Teaching and Learning Citizenship:
The DRC and its Teaching & Learning Group

David Kahane and Bettina von Lieres

1. Introduction

   This Practice Paper explores the work of a complex team developing teaching and training practices around citizenship for diverse transnational contexts. Its focus is the work of the Teaching and Learning group (T&L) of the Development Research Centre for Citizenship, Participation and Accountability (DRC). The DRC was formed in 2001 and funded for ten years by the UK Department for International Development (DFID). Involving more than 60 researchers and activists drawn from more than twelve countries, this network has researched the dynamics of citizen participation in diverse political contexts. The DRC links research, teaching and action. It's overall objectives include generating new knowledge, disseminating this widely to decision-makers and practitioners, and building the capacity of partner institutions to carry out high-quality research, communication, and policy engagement. Many of the DRC's research projects are original empirical case studies. They have relied on participatory and action-oriented methods, which bring academics and practitioners together as co-researchers in a process through which the inquiry itself becomes a catalyst for further action. (DRC Annual Report, 2009) DRC research embeds inquiry in inclusive processes of social and institutional learning and change. This integral approach to research and knowledge transfer has increased citizen awareness and action in various sites— for example, bolstering groups working for Dalit rights in India, for recognition of civil society's place in Angola, and for a more democratic health sector in Brazil.

The DRC's T&L group was made up of fifteen DRC researchers and practitioners from seven countries developing courses and trainings on citizenship for highly diverse contexts in north and south (Bangladesh, Brazil, Canada, India, Mexico, South Africa, UK). Its collaboration brought together a diverse group of researchers and activists with different teaching objectives within three different kinds of learning sites: universities in Mexico, South Africa, Bangladesh and Canada; donor-sponsored learning spaces for public officials in South Africa and Brazil, and an NGO-led distance learning course in India. The university group included old and new universities. Within the public officials group there was a multi-country engagement process (South Africa) and a regional one (Brazil), and within the distance learning group there was an attempt to introduce a new curriculum into a well established and long-standing distance education program. These diverse teaching and learning spaces were situated in different political contexts with different institutional cultures and teaching practices.

This Practice Paper documents the echoing of the DRC's research and collaborative practices in an international teaching and learning project that has sought to develop courses and pedagogies from DRC materials, while exploring the implications of this democratic ferment for how we design and run courses and trainings in universities, for government officials, and with other citizens. The first part of the story told in this practice paper is about how DRC materials can be used to invigorate courses and curricula through the introduction of new southern theories and case studies, to build and enhance democratic teaching practices and to deepen experiential student learning. The second part of our story is of the structure of this community's collaboration and its lessons for other complex, transnational teaching and learning teams. The T&L group's collaboration took place, however, within the larger community of the DRC, a fourteen country research collaboration formed in 2001: because T&L's ways of working were deeply informed by the DRC's and because T&L's courses featured DRC research, this Paper also unpacks the DRC's own internal process as a complex north-south team researching complex problems. This Practice Paper synthesizes what we have learned through our courses (each course or training is

detailed in a sidebar in this document) and considers lessons that our collaboration holds for others teaching about citizenship.

Our practice Paper addresses several audiences. Its description of the courses and trainings produced by T&L, and how teachers in a range of settings negotiated the politics and conditions of their institutions, challenges teachers and trainers working with critical, comparative material on citizenship (such as that produced by the DRC) to consider the methods and politics of their own teaching and learning. For individuals and organizations involved in cross-context teaching collaboration, the Paper shows some of the methods that worked, and failed to work, for our group—and the overall value of peer support around course development and teaching that bridges very different contexts. The Paper also addresses those involved in the development of teachers, courses, and programs, insofar as T&L's collaboration represents an alternative to expert-driven models of course and faculty development, showing benefits to lay teachers learning about classroom democracy through collaboration with peers. And finally, the Paper's exploration of ways of working in both the DRC and T&L will be of interest to those convening and participating in complex transnational research and teaching teams.

We begin by explaining the substance of the DRC's research material and its impact on university course development, student experiences in classrooms, and training programs for public officials. We then consider the DRC's distinctive approach to research collaboration. Against this background, we describe the trajectory of the T&L Group's ways of working, and explore a number of themes from this work around democratizing pedagogies, globalizing course content, and negotiating the dynamics of our institutions. We conclude with lessons that the DRC and T&L may hold for other transnational teaching, learning, and research collaborations.

2. The substance of the DRC's research

The T&L group worked together for three years, using DRC material to design new courses, re-shape existing ones and to develop new democratic teaching practices. DRC research material includes 150 empirical case studies of citizen participation from the global south. These have been written up in diverse ways: as policy briefings, book chapters (in the Zed book series entitled "Claiming Citizenship"), journal articles and IDS working papers. The DRC archive also includes a large selection of participatory videos produced by the researchers, practitioners and communities involved in researching the case studies. While most DRC material takes the form of empirical case studies, it also includes a considerable body of theoretical material written mainly by southern academics. The diverse DRC materials speak to both academics and practitioners.

DRC case studies focus on how action by citizens and civil associations shapes states and societies. During its first five year cycle of funding, DRC research focused on how poor people themselves understand citizenship and rights. The second five years examined in more detail the actual struggles and mobilizations through which citizen claim their rights, and how these mobilized citizens effect pro-poor and pro-citizen rights and social change. The DRC's focus on citizen action is important. Over the last two decades, the idea that citizen engagement and participation can contribute to improved governance and pro-poor development outcomes has become an accepted part of global policy discourse. There has been a burgeoning of scholarship and cross-national learning about citizen participation as a route to democracy-building and pro-poor political transformation. Much of this work has occurred in response to a perceived weakening of democratic institutions in the both the global north and south. As key problems of poverty remain and new emerging institutions fail, it has become crucial to understand the role of citizen participation in democracy-building. In response to the democratic deficit in the global south, international development agencies and donors have focused on "political and developmental" approaches—building political institutions and focusing on economic growth. These types of traditional democracy promotion have focused on creating new institutions—elections, parliaments, rule of law,

etc.—on the assumption that active citizenship and democratic participation will follow. In contrast to these approaches, new global networks of researchers and activists (including the DRC) have called for a more "societal" approach to building democracy, one that focuses on how ordinary citizens and their organizations participate to deepen democracy and how citizen participation can help and strength institutions through struggles for rights, demands for accountability, and advocacy for government reforms. The societal approach aims to challenge top down approaches to development, which focus more on institutions than on local realities.

In the global north, proponents of the "societal' approach have coalesced around a "deliberative democracy" movement to reinvigorate institutions through deeper forms of citizen engagement in policy processes. In the global south, concerned researchers and activists have called for greater citizen participation and state accountability through new social movements and new forms of participatory governance, particularly in more fragile political contexts. In examining the dynamics of democracy-building in southern contexts, DRC research has focused on the interaction between states, institutions and societies. Positioning citizens at the centre of democracy-building, it has conceived of citizens as rights-bearers at the heart of development, not simply as consumers of what states have to offer but as active agents of change. DRC research understands that learning or gaining citizenship is not only a legal question, but also involves the development of citizens capable of claiming rights and acting for themselves.

DRC research has shown that citizens often learn democracy by doing it. Informed and aware citizens who can hold states accountable and exercise rights often gain experience through action, not simply through training or civil society membership. It is through action that citizens learn skills and build alliances. DRC research has shown how rights are made real by action and mobilization and how social mobilization extends and deepens democracy. DRC research has also shown that there are important and tangible democratic outcomes that can be associated with citizen participation. These include the actual *construction* of citizenship, the development of knowledge of rights and political agency, particularly in contexts where citizens are forced to engage with authoritarian governments and where their rights are denied by the state. Often, the benefits of citizen action accumulate over time, and enhancing skills in one area can strengthen the possibilities of success in others. (Gaventa and Barrett 2010)

3. Bringing DRC themes into our teaching

As the DRC's program developed, many of its researchers began to introduce its theme and products into their teaching in universities and NGOs. Moreover, in the seventh year of research, the team as a whole began to recognize teaching as a key route to disseminating our findings. Through a trajectory of collaboration described below, a cluster of courses were developed and delivered centering on DRC materials:

- In India, Martha Farrell, Mandakini Pant, and colleagues developed a distance learning course on International Perspectives on Citizenship, Democracy and Accountability as part of a postgraduate diploma offered by the Society for Participatory Research in Asia (PRIA), a prominent Indian NGO. This course aimed to provide students with knowledge about citizenship rights, democracy, participatory governance, claiming accountability, and transparency; and to develop students' political literacy and relevant skills in order to enhance their ability to effect change. Their students were adult learners: practitioners, development professionals, and new actors wanting to make a career in the arena of development.

