

## Living Global Citizenship: A New Pedagogy for Citizenship Education.

Mark Potts

### Mark Potts

*Independent Educational  
Consultant*  
UK

### Abstract

This multi-media account is based on the ideas in the book: International Educational Development and Learning through Sustainable Partnerships (Coombs, Potts & Whitehead, 2014). It traces the origins of Living Global Citizenship in a sustained international partnership between two schools and how this represents an academic leap from the concept of living educational theory. A set of pedagogical protocols are proposed as a practical guide for the development of Living Global Citizenship projects as a means of fulfilling the goal of providing meaningful citizenship education. I also explain why it is significant for those involved in international development work to engage in self-studies of their own influence in enquiries of the kind, 'How do I improve what I am doing?' in ways that avoid colonisation, but enable mutual negotiation and agreement of common values. Finally, I call for others to use living-global-citizenship as a standard of judgment to help to critically evaluate and strengthen this contribution to authentic knowledge.

Copyright: © 2014 Potts

This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution Non-Commercial License, which permits unrestricted non-commercial use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

**Keywords: Global Citizenship; Cultural Empathy; Partnership; Pedagogy; Citizenship Education; International Development.**

## a) The Origins of Living Global Citizenship

### 1) The Development of an International Partnership

The original idea of Living Global Citizenship emerged from my action research enquiry into the partnership between my own school in Salisbury, UK and a black township school in Durban, South Africa. The partnership began in the year 2000 and was established after a UK Department for Education funded visit to South Africa to study leadership. While visiting the black township school I experienced a living contradiction (Whitehead, 1989). In other words, I heard and saw students striving to achieve their hopes and dreams to be professional people capable of looking after themselves and their families and helping their community, yet unable to do so because of the financial constraints on them. Teaching colleagues were working hard to provide an education that would provide the learners with an opportunity to escape the poverty. They were expressing their frustration at how few of their hardest working pupils would be able to continue their studies beyond school. This is a community decimated by poverty and Aids. What I saw and heard challenged my embodied belief in social justice, equal opportunities and humanity. In order to live out those values more fully I knew that I had to act. You can see an example of a video interview that I did with one of the pupils from the school here.



**Video 1: [Hopes and Dreams](#)** (Potts 2012)  
- <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=gVWYck2-SrM>

In this video interview that I conducted with Siyabonga, he expresses the hopes and dreams that the pupils have and we discuss some of the constraints that they face in

realising their hopes and dreams. He talks about the desire of the students to get a good education and a good job so that they can escape the poverty and AIDs that are holding back their community. It was the stories of pupils like Siyabonga that made me want to improve my practice by developing the partnership between our schools.

Thus, the partnership began with emails between myself and one of the teachers. It continues to this day, fourteen years later, and has over the years included several hundred participants from the two schools and the wider communities in Salisbury and Kwamashu. There have been several exchange visits of staff, students and members from the two communities. A joint business scheme has been set up to support the township community and a bursary system has been established to pay for students from the township school to attend University in South Africa.

As the partnership was established I embarked on my action research enquiry of the kind 'How do I improve what I am doing?' (Whitehead, 1989). I was enquiring into how I could influence my own learning through participation in the partnership, how I could influence the learning of the other participants in the partnership, and how I could influence the social formations in which we live and work. I wanted my research to meet the requirements of the academy while at the same time improving the lot of humanity.

## **2) The Emergence of Living Citizenship**

As I worked alongside colleagues to develop the partnership, I used action-reflection cycles to systematically explore how I could improve my practice as an educator through the activities that were designed to increase participation. I studied my own contributions to the partnership and I began to recognise certain key values that were driving me in the actions that I was taking. I identified these embodied values as social justice, equal opportunities and Ubuntu (a Zulu term which translates loosely into English as "I am because we are", and recognises the importance of togetherness). Through the use of video I was able to test the extent to which I was living out these values by showing clips to fellow participants in the partnership and to teaching colleagues. This process enhanced the validity of my explanation of educational influence. As I clarified and communicated my values, the notion of Living Citizenship emerged as I recognised that, just as through the development of a living-educational-theory the researcher is active, in the present and engaged through the research in living out his/her own values more fully, so through "living-citizenship", the participants in the partnership are actively engaged in living out their values more fully through the activities of the partnership. Through this engagement they develop opportunities for living out their values as active citizens. Recognition of Living Citizenship as an original concept represented a transformation in my own learning (Potts, 2012).

