued that economic globalisation and renationalisation have

become intertwined and created a crisis of citizenship in Hong Kong. Partly as a result, youth activism has been stimulated, localist ideas and a native Hong Kong consciousness has been stimulated, with a substantial demand for Hong Kong citizenship. However, while there is much capacity for change on the side of the youth activists, the structural constraints posed by the domination of the authoritarian-neoliberal ruling regime which has established strict boundaries around the development of citizenship can hardly be neglected. This chapter discusses the intertwining of different acts of citizenship and their potential for promoting new and alternative conceptions of Hong Kong citizenship.

The final chapter is the conclusion which provides a summary of the key findings and discusses the implications that this study may have for youth work and social policies in Hong Kong. Limitations of this study will be highlighted, and directions for future research will also be proposed.

Conclusion

As I stated at the beginning of this introduction, I carry out this study both as an academic endeavour and a practice of citizenship. Academically, I anticipate that this research can contribute, however the extent, to addressing the knowledge gap between youth and citizenship studies. I also anticipate that this study can help to provide a better understanding on the ways that young people participate, through activism, to construct alternative meanings of citizenship in Hong Kong. By understanding youth activism and citizenship, youth workers in Hong Kong can then reflect on their existing services in

order to (re)examine practices that can enhance the development of a type of activist citizenship that is answerable to justice. As a practice of citizenship, I anticipate that this research could be used as a point of connection where different activists can have meaningful dialogue in the civil society of Hong Kong.

Chapter 1

Conceptualising Citizenship

The primary focus of this chapter is to conceptualise and operationalise citizenship, which is the core concept of this research work. Citizenship is a complex concept and difficult to understand if it is defined in simple terms because it carries a broad range of meanings. Citizenship is a strongly contested concept (Lister, 2003) and therefore subject to a number of contextually specific interpretations (Crick, 2000; Faulks, 2000). In Western welfare states, however, concern around citizenship appears to have diminished primarily due to the impacts of a movement called the New Right in the 1980s in which only individuals and families were promoted as the core pillars of society. The New Right movement became prevalent again in the 1990s, but the traditional concept of citizenship was noticeably challenged by theories around the extensive social changes associated with "postmodernisation" and "globalisation" (Isin Turner, 2002). The emergence of these new phenomena has triggered social and political changes in the last half-century, including changes in government regimes, the rise of various forms of social movements, increasing international migration, enhanced awareness of cultural and ethnic differences, fragmentation of nation-states and so on and so (Abowitz & Harnish, 2006; Heater, 1999; Isin & Turner, 2002). These changes have also motivated academics, activists and citizens to rethink and redefine the meanings of citizenship. Since the notion of citizenship is fluid, how citizenship is understood and perceived by young people nowadays might also differ from previous generations.

There are two primary sections in this chapter. The first section contains a critical discussion of the concept of citizenship. It is argued that the modern notion of citizenship is not created in a vacuum. Rather, citizenship is closely related to the social, political and historical development of particular societies and its construction is inevitably underpinned by the struggles between different groups and political ideologies. These also extend to the construction of youth citizenship. In the second section of this chapter, I shall focus on discussing Marshall's threefold typology of citizenship with an evolutionary perspective which has had a far-reaching impact on citizenship studies as well as pointing out its limitations. By arguing that citizenship is not merely a status but also the practices and interactions between different actors in society, this study approaches citizenship within a framework that encompasses citizenship as a status as well as practice based on Keith Faulk (2000). With this framework, three major modern citizenship models (republican, liberal and communitarian) are briefly reviewed to provide the background information for a better understanding of youth citizenship in Hong Kong.

Marshall's Theory of Citizenship

British scholar Thomas Humphrey (T.H.) Marshall was the sociologist who "put citizenship on the map" (Roche, 1987, p.394). Marshall's theory of citizenship has been extremely influential in how academics and politicians understand modern citizenship. As Lister (2003, p. 16) said, "most modern accounts of citizenship take as their starting point Marshall's celebrated exposition". The renowned essay on Citizenship and Social

Class written by T.H. Marshall (1964) offered a starting point to structure the framework of citizenship. According to Marshall (1964, p.92):

> "Citizenship is a status bestowed on those who are full members of a community. All who possess the status are equal with respect to the rights and duties with which the status is endowed."

In Marshall's theory of citizenship (Marshall, 1964), the development of citizen rights is closely related to the development of social institutions and material conditions (Dwyer, 2010). Marshall (1964) incorporated related elements of citizenship into his theory of citizenship, including civil, political and social rights. He suggested that these rights have gradually evolved through institutional forces from the seventeenth to nineteenth centuries.

It should be acknowledged from the onset that civil rights developed in the 18th century in which the rights of individuals were endorsed, such as freedom of speech and worship, freedom to enter contracts, and the rights to own private properties and to justice (Marshall, 1964). Marshall's notion of citizenship emerged from market relationships and to a large extent supported them. The downfall of the feudal regime and the onset of liberalism and capitalism contributed to a new civil order, and these rights were necessary for the protection of individual freedom in a marketplace. The foundations of the civil legal system can be seen as a part of the institutional establishments to facilitate the development of individualism and capitalism (Dwyer, 2010). In this respect, the principle and the main concern of civil rights are individual liberties, through the establishment of

a civil legal system with the court to ensure that citizens are able to act and compete in a free market.

Political rights influenced by Marshall's conceptualisation of citizenship emerged in the nineteenth century. These rights ensure that individuals are allowed to participate and exercise political power such as ensuring suffrage and franchise in the political process. All these served to support the establishment of a parliamentary system and democratic government. Political citizenship also bestows rights on politically excluded groups and individuals so that they can politically mobilise, campaign, and organise to ensure their rights and interests, such as better working conditions and higher wages of the working class. As such, new social relations emerged during such political processes, in which the working class played an important role in maintaining their relevance. For Marshall (1964), civil and political citizenship are the corresponding rights for achieving social equality.

Marshall (1964) stated that social rights are the final set of rights developed in the twentieth century. The essential characteristics of social rights include "the whole range from the right to a modicum of economic welfare and security to the right to share to the full in the social heritage and to live the life of a civilised being according to the standards prevailing in the society" (Marshall, 1964, p. 72). Social welfare systems, housing and education policies. were important institutions that facilitated social citizenship. Social rights were promoted to mitigate social inequality in the early days of capitalism. As Turner (1990) said, Marshall's social rights are "the principal political means for

resolving, or at least containing those contradictions" (p. 191). According to Marshall (1964), the role of social rights and the welfare system is to provide basic support for disadvantaged members in the nation state and ensure that they can enjoy civil and political rights.

The theory of citizenship proposed by Marshall (1964) has enhanced the development of social democracy in western countries, and the advancement of social citizenship has been the cornerstone of the modern welfare state since 1945. By recognizing social rights, citizenship is considered to be not merely a social contract to balance legal protection and self-governance, but also entails the active role of the state to intervene in the lives of its citizens through social policies and welfare, and provide material support for its citizens to fully participate in society. The emergence of the welfare state was a historical process by which citizens of a national community "became inclusively entitled to the material promises of civil freedom and political equality" (Bussemaker, 1999, p. 2). The development of the welfare state contributed to enhancing the quality of life of citizens and provided the substantial promises of civil and political rights. During this period of time, Gunsteren (1998) stated that "citizenship is a matter of emancipation, of successively realizing these three aspects of political, legal and socioeconomic participation for all people who find themselves on the territory of the state" (p.13).

Criticisms of Marshall's Theory

However, Marshall's theory of citizenship has been the subject of criticisms and counter arguments. One of the main criticisms states that Marshall's social democratic model of citizenship is only able to rework but not challenge capitalism. Also, Marshall's account of citizenship inherently contradicts the principles of citizenship and capitalism. As suggested by Heater (2004), "citizenship is predicated upon the principle of equality, capitalism on inequality" (p.102). Marshall attempted to redistribute power and resources in society but obviously took the trajectory of capitalist states for granted. Also, Marshall inadequately acknowledged the conflicts of interest between social rights and market values, capitalism and citizenship, as well as the persisting conflict between the markets and the state. Anthony Giddens (1982) also criticised Marshall for neglecting the consequences of historical evolutionary changes that have a considerable impact on society. Giddens (1982) argued that the extension of social and other rights is an inevitable result of social and political conflicts and struggles. However, the assurance of citizenship has failed to resolve class conflicts. Instead, they are only a "medium of the extension of citizenship rights rather than to say that the extension of citizenship rights has blunted class divisions" (ibid p. 174).

The second main criticism around Marshall's account of citizenship is that it is Anglo-centric and based on historically specific contexts, and thus it cannot be assumed that the evolution of citizenship will take the same form in all countries (Mann, 1987; Turner, 1986). Marshall proposed his theory of citizenship in the period after the Second

World War when the welfare state was established for post-war welfare settlement purposes. The idea of citizenship was brought up as an institutional response to the self-criticism of Britain towards the war and, to some extent, represented aspirations towards post-war reconstruction (Dwyer, 2010; Titmuss, 1962). Therefore, Marshall's notion received support due to the specific social and economic conditions and post-war British welfare consensus (Turner, 2001). In fact, Marshall (1964) was also aware that the development of citizenship in each society would be different, and noted: "there is no universal principle that determines what those rights and duties shall be" (p.84). This vividly shows that the concept of citizenship is fluid and shaped by different cultural and historical factors.

Thirdly, Marshall suggested a "universal" notion of citizenship which bestows equal status and the same set of rights to all citizens (Marshall, 1964). However, this has also been countered by a number of academics, especially because the notion diminishes the citizenship of women, children and youth (Jones & Wallace, 1992; Lister, 1994, 1997a; Walby, 1994). Marshall stated that citizenship is a universal entitlement regardless of class and social background (Marshall 1964). However, in spite of the claim of universality, citizenship was constructed in a way that actually limited universality (Dwyer, 2010; Finch, 1996; Heater, 2004). As Dwyer (2010) said, "the universal status that Marshall proclaimed appears to have reflected the world of the white, able-bodied, upper-middle class, male citizen" (p.47-48). Therefore, Marshall's conception of citizenship has been widely criticised for neglecting women, ethnic and sexual minorities, and young people (Dwyer, 2010; Lister, 1990; Nash, 2010).

In addition, granting all citizens with the same rights does not mean equitable treatment. In this regard, Lister (2003) rightly argued that the universal notion of citizenship obscures the inequality produced and maintained in political and historical contexts. Hence, it is "false uniformity" (Ellison, 1999, p. 59) which conceals the "realities of power" and "make some more equal citizens than others" (Cornwall & Gaventa, 2001, p. 5). In turn, the illusion of formal equality and universalism not only fails to eliminate inequalities, but further marginalises and excludes existing marginalised groups in society (Gaventa, 2002).

The fourth major criticism about Marshall's theory is its implicit promises that see the nation as an imagined community and the exclusive container of citizenship (Kivisto & Faist, 2007, p. 1). As a matter of fact, the forms of citizenship have been changing so that they are now more fluid, which transcends national and territorial boundaries, and have become transnational and global as well as multicultural in nature (Delanty, 2000; Kymlicka, 1995; Ong, 1999; Plummer, 2003). For example, Delanty (2000) argued that the sequential development of the Marshall citizenship model is flawed and outdated and contended that "the state is no longer the exclusive reference point" and that there are "new possibilities for participation and rights both within and beyond the state" (p.53). Certainly, the implications of globalisation and the declining trend of the nation-state for a contemporary understanding of citizenship cannot be underestimated.

Last but not least, the passive and institutional basis of Marshallian citizenship has also attracted criticism from some scholars such as Turner (1990) and Delanty (2000). This passive form of citizenship has been criticised for neglecting obligations as well as the balance between rights and obligations. Hence, the notion of active citizenship became one of the core debates among the primary theories of modern citizenship, such as passive and active citizenship among communitarians and civil republicans, and the newly emerged neo-liberal and Third Way politics. The debate around active citizenship will be elaborated later in this chapter. In addition, Marshall stated that rights are given by the state and institutionally based. However, Turner challenged this statement as a top-down notion where rights are institutionally based and involve for example, courts and parliament. As such, citizens are passive rather than active (Turner 1990, p.201, 207; Delanty 2000, p.19). Alternatively, Turner (1990) postulated a citizen as an "active bearer of rights" and citizenship can be realized in a "bottom-up form" (p.207). The experiences of the American and French revolutions and social movements exemplify this bottom-up or active form of citizenship per Turner (1990). This point is particularly important for this research study which examines how youth activists shape citizenship by participating in social movements. The contestation of citizenship as a status and as a practice is one of the core debates in the field of citizenship studies. Marshall's theory of citizenship was based on liberalism which defines citizenship as a status. As argued above, this has been the target of criticism and counter arguments that see citizenship as a practice. In this sense, it is important to clarify these concepts and establish a new framework to study citizenship.

Framing Citizenship

Citizenship as a practice.

In addition to accepting citizenship as a political status, which involves formal rights and obligations, the notion of citizenship can also be understood as "a set of practices (juridical, political, economic and cultural) which define a person as a competent member of society, and which, as a consequence, shape the flow of resources to persons and social groups" (Turner, 1993, p. 2). As a modification of the Marshallian concept of citizenship, this view articulates the process of becoming a citizen and emphasises a dynamic process of practice rather than a static status. The main concern around this view concerns the multiple interactions between the juridical, political, economic as well as the cultural institutions in society which define, or otherwise, deny citizenship status. From this point of view, one could begin to argue that citizenship is not simply about the presence or absence of a status, or the entitlement or deprivation of certain rights and obligations. Rather, it can also and sometimes more likely, be a conflict whereby individuals or groups struggle to achieve the status of being a citizen, especially in a multicultural and multiracial society where there are competing national, ethnic and religious identities (Kymlicka & Norman, 1994).

Based on this conceptualisation, Kymlicka and Norman (1994) suggested the differentiation of citizenship into two different concepts: citizenship-as-legal-status which is primarily related to the Marshallian concept of citizenship, and citizenship-as-

desirable-activity. According to Kymlicka and Norman (1994), the discussion of citizenship and the consolidation of democracy cannot be discussed independently of the virtue and responsibility of citizens. Thus, there is a need to transcend beyond the passivity of citizenship-as-legal status and motivate citizens to engage in desirable activities. This view, however, is not in sync with that of the New Right movement where active citizens should be those who are economically productive and self-reliant. Rather, this view sees the virtue and responsibility of being "good citizens" as being empowered to participate in democratic endeavours as well as various social institutions. As so, citizenship can be seen as a purposive activity, which requires the involvement of citizens in civic engagements and participation in public affairs. Therefore, citizenship also includes the idea of "citizens-as-activists" (Kymlicka & Norman, 1994, p. 354). This idea is particularly relevant to the discussion in the final part of this chapter, which argues how youth activism shapes and reshapes the meaning of citizenship.

Citizenship as framework.

In considering the discussion above, it is more useful to consider citizenship as a container with many different elements across various dimensions in which the characteristics are often debatable and vary in different social contexts, instead of defining citizenship as a closed and fixed concept and subjected to a single definition. In this respect, Keith Faulks and others have provided a useful framework for citizenship which is considered to be a multitude of concepts with three essential characteristics including the extent (criteria of being a citizen), contents (entitlements, rights and obligations), and

depth (citizen participation and commitment) of citizenship (Faulk, 2000; Isin & Turner, 2002). This framework for citizenship views citizenship as both a status as well as a practice. Since citizenship is taken into consideration as a framework rather than having a fixed definition, it can be used as an analytical framework to study citizenship based on specific social contexts.

Some important aspects of citizenship should be considered and critically discussed if it is examined within a framework. First, citizenship as a political concept is shaped and underpinned by different political philosophies with the goal of actualising a "good society" based on their own definition (Dahlgren, 2009, p. 63). It is one of the cornerstones that support the political systems of Western democracy, and a vehicle to transfer political beliefs into social and political practices. In this sense, citizenship provides a framework to understand the underlying dominant ideologies and how they define and shape the relationships between citizens, including young people and the particular political community. That is, citizenship is a concept that is closely related to exercising ruling class strategies, social policies and social exclusion. Since my study is to investigate the understanding and interpretations of citizenship of young people in Hong Kong, the political ideologies that are competing in society should be critically examined.

In addition, the discourses of citizenship are often contested and subsequently rearticulated. In the past, citizen rights only belonged to a privileged few. These gradually extended to include most men, and then most people in a society regardless of their race,

gender or social position (Goodin, 2003). As mentioned, citizenship is a vehicle to actualise an ideal society. It is not realistic to assume that there is a common consensus in every society on what is "ideal". As (Mouffe, 1988, p. 30) said:

> There will always be a debate over the exact nature of citizenship. No final agreement can ever be reached. Politics in a modern democracy must accept division and conflict as unavoidable. There conciliation of rival claims and conflicting interests can only be partial and provisional.

In this sense, even though a particular society may have its dominant citizenship discourse and practices, these are continuously challenged by individuals with alternative views. As such, "citizenship is formed, performed and re-formed through activity; it is about participation in society and the role of the state and government" (Parker, 2003, p. 17). In this respect, social movements in Hong Kong can be seen as one of the ways of reforming citizenship, so the civic participation experiences and expectations of young activists are vital means of articulating their understanding of citizenship and views of an "ideal society".

Besides, the form and development of citizenship in a particular polity is closely related to its cultural and historical background. The Marshallian account of citizenship is situated in a post-war western context. Therefore, this account cannot be generalized as it cannot be assumed that the development of citizenship will have the same form in all countries (Ellison, 1997). Lister (Lister, 1998) also reminded us that citizenship "means different things to different people and is the subject of disparate understandings according to the national context" (p.5). As Hong Kong has its unique social, cultural,

economic and historical background, its particular social context should be taken into consideration in conceptualizing citizenship. This will be discussed in Chapter 3.

Dominant Theories of Citizenship

Modern societies primarily embrace three major citizenship models: liberal, republican, and communitarian all offer different views on what the content, extent and depth of citizenship should be in a given polity. In this section, theories around these modern citizenship models are elucidated in detail.

Liberal citizenship.

The liberal theory is considered to be the most predominant theory in the past two centuries, and its influence has sustained over time (Heater, 1999, p. 4). In fact, the development of theories of citizenship has been subjected to on-going debates from a liberal perspective. As Faulks (2000, p.3) suggested, the "modern form of citizenship is characterized mostly by its roots in the liberal tradition, an "inherently egalitarian" establishment of individual rights". As such, it is crucial to examine the notion of liberal citizenship to make sense of modern citizenship. I shall discuss liberal citizenship based on a framework that contains the three essential characteristics of citizenship as suggested by Faulks (2000): extent, content and depth of citizenship.

Extent: The origins of liberalism stemmed from challenging the authority of the established church during the Renaissance period (1300 to 1700 AD). Liberalism represented a shift from a "monarch–subject relationship to a state-citizenship relationship" (Heater, 1999, p. 4). Also, some scholars argue that the liberal tradition of citizenship is consistent with the development of capitalist societies and the nation-state (Dwyer, 2010; Faulks, 2000; Heater, 1999). As Heater (1999, p.7) said: "the decay of a feudal or quasi-feudal society and its suppression by a market economy did introduce changes that were, if no more, at least conducive to the emergence of a liberal form of citizenship" (Heater, 1999, p.7). The emergence of this new form of citizenship in modern society has changed the relationship of individuals with the state, and citizens have gained more power based on more rights and participation in democratic endeavours and the market economy.

Since liberal theories perceive individual freedom as an essential factor, the state is seen as an entity that defends the rights and freedom of its citizens (Oldfield, 1990). Instead of imposing a certain lifestyle and values, the role of the state is to protect and facilitate individual freedom as well as provide a just and democratic social environment for its citizens who can enjoy equal opportunities when choosing and actualising their own values, goals, and interests. In this respect, state neutrality is the best way to ensure individual liberty and social justice. Yet, the liberals differentiate between the public and the private domains (García-Albacete, 2014). By positioning citizens in a confined private domain where social and cultural diversities can be maintained, citizenship and civil society are reduced to pre-political entities (Delanty, 2000). The early liberals felt that the

state should maintain a neutral role with little intervention in the private domain. Only when this is the case, individual liberty and civil society would be closer to actualisation.

Content: As mentioned above, liberal citizenship is a legal status with a set of universal rights that protect and maximise the liberty of its members (Schuck, 2002, p. 132). Basically, the conception of citizenship within the liberal traditions has generally focused on the rights of citizens. The rights of citizens are a form of protection, and liberty is negative freedom (that is, freedom from interference). All citizens are granted the same formal rights, with equal status so that they can exercise their political and economic power. However, they have the choice to decide whether they would like to exercise their rights (Isin & Wood, 1999, p. 7).

As mentioned above, T.H. Marshall has significantly contributed to the development of a liberal concept of citizenship. Marshall argued that a certain level of assurance of economic and social well-being is necessary, and the state should protect its citizens from social and economic uncertainties through welfare provisions (Ellison, 1997, p. 699). Marshall perceived welfare as a minimal safety net but social rights are not to eliminate inequality but reduce the risks for the poorest citizens in a capitalist society. In this sense, Marshall modified the classical liberal understanding of citizenship which only focused on individual rights, and stated that the state has little responsibility to provide welfare for its citizens. This view is seen as the fundamental ideology in the development of the welfare state in western countries. Although this ideology does not have the consensus of all the different schools of liberals and is strongly contested by neoliberals in recent

decades, it is still an influential concept that informs the liberals and debates in the field of citizenship studies.

The liberals perceive citizenship rights as reciprocal and contractual obligations (Schuck, 2002), which emphasises the equal rights of any member of a society, and his/her obligations, such as obligation to pay taxes, work, receive a compulsory education, and participate in military services and "the general obligation to live the life of a good citizen" to promote the welfare of a society (Marshall, 1964, p.117). Although obligations are an important characteristic of liberal citizenship, the normative element of the liberal ideology is mainly concerned with the liberty and the protection of rights of individuals (Janoski & Gran, 2002, p. 17). In this sense, the early notions of liberal citizenship do not emphasise on whether citizens have made a recognised contribution to society, as they are entitled to benefits without being responsibility to society (Walzer, 1989, p. 216).

Depth: Liberals recognize the right of citizens to political participation because in doing so, this enables citizens to safeguard any authority that interferes with personal freedom. In Marshall's account of citizenship, civil and political rights to a certain extent both recognise the right to participate politically, but these are largely seen as rights to participate in a particular political and civic system, e.g. to vote within a representative democratic system, form associations and political parties and exercise free speech (Gaventa, 2002). Under a fair political system, liberals believe that public affairs are best managed by elites and politicians. Citizens are to obey the procedures and value the rule of law, because the liberals believe that laws and procedural rules ensure a fair and

inclusive form of governance and policy making (Gutmann, 2000). In this sense, political participation is not an obligation of citizens. The individual has to make the decision on whether s/he should actively participate in society (Isin & Wood, 1999; Schuck, 2002).

Republican citizenship.

As discussed earlier, the republican tradition can be traced back to as far as ancient Greece and Rome. The basic notions of republicanism are self-government and public politics (Dagger, 2002) Republicans emphasise duties and active participation as the key elements of citizenship, which contradict the liberal tradition of citizenship that focuses on rights (Kartal, 2002)

Extent: The civic republican tradition of citizenship emphasises exclusive membership and is rooted in the ethical sources of a national community. The republicans clearly define citizenship through inclusion and exclusion. As Abowitz and Harnish (2006) stated, this "gives priority to political and national community over universalist or humanist ethics" (p.659). The national community, to a greater extent, is rooted in ethical sources and the identity of an individual is basically defined by his/her nationality (Miller, 2000).

Content: Republican citizenship is a duty-based model. The republicans believe that the duties and obligations of citizens make democracy promising. Instead of considering rights as a form of protection against state interference**,** rights are the means of strengthening the relations between the state and its citizens. To republicans, rights have

certain threats which may alienate citizens from societal responsibilities. Therefore, "for every demand for rights necessarily entails a greater regulation and institutionalization of social life so as to conform to a uniform pattern, and a concomitant withdrawal of more and more issues from the realm of democratic decision-making" (Bellamy, 1997, p.181 as cited in Kartal 2001). In response to this, individuals may be compelled to accept more obligations from others. On the other hand, unlike the liberal perception of rights as a precondition of citizenship, republicans see rights as the outcomes of a political process (Bellamy, 2000, p. 177).

The republican political ideas are associated with authoritarian tendencies as they prioritise civil obligations for the well-being of the political community ahead of individual rights. This is because they believe citizen rights will become hollow promises if these rights are not associated with civic responsibilities, and therefore emphasise on developing a set of civil virtues among its citizens, particularly for the younger generation, such as "loyalty, civic literacy, and service to government, community and country" to promote the capability and intentions of citizens to fulfil their civic responsibilities (Kartal, 2001). To do so, civil society should have the responsibility of enforcing obligations to a certain extent, but the state has direct responsibility for the encouragement and enforcement of obligations on the members of its society through education and legislation.

Depth: The central focus of civic republicanism is on the obligations of citizens to their political community and their participation. The republicans stress the morals of its

citizens, in anticipating that they would actively take part in public debates and demonstrate their commitment to the community (Dagger, 2002). Civic identity is highlighted to enhance the commitment of the citizens to the national state, respect for its symbols and active participation in its common good (Abowitz & Harnish, 2006). Unlike communitarians, the republican theory does not focus on the socio-cultural community, but rather on the political community and political identities such as active citizens as well as the commonality of identity, and presumes that there are obligations to participate in public affairs (Oldfield, 1990, p. 145).

Self-government is another essential element of republicanism. Dagger (2002, p. 146) stated: "in a republic, that is, the government of the state or society is a public matter, and the people rule themselves". As so, citizens should actively participate in society in order to be "self-governing". At a more practical level, Miller (2000) argued that citizens may form factional groups based on their interests in order to represent themselves in the political arena. Accordingly, civic republicans intend to promote deliberative forms of democracy, which is contrary to the representative democracy of the liberals (Heater, 1999). The deliberative manufacture of democracy is to provide citizens with equal grounds to practice self-governance, and they can exercise their power to protect and fight for their beliefs (Dagger, 2002, p.155). In short, politics is considered as an activity that is deep-rooted in public space, in which openness and high levels of democracy should be included as the essential characteristics of the political community (Dagger, 2002)

Communitarian citizenship.

The communitarianism model emerged during the 1970s to 1980s (Avineri & De-Shalit, 1992, p. 2). It is not a new political theory but one of the strands of political ideologies that date back to ancient Greece and Rome. Unlike the liberal ideologies that focus on individual rights and the republican conceptions that emphasise obligations to the state, this model focuses on the community as a whole (Fierro, 2009). Communitarianism is regarded as the most prominent critique against liberal citizenship in contemporary society. Communitarians oppose liberalism due to its "excessive individualism" and its conception of citizenship as an "overemphasis upon rights" (Faulks, 1999, p. 126). Communitarianism emerged in protest of liberalism and individualism associated with late modernity and was intended to offer potential remedies for the problems found with liberalism (Hale, 2004; Selznick, 2009).

Extent: In contrast to liberalism which takes the individual and civil republicanism which takes the nation as their starting point, communitarianism situates civil society in the community. It stresses participation and identity as opposed to rights and duties in liberalism (Delanty, 2000; Hoskins et al., 2012). The community is seen as an essential entity because communitarians believe human beings are socially constituted (Etzioni, 1997). Also, the sense of identity of its members is created only through relations with others in the community in which they belong (Sandel, 1998). Therefore, community is not merely a territory, but an arena to nurture the identity of the citizens and provides stability and morally socialises its members (Frazer, 1999; Stokes, 2002). With regard to

this, citizenship is developed rather than granted and a collective identity which is socially constituted rather than given by the state (Gaventa, 2002)

Since communitarians believe that social values and order are formed collectively rather than at the individual level, they emphasise on the values and orders relayed and enforced in the community by social institutions and community units. As mentioned, communitarians disagree with the liberal ideology that emphasises individual freedom and rights above all and find it important to find solutions for contemporary moral and social dilemmas. They perceive the community as the remedy for social problems caused by individualism. As Etzioni stated (1993, p. 15): "free individuals require a community, which backs them up against encroachment by the state and sustains morality by drawing on the gentle prodding of kin, friends, neighbours and other community members, rather than building on government controls or fear of authorities".

According to communitarianism, the state has a lesser role in implementing social and moral regulations compared to social institutions and community organization (Frazer, 1999). However, this does not mean that communitarians promote ethical neutrality of the state. In fact, they suggest that the government has to ensure the common good through policy making in ways that respect community lives and traditions. In this sense, the community could be the space for the self-realisation, identity building and active participation of the citizens.

Content: Communitarians do not deny citizenship rights, but see individual rights and social obligations as mutually reinforcing and enhancing. Unlike liberal individualism, they postulate that the balance between citizen rights and social obligations should be evaluated and adjusted accordingly. Etzioni (1997, p. 44) argued: "while individual rights and social responsibilities are mutually enhancing up to a point, they turn antagonistic if the level of either is continuously increased". He also opposed that there are "no rights without responsibilities" or vice versa, because citizens are still entitled to basic rights even if they fail to carry out their obligations. Following the same logic, those whose rights have been inhibited still have the responsibility to fulfil their social obligations (Etzioni, 1993). For communitarians, rights and freedom are only possible in a community where citizens have a sense of belonging and shared responsibilities. Therefore, instead of only emphasising rights, communitarians emphasise the value of collective lives and a sharing community, such as "shared fate, shared social identities, shared practices (language, religion, culture), and shared values" (Frazer, 1999, p. 43). Shared values and the reciprocal relationship between rights and obligations are interlinked to a stronger perceived community. Communitarians see the community as a substantial arena which renders citizenship rights and social responsibilities practical and sustainable. In this vein, communitarian scholar Michael Sandel (1998) criticised the liberal conception of individuals as overly thin to bear a range of social obligations. In his view, the community is a stronger means and has greater capacity to support individuals in fulfilling their responsibilities, and can eventually support and sustain citizenship rights (Sandel, 1998, p.16). Thereby, "once we (communitarians) recognize the dependence of the human being on society, then our obligations to sustain the common

good of society are as weighty as our rights to individual liberty" (Kymlicka, 2002, p. 212). In this sense, the obligation of individuals and the state to support the community should be recognised due to the supposition that the "community" has such an important position in people's lives and is a substantial factor for citizenship.

Moreover, communitarians consider that the fulfilment of social obligations can reinforce a sense of belonging and loyalty to the community. According to Taylor (1985), one's sense of belonging is closely associated with his/her sense of responsibility. However, the sense of social responsibility suggested by communitarians is not the same as the republican notion of institutional or legal duty imposed by the state (Oldfield, 1990). Instead, social responsibility should be developed through a sense of belonging and loyalty to a particular community. Obligations to society mean the general will to sacrifice self-interest for needs and promote the interests of the community and society (Habermas, 1995; Janoski & Gran, 2002, pp. 18–19). As such, communitarians call for the recovery of the community and promote social responsibility and participation to address the problems of a society dominated by individualism (Delanty, 2002).

Depth: Citizenship, according to the communitarians, is not given but developed through civic virtues and civic bonding, for example, respect for others and recognition of the importance of public service (Smith, 1998, p. 118). These virtues can be realised in interactions with others in a society. In this respect, communitarians expect citizens to actively take part in society and prioritise the good of the community above individual interest (Janoski & Gran, 2002). As the lasting legacy of Aristotle's citizenship,

communitarian citizenship shares a similar stance as the republicans in some aspects, such as the idea that participation is a form of exercising self-government, and freedom and capacity to contribute for the common good. However, they are unlike the republicans with their state-centric approach, over-emphasis on patriotism, and loyalty to the community and common goals (Lister & Pia, 2008). In this respect, communitarians emphasise free agency of citizens who can commit to the community in which they belong but not necessarily the nation-state. In short, citizens, to the communitarians, are active and “free” members of a community who are also subjected to social norms and moral regulations (Etzioni, 1993; Tam, 1998).

In this respect, developing moral and civil virtues and community norms are crucial in this citizenship model. However, communitarians understand that it is difficult to realise an ideal community in contemporary pluralistic societies. As Sandel (2005) noted: "the civic virtue distinctive to our time is the capacity to negotiate our way among the sometimes overlapping and sometimes conflicting obligations that claim us, and to live with the tension to which multiple loyalties give rise" (p.34). As such, citizens must continuously learn through civic education, and participate in local communities to realise civil virtues. Besides participation, communitarian scholars also emphasise public education and the role of social institutions in developing a “virtuous autonomous citizen” who would become a “complex, educated and vibrant member of society” (Janoski & Gran, 2002, p. 8).

Conclusion

The aim of this chapter is to address the question of "what is citizenship". The discussion here suggests that citizenship is a contentious matter (Lister, 1998). In Hong Kong, the concept of citizenship has not been frequently addressed and there is no common and shared understanding. It is precisely because of this ambiguity that there is the need to gain a more in-depth understanding of the different models and theories of citizenship so as to establish a solid conceptual basis for this research study. The fundamental tenet of this research is that citizenship is not a fixed concept with definite and concrete aspects. Rather, citizenship is a social construct and its meaning is created and reinforced within different historical, social and political contexts. Based on this conceptual tenet, it is recommended that in order to understand how youth activists in Hong Kong understand citizenship, the unique social and political conditions that these young people are situated in as well as the social and political ideologies that underlie these conditions need to be examined. In addition, there is the also the need to understand the social and political values to which youth activists subscribe and the extent to which they subscribe to the mainstream societal ideology. Besides, citizenship is also a vehicle through which political ideals are translated into practices through social policies. Therefore, the relevant social policies that reflect the meanings of citizenship need to be examined, and how youth activists respond to these policies as a reflection of the definition and practices of citizenship in Hong Kong need to be explored. Finally, it should be noted that the concepts of citizenship discussed in this chapter reflect the different understandings of citizenship in different contexts. In this study, citizenship is examined as a framework with three important characteristics, including the extent

(criteria of being a citizen or membership), content (rights and obligations), and depth (citizen participation and commitment) of citizenship (Faulks, 2000; Marsh, O'Toole, & Jones, 2016). This framework is adopted in this study to investigate the understanding of youth activists of citizenship in Hong Kong.

Chapter 2

Reframing Youth, Citizenship and Youth Activism

Following Faulks (2000), citizenship is examined in this study within a framework that contains three characteristics: extent, content and depth. I also incorporate acts of citizenship per Isin (2009) which suggests that citizenship is a process of resisting, demonstrating resilience, and reinvented citizenship. The focus of this chapter is a discussion on youth citizenship and youth activism. Since the primary aim of this research study is to investigate how the notion of citizenship is being understood and interpreted by youth activists, it is therefore imperative to conceptually delineate the concept of youth citizenship to form a viable operational framework for this study. In the first section, I shall discuss the importance of youth in citizenship studies with a specific focus on answering the question of why there is the need to focus on youths. This is followed by a critical discussion of youth citizenship. In the second section, academic debates on the current situation of youth citizenship will be addressed. Specifically, the focus is on youth rights and obligations within the precariousness circumstances that young people face in late modernity. In the final part of this chapter, I shall discuss the practices of citizenship and how they are related to youth activism and social movements.

Youth and Citizenship

Before embarking on the discussion on youth citizenship, I will start by providing a brief discussion on the concepts around youth. In general, the youth phase of the life course is commonly understood as the transition between childhood and adulthood. According to the Oxford Dictionary, the definition of "youth" is the time "between childhood and adult age" ("Youth," n.d.). According to conventional definitions, youth is a biological stage in which there is a universal and normative pathway to adulthood. However, this functionalist approach towards development and its deterministic assumptions have been challenged by sociologists who argue that youth is a socially constructed category (Mizen, 2004; Wyn & White, 1997). Instead, they regard youth as an "unstable sociological category" (Beauvais, Mckay, & Seddon, 2001, p. 4) and youth studies are related to "the social processes whereby age is socially constructed, institutionalised and controlled in historically and culturally specific ways" (Wyn & White, 1997, p. 11). As such, apart from recognising that the experience of young people is pertinent to physical and psychological changes, the extent to which these experiences are socially constructed and individually negotiated should also be carefully considered.

As such, youth can be seen as a "complex transition" (Coleman, Catan, & Dennison, 2005, p. 227) "between the dependency of childhood and the relative independence of adulthood"(Fahmy, 2006, p. 29). In some societies, there had been historically clear definitions of this rite of passage(Beauvais et al., 2001). However, as mentioned, there is no consensus on the age of adulthood, and the boundaries that mark the end of youth and start of adulthood are blurred in modern society. That is, the boundaries that separate

childhood and adulthood are fluid and difficult to define, and the points of the commencement and the end of each stage are not clear as well. Under these circumstances, the precise start of adulthood and with it, the connotations of being an adult including independence, remain contentious (Coleman et al., 2005; France, 2007)

Arguably, there are many contemporary normative indicators of "independence of adulthood". Normative labour market indicators are often considered to be securing a full time and sustainable job in the job market and having property (Faulks, 2000). Leaving the parental home, getting married or having children are often used as normative social indicators (Jones & Wallace, 1992, p. 94). Gaining full citizenship rights and fulfilling political and civic obligations by participating in government processes are examples of normative indicators of civility. In order to successfully negotiate the transition and reach the status of adulthood and full citizenship, young people need to successfully complete the following transitions (Coles, 1995, p. 8):

- School to work: the transition from full-time study or training to full-time work;
- Domestic: the transition from one's family of origin to family of destination; and
- Housing (or residential): the transition from living with parents to independent living.

Theoretically, youth citizenship is a compound concept that combines the notions of both youth and citizenship which may at times compete with each other. In general, when reference is made to citizenship, it is most often associated with adults rather than youths, because youths are often assumed to be "not-yet-adults" who need to go through a transition before they arrive at adulthood in order to accept the responsibilities of being full citizens'. Classical and traditional citizenship theories tend to see youth as those who are in the stages of preparing to become future citizens, so the denial of full citizenship is deemed self-justified. The following sections discuss the three characteristics of citizenship in relation to youth: the extent - identity of being youth and a citizen; content - the citizenship status of youth including their rights and obligations; and depth - the civic and political participation of youth in practicing their citizenship.

Extent: Youth citizenship as "incomplete citizenship".

Youth are regarded as "incomplete" citizens before they become "full" citizens. This notion of youth and youth transition has been clearly reflected in youth citizenship studies in which the status of "full citizenship" is considered to be the end goal of youth citizenship. Being a full citizen means that one can enjoy resources, and opportunity to participate in different areas of political, social, and economic life (Beauvais et al., 2001). However, as argued above, youths per se are not considered to be "full citizens", but rather, "incomplete citizens" who cannot exercise the full rights that the "full citizens" enjoy. Full citizenship is only a privilege of adults according to the classical citizenship models such as republican and liberal citizenship models, As Aristotle suggested, "nature

herself has divided into older and younger, the former being fit for ruling, the latter for being ruled" (Aristotle & Sinclair, 1992, p. 432). Besides, Marshall also suggested that children and young people are "citizens-in-the-making"(Marshall, 1964, p. 81). Thus, the latter are assumed to be "future citizens", "citizens-to-be", "potential citizens", and "incomplete citizens" (Matthews, 2001, p. 299) or apprentice citizens (Henn & Foard, 2011). This perspective of youth citizenship maintains that youths are "becoming" citizens rather than "being" citizens (Bennett, 2013) It can be seen that this "deficiency" of youth citizenship is often adopted in social policies, thus socially disadvantaging youths, at least as far as the practice of citizenship is concerned. As rightly noted by Hall and Williamson (1999),

> "We tend to think of young people as being on their way to being full members of society. Yet the very fact that we think of them in this way as citizens in the making highlights the fact that they are still only incomplete citizens, still falling short of full membership" (p. 5).

The label "future citizens" or "incomplete citizens" indirectly infers that the rights of young people are delayed (Henn & Foard, 2011) but might be enjoyed in the future. Nevertheless, this practice is problematic (Lister, 2007a, 2008b), since young people are treated as "partial' or "semi-citizens", they "do not enjoy genuine equality of status as citizens in the here and now" (Lister, 2008b, p. 13). Future citizenship is actually a diminished form of the citizenship that is experienced by young people in their current context and instead, there is "social citizenship by proxy', which assumes that the rights of children and youth can be received by their parents and other adults on their behalf (Jones & Wallace, 1992, p. 65). In other words, as long as the parents and priorities of the

youths receive the necessary support or services, the rights of children and youth are assumed to be met. Yet, under the "future citizenship" discourse, young people are encouraged if not compelled to be passive about their rights, while at the same time, their autonomy and agency are denied (Lister, 2007a; Wyn & White, 2000).

In addition, as "incomplete citizens", young people are legitimately perceived as "citizens-in-the-making" and targets of socialisation in order to become "good citizens" (Thomson et al., 2004, p. 219). However, an important question then arises: what exactly is a good citizen? The answer to this question would inevitably have critical relevance in informing social and political practices. As discussed in the previous chapter, different political theories result in different responses towards the question of what constitutes as "good citizens". Generally speaking, civil republicans and communitarians focus on the fulfilment of civic duties and devotion of time to community services; that is, good citizens place the "common good" over their own self-interest and uphold civil values and virtue in their public life (Stokes, 2002, p. 31). In terms of duty-based citizenship theories, the definition of good youth citizens closely aligns with the related discussion on active citizens; that is, individuals who are expected to balance their rights by carrying out reciprocal duties(Stokes, 2002, p. 32).

On the other hand, the liberal and neoliberal concepts of youth citizenship are closely related to the process of creating "good citizens" for the market society, in which young people are supposed to be independent from welfare support, law abiding and having certain involvement in formal politics, for example, voting in elections (Evans,

1995, p. 16). In this sense, good citizens are considered to be workers, entrepreneurs and customers. As Wyn and Woodman (2006) argued, "the state has forged a new relationship with the economy, in which economic goals are primary" (p.499). In this sense, children and youth often receive messages that the means of becoming successful citizens and realising their hopes and dreams are to be hardworking and productive workers, responsible voters and active customers in a neoliberal economy, and, in the process of becoming "good citizens", their freedom and private interests will be legally protected (Manning, 2012).

Besides, policy makers often promote the concept of "active citizenship" to promote and shape youth citizenship. In this regard, social institutions and youth policies related to youth employment, education and training are responsible for promoting active forms of citizenship and the direction for young people to ensure that they have a "successful transition to adulthood" (Bessant, 2004). Yet, these social institutions are to a certain extent reproducing and reinforcing the socially constructed orders, and also perpetuating the structural inequalities of the younger generations, for example, gender inequality in the division of labour and market values. In doing so, good youth citizens are persuaded to follow a normative path of life, such as obtaining a basic education, becoming involved in charitable duties in the community, establishing a family at the "appropriate" time, and voting in elections when they reach legal age. Those who do not follow the societally accepted "normal" route, for example, those who become pregnant as a teen or cannot find employment, find themselves condemned, criticised and ostracised by society (Banaji & Buckingham, 2010).

Nevertheless, it is important to recognise that youths are not a homogeneous group, and those who are socially disadvantaged often become more vulnerable and marginalised. Related studies have consistently found that young people from lower class families have less potential of achieving higher educational attainment (Bynner, 2005; Mackie, 2013). Hence, in following the single prescribed path of successful citizenship, young people who come from a socially disadvantaged background may encounter obstacles in attaining full citizenship.

In short, the discussions thus far imply that citizenship is basically an exclusive club. Instead of really defining citizens, citizenship is characterised by excluding those who are not citizens. Yet, youth citizens are an excluded group who are also subjected to manipulation based on the social, economic as well as moral standards of their society and the "default" trajectory of youth development. This has inevitably produced the means of socially controlling young people in order to ensure the creation of proper citizens who are not only cognizant of all the social and economic expectations of the adult world but are also capable of performing in accordance to societal expectations.

Content: Youth citizenship as state of precariousness.

The discussion in the preceding section suggests that youth citizens are regarded as "second class" citizens whose rights and obligations are limited, or deferred, until they are socially recognised to have the eligibility of being full members of their society. As a

matter of fact, the experience of the transition to adulthood of young people has increased in complexity in recent years because this transition is no longer a linear process and also involves unpredictable and less structured trajectories (Flanagan, 2008; Manning, 2012). Accordingly, the transition to full citizenship is not only prolonged but also fragmented; there is thus a "lack of meaning associated with institutional rites" (Brooks, 2007, p. 417).

The impact of neoliberalism on the new patterns of youth transition has been studied in relation to a "risk society" (Beck & Beck-Gernsheim, 2002; Beck & Ritter, 1992). German sociologist Ulrich Beck (1992) argued that modern western society is heading towards a new modernity. This modern society is seen as "a dangerous place in which we are constantly confronted with risk"(Furlong & Cartmel, 2007, p. 3), in which the life course becomes less certain and "traditional securities are superseded by risk choices" (Kemshall, 2002, p. 6). The concept of a "risk society" is therefore used in an analytical framework to explain for the fragmentation and individualisation associated with the journey of youths in their transition to full citizenship.

Fragmentation of youth transition to full citizenship.

In contemporary society, youths are experiencing an uncertain, fluid and complex transition to adulthood, so it is less likely that they will follow the traditional and more acceptable pathway towards adulthood. In this sense, the destination of independence becomes less predictable. In other words, youth transition is, to a large extent, "a decline in the stability of social structures such as family, work and social security and a loosening

of the links between structures such as education and work" (Wyn, 2007, p. 170). As such, the transition experiences of young people are associated with the prolongation of education, high unemployment rates, different marriage and family structures and patterns and so on and so forth (Jones & Wallace, 1992), which means that there is a shift from the traditional linear form of transition towards the so-called "yo-yo" type of transition, which is "going up and down, back and forth", and reversible and unstable in nature (Biggart & Walther, 2006; Wong, 2009). The implication for youth citizenship is that the transition process of youth to become full citizens has become uncertain and prolonged.

Individualisation.

Young people are not only potentially subjected to a prolonged and fragmented transition to adulthood but have also become "solo travellers" who construct their own biographies and trajectories in late modernity. The individualisation thesis is one of the underpinnings of the risk society theory (Beck & Beck-Gernsheim, 2002). On the other hand, the neoliberal market society is highly competitive, so young people have to compete with others including their peers for employment positions, opportunities and resources, for example in the employment and education terrains. They are also expected to make their own choices and plan for their own lives as well as develop their own individual trajectory in response to social and economic changes.

Therefore, young people shoulder greater responsibility in navigating these life struggles, risks as well as opportunities and are expected to be their own "project of the self" by managing and making use of risks during "fateful moments" to turn crises into opportunities (Giddens, 1991, p. 113). While risks are framed, shaped and experienced by individuals, those who are unable to negotiate and manage risks are considered to be failures rather than victims of the outcomes of social factors that are beyond their control (Kemshall, 2002, pp. 7–8). In this sense, risk has become institutionalised in late modernity. According to the "risk society" theory, risk is distributed along class pattern and social order, and the disadvantaged groups in turn bear more risks (Beck & Ritter, 1992, p. 35). In this respect, young citizens who are socially disadvantaged are more vulnerable and marginalised, and tend to take more "risks" compared with their more well-off counterparts in the process of navigating their transition to adulthood (Mackie, 2013). In short, as argued, while the dominated social construction of traditional single pathway to full citizenship is still fixed and rooted, youths who are socially disadvantaged are less likely to achieve independence and at the same time find themselves readily prevented from attaining full citizenship.

Nevertheless, based on the neo-liberal notion of citizenship, the social and political rights of citizenship have been largely diminished and support from the state has been substantially reduced under its market principle and individualism thesis. Economic factors seem to have significant implications on the level of autonomy of young people as well as their experiences of citizenship (Coles, 1995; Lister, 2007a, 2008a). They are also the key determinant of the ability of an individual to realise his or her citizenship

rights (Jones & Wallace, 1992). Therefore, the entitlement to rights and extension of youth citizenship of young people who are unemployed and economically marginalised are significantly and negatively impacted (Lister, 1990; Manning & Ryan, 2004). As a result, many young people find themselves continuously dependent on their parents or family of origin. As Wong (2009) argued, youths are "locked in time and space", and " the road to achieving a legitimate social status and a successful transition to adulthood is anything but easy, particularly in post-industrial societies like Hong Kong and Japan characterized by widening gaps of wealth and power"(p.348). Such experiences have been found as a kind of "precarity" (Waite, 2009) which is related to the vicious cycle of poverty and social exclusion of young people in the context of ever-changing socio-economic patterns and structures.

Precarity.

The concept of "precarity" has been associated with youth studies (Standing, 2011) and the emergence of youth activism (Arnold & Bongiovi, 2012). Precariousness aptly describes the transition from youth to adulthood in which young people have to negotiate with "precarious work" which is flexible, lacks security, and low-paying in nature. In the words of Waite (2009), precarity is defined as "…life worlds characterised by uncertainty and insecurity that are either thought to originate from a generalised societal malaise, or as a result of particular experiences derived from neo-liberal labour markets" (p.426). To portray the formation of a new class in his analysis, the precariat is said to include of many marginalised groups in society, such as youths, migrants and women. Standing

(2011, p.19-24) used the term "precariat" to describe a new emerging class that suffers from fragmented employment with little security, and argued that a large number of those in this "dangerous class" are young people who are situated in the four "As" of precarious situations:

- anxiety, which stems from economic uncertainty;
- anomie, as life lacks meaning;
- alienation, as they lack control over work, and work under conditions that are not of their choice, and
- anger, as they realise that wealth and power lie in the hands of a small minority.

Youth precariousness is closely related to the global neo-liberalisation of the labour market and welfare reform (Standing, 2011). The neoliberal thesis dominates the foundations of state education, employment and youth policies which shape and reinforce individual reactions. In turn, the state promotes self-responsibility and self-blame through social institutions such as education, training and social services, instead of providing support for young citizens to reduce their vulnerability. According to Furlong (2014, p. 29): "[w]hether the ultimate outcome will be social unrest and conflict or whether "the micro-politics of little fears" will lead to self-blame, psychological impairment and social withdrawal is open to speculation". Certainly, the thesis and delineation of youth precarity vary across societies and need to be contextualized (Kalleberg & Hewison, 2013; Lee & Kofman, 2012).

In short, the changing features of youth transition in late modernity have led to remarkable implications for the experience of young people of "the political". The fragmented, uncertain and prolonged transition from youth to adulthood has been "cited as bases for the increasing individualisation of subjective social experience" (Fahmy, 2006, p. 39). How, the conditions and extent that youth precarity might conceivably compel the younger generation to socially withdraw (Wong, 2012)or the development of youth activism to resist (Furlong, 2014), "the political" is an open ended question.

Depth: Youth citizenship as civil deficit.

As mentioned, youth citizens are regarded as future full citizens, so that one of the major emphasises in recent years is the "problem" of youth engagement in politics, which has been seen as a "crisis" in contemporary democracy and a generational deficit (Furlong & Cartmel, 2007). The generational deficit is reflected by the low voting turnout (Pattie, Seyd, & Whiteley, 2004); decline in the participation of young people in political parties (Mair & VanBiezen, 2001); less involvement in social institutions and communities (Putnam, 2000), as well as lack of interest and knowledge of politics (Crick, 2000). Notwithstanding this, the paradigm of youth participation is also changing "from the ballot box to the street and to the internet" (Sloam, 2012, p. 5). As many have argued, young people are concerned about politics but only outside the conventional political system (Furlong & Cartmel, 2007; Sloam, 2012). The increasing number of social movements signifies their drive to redefine citizenship, which is not only found in the democratic countries but also societies with different citizenship models. For instance,

there has been the “Arab Spring” anti-government protests that advanced from North Africa to the Middle East and the UM in Hong Kong. A common characteristic of these social movements is the active and leading role of young people. Interestingly, this shows that youths are mobilising politically, and apparently contradicts the predominant discourse around generational deficit.

In the past two decades, there have been various studies that have analysed youth political disengagement. For example, Kimberlee (2002) reviewed related research and provided a comprehensive analysis on the different ways that the political participation of young people are eroded. She identified four distinctive reasons to explain for youth civil disengagement, i.e. youth focused, politics focused, generational and alternative values, to explain for youth civil disengagement.

First, the youth-focused explanation suggests that political apathy among young people is correlated to life span development. That is to say, young people are still too young and socialised well enough to integrate into society. However, they will become more active in politics and increasingly take part in civil engagement when they are full adults (Dermody, Hanmer-Lloyd, & Scullion, 2010).

Second, instead of blaming the apathy of young people for youth civil disengagement, another approach focuses on the failure of current politics. It is argued that youths are often excluded from formal politics rather than disengaging from the political processes intentionally (Furlong & Cartmel, 2012; Sloam, 2012). Politicians are

in favour of the interests of adults and not as concerned about youth interests, so that young people feel alienated from conventional political systems. Hence, unsurprisingly, they are cynical about formal politics and no longer trust their government and political system (Furlong & Cartmel, 2012; Sloam, 2012).

Then there is also the "generational" explanation which suggests that since the lifestyles of youths are changing, and there is increasing mobility of the young population, they are unlikely to stay in their community of origin for their entire life like their parents. Therefore "young people are less likely than their elders to be involved in the political process at any level"(Pirie & Worcester, 2000, p. 28). Also, youth political disengagement is entangled with the fragmentation of the transition of youth to adulthood. As argued in the previous section, young people find that it is more difficult to self-identify as citizens and exercise their rights and obligation as well as participate in the community and politics because of their financial dependence on their parents (Brooks, 2007).

The last set of explanations for the generational deficit is the alternative values of youths in participation. It is argued that far from being apathetic, youths are actually actively involved in conventional civic duties as well as a multiplicity of political activities beyond the conventional ones, such as attending demonstrations and rallies, boycotts as well as occupations. (Furlong & Cartmel, 2007; Sloam, 2012). Hence, youth activism can be considered to be a form of participatory citizenship beyond that of conventional politics. Apparently, these alternative forms of civic participation are neither recognised nor favoured by policy makers and mainstream society. While these

alternative forms of youth participation are often referred to as youth activism at the grassroots, on the contrary, "active citizenship" is related to top-down ruling strategies to remedy the civic deficits and promote civil virtue and morality so as to facilitate the youths into becoming responsible and active citizens (Lister, Smith, Middleton, & Cox, 2003).

Active and Activist citizenship

Active citizenship.

Since the late 1980s, there has been a revival of active citizenship, in which both right- and left-wing politicians have promoted the notions of active community and political and social participation (Barbalet, 1996). The concept of "active citizens" in western societies and modern citizenship theories is not new. It originated from the civil republican tradition which implies "the understanding of citizenship as participation" and "puts less emphasis on rights as entitlements to be bestowed by a nation-state or another form of government, and more on citizenship that is realized through responsible action" (Gaventa, 2001, p. 278). Scholars from this tradition have argued that the passive or thin conception of contemporary liberal citizenship has overemphasised the importance of rights and personal interests and thus gradually deteriorated the fundamentals in society which underlie individual rights (Lister, 1997b).