- In Angola, Idaci Ferreira prepared a training course for officials on behalf of ADRA, an Angolan NGO, as well as a training on participatory research methods for other Angolan NGOs. She was especially interested in how to innovate in teaching methods in these courses.

- In Canada, David Kahane taught a joint undergraduate/graduate seminar at the University of Alberta that contrasted citizen participation in Northern and Southern contexts using case studies from the Citizenship DRC, using participatory and democratic teaching methods.

- Laurence Piper established a seminar, "Contemporary Democratic Theory—Enhancing Public Participation in Local Governance around the World," for senior undergraduates in Political Science at the University of the Western Cape in South Africa. His goal was to introduce students to concepts such as citizenship, democracy and participation from a citizen's perspective using participatory methods and case studies.

- Carlos Cortez Ruiz taught in a Masters in Rural Development at the Autonomous Metropolitan University (Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana) in Mexico. He wanted to support his students in reflecting on concepts and theories of social agency, power, social movement, citizenship and rights; and then to applying these concepts to their own work through action-research. These students were practitioners in rural development taking a Master's while still working in their organizations.

- Alex Shankland and Vera Schattan Coelho were working with CEBRAP, a Brazilian research institute, to develop a training initiative for Brazilian public officials who sat on and convened participatory committees; CEBRAP aimed to develop both curriculum and method for these trainings.

- Bettina von Lieres taught a new 3rd year Undergraduate Political Science module at the University of Toronto in Canada exploring theories and practices of citizen participation in the global South, while also developing co-taught courses for the University of the Western Cape. Her Canadian students were mostly female and most were first or second generation Muslim immigrants; they had very little background in political theories or understanding of citizenship in the global South.

In addition to these new courses, some T&L participants re-structured and re-designed existing courses to include DRC materials.

- The political theory graduate program at the University of Alberta was reshaped with an emphasis on practical engagement.

- PRIA introduced a new distance learning course course content based on DRC materials into one of its other distance courses on leadership and governance.

- In the UK, John Gaventa introduced DRC material into an MA- level course on democracy at the Institute for Development Studies at the University of Sussex.

- In Angola, ADRA introduced the themes of democratic citizenship and citizen participation into other training programs for public officials and practitioners.

- At the National University of Mexico, DRC participatory videos were introduced as new teaching resources to help students reflect course material.

- At the University of the Western Cape DRC material has been introduced into a MA level course on issues of governance. Here John Williams revised a course in "Governance, Administration and Ethics in the Public Sector" as part of the Honors in Public Administration module by introducing senior undergraduates to concepts like good governance, power, accountability, and participation and to explore the relationship between governance, politics, economics and administration while grounding concepts of governance and citizenship in everyday realities. He

also introduced DRC research methods into an the annual Africa-wide Council for the Development of Social Science (CODESRIA) Research Methodology seminar.

•   At the University of Toronto Bettina von Lieres introduced DRC materials into a PhD course on the dynamics of global change.

A number of new teaching programmes are planned for the future. These include a new MPhil and PhD programme in Citizenship Studies at the University of the Western Cape in South Africa, a new 12 month diploma course on Citizenship and Governance at PRIA in India, and a new MA course based on DRC material is planned for next year at BRAC University in Bangladesh.

The importance of context

As we outlined above, DRC research and teaching materials focus on issue of democracy and citizenship, with a specific emphasis on examining issues of democracy from the perspective of citizens. Within the T&L group this material was taught in diverse political contexts. These ranged from more stable political contexts (in both north and south) with longer histories of public discourses and practices of democratic citizenship (mainly middle-income countries such as India, Brazil, Canada and South Africa) to more fragile political contexts with largely absent or unresponsive states and few or no possibilities for active citizen engagement (e.g. Angola, Nigeria and Bangladesh).

Teaching DRC themes on citizenship and democracy was felt to be politically important by all T&L participants, especially those teaching in societies that are undergoing or have undergone new and often difficult transitions to democracy. For researchers, students, policy-makers and activists in these contexts, DRC material offers examples of how citizens can hold states accountable where states are not responsive to their needs. In middle-income countries such as South Africa, India and Brazil, for example, with relatively stable states but few avenues for citizen engagement, the challenge is often to develop and build citizens' organizations as a counter-weight to the state. At one of our meetings, John Williams from the University of the Western Cape in South Africa pointed out that DRC material, with its emphasis on the role of engaged citizens, "raises the importance of citizens' rights which together with state accountability is an important challenge in South Africa. Most politicians view the state as the only answer to democracy, under-valuing the role of citizens." This was echoed by Laurence Piper:

> in South Africa political action independent of ruling party is weak. Not only weak, but it is regarded as suspect by the ruling party which sees itself as the only legitimate rulers. DRC material draws attention to citizen voices that are more independent. It introduces very different conceptions of democracy. The idea that you can democratically protest against your government is not widespread amongst the ruling party in South Africa.

Referring to the Pioneers project which brought public officials and civil society leaders from several Southern African countries together in a three-day training workshop on citizen engagement, Piper reported that

> Participants from other parts of the world said that South Africans are very state-centric and that they had paternalistic expectations of the state. DRC material teaches us that citizens need not to wait for the state. One of its important messages is that citizens need to build civil society and take responsibility for shaping decision-making.

In fragile states with weak states citizens often have little experience in formulating and claiming rights. There is often little civil society organization and rights are denied. Here the challenge is to build both state and society, and building the capacity of citizen leaders to claim rights. Several DRC case studies

speak directly to the challenges of building democracy in fragile states. Idaci Ferreira, working with an Angolan NGO, said that

> in my context in Angola democracy faces real challenges. Issues of participation and accountability are very important for us as Angola is a very new democracy. DRC material is very useful and has helped us with capacity building in our training of local community leaders. From the point of the NGOs, from the point of the community groups, some leaders told me how empowered they felt to speak outside of their local community meetings after this process of learning from DRC materials. They now speak in spaces that were before dominated by NGOs. They now talk about how they have become leaders in their own negotiations with the government at the municipality level.

In some context with unresponsive states the term "citizenship" is disconnected from the idea of rights in public discourses. DRC material focuses our attention on rights as a crucial ways of understanding the challenges of building democracy. As Simeen Mahmud pointed out in one of our meetings:

> In Bangladesh we don't think of citizenship in relation to the state. So bringing in case studies that highlight the idea that mobilization around rights and engagement with the state is actually a form of citizenship is important. It shows students how important it is to move from the idea of belonging to the idea of claiming. DRC case studies that have highlighted this have been important for us.

The reception of DRC materials by different learning audiences

From the beginning it was clear that there were important differences in the ways core DRC themes like "citizenship" resonated in these different political contexts. In contexts where students and practitioner-learners had actual experiences of democratic citizenship, classroom discussion often focused more on legal definitions of citizenship and democracy, and less on the politics of negotiating citizenship. In more fragile contexts where the term "citizenship" does not resonate publicly, the initial focus of classroom discussions was often on the role of the state or on the wider politics of negotiation and contestation.

In some contexts specific DRC themes resonated more than in others. In the UWC MA course on citizenship and democracy, South African students focused on two core DRC themes: the building of new participatory institutions and the dynamics of social mobilization. This was not surprising given the wider political context in South Africa, with its relatively new democracy and the concomitant challenges of building new institutions and civil society organizations that reflect the interests of citizens. Here selected DRC case studies such as those on new participatory governance institutions in Brazil and NGO mobilization in Kenya and Bangladesh were especially useful. These themes are explored in at least two Zed book volumes, the *Spaces for Change* volume and the *Mobilising for Democracy* volume. The first explores whether and how new invited spaces for citizen participation are places for significant change. Looking across such spaces as health councils in Bangladesh and Brazil, local government institutions in India, and large scale infrastructure development projects in Angola, this volume argues that these spaces have potential for revitalizing democratic institutions which in turn may contribute to tangible development outcomes. The second explores how citizen mobilization contributes to the strengthening of democratic practices, institutions and cultures, and with it the ability of these institutions to be more responsive to development outcomes. Laurence Piper pointed out that

> engaging with the DRC model of participation and applying it to cases students themselves have chosen and using those cases to engage with theory, many student had important moments of insights. One student had an insight that because nothing was happening with cyclists was that they were in a disempowered invited space and needed social mobilization. They had 400 cyclists

in a rally, and then suddenly nothing was happening. So engaging with the theory helped him to understand his personal politics.

