International Conference
NEW PERSPECTIVES in SCIENCE EDUCATION

Global-local Citizenship Strategies to Improve Communities' Resilience: Inspiring Cases from Different Communities

Albertina Raposo[1,2], Isabel Abreu dos Santos,[2] José Carlos Ferreira,[2,3] Lia Vasconcelos[2]

[1]Polytechnic Institute of Beja, Portugal
[2]MARE - Marine and Environmental Sciences Centre, ARNET - Aquatic Research Network Associate Laboratory, NOVA School of Science and Technology, NOVA University Lisbon, Portugal
[3]School of Science and Technology. NOVA University of Lisbon, Caparica, Portugal

Abstract

Active public participation in managing natural resources is already recognized as the key to sustainable development and democratic societies. The interaction, the individual and the collective awareness, and, as a result, the social transformation generated by participative processes, provide people with the ability to manage their lives and to contribute to a common and sustainable world. Increasing meteorologically extreme events exacerbated by climate-change phenomena, pose new challenges, jeopardizing human settlements. In addition, adaptation measures are often sources of conflict between decision-makers, authorities, emergency agents, experts, and local actors. In this work, we propose a critical reflection on the importance of educating for global citizenship through processes of active public participation, framed by bibliographic research and case-study analyses. Results show that global citizenship is a process based on action that makes sense due to the knowledge created through real-life experiences, which enables people to manage their lives better and contribute to integral and sustainable development without forgetting fundamental values and attitudes. These collaboratively built solutions are urgent.

Keywords: [*Global citizenship]; [Critical literacy]; [Social transformation]; [Active public participation]*

1. Introduction

Looking for climate change as a threat to desired sustainable development and to the natural conditions of ecosystems, security, or even the survival of most human communities is key. Although the vulnerability indices incorporate different conceptual frameworks [1] the severity and nature of the impacts depend on several factors such as geographic location [1] or natural phenomena [2]. The small scale of some communities is even more susceptible to environmental changes, causing a lower adaptive capacity [3].
Providing communities in each location with knowledge and understanding of the global problem and the different climate change scenarios can significantly affect how communities deal with mitigation and adaptation measures to face this challenge. Helping people to think together, discuss and reflect collaboratively about locally known problems, and promote valuable and significant learning can give these communities the tools they need to act [4,5]. Martins and Gasalla [6] point out that it is essential to understand vulnerabilities and local strategies to adapt to environmental changes if one wants to develop actions to enhance community conservation and survival.
This paper develops a critical reflection on the importance of educating for global citizenship through processes of active public participation, supported by literature review and two case study analyses. The selection of the case studies was based on the effective representation of all stakeholders at all stages of the process, including decision-making.

2. The Interdependence between Local and Global Citizenship in Coastal Communities

In recent decades, the interdependence between local and global identities and affiliations has increased, which is also true for issues related to environmental management, particularly in coastal communities. These regions are often overly vulnerable to phenomena related to climate change, namely sea level rise and marine ecosystem degradation. They are therefore territories where it is

essential to work on empowering their communities so that they can act responsibly in their local context, while recognizing their roles as global citizens.

Recently, several studies have reinforced the importance of citizenship education in coastal areas. Works such as those by Cruz et al. [7] or Pinheiro et al. [8], are examples of initiatives that illustrate how formal and informal education can cultivate environmentally literate citizens, creating synergies for action between their local contexts and their global responsibilities. In addition, the role of governance in promoting inclusive coastal management has received academic attention. Different studies [9, 10, 11] emphasize the need to incorporate local voices into international dialogues on different policies. This practice not only strengthens democratic participation but also improves results in terms of conservation and sustainability in the targeted territories.

