Marika Tsolakis

Citizenship and Transformative Human Rights Education: Surveys as 'Praxis' in the São Paulo Periphery

In Latin America, citizenship is often expressed as a struggle for rights and has repeatedly been won through ground-up movements. For this reason, a transformative human rights education (HRE) framework, largely based on ideals of Paulo Freire, is useful for considering the roles and processes of citizenship education in Latin America. This article explores the concept of human rights education as a form of citizenship education and uses the core principals of Freire's work, along with Paul Giroux's 'border pedagogy,' to elucidate the enactment of transformative HRE. This article also highlights the use of surveys as a Frereian pedagogical tool in transformative human rights and citizenship education. The concept of surveys as praxis is derived from a small, qualitative case study of Rights Now!, a programme that teaches about the right to education to disadvantaged youth from the São Paulo periphery. Observational data, survey data from students and interview data all illustrate transformative citizenship education in action. Finding show that surveys were effective as a pedagogical tool within a broader environment of problem-posing education and with the guidance of a well-trained teacher.

En Amérique Latine, la citoyenneté s'exprime souvent comme une lutte pour les droits humains et s'achève souvent parmi des mouvements populaires. Pour cela, une pédagogie transformative des droits humains, fondée sur les œuvres de Paulo Freire, nous offre un cadre utile pour examiner les rôles et processus d'éducation à la citoyenneté en Amérique Latine. Parmi une étude d'un programme brésilien qui enseigne le droit de l'éducation aux jeunes de la périphérie de São Paulo, cet article met également en relief l'utilisation des sondages comme outil pédagogique dans une vision transformatrice et Freireian de l'éducation aux droits de l'homme et à la citoyenneté.

Introduction

In Latin America, claims to citizenship have often arisen from grassroots movements for social and economic equality and recognition (Mische 1995; Oxhorn 2011; Torres 1990; La Belle 2000), lending itself to the Arendtian (Arendt 1973) notion that Latin American citizenship is defined by the struggle for "the right to have rights" (Dagnino 2003, 214). This close association of rights and citizenship distinguishes Latin America from other regions and suggests the necessity of a human rights education framework to teach citizenship in a relevant manner. In particular, this article presents the notion of transformative human rights education (HRE) (Bajaj 2011; Tibbits 2002, 2005) as a form of citizenship education in contexts of social, economic and cultural inequalities wherein constitutionally and internationally designated rights have yet to be realised across society. In such cases, citizenship education should raise awareness about rights and enable students to use this awareness for societal transformation (Dagnino 2003; Bajaj 2011). In both aims and outcomes, transformative HRE draws from Paulo Freire's (1970) legacy of popular education, making it a particularly salient lens through which to consider education, citizenship and rights in Latin

America. Thus, critical pedagogues and human rights educators can develop and refine practices to further the project of education for social transformation using the cornerstones of Freire's pedagogy, including dialogue, generative themes and horizontal relationships.

In order to illustrate the use of Freire's pedagogy as a practice within transformative HRE, this article presents a case study of *RightsNow!*[1], a programme that teaches youth from São Paulo's Eastern periphery about the right to education. Along with bases of "problem posing" education such as dialogue and horizontal teacher-student relationships, classroom observations unearthed the use of surveys as a pedagogical tool to encourage reflection and action, thus forming an integral part of praxis, or the dual process of reflection and action (Freire 1970). These surveys also enabled students to cross cultural and physical borders of São Paulo (Giroux 1991a, 2005), consequently reconfiguring their navigation of the urban landscape. The use of surveys as teaching and learning tools reflects a broader trend in Latin America and merits further exploration of its value within contemporary applications of Freirean pedagogy and citizenship and human rights education.

This article contributes to the advancement of the methods of Paulo Freire and critical pedagogues (e.g. Giroux 1991, 1997; Kincheloe 2004; McLaren & Kincheloe 2007) who seek to use education as a site of political struggle and social change. Furthermore, it underscores the lasting importance of Freirean pedagogy in education for transformative human rights and citizenship in Brazil and the conceptual necessity to consider human rights education as

Marika Tsolakis is Polonsky Foundation PhD Scholar at the Institute of Education, University of London.
Institute of Education, University of London
20 Bedford Way, London WC1H 0AL
www.ioe.ac.uk

citizenship education in Brazil and the wider Latin American context. This article first describes the interlinking discourses of citizenship and HRE and then introduces the Brazilian context. Next, Freire's (1970) core concepts are presented as a tool of teaching transformative HRE along with elements of Giroux's (2005) border pedagogy to elucidate particularities of the case study. Finally, a brief discussion of the use of surveys as a Freirean pedagogical tool is given before presenting the case study to illuminate the use of surveys as a form of praxis in transformative HRE.

2 Citizenship education and HRE

The conceptual linking of HRE and citizenship education is not restricted to the Latin American context. For example, the Council of Europe, an eminent source of HRE resources, groups "democratic citizenship/human rights education" as a single category (www.coe.int), yet important tensions and differences exist in their dynamic relationship. While Dagnino (2003, 214) sees citizenship as the "assertion and recognition of rights," Brysk and Shafir (2004, 3) argue "citizenship is a mechanism for allocating rights and claims through political membership." Thus citizenship can be conceptualised as the giving of rights or the means for claiming rights, depending on the perspective and context. Brysk and Shafir (2004) also posit that as citizenship has expanded and evolved, from minimal to maximal (McLaughlin 1992), so has the concept of rights from first generation civic rights to social, cultural, identity and other second and third generation rights. The conception of rights relates directly to how a society and government regard citizens and what citizens feel entitled to demand. This will undoubtedly continue to evolve, as debates surrounding rights and citizenship encounter new challenges, such as group versus individual rights and migration and refugee rights. Finally, while citizenship education and HRE can easily be conflated, not all citizens have the capacity to exercise certain rights nor are all rights enshrouded in international conventions translated into laws (Goirand 2003). Thus citizens of the same country can have their rights protected or violated in very different ways, requiring forms of education that can fully address such social injustices. For this reason, it is also important to note that human rights and rights are distinctive and that human rights can extend beyond the concept of national citizenship and rights granted in any particular country.

In attempt to distinguish citizenship education and HRE, Fritzsche (2007, 48) claims that HRE regards how "the individual learn[s] to live [a] self-determined and non discriminated" life whereas education for democratic citizenship addresses the issue of how "citizens learn to support and stabilize the democratic system and the community through participation." Yet this appears to be a false dichotomy: at times, human rights affect entire communities and must be acted on in groups, which

is why social movements often engage in popular education in Brazil and Latin America (Ribeiro 2006; Torres 1990; LaBelle 1987). Furthermore, HRE, in many of its manifestations, inherently deals with social change and transformation and cannot be seen as an individualistic learning process nor can it be seen as merely supporting the existing political system (Bajaj 2011; Tibbits 2002). Fritzsche's distinction also calls into question the tensions between group and individual rights, which is not fully in the scope of this paper to discuss. However, this is a point of tension that must be reconciled in each situation. For example, Freire (1999) highlights the importance of conscientization in the larger struggle for group rights and importance of individuals' awareness for group action.