On the other hand, the idea of active citizenship has also been used by the New Right and neo-liberal scholars and politicians as political rhetoric and ruling strategies to counter the welfare state and social citizenship. Many argue that the moral image of citizens are constructed in political programmes to distinguish between "risky and inactive citizens" and "good and active citizens" (Dean, 2008; vanHoudt, Suvarierol, & Schinkel, 2011, pp. 410–411). For example, the young night drifters in Hong Kong (Groves, Siu, & Ho, 2014) and young people who are socially withdrawn (Wong, 2012) are considered to be problematic or at risk youths. On the contrary, those who are "highly educated, entrepreneurial, and self-reliant, but also politically compliant and patriotic" are praised as good and active citizens (Groves et al., 2014, p. 829). Along a similar line, Lister (2003) also noted dual forms of active citizenship: on the one hand, citizenship can be in a progressive form expressed through radical collective activism. On the other hand, it is also a conservative and narrower understanding of market-oriented contributions that focus on voluntary and charitable work (Lister, 2003).

Notwithstanding the above, active citizenship is also being challenged as the political rhetoric of social institutions for exercising social control (Osler & Starkey, 2003). It provides a language for the state to mobilise civil society and social institutions, such as education institutions and social service organisations, to prepare young people to take their place as future good citizens who are guided by the given social, cultural and political order of the nation state (Faulks, 2000; Smith, Lister, Middleton, & Cox, 2005). The language of active citizenship and community empowerment is attractive because it is associated with many civil values such as self-sufficiency, mutual help, community

spirit, solidarity and individual freedom. Besides, this language also serves to promote individual action, activism, individual responsibility, self-reliance and family responsibilities, which effectively justify the diminished role of the state in social citizenship as righteous and desirable. Hence, in short, the notion of active citizenship as a political rhetoric seems to be a tool to co-opt civil society rather than empower citizens.

Having discussed all of these, it is important to note that discussions of active citizenship have developed and evolved within the framework of modern citizenship with ever-changing rights and obligations that are adapting to the changing social and political contexts. The changes in the understanding of citizenship, including the reciprocal relations between the state and its citizens and the balance of rights and obligations, represent the conflicting political ideologies in different societies. This view is well supported by Turner (1990) who argued that "it is important to put a particular emphasis on the notion of social struggles as the central motor of the drive of citizenship" (p. 193). The dynamic process of shaping citizenship has been well-presented by (Isin, 2009), which will be more thoroughly discussed below.

Activist citizenship.

The concept of "activist citizenship" proposed by Isin (2009, 2014) is a departure from the normative citizenship theory by presenting new insights into the theorizing of citizenship. Activist citizenship is different from the normative practices of active citizenship which are framed within institutionalised and acceptable standards. He noted

that "in contrast to active citizens who act out already written scripts such as voting, taxpaying and enlisting, activist citizens engage in writing scripts and creating the scene" (Isin, 2009, p.383). In other words, citizenship is not a normative and given status, nor purely exercised through a set of routine activities. Rather, it is a process to make ways to practice citizenship and claim rights, duties and identity. This view aligns with the concept of invited and invented spaces of citizenship per Miraftab (2004). Active and activist citizenship are not the same. Active citizenship is invited and legitimate space for the civil and political participation of youth, while activist citizenship involves invented space for struggles and confrontation with the "authorities and the status quo" for citizenship (Miraftab, 2004, p.1). The underlying argument here is that citizenship is not equally enjoyed by each and every group in society, as there are those whose citizenship is either entirely deprived or only partially experienced e.g. youths, non-heterosexuals, and migrants. Some groups may not even agree with the given and pre-defined contents of citizenship that are required of them. In this sense, citizenship is an identity that has to be claimed and advocated, and activist citizenship can be considered as the process of struggles and confrontation with the authorities and status quo. This is coined "acts of citizenship" by Isin (2009).

According to Isin, "acts of citizenship" have been developed within the context of a contemporary global political economy and increasing mobility of labour and products. Under this circumstance, the modern conception of citizenship characterised by a "singular loyalty, identity and belonging" has been shaken (2009, p.369). By focusing on the "acts", Isin (2009) instead shifts the traditional ways of understanding citizenship

towards a new way of theoretically understanding citizenship which transcends beyond "membership" in a political community. He argued that "citizenship studies often proceeds with a focus on the three ontic aspects of citizenship: extent (rules and norms of exclusion and inclusion), content (rights and responsibilities), and depth (thickness or thinness of belonging)" (Isin, 2008, p.37). Note that Isin (2008) did not reject these three aspects of citizenship but was critical that the changing scene of citizenship is not taken into consideration because these aspects "arrive at the scene too late and provide too little for interpreting acts of citizenship" (p.37).

Activist citizenship challenges the rules and definitions of a modern citizenship regime, and redefines the basic beliefs of a mainstream citizenship regime and its enactment. Thus, contemporary citizenship is no longer restricted to legal membership nor confined within the framework of a nation-state. Instead, "regardless of status and substance, subjects constitute themselves as citizens or, better still, as those to whom the right to have rights is due" (Isin, 2008, p.18). Therefore, instead of asking "who is a citizen", Isin (2009) proposed that the query of "what makes a citizen"(p.383), because "what is important is not only that citizenship is a legal status but that it also involves practices of making citizens – social, political, cultural, and symbolic" (Isin , 2008, p.17).

Following the discussion above, acts of citizenship imply that there is resistance amongst those who are marginalised and reject the formal process of claiming rights. As Isin (2009) said:

> "thinking about citizenship through acts means to implicitly accept that to be a citizen is to make claims to justice: to break habitus and act in a way that disrupts already defined orders, practices and statuses". (p.384)

The acts of citizenship also determine lived experiences, processes of habitation and survival strategies within and beyond government practices and formal politics, as well as signify and record the ways and processes of the marginalised in shaping the definition of citizenship from the grassroots level (Isin, 2008). Conceptually, acts of citizenship as a perspective provide an alternative yet a dynamic entry point for understanding citizenship. In real life politics, these acts also inspire the deprived and marginalised to champion for justice by giving them opportunities to make themselves true citizens. The new actors, according to Isin (2008), are considered "as activist citizens (claimants of rights and responsibilities) through creating new sites and scales of struggle" (p. 39).

It is important to point out here that the meaning of "acts" in acts of citizenship is different from the ordinary understanding of acts. Isin (2008) explained that these "acts" of citizenship produce "subjects as citizens" (p.371). Four areas need to be considered in developing acts of citizenship. First, the status of actors should not be pre-conceived in advance, and they are not necessarily individuals. Instead, such actors can be the state, non-governmental organisations (NGOs) and other legal or quasi-legal entities or persons. As mentioned, the "acts" of citizenship depend on whether particular acts are able to produce "subjects as citizens". In this sense, the status of the subject is not the defining factor for citizenship but the act itself. Through acts of citizenship, actors can transform themselves into substantive citizens and right claimants.

The “site” is the second area that is considered in developing acts of citizenship. Acts of citizenship create new sites of contestation which are different from conventional sites of citizenship contestation (such as voting and military service). For Isin (2009), these new sites of contestation, belonging, identification and struggles are created and extended to various bodies, media, streets and borders and so on and so forth. Based on this, it is possible to argue in the case of Hong Kong that social movements in recent years have been an important site of citizenship contestation. This is partly due to the failure of formal politics as mentioned in the previous section which deprives full participation in civil and political life. Also, social movements in Hong Kong are clearly the acts of some groups who do not identify with the status quo which fuels their quest for justice and a redefinition of citizenship in society. This point will be elaborated in a separate section under social movements.

Third, the boundaries, frontiers and territories of acts of citizenship extend beyond nations towards different territorial scales such as cities, regions and globally. Hence, the boundaries of citizenship remain highly fluid because of the complex and overlapping levels of contestation.

Lastly, Isin (2009) postulated that to develop and theorise on acts of citizenship, the focus should shift from concerns around the opinion and perception of citizenship to its practices, which is “what people do” (p. 371). However, “what people say” is still

considered as “an important supplement” as a counteraction to allow people to speak out about their citizenship and identity.

In line with Isin (2009), Staeheli, Attoh and Mitchell (2013) argued that young people could adopt the role as “activist citizens” while they challenge the status quo as part of a broader effort to undermine the current state of affairs. A typical example of how this can be done is by engaging in informal settings and areas where the government and authorities are not able to fully control, such as occupying campus buildings and disrupting meetings. This provides opportunities for young people to act as activist citizens and right claimants by challenging the given rules and regulations through which they become political agents and substantive citizens. In this sense, social movements can be seen as an important site for claiming citizenship. The following section discusses the concept of social movement through which acts of citizenship can be expressed.

Social Movements and Citizenship

Social movements are social and political activities located at the forefront of society that break down and transform mainstream politics. As the impetus of social change, social movements are considered to be one of the major sites for examining youth participation and their claims for citizenship (Crossley, 2002). There is a rich body of literature in social movement studies and the definitions of social movement therefore vary. However, the definition given by Melucci (1985) is used here which is:

> "a form of collective action (a) based on solidarity, (b) carrying on a conflict, (c) breaking the limits of the system in which action occurs…conflict is a relationship between opposed actors fighting for the same resources, to which both give value. Solidarity is the capability of an actor to share a collective identity, that is, the capability of recognizing and being recognized as a part of the same system of social relationships" (p.794-795).

Although collective action, solidarity and competition for scarce resources are often regarded to be essential components of social movements, these do not directly imply that social movements must consist of protests, because social movements can be carried out in various forms such as by creating and practicing different ways of living. Taking social movements that are related to gender and body politics for example, raising awareness through body and life politics is often articulated as a movement rather than by organizing protests. In addition, Diani (1992) further differentiated among the various forms of civil activities such as one-off protests and organizing concern groups. According to Diani:

> "A social movement is a network of informal interactions between a plurality of individuals, groups and/or organisations, engaged in political or cultural conflict on the basis of a shared collective identity (Diani, 1992, p.13).

When taking the above definitions into consideration, it is found that the actors of social movements include both individuals and groups, but in the case of individual actors, they must be engaged in a form of collectivity that imparts a sense of solidarity and common purpose. Hence, only single individual or group actions are not sufficient to be considered as social movements. Meanwhile, although protests and social actions can be part of social movements, but if they seem to be single and isolated actions, they also

cannot be defined as a social movement. Snow, Soule and Kriesi (2004) offered a useful inclusive definition of social movements:

> "collectivities acting with some degree of organization and continuity outside of institutional or organizational channels for the purpose of challenging or defending extant authority, whether it is institutionally or culturally based, in the group, organization, society, culture, or world order of which they are a part" (p. 11)

According to the above definitions, the essential elements of a social movement include collective identity and some degree of organisation which can even be informal networks, and the initiation of conflicts with the goal of challenging the extant authority. In this research, I focus on youth activists in social movements which can be seen as a possible venue where youth activists express their dissatisfaction and disagreement with current mainstream understandings of citizenship and the formal political system. Besides, youth activists in social movements can also be considered as involvement in a kind of contention over the values and lifestyle meanings. In other words, social movements can be seen as sites that are full of imagination and energy in the struggle for a better society.

Theoretically, there is not a single and fixed typology of social movements. The most widely known related theories include a collective behaviour approach (Smelser, 2011), resource mobilisation (Zald & McCarthy, 1987), political process (McAdam, 1999) and new social movements (NSMs) (Touraine, 1981). Since the focus of these theories is mainly on the internal operation process of social movement mobilisation and does not emphasise the external relationships with the state and the targets of claim makers, I shall

not go into depth in this area of discussion because it is somewhat beyond the scope of my study. Notwithstanding this, however, I find the discussions on traditional and new social movements crucial as they are to a significant extent helpful for understanding youth participation in social movements, particularly with regard to their articulations of NSM goals and approaches and their conceptions of citizenship.

New social movements.

It has been argued by some sociologists that based on systemic changes in contemporary society where class struggle is no longer the sole factor that leads to social injustice and social disadvantages, the advocacy and organisation of social movements will inevitably have to use alternative approaches. Against this backdrop, NSMs are developed with primary concerns around cultural elements such as lifestyle and identity issues rather than the Marxist traditions of class struggle and economic materialism in the industrial era (Kuah-Pearce & Guiheux, 2009; Touraine, 1981). To put it in another way, class conflict based on Marxist analyses is represented and carried out in socio-cultural forms instead of the classic socio-economic form. In other words, there has been a cultural turn in the development of social movements in post-industrial society (Williams, 2004). Nevertheless, even when expressed through a different context, a social movement is still, as Touraine (1981, p. 77) said, "the organised collective behaviour of a class actor struggling against its class adversary for the social control of its historicity".

Hence, NSMs place their primary concern on the new contradictions of society, which are those between individuals, the dominant ideology(ies) and the establishments. The emergence of NSMs and changes in values in this cultural turn has introduced a new venue as well as a new approach for the younger generation to express their social and political concerns as well as their social ideals which are characterised by the values of a post-material society (Inglehart, 1977). In this respect, class interests have transformed into universalist concerns (Nash, 2010).

NSMs have several specific characteristics. Nash (2010) suggested that the main characteristics of NSMs are largely reflected in "their orientation, organization, and style" (p.88). In terms of orientation, NSMs are more oriented towards civil society instead of focusing on state institutions because they do not trust bureaucratic structures. Therefore, in their quest for change, NSMs are thus more oriented towards inspiring the public with new ideas rather than pressing for changes in the state structure. As far as the approach is concerned, the focal attention of NSMs is primarily on promoting changes in culture and lifestyle rather than claiming socio-economic rights (Nash, 2010). With regard to the form of organisation, the organisation strategies of NSMs also differ from those of conventional social movements as they are more informal and loosely organised, and carried out in more flexible ways. In addition, like all social movements, NSMs also appeal to the public for attention and concern, so it is heavily reliant on the mass and social media (Bennett, Wells, & Rank, 2009; Nash, 2010). In Hong Kong, as many local commentators argue that the forms of political participation and social movements have been changing, particularly with a marked increase in youth participation (Chen & Szeto,

2015; Cheng, 2014a), the trend of youth activism and social movements in Hong Kong are therefore specifically discussed in the following section.

Activist citizenship and social movements.

Having discussed the concepts of activist citizenship and NSMs, the connections between citizenship and social movements can be better illustrated as a framework for studying the citizenship of youth activists. Based on the activist citizenship proposed in Isin (2009) and other related studies in the literature, Papa and Milioni (2013) outlined four linkages between citizenship and social movements. The first is closely aligned with the acts of citizenship in Isin (2009), which suggest that alternative meanings of citizenship can be found beyond formal political practices by focusing on the acts of citizenship in social movements. This is because activist citizenship involves practices and acts that produce subjects as citizens and right claimants in a variety of sites and at different scales, and claims that "acts make a difference" as they "break routines, understandings and practices" (Isin, 2009, p.379). Activist citizenship also argues that activist citizens are "not necessarily founded on law or on responsibility; rather, they call the law into question and may, sometimes, break it" (Isin, 2009, pp. 379-382).

Second, citizenship can be the driving force that compel activists to participate in social movements. Comparable with the republican and communitarian notions of active citizenship, civic values and identity are the preconditions for all kinds of social participation and engagement as per Papa and Milioni (2013). Civic values include

substantive forms of values such as equality, liberty, and justice, while procedural forms of values are openness, responsibility, tolerance and so on and so forth. These civic values accompanied with civic identity facilitate social and political activeness and engagement as social members in public life (Papa & Milioni, 2013). Nevertheless, citizenship can be a source of participation in social movements in another way if it is relatively lacking. Papa and Milioni (2013) as cited in Isin (2009) argued that the history of citizenship is very often that of outsiders and the marginalised groups striving for the redistribution of resources and recognition on the basis of a new site of struggle (for example, gender, culture, and socio-political attributes). In other words, the process of shaping and reshaping citizenship is the result of recasting the established sites of citizenship. As pointed out by Isin (2009), this ongoing historical process of the transformation of citizenship reflects "the emergence of new actors that are constituted much less by what they possess than by what they ostensibly lack: strangers, outsiders and aliens had become claimants to citizenship" (p.376). These new actors may be those who are excluded from citizenship as well as individuals who are granted legal citizens status but cannot substantively enjoy and enact their rights and obligations as full citizens, for example, young people. The inability to gain full citizenship and status, and to a considerable extent the disagreement with what citizens should be allowed to enjoy, may trigger more social movement activities. As discussed in the youth citizenship section, the precariousness faced by young people and their distrust towards conventional political institutions may lead young activists to participate in social movements.

Third, as Papa and Milioni (2013) argued, citizenship is a predominantly used to frame contemporary social movements. The rationale behind this argument is that the forms of social movements have changed dramatically, and actors of social movements have deliberately distanced themselves from the transitional participants of social movements. According to Papa and Milioni (2013), participants of "indignados" or the "occupy" movements in western countries tend to adopt "citizen", "citizenship" and "democracy" to frame movements and actions. They used the Spanish movement "Democracia real Ya' as an example in which the protestors demanded "real" democracy and invoked the citizens identity as their core identity. Additionally, they intentionally differentiated themselves from conventional political institutions, ideologies and practices which the general public had reservations about, and maintained fluidity of the boundaries and openness of the movement to allow different members of society to take part, even those who are excluded from formal citizenship. In recent years, social movements in Hong Kong also share some of the characteristics of these movements, such as the UM. I will further discuss this phenomenon in next chapter.

Lastly, social movements can be seen as a site to construct and transform civic identities. Papa and Milioni (2013) suggested that the relationship between citizenship and social movements is reciprocal, which means that on the one hand, citizenship or civil identity can be considered as a reason for activists to participate in social movements, but in turn also shapes and transforms the experiences and identity of citizenship. In other words, social movements are sites where activists are able to explore, forge and consolidate common interests and create new and collective identities. Hence, social

movements are not only sites of struggles for specific goals but also venues to transform identity, understandings and practices of citizenship. As Papa and Milioni (2013) suggested, the ideologies behind the citizenship is open to question and construction: "[t]he question that needs to be asked, then, is what kind of citizens contemporary social movements construct, or in other words, whether contemporary social movements give rise to civic identities significantly different from prior forms" (p.29). This question is also one of the questions that is raised in this study.

In short, activist citizenship per Isin (2009) is a fluid and dynamic form of citizenship: "citizenship keeps fluxing with combined elements, including sites, scales, actor, and rights of citizenship" (p. 377). In this sense, citizenship can be seen as a social practice (Isin 2009; Turner 1989; Lister 1997a). It sheds light on contemporary citizenship studies as well as provides a useful and open account for studying the perceptions and practices of citizenship of youth activists in their daily life as well as the social movements in Hong Kong.

Conclusion

I have critically discussed the changing notions of youth, active and activist citizenship in this chapter. I have examined the way in which the state, primarily through its neoliberal ideologies and social policies, shapes and reinforces the citizenship of young people through a top-down approach. I have also discussed the ways in which young people resist this construction of citizenship by reclaiming the meaning of

citizenship from a bottom-up approach. The acts of citizenship per Isin (2009) have been specifically discussed in which citizenship is not a status but rather a process that constitutes as a series of claiming acts. This notion is closely connected with youth participation in social movements because it is a site where young people attempt to build their identity and interpret citizenship.

Chapter 3

Contextualising Citizenship and Youth Activism in Hong Kong

The preceding chapters have provided a framework for investigating the citizenship of youth activists. This chapter aims to contextualise the development and definition of Hong Kong citizenship. Beginning with providing a backdrop about youth social and political participation in Hong Kong, and an overview of the development of civil, political and social rights, the goal is to determine the elements that constitute towards citizenship in Hong Kong. This analysis provides a backdrop for an in-depth discussion in the second half of this chapter, in which the trend of youth-led social movements after 1997.

Social and Political Participation of Youth before 1997

Hong Kong was a crown colony and had been ruled by a British colonial government for 150 years before it was returned to China in 1997. According to Miners (1998), Hong Kong had a highly administrative-led government whose governor was appointed by the Colonial Office in London with powers assigned according to the Letters Patent and Royal Instructions. The Letters Patent was an open charter granted by the British Monarch which gave legal status and legal power to the Hong Kong colonial government, while the Royal Instruction provided the legal framework for the establishment and operation of the Executive and Legislative Council. The Executive Council (Exco) was first established in 1843. It was charged with the responsibility to advise the governor on all policy matters before they were brought up to the Legislative Council (Legco) for

approval. The Legco, which was established in the same year as the Exco, was the body which was supposed to pass all laws and approve government budgets. However, all Legco members were appointed by the governor, who was also the Chairman of the Legco. In other words, the political structure in early colonial Hong Kong implied that there was a strong centralization of power in the hand of the colonial administration where political participation in decision making was only by invitation and co-option. Lau (1992) suggested that this was an indication of "well-nigh complete monopoly of political power which dominated the political arena of the territory" (p.226). Along the same line, Cheung & Wong (2004) also pointed out that advisory politics was, and still is, a key feature of Hong Kong's system of governance where political advisors were selected and co-opted into different levels of government decision-making. One of the salient features of centralization of government power was its favour in so-called consultation and co-option, where the government could effectively control and absorb public opinion as well as, to some extent, discontents (King, 1975). Cheung & Wong (2004) recorded that government advisory committees proliferated from about 50 in the 1950s to more than 200 in the 1980s, and further increased to 300 in the eve of sovereignty change in 1997. The proliferation of government advisory committees might appear to be an increase of opportunities for social and political participation, but at the same time it must be recognized that these participation channels were only open for a selected group of elites whose advice were more or less in tune with government rule, and that the function of advisory committee served only for consultation and discussion purpose (Walden, 1983, quoted in Cheung & Wong, 2004).

The absence of open channel for social and political participation can be seen as one of the major structural obstacles hindering youth political participation in Hong Kong, and this problem has long existed before 1997. Suffice to the structural constraint, Lau (1992) observed that there was an apathetic attitude among people of Hong Kong towards political participation especially before the 1980s, partly due to the priority that people gave to economic development over political participation. This is a kind of instrumental attitudes that people in Hong Kong held, basing on the belief that political participation would not contribute to material and economic benefit. The instrumental attitudes of Hong Kong populace had led to a general lack of interest in political participation throughout the 1980s and 1990s. In this regard, Tse (1995) observed that even after the set-up of District Boards in 1982 (now called District Councils) where people were given the rights to elect their own local council members, responses were not enthusiastic. One of the major reasons for political apathy, as argued by Tse (1995) is that political power had not been devolved to the District Councils which were only charged with district level minor urban management responsibilities, and their role was (and still is) mainly advisory. In other words, political apathy of Hong Kong people during the colonial era should not be taken as an inherent character of the population. Rather it was learnt through everyday practice under a government which deprived people of their power and channel to make political decisions.

Indeed, it was rightly argued by Wong and Chiu (2005) that Hong Kong colonial government established its ruling legitimacy and won its support from Hong Kong people primarily, if not solely, through economic success. However, it must be stated here that

alongside economic growth income disparity had become more serious, but this problem was regarded as a natural outcome of economic development which could gradually be offset by real income increase. Furthermore, the Hong Kong colonial government also promoted the so-called "Lion Rock Spirit" (which was originated in a drama series produced by the RTHK about ordinary livelihood of Hong Kong people during 1970s and 1980s) which stressed the morality of hard work and self-reliance in dealing with economic hardship. This had successfully personalized the problem of income disparity by a moral economy of self-responsibility (Chiu & Wong, 1998; Sayer, 2017) and further pacified public dissatisfaction towards the colonial Hong Kong government caused by massive social and economic inequalities.

That said, however, social and political activism still existed, and there were also organized protests which took people to the street to demand for social and political changes. Lau (1992) observed that before the 1990s most of these protests were concerned with welfare issues, covering demands for, amongst others, housing improvements as well as improvement of public welfare. Lau's observation (1992) echoed well with the review of youth civic engagement and political participation by Low, Busiol and Lee (2016), where it was found that young people were generally viewed to be lacking enthusiasm in political participation, and when youth civic engagement was referred to, it was mainly about encouraging young people in volunteering and promoting social concern rather than engaging in social movement and youth activism. This is no doubt one of the major characteristics of youth participation in Hong Kong which is characterized by de-politicization. Ng (2009) suggested that this is a result of de-

politicized civic education in Hong Kong since the colonial era where the contents are strong in arousing civic and social awareness but are weak in stimulating critical reflection of young people's political rights. Leung and Ng (2007) further argued that civic education curriculum has tended, even after 1997, to minimize developing students with an ideology of participatory democracy and active citizenship. It is under this social and political backdrop that youth citizenship in Hong Kong is discussed below.

Development of Citizenship in Hong Kong

The Hong Kong Special Administrative Region (HKSAR) of the People's Republic of China (PRC) is an autonomous region governed under the principle of "one country, two systems" formulated by Chinese leader Deng Xiaoping in the early 1980s (Lee, 1999, p. 26). In principle, the HKSAR enjoys a high degree of self-governance over its internal affairs. The legal definition of citizenship in Hong Kong is considered to be territory-based (jus soli) rather than ethnicity-based (jus sanguinis). The legal status of Hong Kong citizenship has been clearly defined in Article 24 of the Basic Law (i.e. the "mini constitution" of Hong Kong) as permanent residents "have the right of abode in Hong Kong Special Administrative Region"(Hong Kong Special Adminstrative Government (HKSAR), 1997, p. 10). By definition, the status and rights of Hong Kong citizens are not defined by ethnicity or nationality but conferred to permanent residents (Ghai, 2001). Although this legal definition clearly stipulates the legal status of Hong Kong citizens, the meaning of citizenship in Hong Kong is more multifaceted than the legal definition itself. In the following section, I shall provide a review of the development of citizenship

in Hong Kong based on Marshall's threefold typology of citizenship (civil, political and social rights).

Citizenship in colonial era.

Hong Kong, a former British colony, was portrayed as "a borrowed place in a borrowed time" (Hughes, 1976). Therefore, the colonial government never seriously considered the development of citizenship. The amendment of the Nationality Act in Britain in the 1970s showed that the British government formally denied the people of Hong Kong full citizenship of the United Kingdom (UK), and therefore Hong Kong people had never been able to enjoy the citizenship rights of their British counterparts. Economic growth was of prime importance in colonial Hong Kong so some civil rights and freedom were granted to facilitate the smooth operation of the free market. As Ho (2004, p. 25) argued, civil rights in the colonial era were rights to facilitate the market economy rather than to protect the citizens.

Since the colonial era, the government has made it clear to Hong Kong people that its welfare responsibility would be limited if not minimal. Although the colonial government commenced the provision of various social benefits such as education, public housing, social assistance scheme after the riots in 1966 and 1967 for increasing the Star Ferry fare and demonstrating against the British government respectively, this was not an attempt to promote social rights. Instead, this provisions of social benefits was the attempt of the colonial government to promote a "residual welfare state" to maintain its legitimacy

and the stability of the market (Ho, 2004; Lee, 2005). In other words, Hong Kong is not a welfare state, and its government has never been elected by the citizens. Political rights during the colonial period were mainly to safeguard the efficiency of public service and the rule of law (Ho, 2004; Lo, 1997). The right to democratic participation has always been restricted. That is to say, instead of treating people as "autonomous citizens" and granting them equal political rights, the colonial government adopted paternalism as its ruling strategy to govern its colonial subjects. By doing so, Hong Kong was reinforced as a de-politicized society so that social stability for economic development can be guaranteed (Ku, 2009). The kind of state-citizen relationship that the western welfare state has been implementing for decades, in other words, should not be expected in Hong Kong.

The critical period for the development of political citizenship arose in the 1980s and 1990s when the British government was approaching the end of its colonial rule. In 1984, the Sino-British Joint Declaration stipulated the "one country, two systems" principle, which was seen as the starting point of the transition towards reunification with China in 1997 on the one hand, and the beginning of the struggles over political citizenship in civil society on the other hand (Ku, 2009). The introduction of political reforms in the 1980s brought electoral politics into the legislature where a portion of seats of the legislature were designated through elections. However, democracy was only promised on an incremental basis, and functional constituencies were established in which elite-based elections were brought about to incorporate a rising middle class and professionals into politics. In this sense, the "administrative absorption of politics" (King, 1975)and half-hearted political reforms (Ku, 2009) have prevented the genuine

development of citizenship. On top of that, the government has even consolidated an undemocratic political establishment to protect the interests of the business and professional sectors. Notwithstanding this, the Tiananmen massacre in 1989 initiated concerns in Hong Kong about citizen status and rights (Ku, 2009).

Citizenship after the handover.

Some have argued, which is up for debate, that the development of citizenship in Hong Kong has been further limited after the handover of Hong Kong back to China in 1997 (Hui & Lau, 2015; Ku, 2009). In theory, the Basic Law stipulates that under the special arrangement of "one country, two systems", Hong Kong can enjoy a period of self-autonomy for 50 years and that Hong Kong people are formally emancipated from colonial rule and have become "master of their own destiny" (Tung, 1997). Nevertheless, Hong Kong has witnessed several local and global crises after 1997, such as the Asian financial crisis in 1997 and the outbreak of the Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome (SARS) in 2003. Not only did the crises themselves shake the economic and political confidence of Hong Kong , the ways in which the HKSAR government handled these crises further raised questions about its ability to lead Hong Kong towards being a master of its own destiny. Furthermore, the HKSAR government has the tendency to prioritise the interests of the business sector and the central government of China, and uses executive domination and interventionism as governing strategies to inhibit the development of citizenship (Ku, 2009, p. 514).

Civil rights.

Although Hong Kong has only enjoyed a very form of limited democracy in the colonial era, it is believed that Hong Kong people have been enjoying a variety of civil rights such as freedom of speech and press and freedom to protest against the government. However, without due recognition of full citizenship and the right to democratic political participation, it is difficult to maintain civil rights under the influence of current political situation, even though Hong Kong has "a sound foundation of rule of law and civil liberties" (Ma, 2007, p. 7). After the handover, there has been an increasing number of social movements (Ma, 2005), but the increase in protests and demonstrations can hardly be taken as a reliable indicator of the demand for freedom and civil rights because it is an undisputed fact that the government has taken more active measures to control mass demonstrations and protests. For example, the government proposed in 2003 to use Article 23 of the Basic Law to control acts by legislation such as sedition, treason, secession and so on and so forth. This triggered half a million people to take to the streets and march on 1 July 2003 in protest against the so-called "state security bill" or the National Security (Legislative Provisions) Bill 2003. Although the government withdrew the bill, civil rights appeared to have been increasingly restricted rather than preserved.

Social rights.

The Asian financial crisis occurred right after the handover, which caused an unprecedented economic recession in Hong Kong and other Asian countries. As argued,

the residual welfare approach adopted by the Hong Kong government is fundamentally a governing strategy for maintaining social stability rather than bestowing rights to its citizens, and its aim is to protect the market rather than the citizens (Ho, 2004). Therefore, the government reneged on its commitment on various social provisions rather than provide more support to Hong Kong citizens during the hard times, and introduced a budget-driven welfare reform system (Lee, 2005; Ku, 2009). In addition, a welfare dependency discourse (e.g. the Comprehensive Social Security Allowance would only serve to encourage laziness and create a dependency culture and underclass) has also emerged in Hong Kong since the establishment of the HKSAR government, with the intention to discourage and even punish welfare recipients. Unsurprisingly, the discourse has triggered even more social discontent toward the HKSAR government.

Political rights.

In the face of social discontent and a legitimacy crisis, the HKSAR government is reluctant to put forth any drastic political reforms or substantially increase the political rights of the people of Hong Kong. Rather, the government is making attempts to strengthen its governance and create social consensus by adopting "assertive authoritarianism" on the one hand and exercising political corporatism on the other hand (Ku, 2009). After the handover in 1997, the HKSAR government further skewed the political structure in favour of business and establishment interests in exchange for their support. Universal suffrage, which has long been the demand of Hong Kong people, has been limited to electing some of the Legislative Council of Hong Kong (Legco) and

district council members, while the chief executive is elected by a 1,200-member election committee which consists of four sectors that represent various social groups. While labour and the major service professions are represented in these elections, the system is heavily overrepresented by business and pro-establishment forces. Such a constitutional design largely reflects the will of the People's Republic of China (PRC) government and the interest of the business sector to limit democracy in Hong Kong. While the pro-establishment and investors gain increasingly more political and economic advantages, their political position also enables them to have a greater stronghold in policy-making to benefit from public resources, and their power infiltrates into different aspects of daily life such as the media, education, land use, social welfare and so on and so forth (Hui & Lau, 2015). Arguably, the divergence between civil society and the state on how political rights are perceived and the expectations has become a major factor that has facilitated the increase in social movements in Hong Kong (Hui & Lau, 2015; Ortmann, 2015).

In short, the development of citizenship in Hong Kong is a rather unique case. Arguably, Marshall's threefold typology of citizenship with an evolutionary perspective appears to be insufficient for explaining the development of citizenship in Hong Kong. In principle, the social democratic model of citizenship per Marshall suggests that contradictions between capitalism and citizenship can be resolved or mitigated through the extension of political and social rights (Ku, 2009; Marshall, 1964). However, this is not the case in Hong Kong. Far from recognising the political rights of citizens, civil rights and residual welfare seem to promote and enhance the legitimacy of the authority of the government. Therefore, the development of citizenship in Hong Kong appears to

be in a deadlock based on Marshall's perspective of social democratic citizenship. As Ku (2009, p.541) postulated:

> [P]olitically the half-reformed system poses a problem of legitimacy under contested citizenship while providing a highly politicized, far from effective channel to resolve conflicts through the legislature. Socially and economically, a global ideology of neo- liberalism begins to put in place a new governance strategy by the government that aggravates the tensions between capitalism and citizenship.

Without democracy, citizenship can be only defined by the ruling class. As argued, Marshall's threefold typology of citizenship is restricted to predominating ideologies and the boundaries of the nation state; therefore, his perspective lacks vision and imagination of citizenship beyond those of existing institutions (Isin, 2009; Lister, 1997b). In the following section, the ideologies and forces that have shaped the constitution of citizenship in Hong Kong will be discussed and elaborated.

Primary Forces that Have Shaped Citizenship in Hong Kong

It is argued in the literature that the predominant conception of citizenship in Hong Kong is one that is neoliberal–authoritarian, and shaped by two prevalent forces: neoliberalism and Chinese elements in terms of cultural, economic and political factors. These two forces may appear to be unrelated and at times contradicting since the former emphasises on the market forces while the latter on state power. However, as Ku (2009) argued:

> [o]n the surface, the new brand of interventionism seems to be at odds with the neo-liberal form of governance (with an emphasis on the market). This is in fact not quite the case, as the latter approach signifies only a shift in the form and focus of governance but not a diminished will to govern. That is, neo-liberal rule now takes the form of a new alliance among state, market, individuals, and other social institutions in the production of an economically competitive city. (p.515).

Neoliberalism and citizenship in Hong Kong.

Harvey (2005) defined neoliberalism as a political economic theory which suggests that the well-being of humans can "best be advanced by liberating individual entrepreneurial freedom and skills within an institutional framework characterized by strong private property rights, free markets, and free trade" (p.2). Thus, the role of the state is "to create and preserve an institutional framework appropriate for such practices" (Harvey, 2005, p. 2). As a strand of liberalism, the focus of neo-liberalism is also on individualism (Heywood, 1999; Hung, 2011) but it is distinct in its underpinning of a "free-market ideology of capitalism and aggressive individualism" (Hung, 2011, p. 173). Dean (2008) pointed out that neoliberalism overturns the early liberal tradition of the minimal state, as there is an "external principle supervising the market to make the market form itself the regulative principle underlying the state" (p. 48). As such, the social and political lives of citizens realign based on the "ideal of competition within markets" (Dean, 2008, p. 49). Hence, as Miller (2010) argued, a "grand contradiction" can be found in the neo-liberalism discourse as active intervention is exercised under the guise of non-intervention (p.56).

Hong Kong is considered to be one of the most capitalised economies in the world and had ranked first by the Economist, a leading newspaper with an economic liberalism perspective, in an index of crony capitalism in 2014 (Ortmann, 2015) Market supremacy is considered to be the iron rule for economic development in Hong Kong. Nevertheless, this has led to an increase in income disparity from 0.451 in 1981 to 0.537 in 2011 based on the Gini coefficient or Gini index, which is used as a measure of class polarisation(Census and Statistics Department -The Government of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region, 2012). This phenomenon is closely related to the neoliberal ruling strategies of the HKSAR government.

As mentioned in the preceding sections, a set of governing strategies were executed to maintain and implement the neoliberal philosophy after the Asian financial crisis in 1997 in Hong Kong. Apart from maintaining a low tax rate and high land price policy, fiscal conservatism is implemented by limiting public expenditures and the use of social funds to avoid recurrent spending for the long term (Wong, 2015; Wong & Chu, 2017). Also, while the government has accumulated a massive cash reserve, public and welfare expenditures are continuously reduced which is justified by the need to contain uncertainties and risks under a volatile global economy (Chan, 2009; Wong & Chu, 2017). As Harvey (2005) stated, under a neoliberal regime, the role of the state is to create and uphold a neoliberal market framework by using all means, including through legislation, and by enforcing the rule of law as well as policing to safeguard property rights and market freedom. Furthermore, the state also initially promoted marketisation in the public sector (Harvey, 2005). This is the case in Hong Kong, where a series of reforms related

to privatisation and marketisation have been launched in accordance with neoliberal ideologies since the late 1980s. These reforms are found in the education, social services and various public service sectors (Ku, 2009; Lee, 2005; Tse, 2007; Wong, 2015; Wong & Chu, 2017)

All of these measures together have created a social atmosphere where universal social rights have been inhibited and political rights contained. As a result, the relationship between the state and its citizens with reciprocal rights and obligations has been gradually replaced by a market relationship characterised by transactions between for-profit service and goods providers and consumers. As such, the rights of citizens are replaced by those of consumers whereby the state has gradually retreated in their role to meet the needs of its citizens, safeguard their security, and build an integrative and cohesive society (Jones & Wallace, 1992). Under the neoliberal impacts on society, communities with closely knitted and mutual responsibilities have gradually faded away with only individual consumers and family now remaining. However, this kind of society which has now lost cohesiveness and citizenship, especially in terms of social rights, has been dismantled (Pierson, 1994). As Bauman (2000) argued, this is precisely the result of individualisation under the dominance of neoliberalism.

Youth citizenship in Hong Kong

As a result of the dismantling of citizenship, the citizen has been replaced by the new and unavoidable status of a consumer who is responsible for bearing the costs of

social risks, such as meeting his/her own medical needs, finding alternatives in the event of unemployment and managing other precarious issues in life. The pervasive ideology that emphasises on achievement has placed increasingly more social stress on the younger generation and contributed to an overall mood that life lacks meaning as well as cynicism towards social mobility (Shek, 2007, pp. 2024–2025). Besides, young people in Hong Kong are also facing many more uncertainties and precariousness in their prolonged transition to adulthood.

According to official unemployment figures provided by the Hong Kong Annual Digest of Statistics, youth unemployment and underemployment rates have always been higher than the overall employment rate, regardless of the economic situation. For example, when Hong Kong was under an economic recession in 2004, the unemployment rate of young people between 15 and 19 years old was as high as 26%, which was 3.82 times higher than the overall employment rate. After economic growth resumed in 2014 and the government budget saw a significant surplus, the unemployment rate of those between 15 and 19 was reduced to 12.5% but still 3.78 times higher than the overall unemployment rate. A similar situation was found among young people between 20 to 24 years old. In 2004, the unemployment rate of this age group stood at 9.1%, which was 1.3 times of the overall unemployment rate. In 2014, there was still 8.7% who were unemployed in this age group or 2.6 times the overall unemployment rate despite that the overall economy in Hong Kong had greatly improved compared to the situation 10 years ago (Census and Statistics Department, 2015). Besides, according to the Hong Kong Population Census 2011 Thematic Report on Youth, the labour force participation rate of

youth shows a trend of reduction, that is, from 48.2% in 2001 to 46.5% in 2006, and then further reduced to 40.4% in 2011 (Census and Statistics Department - The Government of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region, 1992).

The reduced participation of youth in the labour force can be partly seen as the precariousness of youth transition, which indicates that young people are experiencing a prolonged transition period where they have move in and out of training and continuing education before entering the labour market. Unfortunately, even if young people enter the labour market, many of them (34%) are only able to work in services and sales which are low paying, short-term, lack security, and have no career prospects and employment security. This is strongly supported by the official statistics on the median income of youth (HK$8,000 in 2011) which is only two-thirds (66.6%) of that of the overall population (HK$12,000) (Census and Statistics Department - The Government of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region, 1992). Not only are youth suffering from low pay, their median income in comparison with that of the overall population has also been on the decline in the past decade. For example, the median income of youth in 2001 was 72% of that of the entire Hong Kong population. While this number dropped to 70% in 2006 and was further reduced to 66.6% in 2011 (The Government of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region Census and Statistics Department, 2013), the per capita GDP actually increased by 37% and overall median income increased by more than 10% during that period of time (Census and Statistics Department, 2015). Such evidence strongly supports the argument that youth transition to adulthood has become more precarious and economic disadvantages have placed young people in a situation where full citizenship is

restricted even if they have reached the age of adulthood. Hence, they are not only excluded from the many rights, such as affordable education and housing, young people also find it difficult to develop a sense of citizenship and identity in Hong Kong (Adorjan & Yau, 2015; Chiu & Lui, 2004).

Notwithstanding the above, the government has not taken active measures to remedy the social and economic disadvantages of young people primarily due to their neoliberal policy of a "small government, big market". A typical example of the non-intervention of the government is its encouragement of the privatisation of higher education instead of subsidising university placements for young people. Not only has the government aggravated the challenges that young people face but also promoted a negative welfare discourse that blames the victims by personalising problems as personal failure. As far as citizenship is concerned, the government has also promoted a public discourse that those who are not able to be economically independent are "ineligible citizens", and labelled those who resist this discourse as problematic individuals who need to be properly educated and controlled.

On the other hand, the government has been promoting the spirit of entrepreneurship in recent years, which suggests that young people need to be innovative in the economic market. Instead of designing policy measures that maximise employment opportunities and outcomes for young people, the government encourages entrepreneurship as a means to motivate young people to start up a business both locally and in China (Wong & Au-Yeung, 2017). By encouraging this kind of life course, the immediate advantage to the

government is reducing the unemployment rate but not contribute to the career development of young people. Under such circumstances, citizenship is no more an adult entitlement that is determined by age, but by economic status in the free market. The result is that young people who are disadvantaged in terms of social class, gender and education background would be further excluded from their right to exercise their citizenship. In other words, youth citizenship has been further marginalised and excluded under current neo-liberal social policies in Hong Kong (Adorjan & Yau, 2015).

China factor and authoritarian-patriotic citizenship.

Whether geographically, historically, culturally or politically, Hong Kong is closely tied to China. After the handover, there have been notably increasingly more economic, social and political influence from China. Although selectively using Confucianism and emphasising economic connections with mainland China as well as strengthening political control over Hong Kong, the HKSAR government has every intention of creating an authoritarian citizenship. To do so, young people are disciplined, and their responsibilities, national identity and loyalty are also emphasised.

Patriotism and youth citizenship.

A patriotic notion of citizenship has been constructed by the HKSAR government to justify its authority and ruling legitimacy. By selectively reinforcing Confucian cultural values and virtue such as collectiveness, political quietness and authoritarian style of

ruling, the state legitimises and reinforces the "administering" of political processes and a bureaucratic political culture (Rodget, 2003). Meanwhile, Confucianism is also used to promote the conservative version of republican active citizenship to reinforce the responsibilities of citizens and cultivate a patriotic sentiment towards the nation-state (Lam, 2005; Wong & Chiu, 2005). This has been made evident on the very first day of the establishment of the HKSAR government where the first chief executive, Tung Chee-hwa, outlined the intention of the government to shape a new citizenship that is strongly oriented towards traditional Chinese culture and social responsibility. He stated:

> We will continue to encourage diversity in our society, but we must also reaffirm and respect the fine traditional Chinese values, including filial piety, love for the family, modesty and integrity, and the desire for continuous improvement. We value plurality, but discourage open confrontation; we strive for liberty but not at the expense of the rule of law; we respect minority views but also shoulder collective responsibilities. I hope these values will provide the foundation for unity in our society.(Tung, 1997.).

By emphasising the traditional Chinese culture and identity, the ruling class is characterised by personal and family responsibilities, and loyalty to the HKSAR in constructing patriotism and neoliberal notions of citizenship. After the hand-over, a series of measurements were facilitated to foster patriotism and nationalism to create "a unified Chinese identity" (Kaeding, 2011); for example, introducing patriotic elements in the civic education curriculum (Morris, Kan, & Morris, 2000; Tse, 2007), promoting a positive image of the Chinese government by emphasising their advancements in technology, economic development and achievements both locally and internationally (Cheung, 2012), introducing teaching in the mother-tongue (Chinese) in secondary

schools as well as promoting national awareness, such as by broadcasting the national anthem and flying the national flag at education institutions and in the mass media, launching a variety of civil education activities in the community. All of these attempts aim to enhance patriotism in Hong Kong and identification of its people with the PRC government (Kaeding, 2011).

In order to strengthen the identification of youths with China, the HKSAR government introduced "Moral and National Education" (MNE) in 2010 as a compulsory school subject. However, this measure aroused even greater discontent in society especially among young people who have strong reservations towards the PRC government. This facilitated an anti-national education movement led primarily by young people, such as by a group called Scholarism. They "performed" another activist vision of good citizenship in response. These sorts of movements were initiated, developed and flourished against such a social and political backdrop and successfully challenging the PRC government's attempt to use the education system to turn Hong Kong's youth into "good citizens". Although the HKSAR government eventually withdrew the national education curriculum proposal, the rift between the HKSAR, and to some extent the PRC government and the Hong Kong community especially young people had increased and became seemingly irreversible. This is reflected by a series of more social movements, such as the anti-smuggled goods campaign and other local movements that were widely supported by young participants. The social signals from these movements indicate that the formation of the national identity of some of the youths in Hong Kong has greatly veered away from that anticipated by the HKSAR and the PRC governments. On the one

hand, there seems to be an increasing trend in which a considerable number of local youths call for the development of a local Hong Kong "national" identity while on the other hand, there is also an increasing force, seemingly originating from the government, to increase the identification among local young people with their Chinese nationality. This discrepancy in expectations has become one of the major crises in governing Hong Kong (Kaeding, 2017; Veg, 2017).

Paternalism and youth citizenship.

The discourse around the inevitability and necessity of economic integration with mainland China (Vickers & Kan, 2003; Wong & Au-Yeung, 2017) has been adopted by the state to promote paternalism and the hierarchical order between Beijing and Hong Kong. There is emphasis on how the PRC government has put forth various measures that serve to boost economy of Hong Kong after the handover, such as promoting the Individual Visit Scheme which allows mainland Chinese visitors to visit Hong Kong since July 2003; offering tariff-free treatment for Hong Kong products as well as launching the Closer Economic Partnership Arrangement (CEPA) to offer more opportunities for Hong Kong services and professionals to explore the Chinese market. All of these economic opportunities and benefits have been reinforced by the PRC and HKSAR governments. Moreover, the business sector has enabled more intimate cooperation opportunities and greater degree of integration between China and Hong Kong. In recent years, several major cross-boundary infrastructural and urban planning projects have been carried out which are considered to contribute to the integration of Hong Kong with China, such as

the Hong Kong-Shenzhen-Guangzhou Express Rail Link and Hong Kong-Zhuhai-Macao Bridge. Instead of facilitating economic development that benefits both Hong Kong and China, there is a prevalent discourse of a growing reliance of Hong Kong on China, and paternalism and top-down power relations between the PRC government and Hong Kong are also implied. This discourse is used to shape youth citizenship by emphasising the economic opportunities that China provides to Hong Kong youths, as former Chief Executive Leung Chun-ying stated in his policy address in 2014:

> The country's gradual opening up and reform process is creating and will continue to create opportunities for Hong Kong. The most pressing issue, I believe, is how to capitalise on these opportunities. The Government is fully committed to strengthening Hong Kong's business-friendly environment… that connects investors from around the world to the opportunities in the Mainland of China and Asia, and an environment that rewards hard work and brings the best out of our younger generation. (Leung, 2014)

That said, by emphasising the economic opportunities offered by China to Hong Kong, the HKSAR government intends to strengthen the neoliberal notion of citizenship which emphasises individual responsibility and an entrepreneurial risk-taking spirit as well as promotes the paternalism notion of citizenship among youths (Wong & Au-Yeung, 2017). However, this discourse of developmentalism does not appear to be feasible for many Hong Kongers, particularly the youths. The attempts to promote further economic integration with mainland China have generated strong opposition particularly from the younger generation (Chen & Szeto, 2015; Xia, 2016). They have also aroused many social movements that aim to counter these so-called “white elephant projects” such as the anti-

Express Rail Link (XRL) campaign in 2009-2010 and the still ongoing campaigning against the urban development of the northeast New Territories.

Authoritarian and youth citizenship.

As some commentators have argued, the PRC government did not interfere with Hong Kong affairs in the initial period after the handover (Lee & Chan, 2012). However, after the rallying of half a million Hong Kong people against the "state security bill" or the National Security (Legislative Provisions) Bill 2003, there has been significant change in the relationship between Hong Kong and the PRC government. Since then, the PRC government has seemingly increased its monitoring efforts and control over Hong Kong issues particularly with respect to political development. According to Cheung (2012), the PRC government has been taking a more proactive stance to address issues in Hong Kong, such as pressuring the HKSAR government to promote patriotism and national education and increasing the economic integration of Hong Kong with mainland China as mentioned above. Also, the PRC government is more directly emphasising its constitutional authority and exercising its influence in guiding political development and shaping governance in Hong Kong through a variety of control mechanisms. Hence, it is obvious that under the influence of the PRC government, the HKSAR government is considered "more illiberal and less tolerant of dissent" (Jones & Vagg, 2007, p. 574) and Beijing has increased its influence in the local affairs of Hong Kong (Cheung, 2012). This has led to increasingly more discontent and anti-mainland Chinese (government) sentiment among Hong Kongers as well as the demand for increased political autonomy.

However, this has resulted in a noticeable conflict after the SCNPC of China made the decision to reject civil nominations for Chief Executive candidates and universal suffrage for electing Legco councillors on 31 August 2014 (Hui & Lau, 2015; Ortmann, 2015). To a considerable extent, the event directly triggered the outbreak of a 79 day occupation movement. It is thus argued here that the extension of the political influence of China has intensified anti-China sentiments and facilitated the local consciousness of young people (Kaeding, 2017; Ma, 2017b; Veg, 2017).

Subsequent to the tightening of civil, social and political rights, participation in social movements appeared to be the only viable means for activists in mobilising for change. In the following section, I shall discuss how Hong Kong people, especially youth activists, have attempted to construct the meaning of citizenship through social movements.

Social Movements and Youth Activism in Hong Kong

The ways that citizenship are conceptualised and interpreted, and how the interpretations are translated into the rights and obligations of citizens are to a certain extent, a representation of the imagination of an ideal society. Saying this does not imply that all societies naturally and automatically come to a consensus about how this ideal should be encompassed, and the rights and obligations that their citizens should enjoy. Rather, as argued in the previous sections, the process is often a struggle between different groups in society. In this section, I shall briefly discuss the trend of social movements and youth activism in the local context of Hong Kong.

Trend of social movements in Hong Kong after 1997.

After 1997, Hong Kong has been described as a "city of protest" (Ma, 2005). In view of the outbreak of the democratic revolutions in Eastern Europe called the Revolutions of 1989, the 1989 Tiananmen Square protests and the handover of the sovereignty of Hong Kong back to China in 1997, many civil society organisations (CSOs) and young activists have realised that Hong Kong is subjected to the strong social and political control of the Chinese government. However, the increasing number of social movements and increase in protests and demonstrations can hardly be taken as a reliable indicator of the demand for freedom and civil rights because it is an undisputed fact that the government has taken more active measures to control mass demonstrations and protests. In addition, the absence of a genuine democratic system and democratic political participation mean that civil rights are not protected in the current political climate of Hong Kong. These issues help to explain the outbreak of social movements by youths after 2000.

Social movements - Post 2000s and after the 1980s.

After 2000, there was a gradual paradigm shift from conventional social movements to new social movements. The latter are more confrontational and creative in actions with stronger ideological agendas. On 1st July 2003, half a million Hong Kongers took to the streets to march in protest against the National Security (Legislative Provisions) Bill 2003. As many commentators observed, this unprecedented massive rally was the turning point of Hong Kong's political situation and the start of regular and more controversial social

movements (Chen & Szeto, 2015; Lee & Chan, 2012; Ortmann, 2015; Xia, 2016). While the PRC government has been tightening control over Hong Kong, youth activism in many vibrant and diverse forms has been emerging on the political stage after 2003. These social movements and their new forms of social actions are mainly mobilised via new forms of social media led by young people, thus reflecting new ways of initiating and facilitating movements and new social ideologies such as those that work against the neoliberal governing ideology and developmentalism (Chen & Szeto, 2015; Ku, 2012; Xia, 2016). All of these appear to be distinct from the agenda of their predecessors prior to the return of sovereignty in 1997.

The main theme of the mass rally of 1st July 2003 was to protect civil rights and freedom as the "core value" of Hong Kong. The protest has been described as a "peaceful and rational" form of resistance that shows the people's power, and the rally has somehow become a "tradition" or a "ritual" today through which citizens express their grievance and multiple concerns over a wide range of social issues on an annual basis (Lee & Chan, 2012). The 2003 rally was regarded as a successful effort for several reasons. First, there were a record-breaking number of participants not seen since the 1989 Tiananmen Square incident. Second, the government subsequently withdrew the National Security (Legislative Provisions) Bill 2003 in Legco, and third, even the then Chief Executive Tung Chee-hwa had to resign from office as an indirect result of the protest. Most important of all, the rally was seen to some extent as a victory of the citizens of Hong Kong to protect civil citizenship. This was particularly felt by the older generation who deeply believed freedom to be a fundamental value of Hong Kong. However, the values

of the younger generation may not be the same as their more mature counterparts although people may share the same feeling of discontent and are angry towards both the HKSAR and PRC governments. Nevertheless, the rally of 2003 has encouraged young activists to experiment with different approaches and attract a diversity of participants. Arguably, not only has the new wave of social movements that emerged after 2003 set their focus on claiming rights and full citizenship from the HKSAR and PRC governments, but also attempted to redefine the meaning of citizenship through the process of participation in community and various social movements.

In these movements, it is apparent that an ideology is emerging; one that is similar to the Western version of post-materialism which emphasises conservation and sustainable development (Inglehart, 1977; Inglehart & Welzel, 2005). Moreover, these movements have been associated at the same time with a sense of cultural identity that is unique to Hong Kong (Chen & Szeto, 2015). For instance, in the redevelopment plans of the Lee Tung Street in Wanchai District (also known as the Wedding Card Street), a campaign was launched where public opposition was mobilised and there was an increased call to protect heritage in Hong Kong. Besides, there were campaigns in 2006 and 2007 against the demolition of the Star Ferry pier in Central and the nearby Queen's Pier, a hallmark of the colonial period. In this campaign “local identity” formally sets the tone of the social movements (Chen & Szeto, 2015; Ku, 2012; Lee, So, &Leung, 2015; Xia, 2016). Despite the failure of the campaigns to preserve the heritage infrastructure, the young activists, who are Generation Y or the Millennials (young people who are born

after the 1980s) have emerged from these movements, and have become the new leaders of social movements in Hong Kong (Cheng, 2014a).

