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Editorial

**ROUND PEGS IN SQUARE HOLES? DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION, THE FORMAL SECTOR AND THE GLOBAL KNOWLEDGE ECONOMY**

Niamh Gaynor

Education is at a critical juncture. While its role and effectiveness in nurturing a sense of values, critical enquiry and civic engagement have been debated for centuries (see, for example, the celebrated work of John Henry Newman, 2013), such debates have been eclipsed in recent years by the new language and exigencies of the global economy. Talk of civic values, justice, transformation, and flourishing has been replaced with talk of efficiency, performance, competition, and employment. A range of new forces, influences and technologies has entered the field and the work in rewriting the scope, ambition and mission of our schools and colleges, together with that of their students, is almost complete. As the contributions to this volume ably demonstrate, this new vision for education – one that places it at the service of the global economy rather than society more broadly, building ‘knowledge economies’ rather than ‘knowledge societies’, poses significant challenges to development educators. Attempting to introduce development education, with its critical and transformative approaches and practices, into these formal spaces is akin to attempting to drive a round peg into a square hole. There are scrapes and splinters. At times the peg does not fit at all, yet at times it finds its way. And, as many of the articles in this volume demonstrate, driving the peg through requires considerable imagination, determination and ingenuity as well as an acute appreciation of the precise parameters and context within which manoeuvre is possible.
Round pegs and square holes: The challenges of development education in the formal sector

The challenge of carrying out development education within the formal sector is an all too familiar experience for many readers of *Policy and Practice*. And, as the years progress, it has not become any easier. As Khoo and McCloskey (2015: 9), reviewing ten years of development education, have recently noted:

“‘Education’ has … narrowed, not widened in scope. Education has come under increasing global pressure to define itself in terms of a direct instrumental economic role, and to relate its role to narrow and generalised understandings of ‘poverty alleviation’.”

This trend is also noted by Bryan (2011: 4) who points to:

“an inherent tension between the goal of development education – which seeks to develop active citizens who can respond to pressing global issues – with a more dominant instrumental approach to schooling which views the primary purpose of education as to prepare students for competitive employment in the global marketplace”.

This is glaringly apparent at primary, post-primary and tertiary levels alike. At both primary and post-primary levels, Bryan (2011) refers to policy proposals which instill a ‘relentless focus’ on literature and numeracy within teacher education and in schools, citing the 2010 Department of Education and Skills’ *Draft National Plan to Improve Literacy and Numeracy* as evidence of this trend. Indeed, this narrow, instrumental focus on education as ‘the three rs’ (reading, writing and arithmetic) surfaces in a number of contributions to this volume. Furthermore, as Bryan (2011) also notes, the exigencies of the national examination system at post-primary level adds to the difficulties experienced by teachers as they struggle with engaging students critically with complex development issues and the pressures to produce “‘safe’ and acceptable answers” within their exams. These contradictions between the exam-driven focus of post-primary level
education and the need for in-depth exploration of complex development themes is also raised by Bryan and Bracken in their comprehensive study into development education within the post-primary system (Bryan and Bracken, 2011). Within this study, the authors also highlight the marginal status of development education within the formal curriculum where it is widely seen as a ‘Cinderella subject’, together with the persistent framing of development activities in charity terms where activities are dominated by what the authors term a “‘three Fs approach’ – Fundraising, Fasting and Having Fun” (Bryan and Bracken, 2011).

Within the field of higher education, Khoo and Lehane (2008) discuss the impact of the increased marketisation and commodification of third level education on development practice and meaning. Noting the narrowing of space for critical reflection and debate, they urge development educators within third level institutions to create and participate within such spaces. Also focusing on the tertiary level, I have previously argued that the relentless global market-focus of higher education institutions, while producing skilled workers for the global economy, is neglecting to produce critically engaged citizens capable of negotiating, interrogating and, where necessary, challenging and transforming these economies (Gaynor, 2010). Indeed, an analysis of the strategic plans and graduate learning outcomes of the seven universities in the Republic of Ireland uncovers a bias towards volunteering and/or charity as dominant forms of civic engagement or activism promoted within these institutions (Gaynor, 2015). As we will now see, these challenges all form part of the broader trend of marketisation and commodification of the formal education sector.

**Marketisation, commodification and the ‘new managerialism’ within education**
Writing of developments within the education sector broadly, Kathleen Lynch is fiercely critical of what she sees as its growing marketisation and commodification, together with its associated technologies of ‘new managerialism’. She warns (2012: 96) that this move towards education as a marketable commodity rather than a human right ‘has implications for
learning in terms of what is taught (and not taught), who is taught and what types of subjectivities are developed in schools and colleges’, going on to argue that this market-driven model of education defines students as economic maximisers, acting in individual capacities and governed by self-interest. As she notes (2012: 96), “there is a glorification of the ‘consumer citizen’” and so, it is no great step to understand how the dominant form of development activism among third level students is seen to be fair trade or ‘activism as consumerism’ (see Gaynor, 2015).

The same trend seems to have befallen educational policy and practice in the UK. Hill (2005: 259) sets out a range of policy developments that have taken place in recent years. These include deregulation and decentralisation; the importation of ‘new public managerialism’ into the management of schools and colleges; a fiscal regime of cuts in publicly funded schooling and further education services; the charging of fees; outsourcing of services to privately owned companies; and the privatisation and ownership of schools and colleges by private corporations. Observing these developments, Hill argues that the plan for education in the UK has now become ‘to produce and reproduce a work force and citizenry and set of consumers fit for capital’.

Writing primarily in relation to third level education, Henry Giroux has long been an ardent critic of these developments. His writings trace the transformation of higher education from its central role within the global project of democratisation, educating students to be willing and able to engage in issues of equality and social justice within public life, to its reconfiguration ‘on the model of a discredited business model, reducing faculty to contract labour, and positioning students largely as customers’ (Giroux, 2009: 669). He goes on to argue that:

“as universities adopt the ideology of the transnational corporation and become subordinated to the needs of capital, they are less concerned about how they might educate students in the ideology and civic practices of democratic governance and the necessity of
using knowledge to address the challenges of public life” (Giroux, 2009: 672).

A new role for education? The rise of the global ‘knowledge economy’

While it is tempting to view these trends as simply indicative of the general spread of neoliberalism throughout cultures and institutions worldwide, it is important to be aware that they are, in fact, part of a far more deliberate, strategic plan for education. This is important because it signals a decisive, planned shift in formal education policy and practice, with significant attendant implications for development educators, funders and practitioners. This shift can be traced back to 1996 when the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) published a widely circulated report entitled *The Knowledge-Based Economy* (OECD, 1996). Within this report it is stated that ‘knowledge, as embodied in human beings (as human capital) and in technology, has always been central to economic development’ (1996: 9). Developing this thesis, the OECD goes on to argue that ‘government policies, particularly those relating to science and technology, industry and education, will need a new emphasis in knowledge-based economies’ (1996: 18).

This subordination of education to the service of the economy rapidly became the focus of a number of other influential global institutions, including inter alia, the World Bank. With the OECD focused on Northern institutions, the Bank, through its *Education for the Knowledge Economy* programme is targeting educational policy and practice in the global South where it aims, in its own words, ‘to cultivate the highly skilled, flexible human capital needed to compete in global markets—an endeavour that affects a country’s entire education system’ (World Bank, 2009). As the Bank notes in a comprehensive volume devoted to the topic (World Bank, 2007: xiii)

“…whatever their level of development, countries should consider embarking on a knowledge- and innovation-based development
process. In these times of accelerated globalization, ‘grey matter’ is a country’s main durable resource.”

Thus, education reform is key to this process. At primary level, universal primary enrolment remains a priority, as reflected in the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs); at second level the Bank maintains that reforms need to focus on the development of ‘programs relevant for working life as well as for tertiary education’; while at third level the focus is firmly vocational, with the Bank advocating that education be aligned with the skill needs of economy (World Bank, 2007: 118). Indeed, our collective progress in this regard is now on record – through the Bank’s Knowledge Economy Index, an aggregate index that represents the overall level of development of a country or region towards the Knowledge Economy. Ireland is currently ranked 13th and the UK 8th out of 315 countries (World Bank, 2012).

These global policy shifts are directly linked to developments within the field of education in the Republic of Ireland. In 1994 the government established Forfás, a national advisory policy agency for enterprise, trade, science, technology and innovation. Run by a board appointed by the Minister for Jobs, Enterprise and Innovation, the agency argued that major changes were required in the formal education sector in order to create the skilled and innovative workforce required to drive the economy (Forfás, 1996). Two years later, echoing the recommendations of the 1996 OECD report, Forfás officially recommended to the government that Ireland should reposition itself as a ‘knowledge-based economy’ (Forfás, 1998: n.p.). In line with these developments, in 1997, in a largely unremarked upon but nonetheless remarkable development, the Department of Education (in existence since 1921) became the Department of Education and Science, later (in 2010) to become the current Department of Education and Skills. This shift represents an official move to equate education, first with the pursuit and acquisition of scientific knowledge and, following some afterthought, with skills to fuel the knowledge economy more broadly. Indeed, as Kirwan and Hall in a recent paper fascinatingly demonstrate, the so-called ‘crisis in
maths’ at post-primary level, which has been widely reported and commented upon in the popular media and which has formed the basis of significant policy reforms in the subject, was a construct of economic agents acting upon educational discourse and centring on market-led reform and a redefinition of ‘human capital’ in service of the market (2016: 377).

This subordination of the education system to the demands and exigency of the global economy – widely hailed as one of the key factors behind Ireland’s celebrated yet problematic ‘Celtic Tiger’ economy (see Fitzgerald, 2000 for example) – continues apace. At the launch of the National Skills Strategy in January 2016, the Taoiseach (Prime Minister) (in attendance with the Minister for Education and Skills) emphasised this relationship.

“The Government has a long term economic plan to keep the recovery going and the first step of that plan is the creation of more and better jobs. The ability to attract new jobs, and having our people fill those jobs, is dependent on having a well-educated, well-skilled and adaptable work force. This National Skills Strategy aims to provide an education and training system that is flexible enough to respond to a rapidly changing environment and that can provide the mix of skills needed over the next ten years, and beyond…” (Department of Education and Skills, 2016a).

More recently again (September 2016), in his Forward to The Action Plan for Education 2016-2019, the Minister for Education and Skills, having noted his Department’s broad-based aims for education, goes on to emphasise that ‘By delivering the best training service in Europe, we will ensure that we can create more of the sustainable well-paying jobs that we so badly require’ (Department of Education and Skills, 2016b: 6).

It is important to reiterate that this market-driven ambition and logic is not limited to curriculum reform alone. The ‘knowledge economy’ project has also significantly impacted in the areas of both policy making and management within formal education. Educational policy is no longer the
purview of educationalists alone. It is now permeated by the language and values of, and powerful actors from the business sector. Meanwhile, as Lynch et al (2013) have comprehensively outlined, a new managerialism, replete with its constrained and constraining technologies of oversight and control, now sculpts and defines what is acceptable and possible within formal education at all levels. As the contributions to this volume demonstrate, this poses significant challenges to development educators operating in this context. Yet, more positively, the contributions also demonstrate that, with some ingenuity, imagination and critical awareness, spaces for manoeuvre, reflection and independent action can still be reclaimed.

**Challenges, innovation and criticality: Contributions to Issue 23**

Collectively, and in many diverse ways, the contributors to Issue 23 of *Policy and Practice* struggle with the challenge of fitting critical exploration and analysis of complex issues – many the product of the global economy which the formal sector is now fuelling – into structures and curricula which privilege skills acquisition and readily quantifiable outcomes and outputs tailored to the global marketplace. They struggle to fit their round pegs in the uninviting, and at times, unyielding square holes. Challenges raised in this regard include the dominance of a charity approach to development within schools and colleges; the individualisation of teaching, curricula and action; and the increased pressures and stresses on students and teachers alike wrought by the new managerial emphasis on accountability and results in the form of quantifiable indicators and measures in an era of austerity and rationalisation.

However, as any carpenter knows, round pegs can fit into square holes if the holes are adapted to the purpose. A number of the articles presented here offer ways in which this has and is being accomplished. These include the questioning of and critical reflections on the charity model; efforts towards more collaborative approaches with non-formal actors, together with a targeting of institutional leaders; the use of digital tools to reduce the time pressures of new managerial reporting requirements; and
approaches to measurement and targeting as a means of learning and development rather than control. Taken together, the articles presented here offer much food for thought for development education policy makers and practitioners, highlighting both the challenges posed by the marketised square box of formal education and a range of possibilities for the round peg of development education in this context.

This issue begins with an article by Downes which highlights the persistence of a charity model within imagery and messaging within higher education institutes. Her research, which engages staff and students in analysing over 200 images displayed within the institution, demonstrates that there has been little change from a charity-based vision to one centred on empowerment, and that ‘development pornography’/Live Aid style paradigms are still rife. More optimistically however, her findings also show that students are somewhat aware of the manipulative and problematic nature of representations of poverty. As Downes concludes, her research suggests that:

“higher education students have a much more sophisticated reading of visual images than we might anticipate… their insights and responses challenge the assumptions of image makers, who it appears, underestimate the critical literacy skills of their audience.”

The persistence of this charity approach to development is also evident in the findings of research conducted by Doggett, Grummell and Rickard which focuses on the attitudes and activities of second level school leaders in relation to development education. Their online survey of 186 post-primary school leaders coupled with interviews with principals of 11 schools also uncovers an individualism in engagement where involvement in development education is very much dependent on the commitment of individual teachers and students who struggle to fit this into the formal curriculum. The authors thus conclude that:

“a holistic sense of commitment to development education in the institutional structures and culture of an organisation is crucial ...
More collaborative conditions, critical reflexivity and supportive contexts are needed for development education that promotes active learning.”

Wilde’s contribution draws from a year’s ethnographic research in an organisation working with returned British volunteers on their gap year between second and third level. Reflecting on how development issues are presented and taught to these volunteers, she finds a marked lack of structural analysis in the treatment of development issues with such analysis being dismissed by the coordinator as too ‘academic’ and off-putting. As Wilde notes: ‘questions about what development is, the global structures and bureaucracies involved in it, indeed any form of “academic knowledge” are rejected here in favour of “experience”’. In line with some other contributors to this volume, Wilde also finds that the practices of citizenship that emerge from the programme result in individualised actions:

“These global citizens take on individual responsibility for social problems and global issues and seek to change their own behaviours, rather than reflecting on or tackling political, economic and structural causes collectively.”

She attributes this individualisation of action to the auditing requirements of the programme’s funder which focuses on readily measurable quantitative targets. Her research highlights the pervasiveness of the new managerialism within the development as well as education sphere.

This target-driven focus within development circles is also the focus of Gallwey’s article which examines targets for education in the context of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). Noting that ‘results’ in development education are notoriously difficult to define, let alone measure, she cites three examples of innovative practice from Ireland in this regard. Gallwey’s overall argument, that progress in development education requires co-operation, dialogue and diverse approaches to outcome measurement among and between different actors, together with the employment of targets
As means of learning and development, rather than as a means of control, is a timely reminder to policy-makers and funders alike.

Golden’s article turns our attention to primary level and the clash between development education approaches and those of the British government. Her article, which draws on a case study of a primary school in the UK which developed an integrated curriculum focused on global citizenship education, provides an excellent example of a case where teachers managed to cater to the demands of the new managerial target-driven culture, while implementing a more integrated, student-led curriculum. This is facilitated, in this case, by a digital curriculum tool which, allowing teachers to tick off national targets once they are met, aims at reducing stress and repetition, thereby opening the space for more transformative approaches.

Lest any of us should be tempted to rush off and try to implement some of the more innovative practices and approaches outlined in these articles, Kazima et al’s article, which presents the evaluation findings of a collaborative student teacher placement programme between universities in Malawi, Mozambique, Northern Ireland and Uganda, offers a salutary lesson on the dangers of seeking to export models of ‘best practice’. Highlighting the distinctiveness of some of the local issues uncovered which impacted on the programme, the authors note that ‘it is essential to be mindful of the complex, challenging, context-specific realities…’ in which practice is delivered. They go on to caution against

“the dangers of international agencies urging developing countries to adopt ‘best practices’ with regard to teacher professional development that ignore the everyday realities of the classroom, and the motivations and capacity of the teachers to deliver such reforms.”

While the authors are referring to resource constraints in their own particular cases, their words of warning apply equally to development education policy-makers and funders seeking transformative results within the formal sector.
The contribution of McCarthy and Gannon turns our attention once again to the post-primary sector and the findings from the final evaluation of the WorldWise Global Schools programme in the Republic of Ireland. The programme sought to tackle many of the issues raised in the other contributions to this volume – notably the dominance of the charity approach to development education, its low status within schools, and the lack of shared tools to measure impact. Among the findings reported by the authors are varying results in a move from charity to justice approaches within participating schools and a dominance of individualised action over more political type action among students. McCarthy and Gannon stress the need for financial support for development education work (for substitution etc.) as well as strong support and commitment from school principals.

The final article in this volume also reviews evaluation evidence from a development education programme implemented in schools, this time both primary and post-primary in Northern Ireland. Aimed at strengthening the capacity of lead teachers and school leaders to embed development education in an integrated, holistic manner, the programme, although still at an early stage, is reported to be bearing fruit. Research findings reported by McCloskey reveal evidence of ‘a shift in the Lead Teachers’ thinking from charity-based solutions before the training to solutions based on collective responsibility and education after the training’. These positive outcomes notwithstanding, McCloskey does sound a note of caution, highlighting ongoing challenges associated with rationalisation within the sector; and the difficulties inherent in introducing an integrated ‘whole of school’ approach into a ‘silo-ed’ system focused on literacy and numeracy where development education is often perceived as a mere ‘add on’ to an already packed curriculum. He notes the importance of engaging senior leadership support in this context, and also highlights the usefulness of drawing on development educators from outside the formal education sector for teacher training.

Taken together, the contributions in this volume highlight the sharp contradictions – in values, content and practice – between development education and the marketised model promoted within the formal sector at all
levels. This point should be noted by funders and policy makers within the respective Irish government departments (Education and Foreign Affairs and Trade) as it evidences, once again, the lack of joined up thinking within government policy. However, the contributions also demonstrate that, while it is indeed difficult to introduce and promote development education within these formal spaces, it is not impossible. Round pegs can indeed fit into square holes. Indeed, eighteenth century woodworkers are said to have employed both to increase the structural integrity of their buildings. What matters here is context. It is important that, in driving the pegs through, we take care not to deform or damage them in any way. In other words, in attempting to implement development education in formal contexts, it is imperative that we examine and analyse our approaches and practices in the context of the wider power relations, structural imperatives and institutional structures, discourses and practices with which they interact.
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THE VISUAL REPRESENTATION OF GLOBAL DEVELOPMENT ISSUES IN A HIGHER EDUCATION ENVIRONMENT: PERCEPTION, INTERPRETATION AND REPLICATION

Lizzie Downes

Abstract: What kinds of perspectives of global development issues are students exposed to through the visual imagery displayed in higher education institutes? This study explores the messages being communicated by these images and how they are interpreted by students and staff of a higher education institute in the Republic of Ireland. Following an overview of the theoretical literature, original fieldwork is presented, in which interviewees were invited to respond to visual representations of global development issues on display in the institute. The study looks at how these visual messages contribute to viewers’ perceptions of people from the wider world, particularly those who are vulnerable or living in poverty. It examines how students (and their educators) negotiate these messages and the ideological perspectives they represent, and the implications for their subsequent work environment and practice.

Key words: Messages; visual imagery; visual representation, development imagery; photography; teacher education; global issues; poverty.

In our visually mediated world we have come to ‘know’ many of the realities of our wider environment through witnessing visual representations of it, long before experiencing the actuality: we visit a new city online on Google Street View before we book the flight to our chosen destination; we take a virtual tour of our hotel before checking in. The visual in our culture, either in its static or moving forms, is afforded high status; Gregory refers to the favouring of ‘vision’ in ‘Western’ contemporary society (1994: 64); Rose reminds us of the increasing saturation of Western societies in particular by
visual images, and suggests that ‘Westerners now interact with the world mainly through how we see it’ (2012: 3). An image can be an idea or even a memory, something we ‘see’ in the mind’s eye, so much so that it can be difficult to separate the actual image viewed from the imagined or remembered image.

The development sector depends heavily on photographic imagery for communication, publicity, information and awareness-raising purposes. Equally, imagery can be an effective tool for development educators to engage with learners on complex global issues. Although the issue of visual representation has been a focus for development practitioners and researchers for decades (Alam, 2007; Dogra, 2014; Lidchi, 1999; Lissner, 1977; Moeller, 1999; Pieterse, 1992; Said, 1978; Sankore, 2005; Sontag, 1979; Young, 2012), it is only relatively recently that theorists have turned to the issue of problematic representations of development in formal education (Bryan and Bracken, 2011; Honan, 2003; Jeffers, 2008; Smith and Donnelly, 2004; Tallon and Watson, 2014).

This article examines the ways in which global development issues are represented visually in the higher education institutional space, what key messages are being communicated by these visuals and how higher education students and their educators interpret or are influenced by these ideas. It presents an overview of the literature, outlining the theoretical backdrop of contemporary visual representation and the discourse surrounding the issue in the development sector; it addresses this under thematic headings, exploring the impact of visual imagery on perception, from the perspective of those viewing as well as those depicted. This is followed by an account of a consultative research project devised to explore these themes in the field. The project took a selection of visual representations of people living in poverty as displayed in a higher education institute in the Republic of Ireland, and interviewed staff and students to examine the impact of those visuals, studying their interpretation and, and the potential implications for their subsequent work and practice. This field research process and the methodology involved is outlined in greater detail below.
Theories of representation

Ways of seeing

Visual culture theorists suggest that we articulate knowledge visually to the extent that we conflate seeing with knowing: ‘Looking, seeing and knowing have become perilously intertwined’ to the extent that ‘the modern world is a seen phenomenon’ (Jenks, 1995: 1-2). In regard to photography (and video) in particular, there is a tension between the idea of an image as reality and the perception of it as ‘an artefact, … an expression of culture which needs to be read very much like a painting’ (Emmison, Smith and Mayall, 2012: 22–23). Dogra refers to the ‘truth claim’ of a photographic image, that is ‘the documentary-like or evidence effect’ which suggests it is real and actually happened (2014: 160).

Writers on visual culture, such as Sturken and Cartwright (2009), argue that it is not simply the image that is significant but how the image is looked at. They draw on Berger’s (1972: 9) assertion that ‘we never look just at one thing: we are always looking at the relation between things and ourselves’. Images are polysemic, that is, they have multiple possible readings depending on the experiences, knowledge and perceptions of the viewer. Intertextuality – the way in which meanings of images or texts are reconstructed and reproduced around similar types of visual images – can also influence discourses around similar visual texts (Rose, 2012: 191). So, we consciously or unconsciously cross-reference when interpreting images of a similar genre.

The ‘Other’ imaged – recurring themes

Smith and Donnelly (2004) cite Gregory’s (1994: 64) description of the significant role played by vision in our ‘construction of “knowledge” of the “Third World” “other”’. Referencing Said’s seminal Orientalism (1978), the authors describe Said’s exposé of the ‘power dynamics of colonialism’ in visual representations of the Orient, a visualisation which Said asserted could not be separated from social relations. Drawing on Foucauldian theory, Said claimed that the ‘other’ was actually about ‘reflecting the self’ (1978: 208). The idea that ‘to see is to know’ was a ‘fundamental tenet of colonial
domination and appropriation’, as well as a mistaken ideology of development practice (Smith and Donnelly, 2004: 129).

In *Representations of Global Poverty*, Nandita Dogra describes how the ‘construction and maintenance of “difference” between “us” and “them” or “the West” and “non-West”/“East”/“Orient”’ informs ongoing colonial discourse and continues ‘to linger and inform the ways of seeing and representing “Other” cultures’” (2014: 12). Dogra extends her argument to include the ‘whole history of colonial imagery that *did* infantilise the non-West (McClintock, 1995; Mudimbe, 1988; Shohat and Stam, 1994)’, primarily through ‘the use of children as symbols’ (Dogra, 2014: 38), and ‘the representation of the Third World as a child in need of adult guidance’ (Nandy 1983, cited in Escobar, 1995: 30). This representation involves contradictory associations, including innocence, neediness, paternalism, helplessness, dependency, ignorance and underdevelopment.

Similarly, the predominance of women in development imagery is hugely symbolic and equally complex, drawing on associations with nature, motherhood, nurture, victimhood, tradition and vulnerability, as noted by Dogra (2014). She highlights for instance how ‘the form of the female figure, akin to that of a child, can project ideas of “nature” while hiding other ideas such as the historical background and politics of famines’. Such images misleadingly ‘project the women and children as a homogenously powerless group of innocent victims of problems that just “happen to be”’ (2014: 40). This overemphasis, in non-governmental organisation (NGO) imagery in particular, is also borne out by recent research commissioned by Dóchas in Ireland (Murphy, 2014) and by ASCONI (Young, 2012) in Northern Ireland. Murphy refers to the personal stories of women in direct fundraising appeals as more likely to be used in a way which ‘depicted the causes of poverty as internal to the developing country, or even the fault of the beneficiary herself’ (2014: 55). She also expresses concern at the significant portrayal of women in gendered roles (needy, dependent, primarily care-giving etc.), as explored by Dogra.
The Dóchas research draws on theories of ‘frames’ as developed by Darnton and Kirk (2011) in their major research project *Finding Frames: New Ways to Engage the UK Public in Global Poverty*, elaborating the theory in an attempt to understand and address the problematic public engagement model entrenched in the ‘Live Aid Legacy’ – the dominant giver/grateful receiver mode. Darnton and Kirk’s theory builds on the work of the cognitive linguist George Lakoff who ‘identified a number of “deep frames” which inform how we behave, how institutions are constructed, and how we think and talk about the world’ and ‘represent moral worldviews’ (Darnton and Kirk, 2011: 2). The *Finding Frames* report employs Lakoff’s theories to identify prevailing themes underpinning development practice. It identifies positive deep frames including participatory democracy, and negative surface frames including ‘charity’ and ‘aid’. Murphy (2014), who used the same methods of analysis as Darnton and Kirk in her study of frames emerging in the communication materials of Irish NGOs, found ‘charity’, ‘help the poor’ and ‘poverty’ to be the dominant surface frames here also. Murphy’s concern is that such negative framing ‘only serves to emphasise a divide between rich and poor, black and white, or superior and inferior’, reinforcing the “us and them” mentality (2014: 52). Images of ‘Poster Children’ and women are also dominant in Murphy’s findings, that of women so significant that she coined a new category, the ‘Gender frame’ (ibid: 55).