In the case of Latin America, the concept of transformative HRE seems to reconcile some of the tensions between citizenship and rights and importance of group mobilisation for accession of individual rights. Transformative HRE proposes the teaching of rights with the aim of mobilizing to change society and preventing future violation of rights (Bajaj 2011; Tibbits 2002, 2005; Huaman, Koenig, Schultz 2008; Kapoor 2008). While conventional approaches to HRE deal with many of the same issues, primarily to educate and inform citizens about their human rights, transformative HRE constitutes a more politically radical approach that is:

> implicitly and explicitly concerned with relation-ships of power....this concern with power and asymmetries in power relations translates into an analysis of how human rights norms and standards are often selectively respected based on communities' varied access to resources, representation, and influence. (Bajaj 2011, 493).

This is inherently linked to both awareness-raising and action, echoing Freire (1970) and other critical pedagogues (Kincheloe 2004; McLaren, Kincheloe 2007). Furthermore, it underscores the importance of empowerment through HRE (Meintjes 1997) and the need to "teach them about concepts and values aimed at enhancing their social and political choices" (Bajaj 2011, 73). According to Tibbits (2005), transformative HRE also draws upon transformative learning theory (Mezirow 1990, 2000; Taylor 2007) that suggests that through processes of critical reflection, rational discourse and experience, learners can change their perspectives and, consequently, their actions. Ultimately, the concept of transformative HRE overlaps significantly with critical citizenship education (DeJaeghere 2009; Johnson & Morris 2010), radical democratic education (Fielding, Moss 2010), deliberative democratic education (Gutmann, Thompson 2004) and other movements that view education as a tool for social justice. Furthermore, transformative HRE has simi-lar objectives to Banks' (2008, 136) "transformative citizenship" which "involves civic actions designed to actualize values and moral principles and ideals beyond those of existing laws and conventions" and requires citizens to "promote social justice even when their actions

existing laws, conventions or structures." These various terminologies and pedagogies share similar aims and processes, albeit with nuanced differences and emphases, and this article does not attempt to differentiate or crystallise them. Rather, the term transformative HRE is employed in this article to emphasise the importance of rights within Brazilian struggles for citizenship (Dagnino 2003; Pinheiro 2002) and to underscore epistemological origins in Freire's work. However, HRE, transformative citizenship education and other theoretical and pedagogical concepts may ultimately resemble each other both on paper and in practice and no definitive distinctions are made in this article.

3 Struggles for citizenship and rights in Brazil

Although the 1988 Brazilian Constitution made sweeping guarantees of social, economic and human rights, full and equal citizenship has not become a reality for the majority of poor Brazilians (Goirand 2003; Maia & Pereira 2011; Pinheiro 2002). Veloso (2008, 48) attributes this to the fact that the idea of universal rights was imposed on "a profoundly unequal, exclusionary, racialized, and class-stratified social world." Thus, children from elite and poor backgrounds in Brazil access their rights differently and, consequently, learn about their rights in very different manners. The Secretary of Education of Rio de Janeiro recently claimed that Brazil is in a state of "educational apartheid" where lower class children are trapped in to a low-quality system that does not prepare them for social mobility or full rights as citizens (Costin in Otis 2013). Data consistently shows the underperformance of black students in secondary (Ribeiro 2006; Vegas & Petrow 2008) and university levels (Osario 2008), problematising the widely held belief that inequality in Brazil stems primarily from class and not race (Sheriff 2001). For this reason, it is particularly important to look beyond recent Brazilian educational data reporting increases in spending on education and rising enrolment rates (OECD 2010). While these efforts are commendable, a human rights perspective can serve as a "yardstick for assessing the myriad of exogenous determinants of education" such as segregation, violence, discrimination and quality (Tomasevski 2003, 21), all of which continue to plague Brazilian education and restrict the rights of even those within formal schools. This also bears relevance to this article's selected case study that involves youth who attend or have completed secondary education albeit in substandard peripheral schools where education did not always fulfil rights or enhance citizenship.

A critical of understanding rights and citizenship within the geospatial inequality of Brazilian urban centres plays an integral role in the discussion of human rights education at the São Paulo periphery. During the rapid urbanization during the 1950s and 1960s, "special segregation and citizenship differentiation were concurrent processes in a project of national modernization" (Holston 2011, 146). The concentration of wealth remained in city centres

while workers and new migrants settled in the periphery, often squatting on land and building temporary settlements. In São Paulo, the majority of upper and middle class communities still inhabit the central and southern areas of the city, encompassed by concentric circles of increasing destitution and violence (Caldeira 2000). Straubhaar (2012) goes as far as to argue that the well-documented poverty and lack of infrastructure in Brazil's poorest favelas, or urban slums, qualifies them as "fragile states." In short, the residents of the peripheries of São Paulo, and other urban centres, still have unequal access to transport, education, health services, cultural centres and museums and a violence-free environment than more affluent centre-dwellers possess, impinging upon the ability to claim and access a multitude of rights.

Since the Worker's Party (Partido dos Trabalhadores, PT) assumed power in 2002, both education and participatory democratic structures have become a focal point of governance, renewing the discourse of citizenship and rights (Gentili, McCowan 2003; Avritzer 2011). The PT has committed to reinventing the public school and has linked education to transformative rights and citizenship by proclaiming education as a fundamental right and also as a constructive right that leads to the enlargement of existing and creation of new rights (PT, in Gentili & McCowan, 2003). The PT also disparages the "banking" model of education (Freire 1970) by asserting that "the pupil is not a receptacle of socially produced knowledge" but a producer of knowledge and meaning (in Gentili & McCowan 2003, 24). Prior to 2002, PT leaders in municipal and state governments had already supported several demo-cratic citizenship programmes, including Freire himself who enacted many reforms in school management, school councils and youth and adult education during his time as Secretary of Education of São Paulo (O'Cadiz et al. 1998; Freire 1993). PT has also attempted to improve access to quality education through augmentation of the Bolsa Familia that provides financial support to families (OECD 2010) and the enactment of affirmative action for higher education (Osario 2008). While these have been noble efforts, Gadotti (2011) notes that the literacy rates in Brazil have stagnated since the 1960s and more efforts need to be made to ensure that children start school on time and have access to quality education. Thus while the political climate has been ripe for integration of Freirean reforms, the realisation of education that achieves aims of trans-formative HRE has occurred less frequently.