In Mexico, doctoral students in a course on rural development engaged actively with some of the more theoretical introductions of two other Zed book volumes—volume one, *Inclusive Citizenship*, and volume five, *Citizenship and Social Movements*. The first sets out to explore how poor people in differing contexts understand and claim citizenship, and the rights they associate with it. While the focus is largely on the meanings and understandings and how they might differ from dominant ideas about citizenship, there are also important examples of outcomes that emerge from struggles for rights. These include dignity in Brazil, the provision of security and services for women in Bangladesh, housing and water in South Africa, and transformational empowerment in Bangladesh. The second volume examines the limits of participation through institutionalised forms of engagement and the role of mobilization and social movements in winning rights and achieving development gains. Rather seeing social movements as anti-state, it argues that they can also contribute to building more responsive and accountable states.

[[Carlos, do you have something you could say in your own voice about this here?]]

John Williams from South Africa reflects that

> My students are new to these concepts of citizen participation. Using DRC case study material from India on the nomadic movement in Rajasthan and how they claim rights showed students that it is possible for rights have to be claimed, not only conferred. The DRC case studies and participatory videos on the Zapatista movement, where the community can self-govern and make decisions introduced a new idea to students—the possibilities associated with citizens being actively involved in decision-making processes. The DRC case studies from Brazil on citizen mobilisation around dams was also a wonderful example of how communities can actually stop local government and potentially change it. They show how communities need not be subsumed under the state, but can engage vociferously with government officials. It is very important to get material from other contexts. It makes us realize that while South Africans have their own problems these problems cut across contexts and that problems are similar across the world."

In other contexts, researchers and practitioners relied on DRC materials from their own contexts, and on broader DRC themes adapted to their context. Idaci Ferreira from Angola, has this to say about ADRA's training courses:

> We used experiences from Angola that were researched by the DRC. The Nigerian case studies were good, but we did not have enough time to translate these, but the Angola experience we used a lot as a way of inviting people from the local associations to talk about their experience. The most important things was to bring people together to talk about subject of citizen engagement with government.

In some teaching contexts, particularly northern ones, it was useful to expose students to multiple approaches to and different meanings of core terms like citizenship. David Kahane felt that

> while it is important to know where our students are starting fro, there's actually value in juxtaposition and in showing them different meanings—showing them that citizenship might be much more politicised than their understanding. I think we just should mix things up—demonstrate that citizenship in Brazil, Nigeria, and so on can mean very different things

The value of south-south learning

Our T&L collaboration facilitated important south-south, and north-south learning, and with these a move away from the usual reliance on northern texts and practices. DRC materials focus largely on case studies

from the global south and include a substantial body of theoretical pieces from southern theorists. In some T&L courses these southern texts filled an important gap in what are usually "northern text heavy" curricula. Many northern texts fail to engage with new innovations from the south and can remain locked in older, northern-centric debates on policy development and governance. DRC material, largely drawn from recent southern cases, provides contemporary examples of innovative policy and governance practices and the challenges associated with citizen participation. Zed Book volume six, *Citizen Action and National Policy Reform*, for example, moves beyond local southern case studies and examines how citizens mobilize to effect pro-poor and pro-justice changes in national politics in diverse southern settings. This volume brings together cases which illustrate successful and significant example of policy and governance changes that involved citizen engagement. These DRC materials act as an important catalysts for south-south learning. As Laurence Piper explains:

> In the past I used mostly of theories from the north in my teaching. DRC material brings theories from southern contexts and speaks more effectively to our contexts. During the Pioneers workshop many South African public officials were very South-Africa-centric and they often had a very often very technocratic view of the role of state and citizens. The effect of the Pioneers Workshop was to get people out of their defensive modes and to develop more sympathetic view towards citizens' rights.

Carlos from Mexico said that

> Our international comparisons in our courses focus mainly on the wider Latin American context. In the past we used mainly texts from academics in the north writing on Latin America. Using DRC materials exposed our students to the different perspectives of academics from within southern countries. It is interesting for the students to think about the concepts they are using, for example rights through the perspectives of writers from the south. A lot of DRC material is much more easier to understand."

DRC material includes many original empirical case studies from a broad spectrum of Southern situations. Learning about citizenship and democracy from such a diversity of perspectives was enriching for both teachers and students. Laurence Piper from UWC said that

> my fourth year honours module is almost entirely DRC materials. Students really respond to case study materials and to cases from around the developing world. Not only because it is grounded in experience, but because other contexts are similar and different. The students feel like they are part of a global project when they are exposed to this kind of literature.

He also talks about using DRC materials in the Pioneers workshop with public officials:

> We had three resource people from India, Brazil and the UK. They gave examples for different contexts and these were very effective in that they gave a sense that there were innovative and important international practices and that this was not peculiar or freakish in the southern African context. Many participants related more to the stories from the African context. However, there a great value in being part of a broader movement reflecting on these issues and understanding that there is a tremendous variety of ways of going about citizens' mobilisation and participation. There were many inspiring examples: the Homeless Women's Movement in Zimbabwe and citizen organizations in the refugee camps in the Sudan, for example. These gave a sense that there is an approach to governance that can work in both non-democratic and democratic contexts.

Idaci Ferreira from Angola pointed out that "When I engaged and reflected with PRIA about action research it was very close to my reality; I also learnt about Bangladesh and about their grassroots

groups—I can learn and use these experiences and reflections—it helps me to do things better." And Simeen Mahmud from Bangladesh felt that "in the T&L group we really learned from the diversity of contexts. If new practices can be introduced in such diverse contexts, then it can also be done in our contexts."

Impacts on Institutions

Many T&L participants felt that the T&L collaboration demonstrated how international collaboration can help to overcome institutional barriers. Change does not happen easily, but global collaboration can help individual faculty, trainers or researchers in their quest to introduce new courses and new teaching and training methods.

- Martha Farrell from PRIA reflected that her participation in the T&L group encouraged her to play a new role in leading course development initiatives with PRIA. PRIA's collaboration with the T&L group also boosted its own credibility as a knowledge provider—something many NGOs involved in course development often struggle to achieve.

- In Angola, Idaci Ferreira's involvement with T&L group "changed ADRA's programme, both content-wise and in terms of training methods for public officials and local association leaders." ADRA is now collaborating with an Angolan University to introduce its training programmes into a university course.

- At IDS other DFID-funded DRC's have picked up the idea of linking research to curriculum.

- At UWC the T&L collaboration helped foster a network of academics who have challenged their institutions to offer new courses.

- At the University of Alberta DRC models of democratic pedagogies and workshop methods are core to how graduate student instructors are being trained. Here the T&L motivates an evidence-based push for grassroots and peer-led teacher development, against a new institutional push for expert-led models of teacher development.

==[[Do others have examples to add, or analysis of the above to articulate? As importantly, does anyone have a few sentences to say in the first person about this? This section seems short…..]]==

4. Democratizing pedagogies

Initially, many of the conversations that gave rise to the T&L group were about disseminating DRC research materials, but this framing challenged by fundamental commitments of the DRC—to knowledge creation as a collective process, and from research, democracy, and pedagogy all starting with the experience of ordinary people. This suggested that communicating DRC perspectives required that learners explore their own democratic agency, including within the space of classrooms and trainings. The emerging focus on democratic teaching methods and students' experiential learning seriously emerged from the DRC's overall approach to democracy and research, i.e. that democracy begins with people's experiences and voices and is not about experts or authoritarian governments making decision for people. There was a strong sense by some members of the group about the interconnectedness of research methods, ways of collaborating and democratic ways of teaching.

Throughout our collaboration, we recognized and brought to the fore the specificity of our cultural and institutional settings. This helped us to understand the situatedness of our own teaching methods and ideologies. It allowed us to see how our own context shapes possibilities and limitations for participatory

teaching methods and new course content. It destabilized our taking for granteds about our students, our institutions, and our own practices in our own contexts.