**Impact on perceptions**

In a Suas national survey of 1,000 higher education students in Ireland, participants were asked to ‘identify the first word that came to mind when they heard the term “developing countries”’. The terms ““Third World” (18%), “Africa” (15%), “poor/poorer” (12%) and “poverty” (5%)’ featured in the proportions indicated (2013: 2). In an earlier DCI (Development Cooperation Ireland) study of development education effectiveness in Irish schools, Honan (2003: 21) reports ‘overwhelmingly negative images of the Third World’ in students’ responses. The research relates this negativity to what it terms a “black babies” and “assistencialist” approach to the issues, reinforced by ‘teacher attitudes and experiences, the role of the media and the
constant fundraising and advertising activities of NGOs’ (Honan, 2003: 21, 41).

Sankore is concerned about the impact of ‘increasingly graphic depictions of poverty projected on a mass scale by an increasing number of organisations over a long period’, which he maintains must ‘impact on the consciousness of the target audience’. He describes the unintentional effects of potentially well-meaning charity campaigns:

“the subliminal message [is] … that the people in the developing world require indefinite and increasing amounts of help and that without aid charities and donor support, these poor incapable people in Africa or Asia will soon be extinct through disease and starvation. Such simplistic messages foster stereotypes, strip entire peoples of their dignity and encourage prejudice” (2005: para.6).

Keen also underlines the effect of a cascade of negative images: ‘If the only thing you get is the negative stories, you become inured and people seem less human’ (quoted in VSO, 2002: 11). This is not a new idea: Sontag (1979: 20-21) suggests that ‘the vast photographic catalogue of misery and injustice throughout the world has given everyone a certain familiarity with atrocity, making the horrible seem ordinary – making it appear familiar, remote, inevitable’. This ‘catalogue’ of imagery has become disproportionately associated with the global South. Bryan and Bracken suggest that because we are not exposed to the daily realities of people in Southern countries going about their business we tend to make broad assumptions and attribute the sensational or disastrous to the “‘African” or “Indian condition’” (2011: 123). Additionally, there is a tendency to perceive the global South as ‘a series of absences’ (Smith, 2006: 76).

Much of the typology of negative imagery includes a significant level of so-called development pornography – defined by one commentator as ‘the pictures of victims that show in shocking detail what’s happened to them, stripped of life and often stripped of dignity’ (Humphrys, 2010). Common in the media as well as in many NGO publicity campaigns, such
imagery is also prevalent in school textbooks, as Bryan and Bracken’s 2011 study highlights. The authors point out that while development NGOs might attempt to justify the use of shocking imagery as a fundraising tactic, a rationale for its use in secondary school textbooks is ‘less clear-cut’ (2011: 112). They contend that students from countries in the majority world attending Irish schools can be upset and offended by textbook representations of their culture and nationality.

An indicator of the lasting power and impact of imagery on perceptions or ‘the still image lingering’ is evidenced in the strong associations which Ethiopia has for many people born well after 1984 (Clark, 2004: 12). Moeller describes the result of formulaic coverage where ‘iconic moments become symbols, then stereotyped references that become at best a rote memory’ (1999: 53). Beg (quoted in Smith, 2006: 24) asks if ‘the “developing” world is not static – then why don’t the images change constantly with the progress that is taking place?’ Moeller (1999: 43) suggests that there is a ‘built-in inertia that perpetuates familiar images’, an inertia that the public submits to as a result. She suggests that the inevitable consequence of formulaic or even sensationalised coverage is ‘compassion fatigue’ (ibid: 53). In the context of visual imagery, compassion fatigue refers to the phenomenon whereby graphic or upsetting imagery ceases to have an impact because it has been seen so many times before. Sankore believes that ‘fatigue has already set in’ and insists the result of a lack of clarity on the causes of poverty in the South will be a ‘backlash’ as ‘ingrained negative stereotypes’ lead to ‘ignorant prejudice’ (2005: para.13).

Such a backlash is already being felt by African diaspora communities. Young points to some of the particular effects on people of African origin living in Northern Ireland, including the perception of ‘Africans as helpless’ and the continent perceived as ‘a monolithic, undifferentiated region’ (2012: 22). Young asserts that individuals are ‘profoundly negatively impacted by these images and the messages they convey’. She shows that the imagery is part of a ‘broader narrative [which] implicitly emphasises the “otherness” of these individuals and groups and
ostracises many new communities and reinforces the perception of them as on the periphery of society in Northern Ireland’ (2012: 38). As Manzo suggests, that stereotypical imagery affects not only how “‘we” see “them”, but also how “they” see themselves’ (2006: 11). Wambu also shows that stereotypes impact on young people of African origin living in the West, who ‘often feel negative towards Africa and seek to dissociate themselves from their place of heritage. This hinders their participation or engagement in Africa’s development’ (2006: 22). A quotation from a focus group participant from the diaspora in NI further points to the ‘psycho-social’ impacts: ‘These images have to erode at our social conscience as a people. African people start resenting each other, as it makes me feel different to them, and it destroys a collective people’ (Young, 2012: 25).

**The image in the institution**

As far as this author has been able to establish, no research to date, either in Ireland or elsewhere, has focused on the way in which global development issues are represented in the public spaces of institutes of higher education. Cox, Herrick and Keating point out that other than in reference to the architecture of schools, ‘until recently the nature of space and learning itself has not been greatly studied or theorised’ (2012: 698).

Similarly, there is a scarcity of academic literature on the actual visual spaces such as noticeboards or vertical display areas of educational institutions, notwithstanding the obvious connection between the visual and the spatial – that is, between an image and the context in which it is viewed. In a survey carried out on behalf of the Irish Traveller Movement in the former Froebel College of Education (Power, 2012), the issue of the institutional environment was touched on, where, in the context of creating a more inclusive campus, participants raised the issue of the images (and icons) on display there. As Emmison et al. emphasise, buildings are ‘not simply functional structures whose built form reflects imperatives of utility and cost. They also reflect the cultural systems in which they are embedded’ (2012: 153).
Field research in a higher education environment

The complex associations and reactions described in the theoretical framework above come into play whenever such images are used, whether in promotional material, in textbooks, or in public displays. The theory formed the backdrop for the research project carried out by the author between June 2013 and December 2015, which analysed a selection of images depicting global development issues which appeared on noticeboards in a higher education institute in Ireland. The institute in question specialises in teacher education and offers a range of undergraduate and postgraduate programmes in education-related studies including a B.Sc. in Education Studies and a Bachelor in Education (Primary) (B.Ed.).

The primary data used for analysis included sixteen semi-structured 30-minute interviews with staff and students (which were audio-recorded, transcribed and then coded). This interview data was supplemented by 35 completed research questionnaires which had been returned by a combination of staff and students. Initially an inventory was made of imagery in the institute depicting any aspect or reference to people or places in the global South. Approximately 200 photographs were taken of relevant imagery in noticeboards and public display areas in the college. The researcher selected twenty representative images and printed them in full-colour A4 format. Global themes depicted included trade, environment, equality, peace and conflict, poverty, play, culture including art and music, inclusion, aid and volunteering. Subsequent analysis showed that ten of these images derived from NGO sources, two from a government department, three from government or state-sponsored bodies, one from a national faith-based representative body, one from a faith-based foundation, four from lecturers’ own curricular-area-related displays, one from a student volunteering experience, one from a framed corridor photograph and one from an unknown source. Images were chosen to reflect a variety of compositions and themes, regardless of their source. These visuals were used to prompt and focus the discussions in all interviews with staff and students.
In this text all interviewees have been anonymised and numbered: student interviewees are referred to as ‘SD’ and staff as ‘SF’. As distinct from an ‘interviewee’, the term ‘respondent’, when used in this research, refers to any individual who returned a completed research questionnaire. A ‘participant’ refers generally to any respondent or interviewee who participated in the research process.

Discussion
A number of common themes emerged repeatedly in the interviews with staff and students who participated in this research. The breadth of this article does not allow for discussion of all of the key themes so I have selected a single overarching theme, Perspectives on Poverty, which exemplifies many of the issues discussed above.

Perspectives on Poverty
When asked to identify common themes displayed in the selection of images of global perspectives drawn from the institute noticeboards and display areas, poverty was identified as a dominant issue by all staff and students interviewed. At least half of those interviewed named it specifically, with the remainder alluding to it through reference to associated issues (starvation, hunger, deprivation, struggle, hardship and so on). Responses to the idea or the image of poverty included pity, sadness, sympathy, shame, and even anger. A number of interviewees named empathy as an emotive response, although their actual understandings of the concept of empathy were not explored in any depth. The idea of people being ‘happy subjects’ and somehow resigned to their poverty was commonly expressed: ‘the kids there seem to be fairly resolute and, and happy with themselves, [despite] the situation they find themselves in’ (SD2). This conflation of poverty with either happiness, or equally sadness, seemed to be a pattern associated with a type of image or a genre of imagery and was expressed as a response to the idea of that genre, possibly sparked by viewing one or two suggestive images on campus: ‘That they’re, kind of, always sad, and they’re always in poverty’ (SD4).
In expressing strong feelings about the fact of poverty, the focus was on the problem, with little or no reference to the causes or possible solutions. Poverty was rarely understood as something which we have a stake in, except in terms of a moral obligation to help or feel guilty at our own relative fortune. Although the inequalities and power dynamics between North and South were fleetingly alluded to, it was only suggested by two interviewees and one questionnaire respondent that there might be historical, structural or political causes for these inequalities or that the North might be implicated in perpetuating them. Even where the inequality was acknowledged, it was presented as infinite, as a *fait accompli*: ‘that the wealth is not shared around and inequality is just reproduced throughout the years’ (SD2). The same student pointed out that:

“you never really see the person who has escaped the … poverty, or the, have overcome the overwhelming odds against them … When you give preference to one, eh, depiction say for instance, the poverty and what not, … [it’s] so prevalent that you don’t even think about an alternative” (SD2).

One particular appeal poster (permission for reproduction was withheld), which depicted a ‘small scared child’ (SD6) peeping around a doorway with the caption ‘Empowering the poor: Giving a voice to the vulnerable’, drew a lot of attention. This is a graphic example of the ‘Poster Child’ genre, where the child in the image acts as a signifier for the entire global South, portraying it as a ‘child in need of adult guidance’ (Escobar, 1995: 30). To respondents, this poster image more than any other, while not explicit, was suggestive of many of the stereotypical characteristics that people would associate with a familiar genre. Initial responses to this image included ‘pity’, ‘sorrow’ and ‘sympathy’ for the girl, acknowledging that it was ‘pulling on the heartstrings maybe a little bit’ (SD6).

A number of interviewees, who at first appeared to be moved by the image, on further reflection expressed irritation and cynicism because they noticed that the child looked ‘fearful’ or ‘vulnerable’, feelings which they
perceived to be at odds with the message of empowerment promised by the poster wording. One student asserted that the caption itself was disempowering in assuming ‘do they not have a voice without it?’ (SD6). Arnold explains that the ‘charity vision’, which this kind of image represents was until relatively recently seen as the ‘motivating force … to inspire compassion and to awaken a sense of “moral duty” to help the less fortunate’ (1988: 188). A more graphic and extreme form of the genre constitutes what is often referred to as development pornography or poverty porn. The use of this kind of voyeuristic imagery has been widely condemned in development circles for decades and contravenes established codes of good practice on development imaging. Although there has been a shift of sorts from ‘a charity-based vision to one centred on empowerment’ (Arnold, 1988) recent research suggests that this shift is minimal. In their 2011 analysis of school textbooks Bryan and Bracken note numerous incidences of development pornography within current post-primary texts. In her recent study of Irish NGO public communications, Murphy suggests that the sector still frames poverty and charity in line with live-aid style ‘paradigms’ (Murphy, 2014: 52).

The ‘Think Again’ aid campaign poster (Image A) developed by the Irish NGOs 80:20 and IDEA (Irish Development Education Association) for educators drew a different kind of mixed response. The photograph, which depicts a seated Zambian, Godfrey Ngandu, staring intently at the camera, alongside the caption, ‘If you think aid is about poverty... Think Again’, was described by one student as ‘sad’, ‘very dark’ and ‘uncomfortable’ (SD7), and while the poster tries to explain the need for wealth sharing, and tries to ‘ask rather than tell’ (SD8), it manages to communicate a confusing and ‘contradictory’ message. Another student, uneasy with the same image, concedes that it does allude to the man’s ‘right’, with a suggestion that ‘it might be our fault that this is happening’. She elaborates that ‘it’s kind of, calling you to reflect on yourself, or maybe what you could do’ (SD8).
if you think aid is about poverty...

THINK AGAIN

From the perspective of the poor, aid is about wealth: who has it and who doesn’t. Aid is about choices, to share fairly or not to, to include or to exclude. And when inclusion costs so little, it is hard to justify not doing so.

Aid is about our wealth, and what it stands for in today’s world.

Photo: Gareth Bright. 
Kapinyu, Uganda, January 2010.
This poster certainly represented a departure from the norm displayed in the message it sought to communicate. However, the fact of its ambiguity meant that its message was diluted and the potential impact lost on many viewers.

An example of a poster (Image B) which was more successful in connecting with viewers was the Value Added in Africa (VAA) campaign created to support their African producers. One student pointed out that its ‘business’ theme enhances the portrayal of the subject from simply ‘happy, healthy, content’, into someone who is genuinely empowered (SD6). Arguably, there is nothing distinctly business-like about the images used or the poster itself, but the combination of so-called positive imagery and a carefully balanced marketing blurb gives this poster more of an upbeat feel. The fact that trade justice is a theme which has been ‘imaged repeatedly without recourse to the iconography of childhood’ is noted by Manzo (2008: 645).

Image B
What appears to be counter-productive in many of the typical anti-poverty poster campaigns witnessed (both on campus and from interviewees’ memories) is their overemphasis on what a few students have criticised as manipulative ‘emotive’ images of people, more often than not young women: ‘Everyone plays on the emotional thing. You get bored of that’ (SD6). This kind of repetitive focus on the female subject is emblematic of what Dogra (2014) describes as the woman/child figure suggesting the natural order, hence obscuring the critical backdrop of history or politics behind a food crisis or poverty-related issue.

So, while it might be disheartening that the key messages about the complex causes or creative solutions possible in relation to poverty are not being clearly communicated, it is reassuring to see that students are to some extent aware of the manipulative and problematic nature of representations of poverty, and the consequent gap in their perception of the issues: ‘If you conform to, kind of, one set of ideas and you don’t, kind of open yourself up to information, em that can be very ... it gives you a very one sided, eh, depiction’ (SD2).

**Implications for practice – replication or reform?**

Students in this study were clearly aware of the lasting impact of the stereotypical imagery to which they themselves had been exposed in their own schooling, and equally conscious that in many ways, although the dynamic may or may not have changed, the perceptions still prevail:

“I know when I was younger and this is awful to say, but this is just how I, how it was approached with me when I was in school. First of all, I thought Africa was a country, and secondly, ... like if they were African-American or if they were dark coloured skin then they were poor, because that’s all I was used to seeing on posters ... So, that’s just something I am very critical of. And it’s the same with all these posters, you know” (SD7).

A study commissioned by Ireland Aid, around the time when this student would have been in second or third class in primary school, showed these
kinds of perceptions to be very prevalent. The report found that the most frequent image associations amongst Irish people of the ‘Third World’ were “starvation, hunger, no food”; “poverty/no money/babies/children”; “diseases/sickness/blindness”; “suffering/sadness/despair/pain” and “dying people/death” (Weafer, 2002: 8). Like many of her cohort, the aforementioned student was acutely aware of the impact of similar imagery on her pupils, as well as the need to be equipped to challenge the resulting perceptions: ‘It’s like, it almost puts a stigma. And, and especially when there is a lot of, more diversity now in Ireland, we can’t have that stigma’ (SD7).

On the whole, the students who participated in this study (the majority of whom were student teachers) appear to be aware of the need to prepare themselves for diversity, particularly ethnic diversity in the classroom or workplace, and even at school placement (teaching practice) stage, find themselves having to challenge prevailing practices and perceptions. Two students gave examples of particular difficulties they faced on school placement in relation to challenging stereotypical and outdated imagery in visual aids and textbooks: ‘I actually think that it’s maybe because they’re uncomfortable or maybe because they’re ignorant to it, because that means somebody else doesn’t get represented’ (SD6). Indeed, the equally complex range of reactions to the images depicted shifts from appreciation to helplessness to anger to guilt to discomfort to cynicism at times. It is unclear as to how individuals deal with such emotions and the precise impact such feelings will consequently have on their individual perceptions or actions, whatever about how they share their perceptions through discussion or in their subsequent classroom or work practice.

Several interviewees recounted being stopped in their tracks by particular images and noted the transformative effect those images had on them personally: ‘The pictures that were there [reference to an exhibition of global images during an awareness-raising week in the institute] were of people doing ordinary things. It had an impact on me so I’m now looking at things differently’ (SF4); and ‘Maybe it works [reference to International Women’s Day image display] because it just makes me feel that little bit
uncomfortable, you know’ (SF8) and ‘I was thinking about them all day. I was, even when I was talking to anyone, I’d say, did you see the picture like’ (SD4). Equally, the impact of certain images suggested compassion fatigue: ‘Well, that’s happening there, em, it’s terrible and then, when is my next assignment due” (SD2). And ‘If you get bored, you stop listening, em, with the likes of … even images like that, the … appeal. Like, the likes of that, you know, you’ve seen that so many times, so many times’ (SD6). Strikingly, several interviewees attributed their recently increased awareness of global perspectives and the potential impact on their practice to the very fact of this research: ‘Until you sent out the questionnaire I was oblivious … I wasn’t really aware of what I was doing until you drew my attention to it’ (SF4); ‘Even this research, the fact that it’s going on, will raise my awareness … the fact that I’m here this morning, it’s there, it’s …, in your head, that you’re thinking about it’ (SF5) and ‘Just looking at the pictures and actually sitting down and looking at them, I think it’ll impact my practice more now’ (SD7).

Indeed, this may be somewhat reassuring, but as O’Brien, drawing on Cochran-Smith (1991) points out: ‘student teachers need to know that they are part of a larger struggle and that they have a responsibility to reform, not just replicate, standard school practices’ (2009: 198).

Conclusion

This research suggests that higher education students have a much more sophisticated reading of visual images than we might anticipate. In the study their insights and responses challenge the assumptions of the image makers, who it appears, underestimate the critical literacy skills of their audience. In the words of one student interviewee, imagery should ‘ask rather than tell’ (SD8). Carefully created or well-chosen visuals can further critical thinking and provoke deeper questioning. While there is evidently much room for the development of visual literacy knowledge and skills at all stages of primary to higher level education, image producers also need to catch up with their audience by informing themselves and interrogating their approaches. Fundamentally, images of global development need to be produced within a rights-based rather than a charity-based framework, or what Darnton and Kirk refer to as the ‘justice not charity frame’ (2011: 33). Translating this
framework to the realm of visual imagery requires on the one hand a rethink of how we depict people and places from the global South, but also a reappraisal of how we should interpret and respond to such images and the situations they highlight. It is time for a radical shift in the visual discourse within the development sector. In the meantime, educators must equip themselves to resist and reform conventional visual approaches.

Note
This article is drawn from an Irish Aid funded research project which was carried out in a higher education institute in the Republic of Ireland between June 2013 and December 2015. The full research report, including detailed methodology, is available at: www.diceproject.ie/research/papers-reports/
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OPPORTUNITIES AND OBSTACLES: HOW SCHOOL LEADERS VIEW DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION IN IRISH POST-PRIMARY SCHOOLS

Brendan Doggett, Bernie Grummell and Angela Rickard

Abstract: School leaders play a vital role in ensuring that schools attend to issues of local and global justice within the ethos and daily practices of their school community. This article examines the attitudes and activities of school leaders in relation to development education and their vision for its integration in schools based on a national survey of post-primary school leaders in the Republic of Ireland. We consider the conditions needed for development education to be successfully implemented and the drivers of change required that can sustain it in the longer term. We examine why some school leaders and communities seem to be disconnected from development education opportunities and unaware of available supports, whilst others engage actively with it as an organic part of their school culture. This has broader implications for resilience of school leadership, the teaching profession and school community, particularly in an era of constraint. It offers a unique insight into development education from the vantage point of those leading schools.

Key words: Development education; school leadership; post-primary education.

Leading development education in Irish post-primary schools

Ireland claims a ‘proud tradition as a champion for international development cooperation’ (Dóchas, 2011: 2) and development education, in particular, is well-established in the Republic of Ireland education system (Fiedler et al., 2011; Kenny and O’Malley, 2002; Irish Human Rights Commission, 2011). However, it remains a somewhat marginal and non-compulsory part of the broader curriculum (Bryan and Bracken, 2011). The need for a holistic approach which includes school leadership in embedding development issues in education is acknowledged as important (Toland, 2006) but has only
tangentially been addressed in the development studies literature (Gleeson et al., 2007). Similarly, literature on school leadership has seldom addressed the issue of leading development education, although it does offer useful perspectives. The role of principals in leading the school through a ‘process of influence’ is vital to embedding initiatives like development education within the entire school community (Gunter, 2010: 527). Bottery highlights the inherent complexity and interconnectivity of ecosystems such as the school community wherein ‘the art of leadership lies in the balancing of the different interests’ (2013: 8). This concept of leading by influence in a context that acknowledges the complexity of the school ecosystem offers a useful lens to examine the leading of development education.

School leadership literature highlights the importance of leaders being driven by a moral purpose (Fullan, 2003; Sergiovanni, 1992). The moral stance of school leadership for values-driven curriculum such as development education is also significant. The legacy of overseas missionary work in some schools very often influences the particular approach to and practices of development education they espouse (Bryan and Bracken, 2011; Kenny and O’Malley, 2002). The nature of this moral purpose or imperative of leadership is significant, with a substantive difference between the soft and critical modes of development education evident in Irish schools (Bryan and Bracken, 2011: 158). The moral purpose driving leadership is significantly different from a critical human rights stance. In recent decades, the efforts of advocacy and community activist groups, that were formed in response to mid-twentieth century civil and international conflicts, contributed significantly to critical awareness-raising about the causes of global social inequality and the significance of human rights, intercultural learning and sustainable development in school leadership (Amnesty International, 2012; Bottery et al., 2012; National Council for Curriculum and Assessment, 2006). These approaches tend to highlight the importance of developing democratic and distributed modes of leadership that promote equal participation and governance across the school community (Amnesty International, 2012).
In the Irish research context, it is relatively rare that this literature on school leadership and development education interacts. Recent studies on development education in Irish schools focus on teachers, students and curriculum aspects of development education (Clarke et al., 2010; Fiedler et al., 2011; Gleeson et al., 2007; Liddy, 2012; Tormey and Gleeson, 2012), with leadership only noted tangentially.

**The positioning of development education in schools**

Research on development education has tended to map its position within specific aspects of education, such as its role in a number of subjects on the post-primary curriculum, namely Civic Social and Political Education (CSPE), Religion, Geography and Social Personal and Health Education (SPHE). More recently opportunities to incorporate development education more explicitly into revised syllabi have been identified (National Council for Curriculum and Assessment /Irish Aid, 2006). Programmes such as the Leaving Certificate Applied (LCA), the Leaving Certificate Vocational Programme (LCVP), Transition Year (TY) and the emergent Junior Cycle short courses offer opportunities for development education by virtue of the cross-curricular approach and active methodologies they espouse (Honan, 2005). Initial Teacher Education (ITE) programmes throughout the country include elements of development education as core or elective modules (Jeffers and Malone, 2003; Liddy, 2009)

In spite of its long trajectory and apparent prominence compared to other ‘value educations’ (Irish Human Rights Commission, 2011: 168), development education, along with other such subjects, still occupies a somewhat marginal position in Irish schools and faces considerable cultural and infrastructural challenges to its successful and appropriate integration in teaching and learning (Bryan and Bracken, 2011; Clarke et al., 2010; Jeffers, 2008). Research highlights the historically low status of the so-called ‘softer subjects’ such as Religion, SPHE and CSPE and their minimal allocation of class time (Bryan and Bracken, 2011; Jeffers, 2008) coupled with the pervasive lack of comfort with ‘active methodologies’ (Clarke et al., 2010; Cosgrove et al., 2011). These factors conspire against full realisation of the
educational potential of a values-based subject like development education. This makes development education a particularly pertinent challenge for school leaders, given their central position in influencing and sustaining school values, cultures and infrastructures (Day and Leithwood, 2007; Gunter, 2010). So while we are cognisant of the achievements of the development education sector in recent years (Gleeson et al., 2007; Liddy, 2012), it is worth examining the challenges and constraints that still remain for schools from the perspective of those leading schools.

Gleeson et al.’s (2007) national study mapping 4,970 post-primary students’ and 1,193 post-primary teachers’ knowledge, attitudes and activism in relation to development issues and development education reveals clear evidence of engagement by teachers, students and the school community. School leadership is not a focused theme within this study, although many principals did participate in the interview part of this study. Similarly, Liddy’s study of pre-service teachers’ use of active learning methodologies in development education notes the importance of the support of school leaders amidst a range of other structural factors (2009: 39), but these factors were not central to her study. Bryan and Bracken’s research (2011) also acknowledges the importance of supportive school leadership and management in schools which had a high visibility or moral obligation for development education. Richardson (2009) notes that the willingness and capacity of school management to support teachers is crucial, highlighting the supportive role and culture developed by school leaders. As these studies reveal, the contribution of school leadership to development education is an area that has been tangentially examined in the literature, despite research and policy emphasising the centrality of leadership in enhancing and sustaining change in schools.

**Researching development education in Irish post-primary schools**
This article is based on research conducted with principals and deputy principals of Irish post-primary schools in 2013. It was conducted on behalf of WorldWise Global Schools (WWGS) to inform the development of its 2013 - 2016 strategy. WWGS is an Irish Aid initiative that is being delivered...
on its behalf by a consortium of three organisations (Self Help Africa, Concern Worldwide and City of Dublin Vocational Education Centre Curriculum Development Unit) supporting clusters or groups of schools that work on projects in development education. The purpose of this research was to explore school leaders’ perceptions of current development education activities and networks evident in participating post-primary schools. We present the key obstacles, opportunities and supports for development education identified by school leaders and examine the conditions required for development education to be sustained in schools before discussing the implications for future research, policy and practice.

