

2.2 Development Education

This section is divided into 4 parts. In the first part I examine different definitions of development education. In the second part I present a genealogy of the term from the 1960s to 1990s from two different perspectives that are then compared to approaches to development studies. In the third sub-section, I present a genealogy from 1990s. In the final sub-section I outline current debates in development education that are related to this research.

2.2.1 Definitions of Development Education

The Development Education Association (DEA), founded in 1993, presents itself as the umbrella body to raise awareness and understanding of global development issues in the UK. It has 240 member organisations, including 45 DECs and 50 BME organisations (DEA, 2005). The DEA is also linked to development education networks in Japan, Australia, New Zealand, Germany, USA, Norway, Ireland, Netherlands and Portugal and publishes an Educational Journal 3 times a year. The DEA defines development education as life-long learning that...

- explores the links between people living in the "developed" countries of the North with those of the "developing" South,

enabling people to understand the links between their own lives and those of people throughout the world;

- increases understanding of the economic, social, political and environmental forces which shape our lives;
- develops the skills, attitudes and values which enable people to work together to take action to bring about change and take control of their own lives;
- works towards achieving a more just and a more sustainable world in which power and resources are more equitably shared (DEA, 2005).

The DEA justifies the importance of development education on their website with the statement that:

We live in one world. Our food, clothes, jobs, entertainment, health, holidays, leisure and environment link us closely with the rest of the world. The growth of international trade, travel and communications means that our lives are increasingly influenced by events in many different parts of the world.

If you are a teacher, youth worker, peer educator, lecturer, adult education tutor, community worker, or a student, development

education can help you to explore global perspectives and influences as part of your teaching and learning throughout life (DEA, 2005).

However, it is important to point out that each group or organisation working in the area may have a different understanding of development education. The focus, agenda and meaning of development education is reinterpreted in each context where it is practised, according to practitioners' assumptions and political, organisational, social and economic constraints and possibilities. This can also be argued in relation to the changes in language over time and within different schools of thought.

The DEA's first promotional leaflet, for example, defined development education as:

... a process which explores the relationship between North and South and more generally the links between our own lives and those of people throughout the world. It is also about recognising our global interdependence and that for any change to take place, a change of attitudes and values is required by the North. Development education concerns itself not with seeing southern peoples as powerless victims awaiting charitable support but as equal partners in the development process, from which we have much to learn. Development education is about finding new ways to live and exploring new options for the future. It is about developing the skills and knowledge by which people can

take greater control over their lives and make informed choices. It is about participation, effective action and lasting change (DEA, 1993).

On the other hand, other authors in the area adopt a different agenda. The United Nations (UN) definition of the term, quoted in Hicks and Townley (1988) is that

Development education is concerned with issues of human rights, dignity, self-reliance and social justice in both developed and developing countries. It is concerned with the causes of underdevelopment and the promotion of an understanding of what is involved in development, and of reasons for and ways of achieving a new international and economic social order (p.9).

The term 'development education' was first used by the UN in the 1960s with the purpose that it would increase the political support of the 'North' for the 'South' (Yamashita, 1998). The two understandings place the North in very different positions in relation to the South. While the DEA puts emphasis on issues of power, partnership and questioning of assumptions in the North, the UN definition seems to present the case for a 'new economic social order' dictated by the North, downgrading the importance of self-determination and equality in international dialogue.

UNICEF reinforces this tendency by conceptualising education for development as:

...a learning process which proceeds from knowledge to action. It has evolved from being about education about developing countries to a broader concept of education for global citizenship (UNICEF, 1992:47).

In 'Development Education: global perspectives in the curriculum' (Osler, 1994), the only specific book about development education written in the UK, there is again a strong emphasis on the connection of development education to democracy, human rights and economic growth. In the opening chapter Starkey (1994) states that the aims of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights for education correspond very closely to aims drafted by development educators:

Education shall be directed to the full development of the human personality and to the strengthening of respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms. It shall promote understanding, tolerance and friendship amongst all nations, racial or religious groups, and shall further the activities of the United Nations for the maintenance of peace (OHCHR, 1996: article 26.2 cited in Starkey 1994:12)

Starkey further states that:

...a free society, respectful of human rights, is a requirement for economic development and ultimately for peace. Or to put it the other way round, repressive and undemocratic governments, whatever their rhetoric about progress, are unlikely to be able to create the conditions for sustained economic development (ibid).

In contrast with the DEA definition of 1993, Starkey makes the case that, with the exception of China and South Korea, undemocratic governments cannot bring economic progress. He makes reference to the military governments of developing countries in the 1960s, 70s and 80s as examples of that (Starkey, 1994).