For Rölfer et al. [11], resilience is a multidisciplinary concept, and to operationalize resilience in environmental management—and specifically in coastal governance—a deep understanding of the concept of resilience and its different approaches is essential. In environmental and sustainability science, resilient thinking is often rooted in ecology, but when attempting to operationalize resilience in relation to coastal governance under climate change, it is important to consider other aspects. Knowing that coastal socio-ecological systems represent a particularly diverse base of environmental resources,

there's been a recent advocacy for bringing together different types of knowledge that can generate new insights [12, 13, 14, 15]. It seems, as pointed out by Norström et al. [16] to be a consensus that it's important to increase acceptance of scientific evidence by co-producing knowledge with society, using a transdisciplinary approach. These practices, based on knowledge exchange between different actors and knowledge of governance systems, show that various types of knowledge should be part of the local debate on coastal resilience. As argued by Gonçalves and Pinho [10] governance covers the collaboration of government and non-government actors, emphasising rules, processes, theories, values, institutions, actors, and discourses through which societies make decisions that affect coastal landscapes. Such conditions, as Ernoul and Wardell-Johnson argue [9], are not supported by a standardization of governance strategies; instead, it is necessary to work considering local governance approaches and existing local sociocultural values, identifying and understanding governance relationships in the region in scope. Guzmán and de Velazco [17] also highlight the growing recognition of the importance of include and respect the knowledge of local actors and their different identities, validating the response of education to global citizenship in preparing individuals and communities to build a more resilient future.

3. Educational Processes as a Tool to Deal with Social Decisions

As Oscar Jara argues [5], there are two types of educational processes: the ones that allow us to adapt to the changes that are taking place in society; and the others that are generated by those who participate in capacities for transformation and change to the kind of society we aspire to [5]. The first type leads learners to conformism, accommodation, and the tranquility of remaining passive objects in a story others promote. The second, on the contrary, leads to restlessness, curiosity, and transgressive innovation; it allows learners to be active protagonists in the construction of history as subjects capable of transforming the world around them. For Jara, the first way refers to the need for education for competitiveness, efficiency, and individual triumphant success to satisfy the global market demands. In contrast, the other path confronts the first and places people in search of an education for democratization, equity, and respect for the diversity of human relationships; in other words, an education for democratic global citizenship, for the defense of life and the globalization of solidarity. So, these approaches respond to two different and opposing ethical, political, pedagogical, and aesthetic paradigms [5].

Collaboratively built solutions help people respond to existing problems, problematize new problems, and find new ways to deal with adversities [5, 14, 15, 18]. Nevertheless, how to deal with the urgency of the challenge to act and the time needed for conscious transition processes? Building these common goals takes time, and critical literacy plays a significant role in critical global citizenship education [18]. If educators are not critically literate to engage with their approaches' assumptions and implications/limitations, they risk (indirectly and unintentionally) reproducing the systems of belief and practices that harm those they want to support [4, 18]. Critical literacy can be seen as a significant dimension of critical global citizenship education [18]. Furthermore, it contributes to education for global citizenship. It allows, in an integrated perspective, work on complex thinking [4] providing an opportunity for reflection on epistemological and ontological assumptions [18] instead of revealing an absolute truth to learners [19].

4. Active Public Participation and Global Citizenship

A close look at current policies and public planning suggests that politicians and public managers struggle to integrate participation and sustainability within public planning. Clausen et al. [20] argue that a new and deeper democratic understanding of sustainability is needed to produce the necessary changes in society. This understanding necessarily involves participatory processes that allow the inclusion of citizens in their various dimensions. The authors [20] stress the importance of knowing the extent to which public entities and institutions can defend proper democratic, sustainable development. If all institutions have a purpose, how can they understand that nature and society are something that people have in common? If sustainability have any meaning in producing changes in the way humans coexist with nature, these changes must be based on collective visions of the future. This aspect represents a challenge: it is necessary to find solutions that overcome the structural barriers in communication between citizens and local actors to participate in the creation of new and more sustainable visions for the future.

The greater the complexity of the problems to be addressed and the greater the uncertainties, the more necessary it becomes to count on citizenship and the different social, political, and economic agents [15]. Open debates involving stakeholders in the early stages of the decision-making process will (i) improve knowledge, (ii) help to avoid and resolve conflicts, creating relationships and networks, and develop social and common intellectual property hardly attainable otherwise, (iii) generate a greater diversity of solutions and (iv) improve the legitimacy of decisions. Indeed, several authors [15, 21, 22] claim that network relationships share the assumptions that different partners contribute with different perspectives, knowledge, and resources in identifying and understanding common problems. These multiple perspectives and resources can be effectively articulated to develop solutions for these partner communities, making it possible to generate the capacity to build agreements, get to know reality better, and adopt the solutions that best adapt to social needs. The format of active participation that leads to interaction between participants generates the collaborative construction of the diagnosis and the solution, which can belong to all those involved in the process and not just to a restricted group [23].