Living Citizenship recognises the contribution that can be made by educational partnerships to improving the lives of oneself and of others, focusing on the question, 'How am I contributing to improving the lives of others?' Living Citizenship projects are motivated by the desire to contribute to the improvement of our own lives and to the lives of others (Whitehead & Huxtable, 2013).

### 3) Living Citizenship Becomes Global

Another transformation in my learning occurred as I shared the notion of Living Citizenship with friends and colleagues. This transformation was the addition of the global aspect of citizenship so that it became Living Global Citizenship. In our book (Coombs, Potts & Whitehead, 2014) we argue that the global perspective of citizenship occupies a description of humanity itself, indeed, a humanity described in terms of its rich cultural differences and contributions to a 21st century world. So a global citizen can be understood in terms of cultural origins, exchange and development. Moreover, the ability of an emerging global citizen to appreciate other cultures and societies and move towards a common shared set of values and understanding is a valuable goal. This global appreciation of other cultures, traditions and values is something we argue as “cultural empathy”. Cultural empathy is both a social policy and an act of humanity and when combined with our notion of living-citizenship helps us to define what we mean by “living-global-citizenship”. Cultural empathy also helps us to celebrate and appreciate the richness of cultural difference as promoted by Martin and Griffiths (2012), and others (Andreotti 2011; Todd 2008). Whilst cultural empathy is a human – indeed living – human quality, it is also something that can be formulated into social and educational policy. We use the term *living global citizenship* because it is an expression of how global citizenship can be lived out as a value. This idea of living out our values derives from Whitehead's (1989) notion of Living Educational Theory research. The connection between Living Global Citizenship and Living Educational Theory research is explored further in the next section. Existing educational areas such as citizenship can become living global-citizenship where such a curriculum includes both content and activities that enable cultural empathy to take place. Clearly, cultural empathy goes beyond mere study. It is something that needs to be acted upon and experienced by all those engaged within such a curriculum.

This transformation from living-citizenship to living-global-citizenship incorporates a postcolonial perspective on development that recognises that the focus of any partnership should not solely be on economic poverty, but should also examine and confront the issues of injustice and power-relations. Thus, such transformed partnerships need to initially negotiate their terms of reference through jointly identifying and articulating the key *shared values* of importance to all participants. In the partnership with South Africa the shared values were developed through consistent dialogue between participants including students and teachers from both schools and members of both communities. By keeping these lines of dialogue open we were learning from each other and developing activities in tune with our values. For example, we learned about the value of “Ubuntu”, a Zulu word with no direct translation into English but meaning approximately, humanity (Tutu, 1999). We jointly devised a bursary scheme to support students who graduated from Nqabakazulu School to continue their education at University. When the Headteacher of Nqabakazulu School says, ‘You did Ubuntu by making them realise their dreams. It was an act of humanity’ (Potts, 2012, p. 226), he is using the word Ubuntu to describe the sense of awareness of others that participants in the partnership have shown in providing support for pupils to further their education by attending University. Such a values-led agenda predicates the flow of all such actions that any project may take forward. It can also usefully underpin any social manifesto (Coombs, 1995, p. 315) or bespoke charter-agreement that builds in the unique cultural contexts and needs of all the participants. In this way Living Global Citizenship’s designed

(and inspired) projects celebrate and put cultural difference and cultural knowledge at the heart of any international partnership. Understanding different cultural contexts and celebrating such *difference* as part of the essential design of any partnership project requires the core value that we refer to as “Cultural Empathy” (Coombs, Potts & Whitehead, 2014).

An Ubuntu way of being, doing and knowing can be used to extend the idea of living-citizenship into living-global-citizenship. This term, “living-global-citizenship”, is one that we have developed and it fluidises cultural and ethnic boundaries that could otherwise limit living-citizenship within impermeable national and cultural boundaries. It can enhance flows of communication within and between these boundaries with values that carry hope for the future of humanity and thereby enables greater social justice through challenging and mitigating cultural divisions (Coombs & Potts, 2013) within and across global societies.

#### **4) Living Global Citizenship and Living Educational Theory research**

The idea of Living Global Citizenship was inspired by my engagement in Living Educational Theory Action Research. Using my own “methodological inventiveness” (Dadds & Hart, 2001, p. 166) I created my own unique way through my research. With support, I created an enquiry approach that enabled a new idea to emerge, an idea that empowers practitioners to improve their practice for the benefit of others. I distinguished *living citizenship* with Ubuntu, social justice and equal opportunities and brought it as a living standard of judgment into the Academy through the legitimation of my doctoral thesis (Potts, 2012).