The research adopted a mixed method design comprising three elements: desk research about development education and leadership in Irish schools; a national on-line survey of school leaders about integration of development education in second level schools; and in-depth qualitative interviews with selected principals. All aspects of the research abided by institutional ethical guidelines that respect participants’ rights, maintaining the confidentiality and informed consent of respondents at all times (Maynooth University, 2012). The questionnaire was distributed to all principals on the Department of Education and Skills (DES) database of second level schools in Ireland, as well as to online mailing lists of schools, education bodies and school trustees held by WWGS. The questionnaire asked principals to complete a series of closed and open-ended questions about their school’s profile, its development education activities, how development education is integrated into the school curriculum, their involvement in development education networks, and a series of general attitudinal questions about opportunities, obstacles and achievements of development education in school (Rickard et al., 2013). Question formats ranged from Likert scales to open-ended questions asking for further elaboration and rationale for answers. These were analysed using SPSS and MS Excel software to examine the basic frequencies and cross-tabulate answers.
Online surveys gave a very effective and quick means of distributing the survey (Matsuo et al., 2004) to the target population of school principals. 186 school leaders (80 percent were principals and 20 percent were deputy principals) responded, representing 26 percent of the relevant schools (based on the DES school database). This represents a satisfactory response rate, given the typically lower response rate to online surveys (Couper, 2000) and the continual demands made on school principals (Lynch et al., 2012). It raises the question of the potential skewing of results that this self-selection by 26 percent of eligible principals presented. We can assume that these represent principals and schools that are more engaged with development education issues. This self-selection leaves unexplored the attitudes and activities of those less involved or motivated, which represents a significant area for future research. Another limitation of the survey response was the gradual fall-off in participation with 92 respondents fully completing the survey. This fall-off occurred during the section asking principals about their understanding of and involvement in development education (as noted throughout the findings section). While fall-off is an acknowledged limitation of all on-line surveys (Porter and Whitcomb, 2003), we can also speculate that this implied a lowering of engagement levels in these schools and hence respondents opting out of the survey at this point. One respondent acknowledged that completing the questionnaire raises awareness that ‘I now feel very ignorant about this topic. I suppose that, in the present economic climate, global issues have been somewhat side-lined’ (Principal Survey 62.14) [1].

Qualitative interviews with principals in eleven schools chosen from WWGS’s database were then conducted. They represented a cross-selection of schools with varying levels and involvement in development education. These interviews enabled us to explore more fully the nature and type of engagement in development education activities through the lens of the school leader’s vision. Interviews discussed their understanding of the place of development education in the school, the level and extent of development education provision within school, involvement in and collaboration with development education providers, attitudes to change and capacity building
within school (especially in light of curricular change and network building), and perceived barriers to development education. A semi-structured approach was adopted by two researchers who visited schools over one month to interview the principals following a topic guide based on the themes outlined above (Cohen, Manion and Morrison, 2011). The interviews offered rich and detailed insights into the activities, motivations, and opinions of school leaders and were analysed using the qualitative data analysis software MAXqda. Through a system of open coding of the emergent themes and subsequent re-checking and categorisation of these codes (Corbin, 2007), key themes were identified. These included: general awareness and understanding of development education among school leaders; leaders’ backgrounds; influential aspects in leading development education in schools; challenges to the integration of development education in schools; the impact of economic and school contexts for development education; and future opportunities for development education in Irish schools.

Profile of participating schools and leaders
Based on the data emerging from this research, we mapped current development education activities and networks evident in participating Irish post-primary schools. The online survey was circulated to all 723 Irish post-primary schools with 186 (26 percent) schools responding. The diverse geographical spread and school type participating in the research reflected the national profile of post-primary schools as below shows; with 33 percent vocational, 44 percent secondary, 10 percent community and 2.4 percent comprehensive schools. The remainder indicated that they were independent, gaelcholáiste or ‘other’. 43 percent (60) of respondents were in single sex schools (compared to a national average of 34 percent). Similar to the national profile, there was a concentration of responses from schools based in the towns (nearly 50 percent) and cities (36 percent). Many of these responses were from Dublin, South and West Leinster, followed by a more even spread across the country. Less than 20 percent of responding schools were based in a rural location. 32 percent (46)
of respondents were located in designated disadvantaged (DEIS) schools. There was a wide spread of school size ranging from 15 percent with under 200 students and 22 percent with over 800 students.

While an element of bias must be assumed in a self-selected sample such as this, the research profile of schools participating in this research compares favourably to the national average (DES, 2012). Our response group represents a relatively balanced sample set with a mix of gender, urban and rural, single-sex and co-educational schools (see Rickard et al., 2013).

Figure 1. The response percent of school type to the survey compared to national percentages
Findings

School leaders’ awareness of development education

The level of general awareness and understanding among school leaders varied significantly. When asked what they understood by the term ‘development education’, the majority of interview and survey respondents focused on the human rights aspect:

“Highlighting human right issues and the development of a more fair and equal society” (Principal Survey 14.16).

“Education which opens people’s eyes and minds to the realities of the world, particularly including the majority world, and enables them to engage in learning for social change, local and global” (Principal Survey 14.96).

A quarter of survey respondents associated development education with the Third World or developing world, ‘helping to promote and develop education in Third World countries’ (Principal Survey 14.94). ‘Awareness’ and ‘Understanding People and Cultures’ appeared in 20 percent of explanations. A diverse range of understandings of development education in schools was evident, ranging from more critical and embedded perspectives on global studies:

“Development Education is about increasing awareness and understanding amongst people about the unequal world in which we live. It aims to support people in understanding and acting to transform the cultural, social and economic structures which affect their lives and others at local, national or international levels, as it encourages critical examination of global issues” (Principal Survey 14.19).

This view contrasted with the softer and more traditional notion of development education as embedded in charity fund-raising and the:
“[W]hole idea of vocation, the … Voluntary Service Overseas … wouldn’t it be wonderful if we could encourage young people for instance to do a developmental year. What do you call it – a gap year – we don’t do enough of that in this country” (Principal Interview H.12).

These diverse understandings of development education by school leaders are key to understanding how principals approach development education in Irish schools. The global human rights approach fits with current curriculum practices and the active learning approaches promoted by curriculum bodies and development education organisations. The charitable approach expressed by many school leaders enabled greater distancing and an aspirational stance rather than active involvement in development education. It implies a softer approach that neglects the complex culpability of the global North and dilutes the critical capacity of development education (Andreotti, 2006; Bracken and Bryan, 2011).

School leaders were also asked about their awareness of the organisation responsible for Ireland's development aid and to name organisations involved in the provision of development education to gain an insight into their knowledge of structural issues. Half of the survey respondents were not aware of the organisational structure for Irish development education or gave a wrong answer, revealing a lack of visibility and awareness about the systemic structures of development education.

**Development education activities**
The majority of school leaders described how they integrate development education into a wide variety of school activities and support the embedding of development education across the curriculum. Respondents described how most development education activity (77 percent and 80 percent respectively) takes place at the early parts of the school cycle, the Junior and Transition Year level respectively. 33 percent (31) of respondents include development education in Transition Year where modules such as ‘Social Education’ and ‘Development Education’ cover development education.
topics. This raises issues about the status of development education in the school cycle and curriculum. Similar to the Gleson et al. study (2007: 55), many school leaders favoured a broad approach that diffused development education across the curriculum where ‘development education should be a component of nearly every subject rather than being separated out’ (Principal Survey 62.31). However, in practice, they described how development education delivery is concentrated in particular subjects. Figure 2 shows the spread of subjects which leaders felt included a focus on development education.

**Figure 2. Subjects which include a focus on development education**

32 percent (29) of principals responding also noted a development education component in their extra-curricular activities. While the subject is taught mainly through Religion, Geography and CSPE, associated activities such as
the Trócaire and Concern fasts or Concern debates take place on an extra-curricular basis.

While development education may percolate across the curricular and extra-curricular aspects of the school day, it does not have a whole school focus in most schools. Gleeson et al. (2007: 58) similarly note that the general support and ‘status ascribed to development education is not necessarily reflected in the practice of the school’ as evident in their research through the lack of discussion about it at staff meetings. 87 percent (88) of principals in our study did not include development education as part of their staff or student planning days. Introducing development education as part of school planning days received the least interest overall with 24 percent (22) principals rating it as ‘0’. The majority of schools, 98 percent, do not have a written policy on development education with only 21 percent considering developing a policy in the short term. In many instances, principals felt that development education was inherent in the school mission and ethos. Developing a school approach and policy was acknowledged as time consuming and resource intensive, yet probably the best way to get whole school involvement: ‘it was a bit of a trawl to get everybody on board working on this so that it became a school wide thing’ (Principal Interview G.1).

During the previous school year, 54 percent (56) of schools accessed some development education resources. Principals listed sources such as Waterford One World Centre; DevelopmentEducation.ie, Schools Development Ireland, Fair Trade, Trócaire, Loreto Education Centre, WorldWise, Concern debates resources and Concern Worldwide staff, as well as the Development Education Research Centre. 31 percent (32) of schools have developed some of their own resources and support links, but 68 percent (63) acknowledge that they would like additional development education resources and called for ‘support from development organisations to reinvigorate and reintroduce development issues into the school’ (Principal Survey 62.5).
Several schools indicated their involvement in networks such as Science for Development, with 27 percent in SciFest, 26 percent participating in BT Young Scientist and Technology Exhibition (YS TE), and 2 percent in Google Science Fair. 46 percent (46) of respondents are involved with Young Social Innovators (YSI). By participating in these competitions, principals felt that action at a local and global level can be fostered and developed; a finding that was also echoed by Bryan and Bracken’s research (2011: 158-9).

**Leading development education in schools**
Several principals acknowledged how their awareness of development education was shaped by their own professional background as teachers:

“[My] interest in DE evolved initially as a teacher” (Principal Interview H.1).

“I am not usually [aware of development education]. I’m new. As a principal I have been here only four years. Up to that I was teaching engineering” (Principal Interview K.1).

This raises interesting questions about the background influences, especially teaching, that impact on school leadership and is an area that warrants further research. Principals spoke about the factors that shaped their capacity to lead development education. The context and ethos of the school for example was considered vital, whereby schools with an explicit religious or social justice mission were perceived as being most attuned to development education.

While school leaders acknowledged that a whole school approach is important, teachers were identified as central to establishing development education in schools: ‘Ideally you want a group of teachers but you do need a single person that’s going to share everything’ (Principal Interview J.6). Others described this person as ‘a warrior’ (Principal Interview G.3); a committed individual who ‘is a leader and somebody who has the energy to keep going with it’ (Principal Interview I.2). Principals acknowledged the
need for support for individual teachers, especially younger teachers echoing Liddy’s findings from Ubuntu network (2012).

The investment in the commitment of the individual teacher points to both the strength of this leadership approach; supporting the passion and energy of a committed advocate, but also to its potential weakness and subjectivity, as it is ‘down to the goodwill of the individual teachers who were promoting their individual projects’ (Principal Interview G.3). Principals were very conscious of the limitations of this approach as staff move on or their circumstances change. Given this reliance on staff, the people management skills of leaders are vital to nurture such approaches within schools as they ‘have to go back and sell this and get people, or get a teacher or a group of teachers that will bring this forward’ (Principal Interview J.2). Liddy (2012) and Bryan and Bracken (2011) also describe a similar dependency on the personal investment and commitment of individual teachers.

A recurring theme among school leaders in the research was an acknowledgment of what impels leadership, with development education identified as particularly resonant for schools with an explicit religious or social justice ethos. Bottery et al. (2012) note the importance of educational leadership being seen as driven by a moral purpose that frames how leaders engage with each situation and issue they face. Development education matches the religious and/or social justice agenda of many schools but with very different motivations and ends, as explored later in this article. There was a clear acknowledgement that leadership has to be set within broader support structures such as the school bodies that support principals, teachers and schools. While this is often taken for granted in schools with a religious trusteeship, it can be difficult, with one principal commenting that they expected a greater level of support from their school trustee: ‘I would have thought they would have jumped on the thing a bit more and run with it a little bit more strongly’ (Principal Interview G.5).
Challenges to leading development education in schools

Findings in our survey and interviews revealed a range of issues that represent challenges to the integration of development education in schools. The pressures of time were noted as the most significant factor impacting on development education activities:

“In school we are already trying to do far too many things. The same people are so busy all the time and we are at breaking point” (Principal Survey 55.3).

This is related to the complex pressures of a full timetable (65 percent) and little class time for development education (42 percent), a busy extracurricular timetable (29 percent) and the related issue of overworked teachers (53 percent), with calls for more to ‘be done through the curriculum i.e. in the classroom not extra-curricular’ (Principal Survey 62.35). These challenges of time and curriculum were also noted by Jeffers (2008), Bracken and Bryan (2010) and Liddy (2012), as well as in the general literature on school leadership (Sugrue and Goodson, 2010; Lynch et al., 2012).

Respondents called for ‘a clear priority to dev-ed and a cross-curricular/integrationist approach [which] means that some of the above cease to be obstacles’ (Principal Survey 55.4). The cross-curricular nature of development education was cited as an opportunity with some respondents, while others described its cross-curricular nature as a constraint in the current context where development education struggles to find a place in the existing subject-based system – similar to what Bryan and Bracken (2011) have noted. Respondents highlighted cultural factors within the school environment that potentially hinder development education as:

“[T]he idea that you’d have to work closely with other subject departments and work as more of a team rather than individual – unfortunately teaching has been in the past very much a sole trader kind of approach where teachers went in and closed their doors and they were the masters [sic] of their domain” (Principal Interview G.8).
The challenge of making cross-curricular links where ‘the price of a strong ethos of teacher autonomy can be a culture of teacher isolation’ was also noted by Jeffers (2008: 18) in the context of CSPE. Tormey et al. (2009) highlighted the importance of interdisciplinary literacy which could build interdisciplinary diversity and a critical awareness of knowledge production and power. The broader context of pressures on the educational system was also mentioned by principals, acknowledging that:

“Given the current ‘change process overload’ complaint from schools, it is crucial that any DE focused processes are seen to be within, not additional to, existing and emerging change processes ... otherwise they will be rejected” (Principal Survey 62.40).

Other obstacles that respondents described were examination-related factors; that development education was not an examination subject (28 percent) and the pressure of achieving exam results (26 percent), which reiterates Bryan and Bracken’s (2011) point that development education is difficult to deliver in an education system dominated by a strong focus on terminal examinations:

“I support Dev Ed and think it is important but in an already crowded curriculum, with the pressures of exams etc. people might just see this as another added hassle for teachers and schools to take responsibility for” (Principal Survey 62.9).

Other principals cited logistical reasons that restricted network building and event participation, such as geographical location and the centralised location of development education agencies and events. For example one school leader said, ‘we used to do YSI but logistics of always having finals in Dublin is an obstacle’ (Principal Survey 62.38). In-school communications were also noted by some, with principals citing a limited scope of general announcements in assemblies and school noticeboards as the main way of transmitting development education across the school community.
Issues to do with the teaching profession were particularly significant, as principals acknowledged the impact of the increased workload where:

“[T]eachers are very stressed and the burden of their work has increased hugely over the last 5 years, [but] teachers who are passionate about DE [sic] will always make room for it and promote it” (Principal Survey 62.29).

This issue of individual commitment to the values of development education is vital and one to which we will return later.

Principals focused on developing curricular opportunities for development education as a short course for the new Junior Cycle and Transition Year (38 percent and 28 percent very interested in these options respectively), acknowledging that it ‘could fit in very well with new Junior Cycle and Transition Year’ (Principal Survey 62.38). This is related to their interest in developing subject support for staff (24 percent very interested in this), seeing broader potential for development education in ‘the context of this school and with the new Junior Cycle, I think there definitely could be greater scope’ (Principal Interview H.2). The potential for development education to facilitate participative learning methods was noted, given its capacity to focus on:

“real ‘stories’, not abstract, and also be pertinent to life stories that our students can relate to. For example, move from discovery of a particular family’s life story in Sierra Leone to a discussion on conditions in that country” (Principal Survey 62.31).

The impact of economic and school contexts for development education
“[T]eachers are very stressed and the burden of their work has increased hugely over the last 5 years, [but] teachers who are passionate about DE [sic] will always make room for it and promote it” (Principal Survey 62.29).
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Principals focused on developing curricular opportunities for development education as a short course for the new Junior Cycle and Transition Year (38 percent and 28 percent very interested in these options respectively), acknowledging that it ‘could fit in very well with new Junior Cycle and Transition Year’ (Principal Survey 62.38). This is related to their interest in developing subject support for staff (24 percent very interested in this), seeing broader potential for development education in ‘the context of this school and with the new Junior Cycle, I think there definitely could be greater scope’ (Principal Interview H.2). The potential for development education to facilitate participative learning methods was noted, given its capacity to focus on:

“real ‘stories’, not abstract, and also be pertinent to life stories that our students can relate to. For example, move from discovery of a particular family’s life story in Sierra Leone to a discussion on conditions in that country” (Principal Survey 62.31).

The impact of economic and school contexts for development education
“[T]eachers are very stressed and the burden of their work has increased hugely over the last 5 years, [but] teachers who are passionate about DE [sic] will always make room for it and promote it” (Principal Survey 62.29).

This issue of individual commitment to the values of development education is vital and one to which we will return later.

Principals focused on developing curricular opportunities for development education as a short course for the new Junior Cycle and Transition Year (38 percent and 28 percent very interested in these options respectively), acknowledging that it ‘could fit in very well with new Junior Cycle and Transition Year’ (Principal Survey 62.38). This is related to their interest in developing subject support for staff (24 percent very interested in this), seeing broader potential for development education in ‘the context of this school and with the new Junior Cycle, I think there definitely could be greater scope’ (Principal Interview H.2). The potential for development education to facilitate participative learning methods was noted, given its capacity to focus on:

“real ‘stories’, not abstract, and also be pertinent to life stories that our students can relate to. For example, move from discovery of a particular family’s life story in Sierra Leone to a discussion on conditions in that country” (Principal Survey 62.31).
Despite the context of economic recession in the country, the relationship between development education activities and finances was not to the forefront of leaders’ minds. However, those involved in immersion projects did highlight funding pressures, describing the frustration when the immersion project that:

“is an integral part of school life and feedback from the previous students who have travelled have described it as a ‘life changing’ event. However, as you can imagine it has become extremely difficult under the current economic climate to come up with funding and donations” (Principal Survey 57.21).

Generally, principals perceived a wide range of opportunities through existing initiatives and networks such as Young Scientist Ireland (38 percent), Science for Development (33 percent), development education day/week in school (21 percent), UNESCO awards (23 percent) and Linking and Immersion programmes (20 percent). Several principals cited the ‘benefits of close partnerships’ describing how it:

“empower[s] students to understand their rights and responsibilities as global citizens, as well as how they have the potential to effect change for a more just and equal world” (Principal Survey 62.10).

They welcomed support from development education providers and policymakers to nurture initiatives and networks.

The opportunities noted by principals must be set within the context of the supportive school culture with clear commitment to development education, with one principal describing how ‘students and adults can get more out of helping someone else than from any other activity’ (Principal Survey 62.41). Others placed this commitment within the institutional context of their school ethos: ‘we are a Catholic school, I think that it is important and should not be just a “tick the box” thing in school’ (Principal Survey 62.9). This context cannot be taken for granted as other issues take precedence in some schools, with one respondent acknowledging that:
“[I]t was very difficult to answer this survey as I have little information or involvement in this area. That is not to say that some of my teachers are not interested in being involved or they may not - certainly in terms of awareness it isn’t a high priority in our school as many of our students and families are disadvantaged” (Principal Survey 62.11).

Conclusion: future opportunities for development education in Irish schools

Ireland’s post-primary schools are clearly active in many forms of development education and are eager to develop an awareness of global issues such as social justice, human rights and intercultural relationships at national and international levels. We found diverse approaches to development education amongst participating schools, revealing how the complexity of the school setting, institutional culture and broader education system impact on involvement in development education.

Different approaches and aspects of development education were evident amongst respondents. For some, a charitable approach dominated where the focus of students’ actions remained limited to inviting ‘visiting speakers and fundraising’ to use a phrase coined by Jeffers (2008: 15); or the approach described by Bryan and Bracken (2011) as ‘development-as-charity’. As these authors would argue, such approaches tended to dilute power and eschewed critical approaches to teaching about global social injustice. They focused on relatively passive forms of action rather than encouraging critical analysis or systemic transformation. A second approach of individualism was often allied to this and focused on the commitment of individual teachers and students, leaving an over-reliance on the energy of individuals rather than a systems-level commitment to development education. Many school leaders expressing this perspective spoke about time pressures and their constant frustration at trying to fit development education into the formal structures of the curriculum and current system.
The third approach emphasised an institutional level of cultural support that was seen as key to ensure that development education became an ‘organic … part of the culture of the school’. Many schools successfully encouraged greater participation on the part of students, teachers and the school community on diverse issues, thereby integrating social justice, human rights and development education into school culture and practice. Drivers of change were acknowledged as crucial with development education initiatives often starting from something very simple and being driven by committed individuals and a supportive school management and wider school community. This cultural identity and commitment to development education was key to understanding the level of dedication and ongoing sustainability of development education, but one which must be located within a supportive environment and structures.

Leaders noted the need for a broader level of support from school bodies and trusteeships for development education efforts. Bryan and Bracken (2010: 24) similarly highlighted the willingness and capacity of school management to support teachers in development education endeavours as crucial, especially new teachers as they develop their professional capacities. Pedagogical capacity-building was important, with many respondents calling for staff workshops to give confidence and support for teachers, especially in the use of the more active learning methodologies associated with development education, echoing Liddy’s findings (2012).

Linked to this is a cross-curricular emphasis with many respondents highlighting the need for broader school networks and institutional and curricular supports for development education. This was often contextualised by the opportunities offered by Transition Year or the new short courses for the Junior Cycle. Many principals felt that development education should be integrated in as many subjects as possible and on a cross-curricular basis. However, others saw its cross-curricular nature as a constraint in the current context where it would struggle to find a place in the existing subject-based system, as also noted by Bryan and Bracken (2011). Systemic level issues are very pertinent with development education’s cross-
curricular nature posing particular challenges and opportunities in the current structure of the post-primary curriculum, examination-driven system, ownership structures and broader educational system.

A fourth element was the local-global emphasis in development education, beginning with local issues and concerns to which students could readily relate, such as a:

“local scheme. Even though I know development education is global … But it would be a strong starting point. It’s about developing what we have and being aware of what’s around locally but also on a wider scale” (Principal Interview J. 3).

This local focus was seen as a way to explore how some of these issues may impact on attitudes to other cultural and diversity issues within Irish society (Tormey and Gleeson, 2012). Principals called for a diverse range of development issues and contexts on a truly global level to be emphasised; not just about Africa. This acknowledged the wider development education conversation, highlighting development education as a way of transversing local and global issues; and moving to a more critical and systemic analysis of power.

These findings raise important implications for development education and for social justice in Irish schools. A holistic sense of commitment to development education in the institutional structures and culture of an organisation is crucial. The traditional ‘silo’ approach of the individual teacher in the classroom leading to isolation and stasis has been part of the teaching culture of the second level system. More collaborative conditions, critical reflexivity and supportive contexts are needed for development education that promotes active learning (Fullan, 2003; North-South Centre of the Council of Europe, 2008). The holistic nature, active methodologies, capacity-building and collaborative ethos encouraged by development education offer potential for a re-imagination of the values of education.
This article identifies the important role of the school leader in supporting development education in schools as well highlighting the challenges and limitations of this perspective. Ultimately, these leaders highlighted the greatest resource for development education as students:

“Young people still have passion, young people have still vision and they’re the people, that like sometimes when we get a bit older we lose a little bit of it ourselves. So I think that we should be tapping that” (Principal Interview H.15).
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‘PLUGGING GAPS, TAKING ACTION’: CONCEPTIONS OF GLOBAL CITIZENSHIP IN GAP YEAR VOLUNTEERING

Rachel J. Wilde

Abstract: This paper presents ethnographic data from a third sector organisation in 2009, as it set up a development education programme to enhance its standard gap year volunteering experience. Beginning with returned British volunteers, the organisation aims to ‘cascade’ more elements of development education into their work so that the principles of international development are embedded into its organisational mission. The stated aim of the programme is to create a community of active global citizens by building on volunteers’ experience of working on development projects, improving their knowledge of international development goals and teaching them campaigning techniques to enable them to design their own ‘actions’ to promote international development.

The paper analyses the approaches of the programme, exploring the constraints and competing interests invested in the scheme by different actors and how these impact on the type of ‘global citizens’ that are crafted through this programme. By reflecting on how development issues are presented and taught to the volunteers, the paper explores what notion of global citizenship emerges in the organisation. As the programme is funded by the UK government, the auditing requirements are quantitatively focused. This concern with numbers shapes, unintentionally, the possibilities for what the programme can be. Due to these limits, the practices of citizenship that emerge from the programme result in individualised actions. These global citizens take on individual responsibility for social problems and global issues and seek to change their own behaviours, rather than reflecting on or tackling political, economic and structural causes collectively. In consequence, the programme represents another form of individual responsibilisation that has become common in the neoliberal political economy. This is at odds with the stated ethos and mission of the
organisation, but symptomatic of the co-option of much of the third sector into neoliberal goals and aims.

**Key words**: Volunteering; voluntourism; neoliberalism; gap year.

The Department for International Development’s Development Awareness Fund (DfID DAF) ran from 2006 to 2010 and provided funding to non-profit organisations for projects that raised public awareness and understanding of development issues outside the formal education system in the UK. In 2010, the coalition government scrapped this funding following a review (COI, 2011) which stated that while the authors felt that development education (DE) had an effect on reducing poverty, there was no quantifiable measure that proved it. The report explicitly stated that the decision about the fund was one of ‘opinion and judgement and therefore a political decision’ (2011: 5). John Hilary argues further that as development education programmes ‘automatically’ include an interrogation of neoliberal economic policies and their effects, the motivation for axing funding was to ensure that these critiques would not take place as the government pursued its own neoliberal austerity measures (2013: 10).

Development education is inherently a political matter because international development tackles how we organise and structure ourselves and distribute resources across the globe, through trade agreements, forms of governance and so on. The purpose of DE and the role of NGOs (non-governmental organisations) and charities in its design, framing and delivery is thus a contentious field. Questions have been raised about whose interests’ DE serves, and whether in particular, it is critical enough of dominant political ideologies which perpetuate the conditions which cause and exacerbate global inequality and injustice (Bryan, 2011; Hilary, 2013; McCloskey, 2012). DE is accused of either ‘falling in’ with the neoliberal marketplace agenda, or being reluctant to offer critiques (Selby and Kagawa, 2011) or framing debates in simplistic forms that fail to increase public understanding of structural causes of poverty (Hilary, 2013). Calls from the academic field and from more radical parts of the third sector (Bagree, 2013;
Hilary, 2013) demand that NGOs be more critical of neoliberal agendas. Selby and Kagawa offer some ideas as to why ‘collusion’ in ideological goals might be happening, suggesting that NGOs make compromises in the hope of a ‘place at the table’ that will ultimately inform policy (2011: 17). Hilary (2013) argues that international NGOs gain more from their collaborations with the powerful than by challenging them, even if this does very little to change the status quo of global inequality.

This paper explores one of the DfID DAF projects where the demand for quantitative measures to prove its effectiveness ensure that this ‘automatic’ critique of neoliberalism was annulled. Instead, this programme, in its focus to ‘plug gaps’ in knowledge and encourage ‘action’ resulted in a form of DE-light. The programme was co-opted by neoliberal agendas rather than critiquing them. I show how the outcomes of a predilection for quantity over quality evaluations in the audit regime means that rather than raising development awareness, the programme acts as a form of governmentality, whereby individuals take action on their selves rather than engaging in collective social change.