The DEA's and Starkey's definitions illustrate a major split in the discourses of development education. From one perspective DE is seen as connected to development understood as economic growth (the modernisation or neoliberal strand of development studies), from the other, the emphasis is on human development and human autonomy (the dependency, alternative development and post-development strands of development studies). It can be argued that each perspective sees education in a different light: one proposes the adoption of a framework for ethics based on human rights (in which people are encouraged to adopt a specific universal set of values), the other, as a reaction to colonialism and Eurocentrism, focuses on education for autonomy (in which people and communities have a right to self-determination), which implies an educational framework that emphasises

reflexivity and independent thinking, like the one proposed by the (former) Birmingham Development Education Centre (now TIDE – Teachers in Development Education):

Development education is about developing the skills necessary for effective participation in the world:

- skills of recognising one's own values and the influences on these;
- skills of empathy with people in different situations and with different cultures;
- skills of acquiring information and of critical analysis of such information;
- skills of recognising the validity of different points of view;
- skills of forming one's own conclusions;
- skills of recognising the way one relates to the world;
- skills of recognising possibilities for future action (Sinclair, 1994:54)

The first perspective can be linked to the discourse of human capital theory in education, in which the focus is on investing on the education of individuals in order to maximise the economic growth of societies (Hickling-Hudson, 2002). Development education is thus perceived as a means to promote development as defined by the 'North'. The second perspective can be

associated with discourses of 'critical pedagogy' and of critical multiculturalism/cosmopolitanism. What can often be observed is that words like democracy, freedom, cosmopolitanism and global citizenship are used by both strands with very different meanings with different implications.

2.2.2 Two Genealogies of Development Education from the 1960s to the 1990s

The different definitions presented point to the difficulty in narrating a story that can be told in many different ways from different standpoints and epistemologies. Therefore, in this section I present two narratives representing one of the epistemological tensions in the area based on my interpretation of genealogies of development education told from the perspectives of Ann McCollum and Hugh Starkey. Ann McCollum's unpublished PhD thesis "On the Margins? An Analysis of theory and practice of development education in the 1990s" (1996) narrates the story from a perspective emphasising human development and autonomy. Hugh Starkey's opening chapter of *Development Education: Global Perspectives in the Curriculum* (1994): "Development Education and Human Rights" presents a genealogy from a perspective based on the modernisation approach to development. I also offer my own analysis of the two narratives in the last part of this section.

McCollum's perspective

McCollum (1996) gives an overview of the historical trajectory of the area of development education. She locates the roots of development education in the 1960s, when a new stage of international politics started with the Non-Aligned Countries Movement the United Nations' first development decade and the fifteenth UN General Assembly in 1960, where 17 'new countries' of the Third World had a message reminding the 'First World', that the inequality and exploitation established by colonialism and imperialism were the most important causes of tension, conflict and violence in the Third World (McCollum, 1996). She cites Brodhead (1984) who identifies other causes for the emergence of the area: questions raised about the effectiveness of early aid efforts, the critical mass of committed people created with the return of a great number of Voluntary Services Overseas (VSO) volunteers, the liberal, expansionist climate of the times, the impact of liberation theology and the spaces created by certain UN agencies (Brodhead, 1986:121-122 cited in McCollum, 1996).

McCollum argues that much of the pedagogies of development education in the North has been inspired by Southern activists and educators who were active in struggles for decolonisation:

Development education is essentially a by-product of colonialism, and it represents a troubled response by concerned groups in the North to the challenges encompassed within the demands for a New

International World Order, and a realization that the main problem for many countries of the Third World is that they are enmeshed in a global economic system designed by and for the nations of the First World (McCollum, 1996:3).

McCollum problematises this relationship citing Foubert, who questions the assumptions behind this well-meaning intention:

Could it be that the present concept of development education still remains too entangled in its rather questionable roots in fundraising appeals and semi-colonial and paternalistic vision of the Third World? (Foubert, 1986:122)

As a possible explanation for Foubert's concerns, Pradervand (1982) identifies four key features which have determined the area: its middle class origins, its church and missionary roots (e.g. CAFOD and Christian Aid), State intervention and the connection to campaigning NGOs.

In the 1970s the UN Second Voluntary Decade shifted the attention of the development debate from aid programmes in the Third World towards the educational responsibility of voluntary agencies in their home countries, highlighting the importance of public opinion in the West. Lissner (1977) states that the lasting image coming across to the public was the following:

The development problem is all out there. It is caused by endogenous factors inside the low-income countries. We in the high-home countries are outside spectators; our present state of living is the result of our own efforts alone. The only and most important thing we can do to reduce poverty and human suffering in the Third World is to provide more aid and resources (Lissner, 1977:9).

The focus then was on the creation of public understanding of development issues in order to challenge the structural causes of poverty, as McCollum describes:

As relief agencies, these charities had shared Western assumptions regarding the Third World, they therefore operated within and endorsed the Western value system and concomitant political and economic arrangements. The Western prescription for Third World development was simply that these poor and backward countries try to replicate industrialized countries through a combination of technology transfer, Western know-how and rapid modernisation (McCollum, 1996:18).