Important shifts occurred for many participants in their own teaching practices through participation in T&L. However, the inclination toward democratic and participatory pedagogies wasn't shared by all in the project, especially early on: indeed, a fascinating aspect of the deep diversity of the T&L team was encountering different convictions about teaching and learning, which ranged from the highly didactic (in Indian universities, for example) to the Freirean (in Masters in Rural Development at the Autonomous Metropolitan University). In early meetings of the group, discussions of classrooms as democratic spaces would engage an enthusiastic subset of participants; others, though, would either sit quietly, or respond that these methods were not applicable in their context. These divisions over the appropriateness of participatory pedagogies were often an entry point to resonant descriptions of our institutional and classroom conditions. This was especially the case for some of the southern partners in the T&L project. In many North American and European settings teaching institutions are used having the space and resources to experiment with democratic teaching methods. In many southern contexts this is not the case, especially for teaching institutions in countries with a history of authoritarian governance such as Bangladesh and Angola. Where wider societal democratic practices are not common, it is especially important to build democratic teaching methods in institutions where there are openings and possibilities.

To take just a few of the contextual reasons for doubting the applicability of participatory pedagogies:

• John Williams of the University of the Western Cape in South Africa pointed to how ill-equipped his students were for extensive participatory learning: students came from diverse linguistic groups, were often woefully prepared for university studies, and were overflowing crowded classrooms into the hallways. How could classroom work in groups, for example, be anything but a disaster in this setting?

• Laurence Piper, also of UWC, pointed to how styles of classroom interaction were shaped by some students' involvement in movement politics: participating in discussions, these students would default to a rigid style of chairing typical of political meetings.

• Martha Farrell from PRIA in India acknowledged the tendency of discussions in their web-based courses toward dyadic exchanges with instructors, and pointed to students' sense of the importance of learning from instructors' expertise, and reluctance to pursue extended discussions amongst themselves.

• ==[[These are all described in the third person; does John or Laurence or Martha, or anyone else, have a first person recollection of why you doubted participatory pedagogies?]]==

These discussions of contextual differences were also revealing, though, of the limitations of the participatory pedagogies being advocated by some. In response to David Kahane's affirmation of the value of giving students agency in the design, process, and evaluation methods of their courses, for example, Alex Shankland from Brazil wryly pointed to the Portuguese word 'democratismo', which describes a setting with all of the trappings of democracy, but no real democratic power. As David Kahane says, "This particular exchange with Alex, and also the real risks some of my colleagues took in bringing democratic methods into their classrooms, made a lasting impression. The rhetoric of 'democratic pedagogies' is so easy; yet making this real in the classroom is subtle and countercultural and really very difficult. This has been one of the biggest challenges presented to me by the T&L collaboration; I still wrestle with it." Out of these international exchanges about pedagogy arose a set of deep questions about why we teach as we do, and about how our pedagogical pieties map onto the reality of our classrooms and our students' experiences.

There also was learning about the complex relationship between the democratic character of teaching spaces, as against surrounding political spaces. From the beginning we realized that there were deep differences in institutional cultures as well as cultures of learning and teaching. Some institutions were more democratic and less hierarchical than others, and some classrooms were more participatory than others. However, the relationship between institutional culture and participatory classroom cultures was often complex. In some contexts with histories of popular uprisings and institutions allied to radical social movements (Mexico), students would bring their own experiences of activism and participation into the classroom, leading to highly politicized and participatory discussions. In other contexts with similar institutional alignments to pro-democracy movements, however, there would be the same level of politicization in the classroom, but far less participation (South Africa). We found that the relationship between institutional cultures and democratic teaching is by no means linear. Democratic institutions do not necessarily produce democratic classrooms and undemocratic institutions do not necessarily indicate diminished classroom democracy. [[First person vignette to go here?]]

Even in these early days of the T&L group, when questions of democratizing pedagogies were in play but by no means a focus of group activities, these themes took on new life in the iteration between group meetings and returning to our home contexts. Once these themes were alive in the our minds we started to see events in our classrooms differently, and could bring these observations and interactions with our students back to our meetings. For example, John Williams at UWC structured his courses around empowering his students by giving them an acquaintance with a wide range of canonical texts in social and political theory. Without abandoning this goal, he started to listen differently to his students' encounters with these texts, and to open up to the possibility that this conceptual learning needed to be complemented by new forms of classroom activity. [[John, do you have a few first person lines to offer here?]]

Another impetus for discussions of power and participation in teaching and learning came from the focus of a minority of T&L members on trainings for civil servants, elected officials, and NGO workers. While in these contexts too there is a spectrum from more didactic to more participatory approaches, the default is toward a more participatory and engaged set of methods that build on the experiential knowledge of those attending trainings. Such trainings also frequently involve questions not only around the authority and power of trainers, but around how to deal with power differentials between students (e.g. deference toward more senior officials, or domination of training sessions by the more powerful). [[A story or two to go here from SA or Brazil or Angola?]]

All of these dynamics shifted collective focus in T&L toward teaching methods. The most significant shift, however, came when we devoted meeting time to modeling participatory methods for one another. At Dunford House, for example, participants were asked to speak into plenary about an innovative teaching practice that they found important in teaching DRC themes; a vote selected three methods to be modeled for 45 minutes each. Teams went away to prepare, with the stipulation that the person who had proposed the method had to equip someone else to model it. Three quite fascinating classroom methods were presented: a process used in Indian trainings to enable workshop participants to take a stand on controversial issues with minimal risk; a process (called the 'soft shoe shuffle') whereby Canadian students moved in space to indicate their shifting beliefs and positions as a discussion proceeded; and a practice used in a South African classroom to help students experience the democratic qualities of the spatial setup of the classroom in their first session. This experiential learning about classroom methods not only made them tangible but gave an embodied sense of participating in or leading an exercise that could be carried back powerfully to one's own teaching context. [[Does anyone have something they'd say in their own voice about the power of these experiences, in this T&L meeting, of teaching methods?]]

Collective reflection on classrooms as democratic spaces was a recurrent theme in our meetings. Some T&L members also carried this question back to their students in explicit ways (as the South African

exercise just mentioned), and these insights then could circulate back into T&L. David Kahane, for example, wove reflection and engagement on questions of classroom power into his course in democratic theory and practice—including around subtle relations of power that undermine democratic pretenses in both public democratic forums and the classroom. This reflection spurred one of his students to undertake a major video project with peers about the internalization of undemocratic educational habits, and the challenge of shifting these within the confines of any single course.[i] Many T&L participants reported greater confidence and skills in facilitating a democratic classroom through an increased variety of methods. Laurence Piper from South Africa reflected that the "T&L collaborated has changed my sense of myself as a teacher. I have become much less of a traditional teacher. I am now more sensitive to the fact that students bring all kinds of knowledges that I do not have, and if you bring these into the classroom something enabling really happens. I am now much more open to using participatory methods in the classroom and I now have a better understanding of linking research to creative ways of teaching and action." [[Another testimonial for here?]]

Working with students' experiences

T&L participants reported important shifts in their own teaching practices as a result of engaging with the DRC and its materials. Key amongst these was feeling deeply challenged to bring new forms of students' experiential learning into the classroom and develop a greater confidence to use students' own experience as a learning tool in the classroom. Many participants reported that they has learnt to be more 'democratic' in dealing with younger colleagues and students. A few T&L participants had to overcome initial scepticism about experiential learning. Laurence Piper, for example, said that

> I started off somewhat skeptical but then I became more inclined to see the value of operating in a more inclusive way when you bring the knowledge and skills of students into the classroom, it is so interesting and very productive and it transforms the classroom into a much more productive and energized space; I've tried to be more participatory. Early on I treated students far too much as peers. Now I start with what is your experience on this and how does this relate to the topic. Recently I taught a module in which I required students to interpret DRC material by applying it to a case which they selected from their own areas. So, for example we'd do a week of social mobilisation and then relate it to a case. One student from Cameroon talked about his experience in a local anti-xenophobia march he took part in Khayelitsha. This is experiential learning in term of how we empower students, relying on their own expertise. The quality of discussions we've had around this has been incredible.

As we discussed challenges of democratizing the classroom—and of supporting students in breaking out of their habits and preconceptions about democracy both 'out there' and in classroom dynamics—we realized that using cross-national course materials and case studies supported some of our students not only in understanding substance but in becoming bolder in exercising democratic agency in reflection on courses. In many T&L courses exposure to DRC materials stimulated students to work on issues of citizenship and rights outside of their classrooms and in their own localities. Students were challenged to advocates and to turn research knowledge into action. DRC material helped to empower students to social action in their own environments through "recognising other actions, possibilities and learning from others," in Carlos Cortez's words. He goes on to describe how

> one of our students was trying to establish community-based indigenous radio in a place where government is not allowing this. They are trying to do this based on the right to communication, the right to culture, etc. Initially in her classroom presentations she was not interested in the discussions on citizenship and rights. By the end, she said that this would be very useful to relay to the group with which she worked. Two years later she

can now talk about how the programs in the now-running radio station deal with discussions of citizenship and rights. I really feel that this is the result of our work. It is a very interesting outgrowth of the course work and the discussions.