This is symptomatic of the neoliberal agenda. Neoliberalism is not simply an ideology that informs policies that affect people’s lives; it operates in multiple ways through individuals, groups, policies and practices via diverse tactics. Allowing markets to function without restriction, and upholding the liberal promise of individual freedom, the doctrine rests on the premise that individual freedom coupled with private property rights, free markets and free trade best serve human progression and wellbeing. Government welfare provision is ‘rolled back’ in case it interferes with the workings of the market (Graeber, 2009: 81), with a combination of market-based institutions and NGOs stepping in to fill the void (Gledhill, 2004: 333).

As neoliberalism becomes ‘part of the fabric of our ways of thinking about and acting upon one another and ourselves’ (Barry, Osborne and Rose, 1996: 7), new techniques of governing citizens develop (Barry, Osborne and Rose, 1996; Biccum, 2007; Cruikshank, 1996; Hyatt, 2002; Lyon-Callo,
2008). In this paper, I look at an ethnographic example of creating ‘global citizens’ and how the system of numerical targets acts as one of these techniques, prompting a form of citizenship that focuses on individualised action.

The concept of ‘global citizens’ – persons who feel a responsibility and affinity to the world as a whole, instead of, or in addition, to their nation-state – is closely associated with development education. As globalisation took root and became subject to critique as a force for exploitative capitalism and inequality, the idea of the global citizen emerged as a potential antidote that would harness the compression of time-space (Harvey, 1989) for good. However, global citizenship lacks coherence and definition, which raises the further question of how to go about creating such a phenomenon. This article explores, through empirical evidence, the early attempts of a British charity, Endeavour, to design and deliver a DE programme that seeks to produce a community of global citizens. It charts the internal debates within the organisation, documenting the concerns of an NGO at the front line of design and delivery and how they understand what they do. This scheme was funded by the DfID DAF before it was scrapped, and the article considers the external constraints that shaped the programme in particular ways, which in turn informed the practices of citizenship that emerged. I argue that the approach of the charity and the auditing requirements of the funder resulted in individualised practices of citizenship. The names used in the presentation of the research are pseudonyms.

**Methodology**

Set up in the 1980s, Endeavour was one of the first organisations to provide unskilled volunteering opportunities for young people. Personal development is one of its key objectives, even while it has branched out into other areas. I spent over a year with Endeavour in 2009-10 conducting anthropological ethnographic fieldwork in their head office in London and on their projects in Central America. As an anthropologist, I took on a participant observer role. In return for access, Endeavour requested that I contribute where possible, rather than being a ‘spare tyre’. Initially I worked
in the charity’s London archive researching their past projects and then as a volunteer in administration and logistics while in Central America. After returning to London, I was asked to support the Global Citizen programme by sourcing teaching resources. As I learnt more about the programme I became increasingly uncomfortable as I realised that it ultimately taught a version of international development that I disagreed with, masking the structural causes of poverty and simplifying development as an easy solution to poverty (Biccum, 2007; Ferguson, 1990; Green and Hulme, 2005).

The initial research design never intended to evaluate Endeavour’s practice in terms of its effectiveness or impact; it was rather an exploration of how a gap year produced a particular form of personhood. However, working on a programme that I disagreed with without in some way evaluating practice would not be possible. Development has been described as anthropology’s ‘evil twin’, inextricably and antagonistically linked to it (Ferguson, 2005). I am not what Lewis (2005: 472) describes as an ‘antagonistic observer’ with a ‘basic hostility’ for development ideas and motives, but nor am I wholly convinced that it is unquestionably a good thing either. Despite my own position of critique regarding international development, my research aims were to understand the concerns of this organisation and how the internal dimensions and external constraints influenced their practice and ideas. Thus, this article acknowledges the critiques of development and the particular form found in gap years and voluntourism, but seeks to set aside critique for its own sake in order to understand the factors at play as these forms are produced and carried out.

**Gap years and voluntourism**

Gap years are a largely distinct British phenomena, becoming increasingly popular elsewhere, and comprising a period outside of formal education or employment. The Longitudinal Study of Young People in England defined a gap year as the year preceding university, while the British Cohort Study identified any breaks in full-time education as a gap (Crawford, Cribb et al., 2012). Jones (2004) classified a gap year as any period between three months to two years, estimating that between 200,000 and 250,000 young
people aged 16-19 took one. Unlike the negative connotation of ‘NEET’ (not in employment, education, or training), gap years usually entail activities to enable personal growth.

Endeavour’s gap year takes the form of overseas volunteering. Young people are with the charity for ten weeks and participate in three projects for three weeks each. This is a short period for each group, but Endeavour has long-term partnerships with NGOs in their host countries and has become more attuned to the principles of sustainable development. Though predominately British, volunteers come from all over the world, including from within the host countries. They attract many pre-university students, as well as graduates, but Endeavour also has several partnerships with youth organisations who work with disadvantaged young people.

Their programme is explicitly about personal development and these ideals are intimately connected with neoliberalism, but as I argue more comprehensively in my thesis, neoliberalism is not all pervasive. The model of personal development is rooted in connections to others, emphasising relationships and cognisance of an individual’s impact upon others. Particular employees at Endeavour were keen to re-educate those volunteers who wanted to ‘help the needy’ in a paternalistic manner, seeking to show them the need for working in partnership as equals. Endeavour also expected that volunteers would make a difference in their home communities once they returned home to put into practice what they had learnt abroad. With the growth of other charities and businesses in an emerging gap year market throughout the 1990s and 2000s, differentiation became of particular importance for Endeavour. Endeavour’s new global citizen programme was supposed to emphasise this latter aspect of the gap year, as well as function as part of their differentiation efforts.

The critiques of voluntourism include the reinforcement of colonialist stereotypes and a simplistic understanding of development issues, giving young people the view that they have the skills and right to be the ‘solution’ to the problems of the ‘needy’ Third World (Simpson, 2004,
2005). Simpson also highlights the tendency to construct poverty as absolute, only suffered by a ‘foreign other’ and the reliance on ‘culture’ to explain difference, which means these representations fail to acknowledge material – and I would add structural – inequalities (2004: 687–98). Other issues are the lack of acknowledgement on the part of volunteers of their own power and role in continued global inequality, and the lack of accounts from the communities where these projects take place (Griffin, 2004). The motivations of individuals span a wide spectrum, Sin (2009), for example, categorises volunteer motivations, showing how shorter-term volunteers may be more concerned with personal goals and growth, while longer term volunteers had a more altruistic desire to contribute. Lyons et al (2012) argue that though this form of travel has potential for global citizenship values, it is increasingly evident of its co-optation by neoliberal agendas.

The third sector does not operate in a vacuum, and the pervasiveness of neoliberalism is evident in much of the practice and ideas found in gap year volunteering. Endeavour is aware of the critiques of gap years and ‘voluntourism’, particularly with regard to the portrayal of gap year participants as drunken louts for whom volunteering is fashionable rather than meaningful (Barkham, 2006; Frean, 2006; Mirani, 2010; Roberts, 2004; Simpson, 2004; Tubb, 2006). In response, Endeavour is keen to style itself as a serious development organisation, rather than a travel agency for eco-tourists or voluntourism. While this does not annul these critiques, I will set these aside to focus on the processes by which they seek to do this, and show how this largely fails.

The programme’s aim is to ‘create a community of active global citizens’ by building on volunteers’ experience of working on development projects, improving their knowledge of international development goals and teaching them campaigning techniques to enable them to design their own ‘actions’ to promote international development. It is also part of Endeavour’s mission to carve an organisational identity based on sustainable development. This adds both a ‘unique selling point’ to their gap years, and
opens up new strands of funding vital for ensuring the survival of the organisation.

The Global Citizen programme began with the returned British volunteers, with the next steps to ‘cascade’ more elements of development education into all areas of their work so that the principles of international development are embedded into its own organisational mission. This would primarily be delivered through weekend residential workshops. The form of DE-light that emerges from these workshops stems from the conceptualisation of knowledge as rooted in experience rather than a broader understanding of global structures and processes, and the definition of action as communicating to the greatest number of people possible.

Plugging gaps: Experience as knowledge
The workshop activities were designed on the premise that the volunteers ‘know’ about international development because they have experienced life abroad and volunteered on a development project. The trainers felt that all that was needed was to help the volunteers realise how the work they had done fitted into the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs); now superseded by the Sustainable Development Goals. As a quote from their website explains:

“Your direct experience of living and working with communities with limited access to basic services places you in an ideal position to communicate a deeper understanding of global inequality and injustice.”

This is part of Endeavour’s overall understanding of learning and education which is based on an experiential learning model – all their personal development activities are based on the premise that people learn things by doing them, and learning is enhanced if they can consciously acknowledge and evaluate what they are learning as or after they have done it. After a presentation on the MDGs, the volunteers were put into groups to discuss how the projects they had worked on ‘matched’ the MDG goals and indicators. Fitting a gravity water feed system, for instance, came under Goal
7 (Ensure Environmental Sustainability) and Target 10 aimed to halve, by 2015, the proportion of people without sustainable access to safe drinking water and basic sanitation.

The volunteers had experienced what it is like to live without running water, and some were capable of describing this with passion. This supports the critique that these initiatives encourage unskilled young people to believe they can be the solution to the needs of the poor. Similarly, their positions of privilege, their ability to come home to hot showers and smart phones is left unacknowledged. The voices of those who live every day without water are mediated by the volunteers’ own experience. The inherent contradiction is that, though the ethos of the charity is global interconnection, power relations are unexamined. In privileging volunteers’ experiential knowledge of international development, a crucial aspect of DE – ‘that the voices of the marginalised are heard’ (Bourn, 2005: 55) – is forgotten. The focus on their direct experience is aimed at helping the young people feel empowered as advocates and agents of social change (though the efficacy of this is not self-evident), and to recognise that there is a higher cost if their experience is not linked to global structural inequalities and injustice and their causes. Discussions, for example, about the privatisation of water in some countries and the effects of this on communities were never broached. Instead, discussions focused on how their individual actions and choices in water use had implications elsewhere – for instance quoting the amount of water used in producing a beef burger. The focus ends up on the individual rather than the collective.

There was a fear and lack of confidence in tackling bigger issues and engaging the young people in more critical thinking. Endeavour’s volunteers come from a range of educational backgrounds and levels of life experience. The coordinator of the programme, Fozhan, explained to me:

“The workshops get them to consider the issues they’re working on [during the projects], the wider issue surrounding it and what they can do about it when they go back to the UK. It gives them a hook
to what they can change at home, so they can take action and raise awareness. There’s a perception that development is academic, that you need all this knowledge, and people are afraid to get it wrong … I think we lose people if we go the academic route. People have different knowledge backgrounds. Our approach is to take personal things, have conversations. They don’t need to know definitions, they don’t need to know about the IMF or World Bank, they don’t need to be academic. On the weekends, there’s been interest, but also some fears about talking about it. The point to get across is that they have witnessed development by going on Endeavour. They have an opinion, they’ve lived with communities. This is valid, they are able now to have a conversation.”

Questions about what development is, the global structures and bureaucracies involved in it, indeed any form of ‘academic knowledge’ are rejected here in favour of ‘experience’.

**Taking action: Quantity over quality**

The second day of the workshops focuses on what the volunteers can do with their ‘knowledge’. Action is defined in terms of reaching the maximum number of people with a simple ‘message’. Helen, one of the trainers told the volunteers:

“Day one of this weekend was all about plugging any gaps in your knowledge about development and global issues. Day two is going to be about action … The aim is to think about what we’re going to do about what we learnt yesterday. Acknowledging that we’re only scratching the surface of these issues, how can you spread the development message, in a way that works for you. We don’t want to be prescriptive here but it’s important to think about what’s effective.”

Activities include an introduction to campaigning on Twitter, including coming up with tweetable captions for photographs of their projects, and using an ‘impact matrix’ to assess the ‘effectiveness’ of actions and the ease
of execution. Suggested actions range from starting a blog, to screening a film about a particular issue, to writing something for a local newspaper. They fall into two broad categories: organising an event at which people listen and watch a film or presentation or writing something that people could read and distributing it through some form of media. The volunteers I spoke to raised concerns about their own level of knowledge about international development, and their lack of confidence in communicating these ideas to others. When this is raised with the trainers, they assure the volunteers that they have the necessary knowledge, and ask them to concentrate on assessing which would be the most ‘productive’ action ideas. The quality of engagements, the accuracy of information or nuance or depth is not considered.

Despite the fact that knowledge and understanding of international development is the main project output, and increased knowledge on the part of the volunteers is specified as an indicator, learning is not an action – it is not productive because it cannot be directly translated into the project’s monitoring and evaluation criteria. Learning is seen to have already happened through the volunteers’ experience, fortified by workshops and then completed, rather than a continual process. Volunteers ‘know’ about development because they have ‘done’ it. As Fozhan expressed it ‘they have witnessed development by going on Endeavour’.

For the Global Citizen programme, action is defined by whether it has a measurable output. Endeavour’s role is to teach their volunteers via the expeditions, and ‘embedded’ training before, during and after expeditions in the form of workshops or facilitated discussions and then volunteers should go and do ‘actions’ based on their improved knowledge and understanding. Reaching the greatest amount of people is key. This is represented by the methods Fozhan advocates: ‘Update your Facebook status, tweet!’ she urged. The type of actions suggested by the programme, and the skills it teaches, are orientated towards communications and raising awareness about development. As well as fitting into DfID’s funding criteria, there are further reasons for this emphasis. One is due to Fozhan and her worries about
teaching international development and her perceptions of the volunteers. Fozhan has concerns about the volunteers’ capacity to understand development in what she termed an ‘abstract’ way. The programme also has more than one purpose to fulfil. Officially, the programme aims on the funding proposal were to:

“create a network of highly motivated, skilled and knowledgeable young people to promote awareness of international development issues including global interdependence and the role an individual can play in working towards issues such as poverty reduction.”

The CEO and fundraising team wanted the programme to keep alumni engaged with the charity, hoping for donations further down the line. Other objectives included that the volunteers would go on to do advocacy work at schools, which would raise awareness of development, but also advertise the quality of their experience with Endeavour. As stated previously, it was also hoped this would evidence Endeavour’s commitment to sustainable development as a ‘serious organisation’ which didn’t just provide gap year jaunts. Others within the organisation felt that this was the wrong direction for the charity, which should primarily be focused on supporting young people. The volunteers’ motivations were partly social, partly wanting to recapture their experiences as well as an interest in global issues. Navigating these multiple expectations for the programme was far from easy, and for Fozhan, a focus on practical actions are a way to keep all the volunteers engaged and to help them feel that the programme and international development is accessible. It also creates a clear purpose for people, annulling confusion over what they are supposed to do due to the lack of clarity concerning the concept of ‘global citizenship’. This results in a version of DE light, focused on ‘plugging gaps’ rather than critical thinking and actions that are easy to record.

The audit regime
The funding requirements also played a significant part in shaping the programmes objectives. Fozhan had to provide solid numerical data to DfID
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to fulfil the proposal audit categories every quarter and produce an annual report. Funding was reviewed every year, and projects that failed to reach targets would not receive continued funding. The funding provided the salaries for two and a half employees, and as I have explained, was part of several broader organisation goals. Meeting these targets therefore became a preoccupation for those on the funding team. Outcomes were measured by indicators with specific numerical targets, as well as additional monthly monitoring and evaluation.

The original proposal for the funding states that the outcomes are to increase knowledge and understanding of international development issues. The core indicator is a questionnaire that utilises an understanding scale of core concepts: The Millennium Development Goals, Sustainable Development, Fair Trade, Global Poverty, Global Injustice, Global Interdependence. Before and after the workshops volunteers must self-evaluate their understanding from excellent to poor. Endeavour had to submit quarterly reports to DfID, but monitored themselves on a monthly basis. They record the awareness of key international development issues before and after volunteering, with the target of 95 percent of those surveyed to demonstrate an increase. They aimed to recruit forty-five ex-volunteers per year to carry out regular awareness activities, with the target of them engaging with 1,350 people a year. This meant each volunteer would need to reach thirty people, hence the focus on methods like Twitter that can reach a lot of people with very little effort. Over three years, they aim for 20,000 young people to visit the information on their webpages, Facebook page or online discussion groups. Note these targets say nothing about the quality of engagement, only the quantity. The workshops were designed on the basis of meeting these targets, rather than a consideration of the learning objectives.

Endeavour must prove continually that it is ‘hitting targets’ and ‘achieving goals’ or its funding will be rescinded. Audit has become part and parcel of neoliberal regimes (Pels, 2000: 135; Strathern, 2000: 3) across many sectors. As Shore and Wright (2000) show in the context of higher education in the UK, assessment of ‘teaching quality’ is more concerned with
the production of evidence of concrete products than an academic’s ability to inspire students. Michael Power argues that auditing techniques demonstrate that:

“…what is being assured is the quality of the control systems rather than the quality of first order operations. In such a context accountability is discharged by demonstrating the existence of such systems of control, not by demonstrating good teaching, caring, manufacturing or banking” (1994: 15).

Similarly, as Bryan (2011: 3) highlights, the neoliberal emphasis on ideals such as ‘performance, efficiency and accountability’ predominate in the development field. This concern means that indicators end up driving goals, rather than indicators being derived from the overarching development goals. As Unterhalter (2005) elaborates, the scope of targets such as the MDGs become flattened as the nuance and complexity of an issue such as gender equality is reduced to a measurable indicator. The ways in which indicators represent particular global issues can restrict policy interventions and thereby perpetuate the problem (Green 2006; Green and Hulme, 2005). In Endeavour’s case, the requirement for numerical evidence, to prove their performance and efficiency and be accountable to the funders, shapes the programme, and accordingly shapes the practices of citizenship that it encourages.

Strathern notes that audits are supposedly to ensure ‘good practice’, to be effective and explicit about what an organisation is doing. Actually, she argues, audit ‘creates organizations responsive to the auditing process’ (2006: 190). The concern becomes less about ‘good practice’ rather the ‘right practice’ – in this case, that specified by the audit criteria set by the DfID DAF. Shore and Wright argue, following Foucault, that while at first glance, the ‘transfer’ of auditing practices from the financial sector to other arenas may seem ‘dull, routine and bureaucratic’ these kinds of practices often have ‘profound effects on social life ... Audit technologies ... are not simply innocuously neutral, legal-rational practices ... they are agents for the
creation of new kinds of subjectivity: self-managing individuals who render themselves auditable’ (2000: 57). This can be seen again in the conclusions of the review of the DfID DAF – though the authors felt it ‘likely’ that raising awareness of development did reduce poverty, the inability to ‘quantify the contribution’ meant the decision was founded on other grounds (COI, 2011: 4–5).

**Individualised practices of citizenships**
What emerged from my fieldwork was an emphasis on individually orientated activities, in contrast to the ethos of the charity that focus on interconnections and awareness of an individual’s impact upon others around them. The final activity of the Global Citizen weekend best displays this emphasis on personal action. Fozhan explains to the volunteers that as they have completed the training weekend they are now Global Citizens and that it is time to make a pledge, to pick an action that they are going to carry out. Helen asks the group to read them out. Despite the emphasis over the weekend on reaching out to other people, most of the pledges refer to making small changes to their own, individual lives. A few examples are: buy fair-trade when available, turn the tap off while brushing my teeth or while soaping up in the shower, buy local produce instead of products flown in from other countries. One pair decides to make a film of different people’s interpretations of development, but they are the only ones to suggest anything beyond making a change to their own individual existence, or to work as a team.

These Global Citizens take on individual responsibility for social problems and global issues and seek to change their own behaviours, rather than reflecting on or tackling political, economic and structural causes collectively – or even by seeking to tell others about their direct experience of development, as was hoped. This indicates that their experiential knowledge is less easily translated into social change. Similarly, forthcoming findings from research with primary and secondary school children also found that individualised actions, particularly regarding consumption were more common than other forms of engagement (Hunt and
Cara, forthcoming). In consequence, the programme represents another form of individual responsibilisation that has become common in the neoliberal political economy. As April Biccum argues:

“The mobilization of development awareness in the UK attempts to produce a subjectivity particularly appropriate for a globalising world, that is, a ‘Global Citizen’ who advocates development under neoliberal terms … Rather than signalling the success of global civil society in making development an issue for national debate” (2007: 1112).

This is not the primary intention of the Global Citizen programme, rather it is how things ‘turn out’ (Ferguson, 1990: 19). Perhaps this a less than suprising outcome, given how neoliberalism has encroached into the third sector as NGOs have sought to become more professional. Despite this, the outcomes of the programme feel at odds with the larger ethos and mission of the organisation, and the experiences of the volunteers on their gap years, where teamwork and the collective goal had been paramount. Neoliberalism operates on a promise of individual freedoms in return for citizens taking on individual responsibility (Harvey, 2005). In this case, individual responsibility for ‘global issues’ means making changes to individuals’ own lives, to become personally accountable for their actions, to audit their own behaviour.

**Conclusion**

Endeavour’s programme would seem to fall foul of the critiques of DE presented in the introduction to this article. The way knowledge is conceptualised produces a form of DE light, focused on brief experiences that can translate into actions that can be easily recorded. The young people seem to struggle to engage with these and end up ‘taking action’ on themselves. Rather than simply offering another critique, this paper has sought to document how the internal concerns of the organisation have played a role in this. Endeavour’s desire to reposition their purpose, the fractures this caused and the difficulties of the volunteers’ diversity have
been significant for the way the programme was run. Similarly, the external expectations from the funders also defined how action was conceived. Developing DE programmes that create the envisioned global citizens requires NGOs to recognise and acknowledge their role and the way they are conceptualising DE and global citizenship. I do not believe Endeavour’s failings in this area were intentional, rather that they did not see how their goals were being subsumed. The genuine belief and desire for these young people and the charity to make a difference in the world became unintentionally co-opted into supporting the neoliberal agenda. One means of challenging the neoliberal agenda would be to develop new forms of evaluating DE that are not focused on quantifying learning and impact but instead rewards critical engagement, debate and an understanding of learning as an unceasing process.
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EXPLORING GLOBAL CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION THROUGH INTEGRATED CURRICULA

Brighid Golden

Abstract: This article is informed by a qualitative case study of a primary school in England which developed an integrated school curriculum which focused on global citizenship education (GCE). The school followed a number of steps to create an integrated curriculum with the aim of inspiring its students to engage in global learning and active citizenship. If we are to prepare our students to be effective citizens, we must inspire them to engage with lifelong learning, and not to discard subjects when they have been completed school. Lifelong learning is essential to the aspirations of GCE which aims to equip students to be effective citizens in an ever changing global society (Banks, 2008; Merryfield and Duty, 2008; Banks, 2006; Davies et al., 2010).

This article outlines a number of delivery models for curricula which range from the traditional fragmented model of delivery where subjects follow very distinctive divisions to pure student-led immersed models in which discipline lines fade and the student is enabled to choose the most effective themes and methods to explore topics (Fogarty, 1991; Kysilka, 1998). According to Kysilka (1998) and Drăghicescu et al. (2013) the main focus of effective integrated curricula is on forming connections between the school and the ‘real world’. Indeed, many researchers have found that students who have been exposed to integrated curricula experience both higher academic achievement and a deeper engagement with the topics explored (DeLuca et al., 2015; Anderson, 2013; Drăghicescu et al., 2013; Cervetti et al., 2012; Johnston, 2011; White, 2008; Schultz, 2007).
**Key words:** Global Citizenship Education; schools’ curricula; integrated delivery, immersive education; lifelong learning.

Dewey (1902) has taught us that the ‘child’ and the ‘subject’ are interdependent elements which shape school curricula. When examining the way in which we deliver curricula in schools it is vital that our aspirations for the ‘child’ are intertwined with the ‘subject’ matter we wish to deliver. Fogarty (1991: 61) describes subjects in the traditional fragmented model of curricula as ‘something you take once and need never take again’. This concept is counter to the aspirations for the ‘child’ within global citizenship education (GCE) which aims to equip students to be effective citizens in an ever changing global society (Banks, 2006, 2008; Davies et al., 2010; Merryfield and Duty, 2008). If we are to prepare our students to be effective citizens, we must inspire them to engage with lifelong learning, and not to discard a subject once it has been completed. Furthermore, Ashbridge and Josephidou (2009) have stated that due to the way in which children learn, an integrated approach to curriculum design and delivery is the most effective way to support children’s learning and development. Integrated curricula are those which blur the divisions between subject specific teachings and allow themes and topics to be taught through multiple curricular subjects simultaneously.

This article is informed by a qualitative case study of a primary school in England which developed an integrated school curriculum which focused on GCE. The school in question was highlighted as an example of good practice in the area of GCE by TIDE Global Learning which has worked with a number of schools in the design and implementation of global curricula.

**What is an integrated curriculum?**

There are a number of delivery models which curricula can follow from the traditional fragmented model to a pure student-led immersed model (Fogarty, 1991). The fragmented model organises the curriculum along distinct disciplines, traditionally focusing heavily on mathematics and language. The
ten levels of curriculum integration outlined by Fogarty (1991) identify ways that teachers can ‘blend content and/or create seamless curricula’ (Kysilka, 1998: 198). The curriculum designed by the case study school lies somewhere between level six, the webbed model, and level ten, the networked model. The essential element of the webbed model is the construction of learning around central themes, which was the main focus in the case study school. However, the school did not focus on these themes through distinct subjects, but followed the integrated model of level eight where discipline lines faded and themes were explored through multiple subjects simultaneously (Kysilka, 1998). Elements of level ten, the networked model, were also evident in the case study school as children were in control of the integration process and directed their own learning (Fogarty, 1991).

Kysilka (1998) has labelled the networked model as highly sophisticated and therefore unlikely to exist in either primary or secondary school. Within the case study, school children were given the freedom to choose the themes and methods to explore them. However, it cannot be said that they directed their learning with complete discipline as one might expect given the age group. Teachers needed to ensure that certain learning outcomes were met and so guided the learning and exploration undertaken by the students. Alternative models of integrated curricula are offered by Drăghicescu et al. (2013), who identify four levels of curriculum construction, ranging from monodiciplinarity to transdisciplinarity. While elements of all four levels were evident in the curriculum of the case study school, it was most closely linked with level two, multidisciplinarity. Within this level, multiple disciplines or subjects are engaged with central themes.

Drăghicescu et al. (2013) have also identified a number of elements evident in effective integrated curricula which are in line with those identified by Kysilka (1998). According to Kysilka (1998) and Drăghicescu et al. (2013) the main focus of effective integrated curricula is a connection to society and the ‘real world’. By focusing on themes and issues which are grounded in reality, student engagement is heightened and their learning and
acquisition of skills is deepened. A second essential feature of integrated curricula is an effective partnership between the teacher and students working co-operatively and thereby enhancing the learning experience of all. Additionally, Anderson (2013) has articulated that effective integrated curricula go beyond textbooks in the search for knowledge, and use themes to organise principles being explored.