In Brazil, citizenship and human rights do not exist as explicit subject areas, perhaps in a move to break away from the nationalistic civic education that was required during the dictatorship (McCowan 2009). Instead, citizenship is meant to be taught across subject areas and act as an overarching curricular goal. In an analysis of Social Sciences curriculum, Maia and Pereira (2007, 10) found that citizenship was treated as a concept "that relates to possibilities of social change but does not address questions of inequality and power." This may signify

formal education's failure to "manage the constantly evolving tensions between democratic principles of egalitarianism and the inequality of everyday lived reality" (Fischman & Haas 2012, 177). Nonetheless, citizenship education exists in some special initiatives, such as the UNESCO Associated schools (Shultz, Guimaraes-Iosif 2012), municipal and state government projects, social movements and NGOs (Ribeiro 2006; McCowan 2009). In particular, popular education, generally based on Freire's method, has been geared towards groups denied education by the formal system, especially women (Stromquist 1997), minorities and rural agrarian communities (La Belle 1987, 2000; Ribeiro 2006; Torres 1990) underlining the important relationship between education and struggles for citizenship. The Landless Movement (Movimento Sem Terra, MST) has often been cited as a successful enactment of politically and socially motivated education contained within a social movement and has used methods and subjects generated from within the movement to create social transformation (Knijnik, Wanderer, Oliveira 2012; Issa 2006; Caldart 2001) and has influenced many other movements in Brazil (Earle 2012). Though popular education is a powerful non-formal learning site, it often serves as an expression of a social movement itself, and can have instrumental ends related to the movement's goals, as opposed to education as a right in itself (Streck 2010). In this case, human rights again can act as a "yardstick" to understanding the ways in which popular education can fulfil rights to and through education (Tomasevksi 2003).

4 Freire, border pedagogy and transformative HRE

This section explores Freire's concept of praxis, or reflection and action, and its influence on transformative HRE (Bajaj 2011; Tibbits 2005; Kapoor 2008; Meintjes 1997). A brief discussion of the aims and methods proposed by Freire lays the groundwork for considering how surveys can be integrated into transformative HRE in the following sections. Others have addressed the connection between Freire and the broader concepts of citizenship (McCowan 2009; Johnson & Morris 2010) and human rights (Meintjes 1997; Bajaj 2011; Kapoor 2008) in greater depth, which is not in the scope of this paper.

Freire's methods and aims paint a picture of what transformative HRE might resemble in practice. For one, Freire (1970) criticised the traditional "banking system" of education where teachers deposit knowledge into the empty vessels of students, finding this model irrelevant, alienating and de-humanising. He argued instead for a "problem posing" education that would incite students to ask questions and be seen as equal contributors of knowledge and experience. To facilitate, teachers should conduct research within the surrounding community to collect "generative themes" or important issues, words and ways of speech that render the learning environment relevant to out-of-school lives. These themes can also be used for codification in the literacy process, which requires using pictures and symbols for the learner to visualise and name certain concepts. In Freire's

opinion, this type of environment enables students to engage in praxis, the dual processes of reflection and action for social transformation, thereby undergoing a process of conscientization, or awareness of systems of oppression. Tibbits (2005) has even asserted that the aim of transformative HRE is conscientization. Thus in a transformative HRE classroom, a lecture-based style of teaching may be less useful than a discussion-based format and teachers must familiarise themselves with the lived realities of students in order to create a space for reflection and action. In particular, teachers interested in transformative HRE can engage in dialogue, which Freire conceptualised as an exchange based on love and with explicit, political aims. For this reason, teachers must ensure that dialogue pertains to social justice and equity, eschewing neutrality and embracing tensions (Freire & Shor 1987; Kincheloe 2004). Accordingly teachers must also strive to maintain a horizontal relationship while not falling into the trap of "friendship" which can detract from instructional role (Bartlett 2005). The complexities of dialogue and the delicate nature of the teacher's role point to the importance of well-trained and socially aware teachers for truly transformative HRE.

The critical pedagogue Henry Giroux has advanced many of Freire's concepts in the aim of educating for social justice in the North American context. Giroux introduces the concept of "border pedagogy" (1991a, 1991b, 2005), which provides a useful conceptual tool for applying Freire's work to the São Paulo periphery. As a type of critical pedagogy, border pedagogy focuses primarily on the struggles of those excluded from mainstream society or from dominant discourses. For Giroux (1991a, xxv), borders are both physical and cultural and are "historically constructed and socially organized within maps of rules and regulations that serve to either limit or enable particular identities, individual capacities, and social forms." Giroux's border pedagogy relies heavily on a Freirean type of conscientization and also on praxis, reflection and action for social change. However his processes requires students at the periphery to question the "epistemological, political, cultural, and social margins that structure the language of history, power, and difference" (Giroux 2005, 20). Giroux (1991a, xxv) also demands that students "rewrite difference through the process of crossing over into cultural borders," thus remapping power and permanently altering personal identity and socio-cultural landscapes. In this sense, border crossing also draws out Freire's (1985) belief that learning, and reading, are dialectic processes – for example, learning to read should change the student and also help the student to change society.

Border pedagogy expresses Freire's ideas within a discourse more readily translated to a situation of acute socio-geographic disparities and helps to map specific challenges of citizenship education in an urban area. It evokes an explicitly postmodernist stance that extends the notion of struggle beyond that of class and draws upon concepts of identity

and difference that are not so explicitly constructed within Freire's own writings. Giroux's inclusion of postmodern ideas such as Bourdieu's (1986) cultural capital also are useful for considering the deprivations that arise from urban inequalities, as the periphery of São Paulo has historically constituted an area of economic and social deprivation. Thus the concept of border pedagogy provides an important lens for considering transformative HRE and critical pedagogy within the Brazilian context and specifically in the case study of urban youth in São Paulo.

While the theoretical opus relating to Freire and critical pedagogy is expansive, less has been written about how to operationalise his ideas. In particular, Bartlett (2005, 345) argues that three elements of critical pedagogy continue to challenge educators: "understanding the meaning of dialogue, transforming traditional teacher-student relations, and incorporating local knowledge into the classroom." Many North American critical pedagogues claim to use Freire's practice but do not always succeed in aligning theory and practice (Freire & Shor 1987; McLaren & Kincheloe 2007). In order to do so, Cho (2013, 160) argues that emphasis must shift from abstract concepts such as "hope" and "love" to concrete and practical understandings of how it they can be enacted in a learning environment. In the following sections, aspects of survey design and administration are discussed in response to such concerns regarding local knowledge, horizontal teacher relations and dialogue and provide concrete examples of theory in action.

5 Surveys as praxis

The second aim of this paper is to highlight the use of surveys as a pedagogical tool and their value in a critical pedagogy of human rights. Freire, in an interview with Rossatto (2004, 4-5), argues that a teacher's obligation is "to inspire students' critical curiosity, and to reveal the world in a rigorously methodical manner (…) The task is to provoke the curiosity of the student so that he or she will be methodical and rigorous." Freire felt that educators needed to encourage students to methodically examine the world to understand it. A survey, which requires choosing a topic to investigate and designing a method for collecting information and data analysis, seem to harness the importance of curiosity and rigor that Freire advocates and is increasingly being imported to classroom environments in Brazil.