The importance of living-global-citizenship as a living standard of judgment is its epistemological significance in evaluating the validity of contributions to knowledge where the individual is holding themselves accountable as a living-global-citizen. Such a contribution can fulfill both halves of the core mission of the American Educational Research Association (2012). That is, to advance knowledge about education, to encourage scholarly inquiry related to education **and** to promote the use of education to improve practice and serve the wider public good. It is in relation to improving practice and serving the public good that living-global-citizenship as a living standard of judgment is most significant with the potential to leverage useful social impacts in the community.

At the heart of this idea is the belief that the more that individuals can be encouraged to account for themselves in learning to live their values of global-citizenship as fully as possible and to share these accounts with others, then the more they are contributing to making the world a better place to be. This contribution rests on living and researching enquiries of the kind, ‘How do I improve what I am doing?’ in social contexts where the individual is seeking to live their value of living-global-citizenship as fully as possible. Researching one’s own practice in this way requires the sharing of one’s living-educational-theory with living-global-citizenship as an explanatory principle to which one holds oneself accountable.

There are clear connections between the ideas of Living Global Citizenship and the work of other living educational theorists.

Marie Huxtable (2014) talks about a “living boundary” as a learning space that allows creativity to emerge. This is exactly the sort of boundary/space that can be created by

participants in partnerships to enable them to live out their values as living-global-citizens and to demonstrate cultural-empathy allowing the partnership to flourish along with the participants themselves.

Adler Collins (2014) emphasises cultural differences as a living boundary, which enables him to be creative in holding the tension between his own Buddhist teaching and the teaching of the Koran as he lives and works in Oman teaching in the medical profession. This creative tension gives rise to him living out the value of cultural-empathy as he seeks to overcome “cultural blind-spots” and have a de-colonising influence.

The work of DeLong (2014) on developing a culture of inquiry by providing a safe and supportive space for learning and her idea of being ‘loved into learning’ is akin to the idea of living-global-citizenship as participants share their values and develop a partnership for learning based on trust and mutual support.

### **5) Living Legacies - Living Global Citizenship in Action**

Living Global Citizenship then emerged from a Living Theory action research based study of the partnership between a UK school and a South African school. In order to test its validity and to refine our understanding of these new notions of Cultural Empathy and Living Global Citizenship, we invited others to contribute their narratives of how they are living out these values. In our book, *International Development and Learning Through Sustainable Partnerships: Living Global Citizenship* (Coombs, Potts & Whitehead, 2014), we provide many examples of what we call living legacies – narrative accounts of how practitioners around the world are engaged in values-based activities as they live out their lives as global citizens and contribute to making a difference to the lives of others. These accounts are personal statements that validate these new and original notions of Cultural Empathy and Living Global Citizenship. They include the following examples:

- Je Kan Adler Collins' (2013) account of his work as a nurse in a Thai hospice using touch as a means of relieving the suffering of patients.
- Phil Tattersall's (2011) work in Tasmania in establishing community partnerships to empower communities to tackle environmental issues of concern.
- Professor Lesley Wood's (2012) research in South Africa on the Transformative potential of action research.
- Swaroop Rawal's (2009) research into how she can enhance the educational experiences of disadvantaged young people in Mumbai.
- Moira Laidlaw's (2008) work supporting action researchers in China.
- Margaret Farren's expression of her spirituality in her relationships with students and colleagues in Ireland.

We use such data from different national contexts to support our claim that forms of cultural-empathy and living-global-citizenship are emerging from research by individuals into their own practice that involves living as fully as possible values that carry hope for the future of humanity.

We also identify some possible projects that could be undertaken to demonstrate these key citizenship values. For example: What would a Living Global Citizenship

interpretation of the “Life-in-the-United-Kingdom” test look like? How could the examination process be re-conceptualised? Given the core values of Living Global Citizenship we argue for a shift in approach from the passive assumption of ‘life’ reported second hand, to *living* reported personally by the would-be citizen. This would change the reporting emphasis from researching facts about other's *life* in the UK to instead accumulating evidence of constructive engagement through *living* in the UK. In Living Global Citizenship terms, the applicant would prepare evidence of their *life-case* justification of wanting to become a British citizen, obviously with suitable guidance provided. A personally-constructed and authenticated living-in-the-UK presentation-portfolio could be produced by prospective applicants for British-citizenship. Such a life-case portfolio would be put together so as to demonstrate a genuine attempt by the applicant to become actively included within society and this evidence could also be examined for authenticity through a brief oral examination that could demonstrate language proficiency. In this way various examples of personal experience of understanding and adapting to British culture combined with a personal proficiency of language could be embedded within such a proposed “Living-in-the-UK” test.