Many of the above elements were evident in the case study school, which chose to focus its integrated curricula on GCE in order to create a connection to the ‘real world’. There was also a strong partnership evident between staff and students in the school who worked together to create diverse learning experiences that went beyond textbooks. Many researchers have found that students who have been exposed to integrated curricula experience both higher academic achievement and a deeper engagement with topics explored (Anderson, 2013; Cervetti et al., 2012; DeLuca et al., 2015; Drăghicescu et al., 2013; Johnston, 2011; Schultz, 2007; White, 2008). Schultz (2007) has noted in particular that when focusing on solving a problem, students began reading at a much higher aptitude level than they were used to, and consistently challenged themselves across curriculum subjects in order to reach their goal.

Curriculum integration and global citizenship education
The case study school chose to implement an integrated curriculum as a means to strengthening its commitment to and focus on GCE within the school. While GCE is an evolving field, the case study established that it sits within the discourses of human rights, social justice, and democracy (Clough and Holden, 1996; Davies, 2006; Dower, 2003; Osler and Starkey, 2005; Oxfam, 2006; Poulsen-Hanson, 2002; Smyth, 2011; Tanner, 2007). The school’s interpretation of GCE can be aligned with Dower’s (2003: 7) interconnected components of being a global citizen, namely ‘the normative claim’, ‘the existential claim’ and ‘the aspirational claim’.

Due to his belief in human rights and responsibilities, the school principal was most closely aligned with Dower’s (2003) ‘normative claim’.
This claim holds that global citizens have duties and responsibilities as human beings and that all human beings are worthy of ‘moral respect’. The school’s global curriculum leader had a strong commitment to acting for justice in the world which was in line with Dower’s ‘existential claim’ which posits that as citizens of the world, we are all members of a global community, sometimes understood as ‘institutional or quasi-political in character’. The children interviewed and observed were very ambitious in their world view, and believed that all human beings had the potential to become effective global citizens. This world view is closely linked with Dower’s (2003) third component, the ‘aspirational claim’ which holds ‘that the world can and should become one in which basic values are realised more fully’ and that this requires the strengthening of community and institutions. Dower (2003: 7) holds that these three elements are not mutually exclusive and that in an individual’s approach to the world, these claims will overlap to varying degrees. Although I align members of the school community with just one standpoint, I understand that their beliefs overlapped. The variety of beliefs within the school contributed to an atmosphere of mutual support and growth.

White (2008) outlines that an effective way of addressing social and cultural issues in society is for teachers to embed issues of social justice throughout the curriculum. Indeed, due to a focus on social justice issues directly affecting his pupils, Shultz’s (2007) students were energised in their learning and he posited that ‘every subject lost its compartmentalisation and became integrated and integral in solving the problem’. The students in the case study school also transcended the curriculum in their exploration of GCE. While focusing on the theme of home, children in the case study school chose to create a new country as they asserted that governments needed to become more participatory and communities more united.

**Methodology**

This article is guided by a qualitative case study which was undertaken as part of a Masters thesis in 2013. It examined ‘the inclusion of GCE in a primary school in England’ (Golden, 2013). There were a number of
elements within these boundaries including; the teaching and learning of GCE, the perspectives of teachers and learners, and the overall school atmosphere. Thomas (2011: 13) views the case study as a situation or event, and advises us to attend to the particular set of circumstances which surrounded it. In this instance the case study was influenced at a macro level by national educational policy and at a local level by the socio-economic make-up of the local community.

This case study embraced a multiple methods approach (Robson, 2011), including: one-on-one interviews, focus groups, observation, draw and write, photographs, and document analysis. Rogers (2009: 103) embraces multiple methods in order to ‘privilege the participants’ choice of what data they chose to contribute’. This view is particularly noteworthy in relation to working with children as we need to be ‘open to the many creative ways young children use to express their views and experiences’ (Clark & Moss, 2001: 5). I conducted two individual interviews; one with a classroom teacher – the global curriculum leader – and the other with the school principal. I also held three focus groups with children as I sought to develop knowledge ‘with’ children and not just ‘for’ or ‘about’ them (McNaughton & Smith, 2005: 112).

Structured observation was used in the classroom using a predetermined category recording system where the number of times different categories of behaviour, activities and content were evident in the classroom were recorded. I also made detailed field notes about the activities and lesson content as well as personal reflections throughout the process. While some researchers (Robson, 2011; Thomas, 2009; Simpson et al., 1995) advocate for a higher level of detail in recording through the use of time-scale check-lists, this strategy was not relevant in this instance as there was such a wide range of variables being focused on.

Both photography and draw-and-write pictures were used during focus groups with the children to afford them maximum opportunity to convey their thoughts and experiences through a variety of media. Visual
methods aided the communication process between adults and children (Backett-Milburn and McKie, 1999: 389). On my first visit to the school, children were given an information pack which included written instructions for a draw-and-write task and a request for photographs to be taken on the theme of GCE. These were then used in focus group interviews to elicit information and stimulate conversation. Harper (2010: 13) contends that ‘...images evoke deeper elements of human consciousness than words; exchanges based on words alone utilise less of the brain’s capacity than do exchanges in which the brain is processing images as well as words’. Bradding and Horstman (1999: 173) maintain that ‘the draw and write technique generated rich, qualitative data that has immediate impact and value in its own right’. I found that the visual data created by the children offered a useful insight into their views and thoughts. Secondary data comprised school documents, the school website, and the most recent Ofsted (Office for Standards in Education, Children’s Services and Skills) report and Department for Education (DfE) performance data. Three school documents were also examined: the Curriculum Policy, Equal Opportunities Policy, and Personal, Social and Health Education Policy.

**How one school developed an integrated global citizenship curriculum**

The school made the decision to focus on global citizenship, and subsequently created an integrated curriculum following a review of activities being undertaken in the school and in response to the national educational context. Previously, the sole interaction with global learning in the school was a partnership with a school in The Gambia, which was largely seen by staff as ‘one sided and imbalanced’. The school was also struggling with a national curriculum they found restrictive and not in-line with their desire to focus on global citizenship. The steps taken to implement the integrated GCE curriculum can be seen in the table below.
The role of the Global Curriculum Leader outlined in step two was found to be instrumental in designing and implementing the new curriculum and in maintaining the school commitment over time. The Global Curriculum Leader ensured that staff engaged in continued professional and personal development in the area of GCE; she also coordinated school-wide events and trips on the theme of GCE and monitored the continued implementation of the integrated GCE curriculum.
The digital tool which can be seen in step four was key to easing the stress of teachers trying to meet the objectives of a national ‘monodisciplinary’ or ‘fragmented’ curriculum while allowing their students to guide their own thematic integrated learning. This tool was installed in all the school computers and allowed the teachers to tick off national curriculum objectives as soon as they were covered and track subjects which were being neglected. There was also space within the tool for teachers to make a note of the themes covered by the class and the way each objective was met. The information from this tool was then passed on to the teacher taking the class the following year, which allowed teachers to ensure there was minimal repetition of themes and enabled pupils to build on the skills learned on previous years.

Within class groups, teachers would allow their students to choose a weekly or monthly theme. In older classes students were given the opportunity to choose the themes themselves, whereas, in younger classes, students voted on a set list of themes provided by the teacher. Students then brainstormed on ways to explore their theme and were given the opportunity to guide their own learning and choose methodologies used to explore themes. Through interviews, focus groups and observation it became evident that activities spanned multiple national curriculum subjects, including geography, history, English, art and design, design and technology, mathematics, Information and Communication Technology (ICT) and music.

Using the digital curriculum tool, teachers could track what national curriculum aims were being met by their students. The Global Curriculum Leader identified pupil-led lessons, questioning and discussion as the most frequently used methodologies in the school. She outlined that children were encouraged to work from their own initiative, but occasionally teachers needed to deliver focused teaching to ensure national curriculum objectives were being met. She maintained that pupils often met objectives without realising it as teachers ‘lead a lot more into questioning and discussion in class – there isn't a lot of delivery – I think it’s just us tweaking and where we want the children to go’ (Golden, 2013). Whole-school projects and
activities were often used by the school to maintain the commitment to GCE and further reinforce the pupils learning. Multiple class groups sometimes focused on the same theme and created group projects which were used to engage in peer teaching on the theme. The school also engaged regularly in whole-school assemblies where students and teachers could discuss topics and display work carried out in class groups.

The teachers also spoke of a strong connection with parents, with whom they engaged in on-going consultation and discussion. One example given by the Global Curriculum Leader highlighted the tensions which sometimes exist between the aspirations of the school, and the viewpoints of the parents. The school wanted to take the children to a mosque to learn about Islam in an attempt to counter stereotypes, but many parents felt that the school was promoting extremism and objected to students participating in the trip. The teachers and principal responded by inviting a British soldier to speak with both children and parents about his experiences of Muslim people in Afghanistan. Through discussion and debate, the school and the parents came to a collective decision to go ahead with the trip to the mosque.

Malik et al. (2011) outline twelve tips for developing an integrated curriculum. The case study school follows tips which advocate for training staff members, deciding on the scope and level of integration, continued communication with students and staff, and making a commitment to ongoing evaluation. The school falls down where Malik et al. (2011) promote devising assessment methods and establishing a comprehensive timetable and list of themes to follow. While the school actively chose to follow a more fluid approach to implementing their curriculum without predetermined themes, they admitted to a weakness in their approach to assessment of integrated learning.

Conclusions
According to data analysis, the case study school aligned itself with Fielding’s (2012: 688) fifth level of school organisation: ‘Schools as agents of Democratic Fellowship’. Fielding posits that the ways in which we work
in schools should be transformed by the moral character of what we are doing. This was evident in the case study school as the commitment to and interpretation of GCE strongly influenced the practices, ethos and policies of the school. Organising a school along democratic principles is recognised as an essential element of GCE (Cough and Holden, 1996; Davies, 2006; Osler & Starkey, 2005; Poulsen-Hanson, 2002; Tanner, 2007). The democratic practices being employed in the school were praised by Ofsted who claimed that children’s involvement in decision making was having a positive effect on their learning. The most recent Ofsted inspection to be carried out prior to the case study in September 2011 resulted in the school being rated as ‘Good’. Ofsted was impressed by the school’s commitment to GCE and the evident impact on its students, stating that ‘the global learning project (GLP) promotes pupils’ good knowledge and understanding of different cultures and communities’, and that the GLP is a key driver in pupils’ involvement in planning and guiding their own learning.

As mentioned above, members of the school community have slightly different interpretations of GCE, which was not seen to create a tension but rather a symbiotic whole within the school. During interviews, the school community highlighted that their interpretation of GCE clashed with government ideals for education. This tension between prescriptive national curricula and the principles and ideals of GCE has been mirrored by other researchers (Davies et al., 2005; DfID, 2003; Rapoport, 2010; SERDEC & LDESG, 2002, cited in Davies, 2006). During an Irish Development Education Association (IDEA) annual conference, Wegimont (2013: 8) posited that ‘a paradigm shift is required to put global education at the heart of educational systems’. The case study school invested heavily in the development of GCE through self-reflection working with an outside organisation, and developing policies and curriculum approaches. However, as Wegimont (2013) articulated, in order for GCE to advance nationally, a paradigm shift must occur in order to ensure both government and schools are working towards the same goals. Evidence from the case study suggests that the ‘paradigm shift’ required is a move towards the introduction of a
more integrated national curriculum, breaking down the barriers of existing fragmented curricula.

The key elements in the success of the integrated curriculum found in the school were the development of the digital tool for curriculum tracking and the establishment of the Global Curriculum Leadership role within the school. These two elements allowed the school to maintain its strong child-centred focus without losing sight of their commitment to progress GCE within the school.
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EMBEDDING DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION IN POST-PRIMARY TEACHING AND LEARNING: LESSONS FROM WORLDWISE GLOBAL SCHOOLS

Mary McCarthy and Mary Gannon

Abstract: WorldWise Global Schools, the Irish government’s development education (DE) programme for post-primary schools in Ireland, concluded its first phase of operation in May 2016. This article draws from the findings of the final evaluation of the programme conducted by one of the authors. The article outlines the context, progress and recommendations from the programme’s first phase, with a view to incorporating lessons learned into any future support provided for schools. The programme aims to enable schools to embed development education effectively and sustainably into their teaching and learning.
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“What is Development Education? The breaking of the bubble. To rattle the cages. To make the world a better place” (WWGS teacher, 2016).

WorldWise Global Schools (WWGS) is the Irish government’s development education (DE) programme for post primary schools, which is being implemented within the framework of a four-year strategy (WorldWise Global Schools, 2013). It is the key channel through which Irish Aid support for post primary DE is being coordinated, designed as a one-stop shop of training, funding, resources and guidance. WWGS is managed by a consortium comprising Gorta Self Help Africa, Concern Worldwide and the Curriculum Development Unit of the City of Dublin Education and Training Board.

WWGS concluded its first phase in May 2016. The programme has been extended until August 2017, at which time it is expected that a second
multi-annual phase will be implemented. However, it is not yet clear what the shape or content of that future programme will be. It is therefore of critical importance that the impact of WWGS to date, and key learning from its implementation in 2013-16 is examined in detail and shared, so that the momentum that has been created over a three-year period may be consolidated and built on.

**Background**

WWGS was initiated in late 2012 as the successor to the Irish Aid-funded WorldWise Schools Linking and Immersion Scheme, an initiative managed by Léargas that had run from 2008-11, focusing exclusively on supporting DE through the medium of global school partnerships (Wilkinson, 2011). WWGS, in contrast to its predecessor, was designed to have a broader remit than school linking alone, with a stated aim to increase the quality and quantity of DE taking place in post primary schools throughout Ireland, via a broad range of interventions and supports.

WWGS was, partially, established in response to some of the challenges surrounding DE in Irish post primary schools that had been identified through a number of sources including: the final evaluation of the Schools Linking and Immersion Scheme (Wilkinson, 2011); feedback from non-governmental organisations (NGOs) with a long track record in working on DE with schools; and broader research and evaluation on how DE is understood and practised in school settings, most significantly an influential report on how DE is taught in schools by Bryan and Bracken called *Learning to Read the World* (2012).

The challenges to delivering DE in schools identified by these sources included:

- No shared, common understanding by schools of the theory and practice of DE;

- A charity perspective still dominant, rather than a justice/human rights-based approach;
• A disparate and uneven spread of schools actively engaging in DE;

• DE expertise housed primarily within NGOs rather than being successfully transferred to schools via teacher capacity-building;

• No clear definition of what a school’s ‘active engagement’ with DE means or looks like in practice;

• A lack of shared tools to measure the benefit and impact of DE in school settings;

• Teachers lacking the confidence to implement DE in the classroom;

• A plethora of resources available but not spread across the curriculum, nor accompanied with appropriate continuing professional development (CPD) for teachers;

• The relatively minor status of DE in schools, albeit with further opportunities identified within the new Junior Cycle Framework (Department of Education and Skills, 2015) [1];

• Mostly the same schools being engaged with year-on-year by multiple NGOs, rather than new schools being reached.

From the outset, therefore, WWGS was tasked with responding to a range of complex issues in order to boost the number of schools engaging with DE nationwide, but also with a key coordination role relating to the various strands that contribute to DE in post primary settings – most significantly support for smaller NGOs collaborating with schools. The quantitative targets set at the outset of the WWGS programme have been acknowledged to be highly ambitious [2], the achievement of which could, in fact, have a detrimental effect on the programme simultaneously reaching its qualitative
targets. Therefore, seeking the correct balance between achieving both quantitative and qualitative growth has been a major characteristic of how the programme has operated to date.

**WWGS Strategy 2013-16**

The strategic aim of the WWGS Strategy (2013) is to bring about an increased spread, number and mix of post-primary schools engaging in and availing of quality DE, through three key outcomes:

**Outcome 1 (Quantity):** Increased engagement of post primary schools in DE through the promotion of a coordinated approach nationwide;

**Outcome 2 (Quality):** Implementation of quality standards and good practice for DE in post-primary schools;

**Outcome 3 (Sustainability):** Implementation of a whole-school approach to DE in post-primary schools.

Certain key assumptions made at the outset of the programme and articulated through its strategy have not materialised. For example, the anticipated extent of reforms to the Junior Cycle framework was not accurately forecast. Similarly, the emphasis in the strategy on the role envisaged by school networks did not pan out in practice. Conversely, other elements that did not feature as strongly in the strategy have come to the fore, such as the role played by NGOs in receipt of WWGS funding, which has proven to be an effective model in reaching growing numbers of schools, as well as providing a mechanism for those schools to tap into the skills and experience of DE practitioners working in organisations throughout the country.

**Impact to date**

The recently completed final evaluation of WWGS contains a number of headline findings with clear implications for any future phase of the programme. Principal among these was the finding that, to continually and effectively engage post-primary schools with quality DE, there is a need to maintain all of the current WWGS interventions – grants, CPD, learning
events, school visits, resources and the Global Passport Award [3] – all of which play a significant role in supporting teachers to implement and expand quality DE in their schools. In other words, the programme’s success to date is largely attributed to the combination of interventions and support it offers, rather than any one of these elements in isolation. This indicates that WWGS must maintain the breadth of its programme supports if it is to continue to respond to the DE needs of schools in a meaningful way, but also find a way to ‘scale’ this offering if it is tasked with reaching an ever-increasing number of schools. The final evaluation report highlighted that the diverse support provided by WWGS placed a heavy workload on the programme’s small staff team, with consideration required regarding the capacity available to further develop the programme in any future phase.

WWGS final evaluation: Methodology
The WWGS final evaluation set out to establish the factors that are proving effective in enabling post-primary schools to embed quality DE in their teaching and learning. These factors were identified over an eight-month period of in-depth research and analysis.

Established schools
A key element in the process was carrying out evaluation visits to eleven established schools participating in the WWGS programme. These schools were selected to reflect the range of schools which have been grant-funded by WWGS. Considerations in the choice included type of school, DEIS [4] status, gender, geographical area, participation in the Global Passport scheme, and participation in the WWGS conference and teacher CPD. The breakdown of schools was as follows (taken from Gannon, 2016):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Code</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>DEIS status</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Global Passport</th>
<th>CPD/Conference Attendance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>CS</td>
<td>Deis</td>
<td>Coed</td>
<td>Dublin</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>CS</td>
<td>Coed</td>
<td>Dublin</td>
<td>Yes Diplomatic Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>ETB Deis</td>
<td>Coed</td>
<td>Donegal</td>
<td>Yes Diplomatic Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>ETB Deis</td>
<td>Coed</td>
<td>Cork</td>
<td>Yes Diplomatic Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>ETB</td>
<td>Coed</td>
<td>Meath</td>
<td>Yes Citizen Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>ETB Deis</td>
<td>Coed</td>
<td>Sligo</td>
<td>Yes Citizen Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Sec Deis</td>
<td>Coed</td>
<td>Limerick</td>
<td>Yes Diplomatic Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Sec</td>
<td>Coed</td>
<td>Westmeath</td>
<td>No Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Sec</td>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>Dublin</td>
<td>Yes Citizen Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Sec</td>
<td>Coed</td>
<td>Mayo</td>
<td>Yes Citizen Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Sec</td>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>Monaghan</td>
<td>No Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Within each school the evaluator met teachers, principals and students. Teachers and principals were questioned about the extent to which WWGS funding enabled them to carry out DE alongside the programme’s capacity building interventions, and whether these supports facilitated DE integration.
into the curriculum. They were also asked about how DE impacted on their students and, in particular, the value of the Global Passport as a framework for a whole-school approach to DE.

Students were asked to describe how they understood global citizenship, what they had done in DE, to identify their learning and the impact DE had had on them, and to provide suggestions for the expansion of DE within their school. A small sample of non-WWGS-funded schools and school networks were also interviewed as part of the process for comparison purposes.

Emerging schools
The sixty schools who had received a starter grant in the 2015/2016 grants year were surveyed using a Survey Monkey questionnaire. Of the 60 schools, replies were received from 21, giving a 35 percent response rate, which is a very good return rate from teachers [5]. The survey asked teachers about their experience of the WWGS grants system and key interventions and how likely they were to further expand the DE programme within their school in 2016/2017.

NGOs and networks
Of the four WWGS-funded school networks, one was chosen for interview on the basis of experience of DE and WWGS. A non-funded school network was also identified and their coordinator interviewed. The DE NGO coordinators that took part in a focus group for the evaluation were a self-selecting group representing eight NGOs, or half of all of the NGOs funded by WWGS.

Scope and limitations
As the outcomes of DE are generally qualitative in nature, the evaluation was designed to produce qualitative rather than quantitative data and analysis, the findings of which provide critical pointers for how DE can be most effectively supported in schools. It included analysis of the effectiveness of the key WWGS interventions, grants, capacity building events, school visits, resources/guidelines, and the Global Passport framework in relation to
schools, school networks and NGOs. WWGS also works in strategic partnership with Young Social Innovators (YSI) and the BT Young Scientists and Technology Exhibition (BTYSTE) through its sponsorship of the *Making Our World One World Award* and the *Science for Development Award* respectively. The effectiveness of these partnerships was not investigated as it was outside of the terms of reference for the evaluation, but reference to them was made where relevant.

**Key findings: what is working well?**

(i) **Ensuring meaningful student impact**

Students are the litmus test of how well DE is working in schools. The findings from the student interviews – conducted with groups of students from 2nd year to 5th year in each of the eleven schools visited – present a striking illustration of the benefits of the DE programmes in their schools in terms of their learning, increased awareness and commitment to global justice. They demonstrated that they fulfilled the WWGS vision of ‘students with an increased capacity to think critically and creatively to articulate their role as global citizens’ (WWGS Strategy, 2013). They were, in the main, very capable of reflecting on and articulating their learning, and had clearly become passionate about the issues and themes of DE:

> “I care a lot more about what’s happening around me, that’s not just related directly to me and my life … It makes me want to look into what’s going on in the world and to care about things that are happening to other people other than what I’m just seeing around me.”

The students had developed high levels of awareness about global issues, had broadened their perspectives and views of reality, and to varying degrees, had developed skills of critical thinking, some of them to a really impressive level:

> “You develop your skills of taking in information and analysing it, rather than being spoon fed information – that’s what’s right, that’s
what’s wrong. You get all angles and all views and you learn to listen. Even if you don’t agree with it, you learn to listen.”

The majority of students had made changes in small ways in their own lives as a result of engaging with DE, notably in relation to fair trade. However, there was a notable lack of campaigning or more political type actions, which is an area that WWGS could constructively support in the future.

The fact that quite a number of students said that DE had influenced their choice of future career was quite significant, demonstrating that the students had been affected at a deep level by their experience of DE and that they wanted to contribute to making the world a fairer and more just place. Also of significance was their belief that all students in their schools should have access to DE. Many of the students interviewed were in 5th year and had done a DE module in TY (Transition Year), but the impact of it was still very real for them:

“I want to go out and do something about how the world is. And not just sit there and go ‘ah that’s terrible.’”

“I wouldn’t be going out just looking for an office job now. I want a job that actually matters, that I’ll be able to look back on if I retire and realise I made a change, even if it was just something small.”

(ii) Building teachers’ capacity, understanding and confidence
Twenty teachers from eleven schools were interviewed as part of the evaluation. The teachers who took part in these interviews all articulated a clear understanding of DE as encompassing all of the elements defined by Irish Aid. They were working from a global justice perspective and aimed to support students to become critical thinkers and active global citizens. The schools had developed this work to varying degrees and the level of critical thinking and action differed between schools. All of the schools engaged in fundraising for global and local charities, but in most cases, this was done in the context of analysis of the causes of poverty and injustice. When asked
about the aspects of WWGS that they valued most highly, the teachers singled out grant funding, the provision of CPD and the hands-on support from staff. All of the teachers stated clearly that they could not effectively continue their in-school DE work without the grant from WWGS. They were all committed to continuing some level of DE and if the grants were to cease, DE would continue to a certain extent, but at a much lower and less effective level.

The capacity building events run by WWGS were universally praised and had a significant effect on all of the teachers, regardless of their level of experience. They valued both the variety of workshops and inputs, and in particular the networking with other teachers, from which they gained ideas and encouragement. Many of the teachers highlighted the benefit of having substitution for teachers attending CPD events, and it was clear that the high levels of participation in such events would not have been possible without this support. Similarly, teachers spoke highly of the tailored support available to them through the WWGS team, in particular the project officers. They greatly valued this relationship and felt secure knowing that they had a direct port of call in the event of a query or problem.

The level of integration of DE into the mainstream curriculum varied among the schools, but all of the teachers interviewed had made some progress or were planning to progress this. Curriculum work was generally focussed on TY, but with all schools moving or wishing to move to greater integration and embedding of DE in mainstream curriculum. Cross-curricular work was very evident in a small number of schools with the involvement of several teachers, but in others, DE was still the work of one teacher who experienced difficulty in securing the involvement of colleagues. The level of practice in this respect depended to a large degree on relationships within the staff and the level of interest and commitment of the principal to DE.
(iii) Providing a combination of supports and interventions
The menu of options that WWGS offers to schools was deemed to be its unique selling point, and the aspect that enabled it to reach schools that were new to DE as well as more established schools, regardless of their location, setting, background or experience in DE to date.

Combination of grants & support
One clear finding was that schools require both funding and non-monetary forms of support to enable DE to flourish. Grant funding is an enabler of DE, a necessary support in the context of it being largely an optional extra which schools can choose to engage with, but which cannot necessarily be funded through limited school budgets. Cessation of the grants would mean that activities would have to be dropped in most schools, especially in those with DEIS status. However, alongside funding, the essential support that teachers and schools identified was the on-going supportive relationship between WWGS and the school community, including the teachers, the principal and general staff, especially at the early stages of the introduction of DE. Teachers and supportive principals highly valued the personal support of an external programme, as well as the common structure provided by the Global Passport.

Global Passport
The Global Passport framework is so comprehensive that it might reasonably be expected that teachers would find it overwhelming and not readily buy into it. However, this was not the case from the evaluation findings. The majority of teachers found it very positive and helpful in planning and expanding DE throughout the school, indicating that the framework has, within a short period of time, become a valuable tool for whole-school DE engagement, and one which has even greater potential. The Global Passport could therefore benefit from greater levels of promotion and publicity in order to interest more schools in adopting the framework and applying for the award.

Starter school strategy
Consultation with emerging schools provided clear indications that the initiation of starter grants (or seed funding) by WWGS in 2015 has been a successful strategy in terms of engaging increasing numbers and a more varied cohort of schools from around the country. Not all of these schools are new to DE; some of them are reviving DE within the school or are accessing the funding for specific DE activities. Significantly, the vast majority of the starter schools indicated that they were definitely or highly likely to continue or expand their DE programmes in the coming year. The comments teachers made about starting slowly and building, on developing a structure for DE, on introducing DE as a TY subject and on working on a cross-curricular basis, all indicated a very strong return on the investment in these emerging schools.