Throughout Latin American, the Brazilian Institute of Public Opinion and Statistics (IBOPE) and its subsidiary Institute Paulo Montenegro (IPM) promote the usage of surveys in education through a programme entitled *Nossa Escola Pesquisa Sua Opinião* (NEPSO, translated to Our School Seeks Your Opinion). NEPSO works with NGOs and classrooms across Latin America to equip teachers and students with the tools to undertake surveying and polling. In general, students select topics of interest, develop surveys and conduct them both in and outside of the classroom (Alves 2004). NEPSO argues that this renders the classroom learning more relevant,

encourages critical thinking and allows students to become producers of knowledge, all of which seem in line with the tenets of critical and border pedagogy. The programme is also described as being both humanising and based on love, echoing some of the key tenets of Freire's beliefs (Corrêa & Emer 2007). More importantly, NEPSO encourages schools to use their survey data to create change: for example, in Farroupilha, after conducting a survey and recognising that there was no facility for recyclable waste, the students collaborated with the municipality and a private firm to find a solution (Corrêa & Emer 2007). This also underscores that that surveys are not a standalone tool – they take place amongst classroom discussion, workshops with other NEPSO schools, online forums and post-survey action projects.

Similar to NEPSO, the case study programme, which consists of a non-formal rights-based education programme, revealed that both the teacher and students used surveys to generate themes and knowledge, constituting a unique strategy to counteract "banking education" and to promote horizontal teacher-student relationships. As discussed later, the act of conducting surveys contributed to the remapping and decentring of power by enabling students to embark in new frontiers of the urban landscape, as per Giroux's border pedagogy.

While the use of surveys has produced positive and practical outcomes, their conceptual underpinnings and relevance to Freire's dialogue and praxis must undergo deeper examination. As a research tool, surveys assist in gathering factual information, feelings or opinions, frequency or a population's knowledge about certain issues (Oppenheim 2000; Payne 1952). The act of both writing a questionnaire and administering a survey enables the data collector to make meaning of his or her surroundings, confirm or disprove a hypothesis and give numerical basis to a previously held idea. However, while emphasis is usually placed on how to accurately collect and analyse data, Payne (1952, 26) argues that the person writing questions must also go through a process of awareness, stating that "the first half of the battle consists of putting the issue in a form that we can understand ourselves. We need first and foremost to define the issue precisely, regardless of the general understandability of the worlds." In other words, writing a questionnaire requires the interviewer to engage in a process of critical thought and reflection about *what* he or she wants to discover and thus, when used as a learning tool, could play a part in the "reflection" process of Freirean praxis.

From a Freirean perspective, asking questions plays an important role in both dialogue and in becoming aware of one's world. It can enable the learner to "read the world" by quantifying or confirming one's observed injustices and understanding the shared nature of one's experience or by revealing an unknown phenomenon. It can also serve as a form of codification (Freire 1970) by illustrating a reality through data that the learner can then understand and act upon. However, the act of surveying or

polling has many top-down connotations that seem inherently misaligned with the aims of Freirean pedagogy. Carr-Hill (1984, 276) argues that the survey is a "bourgeois statistical instrument" that reinforces systems of power by 1) placing the researcher in a dominant, "expert" position, 2) imposing the researcher's view of the world through the questions and 3) bestowing power to use the information gathered through the survey. In response to these concerns, Carr-Hill (1984) created a radical survey methodology, inspired in part by Freire, whereby researchers generate the questions from the targeted population prior to survey development to ensure that the language of the survey is accessible and that the questions reflect the community's reality as opposed to the perceptions of the researcher. Community members also participate in data collection and survey results are presented and discussed post-data collection in community forums. Carr-Hill's survey method can be likened to deliberative polling experiments and mirrors some elements of the Choice Work Dialogue method (Yankelovitch 1999), both of which conduct surveys in concordance with a process of dialogue, debate and learning from respondents about the issues at hand. Carr-Hill's model differs though in the sense that the survey is an ongoing process whose findings can empower the community, as opposed to a one-off event, such as many deliberative polling and Choice Work initiatives While some critical pedagogues suggest that surveying may be a strategic tool within pedagogy for liberation, this is generally confined to the teacher's role as in the case of Smyth (2011) who proposes a type of action-research cycle for critical pedagogues (see also Kincheloe 2007). In this sense, these types of Freirean survey approaches differ from the model put forth by NEPSO and IBOPE and which is described in the case study.

As evidenced, the emerging use of surveys as a pedagogical tool in Latin America is a relatively unexplored phenomenon that has potential to be used as a tool within the wider context of education for social transformation, such as transformative HRE. However, a deeper understanding is needed regarding how surveys can assist in generating themes, creating horizontal teaching relationships and opening the classroom to meaningful dialogue. This can ultimately enable transformative HRE and citizenship educators to use innovative tools in their classroom environments or strengthen the practice of educators who already integrate survey methodologies in teaching.

6 Methodologies

This research was conducted over the course of two months in São Paulo during which I attended the bi-weekly meetings of the RightsNow! class and also taught an optional English course. I observed class activities and, on days when class was not held, I worked at the NGO office and collaborated with the teacher, gaining vital insights into the lesson planning process. At the end of two months, I purposively sampled five students - whose names

have been changed to Lucia, Fernando, Vanesa, Claudio and Hugo - to participate in 15-30 minute interviews about their experience in the programme. The students were selected to represent a gender balance, to represent different geographic areas from the Zona Leste and to include students who displayed different levels of classroom participation throughout the course. The semi-structured interviews focused on why they joined the programme, their perceptions of "rights" before and during the programme, their comparisons about the programme and formal school and their opinions about the pedagogies of survey and debate. The interviews took place in Portuguese and were transcribed by a Brazilian. These qualitative research methods were appropriate to the aims of the study, which were to gain an understanding of how HRE curriculum affected the participants and to understand the multiple components which contributed to a transformative environment.

I performed thematic analysis of the data in its original, Portuguese form and personally translated the quotes that appear in the following section. Analysis was conducted by identifying codes in the transcripts and drawing themes from these codes. Themes were then used to consider how the classroom's activities related to Freirean themes. Field journal notes, taken primarily during classroom observations, also served as a primary data source and were used to triangulate data. Finally the data from the students' own surveys was also considered as data which enhanced my own knowledge of the students' life experiences and transformations throughout the course. However, the data set is limited and does not seek to make claims beyond this programme. Furthermore, while the programme is a self-described rights-based programme, it does not explicitly advertise itself as 'Freirean', but through observations of the classroom, along with thematic analysis of interview data, I was able to draw parallels to the theoretical literature on critical pedagogy and transformative HRE.