Echoing the argument of the dependency school approach to development, she further states that this conceptualisation of development ignored the fact that European development had been based on economic exploitation of the Third World: plundering resources, distorting productive strategies and

directing development in accordance with Western needs. She identifies the emergence of a new 'holistic' conceptualisation of development which linked "the political with the personal and the universal with the individual" (McCollum, 1996:18).

However, this view created a problem for NGOs bringing them into direct conflict with mainstream views of North-South relations and the role of charities and education in society. This conflicts of NGOs are illustrated by Korten (1987):

...the contradictions which grip an NGO when the essentially political nature of development is grasped...leads to a fundamental reassessment of the role of NGOs caught between the conceptions of their constituencies, the expectations of their government donors and the changing reality of development needed in the South (Korten 1987:3 cited in McCollum, 1996:20).

According to McCollum, NGOs like Cafod and Oxfam felt an obligation to address the political, economic and social factors underlying poverty. However, if they were too outspoken they could jeopardize public support and funding. Raising awareness was seen as problematic by these NGOs due to their financial dependence and accountability to the public: they should influence public opinion, but were also restrained by it, so they had to aim for a balance between representing and shaping it.

Voluntary organisation face a daunting task if they are to raise public awareness of development issues, for to do so they must puncture some of the dominant western myths regarding First World – Third World relations and battle against a tranquilizing drip of consensus that drips constantly from T.V., radio, newspapers and school textbooks (McCollum, 1996:20).

Therefore, no policy changes were made within the NGOs, but they started to support the work of others considered to be ‘too political’ for them to pursue (McCollum, 1996).

However, despite the tensions related to this ambivalent relationship with NGOs (i.e. funding and competing agendas), in the 1970s “development education was viewed as a subversive force and the concepts and methods which development education embraced were new and largely unknown” (McCollum 1996:18).

In the 1980s, McCollum identifies the World Studies Project as having a major impact on the theory and practice of development education. This was a curriculum project which offered a comprehensive programme with clear guidelines. It worked directly and in collaboration with teachers on the design of materials to develop an awareness of global issues, world inequality, human rights, peace and conflict and social change. She also identifies the

work of the Centre for Global Education in York as very influential. The project “Earthrights” offered an articulation of development education, environmental education, human rights education and peace education as complementary ‘educations’. However, she sees the subsequent ‘paradigm shift’ of the project towards holistic thinking and a Gaian approach as a step backwards as its politics of change focuses on the individual through the development of self-awareness at the expense of change in structures.

According to McCollum, another positive change in the 1980s happened after the cover of the Ethiopian famine in 1984 and the subsequent Live Aid Programme as they boosted support for NGOs and development education as well as prompted practitioners to question the implications of presenting negative images of the Third World in NGO publicity and the media which was seen as a form of exploitation. The concern surrounding development issues were addressed in the Brundtland report of 1987 (WCED, 1987), which placed sustainable development on the international agenda and prompted debates which culminated in the Rio Summit of 1992.

McCollum also associates the changing nature of social movements in the 1980s, to a new direction of a shared “common appeal to personal responsibility for a collective future” (McCollum, 1996:13). As indicated by McCollum, now echoing the arguments of the post-development approach, these social movements were starting to move away from single issue concerns towards an understanding of the “real stakes and underlying unity

behind the different movements” offering alternatives to the “destructive economic and development imperatives of the present global system” (ibid).

In 1993 the Development Education Association was created with the aim to act on behalf of the network to lobby the national government to recognise the value of development education. The publicity brochure for the launch of the association stated that:

The past decade has seen momentous changes for the world. The end of the Cold war and superpower rivalry has given rise to a new world order of increased nationalism and newly emergent states particularly in Europe. For much of the rest of the world there has been an increase in poverty, insecurity and injustice. A phenomenal outflow of funds moves daily from countries as a result of unequal terms of trade and debt repayments. Never has it been more important to foster international understanding and global awareness with regard to the peoples and societies of the South and the ways in which northern policies and practices affect them (DEA, 1993 cited in McCollum, 1996:13).

McCollum suggests that even the government attitude towards development education changed from un-sympathetic (accusing the area of promoting highly tendentious and over-politicised materials in schools) into a praising attitude (saying that the work was very effective and important).

However, in 1996 McCollum concluded that development education was still marginal in the formal educational system due to a tension between the radical and far reaching aspirations of the area and the grounded reality of activities. She states that “in theory, development education will contribute to social change and the creation of a more equitable world order, in practice the principal function which development education fulfils is of teacher support” (McCollum, 1996:2). She states that development education is still a liberal concern and a liberal practice and that it needs to move beyond that.