It can be observed that social movements have rapidly increased in Hong Kong since 2003, and confrontations have also intensified among the movement groups and between Hong Kong and China due to the increase in societal conflicts. It is evident that an increasing number of youths have joined social movements although they may still be a relatively small number of the entire youth population. In 2010, youths led a campaign against the cross-border high-speed railway project (anti-XRL movement) which drew a substantial amount of public attention and support. In this movement, economic development as the prime value of Hong Kong society was challenged by the youth activists, and their appeal echoed the gist of the cultural preservation campaigns of 2006 and 2007, thus suggesting a "new Hong Kong value" which adopts the pursuit of social justice as a prioritised endeavour.

Two years after that in 2010, an anti-national education movement emerged in which "Scholarism", an organisation formed largely by secondary school students, played a central role in the campaign. Without going into the details of this campaign, it should be noted instead that the campaign reflects the strong embodiment of a Hong Kong identity particularly among young people (Kaeding, 2017; Kwong, 2016; Ortmann, 2015; Veg, 2017). More recently, the protests have been against the NENT still ongoing.

The “paradigm shift” in social movements as highlighted above has brought about new ideas as well as new possibilities for social movements. For example, instead of accepting resettlement as their inevitable fate, the objective of the NENT is “no moving; no demolition”, and “preservation of the community” including the community networks, culture, history. (Lam, 2014). However, as some local commentators have argued, young activists in Hong Kong also tend to favour autonomy and self-expression and have post-materialist values (Ma, 2011; Xia, 2016). At the same time, this also shows that social movements have evolved from victims who are fighting for their own interests to citizens who are fighting for the right to define and realise social citizenship through participation in social movements. Rather than being led by trade unions, pressure groups or political parties with the aim to champion for civil and social rights within the established social, economic and political framework, the new social movements are primarily led by youth activist groups, such as student federations, student activist groups (Scholarism) and other local youth groups, who are demanding for a redefinition of the relationship between the state (i.e. the Chinese communist state as well as the HKSAR government) and the citizens of Hong Kong; appealing for ideological reforms (e.g. challenging the primacy of economic progress as the sole social ideal) and contending for alternative ways of life. Hence, youth-led social movements in Hong Kong have been increasingly concerned with the challenges that are being placed on community life and cultural heritage by urban renewal processes and economic development in Hong Kong.

Nevertheless, partly due to constraints in political participation, not all social movement campaigns mentioned above realized their goals. The discrepancy between the

social movement goals and the actual outcome reflects, amongst other factors, shows that there is a rift between how the activists perceive citizenship and the status quo. Under persistently strong social discontent and exasperated by the lack of a genuine democratic system and democratic political participation, it is not surprising that the UM broke out in September 2014. While different movements in Hong Kong revolve around different issues, they are all related in the sense that they are concerned about social inequality, government accountability and Hong Kong identity, which are all closely related to the conflicting definitions of citizenship.

In the above discussion, I have summarised the social movements in Hong Kong that have taken place after 1997 in which young people have gradually adopted an active role. In the following sections, the discussion will focus on two specific social movements that are examined in this study.

Social Movements: Umbrella and New Preservation Movements

In this study, two groups of youth activists, namely those who participated in the Umbrella Movement (UM) and the New Preservation Movement (NPM) in Hong Kong are selected for further discussion in this study. In the former, the participants were from various youth groups who were fighting for the establishment of a "genuine democratic system" in Hong Kong, yet the focus was on extending political citizenship. The latter is a group of young activists who are concerned about preserving the local culture, identity and context, and their protest primarily challenges the dominant social ideology and the

value of economic primacy. The reason for choosing these two groups of youth activists is to unravel and show the different purposes and experiences of youth participation in the two movements and investigate how their actions define and interpret citizenship. Some brief background information of these two movements will be given an introduction in the following section.

The Umbrella Movement.

Ortmann (2015) said, "The Umbrella Movement is deeply rooted within Hong Kong's political history and its protracted democratization process" (p.33). The movement is closely related to the Occupy Central with Love and Peace (OCLP) movement proposed by a group of pan-democratic middle-class intellectuals who called for civil disobedience if the government denied genuine universal suffrage for the chief executive election in 2017 and the Legislative Council elections in 2020 according to "international standards" (Hui & Lau, 2015; Ortmann, 2015). The original plan anticipated 10,000 people would occupy the central business district in a peaceful and nonviolent manner and a highly structured way (Hui & Lau, 2015). However, this event did not happen on the planned date, nor did it happen as the organisers had envisioned. Rather, the OCLP movement comprised young people, particularly students, who stood "at the forefront of the movement" (Ortmann, 2015, p.33) and ultimately, the movement evolved into an unprecedented scale of protest. In a very short amount of time, the occupation spread to three districts in the city including the Admiralty, Mongkok and Causeway Bay districts (Ortmann, 2015).

According to a survey conducted in the locations that were occupied by the protesters as the peak of the UM, 61 percent of the participants are youth under the age of 30 (Chan &Lee, 2014). Another study also found a similar result: 44 percent of the protestors are youth activists between 18 and 29 years old (Yuen, 2015, as cited in Chan, 2015, p. 329). Also, the activists of the UM are highly educated. According to the study conducted by Chan and Lee (2014), over half of the activists claimed that they hold a Bachelor's degree. Although there was the impression that the movement was student-led, the young participants were not all students. Chan and Lee (2014) found that only 26 percent are students and the majority (58 percent) are "white-collar workers". Yet, it could be that a significant number of the participants are young professionals. Also, many of the activists felt strongly about their Hong Kong identity -- over 80 percent identified themselves as "Hong Kongers" (Chan & Lee, 2014).

After vacating the occupied space, the UM has continued their activities in various ways (Hui & Lau, 2015). Some of the activists continue their work from the UM by returning to their communities (Chen & Szeto, 2015). That is, the strategies of the "liberal-to-left-wing" (Chen & Szeto, 2015) activists who continued to uphold the UM vision, such as establishing new organisations to promote civic education and organising local communities; organising political groups to participate in the District Council elections in November 2015; and forming new professional groups to continue to voice their concerns about democratic development in Hong Kong and practicing democracy in everyday life. On the other hand, some of the UM participants have joined the "restoration

campaign" organised by right-wing localists or separatist-populist groups to veto new immigrants and tourists from mainland China which they feel would restore social order to the local communities (Chen & Szeto, 2015).

In short, the UM youth activists have different backgrounds with different political inclinations. In spite of their common discontent of the state and shared appeal for genuine universal suffrage (although they have a very vague concept), each may have a very different understanding and interpretation of citizenship. However, in the process of participation, they have created new experiences and a culture of social movements in Hong Kong, arguably the meaning of citizenship, such as equality in participation, direct participation, and the decentralisation of leadership. Through this, youth activists have attempted to newly define their understanding of civil identity, social rights and responsibilities, and social order. Thus, this research aims to better understand these young activists, in attempting to investigate their understanding and experience of citizenship in and beyond the UM.

New Preservation Movements.

New preservation movement is a social movement concept coined by Chen and Szeto (2015) to characterize a series of actions taken by activists to preserve historic heritage of colonial Hong Kong since mid-2000. As mentioned, a series of social movements emerged after 2003, including the campaigns for preserving Lee Tung Street, Star Ferry and the Queen's Pier, anti-XRL movement and currently the anti-NENT. Chen

and Szeto (2015) comprehensively discussed these movements and labelled them as the NPMs. According to Chen and Szeto (2015), the emergence of the NPM can be seen as a reaction toward the "new urban crises" in Hong Kong. These crises are closely related to the welfare and political crises produced by the global neoliberal ideology. Under the rationale of neoliberalism in which economic development is of utmost importance, urban development has no choice but to follow this logic. Thus, historical sites, rural villages as well as old urban living quarters are now being "renewed" based on free market principles (Chen & Szeto, 2015, p.440). As discussed above, previous social movements tended to emphasise more on fighting for social and political rights and less on the importance of lifestyle and ideology. As Chen and Szeto (2015) argued:

> [t]hese urban crises are the blind-spots of political activists and rights-based (welfare) activists, who, due to years of path dependent negotiations with the government, have succumbed to the governing logic of neoliberalized, economized understandings of media currency, political capital and monetary compensation. (Chen & Szeto, 2015, pp. 440–441)

New preservation movement itself is not a commonly used concept, but its origin can easily be traced and it is closely linked with such social movement concepts as conservation movement as well as new social movement, where the key concerns of the former, amongst other themes, are primarily about preservation of architecture as well as cultural heritage (Glendinning, 2013), conservation of natural ecology and bio-diversity (Escobar, 1998) as well as the conservation of natural history (Griffiths, 1991). This clearly shows the distinction between traditional social movements and the NPMs in Hong Kong, whereby the former endeavours to the pursuit of social and political rights

under the Marshallian framework of citizenship, the latter goes beyond the Marshallian perspective and emphasises more on culture, lifestyle as well as identity. The anti-NENT is a typical example of an NPM, in which urban crises are being articulated by Generation Y or the Millennials, who originally "were constituted by unorganized, disgruntled citizens who stood firm against bulldozers and got haphazardly named by mainstream media as "preservationists" (Chen & Szeto, 2015, p.441).

Nevertheless, the agenda of the NPM activists is more than just preservation. As discussed earlier, this type of social movement is concerned about life style and ideological issues, thus covering a wide variety of concerns including historical preservation (e.g. vernacular architecture); rebuilding social capital (e.g. building community networks); reclaiming public space (e.g. advocating for hawkers markets); environmental sustainability (e.g. recycling projects) ; organic agriculture revival movement (e.g. supporting local farmers) as well as lifestyle which would preserve existing everyday lifestyle and culture in urban and rural settings. Generally, these movements have multiple focuses and their concerns are multi faceted and readily modified in the course of their development (Chen & Szeto, 2015, p.442). In other words, the NPM represents the new focus of social movements in Hong Kong, thus challenging the conventional Marshallian perspective of citizenship. The NPM also raises questions, for instance, they ask who the citizens are, what are the proper rights and obligations that citizens should have, and what constitutes good citizenship. The NPM also attempts to shape the contents of citizenship based on the ideals of the NPM activists.

In the context of Hong Kong, New Preservation Movement, therefore, can be regarded as a concept which encompasses features of both conservation movement as well as new social movement. As discussed later on in this chapter, Chen and Szeto (2015) used this concept to denote the series of protest emerged since the anti-demolition of the Queen's Pier and expanded it to illustrate the development of anti-China sentiment as well as the struggle of local Hong Kong identity. From calls to preserve Lee Tung Street and the Star Ferry Pier to the movements that reject the XRL and more recently the NENT, it is obvious that the NPM has gradually matured and developed a more internally coherent discourse (e.g. a discourse of the domination of land developers and localism). The NPM has also aroused public attention on these issues which resulted in creating more demand from the general public for more democratic urban planning processes.

On the other hand, the supporters of these movements, especially the youth activists, have become more organised and formed into organisations or community alliances, for example, the Land Justice League that advocates for justice in urban development, the Mapopo Community Farm which concerns local farming as well as acts a core of the Anti-NENT movement. In addition, some new organisations in different localities with different community concerns are also being formed, and have attracted the attention of many young people. A typical example is the Save Lantau Alliance whose concern is to monitor land development and preserve the environment in Lantau.

This study interviewed youth activists who are a member of these movements to understand their definition and interpretation of citizenship as well as the relationship between their understanding and participation in such social movements.

Conclusion

In Hong Kong, the unique social and political backdrop has created a unique interpretation of youth citizenship. Based on the premises discussed above, I adopt a perspective that sees citizenship as a shaping and reshaping process in which different stakeholders, including the government and various power holders, participate in the shaping process where different ideologies interplay and interact. In this sense, citizenship can be seen as a battlefield where different ideologies compete and struggle for power. In this struggle, young activists are one of the power holders in the process of shaping citizenship. Through their participation and political practices, they attempt to broaden the meaning of citizenship and reclaim the rights and duties that they envisage as entitlements. Thus, their purpose and experience in participating in social movements do, to a considerable extent, reflect their expectations as citizens on the development of society. This study therefore aims to understand the relationship between social movements and citizenship from the perspective of the young activists. In the next chapter, I shall elucidate on the methodology of this research.

Chapter 4

Methodology and Research Design

This chapter provides a detailed account of the methodological design that is adopted in this research work. The related literature has been extensively reviewed and critically discussed in Chapters 2 and 3. The key theoretical areas are outlined, which include the theories of citizenship and youth citizenship as well as a discussion on youth activism and social movements. Also, the development of citizenship in Hong Kong and the evolution of youth activism in Hong Kong are also articulated. In this chapter, I shall discuss the research design and methodology, data collection method and my approach to analysing the data collected from the respondent interviews. Ethical considerations and research limitations are critically addressed in the final part of this chapter.

Research Objectives and Research Questions

This research aims to provide a better understanding of the meanings of citizenship that youth activists gain from their experiences. As discussed in the previous chapters, the current understanding around youth citizenship is rather adult-centric (Harris, Wyn, & Younes, 2010; Lister et al., 2003). Therefore, this research work will extend this current understanding by focusing on the subjectivity of youth activists and unravelling their understanding and interpretation of citizenship from the course of their participation in social movements in Hong Kong. The specific objectives of this research are outlined below.

Research objectives.

1. To explore how young activists understand and define citizenship;
2. To understand the experience of young activists in practicing citizenship in social movements; and
3. To investigate the relationship between their interpretation of citizenship and participation in social movements.

Research Questions.

Based on the objectives outlined above, this study will answer the three following research questions:

Q1. How is the notion of citizenship being understood and interpreted by young activists in Hong Kong in terms of its extent, content and depth?

Conceptually, citizenship is a social construct which is both contested and subject to interpretation under different socio-political-historical contexts. Since the primary aim of this research is to subjectively understand citizenship as defined within the experiences of young activists in social movements, the first research question is designed to be as open and non-confining as possible so that the respondents could freely state their own definition and interpretation of citizenship. Due to the possible limitations in translation

(the interviews are conducted in Chinese), I asked this question in different ways as follows:

- In your own view, what is citizenship?
- How would you describe citizenship in the social and political contexts of Hong Kong?

These two questions are intended to adequately prompt the respondents to share their understanding of citizenship in Hong Kong.

To obtain a more in-depth understanding, I asked my respondents to further elaborate on their understanding of citizenship along the three essential characteristics suggested by Faulks (2000): the extent (membership), contents (rights and obligations) and depth (participation) of citizenship. The related questions are as follows.

Extent.

- Which political community / communities do you identify with? (e.g. Hong Konger? Chinese Hong Konger? Global citizen?) Why do you identify yourself as such? What criteria do you use to identify yourself with this community/these communities?
- Would you please share your experience as a member of this political community as a young person and young activist?
- How would you describe your relationship with the government?

Content.

- As a citizen, what rights and obligations do you enjoy? Can you share your experience in exercising these rights and obligations? How would you assess your own experience of being a citizen in Hong Kong?
- What rights and obligations should citizens enjoy? Why do you think so? In this regard, do you think that there are any differences in the rights and obligations of young people versus adults? What are they, if any?
- In your experience, what are the obstacles that prevent citizens from enjoying their rights and fulfilling their obligations? Are there any differences between young people and adults in this respect? What are they, if any?

Depth.

- What are the qualities of being a "good citizen" (in terms of attitude, behaviour and values)?
- Could young people influence society socially and politically? What influences might they have? Why?
- Have you ever tried to practice (or express) your citizenship? What did you do? What was your experience like? Are there any difficulties or obstacles that prevent you from practicing or expressing your citizenship? What do you do in the face of difficulties / obstacles?

Q2. What are the driving factors of youth participation in social movements as an expression of citizenship, and the meanings given to them?

This question investigates the experience of the respondents with social movements and seeks to understand the ways in which their experiences contribute to their understanding and interpretation of citizenship. Specific questions may include:

- What social movements have you been involved in? Please share your experience with social movements.
- What motivated you to participate in those social movements? (The UM or the NPM)?
- What motivated / motivates you to continue to participate?
- Do your experiences with social movements have anything to do with your understanding and interpretation of citizenship? If so, what are they? How much has it impacted your understanding and interpretation?

Q3. To what extent has participation in social movements reshaped understanding and practicing of citizenship?

This question seeks to understand the ways in which the experience of the respondents with social movements affects, shapes and reshapes their understanding and interpretation of citizenship. Specific questions may include:

- Have you found any changes in your values, behaviour and attitude towards citizenship after your involvement with social movements?

- What caused the change(s)? Is there a particular experience that you would like to share?
- How do these changes affect your views and actions towards the following issues?
    i. political community
    ii. rights and obligations of citizens
    iii. being a good citizen
    iv. social participation and social movements and their relationship with citizenship

Research Design

Research design is important as it is the framework for implementing research work based on the research objectives. It is crucial to select a method that can appropriately meet the research objectives (Creswell & Miller, 2000; Punch, 2013). In this study, a qualitative methodology is used and a youth-centred research perspective (O'Toole, Marsh, & Jones, 2003) is emphasised based on the research questions.

Epistemological and ontological considerations.

Quantitative research is deductive in nature and focuses on testing theories, while qualitative inquiry is an inductive approach, in which theories are developed from the research work. These two approaches have different epistemological as well as ontological positions. Qualitative inquiry is an interpretivist-oriented approach, in which

the research paradigm is to understand and interpret certain social phenomena through the meanings that people bring to them (Harwell, 2011). On the contrary, quantitative approaches are positivist-oriented, "scientific" in nature and believe that objective knowledge can only be produced through objective observations (Snape & Spencer, 2003). These two distinctive research paradigms also have different ontological considerations. A social reality is constructed in qualitative research (Guba & Lincoln, 2004). In other words, meanings and phenomena are constructed through interactions and experiences. On the other hand, the ontological position of quantitative research is on objectivity, which means that facts and reality can exist independently from social actors (Bryman, 2008). In this study, the aim is to determine how young people understand citizenship and their experience with social movements. The aim is based on the assumption that citizenship is a socially constructed concept with multiple meanings, and thus contentious in nature. Citizenship is therefore experienced by young activists through various dimensions which are not yet completely understood.

Qualitative and quantitative methodologies.

Accordingly, this research is interpretivist rather than positivist in approach. A qualitative methodology is used since it is appropriate for this study. The traditions and culture of quantitative research are rooted in the natural sciences; therefore quantitative research focuses on the "numerical measurement of specific aspect of phenomena" (Thomas, 2003, p. 2). As such, quantitative research tends to rely on the use of statistics, often processing large volumes of detailed information and typically involving contact

with large numbers of people (Carey, 2013). In contrast, qualitative research does not need to rely on objective measurements (Punch, 2013). Due to its interpretive nature, qualitative research tends to ask different questions and is not only concerned with the outcomes, but also the process of different actions and events (Barbour, 2013, p. 26). Although qualitative research may involve a relatively smaller number of cases, quantitative inquiries are able to extract rich information through mixed methods and multiple sources of data, such as interviews, observations, participant observation, textual analysis and so on and so forth (Punch, 2013).

It is important to point out here that qualitative inquiry is "not a unified set of techniques or philosophies" (Mason, 2002, p. 2). Rather, it is diverse with no universal definition. However, some distinctive features can be identified as follows.

Frist, qualitative research is a non-positivist approach. The philosophical grounds are primarily "interpretivist" in nature. Instead of investigating and validating the "truth", qualitative research looks for multiple truths that are socially constructed (Guba & Lincoln, 2004). Therefore, qualitative research is determining how the "social world is interpreted, understood, experienced, produced or constituted" (Mason, 2002, p.3). The interactions between participants and researchers normally take place in natural settings for facilitating a flexible and open research process. The focus of the research is to articulate the beliefs of the participants, what they do, and how they feel and make sense of a social phenomenon. The qualitative inquiry process enables a researcher to

understand the experiences of the participants, and their perceptions and interpretation of themselves and their life experience.

Second, qualitative research is considered to be a critical, self-reflexive form of enquiry. The role of the researcher is crucial as he or she serves as the primary means of describing and filtering observations (Creswell, 2009). His or her beliefs, values, and experiences are influential in the research process. Therefore, the qualitative research process should involve "critical self-scrutiny" or "active reflexivity", which means that the researcher needs to be continuously self-reflect during the research process to prevent or reduce personal bias from influencing the study (Mason, 2002). This point will be further discussed in the "ethical considerations" section of this chapter.

Moreover, instead of relying on rigidly standardised or structured methods of collecting data, this approach is based on a relatively small sample size which is intentionally selected based on flexibility and sensitivity to the social context and a specific set of criteria. As such, although the research should be well-planned, the research design steps and implementation are often not linear, and therefore researchers need to be flexible and prepare for changes (Mason, 2002).

A qualitative inquiry uses "holistic" forms of analysis" (Mason, 2002, p.4) and inductive reasoning for all an rounded understanding of a phenomenon. That is, after collecting rich, nuanced and detailed information, the patterns, trends and correlations are identified through detailed classifications and explanations (Mason, 2002, p. 3). Then

inductive reasoning, which is a logical process, is carried out to derive the related theories or hypotheses, explanations, and conceptualisations (Harwell, 2011).

Youth-centred research.

There is a small but increasing number of studies on youth that adopt an alternative approach from the traditional orthodoxies in youth citizenship studies and in doing so, recognise youth citizenship in a more inclusive way (O'Toole et al., 2003). This youth-centred approach emphasises the youthful and diverse perspectives of young people along with how they experience the components of the social structure, such as social class, gender and education, as well as their unique ways to define and engage with the concept of citizenship (O'Toole et al., 2003; Smith, Lister, Middleton, & Cox, 2005; Wood, 2014). In light of this, this research incorporates a youth-centred approach into the research design.

One of the main characteristics of a qualitative inquiry that incorporates a youth-centred approach is that youth perspectives are privileged over predominant ideas towards youth and citizenship. In other words, such a qualitative inquiry differs from other approaches in youth citizenship studies which mainly focus on ways to transform young people into desirable citizens rather than consider that they are already citizens in their own right (Bennett, 2013). As mentioned in Chapter 3, the majority of youth researchers fundamentally perceive youths as individuals who are merely in a transition period between childhood and adulthood. On top of that, young people are considered to be

unqualified citizens who need to be supported through this rite of passage, and learn to be a good citizen of their society (Billett, 2011; Wyn & Woodman, 2007). Accordingly, the voices of young people are marginalised in mainstream youth studies in which researchers have been focused on "researching youth rather than researching with youth" (Billett, 2011, p.109 ; Fraser Lewis, Ding, Kellett, & Robinson, 2004; Heath, Books, Cleaver & Ireland, 2009; O'Toole et al. 2003;). As such, adults often assume the role of experts, and youth and children are often the objects of study (Fraser et al. 2011). Their voice and perspectives are thus to a large extent overshadowed as they are conceived to be "passive receivers rather than active constructors of their own identity and cultural/social reality" (Billett, 2011, p.109).

The belief that underlies the youth-centred approach in this study is that the perspectives and practices of young people can enrich and enhance current understanding of citizenship, which are also important for social changes. By recognising young people as full citizens here and now rather than as future citizens (Lister, 2007a, 2007b), such a youth-centred approach would actually promote young people themselves as the focus of research, instead of objects that are attached to the adult world. By applying qualitative methods and a youth-centred perspective, young people would have the opportunity to express themselves through "a new range of meanings, contexts and possibilities" and take part actively "in the production, interpretation and reproduction of cultural meaning and knowledge" (Billett, 2011, p.110). As suggested by McLeod and Malone (2000), it is imperative for youth-centred research to address agency and selfhood. In this sense, qualitative research as a method can offer more room for youth respondents to express

their own views and their experiences with citizenship as well as "to develop a much more nuanced understanding of the relationship between [young people's] lived experiences and their engagement and interest in politics" (Marsh, O'Toole and Jones 2007, p. 212). In summary, qualitative strategies and a youth-centred approach are applied in this study because in-depth interviews with young activists can provide thick, in-depth descriptions of their experiences and understandings of citizenship.

Research Respondents

Sample population.

Youth activists are the focus of this study for two reasons. First, as mentioned in the introduction, the phenomenon of youth participation in social movements has been the centre of attention in Hong Kong (Chen & Szeto, 2015; Hui & Lau, 2015). In recent years, there has been continuously an increasing number of social movements in Hong, and young activists have taken an active and leading role in these movements. Arguably, youth activism, to a certain extent, is linked to challenging the contents and definitions of contemporary citizenship. I am interested in finding out how these forerunners of social movements understand citizenship and their experience with citizenship. Second, studies on youth activism in Hong Kong are few and far in between. Studies on youth citizenship and social movements are mainly found in university postgraduate projects, whereas local academic studies related to this topic are hardly found. Hence, this study addresses this research gap and intends to shed some light in this deficient research area.

Youth activists are at the forefront of change because they initiate changes. By participating in social movements, they shape and construct the meaning of citizenship. Therefore, their understanding and experience with citizenship are vital in this study. As discussed earlier, youth activism is a broad term that refers to the involvement of young people in different social actions. The concerns of youth activists are diverse, such as gender equality, environmental concerns, human rights, anti-racism. Their actions also vary, which include those that are low-risk, passive, and institutionalised to high-risk, active, and unconventional (Corning & Myers, 2002). Therefore, youth activists in this study are defined as youth participants who take part in social movements and are relatively experienced in taking collective action and problem-solve with regard to social-political issues. In light of this definition, I have focused on youth activists who are inclined to consistently participate in at least one social movement. As mentioned in Chapter 3, I am focusing on two large-scale social movements: the UM and the NPM. These two movements were mainly led by young activists but had different areas of concern, so I have been able to access a wider population of youth activists who have different perspectives, experiences and political ideologies. Although the UM has already ended, it is still continuing in other forms, such as by returning "back to the community" (Chen & Szeto, 2015). With the above considerations in mind, two groups of youth activists are selected for the sample population in this research work. First, there are those who have participated in the UM and are still active in continuing the work of the movement, and second, those who have participated or are participating in the NPM. In sum, the sample population includes:

- Residents of Hong Kong between 18 and 29 years old at the time of the interview, and
- Participants of either the UM or NPM who continue to be active in the movement.

Two methods were used to identify the sample respondents. First, potential respondents were defined based on the above "definition", and second, the potential respondents were recruited based on third party sources, such as the media, social action groups, internet campaign groups, as well as other campaign organisations. In other words, they are recognised in the activist community for taking part in social movements.

Sampling method.

Youth activists are not a group of people who can be easily identified. This means that purposive sampling would be a more appropriate and feasible method for identifying potential respondents. As a form of non-probability sampling, purposive sampling involves the deliberate selection of "information-rich" cases for in-depth interviews to provide information that is relevant and important to the research questions (Patton, 2002, p. 40). Hence, the sample respondents are diverse enough in certain attributes to represent the youth activist population (Gobo, 2011). In this sense, the sampling of respondents is based on certain criteria (Bryman, 2008).

Sampling criteria.

The experiences of young people, to a large extent, are shaped by their social position (Wyn & White, 1997). Here, the multiplicity of social categories is taken into consideration on how it shapes the conceptions and experiences of young people as citizens. These social categories include social class, gender, education, sexual preference, ethnicity, culture. Yet, apart from the general conditions mentioned above for sampling the population, purposive sampling and the maximum variation principle are also applied for gathering thicker information and better representing the youth activist population (Patton, 2002). Accordingly, three criteria; that is, age, class and gender, and education level, were used as the primary criteria.

Age.

Youth is a contentious term and ever evolving concept (Wyn & Dwyer, 2000). This research work on youth citizenship focuses on the period of "transition" in which the experiences of young people with citizenship are complex and multi-faceted (Lister, 2007b). As argued in Chapter 3, youth as a stage in life has become fragmented and prolonged in the "late modernity" period in which the destination of "youth" and the acquisition of full citizenship are uncertain and arbitrary. The age range that is examined in this research is between 18 and 29 years old, which is chosen for two reasons. First, youths in this age group have already completed their compulsory education and are legally eligible to vote in elections. They are supposed to be autonomous full members of

society and expected to exercise their rights and fulfil their obligations as full citizens. However, as argued in Chapter 2, many young people are legal age but continue to be trapped in a precarious situation and unable to exercise their rights and fulfil their obligations. As a result, they become even more vulnerable and invisible due to exclusion. As (Adorjan & Yau, 2015, p. 163) pointed out, this is "particularly in relation to a sense of citizenship and identification with Hong Kong". Youth activists are part of the youth population and share the same experiences. Hence their interpretation and experience of citizenship are invaluable for this study.

Secondly, youths in this age group in Hong Kong express extreme discontent towards the government, which is reflected through their social movement participation. That is, young people who are under 30 years old constitute as the primary group who express strong dissatisfaction and mistrust towards the government (Adorjan & Yau, 2015). Similar findings are found in studies on the UM, which shows that those who are under 30 years old are the strong supporters of the movement (Chan & Lee, 2014). In addition, the so-called Millenniums are widely recognised as the forerunners of social movements in Hong Kong and are politically active (Adorjan & Yau, 2015; Chen & Szeto, 2015; Hui & Lau, 2015; Ortmann, 2015). Based on these reasons, it is assumed this group of youths would have longer and more richer participation experiences in social movements.

Gender.

Some feminist scholars argue that the universality of citizenship is a male-oriented and gender-blind conception (Leung, 2004; Lister, 1994, 2012). The conventional definition of citizenship has neglected gender differences and the oppression of women. This omission has led to further exclusion of women from citizenship and reduces women to "second-class citizens" (Lister, 1994). Yet, the process of shaping the "ideal citizen" in contemporary society is often associated with a class and gendered project. Since "citizenship is a deeply gendered concept" (Leung, 2004, p. 157), feminists advocate for articulating an alternative vision of citizenship that combines both equality and differences. As Lister (1997a) cautioned, the feminist notion of the "politics of difference" is a battle for gender equality not only in formal politics, but also in the informal political arena, for example, in social movements and everyday life. Therefore, the need for gender sensitivity in citizenship studies has been well-advocated, although there are very few articulations of gender considerations in local citizenship and social movement studies. However, this research work is a small-scale exploratory study and therefore attempting to include every aspect in the analysis is overly ambitious if not unfeasible, and beyond the scope of the work. Thus, the inclusion of gender as a sample criterion is not to test the gender differences as is the case in some of the quantitative designed studies. Rather, the inclusion of gender is to take the subjective experiences of young female activists into consideration so that their views can also be articulated, and the documented experiences will not be overtly male dominated.

Socio-economic status.

Socio-economic status is one of the factors that impact experience with citzenship and perceptions around citizenship. As Skeggs (1997) said: "[citizenship experience is] one of the most ubiquitous signifiers of class ...one of the key mechanisms by which some groups [are] 'othered' and pathologised" (as cited in Smith et al. 2005, p.433). Under the predominant citizenship discourse of economic independence, losers and outsiders are often defined and excluded on the basis of class (Smith et al., 2005). In this sense, young people who are from lower class and disadvantaged family backgrounds might be forced to experience a marginalised form of citizenship. Therefore, socio-economic status in this research work is considered as one of the sampling criteria, and the median monthly household income in Hong Kong is used as the cut-off point to differentiate between respondents who are underprivileged versus those who are more well-off.

Secondary criteria.

In this research work, secondary criteria were also used to highlight some of the potentially influential factors for the enquiry (Snape & Spencer, 2003). The secondary criteria are education background and political inclinations. Education level is considered as one of the predictors of the various forms of civic and social participation (Putnam, 2000, p. 186) and political attitude (Almond & Verba, 1989; as cited in Campbell, 2006). Since the primary criteria such as socio-economic status and age are, to a certain extent, related to education background, this factor is thus considered as a secondary criterion. In this research, education is classified as those who have a degree versus those who do not have a degree or high school graduates. Another secondary criterion adopted for this

study is political inclination. As discussed in Chapter 3, the growing support of localist factions and their pro-right stance is one of key characteristics of youth activism in Hong Kong and undoubtedly related to imagined citizenship. Therefore, support for localist and non-localist factions are included in the sample in this study. With these two secondary criteria, the sampling procedures ensure that the sample is diverse enough to represent the youth activist population (Snape & Spencer, 2003, p.99).

Sample size.

A purposive sample has "symbolic representation and diversity" (Ritchie, Lewis, & Elam, 2003, p. 83). Therefore, controlling the composition of the sample is more important than the size of the sample itself. In other words, this method does not aim to produce a large sample for generalisation purposes. Rather, the sample size of a qualitative study is kept reasonably small enough to ensure rich details (Snape & Spencer, 2003). A total of 16 respondents who meet the three primary and two secondary criteria are recruited in this study and their demographics are shown in Table 4.1.

Table 4.1
Demographics of sample

Gender	Age range (years old)	Socio-economic status	No. of recruited individuals	Secondary criteria

Female	18-24	Above median	2	Education level:
		Below median	2	degree
	25-29	Above median	2	non-degree
		Below median	2	Political inclination:
				pro localist faction
				non localist faction
Male	18-24	Above median	2	Education level:
		Below median	2	degree
	25-29	Above median	2	non-degree
		Below median	2	Political inclination:
				pro localist faction
				non localist faction
Total no. in sample:			16	

Recruitment strategies.

I approached my respondents through existing personal contacts and recruited them through snowballing. Since I am acquainted with the youth activist community, I took advantage of my network to find and recruit suitable respondents. The sampling work

was further enhanced through snowballing because of the requirements set for the sampling criteria and the limitations of personal networks especially in recruiting local youth activists (Snape & Spencer, 2003). Snowballing is a suitable research strategy for this study as suitable youth activists are relatively scattered and few in number. Having said this, however, sending out invitations for interviews was quite a sensitive issue at the time when the police started to arrest the UM participants. Therefore, referrals and snowballing were more appropriate strategies to reach suitable respondents and establish trust. Based on the sampling methods used, sixteen respondents were interviewed based on the sampling criteria. A summary of the purposive sampling process is provided in Appendix 1.

Data Collection

As discussed above, there are many different types of methods for qualitative enquiries. In this youth-centred study, individual in-depth interviews were used to collect the data. In-depth interviewing is considered to be one of the key methods of data collection in qualitative research (Carey, 2013; Legard, Keegan, & Ward, 2003). This method is often described as a conversation with a purpose (Legard et al., 2003). In-depth interviews allow the researcher to converse face to face with the respondents. This is particularly useful for drawing out in-depth information and also allows for a more open dialogue on issues that may be sensitive in nature (Carey, 2013).

Semi-structured and pilot interviews.

In order to ensure that the interviews are purposive and related to the research questions, the interviews were semi-structured and followed an interview guide. In addition, two pilot interviews were conducted in September and October 2016 to draft the interview guide and ensure that the questions and terms can be understood and correctly interpreted. The pilot also provided me with the opportunity to hone my interview skills. After two pilot interviews, the semi-structured interview guide was refined in accordance with the feedback from the two interviewees of the pilot study. The semi-structured interview guide (see Appendix 1) was used to facilitate the interviews, which were given flexibility, and new questions could be asked during the interviews (Carey, 2013; Legard et al., 2003) to ensure that the interview process is interactive and non-directive in nature. For example, according to the interview guide, the interview should start by asking questions that concern the understanding of citizenship. However, it was found in the pilot interviews that this approach does not help the respondents to articulate their views because they had not yet began to think about citizenship at the beginning of the interview. However, after giving them time to discuss their experience with social movements, the respondents were able to make the linkage and started to articulate more in depth about their own experience with citizenship. This shows that in-depth interviews are a process that should allow back-and-forth interactions between the interviewer and the respondents. As several of the respondents indicated (for e.g. Cindy, Eddie, Kit and Olivia), the interview process allowed them to reconsider their own conception of citizenship which they might not have been as well thought out before the interview. As far as the interviews are concerned, a range of interview techniques, such as probing, following up

with questions, using dimension mapping questions and summarizing, were all used to facilitate the articulation of the responses, including "reasons, feelings, opinions and beliefs", in terms of "penetration, exploration and explanation" (Legard et al., 2003)

All of the 16 interviews were conducted individually face-to-face between October 2016 and January 2017. Each interview lasted for two hours to two and a half hours, and the interviews with Gina and Dick lasted almost three hours. The venue of the interviews was flexible: basically it could be any place that the respondent considered to be convenient and comfortable, such as a quiet café, park, or my office. Two of the respondents chose to be interviewed at my home, and one at her home. All of the interviews were audio-recorded and transcribed after receiving consent from the respondents. Since the interviews were recorded, I did not have to take notes and was able to maintain focus, listen and observe during the interview process. The recordings also provided verbatim dialogue including the language used and the tone of the respondents. On the other hand, observations were made during the interview process, noting attributes such as appearance, dress, gestures, facial expressions, and so on and so forth.

Data Analysis

In this study, the inductive approach is used to analyse the data collected and a thematic analysis is carried out to guide the data analysis process.

Thematic analysis.

Since this study aims to understand how the youth activists interpret and experience citizenship, the emphasis is more on theory-building than theory-testing. To guide the data analysis process, a thematic analysis is carried out in this research. Boyatzis (1998) provided the essential features of a thematic analysis:

> "Thematic analysis is a process for encoding qualitative information. The encoding requires an explicit "code". This may be a list of themes; a complex/model with themes; indicators, and qualifications that are causally related, or something in between these two forms. A theme is a pattern found in the information that at the minimum describes and organizes possible observations or at the maximum interprets aspects of the phenomenon. A theme may be identified at the manifest level (directly observable in the information) or at the latent level (underling the phenomena). The themes may be initially generated inductively from the raw information or generated deductively from theory and prior research (vi-vii).

Thematic analysis can be used for a wide range of theoretical frameworks. The method can be applied to produce data-driven or theory-driven analyses. In other words, thematic analysis is a relatively dynamic and open approach for data analysis which does not rely on a specific theory of language or explanatory framework or adhere to them to explain for the experience and practices of the respondents (Clarke & Braun, 2013).

In this study, I conducted a thematic analysis in six stages for suggested by Braun and Clarke (2006). The first stage is familiarisation with the data, which means that the researcher should "immerse" into the data and become familiar with the information by repeatedly listening to the audio-recorded information, reading the details multiple times, and writing down all preliminary analytic observations. For example, I found that many

of the respondents are slightly hesitant when asked about citizenship, and seldom used the term “citizenship” in their utterings. Instead the term “local” or “native” was used repeatedly with ease. Besides, I found that the term “local” or “native” usually has welcoming and positive connotations during the process of familiarising myself with the data. Therefore, I immersed myself into the data before proceeding to the next step, which is coding.

The second stage of a thematic analysis is coding. As an essential element of a qualitative analysis, “developing some manageable classification or coding scheme is the first step of analysis” (p. 463) according to Patton (2002). Coding is the naming and labelling of the essential features of the data. Keywords, terms or quotations were identified with reference to the interview questions. Together with coding, memos were written to record reflections and analysis of the data. In this process, I repeatedly read through all sixteen transcripts and identified key terms such as “local”, “native”, “democracy” “justice”, which I found had multiple meanings. This process is well illustrated by Punch (2013), who pointed out that “memoing links coding with the developing of propositions” (p.177). After applying codes to all of the data items, the codes were clustered into analytical categories and patterns (Clarke & Braun, 2013).

The third phase is “searching for themes”. According to Clarke and Braun (2013), a “theme is a coherent and meaningful pattern in the data relevant to the research question”. Themes are identified by “bringing together components or fragments of ideas or experiences, which often are meaningless when viewed alone” (Leininger, 1985, p. 60).

In other words, “searching” for themes is an active process whereby the researcher must actively construct the themes rather than waiting for the themes to be discovered. In this stage, all of the identified codes were collated into relevant themes after a thorough reading and comparison of the different categories and patterns, so that the conceptions of citizenship of the activists and how they link the conceptions with their experience in social movements gradually became apparent.

The fourth and fifth stages are reviewing the themes and defining and naming the themes, respectively. After the basic themes of youth activism were identified in the third stage, the focus in this stage was to develop the major themes through the process of repeatedly reading, reviewing and organising the identified themes. By doing so, the themes were further organised, through which three major themes were found, and the relationship between these themes was articulated and organised (Braun & Clarke, 2006). By reviewing the related literature and applying their results with the findings here, as well as taking the main findings from the themes into consideration and double-checking them with the available data, richer information for each theme was attained. The process also helped to formulate theme statements and develop the main argument. Three major themes, named respectively, responsive acts, resilience acts and reinvented acts of citizenship, were articulated and identified, and found to form a consistent and convincing story about the data (Braun & Clarke 2006).

The final phase is writing, which is an important component of all empirical research. Writing was an on-going and recursive process in my study, which involved integrating

all of the research findings and contextualising the literature to present a coherent and convincing analysis about the data (Braun & Clarke 2006). In this study, writing is not a linear but a recursive process. In the data analysis process, I went through all the above-mentioned stages, through which rich findings are produced for this study.

Validity and Reliability

Qualitative research is often criticised for its lack of rigour and reliability due to a small sample size and the lack of generalisability. Nevertheless, the epistemological grounds of qualitative inquiries suggest that truth is socially constructed (Guba & Lincoln, 2004). The concepts of validity and reliability are more relevant in the quantitative tradition (Healy & Perry, 2000), thus the limitations around generalizability is not a major concern of this research. However, qualitative researchers still need to heed two important issues (Patton, 2002). Validity and reliability mean different things in different paradigms, but in general, reliability refers to sustainability and validity can be taken to mean well grounded. Therefore, they are also relevant for qualitative inquiries because they determine to a certain extent the "strength of the data" (Ritchie & Lewis, 2003, p. 270). As such, the central challenge of this qualitative study is the extent to which the respondents are able to share their own experiences and perceptions, and I can obtain and articulate rich information. Following the principles recommended by Ritchie and Lewis (2003), I took the following measures to maximise the "strength of the data". First, through purposive sampling, I ensured that the sample selection resonates with the research objectives. Second, the respondents were encouraged to use their own daily

language to express their opinions and experiences in the pilot interviews and based on the semi-structured interview guide after it was refined. On the other hand, as far as youth-centred research is concerned, the respondents were given much space to share their views beyond the boundaries of the interview guide. In addition, since citizenship is not a concept that is used by the respondents in their everyday life, I addressed this issue very carefully during my interviews and reviewed the use of language to ensure accuracy and consistency in the data collection. In the end, all of the interviews were conducted smoothly. Some of the respondents indicated that the interview process is thought provoking and helped them to organise their own understanding and opinions about Hong Kong citizenship. Last but not least, the data analyses were based on a systematic and comprehensive procedure and the data interpretation was well supported by evidence as mentioned earlier. In the following section I shall explain the ethical considerations of this research study.

Ethical Considerations

Research ethics are important in social research work, particularly when the research involves children and youth. Bryman (2008) suggested four major ethical concerns in conducting research, including harm to the participants; lack of informed consent; invasion of privacy and deception. To properly manage these ethical concerns and problems, ethical practices were emphasised during the entire research process. Three measures were used to protect the potential respondents, including informed consent, anonymity and confidentiality.

Informed Consent.

Participation in this research study was voluntary. I obtained informed consent from all of the respondents, including the two respondents of the pilot study, before conducting the interviews. A written consent form (see Appendix 3) was provided to all of the respondents, through which they were informed about the aim of the study, the principles and measures for protecting anonymity, voluntary nature of participation, and confidentiality and privacy principles behind the data collection and usage. In addition, they were informed of their right to reject any questions which made them feel uncomfortable and given the option to withdraw from the research at any point in time without consequences. All of the respondents were also asked to sign the informed consent form to confirm that they would like to take part in this study.

Anonymity.

Anonymity is particularly crucial in this research because to a certain extent, the topic is one that is politically sensitive. Anonymity was used to protect respondents so that they would not be identified at any point in the research and afterwards. To do so, each interviewee was assigned a pseudonym for presenting the quotations in the thesis. Since the youth activist community is not very large and the sample size is relatively small, special care was made to ensure anonymity, such as key identifiers were removed to protect the respondents.

Confidentiality.

Confidentiality was also emphasised in the process of attaining informed consent. The data collection was conducted in strict confidence. The digital database including audio recordings and transcripts were stored with password protection and paper documents with personal information were filed in a locked cabinet. Only I or my supervisor could access the personal data and the data generated are solely used for this research purpose and would be destroyed after the completion of the study.

Positionality.

Positionality has been emphasised in feminist research and should be considered in youth studies as well. Positionality refers to multiple social identities and positions held by the researcher, including "gender, race, class, sexuality and other axes of social difference" (Nagar & Geiger, 2007, p. 267). That is, people are identified based on these social identities and positions. Positionality reminds the researcher that unequal power relations are inherent in different positional ties between the researcher and the respondents, particularly when young people are involved (Skelton, 2010). Besides, the idea of positionality also reminded me that I should critically reflect on my personal experiences and potential biases in the process of the study. As a social worker, I am aware that my past work experience and perceptions towards people in the community, including young people, may influence the research. I must admit that it is possible that my

experience may constitute bias. As Dowling (2005) cautioned, "[t]he best strategy is to be aware of, understand, and respond to it in a critically reflexive manner" (p.25).

As research is an on-going process, the endpoint should not be seen as the completion of the study or receiving a degree based on the work. Instead, the value of the research extends beyond the course of the study, because "[it] is a process, not just a product" (England, 1994, p. 82). Therefore, the researcher has the responsibility to facilitate an empowering experience and relationship with the respondents. To achieve this, I shared the meaning behind this research work with the respondents and their potential contribution to ensure that they are part of the research from the very beginning.

Ethical Clearance

Last but not least, the study has completed all the necessary ethical clearance procedures required by the Hong Kong Baptist University.

Conclusion

In this chapter, the research methodology and strategies have been discussed. A youth-centred qualitative approach is adopted as it is considered appropriate based on the research objectives and questions. In-depth semi-structured interviews are conducted for

data collection. Also, purposive and snowballing sampling are used to identify and recruit all sixteen respondents. Thematic analysis is used for the data analysis. In addition, the specific ethical considerations and limitations of this research have also been elucidated. In the following chapter, I will explain and discuss the findings of the research.

Chapter 5

Responsive Acts of Citizenship: Defending the Exclusive Market Citizenship

> *I think there must be a process where one needs to genuinely experience in flesh and blood being a citizen before citizenship becomes real. There must be an experience that produces this process before it happens, and this process needs to be reproduced and reinforced (Olivia).*

In this chapter and the following two chapters, I shall discuss the experiences of youth activists with social movements and how the experiences have impacted their understanding of citizenship in Hong Kong. As I pointed out in Chapter 1, citizenship is not purely a social status with a given meaning but also practices and interactions found between different actors in society (Faulks, 2000; Isin, 2008, 2009). As evident in the above quotation by one of the study respondents, Olivia, the findings of this research suggest that the meaning of citizenship is produced and presented through the different acts of various actors, and the process is often wrought with negotiations and struggles.

In Chapter 2, I discussed the insights offered by Isin (2008) around the "acts of citizenship" for citizenship research. Isin (2008) argued that citizenship is an evolving concept that is ever-changing, and therefore cannot be premised on static boundaries around the extent, content and depth, because they "arrive at the scene too late" (Isin, 2008 , p.37). Instead, he suggested four areas in the acts of citizenship, including the status of the actors, sites of contestation, extension of boundaries towards different territorial scales, and the practices, to capture the dynamic changes of citizenship (Isin,

2008, 2009; see also Chapter 2). Premised on this understanding, I elucidate how youth activists who stand at the forefront of social movements make sense of citizenship and how their understanding is related to their own participation in social movements.

In this study, youth activism is defined as the acts of citizenship of young people for advancing citizenship. However, note that the meaning of citizenship here is multi-faceted and dynamic rather than singular and static, and different experiences of youth activists also produce different understandings and practices. In light of the "acts of citizenship" per Isin (2008, 2009), I identify three kinds of "acts of citizenship" that are labeled respectively as responsive, resilient and reinvented acts of citizenship (see Table 5.1).

Table 5.1

Three Types of "Acts of Citizenship"

	Responsive Acts of Citizenship	Resilient Acts of Citizenship	Reinvented Acts of Citizenship
Acts	Valiant struggles ◆ Emotionally-driven ◆ Counteractions ◆ Self-defense in crises Identity as citizen established through definition and exclusion by means of valiant struggles and	Community organizing ◆ Ideology-driven ◆ Bonds ◆ Supportive Identity as citizen established by connecting with various civil society groups and individuals and civic participation	Autonomous life practices ◆ Reflexive Practice-driven ◆ Innovative ◆ Based on integrity Identity as citizen established through autonomous and

	confrontations		alternative life practices
Site	The Streets Valiant struggle events as citizenship practices (Site of physical confrontations) Primary characteristics: ◆ State of the confrontations ◆ Uncertainly (state of flux)	Civil Society Participation and activities in public sphere as citizenship practice Primary characteristics: ◆ Public nature ◆ Inclusionary	Culture and Everyday commitment to citizenship practice as an integrated but alternative life practice Primary characteristics: ◆ Down-to-earth ◆ Here and now
Scale	Political community: Regional (HKSAR) ◆ "One country, Two systems" -- defending citizenship of a free market economy ◆ Advocating for the independence of Hong Kong	Political community: Multi-level and multi-faceted ◆ "One country, Two systems"--struggle for a democratic citizenship ◆ Promoting multi-level and multi-faceted citizenship	Political community: locale ◆ "Communit Self-Relief"-- practicing community self-governing ◆ Transforming notion of citizenship in others
Actor	Warrior ◆ Autonomous and fluid ◆ Solo participation and taking high risks	Community organisers ◆ Life in civil organisations ◆ Affordable activism	Modern Ascetics ◆ Post-materialist ◆ Sustainable activism

In the following sections, I shall discuss more in depth the three kinds of citizenship acts that are the focus in my study. I shall begin by examining the findings on responsive acts of citizenship, and then discuss resilient and reinvented acts of citizenship in the next two chapters.

> *"The failure of the government to gain consensus of the people would naturally lead to conflicts…and when they (the government) say that offering a political solution is one of the most civilized methods for solving social problems but fail to do so, the only way to deal with it is to fight them -- this is war" (James).*

The quotation by James is a good example of responsive acts of citizenship, the aim of which is to protect the interests and identity of Hong Kongers against the oppression of the "intruder" and the establishment. Here, the intruder is commonly perceived by the young activists as the Chinese communist government authorities, and the HKSAR government is commonly referred to as the establishment and its allies who hold bureaucratic and legislature power, and situated in various organisations. In other words, Hong Kong citizenship to these activists is (and to some extent must be) expressed, established and protected through radical responses to outsider domination, which is regarded as "non-Hong Kong" in essence. In the eyes of these activists, the HKSAR government has failed to protect citizenship in a free market economy under the principle of "one country, two systems" as well as the identity and interests of "Hong Kongers". The only way to make amendments is to therefore fight – to conduct "valiant struggles" that would defend them from the intrusion because otherwise, Hong Kong identity and Hong Kong citizenship would be unquestionably undermined, if not completely eroded.

Hence, the site where citizenship claims are demonstrated is on the "streets" not in the legislature nor any of the government institutions because, as discussed above, the institutional mechanisms and processes which are usually the avenues to build citizenship are considered to be entirely defective and worthless. Following this logic, the actors of these responsive acts are the "warriors" who venture against the perceived oppressors through protests and physical confrontations on the streets.

Responsive Acts of Citizenship: Valiant Struggles

Valiant struggles are one of the most common approaches used in the protests by youth activists, which means that activists and protesters use their own body and physical force as means of resistance, and retaliate against the violence of their oppressors. This is precisely described by James as "fighting on the streets", or as the other respondents (e.g., Pinky and Dick) described as "using physical force to counter physical force". Specifically, this is one of the most radical ways of protesting against the government and the establishment in recent years (Chan, 2016; Kwong, 2016). Valiant struggles include all kinds of actions used for direct confrontations during radical protests, such as throwing bricks at the police, hitting the police, kicking the luggage and belongings of mainland Chinese visitors, verbally and physically abusing visitors from China, blocking the meeting proceedings of the Legislature. These different valiant actions are driven by spontaneous courage and self-uprightness and usually not guided by a set of clearly defined social and moral principles (Chen & Szeto, 2015). Rather, these actions can be better understood as fierce protests and confrontations that are the result of "emotional outburst" (Hui & Lau, 2015). In this study, I have identified three features of valiant struggles. First, they are emotionally-driven action. Second, they are counteractions

against the oppression of the authoritarian regime (represented by the HKSAR government) which is perceived to have denied Hong Kong's non-China identity. Third, it is self-defense during crises which aim to defend the status quo of Hong Kong rather than building a new Hong Kong identity.

Emotionally driven actions.

Valiant struggles are unlike the conventional protests led by the pan-democrats, which are considered to be routine, stagnate and ineffective (Chan, 2016; Veg, 2017). On the contrary, the study respondents (such as Dick, James, and Pinky) believe that valiant actions prompted by passion and spontaneous reactions, which do not need any long-term planning nor calculation of cost effectiveness, are more able to disrupt the government and compel changes. These valiant actions, which took place during and after the UM, have further moved away from the conventional strategy of "peace, rationality and non-violence and non-profanity" (Kwan, 2016). A typical example is the so-called "Fishball Revolution" (dubbed by the government as the Mongkok Riot) in 2016 during which some of the respondents including James, Dick, Man and Eddie were present. Dick recalled that the Fishball Revolution was emotionally driven and unplanned:

> *I didn't know what the situation would be like. I didn't weigh the consequences. At that time, I felt that it was right so I went ahead and did it" (Dick).*

The youth activists stated that they had not planned to be valiant before they took part in the protest. Rather, they acted impulsively based on the scenario at the time. For example, James felt very angry when he witnessed passerbys who were beaten by the

police so his reaction was to use violence. He stated that he did not feel that there is a right or wrong in being valiant because his actions were a response to the violence of the police. In essence, one of the characteristics of emotionally driven valiance, i.e. using force to counter force, is that it is mutually escalating.

Counteractions.

> *Marching on the streets and holding public assemblies are no longer effective. Peaceful actions have not changed anything. We have to take it up a notch. Even if it means that we use strategies such as occupying the roads as well as using physical force. Throwing bricks at the police is not a big deal. Just like the "fish ball movement" last year, I feel that the confrontations and resistance that took place were not serious. Rather I see that valiant resistance is something quite natural. It is just a counteraction against oppression. It is natural and should be well respected (Pinky).*

Counteraction through immediate and direct retaliation is a characteristic of valiant action. Here, two of the respondents used the logic of oppression and counteraction to portray valiant struggles. Accordingly, oppression and resistance are closely related although they appear to be different. There must be first an oppressive force otherwise a counterforce cannot be initiated. According to Pinky, valiant resilience is a "very natural response" produced under desperate situations. This is a reaction that is likened to the law of retaliation of "a tooth for a tooth" which, according to the respondents, is both natural and effective. The respondents made comparisons of protests and demonstrations in the past, and concluded that valiant resilience successfully drew

the attention of the public and provided a serious warning to the government. For example, Dick commented that valiant actions have gained some "success":

> *I think that valiant actions are acceptable because they are effective. For example, after throwing bricks (at the police), the whole world paid attention to us, and even the officials from Mainland China came to Hong Kong to see what happened. So we caught people's attention. I suppose after this the government might be more conscious about what it does…Yes, I think we should develop our actions along this path (Dick).*

Under such circumstances, some of the respondents, for example, Dick, feel that fierce confrontations with the use of physical force are inevitable, and it is unrealistic to encourage peaceful protests. Similarly, Dick is frustrated by the pan-democrats who condemned their actions afterwards. He argued that it is impossible for the pan-democrats to bring about any concrete changes through high moral grounds, because such a standpoint fails to address the frustrations of Hong Kong people. This is precisely the reason for why he has withdrawn from the Democratic Party.