7 Learning rights and citizenship in RightsNow!

RightsNow! is an eight-month long extra-curricular programme for youth to learn about the right to education and is run by an NGO in central São Paulo with funding from the Municipal Secretariat of Work and Entrepreneurship. The official objective of the programme, as per the municipal website, is to enable at-risk youth to become active mobilisers for the right to education in the Eastern periphery of São Paulo, a low-income zone. However, the programme coordinator described RightsNow! as a political education for youth who want to know more about the right to education and how to access to higher education. In its recruitment materials, the program describes the learning process as including class, debate, and actions in public schools, mobilising other youth and creating materials to help other students think about education. As evidenced from the programme aims, transformation and rights education are key components and thus compliments

the aforementioned discussion of transformative HRE. The programme provides students with a scholarship of equivalent to half of the mon-thly minimum wage and transport stipend of R$80, which in the words of Hugo, acted as a tool for negotiating with parents to be allowed to take the course instead of taking a part time job. All students were between 16-20 years of age, resided in the Eastern periphery and either attended or recently finished secondary school.

Although this article highlights the specific usage of surveys within a rights-based curriculum, the classroom environment that fostered student partici-pation and debate, along with horizontal teacher-student relationship, enhanced the efficacy of the surveying activity. When classroom observations began, the 20 students had divided into groups of three to design their ideal type of secondary education, including subjects, timetables, school structure and field trips. For Vanesa, the act of creating potential solutions was important because even if it was never implemented, she felt that it enabled her to realise that education *could* be a different way in the future. Further validating their visions of future schools, the teacher took diligent notes on their presentations and copied down the visual models that the students had created. At the next session, ideas from each group were included in the teacher's PowerPoint about secondary education, essentially allowing the students to become part of the teaching process. As Hugo mentioned, the teacher demonstrated "flexibility" in course content and methods and integrated the outcomes of class discussion to the overarching themes of the course. This demonstrated a high level of harmony between the process and intended outcomes (McCowan 2013) and embodied a problem-posing education (Freire 1970) in the sense that the students problematised issues of their everyday lives and created new solutions, instead of being taught to exist within the system.

The teacher, who was an alumnus of the project, played an important role in encouraging dialogue. Perhaps because he came from a similar background, the act of generating themes occurred naturally and strengthened his ability to inclusively lead discussion and moderate debate, a trait that the students all agreed was a major strength. Conflict and disaccord were welcomed in the classroom, pointing to a key element of true dialogue (Freire 1970; Freire & Shor 1987; Bartlett 2005). However, the other charac-teristics of dialogue, love and respect, also seemed to be present. The students held the teacher in great esteem, often describing elements of his teaching style that indicated a horizontal relationship. Claudio reported that the students "do not look at him as a teacher, as a superior, but a person who has a little more knowledge than the rest of us, and this bit of knowledge he acquired, he wants to share it with all of us." The use of the word "share" is very important – unlike teaching or giving, sharing implies a mutual, and even dialectic process.

In interviews, students revealed that the course had changed how they viewed education and how

they accessed their right to education. While this cannot solely be attributed to teaching practices that resemble transformative HRE, a certain level of awareness raising through the chosen educational techniques does appear. For example, before the programme, Lucia said that she blamed the teachers for not caring about the students or the headmaster for failing to her job. After hearing lectures and guest speakers at RightsNow!, she said that she learned that "the whole system" was affecting the quality of her education and that change must occur beyond her own school. Claudio admitted that before he took the course, he was planning to enter into a private university if he could not pass the difficult entrance exam for the public University of São Paulo. He told me that through Rights Now!, he learned that it was his right to attend public university and that he wanted to "claim his right" to free university. As Freire (Shor & Freire 1987) argued, educators cannot overlook the practical desires and needs of students, such as the need to work or pursue valued educational or career paths. The programme seemed to be addressing students' rights on two levels – by raising consciousness of *what* their rights were and *how* they were being violated and concurrently empowering them to claim their rights with practical information about universities and higher education. This ultimately constitutes a transformative HRE by not only raising awareness (Meintjes 1997) but also by giving practical tools to change the system through advocacy about rights and through awareness to actually claim one's own rights (Bajaj 2011). At the same time, by bettering their chances of attending public university, the programme potentially remaps the public university student population and contributes to a larger process of decentring and remapping power (Giroux 1991a).

The youth also expressed the importance of learning from their other peers in the conscien-tization process. Interestingly, though all of the stu-dents came from the Eastern periphery and had a certain level of shared experience and identity, the differences in their individual communities and schools lead to rich comparative discussions. In the process of conscientization, learning from other people's realities can play a powerful role in helping students to identify injustices. Rossatto (2004) calls this "collective self-realisation" or the fact that liberation must occur in groups through dialogue and exchange. Often, it was from hearing about other student's experience in other peripheral schools that they began to understand how their rights were being fulfilled or violated. For example, Vanesa explained how she learned about rights from peers through a discussion on school identity cards. While at her school, students were never charged for identity cards, other youth at RightsNow! had been obliged to pay for student IDs required to enter into a school building. Until a discussion at RightsNow!, these students did not realise that their right to enter the school freely, without paying, was being infringed upon and teachers did not inform them of this either. When Vanesa witnessed the students learning about the violation of their own rights, she

said that it impacted her own understanding of the right to free education. This anecdote also illustrates the process of students placing their everyday experiences within a rights-based discourse and understanding their own experiences of injustice (Bajaj 2011).

These classroom elements all set the tone for the use of surveying as a pedagogical tool. The students were introduced to surveys at several moments throughout the course. The teacher began to use the survey by first gathering information about students' normal activities during the week and weekend, asking them to rank the frequency with which they went to parks, parties, the library, photo exhibits, art museums and other sites. The responses from the survey were then compiled into a PowerPoint by the teacher and discussed critically amongst students, with the quantitative information about group's frequentation of spaces like museums, restaurants, friends' homes and parks. This survey also enabled the teacher to generate themes (Freire 1970) for future lectures on cultural capital, and sparked the students to think about why thy pursued certain leisure activities and what spaces they felt were accessible to them as youth living in the periphery. Interestingly, this also highlights the importance of cultural rights within Brazilian society (Dagnino 2003) and the link between educational disadvantage and other social disadvantages the youth experienced.

Following the preliminary survey, the teacher distributed a survey to the students about their experience visiting museums. This time, the youth administered the survey amongst themselves and then compiled and analysed the data as a group. The group discussed the results and considered why they did not frequent museums, citing the cultural and geographic borders of the city (Giroux 2005). Next, youth were assigned to visit a national art museum and, in groups of three or four, administer the same survey to people attending the museum on that day. In addition, the students attended a tour of the museum and viewed exhibits. For most students, this was the first experience doing an interview and they reported positively about the task. Hugo reported that it was a very productive activity and a way of "putting into practice some of what we had learned here [at RightsNow!] about how to communicate." Claudio also expressed that the survey, although small, made them "search more, seek more knowledge," perhaps inciting the desire to metho-dically explore the world, as Freire advocated. Teamwork also made them feel safer to approach strangers in public and in an unfamiliar space, especially for students like Fernando, Hugo and Lucia who mentioned that the survey was a good way to overcome their shyness. In this way, having an assigned activity and a support of the team empowered the students to generate knowledge (Freire 1970) and to "border cross" (Giroux 1991b).