She associates the limited impact of development education with factors like: intransigence, public indifference, lack of clarity of purpose, broad aims, the ambivalent relationships with NGOs, a culture of celebration of anecdotal achievements and a lack of theoretical engagement, of long term strategic thinking and of systematic evaluation of development education work. She claims that development education should engage in the project of individual emancipation and social justice of radical education and propose alternatives to current school organisation, curricula, pedagogies and practices that have a more sophisticated and coherent theoretical basis.

Starkey’s perspective

In contrast with McCollum, Starkey (1994) offers a much less complex perspective. He locates the beginning of development education to the

appointment of Og Thomas to develop an education programme within Oxfam in 1966 in order to increase the awareness of the mass of the general public about the 'immense scale of deprivation' and the conditions of life for the poorest people of the world's poorest regions. For Starkey, the vision and objective of development education were set by John F. Kennedy in a speech at the Second World Food Congress in Washington DC, where he stated: "We have the means, we have the capacity to wipe hunger and poverty from the face of the Earth in our lifetime, we need only the will" (cited in Starkey, 1994:13). Starkey compares the impact of this speech to that of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

Starkey (1994) argues that the first decade of development education is "characterised by idealism about the possibilities of world economic and social progress" (p.13) as the analysis of activists became "more and more radical" (ibid) pointing to Imperialism and exploitation as the major causes of poverty. He identifies Che Guevara as having a major influence on the *younger* generation (as a fighter against the 'twin evils' of Europe and North America). He goes on to criticise this position, which he considered naive:

At the same time, many of their *respectable* elders were identifying with the demands of the Haslemere Declaration of 1968, launched by a group based in the *affluent* home countries of the UK (Starkey, 1994:13 - my emphasis).

He cites Maggie Black's statement related to these demands criticising the political nature of movements against Western exploitation:

Socialist analysis and a vision of the Third World in justifiable revolt against exploitative Western capitalism were beginning to characterize an ideology of development whose primary context was neither economic, nor humanitarian, but political (cited in Starkey, 1994:14).

Starkey acknowledges the support and influence of churches in the development education movement, which perceived the plea as one for the increase of overseas aid. According to Starkey, these churches helped teachers and world development activists to create resource centres, develop materials and work with schools.

Starkey argues that in the climate of the 1960s and 1970s activists and educators did not consider respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms a priority as this could be associated with neo-colonialist and paternalistic attitudes. He acknowledges that this was made more difficult as an "American discourse of human rights was used as a cold war device to justify high arms expenditure and military intervention against nationalist movements, where these expressed communist sympathies" (Starkey, 1994:15).

Starkey also identifies the World Studies project and Oxfam as having a major impact on development education both in the 1970s and in the 1980s. In relation to Oxfam, he associates the organisation's objectives of development education in the 1980s (related to changing attitudes to people overseas and the notion that people should decide for themselves how to develop) to "an overt identification of development education with multi-cultural and anti-racist education" (p.16). Starkey traces this influence to the prestige of educators like Paulo Freire, Julius Nyerere and Ivan Illich who were popular at the time. He concludes that:

Interestingly in the 1990s, reference is still made to Freire, but Illich, perhaps too tainted with unfashionable de-schooling, and Nyerere, whose political achievements tend to be belittled, are rarely cited (Starkey, 1994:16).

Starkey directly associates the aims of development education to those put forward at the General Conference of Unesco in Paris in 1974 related to Education for International Understanding, Co-operation and Peace, and Education related to Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms. He assumes that "Unesco members and experts clearly saw these as interconnected areas" (Starkey, 1994:17).

He identifies the following statements spelt by Unesco as the major guiding principles for educational policy in the area of development education:

- a) an international dimension and a global perspective in education at all levels and in all its forms;
 - b) understanding and respect for all peoples, their cultures, civilizations, values and ways of life, including domestic ethnic cultures and cultures of other nations;
 - c) awareness of the increasing global interdependence between peoples and nations;
 - d) abilities to communicate with others;
 - e) awareness not only of the rights but also of the duties incumbent upon individuals, social groups and nations towards each other;
 - f) understanding of the necessity for international solidarity and co-operation;
 - g) readiness on the part of the individual to participate in solving the problems of his [sic] community, his country, and the world at large.
- (Unesco 1974, cited in Starkey, 1994:17).

Starkey mentions that Unesco set the elements of a syllabus for such education that read more like a list of 'problems of the Third World' to be studied. He particularly identifies the "equality of rights of peoples and the right of peoples to self-determination" (ibid) as one element related to Unesco's concern with decolonisation, which is taken up further down Unesco's list and linked to questions of:

economic growth and social development and their relation to social justice; colonialism and decolonization; ways and means of assisting developing countries; the struggle against illiteracy; the campaign against disease and famine; the fight for a better quality of life and the highest attainable standards of health; population growth and related questions (Starkey, 1994:18)

He identifies as absent from the list the issues of debt and trade. He also suggests that the question of human rights in the list (as well as the other issues) could be perceived as something of concern for countries “outside the circle of the democratic North and the communist block” (ibid).