It can be seen here that valiant resistance is not based on rational actions, nor does it have any long-term guiding plan. Rather, valiant resistance is based on counteraction to sheer oppression. As suggested by some researchers, resistance will escalate when the government increases control, and more youth activists will resort to valiant struggles and confrontations without a sense of boundaries (Chan, 2016; Cheng, 2016; Yuen, 2015). For example, one of the respondents, Man, felt that when the police uses increased force,

anger at the police would correspondingly escalate and the types of resistance would grow increasingly radical in nature.

Acts of self-defense in crisis situations.

On the other hand, some of the respondents indicated that valiant actions are only used as a means of self-defense in crises. This group of young activists (Fong and James) feel that "Hong Kong is dying", and Hong Kongers are struggling to survive. For example, Fong said that using physical force to counter police violence is analogous to dashing an egg against a rock. However, to protect Hong Kongers who are being oppressed and their counterparts who are fighting the battle on the streets, she has to stand up for the "eggs" (protestors). Fong also said that causing injuries to the opponents cannot be avoided for the good of the whole. Another respondent, James, used the metaphor of killing a bear to rescue a man who is at-risk of being fatally mauled by the bear to justify violent actions against the police/government in order to protect the citizens of Hong Kong, which in his view, is the duty of a responsible Hong Konger:

> *If you are a citizen of Hong Kong, then you need to take civic responsibility! Say you see two people who have been killed by a bear and the third is at risk of being killed too, and if you have the courage and the physical strength, and if there is a sharp weapon available, wouldn't you use that weapon to kill the bear? Wouldn't it be the right thing to do? (James)*

It is important to point out here that the self-proclaimed actions of defense – that is, actions to protect the citizens of Hong Kong from domination and intrusion of Mainland

China, and exclusionary actions – that is, actions to exclude non-Hong Kongers, are a political position taken by many localists when they see that their citizenship is being threatened. These actions of defense are also emotional reactions which are considered to be justified because they are premised on the view that the citizenship of Hong Kong people is highly at risk with the domination and intrusion of Mainland China. Under such a circumstance, the use of valiant resistance and violent actions to protect Hong Kong is not only inevitable but also their responsibility to do so. Paradoxically, a few of the respondents such as Dick and James admitted that violent and exclusionary practices, such as boycotting the Mainland Chinese, go against their belief of the universal value of human rights. They also admitted that their actions carry somewhat "fascist" elements yet they do not support fascism. Nevertheless, driven by emotions and passion, and feeling threatened, they opt to use valiant resistance and violent protests to advocate for what they perceive as Hong Kong citizenship. They believe that once Hong Kong becomes independent and the Mainland Chinese threat is gone, universal human rights can be applicable again to Hong Kong.

As such, valiant struggles have transpired from the perceived threat of Mainland China so that there is the need to protect Hong Kong from the danger. These actions are both the result of the perceived responsibility of a citizen and the means of creating a sense of Hong Kong citizenship, because only by using valiant protests would the intrusion efforts of Mainland China be prevented. In this sense, when China no longer interferes with the affairs of Hong Kong, then Hong Kong will be able to sustain its own unique identity.

Site of Responsive Acts of Citizenship: The Streets

> *I think that parliamentary politics can't do much for Hong Kong now…The question is how could we consolidate efforts on "the streets" and use them to pressure legislature for changes. I think that this is the key point. I think that change starts on "the streets". The only role of Legislative Council is whether they can provide the resources to support the protests on the streets" (Hong 284)*

From the viewpoint of responsive acts of citizenship, "the streets" are not a geographical space. Instead, they are constructed as a political space beyond the formal political institutions and party politics. "The streets" are a political space that is not under the control of the political elites, but de facto owned by ordinary people who are denied from the decision making process in formal political institutions. "The streets" are not a completely new concept in citizenship movements because there have been hundreds of protests on the streets in traditional social movements. However, the difference is that people take to "the streets" in traditional social movements to support certain parliamentary politics. That is, conventional social movements are subordinate and supplementary in nature, while taking to the streets in this context is regarded as the quintessence of change (Ma, 2009). As Cheng(2016) observed, after a series of critical events since 2003 when the government proposed the use of Article 23 of the Basic Law to control acts by legislation, there has been "a shift in scale and the public staging of street politics" in the hybrid regime of Hong Kong, (p383).

The findings in this study show that "the streets" are actually a battlefield in which confrontations can be initiated at any moment in time. The confrontations are highly emotionally charged, in which actions and reactions are not rational but rather driven by emotions, and the emotions of the participants are very much affected by the moment. Hence, when public frustrations are heightened, it becomes inevitable that the site of struggle for citizenship shifts to "the streets". This resonates with Isin (2008, 2009) who said that acts create sites of citizenship. In other words, sites where there are acts and actors who carry out responsive acts transform into sites of citizenship struggles. In return, "the streets" where valiant struggles are found have also reconstructed the citizenship of these activists. Hence, two salient features are identified that characterise "the streets" in which valiant struggles are found: the state of the confrontation and the uncertainty/state of flux. These two characteristics have shaped the meaning of citizenship of these young activists who choose to be responsive.

State of confrontation.

Valiant struggles cannot be sustained if there are no confrontations or tension. Therefore, "the streets" are maintained as a war zone only if there are confrontations and emotional tension. Only with continuous confrontations and tension can the actors maintain their energy and will to persevere, and also solicit and secure more supporters who transform into other actors who also commit to valiant struggles. This explains why such actors regard more intense means of addressing conflict such as using violence

against the police as fundamentally important, because they reinforce the emotions to continue the struggle. This point is well observed by Eddie:

> *The protestors may think… some may think that we must use violence against them (the police) at that moment. But if we don't, we'll just be forgotten...we won't be able to change anything… So during the moment, some of the protestors feel that we have to escalate the confrontations. Otherwise we will fail just like the UM in 2014 (Eddie).*

As Eddie argued, it is imperative for the valiant actors to maintain a state of confrontation and tension in "the streets". To do so, they may avoid other actions that would reduce the levels of tension and ease the intensity of the confrontations. Besides, the valiant actors often label other activists who support "peaceful, rational and non-violent" protests as "leftist plastics" (those who fight for democracy not only for Hong Kong but also for China), and further consider these "leftist plastics" as traitors who try to undermine rather than support their struggle. This is a way to compete for leadership, at least for power of discourse (Hui & Lau, 2015; Lin & Liu, 2016).

In sum, the valiant actors maintain a combatant spirit and morale by escalating conflicts and tension, creating enemies, competing for power of discourse and excluding other activists who hold different views toward their struggle. In other words, power is reinforced by continuously emphasising the conflict between "us and them" and enemies and supporters. Preserving a confrontational state of affairs has been witnessed with the UM, as well as the "Fishball Revolution" and other protests initiated by the valiant actors. Not only have they engaged in fierce physical confrontations in the "Fishball Revolution", they also touted "xenophobia and exclusionary politics" and adopted strategies such as

boycotting and stereotyping the Mainland Chinese and ostracising other activists who have different views (Chen & Szeto, 2015; Hui & Lau, 2015). By doing so, they attempt to turn different sites, like the community and cyber space, into battlefields of "the streets" where the citizenship of Hong Kongers is being protected and championed.

State of flux.

Where there are valiant confrontations, there are also sites of valiant struggles. This shows that "the streets" are a site where there are few organised efforts, and the embodiment of confrontation converts street corners into ad-hoc battle fields. The lack of organisation and premediated action plans contribute to the absence of a moral guiding principle for the valiant actions which together serve to increase uncertainty and unpredictability. This is well expressed by Eddie who was involved in a radical movement at the China Liaison Office in the Western District during the UM:

> *When the protestors are not allied, the momentum of the actions become… say if some people had bad intentions to direct the protestors in a negative direction, they may suddenly become very radical. For example, that night in Western District (China Liaison Office), we attempted to appeal to the protestors to control the mood of the protest, but there were too many uncontrollable factors. Therefore, we couldn't control the outcome. (Eddie)*

Fong also used the term "uncontrollable" to describe the uncertainty at the protest site when valiant actions were being carried out. She felt that not only were the mood of the protestors and direction of the protest uncontrollable, but also the response of the police. She recalled that when the protestors were almost ready to disperse, the police

began to use force to dispel them. This action taken by the police intensified the situation and transformed a non-violent protest into a fierce confrontation. Iris, who feels that "the streets" have also become a highly unpredictable site of struggle attributed the problem to the unknown motives and identity of the protestors. There is no knowing who took part in a particular action; that is, the identity of the protestors are not known, so there could be the possibility that troublemakers posed as protestors to cause problems, or were sent by the authorities to radicalise the protest and escalate the confrontations.

In extremely unpredictable circumstances, the valiant actors are inevitably influenced by the rapid changes that take place immediately on the spot and so they have no other options but to bear the risks and accept the consequences that are beyond their control.

Scale of Responsive Acts of Citizenship: Regional (HKSAR).

Notwithstanding the above, this research has also found that the citizenship claim that the responsive actors attempt to protect is the market-oriented citizenship that Hong Kong people have long enjoyed since the colonial era. In addition, the findings revealed that even though they defend the use of valiant struggles to challenge the establishment in order to advocate for a Hong Kong identity, they appear to largely accept the principle of "one country, two systems" and the notion that "Hong Kong people rule Hong Kong with a high degree of self-administration". In other words, the scale of the responsive acts of citizenship have not violated the framework established by the sovereign state in which

Hong Kong is one of its special administrative regions, and seemingly has not violated the ways of life (i.e. different freedoms and value derived from a free market economy) that have been in place throughout the British colonial rule. However, when these activists realise the empty promises of one country two systems, and efforts to fight for the realisation of this principle have become in vain, it becomes vital to then fight for the preservation of free market capitalism and the promises of citizen freedoms . One way of doing so, according to some of the valiant actors, is to fight for Hong Kong independence and establish a Hong Kong nation.

"One country, two systems": Defending citizenship of a free market economy.

As revealed in this study, the quest of the young activists for Hong Kong citizenship under the principle of "one country, two systems" can be understood as a means of ensuring the continuance of a free market economy; that is, to continue the kind of citizenship status with the corresponding freedoms under a market economy that enjoys minimal interference as set out under the British colonial government. The respondents who subscribe to responsive acts of citizenship (e.g. Billy, James, Pinky, Fong and Hong) feel that "Hong Konger' is a social identity that is superior to that of the Mainland Chinese and more respectful. The sense of superiority and need for respect from the Mainland Chinese have been developed, according to the young activists, through the success of the Hong Kong economic system that is characterised by a free market economy, freedoms and civil rights, as well as an independent judiciary. All of these

cornerstones of success in Hong Kong are supposed to be preserved by the Basic Law for 50 years after the handover in 1997.

However, the promise of the Basic Law to preserve the formula for the success of Hong Kong, including its free economy, civil rights and an independent judiciary, has increasingly been threatened. The young activists feel that the central government in Beijing has increasingly intervened in the internal affairs of the HKSAR government which violates the Basic Law. The consensus among the activists is that intervention of the Chinese communist party has also changed the very substance of Hong Kong, that is essentially, the freedoms and civil rights that Hong Kongers have been enjoying, the fundamentals of Hong Kong (for example, a just and transparent government), and an independent judiciary which ensures legal justice. Concisely, the responsive acts of citizenship can be understood as a backlash to and counter resistance against the perceived Chinese threat. Its essence is to uphold the original promise of "one country, two systems" which guarantees the preservation of the Hong Kong system and ways of life, including freedoms, civil rights and independent judiciary which are of prime importance to Hong Kong people. This is demonstrated in the conversations with Hong, Dick, and Fong in which they mentioned that their participation in social movements was to "defend", "reclaim", "restore" and "protect" citizen rights, which Hong Kong people once had but not anymore. For example, Fong specified the freedom of speech and mobility (to freely enter or leave Hong Kong) which have been covertly taken away. Dick mentioned the violation of an independent judiciary (by the so-called interpretations of the Basic Law) and restrictions against the right to political elections. Moreover, Hong suggested that it

is paramount to restore the dignity and pride of Hong Kong people, which have been damaged and lost during the course of intrusion by the Chinese government:

> *"In fact [what we need to do] is to create a new status, a status which Hong Kong should have but has lost in the transfer of sovereignty. So [we have to] restore it. When Sir Murray MacLehose was the governor of Hong Kong, we felt proud to be a Hong Konger. When we went to Mainland China, people treated us with respect and as first class citizens. But this is no longer the case after the return to sovereignty. We no longer feel a sense of pride of being a Hong Konger. I think right now we need to restore a sense of pride, and this is closely related to the responsibilities of the HKSAR government". (Hong)*

These activists who apply their unique responsive acts of citizenship feel that fighting for democracy is the only means to protect the identity and interests of Hong Kong. They do not wish to rebel against the Chinese Communist rule, but only ensure that the interests of Hong Kong people are preserved. Some of them pointed out that only through real universal suffrage in which Hong Kong people elect their Chief Executive who can truly represent the interests of Hong Kong people would the promise that "Hong Kong people rule Hong Kong" be truly realised. Dick also suggested that after Hong Kong genuinely and democratically elects the Chief Executive, other social problems would be eventually addressed. In other words, the best assurance for realising the principle of "one country, two systems" and the best way to protect the identity of Hong Kong people is through a democratic institution.

Nevertheless, it should be noted that the responsive acts of this group of young activists are only to champion for democracy in Hong Kong. Whether democracy can be realised in China is not their concern. There are several reasons for this phenomenon. First, it is not realistic to support the development of democracy in China. For example, Dick pointed out that the political slogan "to build a democratic China" has failed to make any real progress in the past 30 years since the Tiananmen Square incident. In addition, the idea of the "democratic return of Hong Kong" is hardly the ideal of young people in this generation. In his view, the young people of this generation do not particularly feel any good will towards China, and therefore do not feel obliged to accept the mission to "build a democratic China". Furthermore, Billy felt that currently when the interests of Hong Kong are being threatened and the identity of Hong Kong people is at-risk, Hong Kong people should really focus on Hong Kong rather than champion for issues in other places (Mainland China). Billy argued that the interests of the Mainland Chinese have nothing to do with Hong Kong, and the social and political values of the people in these two places are vastly different. Notwithstanding this, Billy suggested that Hong Kong people do not have the obligation to change the beliefs and destiny of the people in Mainland China. That is why Dick stated that young people in this generation are not interested in the internal politics of China and would not intervene in them:

> *It would be fine for Hong Kong if they (Chinese communist party authorities) would just leave us alone and let Hong Kong enjoy freedom and allow the Chief Executive to do her work for Hong Kong without interference. So they have to return the power to us (to rule Hong Kong) so that we can have autonomy. We won't attack China. We won't be able influence many people in China. So if they just leave us alone, or even isolate us, Hong Kong people would be fine*

with that. How many people in Hong Kong will actively and truly seek to build a democratic China? How many of them will be able to do so? (Dick 159)

The findings and discussion above suggest that the responsive acts of this group of young activists, albeit radical, adversarial and sometimes involve the use of physical force, have been primarily focused on building a democratic institution. After this democratic institution is established, they believe that the freedom and autonomy guaranteed by the Basic Law could be protected. In sum, the findings of this study apparently suggest that the responsive acts of citizenship, as reflected in the actions of this group of young activists, aim to protect the citizenship status guaranteed in the Basic Law, retain the social and economic systems characterized by a market-oriented citizenship in Hong Kong, and allow Hong Kong people to enjoy all of the freedoms and rights (and to a certain extent obligations) without interference from China.

Advocating for independence.

Notwithstanding the findings above, however, some of the young activists expressed that protecting Hong Kong's citizenship by upholding the rights and freedoms guaranteed by the Basic Law is a lost cause. They feel that even a modest plea to respect the rights and freedoms guaranteed by the Basic Law has been denied bluntly and crassly by the Chinese government, and the development of democracy (as promised in the Basic Law) has been quashed. Under this situation, some of the young activists believe that fighting for autonomy and citizenship in Hong Kong through the provisions of the Basic Law in

order to prevent interference from the Chinese government is not possible nor feasible. Consequently, some of them have intensified their actions and aim instead for the "self-determination" and "independence" of Hong Kong (Kaeding, 2017; Kwong, 2016; Lam, 2015; Veg, 2017). For example, Pinky previously supported the "one country, two systems" principle, but due to the recent overt suppression of China, she feels that this principle is a farce, and has began to champion for the independence of Hong Kong. Similarly, James suggested that ideas for the future of Hong Kong proposed by some of the localists have genuinely offered a direction that is worthy of further exploration:

> *We all know that the localists want an independent nation. Hong Kong has the substantial elements to become an independent country. It may not be as perfect as some other countries such as those in Europe. But this country – after it becomes an independent country – can certainly offer its people a better livelihood than under the Chinese rule. This was my initial understanding of the Hong Kong localist discourse. What the localists now do is to promote this idea to the Hong Kong people for their discussion and consideration. Whether this is acceptable to the general public is another thing. But what have people in the pan-democratic camp done? They have only criticized the localists as rebels but failed to achieve anything concrete in the Legislative Council. They have only brought up false agendas that cannot be accomplished (James).*

To James and other young activists who support the discourse for an independent Hong Kong, their main concern is not the political and economic feasibilities of separating Hong Kong from China, and they care little about whether Hong Kong has actually the necessary and essential conditions to become an independent nation. However, the importance of the localist discourse which advocates for independence and

separatism touches the deep-lying sentiments of dissatisfaction among some of the young people, and also provides the basis for further responsive acts. Thus, the findings show that under the perceived oppression of the Chinese government, the young activists champion for stronger and more radical responses that fight for separation from China, and in return, this has attracted more supporters who participate in campaigns.

Superficially, some of the young activists support the independence and self-determination of Hong Kong as a way to establish a Hong Kong identity and the unique citizenship of Hong Kong. Paradoxically, however, their attempts and pleas have not created a newly imagined citizenship except that Hong Kong can be free from the control of China. Rather, they appear to appeal to a replication of the citizenship that was found in colonial Hong Kong – one that is based on a capitalist market economy – so that people can continue to enjoy different kinds of freedom in a free market society and the civil rights that underpin capitalism. However, beyond this, they do not have newly imagined scales of citizenship.

In addition, the findings above reveal that some of the young activists see Hong Kong independence or building a Hong Kong nation as only a fictitious agenda. Several respondents including Hong, Pinky and Dick agree that striving for Hong Kong independence is only the means rather than an aim. If Hong Kong could genuinely enjoy a high degree of autonomy in deciding matters pertinent to its economic, social and political affairs, and is free from the intervention and control of China, independence is no longer the issue. Therefore, the differentiation of Hong Kong from China is crucial to

them. For example, Hong pointed out that even though their actions gear towards the independence of Hong Kong, but building an independent Hong Kong is not necessarily his ultimate action goal. Instead, he indicated that his real concern is to see "Hong Kong people rule Hong Kong" to protect the interests of his people. Dick, who endeavours to build a Hong Kong nation expressed that he is a pragmatist who only cares about the outcome. In other words, if there are different approaches that can lead to the same outcome (Hong Kong people rule Hong Kong under the principle of one country, two systems), he would not hesitate to accept China which is under communist rule. He says:

> *We don't fight for Hong Kong independence out of nothing. We don't do it through our own intentions. We do it because we have no choice. It is because the principle of "one country, two systems" is no longer working. When "one country, two systems" only exist in name, we are forced to build our own Hong Kong nation. If things continue as they are now, it is not good for Hong Kong. That's why we promote building a Hong Kong nation. We know that the government doesn't like it, but we don't care. In fact, the core concern here is to find a way out and make changes. If there is a way out of this situation without building a Hong Kong nation, I'm fine with that… (Dick)*

Thus, some of the young activists who are advocating for the independence of Hong Kong and building a Hong Kong nation are actually responding to the perceived collapse of the "one country, two systems" principle. These are regarded as the means or strategies to recoup the autonomy of Hong Kong under the Basic Law. According to Billy and James who support the building of a Hong Kong nation, they have actually adopted a strategy in which they ask for more (Hong Kong independence) in the hopes that what they hope

to receive in the end (more autonomy) is far better than the situation that Hong Kong is facing at present (little self-autonomy).

In sum, the responsive acts of citizenship discussed above are deeply engrained within the existing principle of "one country, two systems". The advocacy for building a Hong Kong nation and securing independence has not offered a new Hong Kong citizens status that excels that offered by the "one country, two systems", and has not provided more rights and better welfare that that of the Hong Kong citizenship offered under the colonial government.

Actors of Responsive Acts of Citizenship: Warriors

Isin (2008) argued that acts of citizens did not exist before acts (p. 37). In other words, new actors and new meanings of citizenship can only be defined through acts. Based on the findings of my research, those who take part in valiant struggles, meaning that those who passively or actively use fierce physical confrontations to strive for their perceived Hong Kong citizenship, are the "warriors". This group of activists include Billy, Dick, Fong, James and Pinky. All of them claim that they are supporters of the localist fraction. Besides, Man and Iris were once "*warriors"*, but have turned their back on the faction because they disagree with the approach.

As discussed above, responsive acts of citizenship are characterized by contingency and unpredictability. It is imperative for actors to respond in an spontaneous, solo and

fluid manner, so that they can respond quickly to the police. Suffice to say, courage for taking such high risks also marks the warriors from other activists, and this in return justifies the valiant actions which stress the virtues of solo risk taking and the price of doing so. In the following sections, I shall discuss these two points in details.

Spontaneity and fluidity.

As discussed above, one of the characteristics of the responsive acts of citizenship is that its participation is spontaneous and its occurrence is fluid and negotiable. The findings of this study suggest that in the event of serious physical confrontations, the participation of the protestors need to appear to be solo, and actions seem to lack premeditation and deliberation. These are realised by remaining flexible in response to the contingencies in the sites of confrontation marked by unpredictability. Dick portrayed the valiant actors as "Batman or Spiderman", using the characteristics of these super heroes to describe the protestors, such as "lone operator", "quick in action", and "does not account to anyone".

Solo participation allows more flexibility and autonomy so that the actors respond to contingencies during valiant actions. At the same time, it also allows more room for the actors when they face the risk of arrest by the police. Hence, just like Batman and Spiderman, working alone allows the actors to conceal their own identity because they do not have to disclose their presence to anyone else. Some of the valiant actors actually resort to wearing a face mask when they are in confrontation with the police to conceal their identity. This also separates the identity of a valiant actor versus his/her real identity

in everyday life. By doing so, the valiant actors are more confident to more freely take part in valiant struggles, and can better protect themselves from the risks and liabilities of participation.

Solo participation stresses the importance of individual capacity, including physical capacity and individual prowess. It is primarily individual prowess and agility which allow the valiant actors to move about quickly in street confrontations and attack opponents when necessary. However, such solo participation also has its limitations. For example, unplanned and uncoordinated actions may increase unpredictability because one hardly knows what will happen next, and it is difficult to identify and pinpoint allies when everyone masks their face. Eddie recalled that each time when a protest ended, the protestors would disperse, and there would be no further actions taken.

Solo opportunities and risks.

Risk and opportunity are closely related even though they may seem to be different. Valiant actors may be able to advance their political beliefs, protect the citizenship of Hong Kong people, increase their political influence, and even enjoy political notoriety which gives them a sense of glory.

However, the price is steep in exchange for these rewards. For example, Man, was arrested in a street confrontation with the police. Nevertheless, the arrest itself seems to have given him a heroic status and also served to promote his position amongst the

activists because he has become a target of state oppression, which, amongst activists themselves, is admirable and desirable. However, Man still must face the risk of imprisonment despite the status. So, the valiant actors face a dilemma. As Man suggested, in confronting the authoritarian regime, there is no escape except to increase physical confrontations. As a result, the activists have no option but to take more risks which can be even more difficult than they expected. Man said:

> *It is inevitable. I still say the same thing: Either you're a coward, so you stand to one side and continue to be a dog, or else you would inevitably get involved deeper and deeper… In fact I'm in quite deep now. [The consequence is] the sentence would be harsher and harsher…because when you already have a [criminal] record, they would give you a harsher sentence. (Man)*

The experience of Man reflects to some extent that Hong Kong citizenship is achieved through sacrifice. Hong commented that Hong Kong people have never had to sacrifice anything for their social and political rights because everything that Hong Kong people have been enjoying all along was granted by the authorities. However, the situation is different now because the Chinese communist regime is restricting the social and political rights of Hong Kong people. Therefore, the only way to recover the entitlements of Hong Kong people is to fight for them, and to be prepared for making sacrifices. As Hong said:

> *Just like Edward (Leung Tin Kei, a Hong Kong activist who was arrested for his participation in the Mongkok Riot), who sacrificed his future and could be imprisoned for 10 years (he was subsequently sentenced for 6 years)..I think that if you really intend to devastate the regime, you have to consider what you can sacrifice [in order to get the result that you want]. I think that if we come to the*

point where sacrifice is needed for the advancement of a political belief, it is worth doing so (Hong).

Retaliating against a body with absolute power disparity and preparing for sacrifice have become highly-praised virtues amongst the youth activists because they think that in situations of confrontations on the streets, the activists who do not have power must instead have the courage, determination and endurance to persevere in their beliefs. They envision that this is exactly what Hong Kong people should do to protect Hong Kong from intrusion. In the process of confrontation, these qualities, i.e. courage, determination and perseverance, are considered heroic. However, they face immense pressure and risks, especially after the "Fish Ball Revolution", and these valiant actors have received a large amount of criticism and condemnation from the public. They have also been suppressed by the government in many ways. In addition, by mobilising dissenters in targeted movements, the legitimacy and effectiveness of their actions have also been critically questioned (Yuen & Cheng, 2017). Also, the price that those young risk takers pay is tremendous, to the extent that they might have already sacrificed their own future.

A paradoxical situation can be observed from the above discussion – social and economic deprivations paradoxically become resources and capital for valiant actions and high-risk confrontations. The findings of this study show that “nothing to lose” is an appropriate phrase for this group of actors. As Eddie observed, young activists are always the ones who are at the frontline in fierce physical confrontations with the police. This could be interpreted to say that young activists might have more courage to confront the

police, even though they know very well that change will not easily come to pass. However, the motto of "no pain, no gain" compels them to continue their acts of protest even without the possibility of any concrete results. James indicated that he took part in valiant struggles and fierce physical confrontations partly because of "economic reasons", thus implying that he, and many other young people in Hong Kong, sees that there is almost no hope in improving his own economic status. Similarly, other actors such as Pinky, Dick and Hong also stated the lack of opportunity for upward social mobility. Dick observed that most valiant actors who do not question the rationale behind valiant struggles and the use of fierce physical confrontations are young people who are marginalized socially and economically with little chance for upward social mobility Even though economic reasons alone cannot fully explain for the emergence of these young activists, social and economic deprivations help to justify the price of taking part in valiant struggles. As pointed out by Hong and Dick respectively:

> *We have little hesitation. Some of us have even less hesitation because there is nothing to lose. Even if we might get arrested, there are few worries, so it is easier to take part (in fierce confrontations). (Hong)*
>
> ***
>
> *In Mongkok, many of the activists are young people… the majority are young. The later the night, the more young people show up. Why? Because of the price to pay – we can afford the price, or the majority can afford to pay a higher price. Nobody can easily say that they can afford to be imprisoned for 10 years. I just think that we can afford to pay a steeper price… Why? Because society has given nothing to us, and we haven't received any resources from society – that's the core reason. Why can we pay a higher price? Because we don't have anything – we don't even have a flat because we can't afford one… (Dick)*

In sum, this shows that some of the young activists are willing to pay a higher price for their opposition activities. In other words, they are willing to gamble on their future for the opportunity to establish Hong Kong citizenship. Hence, it can be seen that in the struggle and resistance against the authoritarian regime in the current state of Hong Kong, there is a serious lack of confidence among the young activists towards traditional protests. Along with the seeming success of youth-led social movements in recent years, such as the anti-national curriculum movement, some of the young activists do not want to wait any longer and are motivated to promote more direct and radical approaches for societal changes to take place. Under such a social backdrop, it is not difficult to understand why valiant struggles and fierce confrontations are accepted as the most effective acts of citizenship to achieve changes. In other words, the social creation of a generation of "nothing-to-lose" youths has concomitantly created a generation of actors of citizenship movements who believe that valiant struggles and fierce confrontations are the most effective approaches to fight for the establishment of citizenship at this historical juncture of Hong Kong.

Conclusion

In the above discussion, I have highlighted that the responsive acts of citizenship, as found in the experience of my respondents, are a counteraction against the suppression and domination of the perceived authoritarian regime – the Chinese communist and the HKSAR governments and their local allies. Nevertheless, I emphasise here that the

responsive acts appear to reminisce the freedoms and civil rights that Hong Kong people have enjoyed in the free market society during the colonial era. The findings also reveal that the strategies of valiant struggles and fierce confrontations appear to be emotionally driven. Hong Kong citizenship is therefore considered to be achieved by excluding non-Hong Kongers (primarily Mainland Chinese) and safeguarding the interests of Hong Kong. Moreover, valiant actors converts protests into fierce physical confrontations, and turns "the streets" into sites of citizenship struggles, or more accurately, battlefields, where showdowns against the police have become the primary means of maintaining the momentum of the protests. During the course of these activities, actions tend to be solo, but at the same time, there is uncertainty, unpredictability and risks. Escalation in the level of confrontation is sometimes needed to exert pressure against the oppressors, but the price paid by the actors could be exceedingly high. The ethos of sacrifice is however praised and being touted as a way to inspire more activists to continue such responsive acts of citizenship.

Chapter 6

Resilient Acts of Citizenship: Cultivating Universal Citizenship

The second type of citizenship acts that are discussed in my study is resilient acts of citizenship. Similar to responsive acts, the resilient acts of some of the activists are also grounded on their dissatisfaction with the current state of Hong Kong citizenship which they perceive to be eroded. This group of activists believe that the government and the political institutions in Hong Kong prior to the handover seemed to have offered a platform for Hong Kong people to agree on a shared identity, albeit a weak identity as well as limited rights that people could enjoy. However, after the handover in 1997, even the weak identity and the incomplete citizenship that Hong Kong people had in the past were further eroded. This group of youth activists is now facing the reality of the hollowing-out of citizenship in Hong Kong, which means that the very limited form of citizenship from the past no long exists, and now a new kind of citizenship must be established and defined. However, unlike responsive acts which largely incorporate radical and confrontational strategies to challenge the perceived domination of an authoritarian regime, resilient acts of citizenship focus on establishing a "civil society". The acts defy an authoritarian regime through "community organising" to strengthen democratic consciousness among citizens, and encourage the resilience of civil society for its persistence and endurance to confront the perceived erosion of the principle of "one country, two systems" and the injustice to the citizenship of Hong Kong people. The findings of this research show that the respondents who carry out resilient acts adopt the

role of "community organisers" in cultivating a localist identity for a more open, inclusive and active citizenship.

Resilient Acts of Citizenship: Community Organising

The study respondents who practice resilient acts of citizenship described their acts as "deep ploughing and rigorous cultivation" in the community. That is, they emphasise the importance of cultivating a democratic consciousness in the community amongst both different groups of people and individuals. They also try to increase awareness and understanding of social and political issues and organise community groups as well as civil society organisations to participate in social and political events that rally for change. Resilient acts of citizenship are ideology-driven and built on the universal values of social justice and social concern. Hence, these acts recognise the diversity of the community and the diverse interests of civil society groups. These acts connect and cultivate people, and are therefore more able to cultivate a citizenship identity in Hong Kong that is more open, receptive to differences and more respectful of diverse backgrounds.

Ideology-driven acts.

Resilient acts of citizenship are practices primarily driven by ideological beliefs. In contrast to the status quo in Hong Kong where rights and welfare are distributed based on a market economy (Cheng, 2014a; Wilding, 2015) that embraces a "market mentality" (Mathews, Ma, & Lui, 2008., p. 15), or the spirit of utilitarian familism which focuses on

family and material interests but politically apathetic (Lau, 1981), resilient acts of citizenship champion the equal value of each member in society, and protect the rights and status of each citizen on an equal basis. A typical example is exemplified by one of the respondents, Iris, who argued that society should not allocate welfare and other social resources purely based on contribution (for example, assessed by their economic productivity). Rather, welfare and other social resources should be allocated according to need. She suggested that this is based due to "social concerns… which reflect the desire to care for people in need" (Iris). Precisely due to their prioritising of social concerns in resilient acts of citizenship, the youth activists tend to be more active in the campaigns that are related to social justice, including those that support the improvement of the standard of living, and challenge social institutions and social policies that cause injustice. For example, Alan, Iris, Eddie and Man are involved in campaigns such as the UM that prioritise universal suffrage and a comprehensive retirement pension system, support container terminal workers who are on strike, challenge NENT development. As their actions are deeply ideologically ingrained, they are inclined to champion for what they believe to be universal values and have internalised related knowledge. Eddie described his actions as "a reflex" as they are driven by internalised ideologies:

> *It doesn't matter where you are, in the community, at school or work, when you see something that's not right, you need to say something. I wouldn't say that it's a duty or obligation. To some extent, it's a natural reflex….(Eddie)*

As an advocate of social justice, Eddie argued that one should not advocate for universal suffrage but neglect the exploitation of grass-root labourers because both issues

are unjust and it is difficult to place more importance on one or the other. Man also echoed Eddie in explaining that the problems of social injustice are found in different aspects of everyday life, which have led to the exploitation and oppression of different people. While Man feels that establishing a democratic institution in Hong Kong would extremely difficult at this point in time, small steps should be taken in the meantime, such as advocating for the establishment of a universal retirement pension scheme as well as legislation of standardised work hours (Man). Eddie and Man show that this group of activists, who are also known as "open-minded localists", consider social justice to be a fundamental universal value that guides their actions. They may advocate for issues that are not directly related to their own interests, but are convinced through their values to support and actively campaign for the welfare of the disadvantaged and underprivileged (Chen & Szeto, 2015).

Connective acts.

Connective acts in this study are defined as actions that increase the connectivity of people with different social backgrounds. Many of the respondents indicated that their participation in social movements as a connective act has broadened their understanding and increased their appreciation of citizenship. An example that illustrates this point is given by Olivia who shared her experience in communicating with a mother who practises her citizenship by supporting the UM. Through this act of connectivity, Olivia has become aware that there are bonds among individuals in society and different ways of bonding: "while there is a line that connects us, it is the publicness (of the movement) that pulls us

together". Her experience with communicating with others and the shared connectivity have changed how she understands citizenship and motivated her to see that there is a common identity and a sense of belonging towards Hong Kong. Some of the respondents (e.g. Olivia, Man, Kit and Iris) stated that their participation in social movements has provided them with experience in addressing issues of public concern. As a result, they now associate with different people in the community who may have different views towards citizenship, and this is an experience that would not be easily attained in their personal life.

The experiences of Iris and Kit are further examples that illustrate this point. Both did not have any personal experience of unjust treatment. Yet in their encounters with people who have been oppressed and exploited, they have stories that have motivated their personal commitment and passion for social justice. Kit shared her experience:

> *I started to hear real life stories and had a better understanding of what was happening in the community. If I just read policy documents, I wouldn't have understood the situation as well. But when I got to know the people, I understood the policies from their experiences, and I was able to make sense and appreciate the logic. (Kit)*

Kit further illustrates that connective acts not only contribute to increasing the connectivity between different people and different civil society groups, they also enable youth activists to gain more insight into social problems, and then relate such problems to the social structure that facilitates them. Iris also suggested that connectivity facilitates

genuine concern about the local social environment and therefore, the development of a sense of belonging. Her direct "concrete and vivid experiences with people who are real in blood and flesh", that is, those who are being oppressed, have enabled her to understand the real meaning of social justice beyond the textbook (Iris).

However, it is important to point out here that connective acts are not simply actions that connect people with the same political views, but also those who have different political orientations and different social and political backgrounds. This is supported by Eddie who expressed that he has gained an awareness that social movements involve a series of tactics and risks that carry ambiguities and conflicts. He suggested that more connective activities are important to "mediate differences and repair damaged relationships in society" (Eddie). Eddie belongs to a concern group called "Students Fight for Democracy" that organises visitations to different households in the community by a community visitation team and explains to the households about the purpose and rationale behind the UM. They also discuss issues with people that have affected their livelihood. Eddie recalled that many of the community members informed him that they do not care much about the struggle for universal suffrage. They did not support the UM because the movement caused them many inconveniences in their everyday life. This experience prompted Eddie to reflect that social movements and campaigns, even those with good intentions, cannot be separated from the everyday lives of the people in the community. Therefore, activists must communicate with people from all walks of life who hold different values and beliefs. In the end, it is a matter of persuasion rather than confrontation. Man had a similar experience after which he changed strategies from using

valiant confrontation to connective actions. He reflected that individuals and groups with different political orientations may face similar levels of oppression in a capitalist market that is supported by the government and the so-called mainstream social agenda. As a result, different individuals and groups could face similar issues which would create commonality in the community. Therefore, he believes that the "true enemy" is the authoritarian regime rather than the people of Hong Kong. Olivia is another resilient actor who also argued that citizenship is about promoting the participation of different people in society as well as inclusion of "voices of the grassroots". By doing so, she believes that "the power of the citizens would be much stronger and more substantial" (Olivia). Moreover, this group of activists feels that, in order to cultivate civic consciousness, it is important to "plough deeply in the community", which means that long-term in-depth connective work should be carried out with individuals and groups in the local community. This is done through contact and interaction with people and groups in the community whom organisers can organise and form into a stronger power base as participants for social change. In view of this, those who carry out resilient acts of citizenship believe that community organisation is of utmost importance. Along this line of thought, Eddie pointed out that social movements may become an individual and discrete endeavour in the absence of central coordination efforts, and thus realising the power of concerted efforts may not be possible. He argued that failure to do so is precisely due to the lack of organisation, mutual trust and coordinated efforts. Instead, communication and collaborations among different individuals and groups should be encouraged, through which some sort of tacit understanding is reached and actions are focused toward reaching a common end.

The above discussion shows how the connective acts that are practiced by some of the resilient actors serve to produce insights and self-reflection, through which the citizenship movement shifts towards a more open and inclusive direction with greater acceptance of differences.

Acts that cultivate.

> *Society needs to put in more efforts to cultivate a sense of citizenship in people, especially those who are socially and politically marginalised. [We should] encourage social participation, probably start by cultivating self-confidence. This is something that might have been neglected in the mainstream (Kit).*

Resilient acts of citizenship can also be seen as acts that help to cultivate and foster citizenship. Many of the respondents (e.g. Eddie, Alan and Kit) pointed out that people in Hong Kong have been busy in realising their own livelihood and are thus less concerned about issues that pertain to citizenship. Therefore, they feel that resilient acts of citizenship are a good means to increase awareness of citizen identity and rights and obligations of citizens. Kit provides an example based on her own experience which suggests that it is essential to create an awareness of citizenship in those who are not very supportive. She feels that awareness of citizenship would create enthusiasm as well as elicit concern, which must be achieved at the grassroots level. For instance, in working with the To Kwa Wan district residents, she identified two types of different people in the community. The first are those who are busy with work and are not aware of community

incidents. Her strategy was to therefore approach them and create connections, through which mutual trust developed and contributed to their reconnection with the community and accordingly, an increased awareness of community issues. The second are those who are activists newly inspired by the UM. Kit found out that they have a vague sense of democracy and Hong Kong identity based on the activities of the UM, but these have not yet been internalised in practice as a value in everyday life. After these new activists leave the site of protest and confrontation, they may lack direction on ways to practice democracy and realise Hong Kong citizenship in everyday life. Hence, as Kit suggested, civic consciousness is not an individual endeavour. Rather it must be cultivated and encouraged through participation in public affairs.

Therefore, as far as developing resilient acts of citizenship is concerned, work must be carried out by connecting with the community, cultivating civic consciousness as well as networking different civil society groups to facilitate mutual trust and common grounds in order to resist the authoritarian regime. Also, the most important site for the struggle for citizenship, as far as resilient acts are concerned, is the community itself, and the most important task is to help a politically apathetic community transform into an active and strong civil society.

Site of Resilient Acts of Citizenship: Civil Society

> *Now that street protests and confrontations are banned, the related activities have been shifted to the different local communities. I think that this is good. For example, community movements where activists now talk about reclaiming the district councils and taking over the community to give residents more say in local*

affairs rather than occupying the streets and confronting the regime. The shift in direction implies that there is a transformation… When you know that protests on the streets cannot continue in the same way, transformation takes place. (Iris)

Unlike acts of valiant resistance where the streets are the site for reclaiming citizenship, the site of resilient acts of citizenship is civil society, which means that resilience is best developed and established in and among civil society groups and the local communities. In this study, many of the respondents mentioned how they see "the community" as the site for citizenship movements and practices. The findings showed that "the community" is not purely a geographical entity. Rather, as indicated by Iris, it is a site where the power of the citizens is articulated and organized. It is also the way in which the power of the people is reclaimed in everyday life by participating in community decision making. The community is a place where civil society is established and developed so that it has the power to monitor the government. However, the study of civil society is a separate research topic and beyond the scope of this study. In modern liberal societies where human rights and freedoms are respected, civil society is the arena which cultivates civil society organisations and enriches social movements. Through active civic participation, a significant force is established which checks state power and influences social policy formulation (Ku, 2002; Warren, 2001). So, in addition to the legal protection by the constitution which safeguards the rights and freedoms of citizens by law, civil society also has a role in checking the power of the state and preserving the operations of a democratic system in modern liberal societies (Putnam, 2000; Seligman, 1992). However, it should be noted that in Hong Kong where citizenship is weak , the function of civil society in checking state power is not sufficient (Ku, 2009; Ma, 2007; see also Chapter 3). In a society where individual and sectorial interests are upheld in a highly market-oriented society, different groups in civil society tend to prioritise economic

pursuits prior to the pursuit of citizen rights and democracy (Ho, 2004; Lau & Kuan, 1995). In addition, as Ma argued (2007, p. 218), "civil society in Hong Kong was vibrant and pluralistic, it traditionally had relatively weak organisational resources and weak horizontal linkage". Under this context, resilient acts of citizenship base their work in a civil society, reinforce the publicness of the community, and practice inclusionary citizenship through connective and cultivating acts. The actors believe that in this stage of social movements, it is important to shift their focus back to working with the grassroots in the community and thorough organisation work with the aim to restore the integrity of the civil society in hopes that it will act as a counter force against the domination of an authoritarian-neoliberal regime. The experience of the resilient actors (e.g. Iris, Man, Eddie, and Olivia) in this study shows that their conception of civil society is a site that can accommodate diverse citizenship experiences as well as a venue that is able to articulate publicness among members in the community. The idea of a civil society and its publicness is of extreme importance for the activists who practice to establish an open-ended identity in Hong Kong.

Publicness.

Publicness is an expression of the relation between an individual and the community. "Publicness" is "a way of talking about the combination of things, ideas, issues, people, relationships, practices and site that have been made public" (Newman & Clarke, 2009, p. 2). In this sense, civil society and publicness are two closely related concepts. Publicness can also refer to the presence of people in a public sphere. However, owing to the problem of incomplete citizenship in Hong Kong, for example, the Legislative Council (which only has limited democracy) is largely represented by councillors who

are elites in society. Citizens usually have only limited participation in public deliberation and decision making under this impaired system of representative democracy (Ku, 2002, 2009). In other words, the civil participation of citizens of Hong Kong has always been restricted except at the point of voting. The lack of publicness has also resulted in the inadequacy of civil society to check state power, and inhibited the development of democracy in Hong Kong (Cheung, 2009; Ku, 2009). As argued above, connective and cultivating acts of citizenship have offered ample insights for the youth activists so that they turn to civil society and transform the community into a site of citizenship practice with extensive publicness. An example is given in Hui and Lau (Hui & Lau, 2015), in which civil society groups are formed by young professionals in the community, while other youth groups are also formed for the purpose of promoting political participation after the UM. All of these experiences have inspired some of the activists to return to their own local communities and establish dialogue, build relationships, raise awareness and organise the community to consolidate their power. As a result, they have contributed to enhancing civil participation of the community which was previously eroded. Eddie reinforced this point and said that it is simply inadequate to enhance publicness only during election campaigns. Rather, he recommended that civic participation should be encouraged and workplaces, schools, and communities converted into sites of citizenship practice that exemplify publicness:

> *There is no reason to end civic participation after casting your vote and then just wait for something to happen. You must continue to participate…I think no matter where you are, you have to encourage the people around you to participate. This is one of the expectations. If you can organize a group of people, whether at your*

workplace or school, or in your local community to challenge things that are socially unjust, then publicness can be everywhere (Eddie).

For publicness to permeate throughout all levels of society, civic participation must be found in different aspects of everyday life, and start with people and the issues that are of personal concern. For example, Kit argued that publicness can be articulated in different aspects of everyday life if one pays enough attention to the finer details. She argued that activists can promote civic consciousness and encourage participation among their workplace colleagues, and considers one's immediate site of citizenship practice (e.g. workplace) is as important as, if not more persuasive with longer lasting effects than confrontations and protests on the streets.

Publicness cannot be separated from politics. As far as resilient acts of citizenship are concerned, civil society and political society are two interconnecting entities. Therefore, the aim of enhancing civil society is, in other words, to exert influence on government policies so that they are more responsive to the demands of civil society. In view of this, resilient actors hold the view that they must continue to focus on social policies and work closely with the legislature. For example, Man argued that emotionally driven street protests would not be able to replace the Legislative Council in Hong Kong which is the "last fort" of rationality. Therefore, Man feels that there is a need to enhance civil society to supplement the inadequacies of the Legislature Council. Olivia, a social worker, suggested that many have become apathetic and indifferent towards the political absurdities and idiosyncrasies that can be found on a day to day basis. In view of this, there is a need to increase the publicness of politics to facilitate changes. According to

her experience, organising social service users to participate in functional constituency elections would be meaningful, because on the one hand, this could challenge the election system which has long been monopolised by the elites and increase the publicness of the elected clique. On the other hand, this could also provide an empowering experience to the people who participate in the election campaign. Olivia is echoed by Eddie who suggested a "parallel movement between street protestors and the legislature". Eddie argued that elections and the legislature are also part of social movements, and envisages that "it is a challenge to the status-quo when protest organizers are elected into the legislature" (Eddie). The imagination of a movement-based political party is that citizens (voters) not only expect their representatives to fight for their interests in the Legislative Council, but also engage in civil society and collaborate to champion for their interests in various social movements:

> *The experience of directly taking part (in a protest) is an empowering one. It is because you can get something out of it…Regardless whether a social movement is successful or not, you get something out of it, whether it's experience, a relationship, or reflections. You only get these when you are directly involved. It It's not like you just cast a vote in the election and find out that you voted for the wrong person and regret it" (Eddie).*

Inclusiveness.

The ideal resilient actors build a civil society with the capacity to allow differences, embrace diversity, fight for public interests rather than self-interests. Accordingly, civil society would offer a communicative platform where different groups of people can

gather without social class considerations, enhance mutual understanding and reduce their differences. It is also a place for different groups of citizens to work through their differences with democratic means. So this is by and large an exercise for citizens to learn and build common citizenship. At the same time, it is commonly known that civil society is not composed of homogeneous groups. Rather, it is formed by different citizens and groups of citizens of different backgrounds and conflicts of interest. Thus, civil society is not necessarily constructive and cultivating, as far as the development of citizenship is concerned. As argued by some academics, such as Paffenholz & Spurk (2006), Chambers & Kopstein (2001) and So (So Alvin, 2017), civil society is not always good as there is dark side (the uncivil society) which may not have the capacity to enhance the development of citizenship or even lead to democratic spill-over. There are signs which show that civil society in Hong Kong is divided and fragmented; receptive to bribery; permeated and absorbed (Cheung, 2012; Fong, 2013; Scott, 2000; Wong & Chu, 2017). Civil society has even been said to be split after the UM (Chen & Szeto, 2015; Hui & Lau, 2015; Wong & Wan, 2018; Yuen & Cheng, 2017). In this study, many of the youth activists also share this concern. Some of the respondents see that the division, exclusion and ostracism in civil society in Hong Kong are produced not only due to political stance (e.g. pro-democratic vs. pro-establishment), but also social identity, such as the conflicts between Hong Kongers and the Mainland Chinese and different generations, and among age cohorts. Iris pointed out that the identity of Hong Kongers, a label that has emerged in recent years, has been created to protect self-interest by exclusion. Similarly, Eddie suggested that "I am a Hong Konger" is just an empty political slogan which is created for populist purposes. This kind of political sloganeering has incited public emotions

against non-Hong Kongers, which intensifies social division and contributes to social conflicts.

On the other hand, Eddie feels that there are different perspectives in approaching citizenship in a civil society. When one party tries to force the other party to accept their values and perspective, a compromise must be made through communication and deliberation:

> *"If there is no communication and deliberation, people would insist on their own views and society would be even more divided" (Eddie).*

In sum, resilient acts of citizenship are a citizenship practice that serves to mend a divided society. To achieve this, mutual respect and democratic practices are essential factors. The site of practicing resilient acts is a civil society where people of different backgrounds and different social and political positions can be mutually accommodated and included. Accordingly, the process of exploring and building Hong Kong citizenship is one that can include different voices and offer opportunities to learn, deliberate and arrive at a consensus. As Man argued, "dissent is part of life" and the site of resilient acts of citizenship is a space where citizens can "meet each other halfway" (Man).

Scale of Resilient Acts of Citizenship: Multi-level and multi-faceted

The findings of this study show that there are different levels of resilient acts of citizenship practiced by some of the youth activists. However, as discussed in the previous chapter, citizenship in Hong Kong is apparently weak and shallow (see Chapter 3) under the current situation in which Hong Kong is dominated by the authoritarian regime of the

PRC government and the HKSAR government which strongly adheres to a sense of neoliberalism. Against this context, the resilient acts of citizenship does not intend to protect a market-oriented citizenship, but rather reform citizenship in Hong Kong. In doing so, resilient acts of citizenship do not deny that there is a relationship between China and Hong Kong historically, culturally and politically. Rather, the youth activists who support resilient acts of citizenship view that democratic development in China is an issue that concerns Hong Kong with the acceptance of the Chinese culture and the concern around the universal value of human rights.

"One country, two systems": Struggle for democratic citizenship.

As discussed above, resilient acts of citizenship involve practices that champion for a broad range of citizen rights, including the political rights of Hong Kong people. The argument is that Hong Kong people have been deprived of the social and political rights that they deserve. In this political context, resilient acts represent the attempts to advance and fight for a "more complete" citizenship. As Alan indicated, the objective of his participation in social movements is to advocate for universal suffrage of the Chief Executive and eliminate the functional constituency in the Legislative Council. He argued that real democracy is very important for the future of young people in Hong Kong:

> *"Now we don't even have a vote. This makes it more unlikely that we can achieve what we want. We are feeling increasingly resentful because we can't see a future for ourselves…… We have dreams, but we can't make them come true (Alan).*

Although some of the youth activists might feel a similar resentment for being deprived of their political rights, Alan thinks that many youth activists have not yet been able to develop the maturity to offer any critical insights into the neo-liberal capitalist system which has caused severe inequalities in Hong Kong. As a matter of fact, before the initiation of the so-called post-80s social movements, social movements in Hong Kong had not been able to inspire this sort of critical discussion (Chen & Szeto, 2015; Law, 2017). In this regard, Iris commented that these political party-led social movements have failed to help broaden citizenship horizons, or create any substantial changes in the rights and power of citizens:

> *I think they (the pan-democratic camp) aren't determined enough to take back anything. Rather, they often defend themselves by stating the number of seats that they have. If are they less defensive and more aggressive, meaning that they want to take back something, the effect might be more significant (Iris).*

From the findings in this study, resilient acts are actions that claim rights, which attempt to negate the status quo of the current political framework. Participation in civil disobedience is a good example of the scale of citizenship, which shows the intention to advance social movements beyond the existing political boundaries and fight for power for citizens. While civil disobedience is an exercise of a citizen's right to protest, nevertheless it erodes respect for the rule of law and existing social and political institutions. The aim is to increase the awareness of the public and their moral consciousness against social injustice through the moral persuasion of disobedience which is peaceful and non-violent (Hui & Lau, 2015; Kan, 2013). The kind of civil disobedience carried out by some of the youth activists shows that the aim of resilient

acts of citizenship is not to overthrow the existing HKSAR government, or repudiate the existing social and economic order. Instead, it aims to reform and reduce the shortcomings of the current political and social institutions and advocate for a relatively more democratic and equal society where citizens of Hong Kong can enjoy more equal political and social rights. To illustrate this point, Man shared his experience in a civil disobedient action. His aim is to express his mistrust of the government. Yet he still believes in the rule of law, so he shouldered the legal responsibility and surrendered himself to the police after taking part in the civil disobedience:

> *I took part in a civil disobedient act. Civil disobedience stresses the importance of disobeying but with legal responsibility. We still believe in the institution and attempt to change it through our actions. But when they arrest and charge you, you need to shoulder the legal responsibilities (Man 100).*

On the one hand, youth activists show the injustices of the existing social and political institutions after they break the laws. On the other hand, they conduct moral persuasion and solicit public support to change the injustices through their acts in accepting legal consequences. All these suggest that resilient acts of citizenship are not directed at overthrowing the existing government or the ruling regime, nor denying the existing social and political frameworks which define the rights and obligations of citizens. Rather, they aim to enhance civil society, check the power of the government and monitor government decisions.

Promoting multi-level and multi-faceted citizenship.

Although the scale of resilient acts of citizenship is the democratic development of Hong Kong, youth activists who subscribe to these acts believe that it is hardly possible to separate democratic development in China and that in Hong Kong, because democracy in the two places is very much intertwined. So, although they view the domination of China as a major obstacle towards the realization of a unique Hong Kong citizenship, they feel that it is not a pragmatic idea to cut off Hong Kong from China. Having said this, some of the respondents such as Olivia and Lok are reluctant to accept the identity of a Chinese citizen, and also resist against the ruling regime of the Chinese Communist Party. However in reality they recognise the geopolitical relations and the cultural affinity between China and Hong Kong. Suffice to their ideological embracement of universal human values such as freedom, democracy, equality, this group of activists is also concerned about and generally supportive of the democratic movement in China. For example, Olivia admitted that she cannot see herself as a citizen of China, but has developed an affective or ideological sense of connection with the democratic movement in China through activities for the 1989 Tiananmen Square massacre. She feels that she cannot neglect the injustices and sufferings of people in China simply because she objects to this regime. Lok also has a similar view. He feels that those who say "China doesn't concern me" are cynical, and suggested that Hong Kong citizens must develop an identity that is unique from that of their counterparts in China. Doing so could serve as a warning to the Chinese authoritarian regime and give them some pressure:

> *I think there is a need to continue the pressure. This would serve as a warning to China, and also a way to shape Hong Kong identity. All along, Hong Kong has been a mirror for China: it was the model for China's capitalist reforms; and now*

democratic reform. That's why I think we need to show them that we still care (about China) (Lok).