For authors such as Nielsen and Nielsen [24], methodologies are more than a simple set of methods and techniques. With an attitude through the non-authoritarian or manipulative organization of the creative process, a more robust knowledge is reached, whose application is not restricted to its introduction into the everyday life of ordinary citizens. However, it can also be extended to all planning and decision-making contexts. Participatory methodologies, if used in research, lead to practical results and knowledge production, giving meaning to the participant's actions. They value individuals and their communities and can therefore play an important role and function as a mechanism leading to greater participation; these methodologies work like a spiral, always leading to reflective learning.

When working in a participatory and collaborative way, those involved change their vision of reality, gaining experience and knowledge through reflection on the data and as reflection and development of their own social culture [24]. Consequently, action happens and makes sense, as well as the development of knowledge which leads to new action. This aspect corroborates the idea that interactive methodologies make people aware of a set of environmental aspects, thus contributing to adequate management of the environment where shared responsibility has an impact [20, 25].

Undoubtedly, the emerging synergies out of collaborative actions show that collaboration increases the capacity of people and organizations to achieve something desirable collectively. There is a pedagogical approach based on learning that brings together the underlying principles upon which the practice has been based [26]; it is also visible a linkage between awareness-raising learning and informed action, with an emphasis on empowerment and democratic engagement.

Although there is considerable literature published on the importance of collaborative and participatory processes, Caser and Vasconcelos [27] and Nilsen [28] make it clear how to do it in two models (A and B) that, being methodologically different, are based on the same principles, as described below.

Model A – This model is based on the idea that research, planning, and decision-making processes need to improve communication and interaction between the stakeholders involved, whether at the level of multidisciplinary or among the various public in general and between these and specialists, so a deep understanding is possible [27]. Professional practice at structuring, phasing, and conducting public participation processes requires fundamentally grounded know-how, both theoretical and methodological. From a conceptual point of view, it is evident that the processes must be carried out in a systematic, structured, and open way. The process phases follow each other logically, each one feeding the next one. Each work phase is divided into manageable steps. The process is transparent,

and manipulation can be more easily identified and eliminated [27]. Model A is not based on paradigmatic sequences of workshops, which are applied to any situation systematically and uniquely, but it is craftly made to address a specific situation. It is vital to understand that each case is a case, and each moment of active participation requires specific and adjusted treatment. Each sequence is structured according to the stakeholder's needs, the subject to be addressed, the moment of intervention, the conflict of the situation, and several other parameters. It is, therefore, a flexible and adaptative model based on various methodologies to choose and compose [27].

Model B – The model tries to create a space for applying the concept of social innovation, establishing what is called by the author [28] as utopian horizon. The utopian horizon is defined as one where there is an opportunity to ask questions and dreams; by releasing the latent dimensions of individual day-to-day experiences, people can transcend themselves. This encouragement from individuals requires a space that is simultaneously distant from everyday life and linked to it. Therefore, Nielsen [28] developed a methodological model based on three steps: 1) creation of the future, 2) research workshop, and 3) public dialogue meetings.

Step 1: Workshops for creating the future - the workshop model starts by asking basic questions. The work in these workshops is not problem-solving but rather based on questions as simple as essential and existential (e.g., how would we like to live? how should we lead our lives?) related to the specific topic that interests the participants. The creation of the future workshop promotes (using specific techniques) an atmosphere where participants learn to listen to each other and themselves and accept ambiguities and ambivalence. Moreover, despite the ideas being in the sphere of utopia, as they relate to the practice and experiences of each one, they maintain the perspective of everyday life and help to create "drafts of how to live" being fun and effective for the collaborative development of ideas, project proposals, and initiatives [28].