Evaluating students

Questions of teaching method and democracy came to play a more prominent role not only out of this iterative movement between meetings and home, but through an increasingly specific discussion of challenges we faced in our courses (especially as DRC-based courses began to be taught by members). Prominent among these discussions of specifics were quandaries around how to assess students' learning, and questions around how we knew what in our teaching was working. Here, issues of classroom and institutional power relations came to the fore, and the impulse to involve students in reflecting on these power relations was broadly shared in the group. So discussion turned to participatory methods that could support student voices in moments of evaluation. Carlos experimented with using participatory video as means to democratize evaluation:

> In our university it is very participative, students have to prepare and participate. How does any theoretical discussion relate to students' own experience—we emphasize this. What I tried is to leave the discussion very open, going from their experience to theory and back again; in this sense it is democratic as knowledge is collectively used; people have the freedom to agree and disagree; even I did an exercise first—a collective evaluation; how role of coordinator; each one does his or her own evaluation; I had never done this—each one evaluate each other; use of the participative video—they chose a story, elaborated a video; this was more participative.

[[It would be great to have one or two more stories about evaluation here. Anyone?]]

5. The DRC's ways of working

The outcomes of the T&L group's work together is significant: a variety of courses and trainings bringing together cases and theories of citizenship, participation, and accountability. But as the following section will emphasize, our process of working together was equally significant. Both the content of our courses and our ways of working drew heavily on the shared experiences of T&L members of a longstanding research collaboration, the DRC.

We have already described key findings from the DRC's collaborative research and how this shaped courses and curricula. In the final months of the DRC in 2010, the team found itself reflecting on the qualities of its decade-long ways of working. There was a strong sense that as important as the research products may have been, the DRC's ways of working together held an equally rich message—about how complex teams can develop to address complex research problems, and about the nuanced processes of aligning and coordinating work over deep differences of culture, location, and resources.

Collaboration as key to research production

The DRC began with an unusually strong commitment to doing research through democratic collaboration, and has sustained this commitment over its decade of work. The commitment had several sources. First, the DRC was initiated to address gaps in development research that could only be filled by an unusually robust network of south-south and north-south collaboration. The DRC proposed to investigate forms of citizenship, rights claiming, and participation that lead to pro-poor outcomes, fully aware that this called for new methodologies and approaches to comparative analysis. Second, key figures in the initiation of the DRC (e.g. John Gaventa, who was Director of the Highlander Center's grassroots community education work before taking a leadership role in the DRC; and Rajesh Tandon, co-founder of

the Society for Participatory Research in Asia) came out of backgrounds in participatory action research, community development, and activist research that gave them a specific commitment to egalitarian research relationships, both within the research team and with communities affected by the work; this background also gave them process skills needed to build open, egalitarian research relationships. Third, while there were deep differences of perspective and experience within the team that began the DRC there was shared commitment to pro-poor outcomes and to redressing power imbalances both within their own societies and in the development research and practice community. There also was a shared critique of the tendency of northern-funded research 'partnerships' to extract case studies from the south for analysis by northerners.

For all of these reasons, the DRC strived from the beginning to be more than a gathering in of research conducted discretely in different contexts. Research agendas, questions, methodologies, and analytical frames were to be developed through iterative collaboration across the whole team. This sort of collaboration was seen as crucial to developing the global research agenda and findings called for by the state of development practice.

Complex membership

The DRC was formed to address complicated questions in the field of development, and had to embody this complexity in its team. The team bridged multiple boundaries and divides: between academic disciplines, north and south, regions and perspectives within the south, and researchers and practitioners. Participants came to the DRC with very different methodologies, contextual knowledge, and understandings of the politics of their research. The test for the DRC was whether these differences could inject energy into the research, while also being susceptible to shifts through exposure to difference—not just conceptual and political difference, but experiences of participation with different others.[ii]

Democratic leadership

Southern partners and researchers entered the DRC with experience of the pitfalls of north-south development research collaboration, with many wondering whether this would be one more extractive process, with southern researchers gathering the cases and data for analysis by those from northern institutions? Control and leadership of the DRC was a crucial and thorny issue from the start.

From the first meeting, there was an affirmation of values of transparency, internal democracy, and sensitivity to power in governance and leadership structures and decisions. Budget and priority-setting, for example, which most often incline toward northern institutional power in development research partnerships, were on the table with the whole team; this move in particular helped southern partners to believe that the DRC could be a different sort of collaboration.

The growth of this trust and the emergence of a governance structure suited to the complex diversity and power dynamics of the DRC were encouraged by self-consciously facilitative leadership. John Gaventa and others in the DRC coordination team designed processes and ways of meeting that allowed the team as a whole to iteratively address key questions and guide the project.

The DRC's leadership structure developed a complexity reflective of the transnational membership and contexts across which it worked. There was centralized coordination team based at the Institute for Development Studies at the University of Sussex but governance was distributed (with responsibilities quite clearly delineated) across a Steering Committee, Central Advisory and Review Group, country teams, and co-conveners of research streams. These different bodies were accountable to one another through joint meetings, review of projects for funding, and critical assessment of research projects and findings. These leadership structures were in turn informed by cycles of critical reflection and trust-based dialogue across the larger DRC team, especially at regular whole-team, face-to-face meetings.

Overall, the skilled, complex leadership of the DRC created a container within which trusting relationships formed among participants and this trust enabled participants to learn deeply and openly from one another. The key term in this collective learning, repeated again and again in reflections by DRC members on 'ways of working', is iteration.

Iterative articulation of shared values, purposes, and analyses

One of the greatest strengths of the DRC as a learning community was its ability to build a coherent program of research not by envisioning or constraining things from the beginning but by repeatedly returning to core questions about purposes, questions, methods, and analyses that united its work. This iteration had a number of dimensions.

First is *iteration across time*. Substantial project resources were devoted to face to face meetings of the whole team as well as of themed subgroups. Out of the increasingly close relationships formed in these workshops and writeshops came a willingness to explain one's work, be challenged, and tease out common threads and lessons from diverse case studies and analyses. These intense, multi-day, face-to-face meetings also provided incentives to have work ready and to be prepared (in some cases, the threshold for attendance was having a draft paper or some other work to share); so they were an important part of the motivational structure of the DRC.

Second is *iteration across levels of analysis*. The DRC began from contextually specific cases selected by diverse researchers, explored with the methodologies each chose. With subsequent gatherings of the team these cases would be revisited and revised, synthetic understandings drawn out, and new languages and tools developed and brought back to particular contexts. This dialectic between close attention to context and abstraction from cases meant that the research did not trace a straight line; and many researchers struggled to connect their contextual case studies with broader themes articulated at team meetings. But this iteration between the contextual and the shared kept the project's learning supple enough to address the diversity of applications without constructing overly neat categories or oversimplifying synthetic points.

Third, and closely related to the movement from cases to collective synthesis, were *iterations of reflection and action* by members of the team. DRC meetings were held in retreat settings in countries represented in the project and these meetings provided space away from the busyness of lives as researchers and activists, a freedom (notwithstanding heavily scheduled time together) for the play of ideas. This would alternate with the return of researchers to the field, to communities where they did research, to their lives in universities and NGOs.

Fourth, over the ten years of the collaboration were *iterations of exploratory research and producing published outputs*—with the latter moments requiring intense work by authors of individual products but also intense exchanges between contributors to volumes and with volume editors.[iii]

These cycles of knowledge production had two profound effects. First, they forged very strong relationships within the team. The diverse motivations and expectations that brought researchers to the DRC developed into a sense of shared values, goals, and fate. DRC meetings, while intellectually robust and feisty, were gatherings of close friends. This created space for struggles with perspectives, methods, politics, and contexts that continued to diverge in important and generative ways. Second, the persistent return to core questions in the research allowed the activities and program of the DRC to be highly adaptive—in light of new learning, changing global conditions, and an emerging sense of potential contributions to development research and practice. As the story of the T&L group will make clear, the DRC has been strikingly ready to adjust its activities and priorities in response to new opportunities that further collective goals.