Moreover, youth activists who choose to carry out resilient acts of citizenship are concerned about human welfare not only in China, but also other parts of the world. Here, many of the respondents (e.g. Alan, Cindy, Gina, Eddie) alluded to the term "global citizens", which suggests that they feel the world is interconnected in every aspect and would include Hong Kong. Incidents that take place elsewhere will also impact Hong Kong. Eddie emphasised that practices of good citizenship should not be restricted by territorial boundaries. If one "does his/her best for the betterment of the global environment, and as long as one works at his/her best for global human concerns, then he/she is a global citizen". Having said this however, the findings of this study also showed that youth activists who subscribe to resilient acts of citizenship have prioritised their own concerns, although they do not limit themselves territorially. Specifically, their utmost concern is the citizenship of Hong Kong, for which they will advocate through resilient acts. As for democracy and human welfare in China and other countries, they also take them into consideration because these may become factors that affect Hong Kong.

All in all, the resilient acts of citizenship can be multi-level and multi-faceted in scale. Youth activists who believe in these acts of citizenship and subscribe to them first and foremost are concerned about Hong Kong and take action to ensure the welfare of Hong Kong first, and if necessary, their concern is extended to China and other parts of the world. They do not deny that there is representative democracy in Hong Kong, but

argue that the system is “incomplete”, and falls short of delivering full and equal citizenship to the people of Hong Kong. They also do not reject the principle of “one country, two systems”, but argue that there is the urgent need to further democratise the political institutions in Hong Kong, for example, by directly electing the Chief Executive of the HKSAR and all members of the Legislative Council, through which the political rights of Hong Kong people can be advanced.

Actors of Resilient act of Citizenship: Community Organisers

This study finds actors who subscribe to resilient act of citizenship see their role as “community organisers”; that is, those who take local community as the primary site of citizenship practice where they organise civil society groups to advocate for citizenship that is more equal and just. These respondents include Alan, Man, Eddie, and Olivia, while a few others including Kit, Cindy, Lok and Iris drift between resilient and reinvented acts. They share two common attributes; first, compared with the other respondents, they place more emphasise on the importance of community life. Second, this group of youth activists are not financially responsible for their respective families. In other words, they can afford to take part in activism and devote their time and energy in social movements and civic participation.

Life in civil organisations.

The findings of this study suggest that experience with civil society organisations which encourages inclusion and self-reflection is a key factor that drives youth activists to transform into resilient actors who persevere during the arduous work of citizenship development in Hong Kong. The most notable point here is that these civil society organizations are fundamentally different from other social and recreational clubs. Instead, they mostly aim to promote social change and stress the importance of increasing the publicness of social life. So, apart from participating in activities which aim to enhance internal cohesion, the members also participate in a variety of different social actions and movements, through which they become acquainted with other groups and organisations in society. For example, Kit learned from her experience that it is extremely difficult to promote democracy within the organization that she is involved with, but through this process they learn about mutual respect, trust, and democratic participation. Therefore, it is necessary to remain open and receptive to different understandings of citizenship to make the collective pursuit of Hong Kong citizen identity more possible.

> *I think citizenship is a broad issue. In your workplace when colleagues share common concerns about their boss and develop ideas to make changes, it's about citizenship. I think that many citizens can participate, experience and learn to make changes around them…(Kit).*

In addition, participation in civil society organisations offers opportunities for members to exchange views on various social issues, and in the course of deliberation, the members learn from each other through mutual stimulation and reflection. As a result, this helps to cultivate the critical and reflective abilities of the members. A typical example of this is given by Alan, who has changed from being a narrow-minded exclusionist to someone who is more open-minded and receptive to differences. This

change is brought about by his participation in a social movement organization (League of Social Democrats), in which he is inspired by other members to read more and consider issues from a broader perspective. Other respondents, such as Man and Eddie, also stated that the culture of deliberation and reflection in the organisation in which they are involved has offered favourable grounds for them to develop critical reflections about citizenship in Hong Kong. As suggested by Eddie, they usually meet and discuss about public and political issues since this is the primary concern of the organisation:

> *What we discuss is usually about public and political issues. Even when we have disagreements, we would try to understand the differences and then settle them by finding common grounds… (Eddie).*

Along the same line, Man suggested that debating on social and political issues is an important task for his organisation. For example, they meet weekly to discuss and debate on whether they should cut their ties with the localists after the "fish ball movement", in which the members frankly shared their views and their underlying reasons for their support or opposition, even thought there might be disagreements. This experience taught Man to appreciate differences in opinion and accommodate differences when taking part in different activities. Man indicated that this is absolutely productive because in taking the opinions and differences of others into consideration, he no longer needs to be a "hero" who engages in valiant struggles on the streets, but instead is now an organizer who coordinates people so that they do not just look see themselves as a solo valiant actor for change. These experiences of the respondents show that the civil society organisations that support social inclusion and critical reflection can, in practice, provide

mutual support to youth activists to continue to develop and explore their ideas around citizenship.

Consequences of advocating for citizenship.

Resilient acts are a type of community organising work because they aim to connect and related to community groups and people in everyday life. The findings here suggest that community organisers see their civic participation as a component of their own life and career planning. However, this is a luxury that only a few can afford to do so. Respondents like Kit, Man, Olivia, Alan and Eddie all consider civic participation for building Hong Kong citizenship as their lifetime endeavour, and all of them aim to be a community organiser in a civil society organization. However, the findings of this study show that not many youth activists can afford to be resilient actors. Those who have conducted resilient acts mainly come from families with an average household income. About half of the total number of respondents have a household income that is higher than the median (e.g. Alan, Cindy, and Kit) and the other half lower that than the median (Eddie, Olivia and Man). Although they are not from well-off families, they do not need to financially support their families so that they can use their time and energy for social and political participation. Moreover, many of the resilient actors (e.g. Man, Alan, Eddie, Olivia, Cindy and Kit) are in a work environment during the day which is closely related to the nature of their activities after work. That is, some of them are even employees at the civil society organisation in which they are a supporting member. For example, Eddie and Alan work in different political organisations, and Man in a related

part-time job. This provides the means for them (because they have the time and energy) to engage in community organising work. The findings of this study show that financial stability have created the necessary conditions for these resilient actors to do what they intend to do. On the other hand, their belief in non-material pursuit also reduces the inhibitions to social and political participation.

For example, Man feels that he doesn't "fancy buying a car, nor do I need to consider forming my own family… So I don't have the worries that other people may have (Man)" and Man considers that he is more fortunate than other youth activists because his family has their own property. In the same vein, Alan thinks that his own economic background (he comes from a well-to-do family with some money) offers him more freedom to lead a life based on his own beliefs. However, this freedom is not available to other youth activists who are from less well-off families (for example, Alan). Man indicated that many of the other youth activists need to face reality and compromise because they have financial obligations, that is, they have bills to pay and need to support their family. As a result, they feel an even stronger sense of powerlessness and helplessness (Man). Due to the circumstances mentioned above, they appreciate the difficulties of the other youth activists and citizens who cannot fully devote to social movements because their circumstances do not allow them to do so. Thus, they feel that they have an even greater responsibility. However, some of the respondents also indicated that they are worried about the future. For example, Kit stated that even though she has chosen an alternative life path, whether this lifestyle can be sustained in the future is ambiguous because she is young and can still dream:

When I choose a different life path that does not follow mainstream expectations, I know that I won't have a comfortable life. But in reality, what is the price that I will pay for that? I can't answer that question right now. Because even if I can sacrifice a lot of things..... If I have children, I am responsible for them…… I also have to think about my parents who will retire one day. How would I take care of them?(Kit)

Kit is not the only youth activist who is concerned about the price of activism. This shows that the participation of youth activists in advocating for Hong Kong citizenship comes with a price.

Conclusion

The findings and discussion above indicate that resilient acts are carried out by youth activists who oppose and resist the continuation of a market-oriented citizenship in Hong Kong. These actors aim for an equal and complete citizenship by advocating for political rights. Resilient acts are driven by ideological aspirations. Through connective and cultivating acts, the youth activists counter and resist the inequality in citizenship that is the product of capitalism. They focus on the community and transform the community into a site where resilient activism is developed and cultivated, government power checked, and public policy debated. Notwithstanding the fact that resilient acts also strive to maintain "one country, two systems", they reject the continuation of a market-oriented citizenship. Instead, they appeal for a more democratic institution and champion for equal distribution of resources so as to establish equal citizenship among Hong Kongers and preserve self-rule. Moreover, based on their desire for universal human rights and

recognition of Hong Kong as an open and diverse society, the resilient act of citizenship of these youths tend to be more accommodating of differences and are more open to a broader range of international standards of citizenship rights and duties. The findings of this study also suggest that the role of the resilient actors is primarily as community organisers who organise people, mobilise actions, raise civic awareness and promote citizen participation in the community. In other words, the resilient actors work in the community and with them to promote democracy. While they base their work in the community, these resilient actors themselves are very much involved in the community for long periods of time. They form deeper connections with residents and strengthen organising work groups. Due to their total involvement in the community as well as and their commitment to the community, many of the resilient actors are literally working at the level of the grassroots, and thoroughly involved in organizing work. Hence, how they combine their work and own personal life and allow activism to be a sustainable part of their life without paying a steep price is a huge challenge in conducting resilient acts of citizenship.

Chapter 7

Reinvented Acts of Citizenship: Inventing Autonomous Citizenship

The third type of acts of citizenship in this study is called reinvented acts. These acts are a search and invention of space for autonomy in the community where people have the freedom and space to lead a community life that is free of domination and an alternative to the market-oriented notion of citizenship. Due to its very essence of creating life space under an existing authoritarian-neoliberal state, these acts are thus called reinvented acts of citizenship. The reinvention of such acts in youth activism is developed out of a particular social trajectory which has a traceable story. As pointed out in Chapters 3, some of the youth activists fundamentally spurn economic developmentalism; reject the so-called real estate hegemony; and renounce the capitalist way of life (Chen & Szeto, 2015; Hui & Lau, 2015). This group of activists assert that citizenship in Hong Kong has become empty rhetoric with no substantial content, and the only purpose is to maintain the legitimacy of the HKSAR government and perpetuate neo-liberalism. As a result, the activists in this study disagree that the nation state has the capacity to establish complete citizenship. Instead, they suggested that genuine citizenship can only be achieved in the "locale" of the actors through endless and continuous autonomous life practices. Hence, it would be futile in their view to trust the government and anticipate institutional changes. On the contrary, they believe more strongly in "culture and everyday life" and see them as the real site of citizenship practices. Therefore, actors of reinvented acts of citizenship are not casual or part-time flexible actors. Rather, they can be described as devoted and committed "modern ascetics".

Act of Citizenship: Autonomous Life Practice

Autonomous life practice refers to the way in which youth activists advance to challenge the mainstream assumption that there is a limit to understanding citizenship in Hong Kong and create an alternative way of life which adds to the content and quality of being a Hong Kong citizen. As a result, the reinvented acts of citizenship rebuild a different set of social relations through alternative practices in everyday life. Reinvented acts of citizenship inspire other activists not emotionally or ideologically, but through reflexive practices that are applied in front of others. In addition, these acts are not ad hoc or sporadic, but rather ingrained as innovative and all-round practices with integrity in everyday life.

Reflexive practice.

Reinvented acts are not emotionally-driven, nor ideology-led. Instead, reinvented acts are directed by reflexive practice and critical dialogue in daily life. This point is well raised by Nikki who likened this alternative practice in everyday life to a kind of asceticism through which they endeavour to impact others:

> *So, the ideal situation of social movements is that there are many well meaning people who are self-sacrificing and really in touch with people in their workplace and community. The idea is to allow people to see how they live and what they*

believe in. In doing so, the impact will be huge. This is how social movements should look like, and what should be done (Nikki).

Gina also pointed out that her practices are based on dialogue rather than monologue, and the dialogue is not purely through mere words, but based on both emotion and reason. In doing so, the problem is completely demonstrated to others. Gina suggested that this is called a life example which demonstrates that an alternative lifestyle is possible. Gina further illustrated this idea by using the Mapopo Community Farm as an example to illustrate how a small rural economic community can open up to possibilities for alternative lifestyle and convince numerous young people in Hong Kong to be activist citizens. The Mapopo Community Farm combines innovative and all-rounded civic practices by connecting with different groups and people around them to inspire public concern about environmental issues and cultivate everyday practices for conserving the environment. They use alternative practices such as developing local-based farming and organising farming households around them and collecting agricultural products to sell in the local "green marketplace". The farm gradually attracted more people to reconsider city planning issues such as the NENT development proposal, agriculture, land use, alternative economies. As such, reinvented acts of citizenship have initiated a new type of social relation in the community, one that is based on mutual benefits rather than self-interest. These acts have gradually started to inspire the local community on citizenship that is beyond their common understanding in Hong Kong. As Gina observed, all of the alternative practices (such as those of the Mapopo Farm) place the values and ideologies taught at university into real life practice and have succeeded in attracting and mobilising many young people to dedicate themselves to this way of life (Gina).

Innovation.

One of the common characteristics of the respondents who subscribe to autonomous life practices is that they make everyday life practices into a part of their social movement and act consciously to counter mainstream social values and expectations in trying out new possibilities for alternative ways of life. One obvious example of this practice is exemplified by Nikki who resigned from a well-paid professional social work position because she believed that the domination of managerialism does not allow social workers to practice in accordance with their social work beliefs. Managerial requirements also consume much of her time to the extent that she only has a little bit of time to work with people whom she believes to have utmost importance. In response, Nikki resigned from a stable, well-paid and higher social status job to work in part-time sales. In doing so, she wanted to show that she was defying common values in Hong Kong that young people should prioritise the pursuit of a successful career and have worthy achievements in life, rather than an impulsive response to job frustration. As a salesperson, her time is now more flexible and also compels her to lead a simple life, reduce material consumption and avoid unnecessary spending which all serve to defy the capitalist ideology of consumerism and material pursuit that are highly valued in Hong Kong. Aside from Nikki, Gina and Lok have both moved to live in the rural areas of the New Territories and changed their way of life. Gina's decision to do so was initiated by her participation in the anti-NENT protest in which both she and her husband are active members. While they were protesting the plans of the government to demolish the village homes of thousands of rural residents for housing development which would primarily benefit capitalists and

developers, they decided to commit themselves wholly to the anti-NENT protest and moved to live in the rural community to support the residents. Lok, on the other hand, moved into a rural community because he is passionate about rural and agricultural rejuvenation in the New Territories. He feels that a genuine commitment must be supported by real life experiences. Through this change, Lok and his family thoroughly and extensively practice their beliefs. For example, they recycle goods and materials as much as possible in order to counter consumerism; refrain from dining out as much as possible, even if it means that they have to bring their own food if they cannot return home to eat. They also make their own basic essentials such as toothpaste, soap. According to this group of activists, this is a way to create possibilities for alternative social and economic dimensions of everyday life amidst the domination of capitalism and consumerism. In doing so, they are also advocating for local production; supporting local businesses and rejuvenating the community economy such as in the form of local and communal markets. As well, they are promoting other types of economies that do not aim to benefit capitalists. All these efforts represent autonomous lived practices in the local community that is beyond the control of the mainstream capitalist system, and produces more opportunities for local production and local supplying of goods. Nikki suggested that this sort of citizenship practice is one that creates the space and conditions for alternative practices which aim to realise "self-supply and self-sufficiency and avoid being controlled and exploited by multi-national corporatists" (Nikki).

Commitment to integrity.

How would you lead your life if you believe that there is social justice? The answer is that you must address social justice as a lifestyle, and ingrain it into everything that you do (Nikki).

Reinvented acts of citizenship are a commitment and a lifestyle in which youth activists address social justice in every aspect of their daily life. The rationale behind this conviction is that one cannot just talk about social justice and citizenship but practice otherwise. As discussed above, Nikki, Gina and Lok practice their beliefs and ingrain them into their lifestyle, such as in their choice of work, where they live, and making changes to their lifestyle. In other words, these activists who perform reinvented acts are concerned not only about responding to constitutional and democratic reforms in Hong Kong, but are revolutionising their own personal practices in everyday life. As a matter of fact, this group of youth activists are often critical about other social movements in Hong Kong for focusing too much on political rights and political reforms (e.g. universal suffrage for electing the chief executive of the HKSAR) and neglecting the importance of establishing a democratic culture through everyday life practices (e.g. Lok, Kit, Nikki and Iris). However, in doing so, they lose sight of the importance of resistance through personal practices in everyday life. Lok further reiterated that a citizen "must be entitled to have autonomy in every aspect of his/her daily life". That is, if one cannot have personal space and cannot advocate for more autonomy in various aspects of everyday life, there would be huge impacts on a policy. Lok and the other reinvented actors criticise participation in "big politics" sometimes has become "performing an act", whereby the movement may have been taken purely as "an issue" for the participation of protestors.

Nikki argued that activists who see social movements as a "project" or an "issue" fail to live out their aspirations:

> *A lot of people including myself, when we were taking part in a social action activity, we felt that what we were doing at the moment was very convincing and for social justice. But what happened when everything was over? It seemed that what we did often contradicted with what we promoted. We talked about justice, but we weren't fair to our family members, and we were harsh to our friends. I think this reflects that our civic practice has not been thorough and holistic enough. Now it's different. My way of civic participation (social movement) is different from the mainstream way (Nikki).*

It is important to point out here that "mainstream social movements" that have involved some of the youth activists have only brought about a one-sided response to advocacy for Hong Kong citizenship, and the participation that mainstream social movements requires is also not in sync with the everyday concerns of the activists.

The problem is that, according to the reinvented actors, mainstream social movements fail to address problems of "incomplete citizenship" and the erosion of the rights of citizens under the dominant neoliberal ideology in Hong Kong. Moreover, actions and protests that advocate for political reforms and universal suffrage may also reduce the discontent to the gradual curtailment of citizen rights, because to a certain extent, the actions and protests lead the public to believe, albeit implicitly, that citizenship is all about political rights. Lok argued that the disconnection between politics and everyday life is actually a technology of governance which prevents civil society from gaining awareness of the politics in other arenas of everyday life. Lok provided

environmental politics as an example and argued that they have been depoliticised and scaled down to become purely a concern of environmental protection which only experts have the professional knowledge to make decisions for solutions. Public participation in environmental movements has thus been depoliticised, and issues such as inequality, monopolisation, exploitation, domination of real estate developers are neglected. As a result, the environmental protection discourse has also been reduced to moral behaviours of individuals such as not littering the country parks.

In summary, the findings of this research show that reinvented acts are a lifestyle commitment of some of the youth activists, who attempt to address the inadequacies of mainstream social movements and the fragmentation of citizenship in Hong Kong through reflexive practices in everyday life. They endeavour to show the public that citizenship in Hong Kong must be advocated through fundamental cultural changes which is done through everyday life practices.

Site of Reinvented Acts of Citizenship: Culture and Everyday Life

Due to the emphasis of reinvented acts of citizenship on mastering autonomy in everyday life, the site for exercising these acts is the community where actors live and work, day in and day out. In other words, everyday life in the local community and through relationships with people is the sites for practicing reinvented acts. To the youth activists, this concept is similar to the idea of citizenship construed by the communitarians who believe that citizenship is constructed within the community where people interact

with one another (see Chapter 1). The communitarians believe that the community is not purely a territory, but rather a site where communitarian citizenship is cultivated and developed (Frazer, 1999, p. 43). Hence, citizenship is established through everyday life practices among different people, and it is "bottom-up" rather than "top-down". As evident from the experience of the respondents, there are two characteristics of community life which shape citizenship. The first characteristic is that it is local and pragmatic, and the second is the stress on the practices in the here-and-now or at this moment.

Pragmatic community life.

A community with meaningful and close relationships among its residents is an important element of sites of reinvented acts. Although the notion of citizenship is often undeniably related to national territory, and in recent years, has been also related to globalisation in which the notion of global citizens is put forth (Isin & Turner, 2007; Ku & Pun, 2004), yet to many Hong Kong people, both the concept of global citizen and the notion of a Hong Konger constructed in recent years by the localists are abstract and fragmented concepts with only vague meanings that are unrelated to everyday life in the local communities. In other words, such abstract concepts of citizenship in Hong Kong, if removed from the daily practices of everyday community experiences, do not make much sense to the community. Hence, it is apparent that reinvented acts of citizenship which is embedded in everyday life practices in the community not only endeavour to create a new sense of citizenship among the community members, but also has to have

some linkage with the traditions and history of the community. For example, in order to promote conservation of natural resources on Lantau Island, Cindy puts forth effort to explore and understand the traditions, stories and culture of the local community by organising and joining guided tours, listening to oral history, as well as organising women of the local community to initiate local farming efforts. Apart from Cindy, other respondents such as Lok and Gina have taken part in land surveying work in their local community and report findings of their investigation in the local newspapers. This sort of work demonstrates to the public that the ways of life in the community can be different: people do not necessarily have pursue material satisfaction but can still be self-sufficient, and people can relate to each other not based on self-interest and economic benefits, but on mutual responsibility. This is exemplified by Gina who suggested that one has to actually live in a community to gain first-hand insights before one can really appreciate the history of that community and how life is really lived there.

Therefore, reinvented acts of citizenship are not the inculcation of outsider citizenship experiences. On the contrary, these acts are ingrained by first gaining an understanding of the community itself and respecting its history, and then showing genuine concern about its future. As Nikki suggested, it is natural that people in a community may have different interpretations of its history. However, it is exactly these differences that can offer different perspectives on how the history of a particular community is viewed and allow communication and discussion amongst the members on equal grounds to determine what needs to be inherently continued and what needs to be changed.

The here-and-now.

Besides emphasising on the importance of local and indigenous community life, the site of reinvented acts of citizenship is also one that stresses on the importance of the reality of the present and the real world. The respondents who subscribe to reinvented acts of citizenship argue that citizenship aspirations are not only envisioned for the future but also a process that is taking place at the present. In other words, the process of practicing citizenship in everyday community life is, at the same time, the immediate realisation of how citizenship is envisioned. Interestingly, this view is shared by many respondents who subscribe to reinvented acts of citizenship. For example, Gina considers her actions in her everyday life as a "dynamic and endless process" to actualise her aspirations for an ideal life, and that process itself is an actualisation of the vision.

Thus, the immediate context in which everyday life takes place is the site for actualising ideal citizenship, based on the youth activists who subscribe to this line of thought. Accordingly, it is suggested that once they start to reinvent a new aspiration of citizenship through everyday practices, the ideal citizenship that they aspire to is already realized in the immediate context (Gina, Kit and Nikki).

Along the same line of thought, this group of youth activists believe that when the people of Hong Kong start to own a local identity and become their own master in what they do and how they think in all matters of everyday life, then there advocacy for Hong

Kong independence from China is no longer needed. Both Nikki and Lok elaborated on this point and stated that advocating for the independence of Hong Kong by the localists is meaningless and lacks substance. They argue that even if Hong Kong becomes independent in name, it is futile and meaningless if Hong Kong has to depend on China for all aspects of life, including social, economic and cultural aspects. Instead, if Hong Kong is not merely independent in name but can maintain a considerable degree of self-sufficiency in terms of say, water supply, agriculture and the economy, its citizens can still enjoy a high degree of self-autonomy. This is well spelt out by Nikki:

> *If we believe in independence, we can start right away. [If we maintain] economic independence, then we can become independent right away and we don't need to talk about constitutional changes. We don't need a policy or a law to formalise independence in Hong Kong. We need to be revolutionary… (Nikki).*

In sum, some of the youth activists envisage that citizenship and self-autonomy are not abstract and far-reaching entities. Instead, they can be realised in everyday practices. It is argued that an alternative aspiration of citizenship and social relationship is possible and can be reinvented by committing to the context of everyday life. The site for exercising citizenship is, therefore, in the present (the here and now) and in the local community where they live. The motivation is that when youth activists live out their beliefs and exercise autonomy in different areas of life as much as possible on a daily basis, the ideals of citizenship will become reality.

Scale of Reinvented Acts of Citizenship: The Locale

Following the line of discussion on the site of reinvented acts which is actual life in the local communities, the scale of the citizenship campaign of this group of youth activists is also closely related to changes in the everyday life of people in the community. In other words, reinvented acts of citizenship do not focus on promoting public policy changes. Instead, they stress the importance of the community taking self-initiative to pursue citizen relations and a way of life that can maximize autonomy in different areas of life beyond the mainstream values of the capitalist free society of Hong Kong. Thus, the scale of citizenship struggles is mainly found in transforming everyday life in the community to realise "community self-help" and personal life transformations – "changing the heart of the people".

Community self-help.

In the present political reality of Hong Kong, reinvented acts of citizenship are not actions that challenge the boundaries of the principle of "one country, two systems", and also not actions that campaign for constitutional changes to advocate for more rights. Rather, reinvented acts are over and above the limits of "one country, two systems", whereby youth activists contemplate autonomy in personal as well as community life. This type of citizenship targets is not the realisation of independence in Hong Kong, but an ideology and a way of life that has the possibility of autonomy, which is an alternative to the mainstream neoliberalism in Hong Kong. As discussed above, this group of youth activists is highly critical of the existing government which favours the so-called free

market. The expansion of the unregulated market has invaded and dominated the everyday life of Hong Kong people, to the extent that all community lives have been replaced by the market and all human needs are supposed to be met in the market and by the market. The domination of the market is believed to have eliminated human capacity for self-autonomy, produced dependency, and diminished mutual caring relationships in the community. Under this domination of neoliberalism in Hong Kong, this group of activists argue that citizenship is just an instrument of the ruling regime, which has destroyed the real value of citizenship and the community. So, there is a need to reinvent citizenship amidst the neoliberalism control, but efforts to recreate citizenship cannot rely on the government. As Nikki said:

> *If we can re-establish connections between people in the community, we don't need to count on the government; we can manage ourselves very well. Moreover, we can be self-sufficient in terms of production, supply, work, etc., we can manage all of that. In other words, we don't need the government, so it's like anarchism. But the reality is that we do have a government, so we need to be very careful about how we do the work.*

On the one hand, the respondents do not deny the importance of political reforms, for example the introduction of genuine universal suffrage which would lead to democracy and the protection of the rights of citizens, but at the same time, they do not want to overly emphasise on political reforms and argued that awareness and practice in everyday life are more important. This reflects the presence of a fundamental distrust of the government, and a complete opposition of the authoritarian and neoliberal ruling

regime that is governing Hong Kong today. Based on this line of thought, the scale of citizenship discerned by this group of activists is "changes in the community" which inspire a new awareness and new relationships between people in the community and practiced in everyday life. This is exactly what the activists who subscribe to reinvented acts of citizenship are advocating as "community self-help", which means the people in the local community rely on themselves to change the community in which they reside. While this may sound like utopia or merely wishful thinking, the youth activists believe that this is possible because there can be self-governing in certain spaces in community life which are not under the control of the ruling regime. For example, Nikki cautioned:

> *Don't ever think about relying on the government. If it works, it has already worked. I think we need self-governing".*

She suggested that youth activists can regain control of their own communities by participating in district level management work, such as the mutual aid committees; owners' corporations, local consultative committees. By taking control of these local resources, they can actualise self-governing in the local community, and have the power to govern bottom-up rather than top-down. Besides Nikki, some of the other respondents also shared their experience in using the local community as a small site to exercise citizenship. For example, Kit indicated that her experience in community organising in the district of To Kwa Wan is actually a movement on *"how to facilitate the community to be more self-governing"*. The main goal, according to Kit, is to put the ideal factors of Hong Kong citizenship into practice at a smaller-scale; that is, at the community level. In

other words, before considering what Hong Kong citizenship should look like, whether or not Hong Kong needs independence, and the sort of election that Hong Kong needs, all of these questions need to be first addressed in the local community. Kit further suggested that those in an ideal community can experience being citizens who have power to make decisions on matters that concern their own community; people can enjoy neighbourhood relationships that emphasise on mutual care, and experience citizenship which they will not be able to enjoy in mainstream society. Kit argued that it is only through direct community experiences that people can begin to develop new imaginations of citizenship in Hong Kong and have a desire to pursue the new type of citizenship:

> *When people have their own idea (about what citizens deserve), they won't be easily influenced and to some extent swayed by material favours. If people begin to be more concerned about the sewage in Wan Chai, and the development of the local districts, they can then develop a genuine concern for society as a whole. (Kit)*

Transforming citizenship in heart of people.

According to this group of activists, "heart" refers to the ideologies, beliefs and values of the people. Therefore, a change in "heart" has fundamental importance because when people change their values and ideologies, they will develop a critical sense of awareness and thereby compelled to question, and then override the mainstream orthodox citizenship which is deeply embedded in the values of Hong Kong society. To this end, Nikki argued that if people believe in justice and are deeply committed to this belief and put it into practice accordingly, their practices will become transform and transcend the

given meaning of Hong Kong citizenship. The problem is that traditional social movements have only promoted concrete policy changes, whereas reinvented acts of citizenship promote fundamental changes in beliefs and values as well as real changes in the social relationships between people in a community. Gina illustrated this point by using her own experiences in the anti-NENT movement. She observed that even though their slogan of "no demolition; no resettlement" represents a radical and progressive idea, yet the "heart" (meaning the consciousness and the ideology) of the villagers has not changed. Gina was disappointed that some of the villagers insisted upon "no demolition and no resettlement" as a negotiation strategy for more compensation (for giving up their land to developers), and were not committed to defending an alternative way of life aside from the pursuit of economic self-interests. After self-reflection, Gina feels that social change must originate from truly a change in heart.

However, according to this group of youth activists, a change in heart is not an easy process; it is a process of reflection-in-action where there is learning and new awareness in the process of reflection and practice. In this regard, Nikki pointed out that this is precisely the way how she had developed her beliefs of citizenship, which is through action and reflection:

> *Citizenship is about… the way in which a person understands him or herself, the community and the world where he or she lives. In return, it is a way in which a person relates to the groups and communities around him or her. All these are guided by ideologies about the community. How do all these happen? Naturally it is by getting to know the people around you; realising the ideal state of your*

society; and understanding the resources that should be allocated to the community (Nikki).

In summary, reflective practice which is based on reflection-in-action is regarded by some of the youth activists as the core element of a change in heart. This change helps the activists to gain a new awareness and thus create new practices. Constant reflection on how an ideal society should look be, how social relations should be constituted, and how social resources should be distributed have inspired the youth activists to search for new imagined citizenship and new practices of citizenship in Hong Kong society.

All in all, the scale of reinvented acts of citizenship is the particular locale and the personal, and to this group of activists, it is also important to promote actual change in the local community by changes in awareness and everyday practices. In terms of geographical space, the scale of citizenship acts seems to be small because it is restricted to a small local community or even at the personal level. Nevertheless, the impacts can be tremendous and widespread because the emphasis is on renewing awareness and changing the values and ideologies of people. In other words, changes begin with a change in "heart" and extended to the community in which the activists reside. Through "community self-help", this group of activists attempt to cultivate an alternative imagined citizenship among the community and practice this belief in their everyday life.

Actors of Reinvented Acts of Citizenship: Modern Ascetics

Actors of reinvented acts of citizenship are like ascetics who practice autonomous community life. In this study, the youth activists who subscribe to this act of citizenship include Gina and Nikki, who are the minority among the respondents. Also, there are a few such as Lok, Cindy and Kit who subscribe to a combination of resilient and reinvented acts. They hold ideals of life that are alternative to those of mainstream Hong Kong society. They refuse to a lead a life dominated and prescribed by mainstream lifestyle and career expectations, which they feel are constructed by the capitalist and neoliberal ideologies. In their everyday life, they hold post material values, which means they place less importance on material pursuits, and endeavour to spend each day in the local community as the real site of citizenship practice. This group of actors sees the exercise of citizenship as a practice of asceticism, and through ingrained efforts and persistence in everyday practices, they strive to inspire more converts in the community and create favourable conditions for changes.

Post-materialism.

Reinvented actors tend to follow a post-materialist life path which focuses less on material achievement and material satisfaction but more on non-material goals, such as the different kinds of freedoms in daily life and the actualisation of democratic beliefs(Chen & Szeto, 2015; Inglehart, 1977; Ma, 2011). In this study, three of the respondents, Nikki, Gina and Lok, are educated (all of them are university graduates) but choose to give up their career to practice their beliefs of ideal citizenship. For example, Lok is an expert in agricultural research who was also an adjunct teaching faculty member

at a university. They choose to lead a simple life with an income that is much lower than the household median in Hong Kong. Partly because of this, they live in relatively poorer conditions compared to their other young and educated counterparts who follow a traditional career path.

As Hui and Lau (2015) suggested, although youth activism may subscribe to post-materialist values, the activists are still angry about the material deprivation that people suffer as a result of social inequalities. In spite of the fact that the ascetics of reinvented acts are inclined to support post-materialist values, they do not deny material needs. Furthermore, their acts of citizenship unambiguously defy and denounce the distributive inequality caused by market-oriented citizenship. To this group of youth activists, what they do and the simple life that they live is a demonstration of their reflection and resistance against the capitalist way of life in Hong Kong which stresses so much on material pursuits and consumerism but overlooks exploitation, oppression and social inequalities.

The actors here have chosen a way of life and live a frugal and simple life according to their values and belief. However, they sacrifice their own career and the related material rewards. While they have not downplayed the importance of material necessity, they believe that a better quality of life can only be achieved by resisting the mainstream definition of a "good life". This is a life commitment, which they believe is the most effective way to inspire people to reimagine citizenship, and best realised and

exercised through the relationships between people in their everyday lives in the local community.

Sustainable activism.

Moreover, the reinvented actors are also concerned about the sustainability of their commitment, both materially and spiritually. To ensure that their commitment is sustainable, they have a firm and clear belief about what they do, and are deeply devoted. Also, they understand that this is a long term and rocky process so they cannot be impatient. As Nikki said, reinvented acts of citizenship are a daily task where changes can only happen slowly and gradually. Gina also described her social movement practices in the local community as "unceasing water drops that flow into a small stream" where changes can only happen slowly and peacefully day by day. In such a process, the activists may have to change their mentality, increase their awareness, and reinforce their willpower to prepare for long-term and sustainable practices of citizenship. Hence, reinvented acts of citizenship are not a direct and fierce confrontation with mainstream orthodox citizenship. Rather, it is a gradual transformation of the "minds" and the "hearts" of the people in the community through innovative and alternative practices.

While practicing asceticism is idealistic, the activists demonstrate in their daily life that it is not unrealistic although its sustainability is questionable. Having said this, there are some strategies that they use which make it possible for them to continue. One of the common strategies is to integrate their acts of citizenship into all aspects of

everyday life. While this is easier said than done, the key is to identify the most suitable role in one's unique social milieu. Also, basic resources must be in place. In Gina's case, she now works part-time on a farm as a casual worker, but in the long run, she is considering the possibility of participating in some form of agro ecological research work. Lok, who welcomed a baby girl into his family, is planning to pursue a doctoral research degree in agricultural studies, with aspirations to become an expert in that area some day and use that position to promote agricultural development in Hong Kong. As for Nikki, while committed to integrating social movements into her everyday life, anticipates that there will be numerous difficulties that lie ahead of her. However, she is determined to lead an alternative lifestyle and aim for any possible strategy that supports her endeavours, including applying for government subsidies to maintain her lifestyle.

From the experience of these respondents, it can be seen that reinvented actors commit to their ideals, and their endeavours may not be unrealistic. They plan concretely for the future, through which they seriously seek their own unique role by integrating their own life and involvement in social movements. In this process, they expect to face obstacles that are not easy to overcome, but this precisely shows the price that this group of activists are prepared to pay in order to exercise their belief of citizenship which is different from the mainstream form. All these exemplify the stories and experience of this group of reinvented actors which demonstrate how they resist the mainstream orthodox notion of citizenship in Hong Kong. Practicing citizenship requires reinvention, and new possibilities are discovered through everyday practices, which is an endless reflective process.

Conclusion

All in all, social movements are a process where these youth activists can transfer their beliefs and values into everyday life practices, and the actualisation of a vision in which change can take place in stages throughout one's own life. Hence, the site of citizenship practices is the everyday life world, where they live. This is spiritual and can be likened to asceticism. In reality, while different reinvented actors have their own focus in their everyday practices, it does not mean they have a narrow understanding of citizenship. Instead, they are selective in what they do, because they believe that change can only happen bit by bit and day by day. As the findings of this study show, this group of reinvented actors are quite aware of the complexities and difficulties that they may face. Yet they are also aware that they have to find their ways by trial-and-error, that is, a process of reflection-in-action which empowers them to carry on with their reinvented acts of citizenship.

Chapter 8

Youth Activism and the Meanings of Citizenship

Following the discussion in Chapters 5 to 7 on the three types of citizenship acts practiced by youth activists in Hong Kong, which are responsive, resilient and reinvented acts, respectively, this chapter provides an in-depth discussion on how the experience of youth activists with social movements shapes their understanding of citizenship and practices. As argued in Chapter 1, the meaning of citizenship is not only provided in a top-down manner by the state, but also a set of practices established through various acts of citizenship, and the process is characterised by negotiations and, sometimes, conflicts and confrontations (Isin, 2008; Kymlicka & Norman, 1994; Parker, 2003; Turner, 1993). In such a citizenship building process, the youth activists are the agents who shape and create the meanings of citizenship through social movement participation according to Isin (2008, 2009). At the same time, alternative meanings of citizenship can be found beyond formal political practices by focusing on the acts of citizenship in social movements (Papa & Milioni, 2013). In the first part of this chapter, I shall explore how the youth activists imagine citizenship and discuss the alternative meanings of citizenship that are created through social movement participation. Then I shall critically examine the extent to which these alternative meanings and practices create rapture, answer to justice and inspire activist citizens in accordance with Isin (2008, 2009).

Imagined Citizenship

Citizenship in Hong Kong is a concept that is both familiar and ambiguous to the youth activists in this study. It is familiar because there is an assumed meaning behind the term, but at the same time, the exact meaning of being a citizen in Hong Kong is ambiguous and vague. This dilemma is well expressed by Iris and Kit, who suggested that the concrete meaning of citizenship has seldom been extensively articulated and discussed because everybody "is so familiar with the term and knows very well what it's all about". In addition, within the group of youth activists, citizenship has been assumed to be a presupposed agenda for discussion and actions (Kit). A typical example quoted by some of the respondents (e.g. Cindy, Dick, Fong, Hong, and Olivia) is the UM which is regarded as a movement that advocates for political rights, including the rights to nominate candidates and vote in elections. However, the study also found that some youth activists tend to feel very distanced, if not alienated, towards the concept of citizenship. For example, Eddie indicated that he cannot think of any concrete references. Similarly, Gina and Nikki also expressed that citizenship is a vague concept to them - it is difficult to define, and its significance even more difficult to concretely define. All of these examples show the dilemma around citizenship that the youth activists in Hong Kong face, which, I would argue, is attributed to the obscurity of citizenship since the colonial era, and the aversion of the Chinese authorities in defining citizenship. As a result, citizenship has become a concept that is only vaguely familiar and to some extent, an alien concept.

To some of the respondents, the aversion to defining citizenship is produced and perpetuated by the civic education system in Hong Kong which some see as a form of government propaganda. For example, Gina questioned the indoctrination of patriotism as a characteristic of Hong Kong citizenship and the "default" meaning of citizenship provided by the state. This controversy is based on the fact that the meaning of citizenship is created not by the people of Hong Kong, who are not only denied the power to define citizenship, but also lack the power that is their right to change society (Gina). Nikki was also reluctant to discuss citizenship:

> *I don't know why the term citizenship makes me feel sick. It seems like something that's vague and unreal in Hong Kong. I feel like citizenship in Hong Kong is like putting people together who don't have a shared-experience and calling it a community with a shared destiny. But in reality, this doesn't take the common hopes of people in this community into consideration…* (Nikki)

While citizenship often implies a community in which members share common experiences and feelings of a common destiny, Nikki feels that these elements of citizenship are not found in Hong Kong. Citizenship in Hong Kong to her is just an empty concept with no substantial content. She further commented that the government has created a "default" type of citizenship which is about accepting the current status quo including the absence of universal suffrage and high land and property prices, and then encourage the people of Hong Kong to support this definition. However, other more important agenda items of citizenship, such as the legitimacy of the existing government, logic behind the high land and property prices which are a burden on housing needs, definition of life have been ignored (Nikki). The aversion, dissatisfaction and indifference

towards the notion of citizenship actually reflect the fragmentation and deficiency of citizenship in Hong Kong. The problem is that discussions and practices of citizenship are very much restricted within a prescribed space and confined scope, such as civic education in school or election campaigns. This unavoidably results in an understanding of citizenship that is one-sided, shallow and fragmentary.

As a matter of fact, social movements have created new public spaces for these youth activists to explore the meanings and contents of citizenship that are outside those of the "mainstream". The advancement of local consciousness and the development of localism in social movements in recent years are vivid examples that reflect how youth activists are advocating for citizenship. The definition of "local" has recently become a contentious term in Hong Kong. Within the social movement sector, the notions of "local consciousness" and "local identity" have also become synonymous with social movements (Chen & Szeto, 2015; Kaeding, 2017; Kwong, 2016; Veg, 2017).

In this study, the respondents frequently use the term "local" more so than the "citizen" and "citizenship". For example, the term "local" was mentioned 200 times by the respondents, while "citizenship" was mentioned only 84 times. This shows the importance that the youth activists place on "localism" and "local identity" as well as the importance of examining localism in studies on citizenship in Hong Kong. Besides, the findings of this study also show that the term "local" or "localism" carries connotations of political validity which the youth activists embrace and support (including "localists" and "non-localists"). At the very least, the terms related to localism are fundamentally

regarded as important yet controversial which cannot be simply dismissed. Among the 16 respondents in this study, 6 claimed that they are "localists" who support the advancement of "localism". Interestingly, the other 10 respondents who do not identify themselves as "localists" also claimed that they are receptive to being "local" but do not support the actions of the "localists". Cindy, Lok and Iris do not support the political position and actions of the "localists". Yet they claimed that they embrace and support being "local". This is because they have a different definition of localism. Thus, like citizenship, which can be defined differently, the concept of "local" and "localism" can also be interpreted differently, which again reflects the different political beliefs and values of different community groups, as well as different social and political positions with different social and political resources and priorities (Hui & Lau, 2015).

In the case of Hong Kong, the interplay of the forces of localisation (which is primarily driven by localism), globalisation and nationalisation has formed the basis for the construction of citizenship (Tse, 2007). Nonetheless, as argued by Lam (2017), "localisms in Hong Kong are by nature hybrids associated with a basket of ideas", and the formation of local identity is an on-going process of exploration and debate through social movements. Yet the on-going process of debate and negotiation instigates, articulates and facilitates newly imagined types of citizenship and new possibilities of the extent, content and depth of citizenship. As Kit pointed out, the exploration of local identity and citizenship has also become a creative force that counteracts the "mainstream orthodox" notion of citizenship indoctrinated by the state.

New Meanings of Citizenship Through Youth Activism

As argued in the previous chapters, youth activists in Hong Kong engage in different sites of social movements and perform different acts of citizenship to resist the state created definition of Hong Kong citizenship on the one hand and attempt to give new meanings to citizenship on the other hand. I argue here that the acts of citizenship performed by youth activists show that there are some progress made to the extent, content as well as depth of citizenship. Moreover, I argue that there are multiple new meanings of citizenship that are being created with fluidity: different acts of citizenship may imply citizenship that is diverse, evolving and sometimes even inconsistent. According to the citizenship conceptual framework of this study, youth activism in Hong Kong has advanced understandings of citizenship based on the extent, content and depth of citizenship (Faulks, 2000; Isin & Turner, 2002).

Search for local identity.

First, citizenship has inspired the development of an awareness of localism and establishment of a local Hong Kong identity in the youth activists. As discussed in Chapter 5, youth activists feel strongly alienated towards the mainstream orthodox definition of Hong Kong citizenship and resist this definition of citizenship, which they believe, is hollowed out if not prescribed by the authoritarian Chinese central state regime and the HKSAR government. In response to politically defined notion of citizenship, they attempt to develop a local Hong Kong identity that is distinct from that of the mainstream

through their involvement in social movements. The development of Hong Kong localism has given added impetus and fodder for imagination so that the youth activists can reassess what constitutes as a Hong Kong identity. Questions such as "what makes someone a Hong Konger" and "who are Hong Kongers" are important to ask in the process of searching for new meanings of citizenship. In other words, social movements provide a platform where youth activists rethink the issues of political identity and consider their political membership and their sense of belonging to this political community. The localisation of social movements, or more accurately, the sense of local commitment derived from social movement experiences, enables youth activists to advance the mainstream framework of citizenship which is prescribed top-down by the authoritarian state and reconsider their own definitions of Hong Kong citizenship in relation to the establishment of a local identity.

Striving for political citizenship.

Secondly, youth activism has also inspired awareness in the youth activists about their own political identity, which motivates them to advocate for political rights that would establish an alternative Hong Kong citizenship based on their ideals. As argued in Chapter 2, citizenship in Hong Kong has always been "incomplete" since the colonial era. Hong Kong people could only enjoy some civil rights, but have been largely deprived of political and social rights (Ho, 2004; Ku, 2009). According to the youth activists, citizenship has been limited to a market-oriented citizenship which stresses the need to be "productive" and "responsible" in a market-oriented society where economic growth

is the only legitimate social goal. This notion of citizenship only produces economically active but politically passive citizens (Lister, 2007a; Wyn & White, 2000). The reality is that youth activists are angry about the "incompleteness" of citizenship in Hong Kong. They (e.g. Cindy, Olivia, Alan, Dick and Kit) think that the deprivation of political rights is the primary obstacle in monitoring the abuse of government power. It is also an obstacle that prevents the people of Hong Kong from obtaining social justice. Informed and inspired by their experience in social movements, the youth activists are therefore eager to overcome the current limitations of citizenship and expand the definitions. Participation in the UM which aims to advance democracy in Hong Kong has thus become a common expression of overcoming the limitations and expanding the definition (Hui & Lau, 2015).

Struggling for the role of new citizenship actor.

Thirdly, the social movement experiences of youth activists can also be understood as a kind of reflexive practice which responds to the "incompleteness" of citizenship in Hong Kong (Chen & Szeto, 2015; Ellison, 1997; Manning, 2012). Their social movement participation not only encourages them to be citizens who are politically active but also inspires them to be the new "agents" who inherit the role of advancing citizen rights from traditional political elites in the legislature and social movement leaders who no longer have the trust of young people. The reason for this is that the youth activists (such as Eddie, Iris, Dick, and Billy) fault the political parties for their failure in addressing their pleas for democracy and social justice, and the absence of a political

vision, along with the lack of idea and reluctance for change. Some of the youth activists also believe that the peaceful, rational and non-violent protests that are carried out in traditional social movements are not effective and have become unproductive (e.g. Dick, Billy, James, and Pinky). Therefore, there is a need to create a new kind of social movement and to adopt new approaches. In this light, the youth activists (e.g. Fong, Iris, Cindy) consider the methods used for the anti-high-speed rail and the anti-national curriculum movements, in which the protest strategies and online mobilisation strategies have received wider and greater recognition and support from the community. All of these considerations have been taken together to revitalise the commitment of the youth activists in redefining the citizenship of Hong Kong through different acts, where the site and scale of citizenship have also been extended from adult-led institutions to sites beyond existing political institutions (e.g. the administration and the legislature) where disruptions and controversies are possible and thus more possibilities for change can be brought forth.

Diverse and Contested Meanings of Citizenship

The discussion above illustrates that youth activism has advanced the meaning as well as practices of citizenship, including the extent, content and depth of citizenship. More importantly, the diverse experiences of youth activists evidenced in their participation in various social movements have also generated diverse and multiple understandings of citizenship with dynamic and evolving meanings. The discussions in Chapters 5 to 7 suggest that the differences in beliefs and political orientations that

underlie these three types of citizenship acts reflect the diversity and fluidity of citizenship construction. Table 5.1 highlights these three different acts, indicating the three different conceptions and meanings of citizenship, which are labelled market-oriented, universal and autonomous citizenship, respectively. In the following section, I shall discuss the controversial and diverse meanings of citizenship articulated by the respondents The discussion is organised based on the three characteristics of citizenship, i.e. the extent, content and depth (Faulks, 2000; Isin & Turner, 2002), which I adopted as a part of my theoretical framework**.**

Table 8.1

Meanings of citizenship

Type of citizenship		**Market-oriented Citizenship**	**Universal Citizenship**	**Autonomous Citizenship**
Extent	Local Identity	Hong Kongers	Equal citizens	Autonomous citizens
	Mode of definition	Exclusion -by definition and segregation (especially with Mainland China)	Universal value -by connections and civil participation	Involvement -through alternative life practices and mutual help in local community
Content	Process of distribution	Market	Institution democracy	Autonomous Community
	Rights	Advocate for political rights		

		Political rights are basis for civil and market rights	Political rights are basis for balancing social and market rights	Political rights are basis for cultural rights and protection of autonomous lifestyle
Depth	Civic Participation	Atomistic	Collective	Connective

Extent (local identity): Exclusion, universal value and involvement.

There is a broader range of understanding as far as the extent of citizenship is concerned. Youth activism has no doubt inspired a newly imagined Hong Kong citizenship through the creation and development of localism in this study, or more specially, a local Hong Kong identity. However, at the same time, there are different understandings of localism, which thus imply the different extents of citizenship as well as different political stances (Chen & Szeto, 2015; Hui & Lau, 2015; Kaeding, 2017; Kwong, 2016; Ma, 2017a; Veg, 2017). This study finds the notions of "Hong Kongers", "equal citizens" and "autonomous citizens" are constructed directly based on "market-oriented citizenship", "universal citizenship" and "autonomous citizenship" through responsive, resilient and reinvented acts of citizenship, respectively. In sum, all of these different versions of citizenship reflect different understandings and different responses to the principle of "one country, two systems". For example, the beliefs that underlie "market-oriented citizenship" and "universal citizenship" similarly accept, and comply to the scale of citizenship stipulated by "one country, two systems". However, at the same

time, the holders of these two versions of citizenship have a conflicting view as to how much Hong Kong citizenship should be available to non-Hong Kongers.

Exclusion is used in market-oriented citizenship to define the identity of a citizen and define the boundaries of citizenship. As argued in Chapter 5, the identity of Hong Kongers upheld by a market-oriented citizenship is built on the perceived superiority of the free market economy in Hong Kong which appears to offer all kinds of freedoms along with an independent judiciary which are not available to the Mainland Chinese. Under this rationality, this group of youth activists believe that as long as the principles of "one country, two systems" and "Hong Kong people ruling Hong Kong" are maintained, Hong Kong can then continue without interference its free market system with all the different kinds of freedoms and ways of life. However, when there is a perceived Chinese intrusion that threatens the Hong Kong ways of life, a series of exclusionary actions, including boycotting visitors from China and calls to reduce welfare provisions for Chinese migrants have emerged to protect and strengthen local consciousness and the identity of Hong Kong which are different from those of China. As "one country, two systems" has failed due to Chinese intrusion, separatism as a brand of localism is suggested for differentiating Hong Kong from China, and there are suggestions, for example, to establish a Hong Kong nation and advocate for Hong Kong independence (see Chapter 5).

Universal citizenship, which is another version of localism, is built upon the historical context of Hong Kong as an international city which embraces universal human

values. It is argued that the unique identity of Hong Kong would not be established by excluding non-Hong Kongers. Rather, the identity should be built on recognition and the acceptance of Hong Kong as a member of the global community. In this sense, it is only through genuine implementation of "one country, two systems" that Hong Kong can maintain its local identity as an internationally open and internally diverse and vibrant city (see Chapter 6). In contrast to exclusionary localism, the notion of universal citizenship advocates for expanding the extent of citizenship, and supports a Hong Kong citizenship that is more open and accommodating. Among the respondents, Eddie and Alan pointed out that as long as people can identify themselves as a member of Hong Kong society, and care about and participate in this society, they are already Hong Kong citizens. This notion of localism suggests that Hong Kong citizenship is not determined by ethnicity or socio-political background. That is why they work towards connecting people of different backgrounds to foster a mutual understanding and promote social and political participation of all groups in the community.

Finally, this group of activists who believe in autonomy of the community argued that citizenship is achieved through everyday practices and involvement in the local community. This version of localism is very much different from other two types of citizenship that claim citizenship as a status, and the extent and practice of citizenship should be based on "one country, two systems". As pointed out in Chapter 1, the notion of citizenship as a status is very different from that of citizenship as a practice. The former refers to membership granted by a political community, while the latter suggests that citizenship is constituted by different acts and practices of different groups. With such

differences, the supporters of autonomous citizenship (such as Gina, Lok and Nikki) argued that personal autonomy and mutual help in everyday life practices in the community are the most pragmatic and effective forms of local citizenship. In other words, genuine local citizenship can only take place when personal autonomy in community life is found. This helps to explain why it is imperative to develop a local agriculture industry and local community economy, because these are considered to be important steps to evade the domination of the Chinese authoritarian regime and the exploitation of the free global market economy. To this group of localists, the creation of space in which people can lead an autonomous life which can be as free as possible from the control and definition of citizenship of the state is of utmost importance for achieving local citizenship (see Chapter 7). In other words, citizenship is created by a community of common practices, and those who subscribe to personal autonomy and mutual-help practices are the citizens. Like universal citizenship, autonomous citizenship shares the view that there may not be a conflict between the development of a Hong Kong identity and the prevalence of a Chinese cultural identity; however, as Eddie, Iris, and Gina pointed out, they are the minority who feel this way in the youth activist community.

Content (distributive justice): Market, democracy and autonomy.

Besides the differences in how citizenship is conceived, there are also differences and, to some extent, disagreements among youth activist groups on the issue of distributive justice. As argued in the last section in this chapter, striving for political citizenship is the common expression of different actors for establishing their ideal type

of citizenship. However, there are disagreements on the contents of the political and social rights attached to citizenship, and there are also different views on the role of the government and the processes to distribute these rights, although the different groups of activists all claim that they endeavour to advocate for justice.

First, the notion of market-oriented citizenship presumes that justice is upheld when social and political rights are distributed by market processes. In other words, the contents of citizenship, including political, civil and social rights, are best distributed based on achievement in the market. Therefore, Hong Kongers who are capable of taking risks will have better opportunities for upward mobility, face fewer setbacks and are more successful. This group of activists feel that the pursuit of political rights is a response to the crisis around market-oriented citizenship. So, these activists (e.g. Billy and Hong) believe that if market freedom is ensured by an independent judicial system and as long as civil rights are fully protected, political citizenship can be redundant (see Chapter 5). Unfortunately, due to the interference of the Chinese government, independent judiciary and the assurance of civil rights have been destructed. Thus, advocating for universal suffrage and the right to elect government and the legislature becomes necessary to regain power so that "Hong Kong people to rule Hong Kong". Only by regaining political power can the civil rights and the independent judiciary of Hong Kong be protected (Dick, Fong, and Hong). Besides, the notion of market-oriented citizenship rejects the protection of social rights, because they negate the free market process where free competition and self-reliance are upheld (Dick, Pinky, Hong and Fong). It is believed that opportunities

and rewards should be distributed based on individual contribution in the free market, and therefore should not be affected by social protection (see Chapter 5).