Step 2: Research Workshops - The ideas created in the previous stage must be systematized, grouped, and confronted with another type of knowledge: knowledge of a different order than our day-to-day knowledge. For this and trying not to subordinate day-to-day knowledge to the knowledge of specialists and academics, the research workshop is developed as a social meeting between academics and citizens, encouraging dialogue and the exchange of different types of knowledge using specific participative techniques. These social meetings aim to invert the specialist/lay citizen relationship, with specialists being encouraged to bring their knowledge to citizens' ideas, projects, and proposals, respecting their how-to-live drafts. This share allows the ideas and proposals developed in step 1 to be strengthened and further developed. For many experts, this is a huge challenge; however, when they identify with the spirit of the workshop, very productive, creative, and personally satisfying exchanges arise from the group. When this happens, the relationship emerges between the local context of practices and knowledge and the broader global/social/universal context. At this point, the group is inevitably confronted with the need to intersect reflection with dependencies and consequences of decisions and responsibility.

Step 3: Public dialogue meetings - The first two steps provide the forum for developing social imagination and encourage society to change its views. It is then necessary to present and debate these new points of view. In this third step, Nielsen [28] proposes that citizens be more than a mere audience and the learning gained cannot be reduced to simple ideas and initiatives. Thus, a fourth step can also be considered to work on the realization and materialization of the ideas, projects, and initiatives taken.

5. Inspiring Cases from Different Communities

Case studies are accurate histories of occurrences from which one can take lessons learned, inspiring life for better practices. We, therefore, selected two case studies that motivated researchers to analyze the experience of different communities: MARGov, in Portugal and Moen, in Denmark. Both cases were supported by specific facilitation models like Model A (the Portuguese case study) and Model B (the Danish case study). Although different, these two facilitation models considered the context regarding the existence of a protected area and the interest of the participants such as points of view, existing knowledge, ideas built up together, individual and collective actions and/or decision-making participated process.

A first case study starts from a context in which the Protected Area of Marine Park Professor Luis Saldanha (Portugal) reveals itself as a focus of disagreements for the community. The Project MARGov started in 2009, intending to promote dialogue and mitigate conflicts [14].

Professor Luiz Saldanha Marine Park (PLSMP) was created within an existing protected area – the Arrábida Natural Park (ANP). This Marine Protected Area (MPA), the first to be created in Portugal in

1998, is part of the Natura 2000 Network - is very rich in marine biodiversity (fauna and flora). Occupying 53 km2 and extending along 38 km of rocky coast, the PLSMP was created by Regulatory Decree (nº 23/98 of 14 October) and, therefore, through a top-down process. The fishermen did not accept the sudden restrictions imposed on them and for not being heard or involved in the decision-making process. The Arrábida Natural Park Management Plan (ANPMP) was published in 2005 and aimed to promote the conservation, management, and enhancement of natural resources, safeguarding different types of heritage, contributing to the organization of various activities, and the promotion of the region's sustainable development and population well-being. As a result, three types of protected areas were defined: total, partial, and complementary, with decreasing levels of protection.

The local population always contested the ANPMP, local authorities, associations, and fishermen's representative bodies. In this context of fragility and threat to the economic survival of the fishing community and general discouragement in the face of the tight restrictions imposed by ANPMP, MARGov arose with the vital idea of promoting sustainable co-management of the marine protected area. The MARGov project aimed, through constructive dialogue and sharing of responsibilities between the different stakeholders, to overcome some difficulties and reduce existing conflicts. Participatory methodologies were applied as an instrument capable of generating the capacity for dialogue in a structured, organized, and productive way. The process was developed in three phases:

Phase 1: development of contacts with institutions and public presentation of the project;

Phase 2: stakeholder identification, interviews to get to know the participants, identification of interests and mapping of existing conflicts, and preliminary definition of the work agenda;

Phase 3: structure of the participatory process and implementation of forums and workshops over two years.

Result of Model A: the collective stakeholder participation allowed to achieve a proposal for a collaborative governance model at the last forum [14].

In a second case study about the creation (or not) of a Natural Park in Moen (Denmark), Clausen, et al. [20] corroborate the idea that the principal participatory methodologies used in recent years in environmental management are often stakeholder-oriented but that it is necessary to take a step forward.