A final form of iteration relied on the strength of trusting relationships and built the DRC's adaptive capacity: *iterative learning about process*. There was ongoing innovation and learning in process design, facilitation, leadership, and governance. With each DRC meeting, each CARG meeting, each e-conference, each new Zed volume, DRC members were able to draw on a deeper knowledge of the styles and needs of those involved, of strengths and limitations of past processes, and of emergent challenges. One of the pleasures of DRC meetings was testing new ways of learning together.

Sustaining a critical edge

Given the longstanding collaborative relationships and strong personal bonds in the DRC, it took work to sustain a culture of mutual critique—especially because the research was self-consciously at odds with some of the disciplinary norms to which participants might habitually have had recourse. Here the deep diversity of the team and their contexts provided an important resource, since each researcher's presuppositions and analyses ran persistently into challenges of generalization to other cases. Moreover, the iterative process of collective synthesis and agenda setting meant working to justify analyses to one another and to skillfully find common ground across difference.

Contextual specificity and difference was made especially vivid for DRC members because meetings moved from country to country, and at most meetings in the south there were site visits to communities in which members were doing research—from health clinics in the Zapatista areas of Chiapas to the favelas of Rio to meetings with homeless HIV positive men in Gugulethu township in South Africa. There was a strong culture of hospitality as one country team hosted others, alongside the acute intellectual and political challenge of encountering the radically new and making space for it in individual and collective work. These site visits were touchstones for DRC work, reminding members of the value of intellectual suppleness, and also of the political stakes of the research.

The DRC continually experimented and innovated in its practices of peer review—ways of presenting work in progress, configurations of reading and response, bringing in external readers, and so on. Tensions did emerge, though, between sustaining inclusive relationships and research methodologies in the DRC, and pushing for critical responsiveness in the research. The practices of critique outlined above were strong, but participants' responsiveness to criticism varied, as did the extent to which published work was revised in light of criticisms. Individual team members remained the arbiters of the focus and quality of their research to a degree unusual in a funded research collaboration.

Dialectic with other institutions and communities

The relatively small size of the DRC enabled, then, the formation of close bonds, and a culture of collaboration and continual learning. Most members felt importantly changed by the experience, including through deep and politicized reflection on mediation, advocacy, and translation implicit in their roles as researchers. There were important shifts in understandings of members' disciplinary identities, in the methods they use as researchers, in their sense of connection to the communities where they did research, and in the vernaculars and means they used to share what they learned.

This process of individual and collective change itself became part of what bound the DRC together. But it also constituted one further site of iteration—repeated movement between the intellectual and institutionally friendly space of the DRC, and local communities at universities, NGOs, among research peers, and so on. There was an insistence from the early days of the DRC that 'capacity building' had to include southern universities, given their roles in training those pivotal to prospects for democracy and citizenship. Many members of the DRC found it difficult, however, embodying and implementing aspects of the DRC approach in their home institutions. This included the kinds of facilitative leadership described above: there was a significant gap between enjoying and benefitting from these collaborative processes and being able to host them for peers in home institutions.

For some members, DRC membership (with its associated funding and peer relationships with researchers from well known institutions) brought a degree of credibility within home institutions. Moreover, the DRC worked hard to support members between face to face meetings. At the same time, though, the DRC's culture and structure could feel distant from local structures of reward, credentialing, and prestige.

Notwithstanding the difficulty of this negotiation between DRC identities and the ones members inhabited within home institutions, the tension could also be generative. It kept alive an awareness of power dynamics that surround research. And it kept alive both the deep challenges of translation for DRC work and the forces confronting the normative and analytical perspective on development that the DRC forged. DRC members had to learn to create spaces for encounter and dialogue as they moved within and between locales.

This brings us to the T&L group, a subset of DRC researchers that turned attention concertedly to how to create space in their home contexts for teaching others about DRC research, and how to democratize spaces of teaching and learning in ways that communicate the approaches to citizenship, participation, and accountability developed in the DRC.

6. The trajectory of the T&L group's collaboration

[[This entire section of the paper is third person description. If anyone can find a place, or a few places, where their voices could tell a part of the section's story, this would be very helpful…. John, this includes you!]]

By its seventh year the DRC had produced a large volume of research, drawing on hybrid methodologies to produce distinctive analyses of citizenship, participation, and accountability in and across contexts in the global south (applying this analysis to some northern contexts as well). Many DRC researchers were bringing this research and analysis into their university or online teaching and into training for citizens, NGOs, civil servants, and elected officials. This marshalling of DRC approaches for teaching and training raised a host of questions: which materials were most appropriate for different learning contexts? How might materials be adapted for different audiences? How to weave together case-based and theoretical learning? What pedagogies were most suitable for teaching and learning DRC research? And most fundamentally, what could the complex analyses of group dynamics, communication, development, and power contained in DRC research reveal about the different scenes of teaching and learning in which DRC outputs were being taken up?

Like many shifts in the DRC program, this coalescence of interest first emerged around the edges of a group meeting, as a group had evening drinks after a day of meetings of at Dunford House in the UK in March 2007 (where members of the 'Deepening Democracy' DRC research stream were reflecting on cross-cutting themes from early case study work). Initial focus on teaching DRC materials was as a form of dissemination: how could DRC materials get noticed and taught? But this group also started to see that a sustained collaboration around teaching and learning DRC materials could realize other goals. As the DRC looked ahead to the horizon of DFID funding in 2010 they were focused on how to synthesize what they had learned together, communicate it, and embed it institutionally. Drawing from DRC research for particular trainings and courses would de facto do this work of synthesis, communication, and embedding, and would feed into broader reflection on themes and currents of the work. Furthermore, a key area of synthetic reflection in the DRC as a whole was on the forms of collaboration that had enabled their work: striking a subgroup to collaboratively develop courses would not only provide a laboratory of collaboration, but invite reflection on how DRC themes might (or might not) cut across the internal process of the subgroup, the dynamics of our courses, and the materials they were teaching.

As noted above, iterative learning in the DRC enabled responsiveness to new opportunities and information, and to new initiatives that captured members' energy. Out of the initial Dunford House

discussion came email exchanges among Brazilian, South African, Canadian, and UK colleagues about the scope of potential DRC work on teaching and learning (including about the degree of emphasis on content vs. pedagogy). These members began to think about a formal, funded DRC working group on teaching and learning, and identified two potential co-conveners for the group (David Kahane, a democratic theorist from the University of Alberta in Canada who had been involved in the DRC as a commentator and facilitator of workshops and write-shops; and Bettina von Lieres, a political scientist from the University of the Western Cape who was deeply involved in DRC research). Once funding was committed—in part through the serendipity of funding left at the end of a fiscal year—an email went around to the whole DRC membership in August 2007 seeking expressions of interest:

> At the March workshop of the Deepening Democracy team we decided to form a working group to explore curriculum development and teaching within the DRC. The goal is to collaboratively produce course materials and pedagogies to communicate what we've learned in the DRC to higher education and training audiences, using materials and case studies that we have produced, together with key external material.
>
> We would like to gather a team to take this funded project forward, and so are extending an invitation to this network. Participation would involve active involvement in e-conferences and meetings, and in many cases the development of a course that you would teach in your own context, and/or participation in co-teaching initiatives.
>
> Initial steps of the work would include:
>
> 1) September 24—30: An e-conference where we will brainstorm together about the shape of the curriculum project, and form working groups that will go on to (i) assemble theoretical and case study materials; (ii) discuss pedagogies that would model the approaches to participation being studied; (iii) determine supports that should be offered for those taking up this curriculum; and (iv) investigate possibilities for teaching collaborations such as DRC researchers teaching together at each others' institutions, or a summer school based on DRC material and involving DRC Researchers.
>
> 2) October and November: Working groups get underway in preparation for a January workshop.
>
> 3) January: Two-day face-to-face workshop to develop and consolidate our DRC curriculum project.
>
> Please be in touch with David or Bettina if you think that you might want to be part of this initiative. Some selection may be involved in assembling the team so that we have broad geographical representation, varied kinds of teaching and course development experience, and expertise in the range of conceptual, applied, and pedagogical issues and literatures with which we'll be dealing. Participants should also commit to testing an idea in practice.