Back in the classroom, the experience of surveying, along with the results from the data collection, were discussed extensively. Each group reported their findings that were then compiled to form a larger data set. Again, this allowed for students to learn from each other and to be active producers of knowledge in the classroom, giving the teacher information that he did not already know. Students began to analyse and control the data, to see whether people from certain areas of the country were more likely to visit museums at an earlier age, or with their family, than other. They compared their own group's responses with those of the larger public and begin to draw conclusions about who could access "public" space like a museum. They realised that no one from São Paulo who was attending the museum that day was from the Eastern periphery, where they resided, and that there were more foreigners than people from São Paulo region. Their data analysis also revealed that the sample began attending museums at a younger age and were accompanied by family, as opposed to their group that went at an older age and was more likely to go with their school. This made them reflect on what societal and economic factors that prevented the RightsNow! students from attending museums and other cultural institutions. The youth eventually connected this to their previous activity on secondary education and their demands for more art and culture within school. The survey contributed to reflection-action dialectic (Freire 1970) by providing quantifiable proof that peripheral youth did not have adequate access to cultural spaces and enabled them to consider how education could play a role in claiming cultural rights. Furthermore, information they gathered during the survey seemed to act as a "codification" (Freire 1970). Freire advocated the use of pictures to codify the concrete realities of students and to help break down words and their meanings, yet this tool was more appropriate when dealing with literacy. However, the numbers and figures derived from the survey seem to adapt the "codification" method for literate urban youth in a transformative HRE setting by giving them concrete symbols with which to make meaning of their environments.

The youth also expressed reactions to the museum visit and to being in a foreign environment. They ultimately linked back to the initial survey about leisure activities and cultural capital and considered why they did not frequently attend cultural institutions, pointing to both the physical distance from their homes and the tacit exclusion they felt as young people and as residents of the periphery. For example, they mentioned the lack of Afro-Brazilian art and culture and the emphasis on European painters. Creating lessons in the outside world exemplifies Freire's (1999, 87) demand that learning diverge from "the narrow view of school as an exclusive space for 'lessons to be taught and lessons to be learned.'" More importantly, the act of going into the museum constituted a border crossing (Giroux 1991a, 1991b, 1999) that enabled them to not only enter into spaces where they might have been excluded but to actively engage with the space and understand how power and privilege shaped museums as a cultural institution. In fact, by engaging the youth in a larger discussion of power structures, they were better able to grasp ideas about

the school curriculum, governance and other educational rights that were affected by the same undercurrents. Thus the survey helped to extend their knowledge of the right to education to a broader political and social consciousness.

To gauge the level of conscientization or analyse whether or not the RightsNow! curriculum actually empowered students to transform society or claim their rights would be very challenging. Furthermore, this research took place during the middle of course thus excluding final activities that would also contribute to awareness and action. However, students expressed changes in their thought processes and a greater understanding of power dynamics, perhaps becoming "more inclusive, differentiating, permeable (open to other viewpoints), critically reflective of assumptions" (Mezirow 2000, 19). Hugo described how he had changed during the programme:

> I understood how things are interconnected. Like, if you live in the periphery, it is related to your school being a certain way, it actively influences the learning environment and everything else. I changed a lot in that sense. I see something, but now I seek to understand. I try to take things out of their surroundings... I need to seek the *why* of things, *why* are things like that, *who* imposes things?....What are my rights? That's changed a lot. How to reclaim my rights and how to research, I think that has changed. I often thought I had didn't have certain rights that I do have.

Through the programme, Hugo began understanding the political nature of education and the injustice in being given a substandard education. Similarly, Claudio said that he learned how to criticize, but "a political criticism, a criticism that has rules, which has a whole movement (…) I'll have this critical view on education. And I'll try to fight for the right to education for all." Criticality and action also could indicate an impact of learning environment that embodied elements of Freire's praxis on the students. In fact, Fernando, Lucia and Vanesa all said that they wanted to fight for the rights of future generations as a result of attending the project. Of course they may have displayed such enthusiastic views since their interviewer was also perceived as a teacher. But the classroom discussions, along with the stories they told about specific issues where they had become aware of rights violations and ways to claim rights indicates that their perspectives did indeed change throughout the course.

The above paragraphs place the use of surveying as a pedagogical tool within a non-formal project that taught human rights as a transformative value. However, it has also shown that surveying cannot be a stand-alone form of praxis. It involves reflection, dialogue both before and after administration and connection to a larger theme of justice and rights. Furthermore, it requires a teacher who is trained and able to facilitate dialogue and surveys in a non-hierarchical manner. While the interview and observational data sets are admittedly limited, they do indicate practices that reflect the broader ideals and practices advocated by Freire and other liberatory

educators. Thus the use of surveys within this setting serves to highlight its complementary role within a transformative HRE and other education that seeks to engage students as active generators of knowledge and agents of change.

8 Conclusion

This article has shown how transformative HRE and citizenship are taught in a non-formal education programme for marginalized youth. It has considered the connections between transformative human rights and citizenship, giving examples from a Brazilian context, and has demonstrated the value of critical pedagogy in the process. In spite of the rapid growth of Brazil's economy and progressive leadership on municipal and federal levels, local and national citizenship in the form of economic, cultural and social rights, has yet to be fully enacted for a large portion of society. Thus it is important to recognize citizenship as an on-going struggle for rights in Brazil and to seek out educational methods that can foster critical reflection and action on prevailing injustices.

This article has offered a small but powerful example of how a rights-based education program can employ pedagogical tools that originate from the work of Paulo Freire and other critical pedagogues. However, as Freire himself acknowledged (1970, 48), "in the struggle this pedagogy will be made and remade," reminding educators that as social and political realities evolve, so must our conceptualisations of citizenship, rights and teaching strategies. Thus by considering the theoretical implications of surveys as a tool within praxis, and considering its use within a transformative, rights-based learning environment, the article has addressed the necessity of advancing the theoretical and practical elements Freire's work.

The case study, though limited in scope, demonstrated the use of surveys as a pedagogical tool that enhanced a "problem-posing" education. Further studies should be conducted in Brazil and Latin America on the influence of NEPSO, IBOPE and classrooms that are using surveys with transformational ends. These findings can contribute to a deeper understanding of how to operationalize Freire's work for citizenship and human rights in Latin America.

References

Alves, Januaria. 2004. Nossa Escola Pesquisa Sua Opinião: Diario de Pesquisa [Our School Seeks Your Opinion: Research Diary]. São Paulo: Global.

Arendt, Hannah. 1973. The Origins of Totalitarianism. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.

Avritzer, Leonardo. 2010. Living Under a Democracy: Participation and Its Impact on the Living Conditions of the Poor. In: Latin American Research Review, Vol. 45, 166-185.