In contrast to the position of market-oriented citizenship, the notions of universal and autonomous citizenship similarly maintain that the free market is the root of all injustices. According to the universalists, citizenship should be an equal entitlement by all citizens of Hong Kong, and the democratic institution is the most powerful means of monitoring the government to ensure the equal distribution of social resources. They believe that equal social and political rights should be protected by laws and ensured by social policies. However, the problem with Hong Kong at present, according to this group of youth activists (e.g. Cindy, Olivia, Alan, Eddie, and Iris), is that Hong Kong people can only have limited political rights as the government and the legislature are not fully elected and therefore not accountable to citizens. This gives the government immense power to make decisions that favour the business sector and creates distribution injustice (Chan, 2009; Cheung, 2000; Ku, 2009; Xia, 2016). As a result, youth activists support the idea of a universal citizenship campaign not only for electoral democracy but also advocate for the development of a civic culture with a stronger tendency for civic participation so that people can seek equal citizenship through democratic participation (see Chapter 6).

As a matter of fact, the notion of equal citizenship is championed by youth activists who subscribed to resilient acts as well as autonomous acts of citizenship. As discussed in Chapter one, T.H. Marshall first put the concept of citizenship on the map.

Though not directly pointing to equality of citizenship, Marshall (1964) argued that social rights, the final set of rights developed in the twentieth century, represented the need to mitigate social inequalities which were prevalent in capitalist societies of the time. As pointed out by Armstrong, (2006), even though political and civil rights suggested by Marshall (1964) may aim to resolve political conflicts in liberal capitalist societies, the presence of massive economic inequalities has undermined the achievement of citizenship. In another word, there is a need to address economic inequalities, and at least, to reduce the social and political resentment caused (Armstrong, 2006; Barbalet, 1994). In this sense, the promotion of social citizenship is closely related to, and to a considerable extent, developed to address social inequalities caused primarily by the unequal distribution of wealth. Besides economic inequalities, equal citizenship is also brought to attention by the fact that even civil and political rights of some minority groups have often been deprived, given that in general they are supposed to be protected. Notable questions include equal citizenship of women and sexual minorities (Lister, 2003) and of the paid migrant workers in Europe (Gullikstad, Kristensen & Ringrose, 2016). The concern of equal citizenship among youth activists in Hong Kong, whether they subscribed to the belief of resilient acts or reinventing acts, therefore, is genuinely vivid. Basically, resilient and reinventing actors both concern about the problem of poverty and massive inequalities of wealth in Hong Kong, which is largely a result as well as a legacy of free and unregulated economy supported by government social policy (Goodstadt, 2013). As a result, poor people are under tremendous pressure to sustain a reasonable quality of life. Massive economic inequalities may also undermine poor people's social and political participation. It is because in an unequal society such as Hong Kong where earning for a

living has become a top priority if not the only concern of many poor and impoverished people, political as well civic citizenship would either be seen as less important, or simply be denied. In a nutshell, equality of citizenship contended by activists who subscribed to resilient and reinventing acts concerns primarily about the problem of massive economic inequalities in Hong Kong which leads to the denial of civic and political participation of the poor and economically disadvantaged people. It concerns also with social policy in Hong Kong which reproduces the status quo, which in the end, denies social citizenship of people of Hong Kong.

Unlike universal citizenship, autonomous citizenship argues that citizenship and social and political rights can hardly be protected by the state. This, as perceived by some of the youth activists (e.g. Gina, Nikki and Lok), is true both theoretically and practically because it coincides with their own experience in Hong Kong. As a result, they hold the view that being autonomous in community life is much more important for exercising citizenship. Therefore, striving for political citizenship is a means to protect personal autonomy in everyday community life. Autonomy reflects the agency of people and that people are able to have a say over their own community and personal life. Therefore, they believe in community self-help and consider that this is the best way to protect social citizenship. As discussed in Chapter 7, these young activists believe that it is hopeless to wait for institutional changes to bring about improvements in citizen rights and protection of them. A more effective approach is to promote innovativeness, autonomy and individual agency and live in a way that is less dependent on the capitalist free market. According to these youth activists, the importance of doing so is to develop a reflexive

project of the self (Giddens, 1991; Manning, 2012). Due to their apprehension towards the government, this group of youth activists do not want to rely on the government to protect citizens, and some of them even consider government measures as strategies that pacify discontent (e.g. Gina and Kit). Once there is dependence on the government, there will no longer be individual agency for self-help and autonomy.

Paradoxically, youth activists who believe in autonomous citizenship share the same belief as the universalists in that capitalism is the root cause of injustices, and also results in unequal distribution of citizenship. This is because capitalism and the spirit of consumerism are deeply embedded into all aspects of everyday life. They dominate social relations and occupy all possible space for developing alternative social relationships in the community. To counter capitalism, the youth activists promote the exercise of citizenship in everyday life by practicing alternative social relationships in their own community (see Chapter 7). The aim is to enhance the sense of personal autonomy, self-provision and self-help capacity of the community so as to resist the political and cultural factors that underlie the mainstream construction of citizenship which is heavily influenced by capitalist rationale.

Depth (civil participation): Atomistic, universal and involvement

As discussed in Chapters 5 to 7, the emphasis of the citizenship practices reflected in the three different acts of citizenship tends to move from the collective (stressing the importance of organisation and collective actions) to more atomistic (stressing the

importance of solo and self-directed actions) and the connective (stressing the importance of connecting individuals and collectivity). This shows the multiple expressions of citizenship through social movement participation. The diverse development of social movement participation and citizenship expression can be seen as the result of changes in value where more youth activists subscribe to the ideology of new social movements partly due to the loss of trust towards the existing institutions (Cheng, 2016; Ma, 2011).

First, the findings of this study also show that youth activists tend to reject hierarchical, top-down and centralised types of organisation in social movements, and have developed a new style of protesting that stresses more on decentralization and loose networks and minimal organisation. As discussed in Chapter 5, responsive acts of citizenship mobilise ordinary citizens to become warriors, who use valiant actions to protect the Hong Kong identity and safeguard the interests of Hong Kong people. Thus, valiant struggles are an individual expression of citizenship in which every activist is a free actor who is only accountable to him/herself. Valiant actors do not need ideological or emotional interflow, and their actions are not bound by collective beliefs and shared responsibilities. They are only bonded by common enemies. In the end, solo actions are somewhat likened to consumer behaviour that is based entirely on personal interest and free choice. Actors can terminate their actions at any time and resume their ordinary life when they are no longer interested or the conditions are no longer supportive of their actions (Bauman, 2000).

Likewise, reinvented acts of citizenship also emphasise individual actions in everyday life, believing in the power of practice in advancing social changes. As discussed in Chapter 7, these acts of citizenship emphasise the use or realization of agency, autonomy and creativity of the individual actors, but at the same time, do not deny the collectivity of citizenship. However, unlike traditional social movements which stress the importance of consolidated and intense organisation, reinvented acts underline the connectivity of different individual agents to build autonomous connected networks in community life. A typical example, as Gina mentioned, is the experience of the Mapopo Farm in the New Territories located some distance away from the urban cosmopolitan landscape of Hong Kong, where the community members have shown the possibility of leading a different way of life in the midst of mainstream orthodox citizenship, by building alternative economic and community networks (see Chapter 7). It can be seen, therefore, that reinvented acts of citizenship emphasise the positive side of individuals as a change agent – such a practice does not see agency and structure as two binary opposites but makes the most of the permeable divide between public and private spheres and attempts to bring about macro-political transformation through micro-politics (Manning, 2012; Micheletti, Stolle,& Berlin, 2012; Stolle & Hooghe, 2011).

Undoubtedly, social movements which highlight individual agency and decentralise the organisation of movements have engendered diversity in social campaigns and social actions, such as pursuing "lifestyle politics" (Bennett, 2013; Giddens, 1991; Manning, 2012; Micheletti et al., 2012). In the course of these social movements, initiative, creativity and new possibilities are encouraged and promoted. Nevertheless, some of the other more experienced youth activists are also worried that such changes may create a

deeper and further divide between different social movement groups in advocating for Hong Kong citizenship. As pointed out in Chapter 6, youth activists (e.g. Eddie, Kit) who embrace universal citizenship often disagree on solo actions because of their disconnection with reality, the conflict they are likely to create among social movement groups, and the failure of this approach to unite different groups to defy the mainstream orthodox notion of citizenship defined by the Chinese communist government and the HKSAR government. Thus, the youth activists (e.g. Olivia, Iris, Eddie, Man, Alan) who support universal citizenship consider that strengthening civic participation and building collectivity in a civil society to be of core importance.

Possibilities and Ambiguities in Understanding Citizenship

The discussion above explains the different understandings of citizenship in terms of its extent, content as well as depth as conceived by the different youth activists. It is shown that there are a variety of meanings of citizenship and the ways in which it is achieved rather than a singular and consensual entity. It is important to note that the different perspectives of citizenship are produced by participation in social movements, which is, nevertheless, fluid and individualised experiences. In other words, there is no single and commonly defined experience in citizenship movements, nor a single interpretation of the experiences in different social movements. Many of the youth activists interpret their social movement experiences differently at different stages of their participation (such as Olivia, Fong, and James), and some have changed how they perceive citizenship during the different stages of participation (e.g. Nikki, James, Dick,

and Man). In stressing the differences in understanding citizenship, it is interesting to note that some of the youth activists (e.g. Kit, Man) have incorporated different citizenship practices, and different acts of citizenship are applied and used. So, citizenship that is perceived differently and different acts of citizenship should not be viewed as counterproductive, as sometimes they are mutually complementary and produce new meanings and visions. A typical example is the experience of Kit who was an organizer but at the same time a reinventing actor who promoted autonomy of the community. Apart from non-compliance if not resistance to capitalist consumption in Hong Kong in her own personal practices, she has also attempted to identify common concerns in the community and organise residents for actions to promote change.

On the contrary, however, citizenship acts based on heightened and intense emotions, e.g. valiant struggles and confrontations, may produce disjointed and conflicting views of citizenship, thus rendering a citizenship movements unsustainable. James offered a typical example. He originally supported universal philanthropism (大愛), but went against his own beliefs to bar new migrants due to the increase in tension between China and Hong Kong. Another example is Dick who completely changed his political stance and approach to political participation because he was angered by the democratic camp who turned their back on the "Fish Ball Movement" activists. These acts of emotionally-led citizenship do not offer a logical rationale for how citizenship is perceived on the one hand, and have brought about a deep sense of disorientation when considering future political activities. This point is well illustrated by James who became

an activist by taking part in social movements yet lacked the opportunity and space to (re)consider the meaning of citizenship means and the goal of his actions:

> *I felt rather lost during the past two years. Life seemed to be so messy. I have no time to consider this issue (meaning of citizenship). There is no doubt that I helped to increase participation in political activities, but I have not thought much about what citizenship means. Maybe I don't see the importance and I thought that it was fine if I just did my best as a citizen. (James).*

In circumstances where actions are emotionally-driven and there is little space for reflection, actions to realise citizenship might not be able to encourage more awareness and a better understanding of citizenship.

Based on the above discussion, the youth activists in this study to a certain extent have been able to transcend the boundaries of mainstream orthodox citizenship, and construct alternative meanings of being Hong Kong citizens. Yet whether this can be considered as a symbol to encourage revolutionary enough to encourage more activist citizenship movements as suggested by Isin (2008, 2009), expand the parameters of citizenship, answerable to justice and inspire more activist citizens remain questionable. Here, the ambiguity echoes the discussion in Chapter 2 in which the three principles of activist citizenship proposed by Isin (2008,2009) are adopted as an important consideration of activist citizenship claims. To briefly reiterate here, the first principle is to consider whether the acts of citizenship can "break routines, understandings and practices" under the dominant constructed citizenship, and whether the acts break laws based on "performance and disturbance" (Isin, 2009, p. 379). So, the key is not whether

the youth activists in Hong Kong have engaged in citizenship movements, because the engagement follows a written script and requires participation in scenarios that are already created. Instead, the focus should be on whether youth activists in Hong Kong have been able to disrupt the status quo and definitions of Hong Kong citizenship. In this light, first, we have to examine the extent that experience with activism and the related acts of citizenship are able to disrupt and unravel the dominant constructed account of Hong Kong citizenship. For example, their acts have served to deconstruct, or at least discredit to some extent the fixed and dominant identity of Hong Kong people as Chinese.

Second, in terms of answerability to justice, the concern here is whether the citizenship acts performed by the youth activists in Hong Kong have encompassed "enduring and convincing arguments for Justice" (Nielsen, 2008, p. 268). The specific concern here is that in the advocacy work to realise a Hong Kong identity, it is easy to advocate for sectoral justice rather than the "common good" for all Hong Kong people. Consequently, it is important not only to disrupt the fixed and dominant meanings of citizenship in Hong Kong, but also promote a fair process that can distribute and protect justice for all Hong Kong people. In view of the youth activist movement in Hong Kong, it is thus imperative to critically examine whether the acts performed contain enduring and convincing arguments around justice.

Finally, we need to more critically examine whether the experience of youth activists in Hong Kong have been able to shape different kinds of political actors, in other words, "activist citizens", who are willing to challenge and break laws and transcend

boundaries that are established by mainstream orthodox citizenship. In light of this, we need to critically examine whether the experience of youth activists has sufficient credibility to transform them into activist citizens who can transcend the limitations and constraints of the dominant status of citizenship and its affiliated meanings.

Youth Activism and Limitations of Market-Oriented Citizenship

It is argued that there are limitations of youth activism in Hong Kong, and as a result, reduced the likelihood of achieving activist citizenship. Per the activist citizenship of Isin (2008, 2009), the limitations are caused by three different factors as follows. First, there is the lack of critical reflection around economic globalization and its negative effects on citizenship. Second, the ideas for citizenship have lacked concrete and substantial contents. Finally, individuals take responsibility for citizenship practices and bear the risks on their own. All of these limitations may lead to speculative citizenship which lacks substantive content and fails to challenge the mainstream construction of citizenship on the one hand and are likely to produce structural risks that are beyond the coping capacity of individuals on the other hand.

Extent: Lack of critical reflection around economic globalization.

The extent to which acts of citizenship can establish a new notion of citizenship is very much determined by the ability to challenge mainstream, and to some extent orthodox, conceptions of citizenship. Although it is found in this study that youth activism

allow new exploration of local identity, nevertheless, it falls short of effectively disrupting the market-oriented notion of citizenship which has been prevalent in Hong Kong. This point is well supported by three interrelated observations. First, these experiences of activism aimed to defend market-oriented citizenship. Secondly, they were built on anti-China sentiments to prevent Chinese authoritarianism from affecting the market-oriented citizenship of Hong Kong. Nevertheless, acts of citizenship primarily built on any "anti-ism" may fall short in establishing alternative versions of citizenship. Thirdly, aside from all of these, and along with the increasing resistance against China, the localists who devote themselves to responsive acts have advanced a sense of citizenship that excludes the mainland Chinese and preserves market-oriented freedom which has long been upheld in Hong Kong since the colonial era. Arguably, this brand of activism of localist youths has failed to disrupt the dominant neoliberal free-market ideology in Hong Kong, and it has not succeeded in challenging the domination of economic globalisation which has been increasingly eroding citizenship, both local and global. Rather, the activism of localist youths has reproduced a neo-liberal perspective of a narrow and exclusionary definition of citizenship (Chen & Szeto, 2015; Hui & Lau, 2015; Wong & Wan, 2018).

Defending market-oriented citizenship.

As discussed in the first part of this chapter, the idea of "nation building" and "independence" initiated by anti-China "nativists" appeared to have produced ground breaking imagined extent of citizenship; nevertheless, these claims have not, in real terms, disrupted the domination of the Chinese central government, but have only served to

protect and reproduce market-oriented citizenship. As suggested by some of the respondents (e.g. Dick, Billy), advocating for independence and nation building is just a radical response against the unyielding Chinese authorities (see Chapter 5). By resisting China in both discursive and action terms, the scale of citizenship seems to increase. Nevertheless, this does not imply a newly imagined citizenship based on a strong love for Hong Kong. Rather it is more like a strategy that preserves the freedoms of Hong Kong people by preserving the free market. So, as discussed in Chapter 5, in spite of advocating for democracy, the "nativists" do not embrace universal human rights for all (e.g. Billy, Pinky, and Man). They are opposed to Hong Kong people who support the democracy movement in China, which they consider to be a matter of another country (Hui & Lau, 2015; Veg, 2017). Underlying this belief is the assumption of a citizenship that is exceedingly inward looking and the postulation that citizenship can be completely immune from economic globalisation (i.e. inequality, the erosion of citizenship). In short, the "antis" citizenship constructs may not achieve anything more than creating a narrow-minded, inward looking and exclusionary type of citizenship in Hong Kong which serves only to protect the freedom of the markets.

"Anti-isms".

As I argued in Chapter 5, the kind of localism that advocates for exclusion is one that is established by defining enemies and excluding and eliminating others. In other words, this kind of localism is defined by "anti-isms": anti-China, anti-pro-China camps and anti-leftist social movements (Chen & Szeto, 2015; Hui & Lau, 2015; Kaeding, 2017;

Veg, 2017). The strong oppression and centralized power of China result in increasingly stronger counterforces against authoritarian measures and exclusionary practices (Chan, 2016; Cheng, 2014b; Kaeding, 2017; Ma & Cheng, 2019). The result is likely to gain the support of more youth activists to test the threshold of the tolerance of the Hong Kong and Chinese governments. This has become almost an inevitable pattern during the UM and in the aftermath of the movement. This is well evidenced by the changing attitudes of some of the respondents (such as Fong, James and Dick) who began to support valiant confrontations and feel empathy towards the exclusionary acts of the localists who vetoed the idea of including the Mainland Chinese as part of the Hong Kong citizen body. To a considerable extent, their experience reflects the belief that quite a number of youth activists are motivated by the spirit of "anti-ism". This can be illustrated by Billy, James, Dick, Fong and Pinky, who all echoed that the citizenship of Hong Kong is being seriously threatened by an external force (which implicitly refers to the Chinese authoritarian regime). They suggested that it is now critical and urgent that the citizens of Hong Kong unite together to resist the external intrusion, and supporting universal human rights is, therefore, of less if not the least importance. Apart from establishing the identity of Hong Kongers by showing discursive and action-oriented resistance against China and its allies, this logic also antagonises the left wing youth activists and marginalises them in the social movement community. Moreover, all of those who had supported peaceful, rational and non-violent actions as well as those who supported autonomous life practices which are less confrontational were accused as traitors who had to leave the social movement community. A typical example of the actions of localists who advocate for exclusion was the aversion against the unofficial alliance of the UM organisers or the pro-democracy

groups. There were calls to purge the "central platform"; that is, the fundamental political stance of the organisers that emphasised universal suffrage. This act symbolised the rejection of the traditional social movements and setback to the culture and community life in the occupied territory (Lin & Liu, 2016).

After the UM, there was increasingly more popular support for the "nativists" amongst the post-secondary student unions who rejected the traditional social movement strategies of the pan-democratic camp (Hui & Lau, 2015; Veg, 2017). In the elections for Legislative members, the localists who held a radical stance against China and advocated the exclusion of outsiders (mainland Chinese) received strong support from young voters and have seemingly transformed into a significant political force alongside the pan-democratic camp (Kaeding, 2017; Kwong, 2016; Ma, 2017b). Under such circumstances, as Wong and Wan (2018) observed, reflection about social inequalities appeared to have declined in importance, and "left-wing localism was gradually eclipsed by right-wing localism" (Wong & Wan, 2018). Hence, it is not difficult to understand why youth activist groups started to show fragmentation, and also explains why youth activism is now more inward looking, populist and exclusionary. Thus, it is an anticipated consequence that anti-colonial perspectives and practices of citizenship that advocate for universal rights and social inclusion would further be marginalised (Wong & Wan 2018; Chen & Szeto, 2015). I shall critically discuss the process and consequences of this issue in the next chapter.

***Practicing exclusio*n.**

Inwardness and exclusiveness are closely related factors of market-oriented citizenship although they appear different. In order to justify exclusion, as discussed in Chapter 5, the "nativists" show Hong Kong and China as polar opposites and naively attribute the local social and political burdens to the intrusion of China (the external force). For example, the suppression of a Hong Kong identity is considered to be the result of the political oppression of the Chinese government. The increased burden on the welfare system in Hong Kong is the result of new immigrants from China who abuse or use the social system. Negative effects on the everyday life of those who live in the New Territories are due to the increasing number of traders from China who stockpile goods that are purchased in the New Territories area (because it is in proximity to the Chinese-Hong Kong border and therefore convenient to cross) and sell them across the border. Finally, the social and political conflicts in Hong Kong are the result of the integration of China and Hong Kong. This approach to constructing citizenship and the discourse offered afterwards may validate the impressions of the public on certain issues. However, as discussed, it also encourages at the same time the disregard of unequal resource distribution and the social disadvantages suffered by ordinary people for many years under the market-dominated economy in Hong Kong. Worse, such a discourse has allowed there to be a direct correlation between the inequalities and sufferings of Hong Kong people and the intrusion of China, so that the public may see inwardness as a form of self-protection and exclusion (of the mainland Chinese) as resistance against intrusion, and both are indispensable (Hui & Lau, 2015). However, this correlation does not appear to be sufficient, but has appeared to some as a received belief. That said, it must be pointed

out here that a construct of citizenship based on exclusion of outsiders (mainland Chinese) is one that reproduces the status quo. In other words, this reproduces the distribution of citizenship according to market principles – only local people who have contributed to the economy are recognised as citizens, and only they deserve citizen rights and welfare. On the contrary, mainland Chinese and to some extent new immigrants are positioned in the polar opposite – they are defined as the "others" and must be excluded from receiving any citizen rights and welfare (Kaeding, 2017; Hui & Lau, 2015). As argued by Law (2015), this notion of Hong Kong citizenship is both virtual and surreal, and has fallen short of a consistent and substantial definition. Yet it is also the lack of concreteness that offers room for people to apply whatever contents desired, through which people enjoy the excitement of this populist rhetoric and transfer their anger and frustration towards the mainland Chinese and "others" who are portrayed to be invaders and forcing them out (Law, 2015). Viewed from this perspective, the exclusionary acts of "nativists" are subject to be incorporated into the hegemonic project of neoliberalism (Harvey, 2007). These acts serve to strengthen and perpetuate the ideology of market capitalism on the one hand, and on the other hand, shifts public discontent of the government by scapegoating new immigrants and mainland Chinese.

Content: Vague and fragmented.

Youth activism has undoubtedly encouraged more activists to advocate for political citizenship. However, the question that remains is whether these efforts are enough to counteract the injustices sustained by the mainstream orthodox notion of citizenship. In

Neilson (2008), acts of citizenship must be answerable to justice. To achieve this, acts of citizenship must have "enduring and convincing arguments for justice" (Neilson, 2008, pp. 268-269). Moreover, this is a continuous process where different groups participate in mutually convincing and persuading each another in the pursuit of common grounds. In addition, acts of citizenship must be built on a process where civic participation can be guaranteed in order to be answerable to justice, and achieved through commitment to democratic practices. Thus, citizenship contents that are answerable to justice need to do more than awaken political consciousness and advocate for political rights so as to arrive at a circumstance where social rights are also recognised and protected. In other words, there must be advocacy for social citizenship aside from political citizenship (Faulks, 2000; Lister, 1997a, 1998; Roche, 1992). However, as shown in this study, youth activism in Hong Kong in general and resistant and valiant acts in particular tend to downplay the importance of social citizenship and deny its essentiality in citizenship building. This problem is reflected through two aspects: First, it is the emphasis, if not exaggeration, on the sole importance of political citizenship and simultaneously the devaluation of social citizenship. Secondly, it is the emphasis on individual responsibility and downplaying the importance of the institutional protection of social rights. This fragmentation inevitably leads to the construction of a citizenship in Hong Kong that is likely not answerable to justice.

Devaluation of social and cultural citizenship.

One of the problems among the youth activists in constructing citizenship is their serious devaluation of social citizenship. Arguably, this is both a product and an extension of the free market ideology in Hong Kong where social inequality is regarded as legitimate (Wilding, 2015) and individual responsibility in welfare production is held in the highest regard (Chan, 2009; Wong & Chiu, 2005). This focus on the individual rather than the collective in terms of welfare is somewhat reproduced in youth activism and thus results in a construction of citizenship that balances the inequality of citizen statuses and disregards social rights. The devaluation of social citizenship is multifaceted. First, acts of citizenship among the localists (or nativists) which target to exclude new immigrants and mainland Chinese help to perpetuate social division and social inequalities based on ethnic origins (division between local Hong Kongers and the Mainland Chinese). This has ignored the specific social circumstances that Hong Kong has been a hybrid society where Hong Kongers have historically come from diverse backgrounds (Law, 2015). However, while localist activism supports the prevalent welfare ideology of Hong Kong which subscribes to self-reliance and residual welfare, social citizenship is indirectly being devalued and minimised (see Chapter 5).

Moreover, it is important to point out that the politics of exclusion practiced by the localists targets not only the mainland Chinese but also people whose way of life does not, according to their definition, comply with the "values of Hong Kong people", including people who hold a different political stance (So, 2017; Veg, 2017). At the same time, as discussed in Chapter 5, the exclusion is also one that is against age as much as against class, since older people and the poor are often blamed for their part in damaging

the image of Hong Kong because of their dependency on public welfare. Interestingly, the rationale behind such an exclusion is to defend the values of Hong Kong which are created by the spirit of free market capitalism, competition and self-responsibility. Guided by this belief, some respondents particularly the localists (e.g. Pinky and Billy) do not support the welfare entitlements of the impoverished and elderly, and they reject caring as a citizen obligation. An example of this was given by Pinky, who suggested that older people are often politically conservative and protect the status quo and the establishment. She therefore labeled older people as "obstacles to the progress of Hong Kong" particularly in view that they are easily subjected to the manipulation of pro-China organisations and politicians in terms of delivering tangible benefits to them in return for their vote of their desired pro-China candidates at both the district and legislature levels (Cheng, 2014a). It can be therefore argued that such youth activism engrained with a strong sense of social and political exclusion cannot motivate young people to fight against the structural inequalities in Hong Kong. Rather, it would more likely aggravate social division and strengthen inequalities.

Another aspect of the devaluation of social citizenship can also be found in the reproduction of gender stereotypes in social movement groups. As discussed in Chapter 2, citizenship is a male-oriented and gender blind conception (Leung, 2004; Lister, 2007b). This is also in the youth activism, which shapes how youth activists conceive citizenship. For example, some youth activists consider male leadership in social movements as a matter of course, while some others consider the traditional gender division of labour as natural and reasonable. For example, Dick, Fong and Pinky felt that female should have

supportive roles in street protests where physical confrontations are found because they lack the physique necessary for valiant struggles. By the same logic, males often assume leadership roles and regarded as natural leaders in social movements. While this belief parallels common sense, it nonetheless strengthens and reproduces the superior status of men and the subordinate status of women in society. The gender stereotyping and the attached inequalities reflect the unawareness of youth activists about the covert and hidden aspects of social domination in society. This is undoubtedly a serious shortcoming in the pursuit of citizenship in Hong Kong, as youth activists are found to fall short of an imagined citizenship with social equality as an essential ingredient.

In spite of the fact that youth activism has answered the plea for political citizenship, the inadequacy of social citizenship (including the enjoyment of cultural rights) has nevertheless reduced the possibility of furthering democracy because of its failure to address justice. As pointed out by Iris, youth activism is not purely advocating for democracy. Rather, it is the demand for "a fairer and just society". According to Iris, even if universal suffrage is achieved but without altruism, democracy would not work. Iris therefore suggested that "social justice must underlie democracy or else things will be terrible for society". Besides, as discussed in Chapter 7, supporters of autonomous citizenship acts such as Lok and Gina feel that the mainstream orthodox notion of citizenship simply equates economic developmentalism. According to these activists, the problem is that even the leaders of the democratic camp and social movements are not aware of the importance of ecological concerns and the issue of sustainability. This is especially the case in recent years where democratic movements that champion for

political rights such as universal suffrage have become the direction of social movements. Under this situation, other social agendas such as preserving the environment, urban sustainability, animal rights (Lok, Gina), and livelihood concerns of the grassroots (Eddie, Iris) have become marginalised, and youth activists who campaign for these issues now constitute as the minority (see Chapters 7 and 8).

Over-emphasis on self-reliance.

Another weakness of youth activism is its neglect of the importance of establishing a fair process where status, power and resources are fairly distributed and redistributed (Lister, 1997a; Roche, 1992). This is the very essence of pursuing a citizenship that answers to justice (Nielsen, 2008). In the process, the role of the state in formulating and implementing social policies which ensure a fair distribution of social resources, including social status, rights and privileges, should not be neglected. This does not suggest that individual agency is not important in exercising citizen rights and fulfilling citizen obligations in everyday life, but there is also an important institutional role that ensures justice, without which people in disadvantaged positions cannot enjoy equal social and political citizenship (Faulk, 2000; Ku 2009). Unfortunately, some of the youth activists especially the localists appear to downplay the importance of the state in rectifying social inequalities through social policies and institutional social provisions (e.g. Hong, James, and Billy, see also Chapter 5). Based on this argument, there is a prevalent belief among these youth activists that personal effort is the key to success, and the implication is that structural deprivation is more a personal deficiency rather than the

result of social inequalities. This group of activists believe that the role of the government is to ensure smooth operation of the free market. With free competition, opportunities for upward mobility will take place without government intervention. This belief of the localists is simply a reproduction of the social policy ideology of the Hong Kong government who supports the neo-liberal principle of a "big market, small government"(Cheung, 2009). However, the problem is that income inequalities have increased under such a policy and the poor are now even more poor and deprived (Goodstadt, 2013; Wong & Chu, 2017). Downplaying the role of institutional welfare and devaluing the importance of the government does not help to develop equal citizenship.

On the other hand, youth activists who support an autonomous community life, or the reinventing actors in this study, also downplay the importance of the government in safeguarding equal citizenship. As shared by the respondents (such as Nikki and Kit), citizenship, including a set of rights and welfare provisions, is but a tool of governance because it eliminates autonomy, self-help capacity as well as the individual agency of citizens. They argued that citizenship is not a status or a set of privileges granted by the state, but rather a relationship that is practiced and realised through self-help as well as community-initiated mutual help in everyday community life. When the state intervenes in community life and replaces self-initiated community networks with formal state provisions, the autonomy of the community will be lost, and realisation of citizenship will be dependent on the state. As discussed in the previous chapter, the significance of reinvented acts of citizenship is to realise citizenship in everyday community life without interference from the government. However, whether this is an sustainable and

convincing argument for justice is questionable because, as argued in Chapter 2, in a society like Hong Kong where free market ideology is dominant and self-reliance is heavily stressed, self-help in the community would easily become a third party strategy to ignore institutional injustices and the disadvantages of those who are powerless. In the end, self-help in the community might be used by the government to justify reduce welfare provisions and evade its responsibilities (Lister, 1998). As argued by Roche (1992), one of the catastrophes of the New Right is its emphasis on social duties to be against rights and the extension of social duties into non-state and civil society spheres that were uncolonized.

In a nutshell, youth activism that promotes self-help and self-autonomy in community life demonstrate individual agency in constructing autonomous citizenship. Yet, it fails to address the structural inequalities that perpetuate inequality of citizenship and falls short of demanding institutional changes. This problem reflects the extent to which youth activism is subtly constrained by the mainstream orthodox notion of citizenship dominated by the capitalist free market ideology in Hong Kong. It also reflects the weaknesses of deinstitutionalization in bringing about a type of citizenship that answers to justice. The process of citizenship building, by the same logic, is also not able to provide convincing and lasting contents which are shared by different groups in the community (Nielsen, 2008). As a result, it may lead to a speculative citizenship which is vague in content and almost impossible to realise.

Depth: Atomisation of citizenship expression and practices.

The third constraint of youth exploration of citizenship is atomisation of citizenship practices in social movements. Despite the emergence of different actors, such as valiant warriors, organisers, and modern ascetics, and despite the development of different acts, sites and scale of citizenship, not all youth activists and not all youth actors are activist citizens who question or even challenge the mainstream definition of citizenship and develop a new perspective towards being a Hong Kong citizen. Instead, many of them are purely active citizens who are defined by the mainstream orthodox script of citizenship and perform their duty as expected. The main difference between activist citizens and active citizens according to Isin (2009) is that the former is basically those who can transcend through the boundaries of a given definition of citizenship through reflexivity, and the latter are primarily those who act within the boundaries of the script (see Chapter 2). To put it simply, the former is the "creator" and the latter, the "doer" (Isin, 2009, p. 39). Along this perspective, it is argued that the solo acts in social movements, such as the valiant confrontations on the streets, not only have risks and uncertainties at the individual level, but also limit the possibilities for reflexive practice that can reduce structural constraint sand create new citizenship meanings.

Atomised social movements participation and individualised risk.

As discussed at the beginning of this chapter, atomisation in social movements gave youth activists more flexibility and freedom during protesting. However, at the same time, there were more uncertainties and risks. An obvious example is the valiant confrontations

during the UM and the so-called “fish ball movement”. While valiant actors are more mobile and their confrontation strategies are more adaptable to changing situations in the street, they were at the same time vulnerable and susceptible to risks. This is evidenced by the experience of respondents like Fong, James and Iris who were injured during their valiant confrontations and became traumatised. Moreover, the youth activists suffered a serious setback in the aftermath of the UM when the HKSAR government, and allegedly the Chinese communist party, used legal prosecution as a measure to sanction valiant struggles and made confrontations on the streets more risky, costly and unsustainable (Yuen & Cheng, 2017)

Under these circumstances, atomised actions of individual actors can hardly be transformed into sustainable political forces which are necessary for initiating social and political changes. After the UM, valiant confrontations have been banned and fierce struggles on the streets turned into resilience in the legislature (Kaeding, 2017; Yuen & Cheng, 2017). The ardent that was attached to valiant confrontations inevitably faded and the movement gradually lost its allure and popularity. As a result, some of the activists such as Dick and Hong felt defeated and a loss in direction. This scenario is common, but somewhat reflects that valiant actors are only situational or conditional agents whose agency and subjectivity depend very much on situations beyond their own control. When conditions for valiant confrontations are no longer present, the valiant actors (such as Hong and Dick) would likely lose their site of performance until the next trigger arises. Thus, this kind of solo action may escalate and even peak at a certain point in time but quickly diminish due to the lack of organisation and resources. Ma and Cheng (2019)

characterised the solo actions during the UM as an eruption of energy in one moment of time. Based on the argument in Breaugh (2013), Ma and Cheng (2019) suggested that this is an unrefined deed which would eventually lose momentum and scatter in different corners of civil society. Due to the lack of organisation and a blue print for action, solo actions can only be defensive resistance that might be repeated at different times.

Challenge to reflexive practice.

Reflexivity is an essential ingredient in the discussion of structure and agency in the fabric of society. It is no less an important guiding principle in the discussion of modern self-identity (Giddens, 1991). For example, Giddens and Pierson (1998) noted that constitutive reflexivity is possible in any social system:

> "....reflexivity refers to a world increasingly constituted by information rather than pre-modern modes of conduct. It is how we live after the retreat of tradition and nature, because of having to take so many forward-orientated decisions" (Giddens & Pierson, p. 115)

Giddens (1991) added to this argument with his "reflexive modernity", where the central argument is that society is becoming increasingly more self-aware, reflective, and hence reflexive over time. Generally speaking, accordingly, youth activism in Hong Kong reflects the new notions of Hong Kong citizenship which are found in various modes and have different degrees of reflexive practice. Compared to responsive acts which are characterised as solo acts, reinvented acts of citizenship appear to have more space for reflexive practice and thus tend to be more sustainable. This is partly because the site for

practicing citizenship for reinventing actors is not the street corners where valiant struggles are found. Rather, it is everyday practice in ordinarily community life where confrontation with the authority seems less conspicuous. Here the actors used reinvented acts to harmonise social movements and everyday life practices and make it a personal reflexive project (Manning, 2012). Different attempts were planned and undertaken by the youth activists in practicing their perceived citizenship under existing structural constraints. For example, Gina was planning to build her own farmhouse and cultivating farmland. Lok is also planning to pursue a PhD so as to maintain livelihood by obtaining a college/university teaching/research post while at the same time furthering local agriculture. All of these can be seen as attempts of youth activists in harmonising social movements and everyday life practices, in which the ideal and reality are prudently negotiated so as to increase more space for alternative citizenship meanings. Besides reinventing actors, resilient actors who promote connectivity of civil society organizations are also against solo actions in social movements. As discussed in previous chapters, resilient actors promote universal citizenship, but they see the importance of different groups having a dialogue which would transcend individual boundaries and develop an embracive conception of citizenship. These "projects", according to Giddens (1991, p.243), involve “the strategic adoption of lifestyle options, organised in terms of the individual's projected lifespan”.

However, notwithstanding the above possibility of personal reflexive practices in everyday life in the community, it must be noted that there are structural constraints which reduce reflexive practices in personal life (Adams, 2006; Lash, 1994). As discussed in

Chapter 2, the fragmented transition and precarious situation of young people become obstacles to the continuation of participation in social movements and the exploration of citizenship. For example, material resources for sustainable actions and personal practices are lacking in many circumstances. This study also reveals some of the youth activists (e.g. Alan, Dick, Eddie, Pinky) are also facing precarity in their own employment, thus resulting in financial instability in their own life as well as that of their family. Furthermore, youth activists (e.g. Kit, Ginna, Lok, Nikki) who subscribe to an alternative lifestyle are usually engaged in work that offers a relatively low and unstable income. The few who can afford active involvement on an ongoing basis are in more favourable circumstances, such as having a higher education background, more support from family and friends, or fewer burdens to shoulder. However, when personal circumstances change, for example in Lok's case in which child rearing becomes a responsibility, and in Kit's case where caring of older parents becomes necessary, active involvement may have to be interrupted (see Chapters 6 and 7).

Conclusion

In summary, this chapter establishes the relationship between the experience of youth activists in social movements and how they conceive citizenship. Based on the findings, the constraints of youth activism in forming activist citizenship is critically discussed. It is undeniable that youth-led social movements have promoted the understanding and pursuit of citizenship of young people. Different social movement experiences have also opened up understandings of the youth actors on appreciating and

practicing citizenship and developing their own notion of citizenship in relation to others and evolving personal and socio-political circumstances. Besides, the above discussion also elucidates the constraints of youth activism in exploring and advancing citizenship in Hong Kong. It is pointed out that these constraints have reduced the possibility for reflexivity and reflexive citizenship practice, and have directed the pursuit of citizenship, which is active and diverse, towards a narrow path of exclusion, downgrading social citizenship, and lack of sustainability and reflexivity. It is argued, therefore, that these constraints may likely reduce the possibility of youth activism to become a more promising activist citizen but rather towards a kind of speculative citizenship. In the next chapter, I shall critically discuss the process and consequences of this development.

Chapter 9

Evolution of Speculative and Activist Citizenship

Based on the discussion in Chapter 8, it can be argued that the evolution of citizenship in Hong Kong has had many possibilities as well as uncertainties. Youth activism promotes the development of activist citizenship (Isin, 2008, 2009) on the one hand, but also leads to speculative citizenship on the other hand. This chapter explores the complex nature of youth activism in Hong Kong, and its composition. Arguably, the emergence of youth activism as well as its possibilities and limitations have not been coincidental. Rather, youth activism reflects the interlocked negotiation process between youth activists as subjects of the struggle for citizenship and the authoritarian-neoliberal construct of citizenship. The analysis is divided into two parts. The first part provides a critical analysis of the composition of youth activism. It is argued that youth activism is the culmination of the frustration and discontent of young people, which have been compelled by the deeply rooted and longstanding systemic problems and institutional failure in Hong Kong. As far as youth citizenship is concerned, the problems reflect failure of a market-oriented citizenship which has created and reproduced distributive injustices. On the other hand, the failure of this type of citizenship is also related to the deficiency of a political citizenship which has deprived young people from political participation and decisions. In the second part of the chapter, the analysis focuses on the shift in youth activism from the culmination of their frustration to their inward collapse in civil society. I argue that it is the renationalisation project of the authoritarian regime

that increased the severity of internal conflicts and enhanced the estrangement between and among youth activist groups. Circumstantially, youth activism has shifted from having different directions to an exclusionary nature, and the direction of the citizenship movement is moving towards the development of speculative citizenship. However, it is emphasised here that the trajectory of youth activism and citizenship pleas is still found to be dynamic and fluid. The interplay of different acts of citizenship continues to create space and possibilities for reflexive practices. New and alternative perspectives of citizenship and creative acts can still be found in the community, which serve to counter the development of speculative citizenship in Hong Kong.

Culmination of Crises with Market-Oriented Citizenship

Youth activism has substantially increased in recent years, which is a vivid manifestation of the culmination of the frustration and discontent of young people towards the failure of a market-oriented citizenship and deficiency of political citizenship in Hong Kong. In the following analysis, it is argued that the problem of distributive injustice which has resulted in massive disparity of wealth and the deficiency of political citizenship which has deprived young people from political participation have resulted in youth activism that demands citizenship and in particular, political rights.

Youth activism: Distributive injustice.

Arguably, the outcry against the injustices of resource distribution created and reproduced by a free market ideology which has dominated social policies and defined citizenship since the colonial era is manifested in youth activism. As argued in Chapter 3, Marshall's threefold typology of social citizenship is not applicable for understanding citizenship in Hong Kong. Compared to economic citizenship, political and social citizenships have always been neglected, and there was little demand for these two types of citizenship during the colonial era (Ku, 2009, see also Chapter 3). However, the expansion of neoliberalism and a radical free market economy based on deregulation and non-intervention is not sustainable (Kotz, 2015.). The return of sovereignty to China in 1997 impacted political stability, and global economic crises (the Asian financial crisis of 1998 and the global economic tsunami in 2007) challenged the government as economic growth in Hong Kong was under serious threat (Chan, 2009; Ku, 2009, see also Chapter 3). In addition, the role of Hong Kong as a bridge between China and the world has also been crippled after China became a member of the World Trade Organization. Not only has Hong Kong not been able to maintain its previously remarkable economic growth since its return to sovereignty, other problems such as higher unemployment rates, low wages, poverty, income disparity as well as an incompetent medical system and lack of a universal retirement pension plan all caused a strong sense of disillusion towards the free market and its associated citizenship model (Chan, 2009; Cheng, 2014b; Wong & Wan, 2018; Wong & Chu, 2017). The emergence and development of a local identity partly originated from the promise of "one country, two systems" which offered Hong Kong people the opportunity for self-governance also showed the limitations of a market-oriented citizenship that was premised upon a crumbling economic base (Ku, 2009; Chan,

2009). In summary, the dominance of a market-oriented citizenship over the social and political aspects of citizenship since colonial rule has been challenged by problems related to economic globalisation (Chan, 2009; Tse, 2007) and demands of localists for a new citizenship status (Ku, 2009, 2012; Ma, 2011). As Ku (2009, p.524) argued:

> [t]his strategy might have worked in the past, but in recent years, as politics become more complicated and civil society more diverse, new problems arose that appear to outrun the adequacy of this model.

In the face of these challenges, however, neither the HKSAR government nor the PRC government used social policies to alleviate the problems caused by the unequal distribution of resources, but rather, they continued to embrace neoliberalism and used state measures from the top-down to reinforce market-oriented citizenship. In line with the development of the market economy in China, there is an obvious amalgamation of the neoliberal free market economy and the authoritarian political regime. As pointed out by Harvey (2005), China is one of the neoliberal regimes in the world, which is characterised by "neoliberal elements interdigitated with authoritarian centralized control" (Harvey, 2005, P.120). In other words, market-oriented citizenship in Hong Kong has continued after the handover in 1997, but the element of Chinese nationalism or patriotism has been added which has transformed this citizenship into one that is state-led (Chan, 2009; Wong & Chiu, 2005).

If ever the distributive inequality increases in severity and frustrations of the public and their resentment of the massive social inequalities also increase (Chan, 2009; Cheng,

2014b; Ku, 2009), the result would be inevitably a citizenship crisis in which there would be questioning about the meaning of citizenship in Hong Kong mean (see also the discussion in Chapter 3). The culmination of increasing public discontent has finally broken out into social unrest and fierce confrontations, where, in particular, the explosion of youth-led social movements reflects the anger of young people towards the crises caused by economic globalisation and the severe inequality in resource distribution.

In Hong Kong, young people are victims of such inequality which compels them to advocate for a fair distribution of resources (Wong & Wan, 2018; Wong & Chu, 2017). Interestingly, however, the problem of social injustice and the corresponding social conflicts do not seem to have received the deserved attention in understanding youth activism. Some recent research work tend to approach social movement and the rise of localism with cultural explanations, for example, that youth social movements reflect post-materialistic values (Ma, 2011; Ng, 2013; Wong & Wan, 2009; Xia, 2016); the re-identification of "new public values" (Chen & Szeto, 2015); and the development of a local identity (Chen & Szeto, 2015; Kaeding, 2017; Kwong, 2016; Veg, 2017). All of these explanations have undoubtedly contributed to understanding the phenomenon of youth social movements, but the economic and material factors that underlie youth citizenship movements have yet to be discussed (Cheng, 2014b; Wong & Wan, 2018; Wong & Chu, 2017).

As argued in Chapter 3, young people often become victims of the free market economy. Many of them are being economically marginalised and struggling in short-

term, low-paid and unstable employment without real prospects for the future. Yet social policies have rarely addressed the issue of youth precarity, and the economic and social disadvantages of young people are also often overlooked (Wong & Wan, 2018; Wong& Au-Yeung, 2017). Youth activism is therefore a protest and a form of resistance against the unequal distribution of resources and, to a considerable extent, resistance against class oppression. As this study shows, precariousness is found in various aspects of the lives of the youth respondents, including education and employment. Some of the youth activists stated that they were subjected to a competitive but standardised system of education. They had to pay high tuition fees because of the privatisation of higher education, and when they graduated, they were burdened with massive debt (Alan, Iris, Fong, and Dick). As regards employment, they worked in low paying, long work hour jobs without stability or any welfare or protection. They were not respected and had little hope for upward mobility and did not have a sense of achievement (Fong, Dick, and Iris). They were socially described as the "moonlight group", which is a play on words in Chinese (moon refers to each month and light is a slang for all gone) and literally means that they have to spend every cent that they earn (their salary is all gone) and are penniless at the end of every month (Iris). Adding to these difficulties, high property prices are also an obstacle in striving for independence and having their own living space has become a far-fetched dream (Pinky, Iris, and Man). All of these circumstances prolong and fragment the transition from youth to adulthood (Flanagan, 2008; Furlong & Cartmel, 2007). Pinky stated that her life just seems to stand still, and she cannot imagine her future. Therefore, the precariousness of the youths is closely related to the problems created by neoliberal

social policies in Hong Kong where young people have little choice but to live life with uncertainty and insecurity.

Young people who face an uncertain future feel worried and lost (Standing, 2016). Some of them also feel frustrated about the present. This can be described as alienation in which young people feel powerless and helpless because they are leading a way of life that is beyond their control. Some of the youth activists simply conclude that they face problems that are a reflection of the intergenerational inequalities where social resources and governing principles are both monopolised by the previous generations. For example, Fong, Hong and Alan all pointed to the situations of inequality that young people are facing today in which they are disadvantaged and to some extent exploited due to lack of equal opportunity as well as unequal distribution of social resources. Moreover, their frustration is also increased as they perceive their life path has been designed by the previous generations, which is something that causes them angst. It is precisely for these reasons that they refuse to accept the governing principles and champion for changes:

> *The voices of young people are not being heard. All of the resources have been taken by those with an agenda. We can see the limitations in employment and the difficulties in buying a flat – it's only a dream that can't ever be realised for us. What young people need, therefore, is change. The reason why so many young people participate [in social movements] is that they have no way out under the current situation, but there could be hope if the status quo is overturned… (Hong, 152)*

In a broad sense, youth activism represents a kind of class struggle against the deprivations and exploitation brought about by the free capital market economy in Hong Kong. They may not struggle for purely material interests but also equal social and cultural rights to being a citizen. Hui and Lau (2015) argued that class consciousness and "conveying a message of class conflict" underlie all of the new so-called social movements which have been taking place in the recent decade. According to Hui and Lau (2015), class analyses should not be examine "purely material interests", rather "a revitalized class analysis should incorporate different identity politics" and "immaterial interests such as dignity and the right to non-conformity" (p.356) should be included. In this regard, although youth-led social movements in Hong Kong have a post-materialistic value orientation, they do not necessary neglect class struggle and the formal political institutions. Therefore, despite the post-materialistic orientation in youth-led social movements, it does not override the plight of young people who search for identity and citizenship in Hong Kong (for example, Lok, Gina and Nikki). Apparently, it would not be completely convincing to relate the multifacetedness of youth activism solely to changes in the values of post-materialistic societies based on the analysis above (Harris, Wyn, &Younes, 2010; Hui & Lau, 2015; Ma, 2011; Soler-i-Martí, 2014). Moreover, the frustrations of young people about the precariousness of life in Hong Kong and deprivations that they face also differ from the social conditions portrayed in post-materialistic societies (Inglehart, 1977; Inglehart & Welzel, 2005). In the context of Hong Kong, it is thus essential to examine youth activism and its continuation in terms of the frustrations of young people towards the inequalities and deprivations that they face and the way in which they protest to overturn the status quo.

Youth activism: Deficiency of political citizenship as a driving force

Social inequalities and serious wealth disparities not only reflect the failure of resource distribution in the free market and under a neoliberal social policy, but also show the problems of an undemocratic political institution which inhibit the development of citizenship in Hong Kong. As a result, the actions of youth activists who are advocating for political rights can be seen as efforts to promote social justice and advance citizenship. The political rights of Hong Kong people have always been undermined by the colonial government as well as the HKSAR government who have depoliticized citizenship (Cheung, 2000; Fong, 2013; Ortmann, 2015). Unlike the colonial government, however, as argued in Chapter 3, the HKSAR government tends to use "authoritarian-patriotic citizenship" to rule Hong Kong, manage its youth citizens, and deny Hong Kong residents from enjoying the political rights which are their entitlement (Ku, 2009; Ortmann, 2015). All of these show the shortcomings of the absence of a democratic institution in Hong Kong in which the means for genuine youth participation is lacking, expression of opinion is silenced, and change seems impossible. This has created a deep sense of frustration among young people on top of material deprivation and social marginalisation.

The frustrations of the people have gradually accumulated and resulted in protests against the undemocratic political institution where the power of the government has been unchecked and changes seem impossible (Cheng, 2005; Sing, 2009). In response to such discontent, the HKSAR government attempted to increase its power by uniting the pro-

establishment camp and gaining support from the PRC government, which as a result, created a political situation, or at least the impression, that power to rule is completely in the hands of the pro-China establishment in alliance with the business sector (Hui & Lau, 2015; Wong, 2015; Wong & Chu, 2017). Article 23 of the Basic Law finally became the breaking point in which half a million people went onto the streets to protest against the "state security bill" which proposed to control acts by legislation such as sedition, treason, secession. This resulted in withdrawal of the bill. This was the turning point in the citizenship movement, and the focus of the movement has also turned towards advocating for political rights (Xia, 2016, see also Chapter 3).

However, the increasing discontent of Hong Kong people has not reduced the political intervention of the Chinese government. Instead, the Chinese government appears to have reinforce its control over any further development of democracy in Hong Kong. The decision of the SCNPC to reject the proposal for civil nominations of candidates for the Chief Executive position finally triggered the initiation of the 79 day UM. Obviously for many youth activists, the UM has been politically enlightening and an important political lesson. The UM also provided the opportunity for different youth activists to congregate and advocate for the common goal of universal suffrage. All of the respondents of this study took part in the UM, and many of them including Billy, Dick, Fong, Hong, James, Olivia and Pinky all felt that the experience awakened their political consciousness and subsequently became activists.

Unfortunately, the UM which lasted for 79 days was unable to reach a compromise with the HKSAR and the Chinese governments, at least as far as the demand for universal suffrage is concerned. Disappointment prevailed among the youth activists after the UM, and many of them also had serious misgivings about the government and the existing political institutions, including the political parties and legislature as well as the so-called representative democracy. This is one of the intriguing reasons that drove youth activists towards solo actions and extra-institutional strategies (Kwong, 2016; Ma, 2017a; Veg, 2017, see also Chapter 8). Some of the youth activists such as Hong and Dick no longer have confidence in the effectiveness of a centralised hierarchical form of organised social movements, and some others also rejected the conventional approach of collective actions which are premised on the principle of peaceful, rational and non-violent demonstrations (Ortmann, 2015; So Alvin, 2017). For example, the responsive actors used valiant actions and considered that the use of physical force is inevitable in critical situations, while those who pursue an autonomous community life (or those who are coined autonomous actors in this study) attempted to transform the community through alternative everyday practices (see Chapter 7). At stake, however, is whether these responses are sustainable for developing citizenship in Hong Kong and answer to justice, or only serve as yet another setback of democratic movements in Hong Kong (So, 2017).

Implosion of youth activism triggered by renationalisation

As discussed above, citizenship is a competition and in Hong Kong, seems to have been won by the authoritarian regime through renationalisation as the means to suppress

youth activism and curb the political rights of Hong Kong people. This has led to an implosion of youth activism whereby an exclusionary and anti-China stance as the leading force in the end has only perpetuated market-oriented citizenship and inhibited diverse understanding and practices of citizenship. It is argued that the direction of youth activism, under such circumstances, has become more uncertain and the strive for citizenship has also become more speculative.

The UM seems to have reduced political influence in Hong Kong as the HKSAR government is now using harsher means to control if not eliminate dissent. For example, Chief Executive Leung Chun-ying in his 2015 policy address singled out an article called "Hong Kong nationality" which was published in the University of Hong Kong Student Union "Undergrad" magazine, and seriously condemned the article for advocating independence in Hong Kong (Leung, 2015, para 10). In doing so, he showed a shift in the government focus from responding to the demand for democracy to preventing discussions of " independence in Hong Kong" as an option. Thereafter, the government used this as their rationale to apply stringent measures that would suppress youth activism and prevent radical youth groups from taking part in the Legislative and District Councils. For example, the government requires all candidates who want to be elected to the Legislative Council to acknowledge Hong Kong as an inalienable part of China, and also uses administrative and legal measures to disqualify candidates as well as councillors who are allegedly pro-independent (Kaeding, 2017). In the views of the youth activists, all of these government tactics are obviously meant to suppress Hong Kong citizenship, and also renege on the promise for the autonomy of Hong Kong. Note here that these

government tactics might have, to some extent, successfully stifled any further advancements in democracy and dissent. However, at the same time, they have also created anti-China sentiments, aroused exclusionary localist ideologies, and escalated a climate of separatism from Mainland China (Kaeding, 2017; Ma, 2017b; Ma & Cheng, 2019; Veg, 2017; Wong & Wan, 2018).