In tracing the use of the term ‘human rights’ in development education, Starkey concludes that it was scarcely taken up in the 1970s. In the 1980s it was used by the World Studies Project but detached from development issues. Starkey claims that the Declaration of Human Rights is a statement of the key values for development and should be adopted as such in development education.

Starkey states that

As a Global International Organisation, the majority of whose member states are in the South, many directly concerned with issues of food

and dire poverty, Unesco is in a unique position of bringing together human rights and development issues (Starkey, 1994:23).

He sees the 'right to development', legitimised in the resolution 32/130 that considers a new international economic order to be an essential element of effectively promoting human rights. Starkey argues that this was a way for the United Nations to reconcile human rights and its commitment to member states.

In his defence of human rights education he implies that the strong level of support in official discourse would protect teachers from being accused of ideological bias or indoctrination as it can "be linked to international treaty obligations and thus command a broad consensus" (Starkey, 1994:24).

In tracing the history of education for human rights in England, he mentions the lobbying of both development education and human rights education (as separate strands) in relation to the introduction of a prescriptive national curriculum in 1988:

The development education lobby is relatively well funded and certainly well organized. It was able, with some success to push for a global perspective in all subject areas. The more recent human rights education lobby concentrated on the cross-curricular theme of citizenship (Starkey, 1994:27).

Starkey concludes his chapter with an endorsement of John Fiens's statement that:

The whole purpose of development education is to promote social justice, to change the world, through understanding, empathy and solidarity with the patterns of life experienced by societies different from our own. In particular it is concerned with the lives and future well being of the oppressed, the people who live in the Third World countries of the 'South' or under Third World conditions in the 'North'. [and so] in relation to values, the role of development education is a pro-active one which involves planning learning experiences which promote the adoption of core democratic values conducive to a sense of justice and a commitment to human rights and dignity. (Fien 1991 cited in Starkey,1994:28).

He states that development education and human rights education are inseparable as

Local, national and exclusive religious or secular formulations of values are inadequate when the topic is global responsibility and intercultural international understanding. These perspectives demand the universal values which are cogently expressed in human rights texts adopted by the whole international community....Development

education and human rights education are now consequently inseparable (Starkey, 1994:28).

Examining the two perspectives

The fact that Starkey's was the opening chapter of the only book on development education published in England and is now the coordinator of the Masters' in Citizenship Studies of the London Institute of Education, whereas McCollum's thesis remains unpublished, could suggest a shift in the mainstream discourses in the area. In the 1960s, the context that led to the emergence of dependency theory (focusing on the economic circumstances of Northern exploitation) and alternative development (focusing on human development) can be seen as having influenced most of the educators and activists working in the field at the time.

It could also be argued that in McCollum's narrative, the strand of post-development also features in the discourses of the 1980s and 1990s. However, the publication of Starkey's perspective in 1994 marks a shift in mainstream discourses, placing perspectives with Marxist or socialist traces at the margins. Therefore, Starkey's perspective is portrayed as neutral (apolitical) and universal and regards deviations from its perceived norm as radical, naïve, closed-minded and backwards. Starkey's focus on economic issues and universal values is consistent with discourses of the strands of modernisation and neoliberal development in development studies, which see

the fall of the Communist block as the end of history and triumph of capitalism (Fukuyama, 1992).

The choice of language and citations that polarise discourses of 'good and bad', 'liberal and radical' or 'naïve and respectable' characterise both narratives. They also show a more or less linear narrative of progression in search of a synthesis, which is bound to both Marxist and Capitalist cultural biases. Although McCollum's perspective problematises various issues related to education, especially with reference to the roles of NGOs, it still tends to portray the liberal characteristics of development education as something that should be eliminated, and substituted by 'radical education' for 'emancipation'. In Starkey's text, the Marxist characteristics of development education are regarded as naïve and too political, whereas the promotion of Western notions of progress (associated with economic growth) and universal values ('affluent countries have the answers') is regarded as ideal and a largely unproblematic issue of 'international consensus'. Both perspectives are normativist and universalist in this sense.

McCollum's reference to the original concern of development education of changing colonial, semi-colonial or paternalistic relationships with the South echoes the concerns of this study. Her analysis of the role of NGOs offers important insights, as the tensions pointed out in her perspective have generated some of the current debates in development education that are central to this research. In the same way, Starkey's major contribution is his

reference to the different lobbying bodies of development and human rights education in 1988 when the National Curriculum was being defined.