In 2000, as recommended by OECD (Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development), a political committee established by the Danish government, raised the question of establishing national parks in Denmark being suggested seven areas that could become national parks. In 2002 the Danish government decided to start a democratic and participative process. The aim was to allow local communities to decide, in a two-year process, if people from the seven communities were interested in establishing a national park and, at the same time, to have the perception of how a park could be integrated with local actors' activities. To emphasize the importance of local participation, the Minister of Environment communicated that the final political selection would depend on a local agreement that was expected to be based on democratic rules. Moen, an island geographically situated about 100 km south of Copenhagen, was one of the places where the participatory process began and was later described by Clausen et al. [20] according to working papers, meeting minutes, events, and interviews. This process, considered a pilot project, was developed in three phases (initial, working, and final phase):

The initial phase started on Moen at the local level, with politicians, tourist activities, and nature conservation organizations. Worried about the idea of not being able to create a democratic process, in addition to the thematic process of the pilot project, it was decided that a non-thematic process would also be initiated. As a result, several people from different communities and places were invited to participate in Future Workshops. During this phase, it became clear that the local community was against the process, and some tensions arose.

In the working phase, the second one, problems continued, the conflicts were more heated, and many people abandoned the process. However, as the non-thematic discussion had started, the Future Workshops continued. In this case, the Future Workshop focused on the neighboring community, Nyord, a small island included in the national park; on this small island, there was a strong attitude against the creation of the park. After having developed and experienced a couple of future workshops, the representatives from the island of Nyord invited University of Roskilde consultants to facilitate future workshops. In the end, the workshops brought ideas and visions for the future that were presented in a report written by the islanders [20]. In the published report, people expressed their fears, perspectives on nature, culture, and socio-economic aspects, and specific proposals for action.

In the final phase, the conflicts persisted. The report to send to the environmental minister was much more based on the problems and not on the search for solutions; everyone was once again invited to

participate in two additional workshops. As a result, a local coordination group emerged and continued the process with the visions and ideas developed during the project. Consequently, without the focus on the creation of the park, "the report from the Moen pilot project stressed the importance of future democratic and local regulation of nature management" [20, p. 9].
Result of Model B: the contribution of the local community prevented the creation of a natural park in that region leaving all the region's management in the hands of the community [20].

6. Conclusion

These two case studies based on Models A and B, prove key actors' deep involvement - engagement - after developing the participative processes, achieving a joint opportunity to manage both areas collaboratively. Although in different contexts, processes, spaces, times, and methodological approaches, it was possible to find, in both case studies, convergent collaborative solutions that best suit the communities: In the first case study, MARGov in Portugal, the collective stakeholder participation allowed to achieve a proposal for a collaborative governance model, solving a long term conflict among stakeholders. In the second case study, in Moen, Denmark, the contribution of the local community prevented the creation of a natural park leaving the region's management in the hands of the community.
Each presented case study is singular, and no universal recipe or approach will serve all contexts. These particularities emphasize how local development actions are essential, since they can address specific needs of local coastal communities, for facing challenges from a bottom-up point of view [15]. This type of participative process must be encouraged within different communities, in diverse regions, due to its practical impact on policies and management plans, showing stakeholders the effective results of their contributions to strategic and/or operational actions [23].
Both collaborative participatory processes allowed the creation of a space to share learning, knowledge, and points of view promoting collective practices to improve coastal communities' resilience. In one case, the synergies created resulted in a proposal for a co-management marine protected area model [14]. In the other, the results allowed the community to take responsibility for managing the key potential community activities [20].
There is no doubt that the new challenges for sustainability require analysis of the interaction between science and society [14, 15, 20, 23]. The aspect of a complex relationship transcends the disciplinary context and articulates proactivity, interdisciplinarity, and transparency in a dynamic interaction. Therefore, it should be based on collaborative work, respect and care for people and communities, the capacity and appreciation of the collective construction of knowledge and citizenship for the common good, connecting communities, processes, and results. As a result, it's no wonder that wherever these processes occur, coastal communities can benefit from them.