## **b) Pedagogical Protocols**

### **1) A Different Kind of Citizenship Education**

Whilst we see examples of living-global-citizenship emerging from practitioners’ accounts as they engage in action research accounts around the world, we also think that it has implications for policy in the field of citizenship education.

Citizenship education programmes are in place in many countries around the world. These programmes have been introduced as a result of the social problems of global mobility and the consequent emerging multicultural societies:

Citizenship education has arisen against a social backdrop of considerable social and political upheaval caused by the rise of nationalism and increased disregard for ‘civic virtues’. Within this climate the nation state can no longer be viewed as the given natural order. (Simon, 2005 p. 1)

According to QCA (1999) citizenship education is further propelled by the ‘increasingly complex nature of our society, the greater cultural diversity and the apparent loss of value consensus, combined with the collapse of traditional support mechanisms’ (p.7).

When citizenship education was launched in UK secondary schools in 1999, Crick recognised its potential educational value: ‘Citizenship is more than a statutory subject. If taught well and tailored to local needs, its skills and values will enhance democratic life for us all, both rights and responsibilities, beginning in school, and radiating out’ (Crick, 1999).

Unfortunately, Crick’s vision for citizenship education is one that schools in the UK have found it hard to live up to. ‘Secondary schools in England are reported to be struggling to provide citizenship lessons, due to other pressures on the curriculum and the low status of the subject’ (Garratt & Piper 2010, p. 18).

This negative picture of citizenship education provision in the UK is supported by OFSTED's 2010 report into Citizenship Education that in just under half of all cases provision is: 'no better than satisfactory overall', and that a 'new direction and impetus are needed' (OFSTED, 2010, p. 5).

The Citizenship Education Longitudinal Study conducted by UK's National Foundation for Educational Research (NFER, 2010) reported that schools needed help with embedding citizenship education into their curriculum, school culture and wider community. Practice remains patchy and uneven, with some schools making better progress with citizenship education than others. The report highlighted that the most successful approach was one where citizenship education is embedded into the curriculum, has links to student participation across the school/college, and encourages links with the wider community. The report called for an increase in the use of *active* teaching and learning methods.

From our Living Global Citizenship perspective of citizenship education, there is a real danger that passive forms of citizenship education such as the Life in the United Kingdom test (See above – section b-5) lead to impersonal embedding of national values as cultural stereotypes and that this in turn leads to potential myth-making and passive misconstruing of the construct of citizenship.

Whilst active citizenship recognises the importance of experiential participation in partnership work, we propose that living-global-citizenship accounts of community-based learning can take the activity a step further. This is because the approach of Living Global Citizenship encourages participation as a form of embedded critical engagement through cultural negotiation, analysis and critical dialogue with participants. Thus, the shift in approach in moving from normal systems of active citizenship is one where living-global-citizenship can be seen as a *values-added* experience linked to meaningful action. Activity in itself is insufficient for a sustained form of participation as a citizen. A more meaningful citizenship experience is one where there is critical engagement between participants, as equals, in dialogue about values that lead to a common understanding on how the partnership develops – as there was in the partnership between Salisbury High School and Nqabakazulu School in South Africa and as there is in the accounts of Adler-Collins, Tattersall etc. (see section a 5 above). From this living-global-citizenship activity the identification and agreement of any resultant project's social manifesto for change emerges. Thus, living-global-citizenship becomes a way of living out one's values more fully through engagement in activities that contribute to improving the lives of oneself, others and the social formations in which we live. In turn this type of social engagement develops a better understanding of diversity and cultural differences through personal acts of cultural-empathy within a climate of mutually-generated trust associated with the core principles of Living Global Citizenship.

A Living Global Citizenship education curriculum would be one in which its participants engage with and develop a real sense of cultural empathy through the *living* activities and opportunities offered. These might include a new interpretation and delivery of international educational exchange visits; smart uses of technology and social networking sites to enable greater access to cultural experiences; and, beyond the classroom, new types of professional development for the educational workforce through a re-conceptualisation



of international educational development and an introduction of a new form of international continuing professional development (ICPD).

## 2) The Pedagogical Protocols

From my reflections on the partnership between my own school and Nqabakazulu School and as I came to clarify and communicate my values as I lived them out through the partnership, a set of pedagogical protocols emerged that seemed to provide an account of how the partnership had developed. This led to me wondering whether they might be applicable to other partnerships. With the help of Jack Whitehead and Steven Coombs I found other examples of practitioners involved in partnership work throughout the world (see above section a 5) and through discussion we refined the protocols further. We offer them here as a tool for learning and for development.