Where is improvement needed?

(i) Action component

“You can sit all day in a classroom and talk about this issue and that issue and about how terrible everything is but if you’re not actually doing anything, it isn’t much good. I think action is important” (WWGS student).

The final evaluation found that actions undertaken by students were mainly in relation to raising awareness and/or fundraising. None of them were overtly political in the sense of campaigning for greater justice, or contacting local, national or European representatives. The schools looking at climate change would have been expected to engage in lobbying the Irish government to push for change at the COP21, the 2015 Paris Climate Conference, but none of the schools took their activity to this level. While the students’ awareness had clearly grown, their attitudes had been affected, and they were taking action within the school and/or community, this, significantly, had not yet translated into more political action. The report therefore recommended that WWGS consider designing workshops to provide guidance to teachers on moving from raising awareness to students undertaking more political action.
(ii) Principals and school management
The principals from the eleven schools who were interviewed as part of the final evaluation were all supportive of DE, although to very different levels. Some were actively engaged in supporting DE through joint planning with teachers, facilitation of planning and co-ordination time, and support for team building. Others were supportive to the extent that they facilitated the inclusion of DE on the timetable as long as there were teachers interested in teaching it, but they would not have been the main drivers of the initiative. This points to the need for WWGS to use some of their resources to work directly with principals and other school management to help them to develop their understanding of DE and to motivate and support them to actively promote DE within the wider school.

The report highlights that engagement by the school principal is an important element of developing a whole school approach to DE. Endeavouring to increase engagement by principals in the Global Passport could usefully be addressed by WWGS, through bodies such as the NAPD, the ETBI, JMB and ACCS, all of whom sit on the WWGS Education Panel [6]. The report recommends that WWGS should use some of its resources to work directly with principals and other school management to develop their understanding of DE and to motivate and support them.

(iii) WWGS funding for NGOs to work with schools
A number of clear findings emerged from a focus group conducted as part of the final evaluation with coordinators from eight of the NGOs currently in receipt of WWGS funding to work with schools on a broad range of DE projects. They were very appreciative of the support from and positive relationship with the WWGS team and found the training days that are run twice a year by the programme extremely helpful, not only in terms of information and guidance, but also because it helped build relationships between them as organisations.

The concerns of WWGS-funded NGOs related to their difficulties in having to fit into a highly competitive annual funding system. This hindered
them in planning in advance and negatively affected their relationships with schools. A strong theme that emerged was the desire to develop a more strategic partner relationship with WWGS and to cooperate more closely with each other in targeting schools, and on complementing each other’s work. A second area of concern was the relationship between teacher capacity building and direct work with students. While there had been a move to prioritise teacher capacity building through WWGS, the NGO representatives felt that there should also be recognition that working with students is part of that:

“They do go hand in hand. An organisation can be doing both.”

Several of the group talked about the diversity of expertise among the NGOs which are being funded and said clearly that they didn’t think teachers can be expected to do all that:

“They voices within the community are often not reflected in mainstream media and all of us would be coming in with critical approaches to issues that affect young people, so I feel quite passionately about student workshops that they’re not a symptom of inadequate teacher capacity but they’re an integral part of the relationship (with schools) that teachers feel extremely supported by.”

A clear mismatch has emerged between the type of support and relationship that NGOs aspire to have with a programme such as WWGS and the relatively narrow nature of the annual grant funding that is currently available to them. The report therefore recommends that WWGS should assess the possibilities to offer multi-annual funding to well-established NGOs with a good track record in delivering quality DE to schools to enable them to plan for a longer term than one year. The programme should also jointly explore with NGOs the possibilities of developing more strategic partnerships.
Opportunities
The major opportunities identified through the evaluation relate to the curriculum and teacher CPD.

Opportunity 1: Curriculum
“I don’t think that development education lives on its own. It’s almost like a lifestyle for me as a teacher, that it flows into every subject, especially with English and Geography.”

In terms of strategic planning for the future, there are opportunities for WWGS to support the integration of DE into the curriculum through the new Junior Cycle and through developments at Senior Cycle as they occur. Ireland’s National Strategy on Education for Sustainable Development (Department of Education and Skills, 2014) offers opportunities for engagement with the DES and mainstreaming of DE. The new Leaving Certificate Politics and Society course (NCCA, 2016), to be piloted in the 2016/2017 academic year, will offer an opportunity for WWGS to support Strand 4 of the course, which focuses on globalisation and sustainable development. This could be done through annual WWGS CPD events or through specific CPD targeted at teachers teaching this course.

Schools that have begun to expand DE out from TY and to engage in cross-curricular work have found it exciting and rewarding. The curricular steps of the Global Passport can support this expansion, as could the establishment of DE teams in schools, supported by substitution cover for in-school planning meetings. The Doing DE series that WWGS initiated in 2014, which consists of a series of guidance notes on how to teach mainstream subjects with a DE lens, can play a key role in helping teachers new to DE to recognise the possibilities within the curriculum. The series of resources produced to date for Junior Cycle English, Business Studies and Digital Media Literacy (WWGS, 2016) have been welcomed by teachers, school leaders and the NCCA. It is crucial to scale up this series so that busy teachers have an instant route into DE in their own subject area. In relation to Science (the next in the series to be developed), resources developed in
this area could be a stimulus for teachers to encourage their students to submit projects related to the Science for Development Award as part of the BT Young Scientist & Technology Exhibition. It could also be of benefit to produce a resource that maps DE onto each curricular area, so that teachers new to DE have an overview of how it relates to their own subject area.

**Opportunity 2: Nature of CPD and support to teachers**

The teacher CPD and on-going support offered by WWGS is highly compatible with the model for teachers’ learning outlined in *Cosán: Framework for Teachers’ Learning*, published by the Teaching Council in March 2016. As the consultation on the implementation of this framework is carried out, WWGS can continue to contribute to its development and to ensure that its CPD will secure recognition by *Cosán*. It will be essential for any CPD to comply with the criteria set by *Cosán* by the date of its implementation in 2020. Given that schools are working in relative isolation from each other, the provision of additional CPD organised on a regional basis could be of considerable benefit to teachers and schools. It could facilitate the participation in CPD by a greater number of teachers from any one school and help maintain the motivation of teachers, as well as leading to higher quality DE. Regional CPD would also contribute to the maintaining of relationships between WWGS and teachers, without the time demands of visits by the Project Officers to individual schools. The regional CPD could be facilitated either directly by WWGS or by NGOs working on specific themes of relevance to the schools in a particular area.

As increasing numbers of schools begin to engage with WWGS through the Global Passport, it is likely that this engagement will also begin to include requests to attend CPD events, as well as the annual conference. There will be opportunities for WWGS to broaden its range of relationships with schools (beyond those that are grant-funded), but this, in turn will put increased pressure on staff and resources, so will need to be carefully managed.
Challenges
In terms of challenges, the main external challenge to the programme both now and in the future is that of the difficult industrial relations climate between teachers and the Department of Education and Skills, and the resulting delays in the reform of the Junior Cycle. As industrial action looks set to escalate over the next academic year, this may impact on the implementation of any DE initiatives, and in the case of WWGS in relation to teachers attending CPD and schools applying for the Global Passport.

Challenge 1: Quality vs. Quantity
Education and the transformation of schools is a long term process, and in order to impact on the educational system, depth rather than breadth is required. Although it is integrated into many curricular areas, DE is not a discrete subject within the current curriculum. It is highly unlikely that all post primary schools, or even a substantial majority, will engage with DE. In the light of the multitudinous demands placed on schools at present, it would seem eminently sensible, and more effective, for WWGS to concentrate on supporting the development of quality DE and a whole-school approach in its existing cohort of funded schools, while at the same time, slowly increasing the number of schools engaging with DE, as the capacity and resourcing of the programme allows.

As schools become more confident in the integration of DE in the curriculum and progress to the Special Global Passport level, it would also be reasonable for WWGS to reduce the level of support provided to them as individual schools and to focus primarily on emerging schools. It may be helpful for WWGS to develop a 4-5 year plan of support based on average progress by schools in establishing DE. This would assist in forward planning and assessment of the number of schools it can reasonably support.

Challenge 2: Terminology of development education in schools
An additional challenge (which could also be seen as an opportunity) is that of the terminology of DE. There has been a longstanding discussion of the continued use of the term development education as opposed to global
citizenship education (GCE), which is more common in other countries. UNESCO uses the term GCE and has named it as one of the strategic areas of work for their Education Programme 2014-2017. Within DE circles in Ireland, there are opposing views on the terminology, but there are valid reasons for considering changing it in relation to work in schools.

Development education is not easily understood by teachers or principals who have not encountered it before and it can lead to a misconception that it is purely about development in the global South, rather than about issues of interconnectedness, interdependency, human rights and global justice. During the evaluation consultations, it was evident that principals were much more likely to talk about their students becoming global citizens than about development education. Global citizenship seems to be a more generally accessible concept that fits better with today’s world. Interactions with teachers bear this out, with global citizenship seen to be a much more understandable term, and one which can be more easily related to the curriculum, thus facilitating the development of a whole-school approach. It corresponds to the language used in the Junior Cycle statements of learning and additionally incorporates the notion of taking action, which may not be immediately evident in development education.

**Conclusion: where to next?**

Having successfully met its goal of creating an increased demand for DE, the critical question for WWGS now relates to how it will now meaningfully cater to that demand and consolidate this growth? Significant progress has been made by WWGS within a three-year period in terms of providing relevant and flexible support to schools to enable them to engage with DE in a sustained and qualitative way. It is imperative that this level of progress is maintained and that existing engagement is deepened, in order to build a sustained momentum around DE in our post-primary schools.

The predecessor programme to WWGS, the WorldWise Schools Linking and Immersion Scheme, was mentioned at the start of this article. It operated from 2008-2011, intensively engaging and supporting 68 post-
primary schools in their global school partnership projects during that period. Significant momentum and in-depth engagement was created, only to be lost in the gap that ensued between the conclusion of that programme and the creation, tendering and set-up of its replacement, WWGS. It is vital that this does not happen again, that the clear lessons emanating from this most recent evaluation process are carefully heeded, and that the long-term focus remains on the formation of skilled and empathetic young global citizens.

“We’re looking for a rounded education, educating the whole child. Students have access to information about what’s happening on a global scale and the school needs to deal with it and help them process it. They need to have an understanding of the interconnectedness of the world and their place in it” (WWGS principal, 2016).

Notes

[1] Significant changes have been introduced in Ireland’s Junior Cycle at post primary level including newly developed subjects, short courses, a focus on literacy, numeracy and key skills, and new approaches of assessment and reporting.

[2] By the WWGS Midterm Review, Steering Committee, and annual reports.

[3] The WWGS Global Passport Award is a self-assessed and externally-audited accreditation for development education that is open to all post primary schools in the Republic of Ireland. It offers a framework of support to assist the integration of DE into schools across seven key areas (or stamps), providing recognition and validation for this work.

[4] Delivering Equality of Opportunity in Schools (DEIS) is the Action Plan for Educational Inclusion, launched in May 2005 by the Department of Education and Skills, which is the main policy instrument to address educational disadvantage.
[5] For web surveys, a 30-40 percent response rate is common, even with populations that are young and have easy access to the web’ (University of Wisconsin, 2010).

[6] NAPD (National Association of Principals and Deputy Principals); ETBI (Education and Training Boards Ireland); JMB (Joint Managerial Body); ACCS (Association of Community and Comprehensive Schools).
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Capturing Transformative Change in Education: The Challenge of Tracking Progress towards SDG Target 4.7

Susan Gallwey

Abstract: Target 4.7 of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) aims to ‘ensure that all learners acquire the knowledge and skills needed to promote sustainable development’ (UN General Assembly, 2015: 17), thereby calling for transformative educational change all over the world. Target 4.7 offers many opportunities for Ireland, such as: providing legitimacy for development education (DE), Global Citizenship Education (GCE) and education for sustainable development (ESD); connecting Irish practitioners to a diverse global community of educators committed to social justice and sustainability; and creating a platform to showcase the impact of DE and related educations.

However Target 4.7 also throws up challenging questions. What are the ‘knowledge and skills needed to live sustainably’, and who decides which ones are the most important? What sort of education programmes are needed to build the required knowledge and skills for sustainable living and global citizenship? And how will we know if these programmes are working? Irish practitioners of DE and related educations have been working at ways to measure meaningful change in the areas of Target 4.7. These methods aim to balance the need for ‘results’ with the need to do justice to the complex learning that takes place in DE.

To move forwards in this challenging area, we need: co-operation and sharing between the various ‘educations’ named in Target 4.7; critical dialogue between the global North and South about the complex nature of global citizenship; recognition that progress towards Target 4.7 requires diverse approaches to outcome measurement; and respectful conversations between practitioners, policy makers and donors, especially in terms of using targets as means of learning and development, rather than as a means of control.
**Key words:** Sustainable Development Goals; Global Citizenship Education; development education; education for sustainable development; measuring impact; sharing practice.

**A new element in the SDG agenda**

The adoption of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) by the United Nations General Assembly in September 2015 set the agenda for international development for the next fifteen years. With seventeen ambitious goals, the SDGs seek to ‘build on the Millennium Development Goals and complete what they did not achieve’ (UN General Assembly, 2015:1). The SDGs have been praised by some for being rights-based, universal, and collaborative (Clarke, 2015) and criticised by others for reinforcing an unsustainable economic model and for failing to address the root causes of global poverty and inequality (Makwana, 2016). Beneath the big debate about the overall SDG agenda, there are smaller, yet no less intense, discussions unfolding about each of the 169 targets that underpin the seventeen goals. This article focuses on just one target and the challenges of measuring progress towards it.

Goal Four aims to ‘ensure inclusive and equitable quality education and promote lifelong learning opportunities for all’. Within this Goal, Target 4.7 states:

“By 2030, ensure that all learners acquire the knowledge and skills needed to promote sustainable development, including, among others, through education for sustainable development and sustainable lifestyles, human rights, gender equality, promotion of a culture of peace and non-violence, global citizenship and appreciation of cultural diversity and of culture’s contribution to sustainable development” (UN General Assembly, 2015:17).

By stating that *all* learners must acquire the knowledge and skills needed to live sustainably, Target 4.7 calls for a transformative change in education not just in the global South, but throughout the world. This is an enormous widening of scope in comparison to the MDG Education Goal, which
focused exclusively on improving education provision in poorer countries. The inclusion of a goal of this nature in the SDGs was foreshadowed in 2012 when UN Secretary General Ban Ki Moon launched the Global Education First Initiative (GEFI). GEFI named Global Citizenship Education (GCE) as one of its three main pillars, and set out a clear rationale for the inclusion of a GCE element in global education goals:

“It is not enough for education to produce individuals who can read, write and count. Education must be transformative and bring shared values to life … helping people to forge more just, peaceful, tolerant and inclusive societies. It must give people the understanding, skills and values they need to cooperate in resolving the interconnected challenges of the 21st century” (GEFI, 2012).

GEFI mobilised those working in GCE, as well as in Education for Sustainable Development (ESD), Development Education (DE) and other related educations (such as Human Rights Education, Intercultural Education, Peace Education) to press for a GCE-related education target in the SDGs. Target 4.7 was the result of a long campaign to ensure that the SDGs highlighted the need for all learners to engage in transformative education on issues of global justice and sustainability.

Opportunities arising from Target 4.7
For the DE community in Ireland, the inclusion of Target 4.7 in the SDGs brings important benefits and opportunities. Firstly, it provides increased legitimacy for DE, and related educations, in Irish educational policy. Target 4.7 supports and amplifies Ireland’s ‘National Strategy on Education for Sustainable Development’ (DES, 2014) which was developed within the national context of Ireland’s strategy on sustainable development (DECLG, 2012) and Ireland’s policy on international development (DFA, 2013), and within the broader international context of the UN Decade on ESD (UN DESD, 2005). The aim of the national ESD strategy closely aligns with Target 4.7 in that it aims to equip learners with:
“the relevant knowledge (the ‘what’), the key dispositions and skills (the ‘how’) and the values (the ‘why’) that will motivate and empower them throughout their lives to become informed active citizens who take action for a more sustainable future” (DES, 2014:3).

Therefore Target 4.7 reinforces Ireland’s ESD national strategy, through connecting it to a global mandate of similar intention. It is worth noting that the ESD strategy acknowledges that DE has important synergies with ESD and that the DE community has a key role to play in achieving the aims of the ESD strategy (DES, 2014: 9).

Secondly, Target 4.7 has the potential to connect Irish practitioners to a diverse global community of educators active in GCE, ESD, DE and related areas. The language of Target 4.7 is very inclusive, naming at least six types of education and adding ‘among others’, so as to encompass all educations which aim to help learners to acquire the ‘knowledge and skills needed for sustainable development’ (UN General Assembly, 2015: 17). Under the banner of Target 4.7, there is the opportunity for a broad coalition of educators to share practice and work towards a common aim. Of course there are important distinctions between ESD, GCE, and DE, but there are also many overlapping areas of interest (Fricke, Gathercole and Skinner, 2015: 18). Stakeholders need to resist squabbling amongst themselves over which ‘brand’ of education is best placed to deliver on Target 4.7, and instead look to see what synergies they can build.

The idea of a global community of educators working together towards Target 4.7 is very appealing, but there is the troublesome issue of just how ‘global’ the global education community really is. Dower (2008:39) provocatively asked, ‘Are we all global citizens, or are just some of us global citizens?’ and certainly it is true that ‘global’ education to date has existed primarily in a privileged, Northern domain. The universality of Target 4.7 brings an opportunity for global educators in Ireland to reflect on their practices and to enter into meaningful dialogue with Southern, postcolonial
and/or marginalised voices. Initiatives such as the ‘Bridge 47 Network’ (2015) offer possibilities for this, but real dialogue will require us to address uncomfortable questions around power, inequality and injustice. Andreotti (2011: 392) has asserted that critical CGE practitioners must attend to how they imagine ‘the globe’, how they imagine themselves as ‘global educators’ and their students as ‘global citizens’, and how they imagine ‘knowledge and learning beyond Eurocentric paradigms’. Therefore Target 4.7 offers an exciting platform for Irish educators to share practices globally, but only if we are willing to risk critical engagement with contested and uncomfortable issues.

A third potential benefit which could arise from Target 4.7 is the amassing of evidence on the impact of DE programmes. DE practitioners in Ireland and elsewhere have been wrestling with the question of impact for years, and this has been exacerbated by pressure from donors who have demanded measurable ‘results’ in return for their investment in DE. Therefore the establishment of agreed global and national indicators around DE/ESD/GCE could help to create a robust evidence base and encourage donors to increase budgets in this area. However, a note of caution should be introduced here, as it would be quite possible to officially establish a poorly thought-out, restrictive impact measurement system which measures what is easy to measure instead of what is important to measure; this would be worse than no system at all.

What are we trying to measure, and how?

Although the introduction of Target 4.7 offers an opportunity for establishing agreed frameworks for measuring DE and related educations, ‘results’ in these areas are notoriously difficult to define, let alone measure (Think Global/Charities Evaluation Services, 2011). To measure progress in relation to Target 4.7, it is necessary to establish firstly, what are the ‘knowledge and skills needed to live sustainably’, and secondly, how we will know if our education programmes are helping us to acquire them? In terms of the first question, ‘What are the knowledge and skills needed to live sustainably?’ there is a huge range of possible responses. For example: is it about
acquiring ‘fixed knowledge across a selection of topics in environmental science and geoscience’ (UNESCO TAG, 2015: 12)? Is it about nurturing ‘adaptability, creativity, self-reliance, hope and resilience’ (Sterling, 2008: 65)? Or does it mean empowering people to create a world ‘structured according to a radical hope of global justice’ (Swanson, 2015: 28)?

Given the breadth of opinion over what we should be measuring, it is inevitable that there is very little consensus on how we should measure it. O’Flaherty and Liddy (in preparation) completed a systematic review of the literature from 2000 to 2015 relevant to the research question ‘What is the impact of intentional development education (ESD/Global Education) interventions?’ In this context ‘impact’ was conceptualised as ‘measured change in knowledge, skills, attitudes, ethics, and actions’ arising from the particular intervention. Of the over 300 articles retrieved, just forty-three met the criteria for this review. Furthermore, the approaches used in the studies varied considerably, e.g. there were exams/knowledge tests, ethics/values measures and even randomised control trials. Overall, the review suggested that measuring the impact of DE/ESD/GCE is not at all a straightforward endeavour. Some commentators have suggested that measuring Target 4.7 is a near-impossibility from a methodological point of view; for example a World Bank blog stated that ‘the challenges of developing a consensus on how to measure skills needed to promote “global citizenship and appreciation of cultural diversity” are simply overwhelming’ (Fiszbein and Bustillo, 2014).

**The indicators game**

Given the complexity and challenges outlined above, it is not surprising that when the UNESCO Technical Advisory Group (TAG) drafted indicators for Target 4.7, they favoured ones that were relatively straightforward to measure, especially at global level, the highest of the four tiers of indicators (national, regional, thematic and global). The initial proposal for the single global indicator for Target 4.7 was ‘Percentage of fifteen year old students enrolled in secondary school demonstrating at least a fixed knowledge of a selection of topics in environmental science and geoscience’ (UNESCO
However, in March 2016, the UN Inter-Agency Expert Group (IAEG) proposed that the global indicator should be the:

“Extent to which (i) global citizenship education; and (ii) education for sustainable development are mainstreamed in (a) national education policies; (b) curricula; (c) teacher education; and (d) student assessment” (UN IAEG, 2016).

If this indicator is confirmed, it would appear to acknowledge that outcomes for Target 4.7 are too difficult to measure at global level, and that it would be preferable to focus on the efforts within countries to promote sustainable development through education (Global Campaign for Education Netherlands, 2016). The new proposed indicator also acknowledges that change needs to happen on various levels and cannot just be measured in terms of student assessment (Fricke, Gathercole and Skinner, 2015: 41). By choosing an indicator that focuses on provision rather than outcomes, the UN IAEG appears to have side-stepped the thorny issue of impact, perhaps leaving it to be taken up by countries when they formulate national indicators.

However, the proposed global indicator still presents many contested aspects. Most importantly, what is the nature of the GCE or ESD that is being mainstreamed? Andreotti (2006: 46-48) set out a framework comparing ‘soft’ versus ‘critical’ citizenship education, where in the soft approach, the potential benefits of GCE are ‘greater awareness of some of the problems, support for campaigns, greater motivation to help/do something, and feel good factor’ and in the critical approach, the potential benefits are ‘independent/critical thinking and more informed, responsible and ethical action’. Mainstreaming ‘critical’ GCE would be a much more challenging and meaningful undertaking than mainstreaming ‘soft’ GCE, and this distinction somehow needs to be captured in the indicator.

Furthermore, the use of ‘mainstream’ is unclear, as mainstreaming does not necessarily involve depth or integration. The ‘mainstreaming’ curricular requirement could mean as little as one required stand-alone
module, or it could mean an ambitious attempt to weave GCE/ESD/DE knowledge, skills and values across the breadth of formal and non-formula curricula. There is a danger that a ‘light’ approach to curricular engagement with GCE/ESD/DE could miss the opportunity to deeply engage learners, and instead would create a ‘general, largely de-personalised and de-politicised sense of global awareness and global belonging’ (Fricke, Gathercole and Skinner, 2015: 36).

Finally, there is a danger that the establishment of this, or any other, global indicator would preclude other types of measurement of DE work. An indicator is simply a piece of measurable information which shows us whether or not our desired change is happening. In order to be measurable, indicators have to be tied to specific sites, target groups and timeframes. Using one indicator does not mean that other valuable types of progress towards the same overall aim are not happening in different ways and on different sites. When the global indicator for Target 4.7 is eventually agreed, we need to stress to donors and policy makers that this is not ‘the only show in town’, and that national indicators need to be developed that reflect the diversity of DE/GCE/ESD practice, particularly in the non-formal education sector.

**Examples of innovative practice from Ireland**

If the proposed global indicator for Target 4.7 is confirmed, Ireland will have to consider how to track the ‘mainstreaming’ of GCE/ESD/DE in educational policies, curricula, teacher education and student assessment. In some of these areas the ground is already well prepared; for example in DICE (Development and Intercultural Education) at primary level and Ubuntu at post-primary level, we have well-established programmes for ESD/GCE/DE in initial teacher education, both of which have systems in place for capturing the impact of their work.

But while we in the Irish DE community await final versions of indicators, we should take advantage of current interest in the measurement of Target 4.7 to showcase some of the innovative and effective systems that
have been developed to measure the outcomes of DE-related work. A number of organisations in Ireland have designed and implemented ways to track meaningful change, balancing the need for ‘results’ with the need to do justice to the complex learning that takes place in DE. The final section of this article provides three examples of innovative approaches, one relating to the assessment of learners, one to measuring changes in schools, and one to tracking actions taken as a result of education.

Within the formal education system, an innovative approach to assessing the knowledge and skills needed for sustainable development can be seen in the National Council for Curriculum and Assessment (NCCA) specification for a Junior Cycle short course in Citizenship, which under the proposed curricular reforms will become available to all students aged 12-15. The Citizenship course aligns closely with Target 4.7 in that it aims to ‘inform, inspire, empower and enable young people to participate as active citizens’ and to build the ‘awareness, knowledge, skills, values and motivation to live sustainably’ (NCCA, 2013: 4-5). Assessment for the course is based on the students’ projects, and allows students considerable choice as to what they present for assessment and how they present it. Therefore in assessment:

“...a sense of student agency and efficacy is promoted, which are important characteristics of active citizenship. Students are not only learning about democracy, human rights and responsibility. They are exercising responsibility and decision making in the ways they are learning and being assessed. Where the material used in the assessment tasks derives from issues of genuine interest and concern to students, assessment in CSPE can contribute to the empowerment of young people to become more active and reflective citizens” (ibid: 17).

Although other proposed Junior Cycle short courses may not have such an explicit affinity with DE, the overall Junior Cycle reforms provide what GENE (2015: 36) has described as ‘the broadest opportunity for DE
integration into Irish post-primary education in decades’, and there is the possibility to implement learner-centred, empowering assessment across a range of Junior Cycle interventions.

In terms of measuring changes in schools, WorldWise Global Schools, Irish Aid’s programme for DE in post-primary schools, has implemented a ‘Global Passport’ system (WWGS, 2014), which is a voluntary, self-assessed, externally audited accreditation scheme. Schools are invited to accumulate points and thereby collect ‘stamps’ for their Passport in seven areas: curricular work; extra-curricular activities; teacher capacity and engagement; student capacity and engagement; school leadership and management; school ethos, policy and governance; and respectful relationships within and beyond the school. Together, the seven areas create a composite picture of a globally-minded school. Within each of the seven areas, the WWGS team has set out parameters for emerging, established and exceptional levels of activity. The Passport system allows schools to be assessed on their own terms, e.g. some schools may especially concentrate on the integration of DE subject knowledge into delivery of the curriculum, while others may put a particular focus on inculcating DE values into whole-school structures. Therefore the Passport can generate an overall numerical ‘score’ for a school which can be collated and analysed at national level, yet each score reflects the complex reality of DE in the participating school. Ninety-five schools have been awarded the Global Passport to date, with many others reporting that the Global Passport framework has provided them with a much-needed planning tool for DE in their schools.