Bajaj, Monisha. 2011. Human Rights Education: Ideology, Location, and Approaches. In: Human Rights Quarterly, Vol. 33, No. 2, 481-508.

Banks, James. 2008. Diversity, Group Identity and Citizenship in a Global Age. In: Educational Researcher, Vol. 37, No. 3, 129-139.

Bartlett, Lesley. 2005. Dialogue, Knowledge, and Teacher-Student Relations: Freirean Pedagogy in Theory and Practice. In: Comparative Education Review, Vol. 49, No. 3, 344-364.

Brysk, Alison; Shafir, Gershon, eds. 2004. People Out of Place. New York, London: Routledge.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1986. The Forms of Capital. In: Richardson, John, ed. Handbook for Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education. New York: Greenwood, 241-258.

Caldart, Roseli. 2001. O MST E A Formação Dos Sem Terra: O Movimento Social Como Princípio Educativo [MST And The Education Of The Landless: The Social Movement As An Educational Principle]. In: Estudos Avançados [Advanced Studies], Vol. 15, No. 43, 207-224.

Caldeira, Teresa. 2000. City of Walls: Crime, Segregation, and Citizenship in São Paulo. Los Angeles, London: University of California Press.

Carr-Hill, Roy. 1984. Radicalising Survey Methodology. In: Quality and Quantity, Vol.18, No. 3, 275-292.

Cho, Seehwa. 2013. Critical Pedagogy and Social Change: Critical Analysis on the Language of Possibility. New York: Routledge.

Correa, Aline; Emer, Simone. 2007.Apprender para Além dos Muros Escolares [Learning beyond the School Walls]. Instituto Montenegro. (www.upplay.com.br/restrito/nepso2007/pdf/reok_nepso _aprender_ paraalemadosmuros.pdf) Accessed 14 July 2013.

Dagnino, Evelina. 2003. Citizenship In Latin America: An Introduction. In: Latin American Perspectives, Vol. 30, No. 2, 211-225.

Dagnino, Evelina. 2005. "We All Have Rights But…" Contesting Concepts of Citizenship in Brazil. In: Kabeer, Naila, ed. Inclusive Citizenship: Meanings and Expressions. London, 149-163.

Darder, Antonia. 2002. Teaching as an Act of Love: The Classroom and Critical Praxis. Boulder: Westview.

DeJaeghere, Joan. 2009. Critical Citizenship Education for Multicultural Societies. In: Interamerican Journal of Education for Democracy, Vol. 2, No. 2, 223-236.

Earle,Lucy. 2012. From Insurgent to Transgressive Citizenship: Housing, Social Movements and the Politics of Rights in São Paulo. In: Journal of Latin American Studies Vol. 44, No. 1, 97126.

Fielding, Michael; Moss, Peter. 2010. Radical Education and the Common School. London: Routledge.

Fischman, Gustavo; Haas, Eric. 2012. Beyond Idealized Citizenship Education : Embodied Cognition, Metaphors and Democracy. In: Review Of Research In Education, Vol. 36, No. 1,169 -196.

Freire, Paulo. 1970. Pedagogy of the Oppressed. New York: Continuum.

Freire, Paulo. 1978. Pedagogy in Process: The Letters to Guinea-Bissau. New York: Seabury Press.

Freire, Paulo. 1985. The Politics of Education: Culture, Power, and Liberation. South Hadley: Bergin and Garvey.

Freire, Paulo. 1993. Pedagogy of the City. New York: Continuum.

Freire, Paulo. 1999. Education and Community Involvement. In: Castells, Manuel; Fecha, Ramón; Freire, Paulo; Giroux, Henry; Macedo, Donaldo; Willis, Paul, eds. Critical Education in the New Information Age. Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield, 83-91.

Freire, Paulo; Shor, Ira. 1987. A Pedagogy for Liberation: Dialogues on Transforming Education. South Hadley: Bergin and Garvey.

Fritzsche, Karl-Peter. 2008. What Do Human Rights Mean For Citizenship Education?. In: Journal Of Social Science Education, Vol. 6, No. 2, 40-49.

Gadotti, Moacir. 2005. A Questão Da Educação Formal/Não-Formal [The Question of Formal/Nonformal Education]. (www.Virtual.Ufc.Br/Solar/Aula_Link/Llpt/A_A_H/Estrutura _Politica_GestaoOrganizacional/Aula_01/Imagens/01 /Educacao_Formal_Nao_Formal_2005.Pdf) Accessed 28 Mar 2013.

Gadotti, Moacir. 2011. Adult Education as a Human Right: The Latin American Context and the Ecopedagogic Perspective. In: International Review of Education, Vol. 57, No. 1, 9-25.

Gentili, Pablo; Mccowan, Tristan. 2003. Reinventar Escola Pública: Política Educacional Para mm Novo Brasil [Reinventing the Public School: Educational Policy for a New Brazil]. Petrópolis, Brasil: Editora Vozes.

Goirand, Camille. 2003. Citizenship and Poverty in Brazil. In: Latin American Perspectives, Vol. 30, No. 2, 226-248.

Giroux, Henry. 1991a. Series Introduction: Rethinking The Pedagogy of Voice, Difference and Cultural Struggle. In: Walsh, Catherine. Pedagogy and The Struggle for Voice: Issues of Language, Power, and Schooling For Puerto Ricans. New York: Bergin and Garvey, xv-xxv.

Giroux, Henry, ed. 1991b. Postmodernism, Feminism, and Cultural Politics: Redrawing Educational Boundaries. New York: SUNY.

Giroux, Henry. 2005. Border Crossings: Cultural Workers And The Politics Of Education, 2nd Edition. New York: Routledge.

Glaeser, Edward; Ponzetto, Giacomo; Shleifer, Andrei. 2007. Why Does Democracy Need Education?. In: Journal of Economic Growth, Vol. 12, No. 2, 77–99.

Gutmann, Amy; Thompson, Dennis. 2004. Why Deliberative Democracy?. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Hanchard, Michael, ed. 1999. Racial Politics in Contemporary Brazil. Durham: Duke University Press.

Holston, James. 2009. Insurgent Citizenship: Disjunctions Of Democracy and Modernity in Brazil. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Huaman, Hilaria; Koenig, Shulamith; Shultz, Lynette. 2008. A Call and Response: Human Rights as a Tool of Dignity and Transformation. In: Abdi, Ali; Shultz, Lynette, eds. Educating for Human Rights and Global Citizenship. New York: SUNY, 11-24.

Issa, Daniela. 2007. Praxis of Empowerment: Mística and Mobilization in Brazil's Landless Rural Workers' Movement. In: Latin American Perspectives, Vol. 34, No. 2, 124-138.

Johnson, Laura; Morris, Paul. 2010. Towards a Framework for Critical Citizenship. In: Curriculum Journal, Vol. 21, No. 1, 77-96.