This set of protocols provides a practical application of Sayers' (2002) notion of citizenship education as touching the hearts of participants. They help to address the concerns of Martin and Griffiths (2012) about educational partnerships as a means of tackling negative prejudice and the concerns of postcolonial theorists (Andreotti, 2011, Bailee-Smith, 2011) about the hegemonic nature of the neo-liberal paradigm in the discourse about international development. Living Global Citizenship provides an alternative approach for international development – one that is contextualised, is based on dialogue between participants, is inclusive, recognises difference as well as similarity and leads to empowerment through common shared values underpinning the flow of action. The absence of a genuine pedagogy for citizenship education led to the question being posed by Gearon (2003): 'How do we learn to become good citizens?' The proposed set of protocols that follow address this question, as well as the question posed by Zammitt (2008) regarding what a partnership based on equality, mutual respect and understanding would look like. I also respond to Kerr (1999), who asks effective citizenship education is.

The fact that these questions were posed illustrates evidence of a curriculum deficit and the need for pedagogical protocols in citizenship education and the need to integrate this within community partnerships. The protocols build on the work of Crick (1999) with an emphasis on citizenship education as a means of exploring and identifying values and developing human relationships. In a wider context, the protocols provide a practical example of enabling Sachs' (1999) notion of an activist teaching profession concerned with eliminating exploitation, inequality and oppression.

These transferable pedagogical protocols both define and enable participants to live out their values more fully as active citizens and they can be applied to other international educational partnerships implying a new socio-ethical blueprint for planning and implementing international education development projects.

I invite you to watch a video of me outlining the protocols by clicking on the picture below and/or read the protocols as outlined below to see whether they resonate with you.



**[Video 2: Pedagogical protocols for living global citizenship \(Potts, 2014\) -](#)**

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=4cqp0UpIQfQ>

The pedagogical protocols for underpinning a Living Global Citizenship international partnership are as follows:

- Participants in partnerships should engage in dialogue about their values. These conversations about values are to explore what matters to the participants and what motivates them in the partnership. They should also encourage participants to recognise the limitations of their own knowledge, perspectives and values, opening their imagination to different viewpoints of the world whilst maintaining their right to contribute to the dialogue. The commitment to genuine interactive dialogue that values the voices of all of the participants is imperative as a means of addressing the imbalance of power relations between the North and the South. During the dialogue the participants need to view the world not only from their own cultural space but also see the world through the lens of other participants, allowing new meanings and understandings to emerge acting as a first step in bridging any cultural divide and working towards cultural balance. An example of this was when the UK participants in the South African partnership learned about the value of Ubuntu from the South African participants. This gave them a new means of understanding the reasons for the partnership activities that they were engaged in. Another example is when Adler-Collins steps out of his own cultural space as a Buddhist to build a partnership with Muslim nurses in Oman.

Such dialogue can be facilitated by the use of resources such as Through Other Eyes (ToE) (Andreotti & De Souza, 2008), an educational resource for participants that encourages an openness and empathy to different cultures of the world. The free online version of the ToE resource is available at [http://www.academia.edu/575387/Learning\\_to\\_Read\\_the\\_World\\_Through](http://www.academia.edu/575387/Learning_to_Read_the_World_Through)

[Other Eyes 2008](#) and focuses on engagements with indigenous/aboriginal perceptions of global issues. ToE focuses on indigenous knowledge systems as ways of knowing that offer different choices related to how we perceive the world compared to those of Western humanism (Andreotti, 2011).

- In order to engage as many people as possible in the intercultural dialogue and to promote exposure to different perspectives, it is important that participation in the partnership is widened. Widening participation to others within the community/ies leads to greater inclusion and sustainability of the partnership and widens the social sphere of influence of the partnership. Increasing the number of community stakeholders provides more participants with the opportunity to live out and develop their values. As participation widens it is important to maintain the principle of equality in the partnership, allowing each participant the space to express their views and offer their perspectives on the way forward for the partnership. As more participants engage with the partnership, all need to accept the principle that the partnership is based on equality. In order to do so, new participants, particularly from the dominant Western culture, may need to go through the process of 'learning to unlearn' (Andreotti, 2011). This is so that they move from an ethnocentric position to an idea of knowledge as located in culture and social/historical contexts – thereby moving from a deficit model of difference to an ethical relationship towards other participants based on the insufficiency of their own perspectives. This second pedagogical protocol of widening the partnership but maintaining equanimity of its membership relationships requires continued dialogue between all participants in order to strengthen the basis of the partnership with these core principles.
- Building an awareness of one's role as a participant in the partnership and developing meaningful relationships with other participants based on negotiated shared values leads to agreed activities. The activities of the partnership are most effective when they touch the hearts of the participants and inspire them to discover and live out their values more fully. These types of activities give the partnership's participants authentic social meaning and engages them to become better citizens. A successful living-global-citizenship project is not taught in the traditional sense: instead it is driven by the participants as they are motivated to develop activities that move the partnership forward. Thus, it is participant-led, focused on their needs and is open and cooperative. The motivation derives from the touching of the hearts of the participants, tapping into their values and emanating from a desire to be involved in activities that enable them to live out their values more fully.
- Activities should be developed that tackle stereotypes and encourage a critical reflective and reflexive approach from the participants. Participants must be challenged to assess their own prejudices and to reflect on their own views of each other so that a different perspective based on a shared Cultural Empathy can emerge. Participants from both cultures come to the