REFERENCES

[1] CARDOSO, E. (2023). O impacto das alterações climáticas nos países em desenvolvimento: uma análise comparativa de índices de vulnerabilidade, Dissertação de mestrado, Universidade de Lisboa. Instituto Superior de Economia e Gestão
[2] TRIMEDIANTO, A., MARSUDI, D., LUSIANI, F. and PANJAITAN, M. B. (2024). Climate Change Impacts on Coastal Vulnerability and Adaptation Readiness: Maritime Perspective, Golden Ratio of Data in Summary, Vol.4, Issue.2, https://doi.org/10.52970/grdis.v4i2.520
[3] ETONGO, D., ARRISOL, L. (2021). Vulnerability of fishery-based livelihoods to climate variability and change in a tropical island: insights from small-scale fishers in Seychelles. Discov Sustain 2, 48 https://doi.org/10.1007/s43621-021-00057-4
[4] MORIN, E. (2005). Ciência com consciência, Bertrand Brasil, Edição revista e modificada pelo autor, Tradução de Maria D. Alexandre e Maria Alice Sampaio Dória, 82ª edição, ISBN 85-286-0579-5
[5] JARA, O. (2016). Dilemas y desafíos de una Educación para la Transformación – Algunas aproximaciones freirianas, Sinergias, Revista nº 4 – Educação para a Transformação Social – Diálogos sobre Desenvolvimento, ISSN 2183-4687, Edição de Centro de Estudos Africanos da Universidade do Porto, CIDAC – Centro de Intervenção para o Desenvolvimento Amílcar Cabral e Fundação Gonçalo da Silveira. https://sinergiased.org/educacion-transformacion/
[6] MARTINS, I. M., GASALLA, M. A. (2020). Adaptive Capacity Level Shapes Social Vulnerability to Climate Change of Fishing Communities in the South Brazil Bight, Frontiers in Marine Science, vol. 7:481. doi: 10.3389/fmars.2020.00481