Apart from applying authoritarian measures to suppress youth activism, the Chinese authoritarian regime has also promoted paternalism and patriotism to justify renationalisation and construct a state-dominated market-oriented citizenship (see Chapter 3). As a matter of fact, the UM has highlighted the deep-rooted social conflicts caused by market-oriented citizenship. However, instead of addressing the roots of social unrest, the government continues to adopt the same strategy – using a combination of authoritarian rule and neo-liberal market strategies – to reinforce a construct built on renationalisation and market-oriented citizenship to define citizenship (Wong & Chu, 2017). A typical example of this can be found in the first policy address of the current Chief Executive, Carrie Lam, who proposed to address "deep-rooted social conflicts" by using a holistic youth development strategy (para. 262). However, the concrete measures that were proposed have nothing new to contribute; that is, they promote education advancement, career development and property ownership so that, in the words of Chief Executive Lam, "the younger generation will see hope and opportunities for upward mobility" (Lam Cheng, 2017 para 262). As far as the promotion of youth political participation is concerned, the proposals of the government, such as the Self-Recommendation Scheme for Youth of the Youth Development Commission, appear to

be nothing more than “old wine in new bottles” because they do not increase the political rights of young people. This example shows that the government has not addressed the deep-rooted social conflicts in society. Instead, the government has only transferred the problems to the individual level and expects that needs would be met by the market.

The main problems of renationalisation measures is that they have created strong anti-China sentiments, aggravated exclusion and deepened social divisions (Chen & Szeto, 2015; Hui & Lau, 2015; Kaeding, 2017; Kwong, 2016). First of all, in Hong Kong where competition is keen and social welfare is at best modest, many young people perceive openness towards China and the influx of Mainland Chinese migrants as a threat to the interest of the city aside from the disparity in wealth and lack of opportunities for young people because politically, they dilute the Hong Kong identity, economically strengthen the free market and reinforce competition.

There is, therefore, the fear that the development of Hong Kong citizenship would be restrained. Moreover, young people would likely face even more fierce competition for resources which may result in stronger social and political exclusion of non-local individuals. This is well argued by Lui (Lui, 2007, p. 222) (2007, p.222), who suggested that “people are becoming anxious, self-protective and insecure in the face of growing competition for scarce resources”. The observations of Lui (2007) are evidenced by a series of anti-China campaigns, such as the anti-smuggled goods campaign and other localisation movements that are widely supported by young people. The social signal sent from these movements is that the formation of the national identity of some of the youths

has greatly deviated from that expected by the HKSAR and the PRC governments. A survey conducted by the Public Opinion Programme of the University of Hong Kong in 2014 showed that 60% of the respondents between 18-29 years old identified themselves as "Hong Kongers", while only 6.5% identified themselves as Chinese, and represented a 24.2% decrease compared to 2006 (Hong Kong University Public Opinion Programme, 2014). At the same time, measures that promote integration with China have also aroused concerns and feelings of uneasiness among young people, which then increases the need to protect the superiority of a Hong Kong status on the one hand and the desire to exclude non-Hong Kongers on the other hand. As the findings of this study show, the renationalisation project has increased as well as deepened conflicts of interest between Hong Kong and China as far as distribution of resources is concerned. In effect, responsive acts of citizenship and the advocated exclusion of non-Hong Kongers have won increasing support amongst the youth activists. This is pointed out by Iris and Eddie who shared their own experience that those who support universal human values and the equality of citizenship but do not wish to ostracise the Mainland Chinese are a small minority among youth activists in Hong Kong.

This helps to explain why youth activism has shifted from multiple and diverse attempts to a right-wing stance and inward looking localism with protectionist and exclusionary citizenship ideologies. On the surface, these acts of citizenship appear to challenge the Chinese authoritarian regime, but at the same time, have not challenged the domination of market-oriented citizenship. The acts to strive for political rights have instead protected the distributive system characterised by the domination of the free

market economy. Moreover, the radicalisation of citizenship acts, such as ostracising the Mainland Chinese and the hatred generated along with such actions appeared to have shown valiant and fierce struggles as overtly radicalised or even overstep the bottom line of morals (Wong & Wan, 2018; Wong & Chu, 2017; Yuen, 2015). This problem may lead to the development of speculative citizenship which involves risks and uncertainties on the one hand and fails to answer to justice on the other hand. As pointed out in Chapter 5, exclusionary acts, as an approach of youth activism, are developed with the aim to protect the market freedom of Hong Kong. These activists consider Hong Kong to be severely threatened by Chinese intrusion and therefore need to use exceptional measures to protect the interests of Hong Kong people and the market system inherited from the colonial government. The struggle for political rights, thus, is a way to protect the principle of "one country, two systems" and preserve market-oriented citizenship. Nevertheless, after the UM, many of the youth activists felt disillusioned about "one country, two systems" and the guaranteed rights under the Basic Law. As such, the only seemingly possible means to remove the deadlock is to become radicalised, and the goal of the struggle for citizenship has also shifted in the direction of independence and building a Hong Kong nation. To these activists, only by establishing a nation would the longstanding market freedom and market-oriented citizenship be preserved (see Chapter 5).

Without a legitimate democratic institution and culture, conflicts and differences in citizenship demands may easily lead to divisions between civil society organisations and may even cause the collapse of civil society as well as youth activism. As a result, different efforts in advancing citizenship may become fragmented and less influential,

which eventually may bring about the balkanization of civil society and erode the power of social movements. Taking the UM as an example, some of the respondents observed that the general public might not support a longer occupation movement as some blamed the protesters for disturbing social order and affecting the economy (Man, Eddie and Pinky). The internal differences between protesters and among civil society groups inevitably created mutual disappointment among them, which further discouraged ongoing participation (e.g. Pinky, Dick, Billy and Hong). Differences in citizenship demand turned into conflicts between the UM and the pro-government camps (including groups such as Caring Hong Kong Power and the Silent Majority for Hong Kong). These pro-government camps used a blue ribbon as their symbol and claimed that they represented the silent majority to protect the rule of law and freedoms of Hong Kong people. They mobilised a number of actions that support the police and engaged in confrontations with the protestors who wore a yellow ribbon as their symbol. It can be seen that division and conflict between civil society groups became more overt and serious (Cheng, 2016; Yuen & Cheng, 2017).

When different groups in civil society strongly disagree with each other in terms of political ideology and protest approach (Chen & Szeto, 2015; Hui & Lau, 2015; Lin & Liu, 2016), this also leads to their demise. As discussed earlier, different acts of citizenship reflected different political ideologies among different groups of people but at the same time, produced different types of conceived citizenship and implied different distributions of social resources. As a matter of fact, conflicts and differences are quite inevitable in the process of citizenship transformation. As suggested by Nielsen (2008),

advancing citizenship that answers to justice is an on-going and perhaps never-ending process of citizen participation and civic practices. However, as pointed out in Chapter 5, the fierce protests and valiant confrontations on a solo basis on the streets are highly mobile and fluid. Limited by the nature of the approach, it is difficult to establish communication and co-ordination between and among the participants, and quite impossible to make democratic decisions in the midst of differences of opinion. Moreover, as discussed in Chapter 5, conflicts were heightened due to internal struggles for power and control over the UM, where the localist groups antagonised and marginalised other groups such as the "leftist plastics" during and after the UM (Keading,2017; Veg,2017) Consequently, social movement groups who were more critical about market-oriented citizenship were side-lined, and the critical voices which supported equality of citizenship were also silenced (Chen & Szeto, 2015; Wong & Wan, 2018).

Possibilities of activist citizenship

The discussion above suggests that citizenship development in Hong Kong has always been under the control of an authoritarian-neoliberal regime, which has driven citizenship towards a speculative citizenship. However, as forcefully argued by Foucault (1981, p. 95), "where there is power, there is resistance". Through this logic, the mainstream orthodox construct of citizenship imposed by the authoritarian-neoliberal regime can never entirely dictate every aspect of citizenship development. Moreover, as

suggested by Giddens (1986), human society and human phenomena can never be solely understood as products of the social structure. Rather, they are structured through interactions of human agency (actions) located within the normative as well as structural boundaries of society (structure). In other words, it is imperative to examine the delicate relationship between structure and agency in society. While structure may produce or constrain actions, Giddens (1991) argued that agency can also change structure through reflexive actions and that no social structure has inherent stability. Putting youth activism into this perspective, it is undoubtedly constrained by the authoritarian-neoliberal regime on the one hand, but through the exercise of reflexivity, youth activists can also negotiate and initiate changes. In the context of Hong Kong, mainstream orthodox ideologies including utilitarianism, productivism and economic developmentalism have doubtlessly shaped how the general public conceives citizenship (Lau, 1981; Lin & Kuan, 1988). Nevertheless, counter ideologies that resist the domination of the mainstream ideology has always been prevalent (Lam, 2004; Lui & Chiu, 2000). These ideologies are clearly reflected in the active capacity of a civil society as well as the frequent mobilisation of collective actions especially in recent years (Lam, 2004; Ma, 2009; So, 2017). Besides, it should be noted that the emergence and activity of the NPM further show critical reflection and resistance among young people towards the dominance of a market-oriented citizenship (Chen & Szeto, 2015; Ku, 2012, see also Chapter 3). It is found in this study that youth activism has inspired a new generation of activists who are critical towards the distributive logic of the free market. In other words, the development of responsive acts of citizenship has not eliminated other acts or actors. Rather, it has stimulated a new generation of anti-free-market youth activists within the realm of youth

social movements (Isin, 2008; 2009). As found in this study, resilient and reinvented acts of citizenship similarly question the distribution of resources under market capitalism and are critical about its unequal distribution outcome. These two acts of citizenship reflect bottom-up community efforts that have emerged in the midst of an authoritarian and neoliberal social environment, and produced alternative conceptions and practices of citizenship.

Continuation of civil society momentum: Resilient force.

Resilient acts of citizenship have always served to monitor the free market. These acts dispute the unequal distribution of resources due to pro-market policies, and continuously advocate for equal citizenship. Despite the fact that citizenship development has long been under the jurisdiction of the state and the market, bottom-up social movements that advocate for democracy and social equality have not ceased (Lam, 2004). In Hong Kong, civil society is active, even though its political capacity is minimal. Although civil society organisations are not influential enough to be a force that is taken into consideration in most political issues, they are still exercising strong moral influence in promoting social justice, equality and other universal human rights (So, 2017; Ma, 2009). The resilience shown by civil society has become an important resource for the development of resilient acts, at least as far as the criticisms of market domination and reflection on practices are concerned. Three major aspects deserve further elaboration in the following sections: first, universal human value, second, experiencing a democratic life, and finally, a continuous reflecting community.

First, as argued in this study, resilient acts in the existing citizenship construct are built on the belief of universal human value, and to a large extent, bred by the social movement experience of civil society organisations for a long time. By and large, many activists who subscribe to resilient acts of citizenship are committed to the belief of universal human value and have closer connections with current social movement groups. For example, Eddie, Iris, and Kit started to contact different social movement groups when they took part in activities organised by political parties along with their family, while Man and Olivia reinforced their beliefs in democracy and social equality during their studies in social work. Olivia, who has just completed a social work programme, indicated that her aspirations and demand for genuine freedom, democracy and citizen rights developed out of the circumstances where

> *"there is more and more introduction of democratic ideas…adding to the fact that Hong Kong is where East meets West, and you have more opportunities to come into contact with more progressive, open-minded and 'Western' perspectives and ideas" (Olivia 183).*

Iris, Eddie, Man, Kit, and Alan similarly stated that their actual experience in advocating for the welfare of the disadvantaged and vulnerable actually heightened their sensitivity and increased their reflections around the problem of distributive injustice in Hong Kong (see Chapter 6). Apparently, resilient acts and the conception of citizenship of actors are nourished by experience with and participation in social movements. At the

same time, the universal human value that underpins social movement participation and the connections established with civil society organizations have become a crucial source of insights for the resilient actors so that they resist against the mainstream orthodox construct of Hong Kong citizenship.

Secondly, the strength of the resistance against market-oriented citizenship also originated from participation of the youth respondents in civil society organisations where they attempted to carry out democratic practices. As a matter of fact, all of the resilient actors in this study are members of civil society or political organisations, and none of them participated in social movements as a solo participant. Apparently, participation in civil society organisations has provided a good learning experience for these resilient actors, and the basis for the development of their conception of citizenship. The process of participation also facilitated democratic practices and helped to establish a citizenship that rests on equality, inclusion and democracy. This point is supported by the experience of Alan whose perspective of citizenship changed from supporting the ostracising of the Mainland Chinese to endorsing universal human value. By participating in political organisations where he had access to perspectives critical to capitalism and discussion with other members caused this change. Man and Eddie also stated that they were able to reconsider social movements and citizenship through discussions and debates with members of their organisations. Kit also pointed out that part of her own first-hand experience was seeing the importance of practicing democratic beliefs in civil society organisations (see Chapter 6). All these show the importance of civil society experience

in increasing understanding of democracy and equality of citizenship and inspiring the practices of the resilient actors.

Thirdly, democratic practices in civil society organisations can enable the continuity of social movements and encourage reflexivity in social movement practices. These mean that resilient acts can be a sustainable driving force to resist the mainstream orthodox construction of citizenship in Hong Kong. Despite the legacy of social movements, resilient actors have also re-examined the value of conventional social movements, and then accordingly revised the approaches and routines. The findings of this study show that the youth activists generally question the approach and leadership of conventional social movements, and resilient actors are no exception. Examples of the objects of the questioning include, amongst others, the so-called "big brother culture" in social movements and political activities (Iris); emphasis on elitism (Man), neglecting the voice of youths, and marginalising youth members when making decisions during the facilitation of the social movement (Man, Lok, and Iris). That said, however, these activists have not negated the value and practices of "conventional" social movements. Rather, they attempt to revitalise social movements through their own participation so that it can effectively respond to the needs of this generation. In this regard, Eddie and Man established a new political organisation in which they place equal participation into practice so that all of the members can share and appreciate different political views. By the same token, Olivia took part in promoting the grass-root members of her community to stand for elections in the attempt to disrupt the control of the elite in functional constituency. In other words, resilient acts of citizenship continue but at the same time,

are critical of conventional social movements. These acts inherit the legacy of carrying out democratic movements, but at the same time, renew and expand on them so that social movements can become a sustainable endeavour in the pursuit of equality of citizenship.

A new value: Reinventing force.

Reinvented acts of citizenship can be seen as the most fundamental and thorough forms of criticism towards market-oriented citizenship. To those who subscribe to the notion of autonomous citizens, the problem of citizenship in Hong Kong at present is rooted in the hegemony of capitalism – so much so that it has dominated the entire society, from economy to politics and cultural practices. The problem has penetrated into every realm of society and affected every aspect of daily life. For example, capitalism has led to a huge disparity in wealth, fractured social relations as well as created an unsustainable ecological environment (Nikki, Gina, Lok, Kit). Thus, reinvented acts of citizenship do not simply aim to improve how citizenship is conceived but progress further to address the more fundamental problem of capitalism: the greed that is implied and the consumption that is encouraged. As Lok said:

> *[We] fight for social justice not only to reduce poverty and differences in wealth. We also want to challenge "consumerism and economism" (economic developmentalism) [because they] deplete us; perhaps [we challenge] developmentalism…I think that our social movement is challenging this problem. To some extent we challenge this more than focusing on political reforms .(Lok 228)*

As pointed out by Kit, political reforms do not necessary bring about change to the capitalist way of life, and "purely talking about institutional change is like "changing the medicine without changing the prescription" (meaning making changes in form without making changes in the content). In the end, nothing would change" (Kit 129). To the supporters of autonomous citizenship, the aim is to counter capitalism and the capitalist culture and way of life, because, according to this group of activists, justice would not be achieved without a change of heart in the people (in terms of their beliefs and mind-set) (Gina and Nikki, see also Chapter 7). They feel that it is not possible to simply advocate for a fair distribution of resources. Rather, the fundamental pursuit is social movement which changes everyday life practices. So, they stress on the self-enhancing capacity of the community, and stand for alternative community life and economic practices (e.g. community economy) in order to counter the hegemony of capitalism. The interesting question is to ask what initiates reinvented acts of citizenship with the domination of a market-oriented citizenship.

Reinvented acts are the initiatives of youth activists who attempt to explore new possibilities and new contents of citizenship. To some extent, they can also be seen as the capacity of a civil society to resist the suppression of colonialism and capitalism, particularly in terms of citizenship development. Viewed from another angle, reinvented acts of citizenship are produced by localist ideas which inspire new hope, new possibilities and new meanings of citizenship. As a matter of fact, localist ideas have evolved and gradually flourished when Hong Kong people started to perceive Hong Kong

as their homeland, and no longer a place for refuge (Hong Kong is a land of refugees, mostly migrants who were fleeing the civil war between the Communists and Nationalists in the 1940s). Local Hong Kong identity and Hong Kong citizenship, which are distinct from merely being Chinese, have precisely emerged under this localist climate and social landscape (Chen & Szeto, 2015; Law, 2017). As pointed out by Chen and Szeto (2015), the new environmental protection movement mobilised by the Millennials actually caused multiple concerns of the younger generation – it was not just one single environmental concern. They questioned the underlying problems of the issue – distributive justice, the logic of urban and spatial development, as well as the whole question of culture of the city. All these doubts about the status quo of society showed a political as well as moral position which stimulated new discourse and inspired young activists. As the findings of this study suggest, reinvented acts of citizenship reflect the continuation of the social movements by Generation Z, and like their predecessors, the Millennials, Generation Z activists also fight against colonialism and capitalism which dominate the construction of Hong Kong citizenship. In this regard, Iris said:

> *As far as the notion of localism is concerned, [we're] talking about the issues of Star Ferry and Queen's Pier. In fact, the idea that the movements conveyed is very good, and it is still necessary now. Also, they have created a new domain [of social movements], not only about constitutional reforms, but conservation and some localist values, reflections on developmentalism, etc. All these were discussed ten years ago. I don't think that it was a failure… We have more experience, and a new discourse has been developed. In other words, the reason why we can now debate with the government on land and land allocation issues is because the discourse has evolved. It shouldn't be seen as a failure…. (Iris 223)*

It should be noted that youth activists who subscribe to the notion of autonomous citizenship have adopted new approaches beyond routines in pursuing new perspectives of citizenship. They stress the importance of integrating everyday life and social movement practices together, and emphasise on building citizenship through direct involvement in a community. To the autonomous citizenship actors, exploring a new type of Hong Kong citizenship is an entirely new project that starts from zero so there is a need to explore different practices and find the best way moving forward. Nikki provided a precise description of this process: "When one way is not possible, try another". These pragmatic practices in the everyday life of a community, such as the Mapopo Farm and other alternative practice projects (Chapter 7) have cultivated the capacity of alternative practices of the autonomous citizenship actors.

Social values which are critical of market capitalism in Hong Kong also cultivate reinvented acts of citizenship. The findings of this study suggest that the domination of market capitalism and its oppressive effects also drive the quest for alternative citizenship. This is because youth activists are not willing to accept the absence of autonomy in social and political life, especially when they cannot see the end result. In addition, the distributive system is so disadvantageous to young people that very few are willing to comply. As discussed in Chapter 7, activists who support autonomous citizenship opt to live alternative simple lifestyles which exemplify their non-compliance. Nikki, Gina and Lok feel that living in an alternative manner has not reduced their desire to pursue a good quality of life. Instead, leading a good quality of life must be supported by alternative

values. For example, they emphasised that leading a good quality life does not have to follow one that prioritises market consumption and market-led work ethics. Rather, the quality of life is re-constructed, such as spending quality time with family (Nikki); facilitating close friendships with neighbours and the community; enjoying and conserving nature, as well as consuming locally sourced food (Lok and Gina). All of these have opened up new possibilities for citizenship beyond the pursuit of economic development and upward mobility. Thus, reinvented acts of citizenship counter market-oriented citizenship on the one hand, but also open up new territories for social movements beyond constitutional reforms on the other hand. Despite by-passing institutional changes and seemingly focusing too much on personal practices, reinvented acts of citizenship have contributed to criticisms of the effects on colonialism and capitalism on ordinary and cultural spheres of life. These acts have also become an adversary practice that the authoritarian regime cannot easily eliminate because they have taken root and infiltrated every aspect of daily life.

In the discussions above, I have attempted to argue that the construction of citizenship predominantly by the authoritarian-neoliberal regime is never absolute and final. Under the limitation of a neoliberal citizenship construct, the development of youth activism has undoubtedly faced many uncertainties, and there is a driving force that follows the direction of personal and de-institutional development. Yet, citizenship is a constant negotiation process where there is no definite winner or loser who can win all or lose all. Therefore, although resilient and reinvented acts of citizenship share the same circumstantial limitations, different strategies based on different citizenship conceptions

and different sets of values have emerged, and their impacts have yet to be known, but there is no doubt that they should not be undervalued.

In summary, as argued by Nielsen (2008), building citizenship that answers to justice is a never-ending process of exploration and exchange within and among activist groups. Under authoritarian rule, resilient and reinvented acts of citizenship have contributed to opening up new boundaries and creating new sites for wrestling control over the form of citizenship. By transferring beliefs and values into everyday life practices, the youths continue to strive for the construction of a Hong Kong citizenship. The findings of this study show that youth activists who subscribe to the beliefs of universal citizenship and autonomous citizenship tend to be relatively more optimistic about the future of youth activism and its impact on the construction of a Hong Kong citizenship. For example, Olivia believes that citizenship is a continuous practice based on the past and the present. Through endless practice and exchanges, the blurred conception of citizenship would become more substantial, clear, and concrete. In this sense, even though youth activism may be speculative at present, the consequences of its exploration is still optimistic. As Kit said, she remains optimistic about the exploration of Hong Kong citizenship, and feels that by continued exploration, injustices would be eradicated:

> *If the value that you treasure is a good value, it will grow. If [it is] unjust it will destroy itself. I have began to feel less afraid about this. [In the past] I was afraid of [the exclusionary localist] the unreasonable attacks on the leftists…But in the end this sort of emotion is not genuine so they won't win…I think even if the localist forces are slowing down, at the end of the day, it is the values that remain… (Kit)*

In summary, the struggle for Hong Kong citizenship by youth activists, who use different acts of citizenship in the context of everyday life as well as civil society organisations, has been found as a active and creative endeavour. New possibilities are produced by the resilient and the reinventing actors, who take initiative to topple the domination of the authoritarian and neoliberal government.

Conclusion

In conclusion, youth activism reflects the subjectivity, initiative as well as capacity of young people to contend with the mainstream orthodox conception of citizenship. Youth activists explore different conceptions and understanding of citizenship and put them into practice through social movement actions. However, in spite of the efforts made by these youth activists, counteractions have been offered by the ruling regime in the attempt to limit the definition of Hong Kong citizenship within a market-oriented and state-led citizenship definition. Strategies such as renationalisation and continuation of neoliberal market policies are adopted, which reproduce if not further increase social exclusion, individualise movement actions and de-institutionalise reforms – all these feature the development of speculative citizenship which does not answer to justice. However, the domination of mainstream market-oriented and state-led citizenship is neither definitive nor absolute. Youth activists are able to create alternative conceptions of citizenship and transfer them into different acts to resist the mainstream definition of Hong Kong citizenship. It is argued that the negotiation process between different notions

of citizenship is dynamic, on-going and intertwining. It is exactly these dynamic but closely-knitted experiences that contribute to the creation of richer meanings and more possibilities for developing new conceptions of citizenship in Hong Kong. The question is, nevertheless, how we would reflect on these creative experiences of youth activism and learn from them so that they can break through the boundaries of existing social movement and disrupt the construct of mainstream orthodox citizenship and bring about a new understanding as well as citizenship practices that answer to justice. This question can be further explored and answered in future research. In the last chapter or Chapter 9, I shall discuss the limitations of this study and the implications for youth work and social policies with reference to the subjects of youth activism and citizenship as well as drawing a general conclusion for the entire thesis.

Conclusion

This study has investigated how youth activists in Hong Kong conceive citizenship and how their participation in social movements has contributed to the construction of citizenship. In-depth interviews have been conducted with 16 youth activists who were recently involved in different social movements in Hong Kong, and thematic content analysis is used to analyse the qualitative findings of this study. Chapters 1 to 4 discuss the social context in Hong Kong which facilitated the development of citizenship, and provide the conceptual framework for the study. Chapters 5 to 9 analyse and critically discuss the findings of this research work. This concluding chapter summarises the findings and major arguments and then discuss their implications for youth policies. Finally, this chapter will discuss the limitations of the study and provide recommendations for future research.

Summary of Major Findings

Guided by the three research objectives, the major findings are summarised as follows.

How do youth activists understand citizenship?

The social, economic and political contexts in Hong Kong since British colonial rule have paved the way for the development of a limited and incomplete citizenship. Thus,

youth activism has emerged as a process that explores and pursues citizenship through social movement practices. The findings of this research suggest that youth activists, although they are at the forefront of the citizenship movement, find citizenship to be both a familiar yet alien concept. Many youth activists are resentful of the mainstream definition of citizenship and even resist this definition. Nevertheless, their concerns around citizenship in Hong Kong have increased after taking part in social movements which has even motivated some of them to explore a local Hong Kong identity and contemplate a new notion of citizenship in Hong Kong. In other words, the youth activists in this study have become actors of citizenship who explore, deliberate and debate the constitution of Hong Kong citizenship from the bottom up. By taking part in social movements, the youth activists practice and accumulate experience with citizen movements, and create diverse and multiple meanings of citizenship. Three types of citizenship acts and understandings of citizenship are found in this study. They are responsive, resilient and reinvented acts of citizenship.

First, responsive acts of citizenship are emotionally-charged and emotionally directed. They are favoured by the youth activists in this study, which emerged in response to the top-down constitution of citizenship and have been developed to confront Chinese nationalisation. In this sense, responsive acts of citizenship are confrontational and adversarial practices that are carried out through participation in social movements, where youth activists adopt the role of warriors and shift the site of citizenship struggles from the Legislative Council to everyday life, such as the streets, shopping malls and internet, and carry out valiant struggles to protest against Chinese nationalism and intrusion from

China. However, in attempting to maintain the distinctiveness of a Hong Kong identity, responsive acts of citizenship also perpetuate market-oriented citizenship, which as a result increases social division and social exclusion (see Chapter 5).

Second, resilient acts of citizenship are driven by ideology. They are citizenship acts and civic participation experiences that emphasise the importance of connecting individuals and groups in the community to collectively advocate for the realisation of citizenship. Here, actors become community organisers who, through organisation and mobilisation, transform the community, including the workplace, school, church into an inclusive civil society with shared public concerns. The actions of and collaborations in the community allow people to advocate and champion for a more equal distribution of social resources. The findings of this study show that resilient acts of citizenship tend to produce a more open and inclusive notion of citizenship (see Chapter 6).

The third type of acts of citizenship is called reinvented acts, which are innovative acts that are primarily driven by the reflexive practices of the actors which are applied in front of others. Actors become "modern ascetics" who practice what they believe in their everyday life and turn the site of personal practice into a site of citizenship movement. Here, the emphasis is on autonomy in everyday life in the community. Reinvented acts stress individual agency and personal capacity in developing citizenship from the grassroots up. By entering into a community and becoming involved, the respondents attempt to establish a particular community identity (see Chapter 7).

Apparently, the three distinctive acts of citizenship provided above have generated different understandings and meanings of citizenship. While the different experiences of youth activists have produced different meanings of citizenship, the findings of this study also show that the experiences of youth activists are not entirely independent or mutually exclusive. Rather, there are areas that intersect so that different experiences are often related to one another. This helps to explain why the different citizenship conceptions of youths produced from different experiences can sometimes contradict but also complement and supplement each another so that they eventually form a thicker understanding and practice of citizenship in Hong Kong (see Chapters 8 and 9).

What are the driving factors for the participation of youths in social movements and what meanings are given to the participation?

The findings show that young people participate in social movements to express their desire for a Hong Kong identity and citizenship that is distinct from the definition given by the HKSAR and the Chinese communist governments. Partly due to the lagging development of democratic institutions which resulted in their lack of ability to participate politically, social movements have become the site for political practices and struggles for citizenship. The findings of this research suggest that youth activism that is carried out for citizenship purposes is a competition between the agency of the youth activists and the socio-political structure in which they live. Thus, youth activism is understood as the culmination of frustration and discontent which are caused by severe distributive injustices that are created and reinforced by the socio-political structure which underlies

a market-oriented citizenship. Despite the differences in understanding and approaching citizenship, making claims for political citizenship has become a common demand and at the very least, common grounds for youth activists. The political consciousness of many of the youth activists has been awakened during the course of their participation in social movements, and many of them were inspired by the UM to advocate for political citizenship and obtain distributive justice through political participation (see Chapter 9).

In the contesting process between the agency and structure, however, the authoritarian-neoliberal ruling regime did not respond to the demands of the activists, nor did it change its course to allow more social and political rights for Hong Kong people. On the contrary, the ruling regime suppressed youth activism and exerted even stricter limitations on political rights. This has angered and deeply frustrated the youth activists, and increased their aversion towards the PRC government and fuelled their advocacy spirit. As a result, the focus of youth activism has shifted from advocating for a more comprehensive form of citizenship to national independence and building a new political identity in Hong Kong. Corresponding to the shift in focus, the practices of youth activism have also become more solo and deinstitutionalised. More importantly, owing to the increased differences in political beliefs and movement approaches between the different acts of citizenship, the culmination of frustration and discontent has shifted to the inward collapse of youth activism due to the internal conflicts between and among different youth activists as a result of renationalisation. In the aftermath of the UM, youth activism was dominated by anti-China sentiments, and in particular, exclusionary localist ideologies for building citizenship received popular support from youth activists. This downplayed

the other youth activists who championed for a more equal and diverse citizenship. In the end, youth activists resorted to supporting speculative citizenship which does not answer to justice (see Chapter 9).

To what extent does participation in social movements reshape the understanding and practice of citizenship of youths?

The development of youth activism in recent years has indeed demonstrated the process of how youth activists resist and challenge the given definition of citizenship. This can be seen as a competition process for redefining citizenship or at the very least, a protest, whereby youth activists use a variety of different acts of citizenship, including valiant struggles, connecting community members, or alternative life practices to establish a new citizenship status and new meanings of citizenship (see Chapter 8). However, the reshaping of Hong Kong citizenship has been met with two major institutional obstacles. The first obstacle comes from the longstanding dominance of a market-oriented citizenship which limits social inclusion and enhances social inequalities. The second obstacle comes from a form of Chinese nationalism which is almost solely anti-Chinese authoritarianism that directs the citizenship movement in general and localism in particular. Therefore, in spite of the bottom-up attempts of youth citizenship movements in recent years, and despite the multiple acts of citizenship in different sites and at different scales, which have actually enriched youth activism and the meanings of citizenship, there are basically three problems that still need to be addressed. First, citizenship with a right-wing position has seemingly developed among the localists or

nativists, which has perpetuated the social inequalities inherited from the colonial days of Hong Kong and increased social exclusion. Second, the principles of equal citizenship have been downplayed, and equal social rights for all citizens have been rejected. Third, solo and self-directed actions in social movements have reduced the impacts of collective action and devalued institutional changes. These problems have reduced the capacity of youth activism to overcome the dominant conceptions of citizenship, answer to justice as well as inspire other activist citizens (Isin,2008, 2009). On the contrary, they tend to lead to the development of speculative citizenship which is uncertain and precarious in nature (see Chapter 8).

Despite the uncertainty that speculative citizenship may likely cause, it is important to point out that at the same time, youth activism can also stimulate the development of activist citizenship and inspire youth activists and the general public to resist the mainstream orthodox definition of citizenship. As argued in the earlier parts of this thesis, different acts of citizenship practiced by different groups of activists are not mutually destructive but rather, feed each another in their controversies and debates, and through communication, thus inspiring new and alternative acts of citizenship. It is therefore argued that resilient and reinvented forces should not be underestimated (see Chapter 9).

Contributions and Implications

Hong Kong is at a point of time where it is facing the combined challenges of economic globalisation, Chinese nationalism as well as Hong Kong localism. Likewise, the development of Hong Kong citizenship is in a state of flux where different political

forces are struggling for dominance and different ideologies compete with one another. Thus, the construction of citizenship seems to be at a crossroad, and its direction is unpredictable. In this process of competing for dominance, youth activism has been at the centre of attention, and youth activists have also become significant actors of citizenship. Under this social backdrop, research carried out on citizenship and youth activism in Hong Kong is both timely and significant. Despite the importance of such a study, however, this topic has not received adequate focus from the local academia, and there are few empirical studies that examine youth activism and citizenship. After the UM, there have been many studies that examine youth participation in social movements, yet few have focused on systematically investigating youth activism and the competition in defining citizenship. As Isin (2008, 2009) stated, the study of citizenship can be best understood in terms of citizenship acts, otherwise the dynamics of the competing ideas could be neglected, and, as far as understanding the construction of citizenship is concerned, we may arrive at the scene too late (Isin, 2008). Thus, this study endeavours to fill the existing research gap. By examining youth activism, the study shows how youth activists who stand at the forefront of social protests conceive and construct the meanings of Hong Kong citizenship, and also examines how youth experiences with social movements shape how they perceive and practice citizenship. Hence, the work offers some insights into understanding the dynamic interplays between struggling to define citizenship and initiating youth activism in Hong Kong. As such, I shall discuss the implications of this study for social policies and future practices in youth work in Hong Kong.

Implications for youth and citizenship studies.

This study has three important implications for youth and citizenship studies as follows.

First, the construction of citizenship is not a static task but rather a dynamic process that involves struggles and competition. To understand the construction of citizenship in Hong Kong, the acts of citizenship cannot be neglected. In other words, it is imperative to study the dynamic process of constructing citizenship from the perspective of citizenship as a practice. It is evidenced in this study that the competing and controversial nature of pursuing citizenship would have been overlooked if the definition of Hong Kong citizenship is accepted as that given by the authorities. Moreover, the static and top-down view of citizenship also fails young people and falls short of reflecting their actual experiences in striving for citizenship. As a matter of fact, the surge in youth activism in recent years testifies to this negligence of young people, and clearly reflects how young people in Hong Kong are trying to transcend the mainstream definition of citizenship and awaken political consciousness. In addition, as discussed in Chapter 2, alternative meanings and practices of citizenship can be found in social movements, regardless of how strongly the mainstream definition of citizenship is propagated (Papa and Milioni, 2013). This point is well emphasised in this study in which social movements have become powerful sites of citizenship practices. Through various acts in different sites and at different scales, it is found that alternative meanings are contemplated and new possibilities are articulated.

Secondly, having stressed citizenship as a practice as well as demonstrating the meaning-producing capacity of youth activists, this study also shows that it is important to make sense of the experience of youth activists in the context of their lived social and political realities. In other words, it is the interplay between agency and structure that needs to be highlighted. The paradox is that youth activists strive to advance alternative meanings of citizenship, but at the same time, they are also bound, albeit ideologically, by the very social and political structures in which they are a member. One typical example found in this study is that the localists in contemplating the identity of Hong Kongers perpetuate inequality in citizenship and reinforce social exclusion. Furthermore, there is ambiguity whether their version of citizenship answers to justice. Therefore, the study of citizenship, at least in the context of Hong Kong, should be able to embrace both the perspective of citizenship as a practice and as a status, and to examine the dynamic process of interplay between different actors.

The third implication from this study is to caution future citizenship studies to heed the subject matter as well as the scope of research. In light of the acts of citizenship per Isin (2008), the focus of future research on citizenship in Hong Kong should extend their scope from studying conventional citizenship acts, such as acts of political parties, legislative council and non-governmental organisations (NGOs) to investigating new actors, citizenship acts, and new scales as well as new sites of citizenship struggles. As implied in this study, youth activists have had a decisive role in advancing new understandings of citizenship in Hong Kong, and also developed new and alternative

practices to achieve citizenship, in their role as warriors, community organisers as well as urban ascetics. All these imply the need to study these new actors more in-depth, and new sites that advocate for citizenship. In other words, there is the need to look beyond formal political activities and study how different acts (for example, valiant struggles, and community organising as well as autonomous everyday life practices) in different sites (for example, the streets, church, school or local community) contribute to constructing the meanings of citizenship and shaping practices.

Implications for policy advocacy and youth work.

This study has shown that youth activism in Hong Kong has significant contributions in advancing citizenship but also has its limitations. On the one hand, different acts of citizenship developed by different groups of activists have contributed to thicker meanings of Hong Kong citizenship. They have also transcended the dated and conventional boundaries of imagining Hong Kong citizenship, and spearheaded new practices in building a Hong Kong identity. On the other hand, there are also limitations in cases where inequalities are overlooked and discrimination is practiced. In view of these possibilities and constraints, the following are some implications for policy advocacy and youth work.

Promote local reflexive consciousness and explore citizenship at different levels.

Social policy and youth work need to transcend the state-led narrow indoctrination of market citizenship and encourage young people to reflexively explore citizenship in the hopes of developing a Hong Kong identity that more embraces differences. As reflected in this study, state-led indoctrination of citizenship and suppression of local identity would only lead to fierce confrontations, exclusion and social divisions (Chen & Szeto, 2015; Cheng, 2014b; Hui & Lau, 2015; Kwong, 2016). Social policies and youth work should therefore use a positive approach to engage more young people in richer and deeper discussions around local consciousness and local identity. As reflected in this study, the rich experience of young people in social movements and citizenship practices has created a rich and diverse exploration of local identity. The key is to help these young people turn such experiences and practices towards the development of an activist citizenship that answers to justice. In this vein, the government should formulate policies, including allocation of adequate resources, and allow more opportunities for young people to understand, connect, and experience citizenship in a global context. Through critical reflection, discussions and debates, they can be encouraged to establish a Hong Kong identity that respects differences and embraces diversity. In other words, the implementation of social policies is not to produce a uniform Hong Kong identity based on nationalism and patriotism, but encourage young people to develop their own critical consciousness and reflexivity. To achieve this, for example, education in Hong Kong must remove its market orientation and emphasis on the market value of attaining an education. There is also the need to reallocate existing resources towards the humanities and social sciences. On the other hand, civic education should be broadened so that young people can access knowledge on human rights, democracy and social equality and the related

practices in a global context. This will give exposure to young people on a broader world view that is not premised on the narrow view that money has precedence, and at the same time give them the ability to critically reflect on economic globalisation and lead a life based on universal human values (Chung, 2013; Tse, 2007; Leung & Ng, 2007).

As shown from the experience of youth activists, different acts of citizenship that take place in different sites and different scales could, invariably, produce different meanings and practices of citizenship. The aim, however, is to learn to respect and allow differences amidst the need to develop a holistic constructed meaning of citizenship, one which is shared, inclusive and comprehensive. As such, a good practice would be to have youth workers, who might be working in different agencies, to provide an open environment so that young people have the space to explore, discuss and debate all possibilities of citizenship development in Hong Kong. Efforts can also be made to promote exchange of ideas between different groups of youth activists so that they can mutually learn from each other in anticipation of future cooperation. Examples of concrete measures include, but are not limited to, promoting networking and exchanges between different youth groups so as to increase their understanding of social circumstances and problems that different people of different statuses and positions in society face, and gain awareness of the structural forces that contribute to how they define citizenship. This will help young people gradually develop the means to critically reflect on the mainstream orthodox definition of citizenship. Moreover, youth workers can also create opportunities for young people to relate their interests with practices of citizenship so as to explore new possibilities for acts of citizenship. This means that everyday life in

communities and youth cultural communities can be turned into new sites of citizenship practice (for example, the internet, workplace, popular culture). As far as the scale of citizenship is concerned, youth workers can launch civic activities (e.g. network with different ethnic groups in the community; becoming acquainted with different communities) to facilitate mutual understanding and exchanges. In doing so, they can enable young people to be more receptive to differences and accommodate differences in the community so that they eventually have a more open attitude towards diverse practices and appreciate different interpretations of being a Hong Kong citizen. In doing so, young people might be able to cultivate and gradually develop a mutually inclusive citizen identity and sense of belonging under an open and supportive social climate.

Establish equal citizenship through social policy and practice.

Secondly, social policy advocacy and youth work practices must challenge the market-oriented discourse which has long been dominating the development of social policies in Hong Kong. At the same time, youth work practices should recognise that there is equal citizenship among young people, and youth work practitioners must also have an awareness and readiness for working with young people to gain citizenship equality. As discussed earlier, the government needs to shoulder the responsibility of protecting the citizens of Hong Kong against social inequalities from the expansion of economic globalisation. As shown in this study, many youth citizens have become victims of economic uncertainties and resigned to low paying and low skill jobs. As a result, many young people have very few alternatives but to live in a state of precariousness produced

by the free market (e.g. living with the 4 As – anxiety, anomie, alienation and anger) (Standing, 2011, and see also Chapter 2). Unfortunately, rather than addressing the precarious situation of young people, the HKSAR government relinquishes its responsibility to the individuals themselves and justifies its actions by using a welfare discourse and political rhetoric that individualise "failure" in the economic market. In doing so, the government inevitably exacerbates social divisions and unavoidably produces a volatile group of youths. In return, youth activism increasingly becomes more radicalized and exclusionary. Consequently, the government would face more uncertainties and unpredictability (Ma & Cheng, 2019; Yuen & Cheng, 2017). Authoritarian rule does not gain the confidence of young people, nor can it strengthen the Hong Kong identity among youths. Instead, fostering a sense of confidence in the government and feelings of belonging must complement one another along with social policies that can address the problems of a prolonged economic transition brought about by economic globalisation and realise equal citizenship in the long run (see Chapter 2). Thus, there is a need to provide concrete support for young people in education, employment, and housing as well as in their social and political participation. All of these provide full citizen rights and protection for young people.

It is important for youth policy advocates and youth workers to encourage social policy reforms to influence structural changes. When working with young people, it is important to provide them with an environment where they are able to critically reflect on market-oriented citizenship and its oppressive consequences against citizenship equality. As shown in this study, many of the young activists are not aware of the divisive

and oppressive nature of unequal citizenship under the domination of a free market ideology. So, there is an urgent need to promote citizenship education so as to enable young people to appreciate and respect diversity in society in the course of pursuing citizenship. One example is the resilient acts of citizenship, in which youth activists were given the opportunity to meet with other community members who have different cultural or ethnic backgrounds. They networked and cooperated with each other, and learned to understand each other and accommodate differences. In the end, different groups of young people are able work together to resist the oppression of the mainstream notion of citizenship. As argued by Lister (1997a), society must provide all necessary resources and remove all obstacles so that its citizens can truly enjoy full social participation. Nevertheless, this study shows that youth precarity has made it less possible for youth activists to participate in social movements. Therefore, youth workers need to work with young people to critically assess the dominant welfare policies and welfare discourse in Hong Kong which would realise youth citizenship and citizenship equality with complete civic, political and social rights.

Promote citizenship practices by networking and organising for structural reforms.

Last but not least, regardless whether the target is social policy or youth work practices, it is imperative to promote and facilitate a greater connection between young people and the community where they live as well as the social institutions that affect their life. As found in this study, youth activism has become solo actions, disorganised and unsustainable due to the lack of confidence towards the government and

disappointment towards the existing social institutions, and has thus failed to form a strong collective power to champion for more fundamental changes. However, it is apparent that young activists are important actors in citizenship movements and promoting social changes (Wong & Chu,2017; Xia,2016). Therefore, instead of providing token opportunities for the participation of youths in citizenship movements, the government must take concrete measures to recognise the civic and political rights of youth and encourage genuine youth participation. For example, the government can encourage and subsidise youth civic action projects, through which different experiences in practicing citizenship can be obtained for social policy consideration. A good example is the promotion of the community economy and the operation of open-air bazaars and night markets (see discussion in Chapter 7), which can help to reform hawker licensing policies. In other words, this kind of creative youth citizenship practices can also be considered and incorporated as a mainstream government policy.

As far as citizenship education is concerned, youth workers should address the problems of social division, lack of trust towards existing social institutions and the lack of horizontal organisation between civil society groups. Youth workers should therefore facilitate more networking and exchanges between different civil society groups and activists who subscribe to different acts of citizenship to form a collective force that would counter the neoliberal and authoritarian regime. To do this, we have to recognise that different acts of citizenship may not necessarily be in conflict and opposition, but rather mutually complement and supplement one another, and create more possibilities for actions. For example, valiant acts and fierce confrontations and the pursuit of autonomous

personal community practices are not necessarily mutually exclusive, but can be mutually accommodating and, through more exchanges that are richer and more substantial, a richer and more colourful meaning of citizenship can be developed. This is evidenced by the experience of some of the youth activists (e.g. Kit) who combines autonomous life practices and community organisation (see Chapter 9) which exemplifies the pursuit of citizenship that is critically reflective. In other words, youth activism is more fluid than fixed, and exchanges between different activists can add to their experience and produce a broader range of possibilities in citizenship building. As discussed in Chapter 6, the experiences with resilient acts of citizenship show that the lived experiences of the organisers can promote sustainable and reflexive participation of youth activists. Thus, the effects of networking and organising can be substantial. They not only promote youth participation in citizenship movements but are also catalysts that promote reforms of civil society organizations as well as political parties and enhances the power of civil society which would facilitate policy reforms.

Limitations of Research and Recommendations for Future Studies

The first limitation of this study is the scale of the work. The subjects are only youth activists of two major social movements that have taken place in recent years. Youth activists who have participated in other social movements have not been included. The understanding of citizenship and practices of other non-activist youth groups have not been examined. However, as pointed out in Chapter 3, the rationale for focusing on youth activists is because this group of young people are at the forefront of initiating the construction of citizenship and promoting changes. That said, however, it is

acknowledged that the sample of youth activists is only a small population of the entire youth population in Hong Kong. Therefore, the findings of this study do not represent the experience and practices of the entire youth population in Hong Kong. Future research on youth activists of other movements and non-activists is recommended.

Secondly, the generalizability of the results of this study is limited. This research work is designed as a qualitative study which aims to obtain an in-depth understanding of how youth activists conceive citizenship and their practices. This does not allow nor provide sufficient quantitative data to carry out an analysis on the correlation between understanding and acts of citizenship and the socio-economic background of the respondents. Therefore, there is no indication as to whether and how the acts and understanding are, or are not, correlated to any of the socio-economic as well as personal demographics, such as gender, income, education attainment, family background. In future research with more adequate resources, a mixed-method approach is recommended for a more comprehensive account of youth activism and citizenship construction.

Thirdly, as emphasised in this study, youth activists and their actions have indeed enhanced the scale, acts and sites of citizenship acts. Yet, there are still some areas which have not been discussed in this study, including the role of new media and the internet which can be topics of study in the future. Information and communication technologies have become important sites of citizenship struggles and therefore, further research in this area would certainly contribute to a fuller understanding of youth activism and citizenship.

Last but not least, this study emphasises that citizenship is a practice found in a process characterised by continuous struggles and negotiations. Therefore, the construction of citizenship is dynamic rather than static process and evolving, but at the same time, contains many possibilities amidst the limitations. However, it should be noted that the research here is conducted at a certain point in time. It does not aim to document the entire process of the struggle, so the findings reflect only part of the process rather than the entire process. Thus, ongoing and longitudinal research work should be carried out for a better understanding of the process of the citizenship movement in Hong Kong.

Conclusion

This chapter concludes the thesis, which has highlighted the major findings and critically discussed the implications of the findings for social policies and youth work in Hong Kong. The research began shortly after the end of the UM and commencement of the post-UM period in Hong Kong, during which changes might have taken place among the youth activists and within youth activism and social movements, as well as the construction of a Hong Kong citizenship. It is anticipated that this research study would enrich current knowledge and understanding of youth activism and how citizenship is conceived in Hong Kong, stimulate more in-depth discussions and inspire more reflexive practices.

Appendix I

INTERVIEW GUIDE

Q1. How is the notion of citizenship being understood and interpreted by young activists in Hong Kong in terms of its extent, content and participation?

1.1 In your own view, what is citizenship?

1.2 How would you describe citizenship in the social and political context of Hong Kong?

1.3 Extent

1.3.1. How would you define which political community / communities you belong? (e.g. Hong Kongers? Chinese Hong Kongers? Global citizen? ...). Why do you have such definition(s)? Based on what criteria do you make this definition?

1.3.2. As a young person and a young activist, can you share the experience as a member in this political community?

1.3.3. How would you describe your relationship with the state?

1.4 Content

1.4.1. As a citizen, what rights and obligations do you enjoy? Can you share your experience in exercising these rights and obligations? How would you assess your own experience of being a citizen in Hong Kong?

1.4.2. What rights and obligations should citizens enjoy? Why do you think so? In this regard, is there any difference between young people and adults? What are they (if any)?

1.4.3. What in your experience are the obstacles which hinder citizens' enjoyment of rights and fulfilment of obligations? Is there any difference between young people and adults in this aspect? What are they (if any)

1.5 Participation

1.5.1. What are the qualities of being a "good citizen" (in terms of attitude, behaviour and value)?

1.5.2. Can young people make influence to the society in social and political aspect? What influences can they make? Why?

1.5.3. Have you ever tried to practise (or express) your citizenship? What did you do? What is your experience?

1.5.4. Is there any difficulty or obstacle which hinders you from practicing or

expressing your citizenship? What do you do when you face with the difficulty / obstacle?

Q2. What are the driving factors for and meanings given to youth's participation in social movement as an expression of citizenship?

2.1. What social movements have you been involved in? Please share your experience in social movements?
2.2. What drove you into these social movements? (The UM or the NPM)?
2.3. What drove / drives you continue?
2.4. Does your experience in social movements have anything to do with your understanding and interpretation of citizenship? If so, what are they? How far has it impacted?

Q3. To what extent does their participation in social movement reshape their understanding and practice of citizenship?

3.1. Do you find any change in your value, behaviour and attitudes towards citizenship before and after your involvement in social movements?
3.2. What makes the change(s)? Any particular experience can you share?
3.3. How does this change affect your views and actions towards the following issues?
    3.3.1. political community
    3.3.2. rights and obligations of citizens
    3.3.3. being a good citizen
    3.3.4. social participation and social movement and its relationship with citizenship

Appendix II

INFORMED CONSENT STATEMENT

Perceiving and Practicing Citizenship:
A study on youth activists' experience in social movements in Hong Kong

INTRODUCTION

You are invited to participate in a research study on Perceiving and Practicing Citizenship: A study on youth activists' experience in social movements in Hong Kong. The purpose of this study is to explore how young activists understand and define citizenship; to understand the experience of young activists in practicing citizenship in everyday life and specifically in social movements; and to investigate the connectivity between their participation in social movements and their participation in social movements.

INFORMATION

In this study I shall invite 16 youth activists to participate in an in-depth interview. Before the interview, you will be invited to sign this "Informed Consent Statement". The interview will last for 1.5 hours approximately. You are encourage to share your views as much as you can.

With your agreement, this interview will be taped and transcribed for further analysis. All tape records and transcripts will be kept safely and confidentially. The records and the transcripts will be destroyed after the submission and approval of the dissertation. However, you have all right to refuse to be audio taped.

CONFIDENTIALITY

Your personal identity will be protected and pseudonyms rather than real names will be used for participants. All data collected will be kept strictly confidential and will only be used for the purpose of this research.

CONTACT

If you have questions at any time about the study or the procedures, you may contact the researcher, Lam Lai Ling, Joy, at Department of Social Work, Hong Kong Baptist University , and 9239 3133 . If you feel you have not been treated according to the descriptions in this form, or your rights as a participant in research have been violated during the course of this project, you may contact the Committee on the Use of Human and Animal Subjects in Teaching and Research by email at hasc@hkbu.edu.hk or by mail to Graduate School, Hong Kong Baptist University, Kowloon Tong, Hong Kong.

PARTICIPATION

Your participation in this study is voluntary; you may decline to participate without penalty. If you decide to participate, you may withdraw from the study at any time without penalty and without loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. If you withdraw from the study before data collection is completed your data will be returned to you or destroyed.

CONSENT

I have read and understand the above information. I have received a copy of this form. I agree to participate in this study.

Signature of the Subject _____ Date _____

Signature of the researcher _____ Date _____

Appendix III

RESPONDENTS' PROFILE

Respondent (Pseudonym)	Gender	Age (years old)	Socio-economic status (MMHI)	Education level	Political inclination	Social movement involvement	Acts of Citizenship
Alan	Male	20	High	No degree	N-Loc	UM	Resilient
Billy	Male	23	Low	No degree	P-Loc	UM	Responsive
Cindy	Female	24	High	Degree	N-Loc	NPM	Resilient
Dick	Male	25	High	Degree	P-Loc	UM	Responsive
Eddie	Male	21	Low	No Degree	N-Loc	NPM & UM	Resilient
Fong	Female	22	High	No Degree	P-Loc	UM	Responsive
Gina	Female	26	Low	Degree	N-Loc	NPM & UM	Reinvented
Hong	Male	29	High	Degree	P-Loc	UM	Responsive
Iris	Female	25	High	Degree	N-Loc	NPM &UM	Resilient & Reinvented
James	Male	22	High	No degree	P-Loc	UM	Responsive
Kit	Female	25	High	Degree	N-Loc	NPM	Reinvented & Resilient
Lok	Male	28	Low	Degree	N-Loc	NPM & UM	Reinvented & Resilient
Man	Male	27	Low	No degree	N-Loc	NPM & UM	Resilient
Nikki	Female	23	Low	Degree	N-Loc	NPM & UM	Reinvented
Olivia	Female	23	Low	Degree	N-Loc	UM	Resilient
Pinky	Female	27	Low	No degree	P-Loc	UM	Responsive

Notes: MMHI = Median monthly household income; N-Loc = Non localism faction; P-Loc =Pro localism faction; UM = Umbrella Movement; and NPM = New Preservation Movements

References

Abowitz, K. K., &Harnish, J. (2006). Contemporary Discourses of Citizenship. *Review of Educational Research*, *76*(4), 653–690. https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543076004653

Adams, M. (2006). Hybridizing habitus and reflexivity: Towards an understanding of contemporary identity? *Sociology*, *40*(3), 511–528. https://doi.org/10.1177/003803850663672

Adorjan, M., &Yau, H. L. (2015). Resinicization and digital citizenship in Hong Kong: Youth, cyberspace, and claims-making. *Qualitative Sociology Review*, *11*(2), 160–178.

Aristotle., &Sinclair, T. A. (Thomas A. (1992). *The politics*. Penguin .

Armstrong, C., Tormey, S. & Simons, J. (2006) Rethinking Equality: The Challenge of Equal Citizenship. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Arnold, D., &Bongiovi, J. R. (2012). Precarious, informalizing, and flexible work: Transforming concepts and understandings. *American Behavioral Scientist*, *57*(3), 289–308. https://doi.org/10.1177/0002764212466239

Avineri, S., &De-Shalit, A. (1992). *Communitarianism and individualism*. Oxford University Press.

Banaji, S., &Buckingham, D. (2010). Young people, the internet, and civic participation: An overview of key findings from the civic web project. *International Journal of Learning and Media*, *2*(1), 15–24. https://doi.org/10.1162/ijlm_a_00038

Barbalet, J. M. (1988) Citizenship: Rights, Struggles and Class Inequality. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.