It is worth dwelling on these beginnings of T&L, since they both echo and diverge from the beginnings of the DRC itself. First, and in an echo of the DRC, there was a commitment to starting where people were: developing different kinds of courses and wanting different things from the collaboration. Rather than inviting people to sign up for an initiative with clear contours (whether dictated from above or based on overlapping purposes), people enrolled in a process of establishing a direction and path together. At the same time (and in contrast with the start of the DRC), this was a group that had been working together successfully for years; there were comradeship, shared values, and trust. These translated into a confidence that collaboration would serve our respective needs. Enrollment was relatively easy.

There also were established DRC forms of collaboration for the group to use: the appointment of co-conveners, e-conferences to prepare for face to face meetings, and a vocabulary of meeting and facilitation processes. T&L could quickly build upon these through further process experimentation and learning: for example, the co-conveners picked up a structure of collaboration whereby meetings were preceded by e-conferences (exchanges of group emails bringing in perspectives on a particular question from as many participants as possible). But in light of the drop-off in participation observed in earlier iterations they staged the conversation around successive sets of themed questions and encouraged very brief responses.

The October 2007 e-conference aimed to prepare the ground for a two day meeting in January 2008 in Delhi (grafted onto an existing DRC governance meeting that already included a number of T&L participants). In the e-conference we each framed the teaching challenges we faced in using DRC materials and reflected on how collaboration could advance our practice—here responses ranged from the content-focused, to a desire to gain teaching skills, to a concern about how to align pedagogies with DRC content. All of the courses and trainings were still in prospect—they were either entirely new initiatives, or major revisions of existing teaching to include DRC materials. A larger group of participants and courses were in the mix in the initial e-conference and the initial meeting in Delhi; those listed in Section 2 are those that continued with the collaboration through subsequent stages.

The Delhi meeting was held for two days at the offices of PRIA. It began by acknowledging and appreciating the diverse teaching and learning contexts represented in the group—and especially the combination of university courses, trainings for officials, and distance learning initiatives. Participants agreed that this diversity was a strength, enabling them to coach and challenge each other, explore ways of linking students and teachers, and use diverse case studies from the global south. They also identified possible challenges, for example institutional resistance to different content and pedagogies, and the need to address students with different needs and expectations. And they heard from a panel of Indian academics, who emphasized the value of spaces to discuss the politics of teaching. Much of the meeting was then spent brainstorming key themes and reflecting on what it would look like to teach courses premised on "seeing like a citizen" (a phrase used to differentiate the DRC approach to its research). At this early stage the group envisioned three parallel teams, divided between university-based courses, distance learning, and training courses for public officials, and a champion was identified for each. (A fourth possible group was left behind at this point, which would have looked at teaching and learning citizenship directly with communities.) Each group was to identify learning goals; identify themes; select and/or develop materials; decide on pedagogies; develop evaluative tools; decide how to document the course; develop peer support mechanisms; and begin publicizing the courses.

The Delhi meeting was the first of several that dovetailed with other DRC gatherings—an efficiency that allowed T&L to meet, but also raised the issue of multiple demands on time. Part of the difficulty of sustaining engagement, especially between meetings, was the sheer busyness of participants, including with other DRC activities. Other groups were also longer established and more intensive in their work (and financial support for participation), so T&L sometimes took a back seat to other demands. Challenges in sustaining active participation between meetings may also have related to a dynamic familiar to many at universities: the devaluation of teaching development relative to research production. This returns us to the dialectic referenced above between energy raised by face to face meetings and the weight of institutional norms and expectations back home.

A small group of participants in the three streams met alongside a DRC gathering in Monkey Valley, South Africa in May 2008 and planned another major e-conference for the following month. The content of this online process marks a decisive shift to concerted engagement with issues of pedagogy. In the first two-day-long phase of the e-conference, participants e-mailed the group responding to the following questions:

[i] What are your central teaching goals in delivering your course (or if you don't yet have a particular course, the genre of course you're considering)?

[ii] What key challenges will you and your students face as the course proceeds? (Here you may talk about challenges like sustaining interest and engagement among participants; connecting theory and practice; supporting students in doing tough readings; getting all participants active in discussion; evaluating student progress; working in difficult classroom spaces or with difficulties of online access; limited student preparedness; etc.)

[iii] What teaching methods have you used before that will be important in meeting these challenges? What new teaching methods are you considering, and why?

In its second stage, the e-conference moved to an online threaded discussion: the co-conveners drew a number of themes out of the first round and invited exchanges under these headings (and others added by participants). In a third stage, a new question was posed:

Does teaching about DRC themes demand something different of our teaching methods?

This is a question that came up in both Delhi and Monkey Valley: To what extent does teaching about democracy entail *modeling* democracy in our teaching methods? Is there a contradiction in using the traditional lecture model to teach about democracy?

For most or all of us, passion for the work of the DRC is based on a deep commitment to principles and values of democracy and citizenship. Does teaching these principles and values require, however, that they be embodied in our courses and trainings -- in the agency students are given to define the terms of their own learning, for example; or in the authority given to participants' own perspectives and voices; or in the responsiveness of our teaching methods to student input?

In other words, what happens to our democratic sensibilities when we enter the spaces where we teach? Do we affirm forms of authority, expertise, or hierarchy in our teaching that we challenge in our political analyses? And are we justified in doing so? These are provocative questions, and ones that can reveal a lot about our understandings of democracy and of teaching.

The fourth stage of the e-conference asked:

[i] What do you hope and plan to do around teaching methods as you develop and deliver your course?

[ii] What kind of support from the rest of us would be useful to you in doing this?

[iii] Is there anything that the experience of this e-conference should teach us about how we collaborate, and/or about emailed and online discussion as ways of learning?

This e-conference set up a three day gathering at Stanmer House in the UK in October 2008, at which the group's work became very practical. Conversations about teaching DRC materials focused on particular teaching goals and contexts. Participants shared both syllabi and reflections in advance of the meeting and received critical feedback. Half a day was spent stepping back and rebuilding syllabi from scratch—articulating course and learning goals and mapping the thematic structure of the course. This was followed by a 'library exercise' that supported participants in browsing the archive of DRC research products (text and video) and sharing what they found most useful for their teaching purposes.

The work also became more practical by turning from broad questions of democratizing pedagogy to modeling particular classroom practices that members thought useful in teaching and learning DRC themes and materials. Attention was also directed at collaborative methods in the workshop—noticing nuances, strengths, and challenges of different sessions and trying on different facilitation roles. This was the first overt reflection of an aspiration that many had held for the T&L group from the beginning: that it would reflectively model resonances between learning in the group and the learning members were trying to facilitate in their classrooms and trainings.

At Stanmer House meeting members also recommitted to collaborating at a distance between meetings, especially as many of the courses were now beginning: those teaching courses would post to a discussion board after each class,[iv] noticing something that had gone well, something that was challenging, something that surprised them, and something they intended to do differently in future. Others would go to the website often enough to offer support and critical feedback. Participants left the Stanmer House meeting charged up for our own teaching, and for communicating closely and supporting one another as our courses and trainings unfolded.

Several members (Kahane, Piper, von Lieres, Williams) did use the Ning site as planned. But ongoing virtual collaboration was difficult to sustain. In talking about DRC ways of working above we noted the iterative movement between the intellectual and institutionally friendly space of the DRC, and local communities and institutions. We also noted the challenges that the DRC grappled with in sustaining dialogue, peer support, and collaboration between face to face meetings. This same challenge faced the T&L group, and the Ning site never reached a critical mass of activity that rewarded those who posted regularly and convinced others that they were missing something valuable. As in the DRC as a whole, the movement of T&L members from their local contexts to face to face meetings and back did have its generative aspects: new knowledge, practices, and commitments traveled, and the isolation that some in felt pursuing DRC agendas in their teaching contexts carried important information for T&L work. But given its focus on innovation in our teaching practices, the absence of day to day peer support and mentoring was a real obstacle. Members' existing teaching practices are held in place not just by institutional constraint or lack experience of alternatives, but by deep habits of mind and heart. It takes an equally weighty practice of individual and collective experimentation, reflection, and encouragement to make significant changes; and this is what the group found tough to implement at a distance. Moreover, the T&L group was much smaller than most other DRC teams, convened less frequently, and had one or at most two individuals from any given institution, so face to face support could be thin.

The reasons offered for limited participation in online dialogue were predictable and real: in some contexts (e.g. Angola), web access was intermittent and difficult; members were all tremendously busy and virtual collaboration took time; and members' institutions didn't reward this investment of time. We suspect, though, that there were more interesting reasons for the difficulty of distance collaboration, perhaps including members' own undervaluing of teaching relative to research; and their investments in current habits of teaching.