---

partnership with their own cultural lenses and need to add other lenses as they work together. Cultural Empathy is the global appreciation of other cultures, traditions and values and represents the shift from Living Citizenship to Living Global Citizenship. A participant in a Living Global Citizenship project therefore needs to embody the value of cultural-empathy in their partnership activity. Constant reflection and discussion about the purpose of partnership activities and the encouragement of a reflective approach in the participants can lead to the articulation and development of shared values and a shared language to express those values, which are then in turn lived out through the related activities. The action-reflection process is integral to this, which is why participant action research is a useful research methodology to adopt.

- The activities of the community partnership should aim at nothing less than meaningful social change, identified and agreed by all partners. In a partnership where there is clear evidence of inequality and social injustice, correcting these injustices and imbalances through social change becomes a key motivational factor and useful direction for the participants. Social change can be achieved by reaching agreement between participants on the need for change and then through the co-development of activities that meet this need. This gives participants in the partnership common ownership of the problem and the transformation.
- Activities with useful social impact outcomes inspire and motivate participants to continue their involvement over a sustained period of time. Embedding the socio-educational values into the partnership activities leads to sustainability and to genuine permanent change. An impact evaluation research methodology should be built into the project, which both leverages and regularly reports the changes being made in the partnership. This would operate as positive feedback with in-project adjustments from regular reviews in order to achieve meaningful sustainable development.
- A focus should be provided on the creativity of the individual participant. Each participant in a Living Global Citizenship project can be seen as an insider researcher who is capable of developing a Living Case. Through participation in the partnership, the individual's contribution as a living citizen who is living out their values more fully adds to the evidence base and contributes a living-case as a real life authentic professional learning activity. Integrating these living-cases generates a case study of the partnership. Such an approach to a partnership gives equal status to each individual participant and recognises their creativity and their potential to make an original contribution to the partnership and to the academy. Thus, each participant in a Living Global Citizenship project is seen as an active, critically reflective participant within a living context. Whilst it is desirable from a living educational theory perspective to emphasise the individual contribution, there is also a need to appreciate that in some cultures the group is valued more highly than the individual.

- Participants should be encouraged to construct narratives from their living-cases that are then put freely into the public domain to encourage discussion and debate. There is value in working with multi-media narratives and digital technologies to clarify and communicate embodied expressions of meaning that are difficult to communicate through printed text alone (Huxtable, 2009). Such acts raise the status of community partnerships as a means of empowering communities, leveraging social change and, in educational terms, raising standards – while providing participants with evidence of professionalism as part of an official continuing professional development (CPD) process.

### **3. The Significance of the Protocols**

These protocols help to address the question about how we can learn to become good citizens. They are transferable to all community partnerships and can help to provide a pedagogical framework for the delivery of citizenship education in a way that enables participants to become Living Global Citizens. Such an activist approach towards engaging in citizenship projects enables participants to take responsibility for their own contribution to civic society and gives them social agency in the form of ownership of the process and priorities for development.

There is widespread agreement that effective citizenship education is about more than knowledge transmission and that what is required is to engage people in meaningful learning experiences and to use active teaching strategies to facilitate their development as politically and socially responsible individuals (Crick 1999, NFER 2010). Living Global Citizenship seeks a shift to a learning environment that is experiential and knowledge elicited from the participated activities.

A living-global-citizenship approach supports the idea of development through participants in partnerships finding their own ways of living and defining their own needs as propounded by Esteva (1996). It rejects models of development that are based on a discourse of labeling Africans and Asians as 'underdeveloped' and casts the Western countries in a role of "civilizing" or "developing" them. Such a discourse ignores the perspective of the recipients of aid. Slater and Bell (2002) remind us:

Genuine dialogue clearly implies, if it is to be effective, recognition that there are other sites of enunciation and other agents of knowledge, located in the South, whose vision and priorities might be different from those of the donor community. The recognition of other voices requires political will, but it is also crucially linked to the presence or absence of a genuine belief in partnership and reciprocity (p. 353).