This brief reference is significant as, despite Starkey's claims of direct association between development education and human rights education, the two fields remain separate and distinct. The first focuses on North-South relationships and issues related to the ethics of development. The second focuses on rights, responsibilities and civic engagement and is associated with 'citizenship education', which has become statutory in secondary schools since August 2002. Development education is associated with the 'global dimension', which should permeate all disciplines according to DfES's Curriculum and Standards Guidance of September 2000. A major debate in citizenship education points to a split in relation to discussions about whether or not the citizenship curriculum should be prescribed and who should decide what it ought to be (Johnson and Holness, 2003; Davies, 2006). The current debates in development education point to the need for a clearer framework for its theory and practice (Bourn, 2003; Andreotti, 2006; Pardíñaz-Solís, 2006). The notion of 'global citizenship' sits in an ambivalent space between the two fields. In development education, it is often used as an umbrella term that refers to the global dimension. In citizenship education, it refers to links with the wider society, to multicultural and anti-racist education as well as to an 'awareness' (and not a discussion or problematisation) of development and poverty issues (Osler and Vincent, 2002). However, overlapping issues facilitate deliberate and indirect appropriations of spaces and discourses

making these divisions much more complex than what is portrayed here. Therefore, for the sake of focus and clarity of this research I decided to define citizenship education per se and debates within this field as outside the scope of this study.

2.2.3 From 1997 onwards

With the creation of the Department for International Development (DFID) in 1997 by the new Labour government, development education entered a new phase. DFID expressed an interest in taking forward the concerns of development education into the formal educational system, as part of their approach to eradicate poverty. In March 1998 DFID formed a Development Awareness Working Group (DAWG) with members from Parliament and Development agencies, media organisations, the DEA and Development Education Centres (DECs).

In 1999, the Strategy Paper “Building Support for Development” (DFID, 1999) was written based on the White Paper on International Development published in 1997 “Eliminating World Poverty: a challenge for the 21st century” (DFID, 1997) which called for increased public understanding of a global mutual dependence and the need for international development and for every child to be educated about development issues, so that they can “understand the key global connections which will shape their lives” (DFID, 1999:1). It acknowledges the progress of DECs and others in the Voluntary

Sector in promoting greater awareness and understanding. However, it states that development awareness has not yet made the breakthrough in global perceptions, if compared to the one achieved by environmental education.

It further states that

If we are going to achieve this breakthrough, the key lies in going beyond attitudes to development based on compassion and charity, and establishing a real understanding of our interdependence and of the relevance of development issues to people's lives (DFID, 1999:2).

In relation to the perceived state of development education at the time, the document identifies 'highly successful and high profile' campaigns such as Live Aid and Comic Relief, but also points to three problematic areas: the lack of commitment to development education on the part of the government, business and civil society sectors; the lack of evaluation and a unified voice in the area; and the lack of a clear message in development education work (DFID, 1999).

The paper sets four objectives that activities funded by their 'Development Awareness Fund' or 'Small Grant Scheme' should promote:

- Knowledge and understanding of the major challenges and prospects for development, especially the poverty reduction agenda; but also of developing countries themselves.
- Understanding of our global interdependence, and in particular that failure to reduce global poverty levels will have serious consequences for us all.
- Understanding of and support for international efforts to reduce poverty and promote development. Recognition of progress made, and that further progress is both affordable and achievable.
- Understanding of the role that individuals can play; enabling them to make informed choices (DFID, 1999:3).

Since the publication of this document DFID has become the most important funding body in the area of development education.

The latest major development in the area happened in 2003 with the launch of the “Enabling Effective Support” strategy (DFID, 2003), an initiative to coordinate the support of NGOs and other organisations in meeting the needs of the teachers in relation to the introduction of the global dimension in the curriculum. The initiative was based on an audit that indicated that teachers found it difficult to access materials related to global perspectives that were appropriate to them. Therefore the initiative was designed to “provide

teachers with more effective and sustained support” (p.2) through the development of locally owned strategies to achieve more comprehensive, high quality support to teachers for the delivery of the global dimension in order to raise levels of Development Awareness by 2015 (DFID, 2003).

2.2.4 Debates, Challenges and Tensions

In a SWOT (strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats) analysis, Osler and Vincent (2002) identify as strengths of ‘global education’ in England: the support of DFID, the existence of the DEA and of DECs, the introduction of citizenship education as a mandatory subject in the National Curriculum and the availability of resources in the area (Osler and Vincent, 2002:70). They recognize as weaknesses: the fact that global citizenship is not central in the citizenship curriculum and is not given proper attention in teacher training, the lack of government guidance on anti-racism and the insufficient support from DfES. They also see the marginalisation of the issues and lack of understanding of terms related to the area (such as development education and education for sustainable development) as threats (Osler and Vincent, 2002). Although they define global education from a citizenship education perspective, their analysis helps situate the field in this study.