Seven university courses and four trainings for officials took place in the year following October 2008, with a fair amount of exchange and reporting back along the way, including an e-conference (focusing on materials used, teaching methods, and course evaluations) and a collaboration with the 'Learning and Teaching for Transformation' virtual network in May 2009 (where members of T&L described their courses and key challenges, feeding into discussion with the network).

Our third major face to face T&L meeting took place for three days in October 2009 at Dunford House in the UK. This meeting had three main tasks: to allow comprehensive reporting back and reflection based on the courses taught; support planning for our remaining year of DRC-funded work (funding for the DRC as a whole would end in the fall of 2010), including comparative learning and research products from our courses; and think about whether we had ambitions to sustain our collaboration beyond the end

of the DRC. Participants shared draft reflection pieces in their courses in advance of the meeting, and the meeting itself involved rich exchange around our courses, framed in terms of dimensions of the teaching that felt risky or surprising, and inviting intensive collaboration on continuing challenges in particular courses and across courses. This was also a chance to share videos that some of us had captured of our courses, and to dig more deeply into cross-cutting themes and successor projects using an 'open space' format.[v] Laurence Piper reflected that the meeting at Dunford House "was a very positive experience as there was reall peer-to-peer sharing of methods that we use in our classes. This brought us together as participants. It was not about expertise, but about doing things together."

Our final T&L meeting was part of a last gathering of the DRC in Rajasthan, India in August 2010. At this meeting Martha from India said that "I come from an activist background, and initially, I was scared to interact with researchers and academics. I listened more than talking in the beginning. But this collaboration really helped me to develop my new role - leading PRIA's continuing education department. I supplemented my old skills (as a trainer) with new ones – teaching and building new courses on citizenship."

From this last meeting came a commitment to continue. While DRC funding has ended, PRIA has committed to hosting a web space in which the team can continue to interact and support one another in teaching collaboration. And we hope that readers of this *Practice Paper* will connect with us around their own initiatives to teach citizenship and democracy by doing.

Looking back over the three year collaboration, a couple of key trajectories are visible. First, members entered the project with some shared purposes and values, but also were challenged to articulate their aspirations for their teaching—which given the character of the DRC, involved social and political transformation. The roots of T&L in these transformative aspirations, and repeated exploration of how members struggled to make this transformation real (often in profoundly challenging institutional and political contexts), offered inspiration and motivation that infused the diverse teaching projects.

Secondly, there was a transition from an early focus on 'disseminating' DRC research through courses to a recognition that DRC findings and the DRC ethos pointed to pedagogies as well. Stepping up to this challenge required that members examine their own practices, categories, approaches, and to see how these were implicated. Members saw that to offer DRC material to their students, they needed to actually allow students to experience the classroom as a democratic space, a space of power, a space of mediation and negotiation.

7. What can be learned from the DRC T&L?

T&L's collaboration resists generalization to other settings in a couple of ways. First, with three years of work behind it, the DRC T&L group is a relatively young and relatively small collaboration, spread over very diverse contexts; so it does not support ambitious claims to replicability or scalability. Second, some elements of the T&L project are atypical in the context of transnational teaching collaboration. The project emerged seven years into an intensely collegial research project, and built on strong relationships of trust and peer support as well as shared purposes and values. It drew funding from this larger collaboration, and so had strong resources as well as centralized administrative support for its work. And the roots of the project in the DRC meant that there was a shared archive of themes and materials mined by diverse courses—allowing members to combine a shared focus with tremendous disciplinary and textual as well as contextual diversity. Yet with all of this said, there are lessons or at least hints for other teaching collaborations.

First, the project challenges expert-driven models of pedagogical development. T&L's collaboration was self-consciously built from the lay teacher's perspective: it centered on peer-to-peer reflection, learning, and support. As such, it stands in contrast to approaches to teacher training centered on learning from

experts, on templates for course design and curriculum development, on 'best practices'. There were a number of virtues in T&L's non-expert-driven approach.

- Rather than applying some a priori account of good teaching to diverse contexts, it treated each member of the team as an expert on the contextual needs and challenges of their teaching, and built up from this local experience. The collaboration thus eschewed one-size-fits-all solutions, and encouraged openness to deep differences in cultural, political, and institutional differences.

- More than this, T&L's inductive approach to learning about how to teach citizenship in and across our diverse contexts supported curiosity about one another's situations, and made these differences a source of real reflection and learning.

- The basis of the project in peer learning and mentoring also undermined hierarchies of teaching expertise: all members were both learners and teachers in the collaboration, and were frequently shocked by these differences into beginner's mind—an openness essential to deep experimentation and learning in teaching. Expert-driven models of teacher development and mentoring aim to build capacity in beginners, but reinforce a dichotomy whereby one is a novice (needing correction, guidance, and support) or an accomplished professional (having what it takes to guide others, adequate to the challenge of teaching). T&L built a sense of teaching as a vocation of ongoing experimentation and learning, which cultivated confidence of those new to it while puncturing the pretensions of those who had forgotten that they always would be new to it. There were dramatic differences in levels of teaching experience in the DRC team, from those who had never taught before to winners of national teaching awards; and yet members listened raptly to one another's perspectives and challenges.

- This argument resonates with research from the broader DRC about how discourses of 'empowerment' and 'capacity building' in development contexts often mask stark limits to the potential of putatively democratic spaces to build real political agency. For example, facilitated and scripted 'invited' spaces of participation often reiterate relations of power between the conveners and the invited. As already noted, the peer learning focus of T&L echoed a fundamental commitment of many members to a pedagogy that sought to meet students where they are, to treat them as already possessing valuable knowledge from which others can learn, and to foreground and challenge habits of deference, hierarchy, and narratives of experts and novices.

Second, transnational teaching collaborations involving higher educators can benefit from bringing in practitioners of other forms of teaching. It was important to T&L's process and learning that it brought together teachers developing university courses with others building trainings for civil servants, elected officials, and NGOs. This kept key issues front and center: how to bridge cases and theory, how to calibrate the quantity and nature of readings to the capacities and tastes of learners, and the proper place of participatory and didactic methods given different purposes and groups of learners. This bridging of very different contexts of teaching also allowed T&L to reflect on and get beyond pieties about empowering students and democratizing learning, to really grapple with what it would take to approach these goals in diverse contexts. It sharpened our attentiveness to the distinctive needs of our very different learners.

Third, T&L members' collaboration as teachers was deepened by their collaboration as researchers in the wider DRC. Some elements of this are distinctive to this group's particular trajectory. But it is worth looking at how transnational teaching collaborations can be enriched by involving participants in common research—research geared not only to their own teaching and learning methods and outcomes, but to the broader societal challenges and outcomes that provide a context for their teaching.

Fourth, the project points to promising directions for transnational teaching collaborations. Many of these transnational projects—including some oriented toward citizenship education and democracy promotion—seek to develop a common curriculum that can be deliver (or adapted then delivered) in multiple contexts. By contrast, T&L sought to learn from the irreducible diversity of contexts, without creating modules or courses that would travel from one to the other. T&L's aim was to support the self-development of teachers in and for their own local contexts.

Fifth, T&L was premised on a southern focus and south-south collaboration. The prominence of content and reflection from the global south enabled distinctive new learning, and sustained a focus on the interplay of pedagogical innovation with institutional and political capacities and challenges. As in the DRC as a whole, this south-focused collaboration and learning yielded new kinds of comparative and global knowledge.

And finally, there is a real value in teaching these materials from the DRC. As John Gaventa said in the final meeting of the T&L group, "In my heart, I feel very proud hearing the testimonies of people from very diverse contexts using DRC materials. This was just a dream a few years ago. So thinking about how we took an idea, formed a group and then made something happen…. The group has followed through and delivered on so many things." [[Here we'd like to end with a few short, pithy statements from members of T&L about the overall value of teaching these materials: can you help?]]

8. Endnotes

---

[i] [Reference the online resource, where we'll put Salvo's video.]

[ii] In this context as in many others, the robust funding for the DRC was a strong enabling factor: it meant that the whole DRC, its thematic subgroups, and its leadership teams could meet regularly and face to face.

[iii] [Describe Zed series.]

[iv] After much consideration of online collaborative environments, the group settled on www.ning.com

[v] http://www.openspaceworld.org/