[7] CRUZ, J.P., MALAFAIA, C., SILVA, J.E., ROVISCO, M., MENEZES, I. (2023). Educating for participatory active citizenship: an example from the ecological activist field. Environ Dev Sustain. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10668-022-02866-7
[8] PINHEIRO, S., TORRES, A.C., PEREIRA, B., MALAFAIA, C., MENEZES, I. (2024). Citizenship education to promote the participation of young people in climate adaptation: crossing curricular boundaries through community profiling. Curric Perspect 44, 501–512, https://doi.org/10.1007/s41297-024-00231-4
[9] ERNOUL, L., WARDELL-JOHNSON, G. (2013). Governance in integrated coastal zone management: A social networks analysis of cross-scale collaboration. Environmental Conservation 40 (3): 231–240, doi:10.1017/S0376892913000106
[10] GONÇALVES, C., PINHO, P. (2022). In search of coastal landscape governance: a review of its conceptualisation, operationalisation and research needs, Sustainability Science,17:2093–2111, https://doi.org/10.1007/s11625-022-01147-6
[11] RÖLFER, L., CELLIERS, L. and ABSON, D. J. (2022). Resilience and coastal governance: knowledge and navigation between stability and transformation. Ecology and Society 27(2):40. https://doi.org/10.5751/ES-13244-270240
[12] BONI, A. (2018). Entrevista Sinergias ED a Alejandra Boni, Sinergias, Revista nº 7 - Trabalho Colaborativo e Construção de Conhecimento, ISSN 2183-4687, Edição de Centro de Estudos Africanos da Universidade do Porto, CIDAC – Centro de Intervenção para o Desenvolvimento Amílcar Cabral e Fundação Gonçalo da Silveira. https://sinergiased.org/entrevista-alejandra/
[13] BOYLE, A. 2020. “Climate Change, Sustainable Development, and Human Rights.” In Sustainable
Development Goals and Human Rights. Interdisciplinary Studies in Human Rights, edited by
M. Kaltenborn, M. Krajewski, and H. Kuhn, vol. 5. Cham: Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/
978-3-030-30469-0_10
[14] VASCONCELOS, L., CASER, U., PEREIRA, M., GONÇALVES, G., SÁ, R. (2012). MARGOV – building social sustainability, Journal of Coastal Conservation, 16, (4) pp 523–530, DOI 10.1007/s11852-012-0189-0
[15] VASCONCELOS, L., FARRALL, H., FERREIRA, J.C. (2020). Socio-Ecological Literacy: Collaboration as a Learning Tool for Society Transformation (174-194) DOI:10.4018/978-1-7998-4402-0.ch009. In Saúde, S., Raposo, M. A., Pereira, N., Rodrigues, A. I. (2020). Teaching and Learning Practices That Promote Sustainable Development and Active Citizenship. IGI Global.http://doi:10.4018/978-1-7998-4402-0
[16] NORSTRÖM, A., CVITANOVIC, C., LÖF, M., WEST, S., WYBORN, C., BALVANERA, P., BEDNAREK, A., BENNETT, E., BIGGS, R., de BREMOND, A., CAMPBELL, B., CANADELL, J., CARPENTER, S., FOLKE, C., FULTON, E., GAFFNEY, O., GELCICH, S., JOUFFRAY, J.B., LEACH, M., Le TISSIER, M., MARTIN-LÓPEZ, B., LOUDER, E., LOUTRE, M.F., MEADOW, A., NAGENDRA, H., PAYNE, D., PETERSON, G., REYERS, B. SCHOLES, R., SPERANZA, C., SPIERENBURG, M., STAFFORD-SMITH, M., TENGÖ, M., van der HEL, S., van PUTTEN, I and ÖSTERBLOM, H. (2020). Principles for knowledge co-production in sustainability research. Nat Sustain 3, 182–190. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41893-019-0448-2
[17] GUZMÁN, D. and VELAZCO, J. (2023). Global Citizenship: Towards a Concept for Participatory Environmental Protection, Global Society, DOI: 10.1080/13600826.2023.2284150
[18] ANDREOTTI, V. (2006). Soft versus critical global citizenship education, Policy, and Practice: A Development Education Review, Vol. 3, Autumn, pp. 40-51. https://www.developmenteducationreview.com/issue/issue-3/soft-versus-critical-global-citizenship-education
[19] FREIRE, P. (1994). Cartas a quien pretende enseñar. México. Ed. Siglo XXI
[20] CLAUSEN, L. T., HANSEN, H. P., TIND, E. (2010). Democracy and Sustainability - A Lesson Learned from Modern Nature Conservation. A new agenda for sustainability, 229-248
[21] NABATCHI, T. (2014). Deliberative Civic Engagement in Public Administration and Policy, Journal of Public Deliberation: Vol. 10: Iss. 1, Article 21. Available at: https://www.publicdeliberation.net/jpd/vol10/iss1/art21
[22] SCHULZ, A.; ISRAEL, B., LANTZ, P. (2003). Instrument for evaluating dimensions of group dynamics within community-based participatory research partnerships, Evaluating and Program Planning, 26, pp 249-262, www.elsevier.com/locate/evalprogplan, DOI: 10.1016/S0149-7189(03)00029-6

[23] GOUACHE, C. (2022). Imagining the future with citizens: participatory foresight and democratic policy design in Marcoussis, France, Policy Design and Practice, 5:1, 66-85, DOI: 10.1080/25741292.2021.1930687
[24] NIELSEN, K., NIELSEN, B. (2006). Methodologies in Action Research in Action Research and Interactive Research – beyond practice and theory, Kurt Aagaard Nielsen, Lennart Svensson Eds, Shaker Publishing
[25] NABATCHI, T., AMSLER, L. (2014). Direct Public Engagement in Local Government, American Review of Public Administration, Vol. 44(4S) 63S–88S, sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav, DOI: 10.1177/0275074013519702
[26] BOURN, D. (2014a). The Theory and Practice of Global Learning, Development Education Research Centre, Research Paper No.11, ISBN: 978-0-9574546-3-7
[27] CASER, U., VASCONCELOS, L. (2008). A Mediação Multiparte e os Desafios e Potencialidades da Mediação Urbana, Campos de Mediação, Novos Caminhos, Novos Desafios; p. 33-40; Minerva Editora, Lisboa
[28] NIELSEN, B. (2009). Social imagination, Sustainability and participatory learning, keynote paper for the 2009 CRLL - Conference Lifelong Learning revisited: What next? 24 – 26 June, Universidade de Sterling, Scotland