In relation to development education, Bourn (2003) argues that:

Although development education may not have distinctive educative roots, as a movement it has continued to exist and develop in the UK and in virtually all of the leading industrialised countries for more than thirty years (p.4).

Within these 30 years or more, several debates have permeated the field, ranging from the definition of terms and epistemological affiliations to the role of specific organisations within the movement. The five most important debates that are relevant to this study are outlined as follows.

A. What is development education?

Bourn (2003) argues that there is still contestation around what development education is. He lists four common understandings:

- a body of educational practice rooted in the agendas of development;
- a way of seeing the world linked to education for social change and the ideas of Paulo Freire;
- a theoretical framework for engaging in learning;
- a series of perspectives and themes which should be reflected across all education (p.4).

This debate also includes the connection of development education to other 'strands' of education such as: international education, peace education, human rights education, environmental education, etc... I do not think there is a clear cut solution to this issue and, from a practical perspective, I do not see the lack of definition as a problem. From a political and academic perspective though, in order to advance the agenda of the area, I would agree with Bourn and call for a theoretically grounded articulation of the field. But I would also acknowledge the risk that, in doing so, the area might become too distinct to be able to take advantage of the ambivalence of other spaces and end up losing certain grounds of negotiation.

For this study, what I consider development education are the discourses and practices related to the global dimension: engagement with global issues and perspectives in schools and informal learning spaces.

B. The lack of 'clarity'

Not only the term 'development education', but also the terms used within the field are a cause of confusion and subject to dispute. In trying to offer some 'conceptual clarity' to the area, Hicks (Hicks, 2004) defined seven concepts related to the 'global' terminology that practitioners and policy-makers use (i.e. global education, development education, global dimension, global perspective, international dimension, global citizenship, globalisation). However, his attempt to fix the definitions and the definitions themselves are

also contested by researchers and practitioners. I would argue that the lack of clarity is not necessarily a negative thing. It can be a positive thing in certain contexts (e.g. it allows for different readings and appropriations in political arenas) and a negative thing in others (e.g. it makes it difficult and confusing to introduce the area to teachers). From my perspective, an awareness of the shifting nature of meaning is more important than trying to fix definitions.

In this study, I analyse the possible assumptions and effects of texts in this area as they are read from a specific perspective. Therefore, glossary definitions of terms used in the literature of development education are not relevant for this research.

C. Campaigning for Change versus Educating for Change

The debate around campaigning and education for change has been happening for a long time in England, as illustrated in McCollum's perspective. The tension between fundraising and education has developed into a tension between the delivery of information and a call to action (telling people what to think and what to do) and education seen as empowering people to make their own informed and independent decisions (addressing complexity and different dimensions and limitations of arguments). As campaigning NGOs still fund a great deal of development education work, the freedom of development education agencies to deliver their own agendas

(that might contradict the fundraising aim of campaigning NGOs) remains an issue of contention even today. This issue is explored further in Chapter 5.

D. Black and Ethnic Minority Groups in Development Education

The idea of authenticity in discourses of liberal pluralism allied to the perception that the majority of development educators in DECs were white 'Northern' middle-class people talking about the 'South' prompted a movement for an emphasis on 'Black' voices in the work done with schools, as stated in the DEA website:

Historically the development education movement in the UK, as with other 'Northern' countries, has been dominated by perspectives from 'white-led' NGOs, be they aid agencies or community groups. During the 1990s the Development Education Association began to address this issue by looking at Black and ethnic minority groups based in the UK and assessing their interest and relationship to development education (DEA, 2005).

The result of this engagement was a report that recommended that "white-based organisations recognise, value and support the development of black perspectives and Black-led development education as a legitimate contribution to their work" (DEA, 2005). Other publications, such as "Black Voices in Development Education" (DEA, 2001) and "Towards Global

Democracy: An exploration of Black perspectives in global youth work” (Joseph, Akpokavi, Chauham and Cummins, 2002) followed and strategies for promoting Black and Southern voices in DE pursued. However, this issue remains hugely problematic in conceptual and political terms. It is also directly related to my position as a ‘Southern’ non-white DEC affiliated practitioner. This is also explored in more depth in Chapter 5.

E. The lack of theory

McCollum (1996) affirms that

Development education has evolved largely through the efforts of individual practitioners who with minimal guidance and few resources have through trial and error gradually developed their own working practices [...]. The development education debate thus remains at a superficial level precisely because there is little discussion of the theory implicit in practice (p. 22).

The perceived split between theory and practice in the field can be one of the roots of the problems identified by McCollum in her research. Similarly, Bourn (2003) argues that, unlike the case of environmental education, there is not a body of research and academic engagement with development education, therefore the area is under theorised. However, as the core constituency of the field involves mainly educators who identify themselves as ‘practitioners’,

there is also resistance to theoretical engagements, which is perceived as elitist and detached from practice, as well as reservations in relation to careerist academic endeavours in the area.