Kapoor, Dip. 2008. Popular Education and Human Rights: Prospects for Anti-Hegemonic Adivasi (Original Dweller) Movements and Counter-Hegemonic Struggles in India. In:. Abdi, Ali; Shultz, Lynette, eds. Educating for Human Rights and Global Citizenship. New York: SUNY, 113-128..

Kincheloe, Joe. 2004. Critical Pedagogy. New York: Peter Lang Publishing.

Kincheloe, Joe. 2007. Teachers as Researchers: Qualitative Inquiry as a Path to Empowerment. New York: Routledge.

Knijnik, Gelsa; Wanderer, Fernanda; Oliveira, Claudio. 2012. Cultural Differences, Oral Mathematics and Calculators in a Teacher Training Course of the Brazilian Landless Movement'. In: ZDM, Vol. 37, No. 2, 101-108.

Labelle, Thomas J. 1987. From Consciousness-Raising to Popular Education in Latin America and the Caribbean. In: Comparative Education Review, Vol. 31, No. 2, 201-217.

Labelle, Thomas J. 2000. The Changing Nature of Non-Formal Education in Latin America. In: Comparative Education, Vol. 36, No. 1, 21-36.

Maia, Angelica; Pereira, Maria. 2011. Citizenship Education and Curriculum Policy in Brazil: Facing Challenges and Prefiguring Changes. In: Transnational Curriculum Inquiry, Vol. 8, No. 2, 4-21.

McLaren, Peter; Kincheloe, Joe, eds. 2007. Critical Pedagogy: Where Are We Now?. New York: Peter Lang.

McCowan, Tristan. 2009. Rethinking Citizenship Education: A Curriculum for Participatory Democracy. London: Continuum.

McCowan, Tristan. 2013. Education as a Human Right: Principles for a Universal Entitlement to Learning. London: Bloomsbury.

McLaughlin, T.H. 1992. Citizenship, Diversity and Education: A Philosophical Perspective. Journal Of Moral Education, Vo. 21, No. 3, 235250.

Mische, Ann. 1995. Projecting Democracy: The Formation of Citizenship Across Youth Networks in Brazil. In: International Review of Social History, Vol. 40, No. S3, 131-158.

Meintjes, Garth. 1997. Human Rights Education as Empowerment: Reflections on Pedagogy. In Andreopoulos, George; Claude, Richard, eds. Human Rights Education for the Twenty-First Century. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 64-95.

Mezirow, Jack. 2000. Learning As Transformation: Critical Perspectives on a Theory in Progress. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

O'Cadiz, Mary Pilar; Torres, Carlos Alberto; Lindquist Wong, Pia. 1998. Education and Democracy: Paulo Freire, Social Movements and Educational Reform in São Paulo. Boulder: Westview.

Oppenheim, Bram. 2000. Questionnaire Design, Interviewing and Attitude Measurement. London: Continuum.

Osario, Rafael. 2008. Class, Race and Access to Higher Education in Brazil'. Department of Social Studies And Policies Of The Applied Economics Research Institute – Brasília. (http://www.Scielo.Br/Pdf/Cp/V39n138/En_V39n138a09.Pdf) Accessed 12 July 2013.

Otis, John. 2013. Brazil's "Educational Apartheid" Cements Inequality Early in Life. Global Post. 17 Jan. 2013. (http://www.globalpost.com/dispatch/news/regions/americas/brazil/130111/brazil-education-income-inequality) Accessed 12 July 2013.

Oxhorn, Philip. 2011. Sustaining Civil Society: Economic Change, Democracy, and the Social Construction of Citizenship in Latin America. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press.

Payne, Stanley. 1952. The Art of Asking Questions. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Pinheiro, Paulo. 2002. The Paradox Of Democracy In Brazil. In: The Brown Journal of World Affairs, Vol. 8, No. 1, 113-122.

Ribeiro, Carlos Antonio. 2006. Classe, Raça e Mobilidade Social no Brasil [Class, Race and Social Mobility in Brazil].. In: Dados - Revista De Ciências Sociais [Data – Social Science Review], Vol. 49, No. 4, 833-873.

Rodrigues, José. 2006. 'Qual Cidadania, Qual Democracia, Qual Educação? [Which Citizenship, Which Democracy, Which Education?]. In: Trabalho, Educação E Saúde [Work, Education and Health], Vol. 4, No. 2, 417-430.

Rossatto, Cesar. 2004. Engaging Paulo Freire's Pedagogy of Possibility: From Blind to Transformative Optimism. Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield.

Sherriff, Robin 2001. Dreaming Equality: Color, Race and Racism in Urban Brazil. Piscataway: Rutgers University Press.

Shultz, Lynette; Guimaraes-Iosif, Ranilce. 2012. Citizenship Education and the Promise of Democracy: A Study of UNESCO Associated Schools in Brazil and Canada'. In: Education, Citizenship and Social Justice, Vol. 7, No. 3, 241-254.

Streck, Danilo. 2010. Entre Emancipação e Regulação: (Des)Encontros Entre Educação Popular e Movimentos Sociais [Between Emancipation and Regulation: (Mis)encounters between Popular Education and Social Movements]. In: Revista Brasileira da Educação [Brazilian Review of Education], Vol. 15, No. 44, 300-310.

Stromquist, Nelly. 1997. Literacy for Citizenship: Gender and Grassroots Dynamics in Brazil. New York: SUNY.

Smyth, John. 2011. Critical Pedagogy for Social Justice. London: Continuum.

Straubhaar, Rolf. 2012. A Broader Definition of Fragile States: The Communities and Schools of Brazil's Favelas. In: Current Issues in Comparative Education, Vol. 15, No 1, 41-51.

Taylor, Edward. 2007. An Update of Transformative Learning Theory: A Critical Review of the Empirical Research (1999–2005). In: International Journal of Lifelong Education, Vol. 26, No. 2, 173-191.

Tibbits, Felicia. 2002. Emerging Models of Human Rights Education. Human Rights Education Association.
http://Www.Hrea.Org/Index.Php?Doc_Id=558 accessed 12 July 2013.

Tibbitts, Felicia. 2005. Transformative Learning and Human Rights Education: Taking a Closer Look. In: Intercultural Education, Vol. 16, No. 2, 107-113.

Tomasevski, Katerina. 2003. Education Denied: Costs and Remedies. London: Zed Books.

Torres, Carlos Alberto. 1990. The Politics of Nonformal Education in Latin America. New York: Praeger.

Veloso, Leticia. 2008. Universal Citizens, Unequal Childhoods: Children's Perspectives on Rights and Citizenship in Brazil. In: Latin American Perspectives, vol. 35, No. 4, 45-59.

Vegas, Emiliana; Petrow, Jenny. 2008. Raising Student Learning in Latin America: The Challenge for the 21st Century. Washington DC: World Bank.

Yankelovich, Daniel. 1999. The Magic of Dialogue: Transforming Conflict into Cooperation. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Endnote

[1] The names of the programme and the students have been changed to protect anonymity.