Living Global Citizenship partnerships emphasise the importance of dialogue and cultural-empathy. Such inclusiveness of all participant stakeholders ensures a process to underpin sustainable development; the recommended protocols for establishing Living Global Citizenship are a potential solution toward the UN's post-2015 mission of securing a working definition for Sustainable Development Goals.

Research into living-global-citizenship enables individuals to create their own living-educational-theories that advance knowledge, encourage scholarly inquiry and improve practice for the public good. Clarifying and communicating the meanings of living-global-citizenship, as one engages in a continuing educational professional development project and creates one's own living-educational-theory, makes an original and significant contribution to the field of Living Educational Theory research.

Living-global-citizenship carries a message of hope for humanity. Such hope is achieved through participants operating within learning-community partnerships that are actively engaged in negotiating, discovering and then living out their shared values more fully – and, in so doing, cultural divisions are transcended, cultural-empathy is developed and real lives are improved. For example, in the South African partnership, bursaries enabled some of the South African students to graduate from University, gain professional qualifications and jobs enabling them and their families to escape the poverty and Aids in the community. Educational partnerships have the potential to embed citizenship education in the community by raising awareness of international issues, challenging existing cultural perspectives, promoting discussion about values and encouraging more active citizens who live out their values with a view to making a difference to their own lives and the lives of others. Thus, participants can become living-global-citizens and in so doing they promote greater community cohesion. Therefore, citizenship education in the UK, the US and in other countries can be re-conceptualised using educational partnerships as a vehicle for the development of activities that touch the hearts of participants and mobilise them to act, to identify, and live out their values more fully. These “citizenship” values should be negotiated and agreed by the participants in the partnership so that they become authenticated, shared and, thereby, underpin the activities that are carried out. This emancipatory process gives rise to the notion of Living Global Citizenship and explains how and why it delivers benefits for both the participants and wider society. Within educational contexts this potentially offers a working plan, indeed blueprint, for establishing educational sustainable development projects.

In order to further explore the potential of this notion we are now looking for more practitioners to develop projects grounded in the value of Living Global Citizenship so that we can test the validity of these pedagogical protocols and whether the outcomes bring improvements for humanity.

## References

- Adler-Collins, J. (2013). Inclusive Education across Borders: How do we prevent educational design of nursing curriculum design from colonising indigenous forms of knowing? Paper presented September 2014 at the *British Educational Research Association Conference*, University of Sussex.
- Adler-Collins, J. (2014). Transcending Colonizing Influences Across Cultural Boundaries. Paper presented September 2014 at the *British Educational Research Association Conference*, London.

- Andreotti, V. & De Souza, L. (2008). *Learning to Read the World Through Other's Eyes (ToE)*. Retrieved December 12, 2014 from [http://www.academia.edu/575387/Learning to Read the World Through Other E yes 2008](http://www.academia.edu/575387/Learning_to_Read_the_World_Through_Other_Eyes_2008)
- Andreotti, V. (2011). *Actionable Postcolonial Theory In Education*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Bailee Smith, M. (n.d.). *European Development days: Beyond 2015*. Retrieved December 12, 2014 from <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=9xOYLfcDIFI>
- Coombs, S. (1995). *Design and conversational evaluation of an IT learning environment based on self-organised learning*. (Doctoral dissertation, Brunel University, 1995). London: CSHL.
- Coombs, S. & Potts, M. (2013). Living citizenship: transcending the cultural divide. *Educational Action Research*, (21)3, 429-443.
- Coombs, S., Potts, M. & Whitehead, J. (2014). *International Educational Development and Learning through Sustainable Partnerships*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Crick, B. (1999). In *The National Curriculum, Handbook for Secondary Teachers in England (QCA)* London: DfES and QCA.
- Dadds, M. & Hart, S. (2001). *Doing Practitioner Research Differently*. London: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Delong, J. (2014, September). Generating educational knowledge through Living Theory research in a Culture of Inquiry. Paper presented September 2014 at the *British Educational Research Association* Conference. Retrieved December 12, 2014, from <http://www.actionresearch.net/writings/bera14/berajdd180914.pdf>
- Esteva, G. (1996). Development. In: Sachs W. (Ed.) *The Development Dictionary* (pp. 12-24). London and New Jersey: Zed Books.
- Garratt, D. & Piper, H. (2010). Heterotopian Cosmopolitan Citizenship Education? *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice*, (5)1, 43-55.
- Gearon, L. (2003). How Do We Learn to Become Good Citizens? *A Professional User Review of UK Research Undertaken for the British Educational Research Association*. Notts: BERA.
- Huxtable, M. (2009). How do we contribute to an educational knowledge base? A response to Whitehead and a challenge to BERJ. *Research Intelligence*, 107; 25-26. Retrieved 17 December, 2014, from <http://www.actionresearch.net/writings/huxtable/mh2009beraRI107.pdf>
- Huxtable, M. (2014). Exploring the Implications of Supporting Educational Research for Developing Professional Practice. Paper presented September 2014 at the *British Educational Research Association* Conference. Retrieved December 12, 2014, from <http://www.actionresearch.net/writings/bera14/beramh210914.pdf>
- Kerr, D. (1999). *Citizenship Education: an International Comparison*. Retrieved June 12, 2013, from [http://www.inca.org.uk/pdf/citizenship\\_no\\_intro.pdf](http://www.inca.org.uk/pdf/citizenship_no_intro.pdf)