I endorse McCollum's insight that development education has great potential yet to be realised. The commitment and contribution of this study is to engage critically with this field in order to better understand its limitations and improve future practice.

References

1. Andreotti, V. (2006). Theory without practice is idle, practice without theory is blind: the potential contributions of postcolonial theory to development education, *Development Education Journal*, 12(3): 7-10.
2. Bourn, D. (2003). Theory of Development Education, *Development Education Journal*, 10(1): 3-6.
3. Brodhead, T. (1986). *Development Education and Northern governments. Development Education: The State of the Art* . Geneva, NGLS.
4. Davies, P. (2006). Educating citizens for changing economies, *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 38(1): 15-30.
5. DEA (1993). *DEA Launch publicity booklet*. London: DEA.
6. DEA (2001). *Black Voices in Development Education*. London: DEA.
7. DEA (2002). *Towards Global Democracy: An Exploration of Black Perspectives in Global Youth Work* by Joe Joseph, Kwame B. Akpokavi, Vipin Chauhan and Viva Cummins. London: DEA.
8. DEA (2005). *Development Education Association Website*. Available at <http://www.dea.org.uk>. 15-10-2005.
9. DEA (2005). *Vision Statement*. London, DEA.
10. DFID (1997). *Eliminating World Poverty: a challenge for the 21st century (White Paper)*. London, DFID.

11. DFID (1999). Building Support for Development. London, DFID.
12. DFID (2003). Enabling effective support: responding to the challenges of the global society. London, DFID.
13. Foubert, C. (1986). Working in Partnership with the Third World. Development Education: The State of the Art. Geneva, NGLS.
14. Freire, P. (1998). Pedagogy of Freedom: Ethics, Democracy and Civic Courage. New York: Rowman & Littlefield.
15. Fukuyama, F. (1992). The end of history and the last man. New York: The Free Press.
16. Hickling-Hudson, A. (2002). Re-visioning from the inside: getting under the skin of the World Bank's Education Sector Strategy. International Journal of Educational Development, 22(6): 565-577.
17. Hicks, D. (2004). Global education: what does it mean? In Ashley Kent and Alun Morgan (eds.), The Challenge of the Global Dimension in Education (pp. 3 -11). London: Institute of Education.
18. Hicks, D. and Townley, C. (1988). Teaching World Studies: an introduction to global perspectives in the curriculum. Harlow: Longman.
19. Johnson, H. and Holness, M. (2003). The complications and possibilities of citizenship education: confirming identity and meaning to enhance emotional and spiritual resilience in a post-September 11th world, International Journal of Children's Spirituality, 8(3): 215-26.

20. Joseph, J., Akpokavi, K., Chauham, V., and Cummins, V. (2002). Towards Global Democracy: An exploration of Black perspectives in global youth work. London, DEA.
21. Korten, D. (1987). Third generation NGO strategies: a key to people-centred development, *World Development*, 15:201-11.
22. Lissner, J. (1977). The politics of altruism. Geneva: Lutheran World Federation.
23. McCollum, A. On the margins? (1996). An analysis of theory and practice of development education in the 1990s. Unpublished thesis submitted to the Institute of Educational Technology, The Open University.
24. OHCHR (1996). Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Geneva: United Nations.
25. Osler, A. (1994). Development Education: global perspectives in the curriculum. London: Cassel.
26. Osler, A. and Vincent, K. (2002). Citizenship and the challenge of global education. Stoke on Trent: Trentham.
27. Pardíñaz-Solís, R. (2006). A single voice from the South in the turbulent water of the North. *Development Education Journal* 12(2): 3-6.
28. Pradervand, P. (1992). Development Education: the 20th century survival and fulfilment skill. Berne, Swiss Federal Department of Foreign Affairs.
29. Sinclair, S. (1994). Introducing Development Education to schools: the role of non-governmental organizations in the United Kingdom. In Audrey

- Osler (ed.), *Development Education: global perspectives in the curriculum* (50-62). London and New York: Cassel.
30. Starkey, H. (1994). *Development Education and Human Rights Education*. In Audrey Osler (ed.), *Development Education: global perspectives in the curriculum* (11-30). London: Cassel.
31. UNESCO (1974). *Recommendation concerning Education for International Understanding, Co-operation and Peace and Education relating to Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms*. Available at <http://www.unhchr.ch/html/menu3/b/77.htm>. 12/12/2006
32. UNICEF (1992). *Education for Development*. 1992. New York, UNICEF.
33. WCED (1987). *Our Common Future*. 1987. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
34. Yamashita, H. (1988). *Implementing development education in primary schools: teachers' perceptions of their work*. Unpublished thesis submitted to the School of Education, the University of Birmingham.