In terms of measuring actions taken as a result of educational interventions, there is an interesting example from Suas, a Dublin-based charitable organisation addressing educational disadvantage in Ireland and in the global South. GCE is a core element of Suas’ work, particularly in their Global Citizenship Programme, a non-formal education programme aiming to promote university students’ progressive engagement with global issues (Malone, Carley and Bracken, 2014). One desired outcome of the programme is that students will take action as a result of participation in the
programme. Aware of the many challenges in tracking and measuring actions as a result of learning (e.g. contribution vs attribution, deep engagement vs ‘clicktivism’), Suas has opted to measure the action dimension not simply by what actions are taken but also by how participants engage with action options. Suas set as an outcome of the programme that ‘Participants will be familiar with a range of action pathways which they can take to create positive change in the world’. An indicator of progress toward this outcome is ‘change in participants’ level of awareness of different ways that they can bring about positive change’ using a multi-method approach to data collection, including participants’ self-evaluation using a ‘Progression Pathway Rubric’. The Pathway is completed by participants at the end of the Global Issues Course and Volunteer Programme and is designed to support students to reflect on the different opportunities for continuous engagement, what they have done and what they would like to do as a result of their participation on the course. It suggests a series of seven general action pathways and captures participants’ inclination to engage with each pathway. The pathway is not intended to compel participants into particular actions; participants are free to opt out of further engagement and/or suggest their own action pathway. However it does provide concrete suggestions and enables Suas to provide tailored supports to students wishing to go further. Suas also track the number of participants who progress through the three strands of the programme and follows up with a proportion of alumni online to ascertain other actions they have taken on foot of their involvement in global citizenship. Overall, this approach has enabled Suas to effectively track the complex relationship between education and action, and to build up a strong evidence base for the effectiveness of their programme.

The examples set out above are just three illustrations of how Irish practitioners are tackling the challenging area of measuring change in DE. There is also much that we can learn from global education practitioners from abroad. For example, in the UK, the ‘How Do We Know It’s Working?’ toolkit (RISC, 2015) provides a creative model for tracking changes in pupils’ attitudes about global issues, and in Belgium, some
organisations have used effectively used Outcome Mapping to measure the effects of global education programmes (Van Ongevalle, 2013: 146).

**The way forward**

In conclusion, the introduction of Target 4.7 brings many opportunities. It increases the visibility of DE/GCE/ESD and affirms its value. It creates a platform for sharing educational practice at a global level, and it opens up a space for dialogue on how to meaningfully track the outcomes of our work. However Target 4.7 also throws up many difficult questions, such as: What are the ‘knowledge and skills needed to live sustainably’, and who decides which ones are the most important? What sort of education programmes are needed to build the required knowledge and skills for sustainable living and global citizenship? And how will we know if these programmes are working? To move forwards constructively in this challenging area, we need: co-operation and sharing between the various ‘educations’ named in Target 4.7; critical dialogue between the global North and South about the complex nature of ‘global citizenship’; recognition that progress towards Target 4.7 happens at different sites and in different ways and therefore requires diverse approaches to outcome measurement; and respectful conversations between practitioners, policy-makers and donors, especially in terms of using targets as a means of ongoing learning rather than as a means of control. If Target 4.7 is to deliver on its promise of a citizenry who have the knowledge and skills to live sustainably, we need to ensure that the systems we use to measure progress towards this goal reflect the complex, challenging nature of the task at hand.
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EDUCATION FOR SOCIAL CHANGE: THE GLOBAL LEARNING PROGRAMME IN THE NORTH OF IRELAND

Stephen McCloskey

Abstract: The Global Learning Programme (GLP) is a four-year initiative funded by the UK government that aims ‘to support schools to teach about global poverty and international development, with a particular focus on upper primary and early secondary school’ (DfID, 2013). The overarching outcome for the project in Northern Ireland is ‘increased and improved delivery of development education in 50% of grant aided primary, secondary and special schools’. It seeks ‘to embed development education and global citizenship as regular practice across curriculum subjects and through whole school initiatives’. The GLP in the north of Ireland is managed by the Centre for Global Education and this article outlines the programme of support provided to schools including Continuing Professional Development (CPD), twilight training, senior leadership seminars and a designated website. The article will also describe the mixed methods approach used to evaluate the impact of the GLP on schools and, in particular, its effectiveness in implementing global learning in the classroom. The article will summarise research findings to date and what they reveal about how teachers have perceived the value of the support provided. The article will conclude by considering the positive impact of the GLP on the wider global education non-governmental sector in Northern Ireland.

Key words: Global learning; primary and post-primary schools; Continuing Professional Development; whole school learning.

The Global Learning Programme (GLP) is a four-year formal sector programme of support for primary, post-primary and special schools in the north of Ireland managed by the Centre for Global Education, a development NGO based in Belfast. The programme in Northern Ireland is part of a UK-wide initiative supported by the Department for International Development (DfID) and also delivered in England, Scotland and Wales. The programme
aims to strengthen the capacity of lead teachers and school senior leaders to embed global learning as a whole school approach. The Northern Ireland Curriculum has distinctive programmes that support a broader and more integrated approach to global learning such as *World Around Us* at primary level and *Local and Global Citizenship* at post-primary level. The GLP team has developed promotional literature and whole school guidance that relates the aims and objectives of the programme to the key learning outcomes of the Northern Ireland Curriculum. It is a programme with serious ambition and intent that seeks to shift schools away from the teaching of global learning through subject silos such as Geography and Religious Education to a more rounded engagement that includes school leadership, community connections and extra-curricular initiatives. Most crucially, it seeks to enable teachers to recognise the value of global learning in supporting curriculum teaching across the full spectrum of subject learning areas and to help resource classroom practice. Ultimately, the programme is focused on enhancing pupils’ knowledge and understanding of the underlying causes of poverty and how it can be reduced.

The GLP is approaching the half-way stage of its delivery and this article is part of a stock taking exercise, reflecting on how the programme has been delivered to date and received by its primary target group; practising teachers at Key Stage 2 (8-11 years) and Key Stage 3 (11-14 years). The central component of GLP delivery is Continuing Professional Development (CPD) in the form of two full days’ training centred on whole school approaches to global learning. The article will consider the CPD content offered by the GLP and how the training has been monitored, researched and evaluated. The teachers co-ordinating global learning (referred to as ‘lead teachers’) and their senior leadership representative jointly complete a self-evaluation tool which assesses the impact of the training on teaching and whole school practice. The lead teachers also complete a questionnaire which measures the impact of the training on their understanding of global learning, on their classroom practice and on their pupils. In addition, a small sample of six schools (a convenience sample distributed across Northern Ireland and representing all key school types) is participating in a qualitative,
longitudinal study for the duration of the programme. The article will summarise research findings to date and what they reveal about teachers’ perceptions with regards to the value of support provided. This support includes a guidance document on ‘A Whole School Approach to Global Learning’ (CGE, 2015), a programme website and the development of exemplar classroom materials. There will also be a brief reflection on the impact of the programme on the wider global education sector in the north of Ireland. The terms global education, development education, global learning and global citizenship are used interchangeably in the article as concepts concerned with enhanced public awareness of, and action on, the issues underpinning social and economic inequality at local and global levels (McCloskey, 2014; 2015). There are two main sections in the article focused on GLP training and research.

The GLP training
In 2014, the Centre for Global Education commenced delivery of a four year programme (subsequently extended to July 2018) funded by the DfID, the Westminster government department responsible for overseas development aid (ODA) and global education. The terms of reference for delivery of the Global Learning Programme included the overarching outcome of:

“increased and improved delivery of development education in 50% of grant aided primary, secondary and special schools in Northern Ireland. The Project will support schools to embed development education and global citizenship as regular practice across curriculum subjects and through whole school initiatives” (DfID, 2013).

The programme was supported by DfID following a 2011 assessment of the impact of its development education work in the UK which ‘recommended that DfID should continue to support development education through the formal education system in the UK’ (ibid). The GLP is therefore their current flagship development education project which includes support for GLPs in England, Scotland and Wales as well as the north of Ireland, with
each programme having the same target. The Programme’s aim is ‘to support schools to teach about global poverty and international development, with a particular focus on upper primary and early secondary school’ toward ‘providing an area of continuity’ (ibid).

The Programme in Northern Ireland has four key outputs: first, that school senior leadership teams (SLTs) understand the benefits of development education and global citizenship; second, that teachers have the relevant knowledge, skills and resources to support classroom practice and a whole school approach in global learning; third, that teachers share their knowledge, expertise and good practice in development education with other schools; and fourth, that the programme provide evidence of effective approaches to development education in line with curriculum guidance. Achieving these outputs would require the delivery of a considerable training programme with the 50 percent school target amounting to 538 primary, post-primary and special schools. The Centre for Global Education determined that reaching this target within the three year timescale would require the provision of substitute cover to schools to secure the release of teachers. Otherwise, in a period of contracting school budgets and over-stretched staff, it would prove very difficult to access teachers in the numbers required by the programme.

The wider educational context in which the project has been delivered so far has been unsettled as a result of fundamental change to the support services provided to schools. Five education and library boards (ELBs) servicing schools in five distinct geographical regions across the north of Ireland have been subsumed into a single Educational Authority (EA) which has resulted in redundancies amid a general contraction of public spending. An estimated ‘1,500 teaching and support staff jobs are expected to be lost in the education sector as a result of budget cuts’ (Black, 2015) which has directly impacted on the Curriculum Advisory Support Services (CASS) provided to schools which includes the Continuing Professional Development (CPD) of teachers. While the EA aims ‘to harmonise policies and the delivery of services’, the new body is not yet fully operational which
makes the GLP’s challenge of promoting its programme to schools all the more difficult. More positively, the availability of high quality training in global learning is a significant selling point given the reduced training output from the statutory sector in this transitionary period. Therefore, the Centre for Global Education set about designing a programme that met specifications of the GLP terms of reference and curricular requirements at Key Stages 2 and 3.

**Delivering the GLP**

The process of engagement with the GLP for schools spans 12-18 months (see Figure 1) and begins with the promotion of the programme through a mailshot to schools in each location in which training is delivered. Each training cohort is normally drawn from 3-5 locations which are rotated to maximise uptake and ensure that all schools have access to a local training venue at some point in the programme timeline. The flyer is disseminated with an accompanying letter and is often followed up with telephone contact to the school principal to explain in more detail the potential benefits of the training. Telephone contact is becoming increasingly essential to the GLP as 233 of the targeted 538 schools have already engaged with the programme, which means that the majority of schools with an existing involvement and/or interest in global education are likely to have already participated in the training. One key challenge facing the project team is to involve schools that are ‘cold’ to this area and less engaged, or have alternative commitments to other global learning initiatives such as Eco-Schools ([www.ecoschoolsni.org](http://www.ecoschoolsni.org)) and Rights Respecting Schools (Unicef UK). In this scenario, contact by telephone can be decisive because busy principals who receive a considerable amount of literature through the post are more likely to respond positively to calls that succinctly explain why their staff and pupils will benefit from the GLP. However, some schools will always struggle to participate in the GLP because of a lack of staffing capacity such as small, rural schools with teaching principals.

The GLP process begins with an optional two-hour briefing session for senior leaders which outlines the benefits of a whole school approach to
global learning, sets out the curriculum areas that support it at Key Stages 2 and 3, provides experiential global education learning opportunities, highlights how it complements existing educational policies and initiatives, and explains how to complete the self-evaluation tool. The sessions target senior leaders because they have planning oversight that can support a whole school approach, and are in a position to monitor delivery of the programme across subject boundaries. The majority of schools that participate in the SLT seminars subsequently nominate a colleague to take part in the CPD days although many schools commit themselves to the entire global learning process prior to the senior leadership sessions. Those schools that do not enrol on the CPD training immediately will normally participate in a later training cohort. This is usually because of a scheduling issue for the teacher or competing priorities.

Following the SLT seminar, the senior leader will discuss the programme internally and identify a member of staff to participate in the CPD training days. At primary level, this is normally a teacher responsible for co-ordination of the World Around Us (n.d.) or Personal Development and Mutual Understanding (CCEA, 2011) – programmes in the Northern Ireland Curriculum which support learning about the local community and wider world. At post–primary level, the school co-ordinator for Local and Global Citizenship (2014) will often attend the training. At Key Stage 3, Local and Global Citizenship deals with themes that include: Diversity and Inclusion; Equality and Social Justice; and Democracy and Active Participation which fit well with the content of the GLP training. Local and Global Citizenship is one of four strands of ‘Learning for Life and Work’, which is a statutory requirement in the Northern Ireland Curriculum, and aims to help students ‘meet the challenges and opportunities of contemporary society’ (CCEA, 2007: 3). Teachers from the schools registered in each cohort of the training attend the CPD days at a local venue, with the two training days organised a few weeks apart to support reflection on content between sessions.
Continuing Professional Development
The content of the CPD days expands upon and deepens the learning from the senior leadership seminars, and aims to strengthen the motivation and confidence of teachers to address global issues in the classroom from the perspectives of knowledge, methodology, curriculum and resources. Day one of the training introduces the concept of critical literacy and how it can be applied to understanding the causes of poverty. It also provides experiential learning opportunities through activities such as the ‘Trading Game’ (Christian Aid, n.d.), a role play simulation exercise on trade justice and inequality that works well in the classroom. Teachers are also given a development policy overview on the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and introduced to the key concepts and a progression of global learning pupil outcomes across Key Stages. The training also gives the teachers the opportunity to reflect on, and familiarise themselves with, a whole school framework (see figure 2) and to consider and share what global learning is already taking place in their schools. Teachers are to consider whether certain activities undertaken by schools constitute good practice in global learning. Every session is resourced with film clips, web links, teaching activities and handouts that the teacher can use in the classroom.

Day two of the training opens with an activity on the global clothing industry through the use of images and enables teachers to reflect on the images they use in the classroom, and how they can perpetuate stereotypes as well as support critical thinking. The session then focuses in detail on the curriculum context of global learning and the development of topic webs that support cross-curricular work on global issues such as water and migration. It also links global learning to literacy and numeracy which are current curriculum priorities for the Department of Education (DE) in Northern Ireland. By demonstrating how global learning can enhance the literacy and numeracy of pupils, the training can strengthen the confidence of teachers to incorporate global issues into their practice. The second half of day two centres on planning next steps including the role of the teachers in cascading the training into their schools. This will include sharing with colleagues the benefits of global learning, how it can be incorporated into different subjects.
and connected learning, features of the programme website (www.globallearningni.com) and where they can access suitable resources.

**Figure 1. ‘The Process’ (CGE, 2015: 5)**

The initial process will take approximately 12-18 months and will be sustainable thereafter through a cycle of global learning planning, implementation and review.

**REGISTRATION**
A Senior Leadership Team Representative must register the school on the Global Learning Programme, nominate a teacher to lead on global learning within the school and support them throughout the GLP process.

**PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT**
The teacher leading on global learning attends two CPD training days with colleagues from other schools at which they will develop their capacity to embed global learning using a whole school framework.

**SELF-EVALUATION AND PLANNING**
The SLT Representative and lead teacher jointly carry out a whole school self-evaluation on global learning, create global learning objectives for the school development plan and cascade key learning to colleagues.

**IMPLEMENTATION AND REVIEW**
- Global learning is implemented across the school curriculum and through whole school initiatives.
- The lead teacher attends two twilight sessions with other schools to receive further CPD and share practice.
- A second self-evaluation is carried out after the first year of implementation and the school development plan updated accordingly.

The GLP process
Figure 1 describes the 12-18 month process for schools on the GLP from registration through to certification. Schools can register on the GLP website (www.globallearningni.com) and, following the SLT seminar and two CPD
days’ training, the lead teacher will complete the whole school self-evaluation tool with their senior leadership team representative in order to assess what stage their school is at in terms of the whole school areas outlined in Figure 2. The self-evaluation tool will also enable them to decide whether they wish to add aspects of the whole school global learning framework to their school development plans. As part of the GLP implementation and review process, schools are expected to participate in two twilight training sessions one year apart. These sessions are normally delivered outside teaching hours hence the term ‘twilight’. They involve clusters of around six schools in the same locality that have participated in the training and are hosted in one of the schools. The first twilight, which takes place one or two months after the second day’s training, enables lead teachers to reflect on their self-evaluation process, share ideas, learn about useful resources available online and decide upon global learning actions to implement in their school over the subsequent year. The actions will include cascading the learning from the training back to their colleagues. The second twilight takes place approximately one year after the initial training and allows teachers to share the global learning practice that has taken place in their schools since the training. They also receive support in developing new global learning actions that will enable them to progress further along the stages of the whole school global learning framework. In terms of post-training support, participating schools receive a login for the GLP website where they can find all of the activities or resources used or referenced during the training. The website also provides stories of good practice, information about further training opportunities and links to other relevant sites that provide high quality resources. Regular project updates are also available from the project’s Facebook and Twitter accounts, and an electronic newsletter (e-zine).

The programme acknowledges that all schools will be at different points in their global learning journey and provides certification in recognition of their commitment to the process. There are two levels of certification. Level 1 requires that schools nominate a lead teacher who participates in the two CPD days; complete the self-evaluation tool in
consultation with colleagues; create global actions for the school development plan; and cascade the training through the lead teacher to colleagues in a peer education session. Level 2 certification additionally requires that the lead teacher, senior leader and other relevant colleagues implement the school development plan actions; the lead teacher attends two twilight sessions within a 12-month period; and schools complete a second self-evaluation tool and create new actions for the school development plan (CGE, 2015: 6). Figure 3 outlines some of the themes discussed in the training and developed into web links. They are issues that complement the key cross-cutting programmes in the Northern Ireland Curriculum that support global learning. However, a potential drawback for the programme is that global learning is not a named strand or component of the Northern Ireland Curriculum and many teachers are not familiar with the terminology used to describe this area of education. These terms include development education, global dimension, development awareness as well as global learning. This can sometimes create uneasiness among teachers with concerns that this is an ‘add-on’ to their workload rather than a platform of support to deliver the existing curriculum. The programme training is crucial in providing clarity to teachers on terminology and where global learning resides in the primary and post-primary curriculum.
Given the logistical challenge of promoting and organising the training, it is not delivered directly by the Centre for Global Education. A small team has been recruited within the Centre to: design promotional literature and disseminate it to schools followed-up by telephone contact; organise training venues and related logistical issues; design and maintain the GLP website; develop a toolkit of resources for schools on global learning;
and liaise with the researchers on the monitoring and evaluation of the programme. The training is delivered by ‘global educators’, a pool of experienced global education practitioners who are either freelance consultants or employed by local development organisations. They deliver the SLT and CPD sessions as well as facilitating the twilight training. Constant liaison between the project hub and global educators is crucial to the success of the project and they regularly meet to reflect on training delivery, adjust the content where necessary and plan future sessions.

A whole school approach
One of the central elements of the training is to explain to teachers what a whole school approach to global learning looks like and how its various elements – outlined in Figure 2 – can contribute to active citizenship for young people with a local and global focus. The Centre for Global Education’s guidance document for teachers suggests that ‘A whole school approach involves incorporating global learning themes, issues, perspectives and approaches more broadly into classroom teaching and learning and beyond’ (2015: 17). In curricular terms, global learning provides teachers and pupils with a range of skills including critical literacy, empathy, self-awareness and reflection, communication, collaborative working, managing complexity and reflective action (Oxfam, 2015). It also promotes values and attitudes that espouse social justice and equality as well as building within the learner a sense of identity and self-esteem. These skills and values are put into practice across a range of subjects including Languages, Science, Mathematics, Art, Drama and History, Music and Religious Education. The benefits of global learning also extend to teaching and learning processes that require active participation and facilitate the ‘voice of children and young people’ (CCEA, 2007).

Beyond the curriculum, a whole school approach requires that the School Leadership Team understand and supports global learning to ensure that a global perspective is included in the school ethos and vision. This is a very ambitious and challenging goal for a three year programme that has not been the direct product of curriculum development. It places a premium on
senior leadership support to ensure that global learning is reflected within whole school policy and in staff development, as well as facilitating student participation in global learning planning and evaluation. Additional aspects of the whole school approach include building connections with the wider community by enabling parents and carers to understand the aims and benefits of global learning, and strengthening links with other schools. The GLP facilitates this process through the establishment of school cluster groups and sharing of good practice. It also enhances connections between development NGOs involved in the programme and participating schools.

Awards and extra-curricular activities constitute yet another dimension to the whole school network. Many schools in the north of Ireland are already participating in award schemes with a global dimension such as Eco-Schools and Unicef’s Rights Respecting Schools. The GLP augments the activities carried out as part of these schemes and provides teachers and pupils with knowledge and understanding that will complement and support their completion of the awards. The Centre for Global Education’s ‘Whole School Approach to Global Learning’ guidance document contains four fictional case studies of schools at different stages on the road to embedding global learning within their whole school environment (2015: 21-27). These case studies provide schools with a sense of what a ‘whole school approach’ means in practice and, by the completion of the GLP, the programme aims to compile actual case studies based on activities in the six schools participating in the qualitative research process.
Figure 3. Global Learning Themes (CGE, 2015: 7)

The GLP research
A mixed methods approach was used to evaluate the impact of the GLP on schools and, in particular, its effectiveness in implementing global learning in the classroom. The quantitative element of the research involved the completion of two online questionnaires; the lead teacher questionnaire and the self-evaluation tool, completed by the senior leader in partnership with relevant colleagues. The qualitative strand comprised semi-structured interviews with lead teachers and small-group interviews with Key Stage 2 and 3 pupils in six selected schools. The convenience sample comprised three primary and three post-primary schools. They represented the two main management types in Northern Ireland, Catholic maintained and Controlled (mainly Protestant), as well as integrated schools that educate together Catholic and Protestant pupils and those of other religions and none (currently some 7 percent of the school-going population). A research team at Ulster University was commissioned to compile the research as a small
scale longitudinal study for the duration of the programme to monitor progress in building teacher confidence to address global issues in the classroom, implement a whole school approach and develop global learning pupil outcomes.

In September 2015, the research team produced their first report (CGE and UU, 2015a, b) which included an analysis of the self-evaluation tool, lead teacher questionnaire, and pupil and teacher interviews. A total of 59 schools participated in the GLP training in year one and a very positive 71.1 percent (39) completed the self-evaluation tool with an even higher 81.35 percent (49) response rate for the lead teacher questionnaire. Figure 4 outlines the various stages of progression for schools toward a whole school approach to global learning. In the self-evaluation tool, schools were invited to identify their current level of involvement in global learning using six criteria, which in ascending order were: ‘non engaged’, ‘early-engaging’, ‘defining’, ‘developing’, ‘expanding’, and ‘embedding’. These criteria were then applied to key elements of curriculum learning and teaching, effective leadership, community connections and school awards.

**Year one findings**
Unsurprisingly, given that schools were beginning their journey toward a whole school approach, a majority designated themselves as ‘non-engaged’ or ‘early engaging’ both in the self-evaluation tool and lead teacher questionnaire. However, the year one report represents a useful baseline from which to measure progress in years 2 and 3 of the project. Importantly, it suggests that post-training, teachers are already experiencing ‘positive impacts on practice’ including: ‘greater awareness of the meaning of GL (global learning); recognising the need for more specific planning for GL; and a greater sense of responsibility by lead teachers in their own role’ (CGE and UU, 2015a: 7). The report additionally found that:

“Post-training, some teachers seem to have progressed in their understanding of the different elements of the GLP in terms of both knowledge and the need for personal and community engagement.
Additionally, there was a greater recognition of the complexity and inter-connectedness of the concepts and issues” (CGE and UU, 2015b: 31).

The baseline pupil interviews, both primary and post-primary, revealed evidence of a ‘sense of fairness’ and ‘desire to help others’ albeit ‘from a charity perspective’ (CGE and UU, 2015a: 15). Equally positively, the lead teacher interviews ‘demonstrated a shift in the Lead Teachers’ thinking from charity-based solutions before the training to solutions based on collective responsibility and education after the training’ (ibid). One of the challenges confronting the development sector as a whole at present is to alter public attitudes from short-term, funding-driven solutions to global poverty toward longer-term, policy- and activist-driven responses that address the underlying causes of inequality and injustice (Darnton and Kirk, 2011). As the GLP research suggests:

“there is very striking evidence from the children’s extracts of the impact of television and wider media advertising by development charities, especially in relation to soliciting monetary donations to support the provision of potable water supplies in Africa” (CGE and UU, 2015b: 32-33).

The research also identified some barriers encountered when attempting to introduce a whole school approach to developing global learning. These included a lack of time to develop lesson plans and cross-curricular activities; persuading colleagues from non-traditional subject areas to engage with global learning; some colleagues perceiving global learning to be an ‘add-on’ to the curriculum rather than seeing it as an integral part; the formal education system’s prioritisation of literacy and numeracy; and identifying suitable resources that support classroom practice (CGE and UU, 2015a: 9).
Figure 4. ‘Stages of Progression toward a Whole School Approach’ (CGE, 2015: 15)
Lead teacher interviews
The one-to-one interviews showed an immediate impact on their practice as an outcome of the training. For example, five of the six lead teachers spoke of definite progression in the global understanding of their pupils who ‘now had a broader and clearer perception of their own place in the world, of the implications for them of events elsewhere, and of the rights they themselves have that are denied to others’ (CGE and UU, 2015b: 16). Post-primary teachers ‘agreed that their delivery of GL extended pupils’ outlook and developed empathy’ and once ‘awakened, it generated a sense of reality and genuine concern’ (ibid: 17). The qualitative data further suggested that support from school management made a real difference in ensuring take-up of global learning by colleagues. As one teacher said:

“I have contacted some individual colleagues who work in different departments … and they were able to give me an idea of what they already cover … Also, (the Vice-Principal) has been very supportive, and was able to give me a much wider view of what’s done, than I would ever have been aware of previously … very positive because she very much knows how important Global Learning is, and wants to encourage it” (ibid: 19).

Clearly, it is critical that lead teachers receive support from senior leadership teams to move global learning into new areas of practice not traditionally associated with it.