- Laidlaw, M. (2008). In Pursuit of Counterpoint: an Educational Journal. *Educational Journal of Living Theories*, 1(1), 69-102.
- Martin, F. & Griffiths, H. (2012). Power and Representation: A Postcolonial reading of Global partnerships and Teacher Development Through North-South Study Visits. *British Educational Research Journal*, 38(6), 907-927.
- NFER (2010). CELS: The Citizenship Education Longitudinal Study. *National Foundation for Educational Research (NFER)*. Retrieved from <http://www.nfer.ac.uk/research/projects/cels/>
- OFSTED (2010). *Citizenship established? Citizenship in schools 2006/09*. Retrieved from <http://www.ofsted.gov.uk/resources/citizenship-established-citizenship-schools-200609>
- Potts, M. (2012). *How can I Reconceptualise International Educational Partnerships as a Form of 'Living Citizenship'?* Thesis (Ph.D.) Thesis, Bath Spa University. Retrieved December 20, 2014, from <http://www.actionresearch.net/living/markpotts.shtml>
- QCA (1999). *National Curriculum. Handbook for Secondary Teachers in England*. London: DFES and QCA.
- Rawal, S. (2009). '... as I engaged in reflection': a play in three acts. *Reflective Practice*, 10(1); 27-32.
- Sachs, J. (1999). Teacher Professional Identity: competing discourses, competing outcomes. Paper Presented November 1999 at AARE Conference Melbourne. Retrieved December 25, 2014 from <http://www.aare.edu.au/99pap/sac99611.htm>
- Sayers, H. (2002). Citizenship in the School Curriculum. *CSCS Journal* 13(2), 14-15.
- Simon, A. (2005). *Citizenship Education and Multiculturalism: The Needs of Educators within the Contemporary Multicultural Context*. Retrieved December 20, 2014, from [http://www.ece.salford.ac.uk/proceedings/papers/14\\_07.pdf](http://www.ece.salford.ac.uk/proceedings/papers/14_07.pdf)
- Slater, D. & Bell, M. (2002). *Aid and the Geopolitics of the Post-Colonial: Critical Reflections on New Labour's Overseas Development Strategy*. Retrieved from <http://home.ku.edu.tr/~dyukseker/slater-bell-aid.pdf>
- Tattersall, P. (2011). *How am I generating a living theory of environmental activism with inclusionality*. Thesis (PhD), University of Western Sydney, 2011). Retrieved 17 December, 2014, from <http://www.actionresearch.net/living/tattersallphd/philtphd.pdf>
- Todd, S. (2008). *Toward an Imperfect Education: Facing Humanity, Rethinking Cosmopolitanism*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers.
- Tutu, D. (1999). *No Future Without Forgiveness*. New York. Doubleday.
- Whitehead, J. (1989). Creating a Living Educational Theory from Questions of the Kind: 'How do I Improve my Practice?' *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 19(1), 41-52.
- Whitehead, J. & Huxtable, M. (2013). Living Educational Theory Research as Transformational Continuing Professional Development. *Gifted Education International*, 29(3), 221-226.



Wood, L. (2012). Action Research: Its Transformative Potential. *Educational Research for Social Change*, 1(1), 1-4.

Zammit, J (2008). Global Learning and School Partnerships, Thinking it Through. Retrieved January 20, 2014, from <http://www.tidec.org/Tidetalk/articles/GL%20and%20Sch%20part.html> (Link terminated).