Barbalet, J. M. (1996). Developments in citizenship theory and issues in Australian citizenship. *Australian Journal of Social Issues*, *31*(1), 55–72. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1839-4655.1996.tb01042.x

Barbour, R. S. (2013). Introducing qualitative research : a student's guide. Sage Publications.

Bauman, Z. (2000). Liquid modernity (p. 228). Polity Press.

Beauvais, C., Mckay, L., &Seddon, A. (2001). *A Literature Review on Youth and Citizenship By Canadian Policy Research Networks*. *Canadian Policy Research Networks*. Retrieved from http://www.cprn.org/docs/corporate/rlryc_e.pdf.

Beck, U., &Beck-Gernsheim, E. (2002). *Individualization : institutionalized individualism and its social and political consequences*. London: Sage Publications.

Beck, U., &Ritter, M. (1992). *Risk society: Towards a new modernity*. Sage Publications.

Bennett, W. L. (2013). Civic learning in changing democracies: Challenges for citizenship and civic education. In P.Dahlgren (Ed.), *Young Citizens and New Media: Learning for Democratic Participation* (pp. 59–78). London, UK: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203941638

Bennett, W. L., Wells, C., &Rank, A. (2009). Young citizens and civic learning: Two paradigms of citizenship in the digital age. *Citizenship Studies*, *13*(2), 105–120. https://doi.org/10.1080/13621020902731116

Bessant, J. (2004). Mixed messages: youth participation and democratic practice. *Australian Journal of Political Science*, *39*(2), 387–404. https://doi.org/10.1080/1036114042000238573

Biggart, A., &Walther, A. (2006). Coping with yo-yo transitions: Young adults struggle for support, between family and state in comparative perspective. In Carmen Leccardi Elisabetta Ruspini (Ed.), *A new youth?: Young people, generations and family life.* (pp. 41–62). Aldershot: Ashgate.

Billett, P. (2011). *Youth social capital: Getting on and getting ahead in life, Doctor of Philosophy thesis*. University of Wollongong. Retrieved from http://ro.uow.edu.au/theses/3533

Boyatzis, R. E. (1998). *Transforming qualitative information : Thematic analysis and code development*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Braun, V., &Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, *3*(2), 77–101. https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa

Brooks, R. (2007). Young people's extra-curricular activities: Critical social engagement - or "something for the CV"? *Journal of Social Policy*, *36*(3), 417–434. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047279407001079

Bryman, A. (2008). *Social research methods*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bussemaker, J. (1999). Introduction. In J.Bussemaker (Ed.), *Citizenship and Welfare State reform in Europe* (pp. 1–11). London: Routledge.

Bynner, J. (2005). Rethinking the youth phase of the life-course: The case for Emerging Adulthood? *Journal of Youth Studies*, *8*(4), 367–384. https://doi.org/10.1080/13676260500431628

Campbell, D. E. (2006). What is education's impact on civic and social engagement? In *In Measuring the effects of education on health and civic engagement: Proceedings of the Copenhagen symposium* (pp. 25–126). Copenhagen. Retrieved from http://www.oecd.org/education/innovation-education/37425694.pdf

Carey, M. (2013). *The social work dissertation : Using small-scale qualitative methodology*. Open University Press/McGraw-Hill Education.

Census and Statistics Department - The Government of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region. (2015). *Hong Kong annual digest of statistics 2015*. *Census and Statistics Department, The Government of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong SAR (Special Administrative Region) Government. Retrieved from https://www.statistics.gov.hk/pub/B10100032015AN15B0100.pdf

Census and Statistics Department -The Government of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region. (2012). *Hong Kong Annual Digest of Statistics 2012*. Hong Kong SAR (Special Administrative Region) Government. Retrieved from https://www.statistics.gov.hk/pub/B10100032012AN12B0100.pdf

Census and Statistics Department -The Government of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region. (2013). *Hong Kong annual digest of statistics 2013*. Hong Kong. Retrieved from https://www.statistics.gov.hk/pub/B10100032013AN13B0100.pdf

Chan, C. (2016). Post-Umbrella Movement: Localism and radicalness of the Hong Kong student movement. *Contemporary Chinese Political Economy and Strategic Relations: An International Journal*, *2*(2), 885–908.

Chan, J., &Lee, F. L. F. (2014, November 10). A preliminary investigation of the new organizational form of the Occupy Movement (佔領運動新組織形態初探). *Mingpao Daily*. Retrieved from https://news.mingpao.com/pns/觀點/article/20141110/s00012/1415556250454/陳韜文-李立峯-佔領運動新組織形態初探

Chan, R. K. . (2009). Risk discourse and politics: Restructuring welfare in Hong Kong. *Critical Social Policy*, *29*(1), 24–52. https://doi.org/10.1177/0261018308098393

Chan, S. C. (2015). Delay no more: struggles to re-imagine Hong Kong (for the next 30 years). *Inter-Asia Cultural Studies*, *16*(3), 327–347. https://doi.org/10.1080/14649373.2015.1070447

Chen, Y. C., &Szeto, M. M. (2015). The forgotten road of progressive localism: New Preservation Movement in Hong Kong. *Inter-Asia Cultural Studies*, *16*(3), 436–453. https://doi.org/10.1080/14649373.2015.1071694

Cheng, E. W. (2016). Street politics in a hybrid regime: The diffusion of political activism in post-colonial Hong Kong. *China Quarterly*, *226*(May 2016), 383–406. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0305741016000394

Cheng, J. Y. S.(2005). *The July 1 protest rally : Interpreting a historic event*. Hong Kong: City University of Hong Kong Press.

Cheng, J. Y. S. (2014a). New trends of political participation in Hong Kong. In J. Y.Cheng (Ed.), *New trends of political participation in Hong Kong* (pp. 3–27). City University of Hong Kong Press.

Cheng, J. Y. S. (2014b). The emergence of radical politics in Hong Kong: Causes and impact. *China Review*, *14*(1), 199–232. https://doi.org/10.1353/chi.2014.0013

Cheung, A. B. L. (2000). New interventionism in the making: Interpreting state interventions in Hong Kong after the change of sovereignty. *Journal of Contemporary China*, *9*(24), 291–308. https://doi.org/10.1080/713675938

Cheung, A.B.L. & Wong, P.C.W. (2004) Who Advised the Hong Kong Government: The Politics of Absorption Before and After 1997, Asian Survey, 44(6): 874-894.

Cheung, A. B. L. (2009). *Governance in Hong Kong: In search of identity, legitimacy and trust*. The Hong Kong Institute of Education. Retrieved from http://libdr1.ied.edu.hk/pubdata/img00/arch00/link/archive/1/instarh/3104_image.pdf

Cheung, P. T. Y. (2012). The changing relations between Hong Kong and the Mainland since 2003. In W.Lam &P. L.Lui (Eds.), *Contemporary Hong Kong government and politics* (pp. 325–347). Hong Kong University Press. https://doi.org/10.5790/hongkong/9789888139477.003.0015

Chiu, S. W., &Lui, T. L. (2004). Testing the global city-social polarisation thesis: Hong Kong since the 1990s. *Urban Studies*, *41*(10), 1863–1888. https://doi.org/10.1080/0042098042000256297

Chiu, S. & Wong, V. (1998) From Political to Personal: Changing Social Work Ideology and Practice in Hong Kong, International Social Work, 41(3): 277-291.

Chung, S. F. H. (2013). Civic education policy of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region: A historical and comparative analysis with theories of the state. *Asian Education and Development Studies*, *2*(2), 177–206. https://doi.org/10.1108/20463161311321448

Clarke, V., &Braun, V. (2013). Teaching thematic analysis: Over- coming challenges and developing strategies for effective learning. *The Psychologist*, *26*(2), 120–123.

Coleman, J., Catan, L., &Dennison, C. (2005). You're the last person I'd talk to. In J.Roche, S.Tucker, R.Thmson, &R.Flynn (Eds.), *Youth in Society* (2nd ed., pp. 227–234). SAGE.

Coles, B. (1995). *Youth and social policy*. *UCL Press Limited*. UCL Press. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13398-014-0173-7.2

Corning, A. F., &Myers, D. J. (2002). Individual orientation toward engagement in social action. *Political Psychology*, *23*(4), 703–729. https://doi.org/10.2307/3792364

Cornwall, A., &Gaventa, J. (2001). *From users and choosers to makers and shapers: Repositioning participation in social policy* (127 No. IDA working paper). Brighton. Retrieved from https://www.ids.ac.uk/files/Wp127.pdf

Creswell, J. W. (2009). Research design : Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches, 260.

Creswell, J. W., &Miller, D. L. (2000). Determining validity in qualitative inquiry. *Theory Into Practice*, *39*(3), 124–130. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15430421tip3903_2

Crick, B. (2000). *Essays on citizenship*. Continuum.

Crossley, N. (2002). *Making sense of social movements*. Buckingham : Open University Press.

Dagger, R. (2002). Republican citizenship. In Engin FIsin &B. S.Turner (Eds.), *Handbook of Citizenship Studies* (pp. 145–157). lONDON: Saga Publications. https://doi.org/10.4135/978-1-84860-827-6.n9

Dahlgren, P. (2009). *Media and political engagement : Citizens, communication, and democracy*. Cambridge University Press.

Dean, J. (2008). Enjoying neoliberalism. *Cultural Politics: An International Journal*, *4*(1), 47–72. https://doi.org/10.2752/175174308x266398

Delanty, G. (2000). *Citizenship in a global age society, culture, politics*. *Issues in society*. Open University Press.

Delanty, G. (2002). Communitarianism and citizenship. In E F.Isin &B. S.Turner (Eds.), *Handbook of citizenship studies* (pp. 159–174). London: Saga Publications. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781848608276.n10

Dermody, J., Hanmer-Lloyd, S., &Scullion, R. (2010). Young people and voting behaviour: Alienated youth and (or) an interested and critical citizenry? *European Journal of Marketing*, *44*(3–4), 421–435. https://doi.org/10.1108/03090561011020507

Diani, M. (1992). The Concept of Social Movement. *The Sociological Review*, *40*(1), 1–25. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-954X.1992.tb02943.x

Dowling, R. (2005). Power, subjectivity and ethics in qualitative research. In I.Hay (Ed.), *Qualitative research methods in human geography* (2nd ed., pp. 19–29). Melbourne: Oxford University Press.

Dwyer, P. (2010). Understanding social citizenship : Themes and perspectives for policy and practice. Cambridge: Policy Press.

Ellison, N. (1997). Towards a new social politics: Citizenship and reflexivity in late modernity. *Sociology*, *31*(4), 697–717. https://doi.org/10.1177/0038038597031004004

Ellison, N. (1999). Beyond universalism and particularism: Rethinking contemporary welfare theory. *Critical Social Policy*, *19*(1), 57–85. https://doi.org/10.1177/026101839901900104

England, K. V. L. (1994). Getting personal: Reflexivity, positionality, and feminist research. *Professional Geographer*, *46*(1), 80–89. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0033-0124.1994.00080.x

Escobar, A. (1998) Whose Knowledge, Whose Nature? Biodiversity, Conservation and the Political Ecology of Social Movements, Journal of Political Ecology, Vol 5, 53-82.

Etzioni, A. (1993). *The spirit of community : Rights, responsibilities, and the communitarian agenda*. Crown Publishers.

Etzioni, A. (1997). *The new golden rule : Community and morality in a democratic society*. Basic books.

Evans, K. (1995). Competence and citizenship: Towtrds a complementary model for times of critical social change. *British Journal of Education & Work*, *8*(2), 14–27. https://doi.org/10.1080/0269000950080202

Fahmy, E. (2006). *Young citizens : young people's involvement in politics and decision making*. Routledge.

Faulks, K. (1999). *Political sociology. A critical introduction*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Faulks, K. (2000). *Citizenship*. London: Routledge.

Fierro, J. (2009). Citizenship and democracy in Latin America and Chile. In *IPSA World Congress of Political Science, July 12-16, 2009* (pp. 1–45). Santiago Chile. Retrieved from https://www.academia.edu/37478890/Citizenship_and_Democracy_in_Latin_America_and_Chile

Finch, J. (1996). Family responsibilities and rights. In M.Bulmer &A. M.Rees (Eds.), *Citizenship today : the contemporary relevance of T.H. Marshall* (pp. 193–208). London: UCL Press.

Flanagan, C. A. (2008). Private anxieties and public hopes: The perils and promise of youth in the context of globalization. In J.Cole &D. L.Durham (Eds.), *Figuring the future : globalization and the temporalities of children and youth* (pp. 125–150). School for Advanced Research Press.

Fong, B. C. H. (2013). State-Society Conflicts under Hong Kong's Hybrid Regime. *Asian Survey*, *53*(5), 854–882. https://doi.org/10.1525/as.2013.53.5.854

Foucault, M. (1981). The history of sexuality. Volum 1, an introduction (p. 168p). Vintage. https://doi.org/10.2307/1904618

France, A. (2007). *Understanding youth in late modernity*. Open University Press.

Frazer, E. (1999). *The problems of communitarian politics : unity and conflict*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Furlong, A. (2014). Young people and the social consequences of the post-industrial economy: Lessons from Japan. In P.Kelly &A.Kamp (Eds.), *A Critical Youth Studies for the 21st Century* (Vol. 2, pp. 25–37). Brill Academic Pub. https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004284036_004

Furlong, A., &Cartmel, F. (2007). *Young people and social change : New perspectives* (2nd ed.). Open University Press.

Furlong, A., &Cartmel, F. (2012). Social Change and Political Engagement Among Young People: Generation and the 2009/2010 British Election Survey. *Parliamentary Affairs*, *65*(1), 13–28. https://doi.org/10.1093/pa/gsr045

García-Albacete, G. (2014). Introduction. In *Young People's Political Participation in Western Europe* (pp. 1–12). London: Palgrave Macmillan UK. https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137341310_1

Gaventa, J. (2001). Global citizen action :Lessons and challenges. In M.Edwards &J.Gaventa (Eds.), *Global citizen action* (pp. 275–287). Lynne Rienner Publishers.

Gaventa, J. (2002). Introduction: Exploring Citizenship, Participation and Accountability. *IDS Bulletin Volume 33 No 2*, *56*(4), 1–11. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1759-5436.2002.tb00020.x

Ghai, Y. (2001). Citizenship and politics in the HKSAR: The constitutional framework. *Citizenship Studies*, *5*(2), 143–164. https://doi.org/10.1080/13621020120053563

Giddens, A. (1982). Class division, class conflict and citizenship rights. In A.Giddens &R. D.Fred (Eds.), *Profiles and critiques in social theory* (pp. 164–180). London: University of California Press.

Giddens, A. (1991). *Modernity and self-identity : self and society in the late modern age*. Stanford University Press.

Giddens, A., &Pierson, C. (1998). *Conversations with Anthony Giddens : making sense of modernity*. (S. U.Press, Ed.).

Glendinning, M. (2013) The Conservation Movement: A History of Architectural Preservation. London: Routledge

Gobo, G. (2011). Sampling, representativeness and generalizability. In C.Seale, G.Gobo, J. F.Gubrium, &D.Silverman (Eds.), *Qualitative Research Practice* (pp. 405–426). London: Sage. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781848608191.d34

Goodin, R. E. (2003). *Reflective democracy*. *Reflective Democracy*. Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/0199256179.001.0001

Goodstadt, L. F. (2013). *Poverty in the midst of affluence : how Hong Kong mismanaged its prosperity*. Hong Kong University Press.

Griffiths, T. (1991) History and Natural History: Conservation Movement in Conflict? Australian Historical Studies, 24 (96): 16-32.

Groves, J. M., Siu, K., &Ho, W.-Y. Y. (2014). The “post-80s generation”, 'young night drifters,’and the construction of a generic youth subject in Hong Kong. *Journal of Youth Studies*, *00*(January 2015), 1–18. https://doi.org/10.1080/13676261.2013.878795

Guba, E. G., &Lincoln, Y. S. (2004). Competing paradigms in qualitative research: Theories and issues. In S. N.Hesse-Biber &P.Leavy (Eds.), *Approaches to qualitative research : a reader on theory and practice* (pp. 1–17). New York: Oxford University Press.

Gullikstad, B., Kristensen, G. & Ringrose, P. (2016) Paid Migrant Domestic Labour, Gender Equality and Citizenship in a Changing Europe: An Introduction, in B. Gullikstad, G. Kristensen and P. Ringrose (eds) Paid Migrant Domestic Labour in a Changing Europe: Question of Gender Equality and Citizenship, London: Palgrave.

Gunsteren, H. R.van. (1998). *A theory of citizenship : Organizing plurality in contemporary democracies*. Westview Press.

Gutmann, A. (2000). Why should schools care about civic education? In L.McDonnell, P. M.Timpane, &R. W.Benjamin (Eds.), *Rediscovering the democratic purposes of education* (pp. 73–90). Lawrence: University Press of Kansas.

Habermas, J. (1995). Citizenship and national identity: Some reflections on the future of Europe. In R.Beiner (Ed.), *Theorizing citizenship* (pp. 255–282). State University of New York Press.

Hale, H. E. (2004). Explaining ethnicity. *Comparative Political Studies*, *37*(4), 458–485. https://doi.org/10.1177/0010414003262906

Hall, T., Williamson, H., &Carnegie Young People Initiative. (1999). *Citizenship and community*. Youth Work Press.

Harris, A., Wyn, J., &Younes, S. (2010a). Beyond apathetic or activist youth: “Ordinary” young people and contemporary forms of participation. *Young*, *18*(1), 9–32. https://doi.org/10.1177/110330880901800103

Harris, A., Wyn, J., &Younes, S. (2010b). Beyond apathetic or activist youth:‘Ordinary’ young people and contemporary forms. *Young*, *18*(1), 9–32. https://doi.org/10.1177/110330880901800103

Harvey, D. (2005). *A brief history of neoliberalism*. Oxford University Press.

Harvey, D. (2007, March 8). Neoliberalism as creative destruction. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*. Saga Publications. https://doi.org/10.1177/0002716206296780

Harwell, M. R. (2011). Research Design in Qualitative/Quantitative/ Mixed Methods. *Opportunities and Challenges in Designing and Conducting Inquiry, University of Minesotta*, 147–182. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781412961288.n380

Healy, M., &Perry, C. (2000). Comprehensive criteria to judge validity and reliability of qualitative research within the realism paradigm. *Qualitative Market Research: An International Journal*, *3*(3), 118–126. https://doi.org/10.1108/13522750010333861

Heater, D. B. (1999). *What is citizenship?* Polity Press.

Heater, D. B. (2004). *Citizenship : The civic ideal in world history, politics, and education*. (3, Ed.). Manchester University Press.

Henn, M., &Foard, N. (2011). Young people, political participation and trust in Britain. *Parliamentary Affairs*, *65*(1), 47–67. https://doi.org/10.1093/pa/gsr046

Heywood, A. (1999). *Political theory : an introduction* (2nd ed.). St. Martin's Press.

HKSAR. The Basic Law of the Hong Kong Special Adminstrative Region of the People's Republic of China (1997). Retrieved from https://www.basiclaw.gov.hk/en/basiclawtext/index.html

Ho, D. K. L. (2004). Citizenship as a form of governance: A historical overview. In A. S.Ku &N.Pun (Eds.), *Remaking Citizenship in Hong Kong: Community, Nation and the Global City* (pp. 18–33). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203400333

Hong Kong University Public Opinion Programme. (2014). *Categorical ethnic identity [Date sets]*.

Hoskins, B., Kerr, D., Abs, H. J., Janmaat, G. J., Morrison, J., Ridley, R., &Sizmur, J. (2012). *Analytic Report Participatory Citizenship in the European Union Institute of Education*.

Hughes, R. (1976). *Borrowed place, borrowed time : Hong Kong and its many faces* (2nd ed.). Andre Deutsch Ltd.

Hui, P.-K., &Lau, K.-C. (2015). "Living in truth" versus realpolitik: limitations and potentials of the Umbrella Movement. *Inter-Asia Cultural Studies*, *16*(3), 348–366. https://doi.org/10.1080/14649373.2015.1069051

Hung, R. (2011). Citizenship with/in or without lifeworld? A critical review of the contemporary perspectives of citizenship. *Policy Futures in Education*, *9*(2), 172–182. https://doi.org/10.2304/pfie.2011.9.2.172

Inglehart, R. (1977). *The silent revolution : Changing values and political styles among western publics*. Princeton University Press.

Inglehart, R., &Welzel, C. (2005). *Modernization, cultural change, and democracy : The human development sequence*. Cambridge University Press.

Isin, Engin. F. (2008). Theorising Acts of citizenship. In E. F. (Engin F.Isin &G. M.Nielsen (Eds.), *Acts of citizenship* (pp. 15–43). Zed Books Ltd.

Isin, Engin. F. (2009). Citizenship in flux: The figure of the activist citizen. *Subjectivity*, *29*(1), 367–388. https://doi.org/10.1057/sub.2009.25

Isin, Engin. F., &Turner, B. S. (2002). Citizenship Studies: An Introduction. In Engin F.Isin &B. S.Turner (Eds.), *Handbook of Citizenship Studies* (pp. 1–11). London: Saga Publications. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781848608276.n1

Isin, Engin. F., &Turner, B. S. (2007). Investigating citizenship: An agenda for citizenship studies. *Citizenship Studies*, *11*(1), 5–17. https://doi.org/10.1080/13621020601099773

Isin, Engin. F., &Wood, P. K. (1999). Redistribution, recognition, representation. In Engin FIsin &P. K.Wood (Eds.), *Citizenship and Identity* (pp. 1–24). London: SAGE Publications Ltd. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781446218129.n1

Janoski, T., &Gran, B. (2002). Political citizenship: Foundations of rights. In Engin FIsin &B. S.Turner (Eds.), *Handbook of Citizenship Studies* (pp. 13–52). London: Saga Publications. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781848608276.n2

Jones, C., &Vagg, J. (2007). *Criminal justice in Hong Kong*. Routledge-Cavendish.

Jones, G., &Wallace, C. (1992). *Youth, family, and citizenship*. Open University Press.

Kaeding, M. P. (2011). Identity formation in Taiwan and Hong Kong-How much difference, how many similarities? *Taiwanese Identity in the 21st Century: Domestic, Regional and Global Perspectives*, 258–279. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203813607

Kaeding, M. P. (2017). The rise of “localism” in Hong Kong. *Journal of Democracy*, *28*(1), 157–171. https://doi.org/10.1353/jod.2017.0013

Kaiman, J. (2014, September 30). Hong Kong’s umbrella revolution - the Guardian briefing. *The Guardian*. Retrieved from https://www.theguardian.com/world/2014/sep/30/-sp-hong-kong-umbrella-revolution-pro-democracy-protests

Kalleberg, A. L., &Hewison, K. (2013). Precarious work and the challenge for Asia. *American Behavioral Scientist*, *57*(3), 271–288. https://doi.org/10.1177/0002764212466238

Kan, K. (2013). Occupy central and constitutional reform in Hong Kong. *China Perspectives*, *3*(January 2014), 73–78.

Kartal, F. (2002). Liberal and republican conceptualizations of citizenship: A theoretical inquiry. *Turkish Public Administration*, *27*, 101–130.

Kemshall, H. (2002). *Risk, social policy and welfare*. Buckingham: Open University.

Kimberlee, R. H. (2002). Why don’t British young people vote at general elections? *Journal of Youth Studies*, *5*(1), 85–98. https://doi.org/10.1080/13676260120111788

King, A. Y. (1975). Administrative absorption of politics in Hong Kong: Emphasis on the Grass Roots Level. *Asian Survey*, *15*(5), 422–439. https://doi.org/10.2307/2643255

Kivisto, P., &Faist, T. (2007). *Citizenship : Discourse, theory, and transnational prospects*. Wiley-Blackwell.

Kopstein, J., &Chambers, S. (2001). Bad Civil Society. *Political Theory*, *29*(6), 837–865. https://doi.org/10.2307/3072607

Kotz, D. M. (2015). *The rise and fall of neoliberal capitalism*. Harvard University Press.

Ku, A. S. (2002). Beyond the Paradoxical Conception of `Civil Society without Citizenship'. *International Sociology*, *17*(4), 529–548. https://doi.org/10.1177/0268580902017004004

Ku, A. S. (2009). Contradictions in the development of citizenship in Hong Kong: Governance without democracy. *Asian Survey*, *49*(3), 505–527. https://doi.org/10.1525/as.2009.49.3.505

Ku, A. S. (2012). Remaking places and fashioning an opposition discourse: Struggle over the Star Ferry pier and the Queen's pier in Hong Kong. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, *30*(1), 5–22. https://doi.org/10.1068/d16409

Ku, A. S., &Pun, N. (2004). *Remaking citizenship in Hong Kong : Community, nation and the global city*. Routledge.

Kuah-Pearce, K. E., &Guiheux, G. (2009). *Social movements in China and Hong Kong : The expansion of protest space*. (K. E.Kuah-Pearce &G.Guiheux, Eds.). Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press. https://doi.org/10.5117/9789089641311

Kwan, J. P. (2016). The rise of civic nationalism: Shifting identities in Hong Kong and Taiwan. *An International Journal*, *2*(2), 941–973.

Kwong, Y. (2016). The growth of "localism" in Hong Kong: A new path for the democracy movement? *China Perspective*, *3*(September 2016), 63–38. https://doi.org/10.2307/2606275

Kwong, Y. (2018). The Growth of " Localism " in Hong Kong, (September 2016), 63–68.

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

Kymlicka, W. (2002). *Contemporary political philosophy : An introduction* (2nd ed.). New York: Oxford University Press.

Kymlicka, W., &Norman, W. (1994). Return of the citizen: A survey of recent work on citizenship theory. *Ethics*, *104*(2), 352–381. https://doi.org/10.1086/293605

Lam Cheng, C. Y. N. (2017). *The Chief Executive's 2017 Policy Address*. Hong Kong. Retrieved from https://www.policyaddress.gov.hk/2017/eng/pdf/PA2017.pdf

Lam, J. T. M. (2015). Political Decay in Hong Kong After the Occupy Central Movement. *Asian Affairs: An American Review*, *42*(2), 99–121. https://doi.org/10.1080/00927678.2015.1035143

Lam, W. (2004). Understanding the political culture of Hong Kong : The paradox of activism and depoliticization, 292.

Lam, W. (2005). Depoliticization, citizenship, and the politics of community in Hong Kong. *Citizenship Studies*.

Lam, W. (2014). Nongovernmental International Human Rights Organizations: The Case of Hong Kong. *PS: Political Science & Politics*, *47*(03), 642–653. https://doi.org/10.1017/S104909651400078X

Lam, W. (2017). Hong Kong's fragmented soul: Exploring brands of localism. In W.Lam &L.Cooper (Eds.), *Citizenship, identity and social movements in the new Hong Kong : Localism after the Umbrella Movement* (pp. 80–101). Routledge.

Lash, S. (1994). Reflexivity and its doubles: Structures, aesthetics, community. In U.Beck, A.Giddens, &S.Lash (Eds.), *Reflexive modernization : politics, tradition and aesthetics in the modern social order* (pp. 110–173). Cambridge: Polity Press.

Lau, S. (1981). Utilitarianistic familism: The basis of political stability. In A. Y.King &R. P.Lee (Eds.), *Social Life and Development in Hong Kong* (pp. 195–216). Hong Kong: Chinese University.

Lau, S., &Kuan, H. (1988). *The ethos of the Hong Kong Chinese*. Chinese University Press.

Lau, S., &Kuan, H. (1995). The attentive spectators: Political participation of the Hong Kong Chinese. *Journal of Northeast Asian Studies*, *14*(1), 3–24. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF03023285

Law, W. (2015). The Development of Hong Kong Local Consciousness from Past to Present (in Chinese). Retrieved December15, 2018, from http://www.inmediahk.net/node/1032059

Law, W. (2017). Decolonisation deferred: Hong Kong identity in historical perspective. In W.Lam &L.Cooper (Eds.), *Citizenship, identity and social movements in the new Hong Kong : localism after the Umbrella Movement* (pp. 13–33). Routledge.

Lee, C. K., &Kofman, Y. (2012). The politics of precarity views beyond the United States. *Work and Occupations*, *39*(4), 388–408. https://doi.org/10.1177/0730888412446710

Lee, E. W. Y. (2005). *The politics of welfare developmentalism in Hong Kong* (Transforming the developmental welfare state in East Asia). *Social Policy and Development Programme Paper Number 21*. Switzerland: UNRISD. Retrieved from http://www.unrisd.org/80256B3C005BCCF9/httpNetITFramePDF?ReadForm&par

entunid=B764A113DEE628D4C125706D0032DA66&parentdoctype=paper&netitpath=80256B3C005BCCF9/(httpAuxPages)/B764A113DEE628D4C125706D0032DA66/$file/Lee.pdf

Lee, F. L. F., &Chan, J. M. (2012). *Media, social mobilization and mass protests in post-colonial Hong Kong : the power of a critical event*. London: Routledge.

Lee, J. C. Y. (1999). China's Hong Kong policy and political participation in Hong Kong. In J. Y.Cheng (Ed.), *Political participation in Hong Kong : theoretical issues and historical legacy* (pp. 25–48). City University of Hong Kong Press.

Lee, P. S. N., So, C. Y. K., &Leung, L. (2015). Social media and Umbrella Movement: insurgent public sphere in formation. *Chinese Journal of Communication*, *4750*(April), 1–20. https://doi.org/10.1080/17544750.2015.1088874

Legard, R., Keegan, J., &Ward, K. (2003). In-depth Interviews. In JaneRitchie &J.Lewis (Eds.), *Qualitative research practice: A guide for social science students and researchers* (pp. 138–169). Saga Publications.

Leininger, M. M. (1985). Ethnography and ethnonursing: Models and modes of qualitative data analysis. In M. M.Leininger (Ed.), *Qualitative research methods in nursing* (pp. 33–72). Orlando: FL: Grune & Stratton.

Leung, C. Y. (2014). Speech by CE at joint business community luncheon, 23 January, 2014. Hong Kong: Hong Kong SAR (Special Administrative Region) Government. Retrieved from https://www.info.gov.hk/gia/general/201401/23/P201401230489.htm

Leung, C. Y. (2015). *The 2015 Policy Address*. Hong Kong. Retrieved from https://www.policyaddress.gov.hk/2015/eng/pdf/PA2015.pdf

Leung, L. (2004). Engendering citizenship. *Remaking Citizenship in Hong Kong : Community, Nation and the Global City*, 157–173.

Leung, Y., &Ng, S. (2007). Back to square one: The "re-depoliticizing" of civic education in Hong Kong. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, *24*(1), 43–60. https://doi.org/10.1080/0218879040240105

Lin, Z., &Liu, S.-D. (2016). Occupation as prefiguration? The emergence of a new political form in the occupy central movement. *Contemporary Chinese Political Economy and Strategic Relations: An International Journal*, *2*(2), 775–794.

Lister, M., &Pia, E. (2008). *Citizenship in contemporary Europe*. Edinburgh University Press.

Lister, R. (1990). Women, economic dependency and citizenship. *Journal of Social Policy*, *19*(4), 445–467. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047279400018250

Lister, R. (1994). "She has other duties" - Women, citizenship and social security. In S.Baldwin &J.Falkingham (Eds.), *Social security and social change : new challenges to the Beveridge model* (pp. 31–44). Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Lister, R. (1997a). Citizenship: Towards a feminist synthesis. *Feminist Review*, *57*(57), 28–48. https://doi.org/10.2307/1395800

Lister, R. (1997b). Dialectics of Citizenship. *Hypatia*, *12*, 6–26. https://doi.org/10.2307/3810731

Lister, R. (1998). Citizenship on the margins: Citizenship, social work and social action. *European Journal of Social Work*, *1*(1), 5–18. https://doi.org/10.1080/13691459808414719

Lister, R. (2003). *Citizenship: Feminist perspectives*. (J.Campling, Ed.), *Citizenship: Feminist Perspectives* (2nd ed.). New York: Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-230-80253-7

Lister, R. (2007a). Inclusive Citizenship: Realizing the Potential1. *Citizenship Studies*, *11*(1), 49–61. https://doi.org/10.1080/13621020601099856

Lister, R. (2007b). Why Citizenship: Where, When and How Children?lister 2001. *Theoretical Inquiries in Law*, *8*(2). https://doi.org/10.2202/1565-3404.1165

Lister, R. (2008a). Inclusive Citizenship, gender and poverty: Some implications for education for citizenship. *Citizenship Teaching and Learning*, *4*(1), 3–19.

Lister, R. (2008b). Unpacking children's citizenship. In A.Invernizzi &J. (Jane M. .Williams (Eds.), *Children and citizenship* (pp. 9–19). S Publications.

Lister, R. (2012). Citizenship and Gender. In *The blackwell companion to political sociology* (pp. 372–382). Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishing Ltd. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781444355093.ch33

Lister, R., Smith, N., Middleton, S., &Cox, L. (2003). Young people talk about citizenship: Empirical perspectives on theoretical and political debates. *Citizenship Studies*, *7*(2), 235–254. https://doi.org/10.1080/1362102032000065991

Lo, S. (1997). The Politics of Democratization in Hong Kong. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-349-25467-5

Low, A., Busiol, D. & Lee, T.Y. (2016) A Review of Research of Civic and Political Engagement Among Hong Kong Youth, International Journal of Child and Adolescent Health, 9(4): 423-432.

Lui, T. (2007). Class Relations after 1997. In R.Yip (Ed.), *Starting From 1997: Civil Society's First Ten Years* (pp. 222–231). Hong Kong: SynergyNet.

Lui, T. L., &Chiu, S. W. (2000). Introduction — Changing Political Opportunities and the Shaping of Collective Action: Social Movements in Hong Kong. *The Dynamics of Social Movements: Resource Mobilization, Social Control and Tactics*, 1–21.

Ma, N. (2005). Social movement, civil society and democratic development in Hong Kong. In *Conference on Emerging Social Movements in China, 23 March, 2005*. University of Hong Kong. Retrieved from http://repository.ust.hk/ir/Record/1783.1-2288

Ma, N. (2007). *Political development in Hong Kong : State, political society, and civil society*. Hong Kong University Press.

Ma, N. (2009). Social movements and state-society relationship in Hong Kong. In K. E.Kuah-Pearce &G.Guiheux (Eds.), *Social movements in China and Hong Kong: The expansion of protest space* (pp. 45–64). Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt46mxv6.7

Ma, N. (2011). Value changes and legitimacy crisis in post-industrial Hong Kong. *Asian Survey*, *51*(4), 683–712. https://doi.org/10.1525/as.2011.51.4.683

Ma, N. (2017a). Changing identity politics: The democracy movement in Hong Kong. In W.Lam &L.Cooper (Eds.), *Citizenship, identity and social movements in the new Hong Kong: Localism after the Umbrella Movement* (pp. 34–50). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315207971

Ma, N. (2017b). The China factor in Hong Kong elections : 1991 to 2016. *China Perspectives*, (3), 17–26.

Ma, N., &Cheng, E. W. (2019). Introduction. In *The Umbrella Movement: Civil Resistance and Contentious Space in Hong Kong* (pp. 11–26). Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press. https://doi.org/10.5117/9789462984561

Mackie, A. (2013). What future for youth work ? Poverty and youth transition. *The Journal of Contemporary Community Education Practice Theory*, *11*, 1–11. Retrieved from http://lac-php-live5.is.ed.ac.uk/Concept/article/view/201

Mair, P., &VanBiezen, I. (2001). Party membership in twenty European democracies, 1980-2000. *Party Politics*, *7*(1), 5–21. https://doi.org/10.1177/1354068801007001001

Mann, M. (1987). Ruling class strategies and citizenship. *Sociology*, *21*(3), 339–354. https://doi.org/10.2307/42853996

Manning, B., &Ryan, R. (2004). *Youht and citizenship: A report for NYARS. National Youth Affairs Research Scheme*. Australian Government Department of Family and Community Services. Retrieved from https://docs.education.gov.au/system/files/doc/other/youth_and_citizenship20100209.pdf

Manning, N. (2012). “I mainly look at things on an issue by issue basis”: Reflexivity and phronêsis in young people’s political engagements. *Journal of Youth Studies*, *16*(1), 17–33. https://doi.org/10.1080/13676261.2012.693586

Marsh, D., O’Toole, T., &Jones, S. (2016). Introduction. In *Young people and politics in the UK* (pp. 1–8). London: Palgrave Macmillan UK. https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230625631_1

Marshall, T. H. (1964). *Class, citizenship and social development: Essays*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.

Mason, J. (2002). *Qualitative researching*. *Saga Publication* (2nd ed.). London: Sage Publications. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13398-014-0173-7.2

Mathews, G., Ma, E. K., &Lui, T. L. (2008). The significance of Hong Kong. In G.Mathews, E. K.Ma, &T. L.Lui (Eds.), *Hong Kong , China: Learning to belong to a nation* (pp. 1–21). Routledge.

Matthews, H. (2001). Citizenship, youth councils and young people's participation. *Journal of Youth Studies*, *4*(3), 299–318. https://doi.org/10.1080/13676260120075464

McAdam, D. (1999). *Political process and the development of black insurgency, 1930-1970*. University of Chicago Press.

McLeod, J., &Malone, K. (2000). *Researching youth*. Australian Clearinghouse for Youth Studies.

Melucci, A. (1985). The symbolic challenge of social movements. *Social Research*, *4*, 789–816. https://doi.org/10.2307/40970398

Micheletti, M., Stolle, D., &Berlin, D. (2012). Habits of sustainable Citizenship: The example of political consumerism. In A.Warde &D.Southerton (Eds.), *Studies across Disciplines in the Humanities and Social Sciences* (Vol. 12, pp. 141–163). Helsinki: COLLeGIUM.

Miller, D. (2000). Citizenship and national identity (p. 216). Malden: Polity Press.

Miller, T. (2010). Michel Foucault, the birth of biopolitics: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1978–79. *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, *16*(1), 56–57. https://doi.org/10.1080/10286630902971637

Miners, N. (1998) Government and Politics of Hong Kong, 5th Edition, New York: Oxford University Press.

Miraftab, F. (2004). Invited and invented spaces of participation: Neoliberal citizenship and feminists' expanded notion of politics. *Wagadu*, *1*(Spring), 1–7. Retrieved from http://appweb.cortland.edu/ojs/index.php/Wagadu/article/viewArticle/378

Mizen, P. (2004). *The changing state of youth*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Morris, P., Kan, F., &Morris, E. (2000). Education, Civic Participation and Identity: Continuity and change in Hong Kong. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, *30*(2), 243–262. https://doi.org/10.1080/713657148

Mouffe, C. (1988). The civics lesson. *New Statesman and Society*, *Cotober 7*, 28–31.

Ng, S.W. (2009) Transformation of Students to Become Active and Participatory Citizens: An Exploratory Study in Hong Kong, Education Research for Policy and Practice, 8(3): 181-196.

Nagar, R., &Geiger, S. (2007). Reflexivity and positionality in feminist fieldwork revisited. In A.Tickell, J.Sheppard, &Peck & T. Barnes (Eds.), *Politics and*

Practice in Economic Geography (pp. 267–278). London: SAGE. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781446212240.n22

Nash, K. (2010). *Contemporary political sociology : Globalization, politics, and power* (2nd ed.). Wiley-Blackwell.

Newman, J., &Clarke, J. (2009). *Publics, politics and power: Remaking the public in public services. Publics, Politics and Power: Remaking the Public in Public Services*. London: Sage Publications. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781446216651

Ng, K. H. (2013). Social movements and policy capacity in Hong Kong: An alternative perspective. *Issues and Studies*, *49*(2), 179–214. Retrieved from http://www.scopus.com/inward/record.url?eid=2-s2.0-84884862040&partnerID=tZOtx3y1

Ng, S.W. (2009) Transformation of Students to Become Active and Participatory Citizens: An Exploratory Study in Hong Kong, Education Research for Policy and Practice, 8(3): 181-196.

Nielsen, G. N. (2008). Answerability with cosmopolitan intent: An ethics-based policis for acts of urban citizenship. In E. F. (Engin F.Isin &G. M.Nielsen (Eds.), *Acts of Citizenship* (pp. 266–286). Zed Books Ltd.

O'Toole, T., Marsh, D., &Jones, S. (2003). Political literacy cuts both ways: The politics of non-participation among young people. *The Political Quarterly*, *74*(3), 349–360. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-923x.00544

Oldfield, A. (1990). *Citizenship and community : Civic republicanism and the modern world*. London: Routledge.

Ong, A. (1999). *Flexible citizenship : The cultural logics of transnationality*. Durham & London: Duke University Press.

Ortmann, S. (2015). The umbrella movement and Hong Kong's protracted democratization process. *Asian Affairs*, *46*(1), 32–50. https://doi.org/10.1080/03068374.2014.994957

Osler, A., &Starkey, H. (2003). Learning for cosmopolitan citizenship: Theoretical debates and young people's experiences. *Educational Review*, *55*(3), 243–254. https://doi.org/10.1080/0013191032000118901

Paffenholz, T., &Spurk, C. (2006). *Civil society, civic engagement, and peacebuilding. Social Development Papers, Conflict Prevention & Reconstruction,* (Vol. 1). The World Bank. Retrieved from http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/822561468142505821/pdf/378130Peacebuilding0WP3601PUBLIC1.pdf

Papa, V., &Milioni, D. L. (2013). Active citizenship or activist citizenship? A framework for studying citizenship in new social movements and the role of ICTs.

Networking Knowledge: Journal of the MeCCSA-PGN, *6*(3). https://doi.org/10.31165/nk.2013.63.303

Parker, G. (2003). *Citizenships, contingency and the countryside : Rights, culture, land and the environment*. Routledge.

Pattie, C., Seyd, P., &Whiteley, P. (2004). *Citizenship in britain: Values, participation and democracy*. *Citizenship in Britain: Values, Participation and Democracy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511490811

Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods*. Sage Publications.

Pierson, P. (1994). *Dismantling the welfare state? Reagan, Thatcher, and the politics of retrenchment*. Cambridge University Press.

Pirie, M., &Worcester, R. M. (2000). *The Big Turn-off: Attitudes of Young People to Government. Citizenship and community*. London.

Plummer, K. (2003). *Intimate citizenship: Private decisions and public dialogues*. *Intimate Citizenship: Private Decisions and Public Dialogues*. University of Washington Press.

Punch, K. (2013). *Introduction to social research : Quantitative and qualitative approaches*. Saga publications.

Putnam, R. D. (2000). *Bowling alone : The collapse and revival of American community*. Simon & Schuster.

Ritchie, Jane, &Lewis, J. (2003). Generalising from Qualitative Research. In JaneRitchie &J.Lewis (Eds.), *Qualitative research practice: A guide for social science students and researchers* (pp. 263–286). Saga Publications.

Ritchie, Jane, Lewis, J., &Elam, G. (2003). Designing and seleting samples. In JRitchie &J.Lewis (Eds.), *Qualitative research practice: A guide for social science students and researchers* (pp. 77–108). Saga Publications.

Roche, M. (1987). Citizenship, social theory, and social change. *Theory and Society*, *16*(3), 362–399. https://doi.org/10.2307/657728

Roche, M. (1992). *Rethinking citizenship : Welfare, ideology, and change in modern society*. Polity Press.

Sandel, M. J. (1998). *Liberalism and the limits of justice* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.

Sandel, M. J. (2005). *Public philosophy : Essays on morality in politics*. Harvard University Press.

Sayer, A. (2017) Welfare and Moral Economy, Ethics and Social Welfare, 12(1): 20-33.

Schuck, P. H. (2002). Liberal Citizenship. In Engin F.Isin &B. S.Turner (Eds.), *Handbook of Citizenship Studies* (Vol. 1, pp. 131–144). Saga Publications. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781107415324.004

Scott, I. (2000). The disarticulation of Hong Kong's post-handover political system. *The China Journal*, *43*, 29–53. https://doi.org/10.2307/2667531

Seligman, A. B. (1992). *The idea of civil society*. Free Press.

Selznick, P. (2002). *The communitarian persuasion*. Woodrow Wilson Center Press.

Shek, D. T. L. (2007). Tackling adolescent substance abuse in Hong Kong: Where we should and should not go. *The Scientific World Journal*, *7*, 2021–2030. https://doi.org/10.1100/tsw.2007.315

Sing, M. (2009). *Politics and government in Hong Kong : Crisis under Chinese sovereignty*. Routledge.

Skelton, T. (2010). Taking young people as political actors seriously: opening the borders of political geography. *Area*, *42*(2), 145–151. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-4762.2009.00891.x

Sloam, J. (2012). Introduction: Youth, citizenship and politics. *Parliamentary Affairs*, *65*(1), 4–12. https://doi.org/10.1093/pa/gsr048

Sloam, J. (2014). 'The outraged young' :Young Europeans, civic engagement and the new media in a time of crisis. *Information, Communication & Society*, *17*(2), 217–231. https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2013.868019

Smelser, N. J. (1962). *Theory of collective behavior*. Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Smith, M. J. (1998). *Ecologism : Towards ecological citizenship*. University of Minnesota Press.

Smith, N., Lister, R., Middleton, S., &Cox, L. (2005a). Young people as real citizens: Towards an inclusionary understanding of citizenship. *Journal of Youth Studies*, *8*(4), 425–443. https://doi.org/10.1080/13676260500431743

Smith, N., Lister, R., Middleton, S., &Cox, L. (2005b). Young People as Real Citizens: Towards an Inclusionary Understanding of Citizenship The paper is based on the project 'Negotiating Transitions to Citizenship' (L134 25 1039), funded by the Economic and Social Research Council as part of the 'Youth, Citize. *Journal of Youth Studies*, *8*(4), 425–443. https://doi.org/10.1080/13676260500431743

Snape, D., &Spencer, L. (2003). The foundations of qualitative research. In JaneRitchie &J.Lewis (Eds.), *Qualitative research practice: A guide for social science students and researchers* (pp. 2–10). Saga Publications.

Snow, D. A., Soule, S. A., &Kriesi, H. (2004). Introduction: Mapping the terrain. In D. A.Snow, S. A.Soule, &H.Kriesi (Eds.), *The Blackwell companion to social movements* (pp. 3–16). Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

So, A. Y. (2017). Hong Kong: Vibrant civil society in a hybrid regime undergoing national unification. In A.Ogawa (Ed.), *Routledge handbook of civil society in Asia* (pp. 68–78). Routledge.

Soler-i-Martí, R. (2014). Youth political involvement update: measuring the role of cause-oriented political interest in young people's activism. *Journal of Youth Studies*, *18*(3), 396–416. https://doi.org/10.1080/13676261.2014.963538

Staeheli, L. a., Attoh, K., &Mitchell, D. (2013). Contested Engagements: Youth and the Politics of Citizenship. *Space and Polity*, *17*(1), 88–105. https://doi.org/10.1080/13562576.2013.780715

Standing, G. (2011). *The Precariat : The new dangerous class*. London: Bloomsbury Academic.

Stokes, G. (2002). Democracy and citizenship. In A.Carter &G.Stokes (Eds.), *Democratic theory today : challenges for the 21st century* (pp. 23–51). Polity Press.

Stolle, D., &Hooghe, M. (2011). Shifting inequalities: Patterns of exclusion and inclusion in emerging forms of political participation. *European Societies*, *13*(1), 119–142. https://doi.org/10.1080/14616696.2010.523476

Tam, H. B. (1998). *Communitarianism : A new agenda for politics and citizenship*. New York University Press.

Taylor, C. (1985). Atomism. In C.Taylor (Ed.), *Philosophy and the human sciences* (pp. 187–210). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Thomas, R. M. (2003). *Blending qualitative & quantitative research methods in theses and dissertations*. Corwin Press.

Thomson, R., Holland, J., McGrellis, S., Bell, R., Henderson, S., &Sharpe, S. (2004). Inventing adulthoods: a biographical approach to understanding youth citizenship. *The Sociological Review*, *52*(2), 218–239. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-954X.2004.00466.x

Titmuss, R. M. (1962). *Income distribution and social change : A study in criticism*. George Alllen & Unwin.

Todd, M. J., &Taylor, G. (2004). Introduction. In M. J.Todd &G.Taylor (Eds.), *Democracy and participation : popular protest and new social movements* (pp. 1–28). Merlin.

Touraine, A. (1981). *The voice and the eye : An analysis of social movements*. Cambridge University Press.

Tse, P. W.S. (1995) The Impact of 1997 on Political Apathy in Hong Kong, The Political Quarterly, 66(2): 210-220.

Tse, T. K. C. (2007, June). Whose citizenship education? Hong Kong from a spatial and cultural politics perspective. *Discourse*. Taylor & Francis Group. https://doi.org/10.1080/01596300701289094

Tung, C. (1997). A future of excellence and prosperity for all, Speech delivered at the ceremony to celebrate the establishment of the Hong Kong Special Administrative

Region of the People's Republic of China, 1 July 1997. Hong Kong: Hong Kong SAR Government. Retrieved from https://www.info.gov.hk/isd/speech/0701ceho.htm

Turner, B. S. (1986). *Citizenship and capitalism: The debate over reformism*. London: Allen and Unwin.

Turner, B. S. (1990). Outline of a theory of citizenship. *Sociology*, *24*(2), 189–217. https://doi.org/10.1177/0038038590024002002

Turner, B. S. (1993). Contemporary Problems in the theory of citizenship. In B. S.Turner (Ed.), *Citizenship and social theory* (p. 194). Saga Publications.

Turner, B. S. (2001). The erosion of citizenship. *British Journal of Sociology*, *52*(2), 189–209. https://doi.org/10.1080/00071310120044944

vanHoudt, F., Suvarierol, S., &Schinkel, W. (2011). Neoliberal communitarian citizenship: Current trends towards "earned citizenship" in the United Kingdom, France and the Netherlands. *International Sociology*, *26*, 408–432. https://doi.org/10.1177/0268580910393041

Veg, S. (2017). The rise of localism and civic identity in post-handover Hong Kong: Questioning the Chinese nation-state. *China Quarterly*, *230*, 323–347. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0305741017000571

Vickers, E., &Kan, F. (2003). *The re-education of Hong Kong: Identity, politics, and history education in colonial and postcolonial Hong Kong*. *American Asian Review* (Vol. XXI). Retrieved from https://civic-exchange.org/wp-content/uploads/2003/12/20040226_ReeducationPostcolonial_en.pdf

Waite, L. (2009). A place and space for a critical geography of precarity? *Geography Compass*, *3*(1), 412–433. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1749-8198.2008.00184.x

Walby, S. (1994). Is citizenship gendered? *Sociology*, *28*(2), 379–395. https://doi.org/10.1177/0038038594028002002

Walden, J. (1983) Does Public Opinion Count in Hong Kong? In J. Walden, Excellency, Your Gap is Showing, Hong Kong: Corporate Communication.

Walzer, M. (1989). Citizenship. In T.Ball, J.Farr, &R. L.Hanson (Eds.) (pp. 211–219). Cambridge University Press.

Warren, M. (2001). *Democracy and association*. Princeton University Press.

Wilding, P. (2015). Social policy and social development in Hong Kong. *Asian Journal of Public Administration*, *19*(2), 244–275. https://doi.org/10.1080/02598272.1997.10800341

Williams, R. H. (2004). The cultural contexts of collective action: Constraints, opportunities, and the symbolic life of social movements. In *The Blackwell Companion to Social Movements* (pp. 91–115). Oxford, UK: Blackwell. https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470999103.ch5

Wong, K. Y., &Wan, P. S. (2009). New evidence of the postmaterialist shift: The experience of Hong Kong. *Social Indicators Research*, *92*(3), 497–515. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-008-9299-3

Wong, S. H. (2015). Real Estate Elite, Economic Development, and Political Conflicts in Postcolonial Hong Kong. *China Review*, *15*, 1–38. https://doi.org/10.2307/24291927

Wong, S. H., &Wan. K. M. (2018). The housing boom and the rise of localism in Hong Kong: Evidence from the legislative council election in 2016. *China Perspectives*, (3), 31.

Wong, V. (2009). Youth locked in time and space? Defining features of social withdrawal and practice implications. *Journal of Social Work Practice*, *23*(3), 337–352. https://doi.org/10.1080/02650530903102692

Wong, V. (2012). Social withdrawal as invisible youth disengagement: Government inaction and NGO responses in Hong Kong. *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy*, *32*(7/8), 415–430. https://doi.org/10.1108/01443331211249057

Wong, V. &Au-Yeung, T. C. (2017). How do ideas and discourses construct youth policies ? The case of Hong Kong. *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy*, *38*(3–4), 280–294. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJSSP-08-2017-0104

Wong, V., &Chiu, S. (2005). Towards a confucian notion of youth development in Hong Kong. *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy*, *25*(10–11), 14–36. https://doi.org/10.1108/01443330510791360

Wong, W., &Chu, M. (2017). Rebel with a cause :Structural problems underlying the Umbrella Movement of Hong Kong and the role of the youth. *Asian Education and Development Studies*, *6*(4), 343–353. https://doi.org/10.1108/AEDS-11-2015-0058

Wood, B. E. (2014). Researching the everyday: young people's experiences and expressions of citizenship. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, *27*(2), 214–232. https://doi.org/10.1080/09518398.2012.737047

Wyn, J. (2007). Generation and Class : Young People ' s New , Diverse Patterns of Life and Their Implications for Recognising, 165–181. https://doi.org/10.1163/092755607X181757

Wyn, J., &Dwyer, P. (2000). New patterns of youth transition in education. *International Social Science Journal*, *52*(164), 147–159. https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2451.00247

Wyn, J., &White, R. (1997). The Concept of Youth. In J.Wyn &R.White (Eds.), *Rethinking Youth* (pp. 8–25). London: Saga publications.

Wyn, J., &White, R. (2000). Negotiating social change: The paradox of youth. *Youth and Society*, *32*(2), 165–183. https://doi.org/10.1177/0044118X00032002002

Wyn, J., &Woodman, D. (2006, November 23). Generation, youth and social change in Australia. *Journal of Youth Studies*. Taylor & Francis Group. https://doi.org/10.1080/13676260600805713

Xia, Y. (2016). Contesting citizenship in post-handover Hong Kong. *Journal of Chinese Political Science*, *21*(4), 485–500. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11366-016-9439-6

Youth. (n.d.). In *Oxford Dictionary*. Retrieved from https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/youth

Yuen, S. (2015). Hong Kong after the Umbrella Movement: An uncertain future for "one country two systems." *Current Affairs*, (1), 49–53.

Yuen, S., &Cheng, E. W. (2017). Neither repression nor concession? A regime's attrition against mass protests. *Political Studies*, *65*(3), 611–630. https://doi.org/10.1177/0032321716674024

Zald, M. N., &McCarthy, J. D. (1987). *Social movements in an organizational society : Collected essays*. Transaction Books.

CURRICULUM VITAE

Academic qualifications of the thesis author, Ms. LAM Lai Ling:

- Received the degree of Bachelor of Social work (Honours) from Hong Kong Baptist University, December 1998.

- Received the degree of Master of Social Work from Hong Kong Baptist University, December 2003.

December 2019