In summary, the research showed that most schools that had received the training designated themselves as ‘early engaging’ on the stages of progression toward a whole school approach as they were at the base camp of their journey. However, the more illustrative lead teacher interviews revealed an immediate impact in shifting teachers and pupils alike toward a more critical questioning of the causes of global poverty and away from more traditional charity-driven responses. Teachers expressed high levels of satisfaction with the resource supports offered by the GLP. For example, 30 out of 39 teachers ‘were highly positive about the GL Guidance Document’
with eleven stating that the document helped them ‘to focus on their present position within global learning’ (CGE and UU, 2015a: 6). The project website and exemplar toolkit of activities on global learning were in development in year one of the project and will be assessed in subsequent reports. A final research report in year three of the programme will provide analysis of year-on-year progress made in schools toward adopting a whole school approach.

**GLP and the global education sector**

One of the positive outcomes already registered by the GLP, even in its earliest stages of delivery, has been its revitalising effect on the global education sector in the north of Ireland. This sector has endured a sustained period of policy change and funding cuts since the publication of a *Review of using aid funds in the UK to promote awareness of global poverty* (COI, 2011). Long-standing global education grant schemes in the UK were withdrawn following the review which was not convinced that it ‘contributes to a reduction in global poverty’ (COI, 2011: 5). However, the review did find that ‘there have been notable successes with the integration of the global dimension into the school curriculum’ and concluded that ‘The formal education sector and media are key *channels* to reaching the UK public’ (ibid: 34). It was on this basis that DfID formulated plans for the GLP in order to maximise public awareness of global issues in the UK.

Although focused only on global education in the formal education sector, the GLP has drawn educators from local development organisations into the delivery of teacher training and has created new teaching and communication tools that support global education practice. Moreover, the programme has supported advocacy activities aimed at widening support for global learning in the statutory education sector including the Education Committee in the Northern Ireland Assembly in Stormont. The GLP also has a Programme Management Group (PMG) comprising representatives from a range of key statutory bodies in Northern Ireland including the Department of Education (DE) and Council for the Curriculum, Examinations and Assessment (CCEA). The PMG plays an important role in advising the GLP
staff on promotions, advocacy, communications and delivery. It also elevates support for, and awareness of, global education practice within the formal sector in an attempt to persuade more schools and teachers to embrace the services offered by the GLP. The programme has, therefore, both enhanced global learning practice in schools but, also, served as a catalyst for collaborative training delivery by DE providers.

Conclusion

The Global Learning Programme has provided teachers at Key Stages 2 and 3 in Northern Ireland with training and resources to strengthen their classroom practice in global learning. This ambitious programme aims to support a whole school approach to global learning that transcends development education delivery through traditional subject silos and seeks to bring a global perspective across the full spectrum of curricular programmes and subjects. The quantitative research results presented here show that most schools are at an ‘early-engaging’ stage on the progression ladder toward adopting a whole school approach after just one year’s participation in the GLP. However, qualitative feedback from schools indicates that the training is already bearing fruit in moving teachers away from charitable concepts of development toward deeper, more critical forms of inquiry into the underlying causes of local and global inequality and injustice.

Some 22 percent of all schools in the north have already undertaken the GLP training which amounts to 233 schools or 43 percent of the targeted 538 to be reached over its three-year lifespan. This total reflects a strong and burgeoning interest in global issues in primary and post-primary schools. Nevertheless, it is anticipated that concerted communication efforts will be needed going forward to maintain the already impressive level of school take-up of the training. The longitudinal research study by Ulster University will afford opportunities in the final year of the GLP to measure the extent to which the programme has supported whole school practice in global learning. However, the initial findings are positive and encouraging in reflecting the programme’s capacity to enhance global learning practice in the statutory and non-governmental sectors in Northern Ireland.
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A GLOBAL NORTH-SOUTH EVALUATION OF PARTNERSHIP SUPPORT FOR STUDENT TEACHERS ON PLACEMENT

Mercy Kazima, Cristina Tembe, Joseph Oonyu, Linda Clarke and Lesley Abbott

Abstract: There is a global recognition of the importance of the quality of teachers for the quality of education in schools and, whilst there is less unanimity about exactly how and where student teachers should be educated, there is consensus around the importance of the professional learning which takes place during the practicum or teaching practice. In this article, such learning is viewed through the lens of Lave and Wenger’s conception of ‘legitimate peripheral participation’ and, using questionnaires, through the eyes of student teachers in Malawi, Mozambique, Northern Ireland and Uganda. The issues raised by the students presented both distinctive commonalities, particularly around mentoring, and also localised issues, such as rudimentary resource provision. Everything depended, however, on the establishment of intentionally structured support mechanisms which recognise the value and distinctive nature of these important periods of initial professional learning.

Keywords: Legitimate peripheral participation; mentoring; student teachers; teacher education.

It is an ineluctable truth that the experience of teaching practice is a critical stage in the process of becoming a competent teacher (Beck and Kosnik, 2002; Ngara, Ngwarai and Rodgers, 2012), and is ‘at the heart of … professional training’ (Maynard, 2001: 39). Indeed, student teachers themselves perceive school-based mentoring to be a crucial element of initial teacher education (Hobson, 2002). This paper describes a four-country project, entitled Developing More Effective School-HEI Partnerships in Initial Teacher Education, which was funded (2010-2013) by the Department of International Development (DfID) and the British Council. It consisted of a series of workshops at four higher education institutions (HEIs): University
of Malawi, Zomba, Malawi; Eduardo Mondlane University, Maputo, Mozambique; Ulster University, Coleraine, Northern Ireland; and Makerere University, Kampala, Uganda. The project aimed to strengthen the support provided by schools for student teachers by developing more effective partnerships between schools and HEIs (Clarke et al., 2013).

In these countries, teaching practice, school experience, placement or practicum is a time when opportunities are provided to translate theory into practice. The student teachers face numerous challenges during what Wragg (1974) called the intoxicating task of survival. Lave and Wenger (1991) cast the practice-based, situational learning of such early stage practitioners as engaging in legitimate peripheral participation, and, whilst HEIs provide numerous support mechanisms, the degree to which the trainees perceive themselves to be well supported in practice can vary considerably (Douglas, 2011). Moreover, supporting them in schools during training is a wide-ranging, complex role, one that it is not the sole responsibility of a single individual (a mentor or teacher tutor), but also of other staff who offer advice (Hobson, 2002). Koern er, Rust and Baumgartner (2002: 35) state that:

“Student teaching is the culminating experience in a teacher education program. For good or ill, this experience has a significant impact on the student teacher who must juggle the responsibilities of teaching (and all that entails) while establishing and developing relationships with one or more cooperating teachers and a university supervisor.”

Whilst the school experience is challenging, benefits are derived by all three stakeholders within the partnership. The university gains access to settings for its students to put into practice ‘the reality of teaching that it cannot provide’ (Taylor, 2008: 23); both teacher educators and school mentors have opportunities for professional development; and students acquire skills and improve their practice. As Hascher, Cocard and Moser (2004) point out, though, while university supervisors monitor the practicum, responsibility for
it is handed to school mentors. Furlong and Maynard (1995: 2) warn, however, that ‘a fuller prescription of the role of the mentor will not be achieved until we have a more thorough understanding of the process involved in learning to teach’. This article reports the opinions of student teachers from four countries on their professional learning experience. The nascent professionals’ views, first, relate to how they perceive the roles of different stakeholders and, second, to their suggestions for strengthening school experience. Their professional learning is viewed through the lens of Lave and Wenger’s notions of legitimate peripheral participation.

The support of stakeholders
Key features of effective practice during student placement were outlined by HMIE (2005) as, for example: students being valued by schools, treated as professionals in training, placed with good role models, given access to resources and given responsibility to teach classes on their own. All these are within a supportive learning environment in which ‘they can experiment and learn from their mistakes’ (HMIE, 2005: 15). Gathering student teachers’ views, Beck and Kosnik (2002) reported that a key component of a good practicum placement is for mentors to be friendly and to give emotional support. Student teachers wanted to be a legitimate part of the school’s teacher workforce, respected and treated ‘as a teacher’ rather than be imbued with lower status; to form a collaborative relationship with their mentor in relation to planning and finding resources, but with limited intervention during a lesson; to have the flexibility to be innovative with teaching methods; and to receive feedback from the mentor, a feature of the utmost importance (Darling-Hammond, Wise and Klein, 1995). Moreover, trainees wanted a workload that was realistic but not excessive. Hobson’s (2002: 9) findings also showed feedback and assistance with lesson planning, as well as mentors modelling teaching practice, to be ‘centrally important in the process of learning teaching’. It seems, therefore, that the school mentor’s role is a crucial one, although its impact can be positive or negative. Rice (2004) suggests that the best outcome is a two-way conversation on an equal footing between the mentor and the mentee. Awaya et al. (2003: 45) also see mentoring as a partnership: ‘The journey involves the building of an equal
relationship characterised by trust, the sharing of expertise, moral support, and knowing when to help and when to sit back.’

Lave and Wenger’s (1991) work on legitimate peripheral participation provides a meaningful lens for research that addresses practice-based learning in schools, something over which HEI staff usually have more limited control (Hascher et al., 2004). A social and situated conceptualisation of the student teachers’ learning, therefore, is at the heart of this multi-national study. This may be understood in the context of situated learning within a community of practice (Maynard, 2001). Lave and Wenger (1991) conceived of a community of practice as a venue for social, situated learning by mutual engagement with other members, and negotiation of the enterprise and of the distinctive repertoire of that community. Concerning teacher education, the cast of community members is diverse and includes head teachers, HEI tutors, class teachers, heads of department, school technicians and other student teachers. They induct the novice student teachers in Lave and Wenger’s process of legitimate peripheral participation within which a neophyte’s required learning takes place, not so much through the reification of a curriculum, as by means of modified forms of participation that are structured to open the practice to non-members.

Student teachers are newcomers within this community and learn through becoming part of practice as a resource for learning (Lave and Wenger, 1991: 85), and through engagement (both formal and informal) with serving teachers – old-timers (in the parlance of these writers) – along peers and others. This is made possible through a combination of peripherality and legitimacy. Wenger (1998) suggests that peripherality provides a guided and gradual exposure to full practice so that students have:

- **lessened intensity** – for example, through periods of initial observation followed by reduced teaching loads;

- **lessened risk** – for example, through close supervision by experienced staff and mentors; and
• *lessened production pressures* – for example, through less administration, report writing.

Sufficient legitimacy is provided for student teachers to allow them to be treated, in many respects, like other teachers, with the support of a well-respected senior teacher. In addition, it is crucially important that they have enough legitimacy to allow their ‘inevitable stumblings and violations to become opportunities for learning rather than cause for dismissal, neglect or exclusion’ (Wenger, 1998: 101).

**The context of initial teacher education in Malawi, Mozambique, Northern Ireland and Uganda**

The research compares the practicum experiences of student teachers from two vastly different parts of the world, sub-Saharan Africa and Northern Ireland, in respect of the contributions from both the schools and the HEIs as members of a partnership. The most striking contrasts between the teacher workforce of the African nations and that of Northern Ireland are around the resource base for teacher education and the relative supply/demand of teachers, with Northern Ireland having an over-supply of teachers and cutting teacher education quotas (Grant Thornton, 2013). Conversely, in common with other African nations, there are some severe teacher shortages in Malawi, Mozambique and Uganda (UNESCO, 2013). A key challenge for the project team was collaborating across four teacher education systems which are briefly summarised below.

First, in Malawi, at primary level, initial primary teacher education is offered through teacher education colleges. Year one is a residential, full-time, taught course; year two is full-time, school-based training through teaching practice. At secondary level, initial teacher education is offered mostly by the University of Malawi through a four and a half year (nine semesters) taught Bachelor of Education programme with the last semester for teaching practice. A relatively new public University (Mzuzu University) offers a similar programme. There is also Domasi College of Education which operates directly under the Ministry of Education and offers the
Diploma in Secondary school teaching. The college was established in 1994 to address the shortage of teachers in Malawi secondary schools.

Second, in Mozambique, public and private institutions currently provide different teacher education programmes. For primary education, the public ones are the 24 institutos de formação de professores (IFPs) (teacher education institutions) providing the Grade 10+1 programme. The private institution is the Ajuda Dinamarquesa de Povo para Povo. Teachers for secondary, technical and professional education are educated at the Eduardo Mondlane University and the Pedagogical University in a four-year, full-time programme.

Third, in Northern Ireland, there are five routes to initial teacher education (ITE): two universities offer the one-year Postgraduate Certificate in Education (PGCE); two university colleges provide the four-year Bachelor of Education; and the Open University offers the post-primary PGCE. A 27-competence model embraces ITE, induction and early professional development (EPD) (Moran, Dallat and Abbott, 1999). The dominant theme of ‘partnership’ signifies a lead partner at each stage: the universities/collages during ITE, the local education authorities during induction, and the schools during EPD (NITEC and CEPD, 1998), with each partner contributing in an integrated way along the teacher education continuum. The PGCE (which is the focus of this study) consists of two blocks of practical, school-based teaching and face-to-face academic study in university.

Fourth, in Uganda, there are five government-established national teachers’ colleges and three private ones, with forty-eight primary teachers’ colleges and five privately owned ones. Most of the thirty-five universities offer teacher education programmes, but less than a quarter have initial science teacher education due to lack of facilities and the costs involved. The recent introduction of the Universal Primary Education programme in 1997 and the Universal Post-Primary Education and Training Programme in 2007 have seen greatly increased student enrolment, thus affecting teacher demand.
(some 9,000-11,000 trainees recruited annually). Kyambogo University is in charge of training all primary and Grade V teachers.

Method
There were two parts to the study allowing a mixed methods approach. Methodological triangulation (using two or more methods of data collection) allows richer, more detailed data to be collected, as ‘exclusive reliance on one method … may bias or distort the particular slices of reality’ being investigated (Cohen, Manion and Morrison, 2011: 195). First, as a preliminary (pilot) study, a focus group was conducted with student teachers from three jurisdictions in order to identify key issues: the Universities of Malawi, Makerere and Ulster. Focus groups reveal ‘how people think about an issue – their reasoning about why things are as they are, why they hold the views they do’ (Laws, Harper and Marcus, 2003, cited in Bell, 2005: 162). The focus groups were conducted in each separate college by research team members, all experienced teacher educators but not assessors of the participants. The findings facilitated the design of a self-completion questionnaire for the main study.

Second, the questionnaire was given to a total of 328 student teachers in the four countries, to seek their views and experiences of teaching practice. A questionnaire was considered best for gathering geographically distributed, cross-national data with a fairly large number of respondents (Cohen, Manion and Morrison, 2011). It was designed to ensure clarity of language, clear layout and the avoidance of ‘ambiguity and imprecision’ (Bell, 2005: 138). The Mozambique respondents required the survey questions and, subsequently, their responses to be translated from English into Portuguese.

The 328 student teachers in Malawi, Mozambique, Northern Ireland and Uganda consisted of, respectively, forty-three B.Ed students, fifty-five teacher education students, thirty Post-Graduate Certificate in Education (PGCE) students, and 200 B.Sc/Ed and B.A/Ed students, representing approximately one-fifth of the post-primary teacher education cohorts in each
institution. Piloting was through agreement on the form of the questionnaire through circulation of drafts between the four university tutors, and with primary students at Ulster University. The returns rates were 100 percent each for Malawi, Mozambique and Northern Ireland, and 93.5 percent for Uganda – 43, 55, 30 and 187 cases, respectively, generating an overall total of 315 responses (96 percent). The statistics were provided by university colleagues in each country and are presented separately for each. Where small sub-sets arose, raw figures only were used.

Ethical approval was granted for both the preliminary and main studies. The respondents gave voluntary informed consent, were assured of complete confidentiality and anonymity, understood their right to withdraw at any time without coercion or penalty, and were told that questionnaire completion formed no part of assessment. The data is reported against each question using selected extracts as appropriate ‘to capture the essence of [a] point … without unnecessary complexity’ (Braun and Clarke, 2006: 93), followed by a discursive overview outlining emerging patterns, differences, international common ground, and, finally, conclusions.

Findings
The preliminary study allowed the project team to form initial impressions of the student teachers’ perspectives on sources of support during teaching practice in three of the four countries (Clarke et al., 2013). Clear similarities and differences emerged from the focus group, although space does not allow all of the initial findings to be reported here. A particularly interesting vignette appears in Figure 1 which shows a comparative ranking of the student views, and the relative position of the university supervisors. They were ranked highest in Malawi and Uganda, yet much lower in Northern Ireland. Recently qualified and other teachers, including Heads of Department, were rated highly in all three jurisdictions. This data enabled the team to identify key issues to address in the questionnaire.
The findings are presented as follows:

- the student population;
- allocation of teachers to support students during school placement;
- frequency of meetings between students and teachers;
- relationship between students and teachers;
- support provided by nominated teacher during school placement;
- ways in which school practice was marked; and
- suggested improvements to teaching practice.

The student population
Regarding gender ratios, the imbalance in favour of females is evident in the figures for 2007 in North America and Western Europe at 61 percent; those
for the Northern Ireland (NI) student teachers in the study are broadly in keeping with the 29 percent of males in secondary schools (UNESCO, 2011: 2, Table 1.1). The Mozambique (Mz) and Uganda (U) figures compare to those cited for sub-Saharan Africa where, by contrast, only 30% of secondary teachers are female. Interestingly, Malawi (M) is different with over half of its respondents male (53.8 percent) and under half female (Table 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1</th>
<th>Gender breakdown of student teachers in all four countries (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Malawi (n=43)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>53.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>46.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Allocation of teachers to support students during teaching practice**
A large majority of students in Malawi, Mozambique and Northern Ireland had a teacher allocated to them during teaching practice (74.4 percent, 92.7 percent and 80 percent, respectively). In Uganda, however, over half did not (58.6 percent).

**Frequency of meetings between students and teachers**
The students were most likely to meet their school tutors more than once a week during placement, particularly in Malawi although least so in Northern Ireland, where weekly and monthly meetings together accounted for over half the responses. Twice monthly meetings were uncommon overall, as were monthly meetings except for Northern Ireland (about one-third) (Table 2).
Relationship between students and teachers
Northern Ireland and Ugandan students were most likely to say that their relationship with teachers in school was ‘very supportive’ (almost two-thirds in each case), with over half of Malawian respondents in agreement. Notably fewer Mozambique students, however, used this category (under a quarter), most saying ‘supportive’ and one-third ‘not supportive at all’ (Table 3).

Support provided by nominated teachers during teaching practice
Examining support provided on teaching practice, there were predominantly positive comments in all four countries with few of a negative nature. Thirty of the forty-three Malawian students (69.7 percent) referred mostly to support in the following areas including using resources, setting objectives, assessment and motivation pupils, with raw figures used because of small numbers (Table 4).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2</th>
<th>Frequency of student-teacher meetings during placement (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Malawi (n=25)                Mozambique N. Ireland (n=53)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than once a week</td>
<td>80.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once a week</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once a month</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twice a month</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3</th>
<th>Supportiveness of student-teacher relationship in schools (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Malawi (n=43)                Mozambique N. Ireland (n=46)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very supportive</td>
<td>58.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive</td>
<td>38.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all supportive</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Some favourable comments were:

“Assisted on how best to use teaching resources and to assess students.”

“… guided me and helped in sourcing materials.”

“He went through my schemes of work and showed me where I went wrong. He gave me advice on which books I should use and also gave me a notebook full of experiments from which I could choose experiments for my class.”

“How best to write objectives and how best to use and choose teaching aids.”

“Helped me … how to teach more effectively and how to behave well in the institution: be more of a professional.”
“She taught me the importance of making a clear introduction in order to motivate the students and the importance of a well-marked conclusion that cross-cuts the development.”

“Very supportive in terms of subject materials, and explained to me some concepts that I could not understand on my own.”

“Letting me observe his classes and he also observed mine.”

One student summed up: ‘A wonderful experience. Both the teacher and the administration supported us’, although much less positive were, ‘The teacher was not helpful in terms of materials/teaching aids and was not there to help when I [was] faced with some difficulties’ and ‘The teacher was not present at any time.’

From the fifty-five Mozambique students, forty-nine (89 percent) identified similar help given, mainly with lesson plans, resources and moral support (Table 5).
The thirty Northern Ireland trainee teachers either identified specific types of help given, or commented generally on the nature and extent of areas in which schools gave them support, whether good or bad (Table 6).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas in which support provided</th>
<th>Frequency (Raw figures)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Help with lesson planning and preparation</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources/materials provided</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral/psychological support</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation of projects/activities</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil-teacher relationships</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thematic harmonisation plan</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustenance support</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical support</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help with classroom difficulties</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifying special educational needs</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5 Areas in which support provided to students on school placement in Mozambique (n=49)
Nine students described the nature and high standard of support given by teachers in school:

“Excellent support and available for advice when needed.”

“Very supportive through email and telephone if needed.”

“A critical friend.”

“A shared learning experience.”

“Time to discuss issues.”

“Included within the department.”

Three, however, spoke very negatively about support:

“Very little to none.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas in which support provided</th>
<th>Frequency (Raw figures)*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Areas for improvement/development</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offering advice and guidance</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback and evaluation</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Checking and talking through lesson plans</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving reassurance</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewing lessons</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observing lessons</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help with behaviour management</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving ideas/suggestions</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Do not add to 30 as some respondents said more than one area.
“Did not seem overly concerned and could have been more supportive.”

“The teacher was very approachable but was not available for feedback and didn’t discuss my development.”

Similarly, Ugandan students pinpointed specific help given, or responded more generally about support, both favourably and less so (Table 7). From 187, 126 replied (67.3 percent).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas in which support provided</th>
<th>Frequency (Raw figures)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Offering advice and guidance</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject related support and resources</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Checking and talking through lesson plans</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic, financial, and moral support</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation to the school and timetabling</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Areas for improvement/development</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help with behaviour management</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving reassurance</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewing lessons</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observing and reviewing lessons</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Four Ugandan students described the support given by teachers in schools in positive terms:

“Supportive and encouraged me greatly.”

“Advised me on everything I did.”

“They believed in me.”
Three less favourable experiences were:

“Very little [support] to none.”

“Saw us as foreigners who never fitted well in the school.”

“Saw us as interfering with normal running of school.”

**Suggested improvements to teaching practice**

All thirty students from Northern Ireland, forty-six out of fifty-five from Mozambique, 119 of the 187 from Uganda, and seventeen out of forty-three from Malawi suggested changes in teaching practice (100 percent, 83 percent, 63.3 percent and 39.5 percent, respectively). Five broad areas were identified in three of the four countries: the first three as listed below in African countries only, and the remaining two in Northern Ireland and in two African countries:

- resources (62: 3M, 3MZ, 56U);
- the role of the university supervisor (60: 2M, 26MZ, 32U);
- financial support (55: 5M, 8MZ, 42U);
- the relationship between teaching practice schools and universities/colleges (34: 3MZ, 9NI, 22U); and
- better/fairer organisation of teaching practice (27: 4M, 11NI, 12U)

Concerning *resources*, it was clear that some students simply did not have adequate teaching and instructional materials. In regard to *the role of university supervisors* during placement, improvements put forward were that they should:

- supervise and be competent in their own area of specialisation;
monitor student teachers more by having greater involvement in the student teaching process;

have more time for student teachers, visit during teaching practice, and provide guidance;

conduct more visits to students’ placement schools;

respect the timetables given to students;

come to student’s class at the beginning of lessons and remain until the end;

support students by stating clear objectives of teaching and identifying appropriate methodologies; and

be more friendly.

Regarding finance, the Malawian student teachers called for:

the teaching practice allowance not to be given ‘before TP time’;

the teaching practice allowance to be increased to fit with the current economic status of the country;

a timely upkeep of money delivery; and

the allowance to be given on time as delays cause problems [for] the student teachers in terms of rentals with landlords.

Mozambique students asked for grants to be provided during teaching practice and, similarly, Ugandan respondents wanted more funding to support them during placement.
Concerning the relationship between placement schools and universities/colleges, students in Mozambique, Northern Ireland and Uganda suggested increased, improved communication between school and university, particularly in respect of the relationship between the student supervisor and school teacher.

Students in Malawi, Northern Ireland and Uganda called for better and fairer organization of teaching practice. This related to university tutors’ school visits and better communication with school heads of department before placement. Northern Ireland students asked for the role of teacher tutor (mentor) in schools to be on a more professional basis, with more contact and regular meetings. They also wanted opportunities for observation which was formative in ethos and atmosphere.

Interestingly, most of the other suggestions made were common to students in all four countries. These included inter alia having the chance to observe peers, reducing their lesson, an emphasis on the non-teaching aspects of school practice, the universities facilitating student placement in various schools, improving school support by strengthening partnerships with the universities, and supervisors harmonising supervision so as to minimise contradictions among themselves.

**Discussion and conclusion**

The evidence here points towards considerable consistency in preoccupations and perspectives of student teachers across these countries. Some distinctive local issues were also highlighted and, in discussing the findings and drawing any conclusions, it is essential to be mindful of the complex, challenging, context-specific realities in the African countries. Indeed, Hardman et al. (2011: 670) caution against ‘… the dangers of international agencies urging developing countries to adopt ‘best practices’ with regard to teacher professional development that ignore the everyday realities of the classroom, and the motivations and capacity of the teachers to deliver such reforms.’

In the current study, a key concern was the variability in the support provided, with obvious differences in the level and quality of help given to
student teachers by both universities and schools within each country. It is clear that resources are a contentious issue in all four locations, although the contrast between Northern Ireland and the African countries makes the complaints from the former appear trivial – so-called ‘first world problems’, as compared to the ‘real life’ concerns of the latter about having enough food and money and somewhere safe to stay.

Resource deficits can have obvious effects on the fundamental well-being of students, but also impact on both the legitimacy and peripherality which are identified by Lave and Wenger (1991) as being so crucial for student learning. Full legitimate participation is only possible where student teachers have access to a resource base which is broadly similar to that of serving teachers. Only then will they be able to take full advantage of learning opportunities during placement in schools. Peripherality is also impinged upon where student teachers have too heavy a workload and where serving teachers do not make allowances for a lack of expertise, seeking instead to highlight mistakes rather than to rectify them.

It is clear that student teachers across the four countries recognised that better partnerships between schools and HEIs could help to correct these problems, with university tutors ensuring that school staff fully understand and support the nature of student roles and learning. For students to learn effectively from their practicum, this must be located and legitimised through better relationships between schools and HEIs with experienced staff (the ‘old timers’) collaborating to encourage the newcomers in ways which support both their peripherality and their legitimacy. Within this context, student teachers can enjoy time, space and growth of confidence during even the most challenging teaching practice. One key project outcome was the development of local mentorship courses in each of the countries, including Master’s level modules based around an agreed set of Guidelines for Student Teacher Mentors (Moran et al., 2012).

Understandably, it is only in Ulster University that the role of information and communications technology (ICT) in teacher education has
been researched by teacher educators, who examined the use of Virtual Learning Environments (VLEs) to support students’ learning whilst they are scattered during placement in schools throughout the jurisdiction. Clarke (2009) sought to diminish the impact of separation and distance by developing online communities of practice in which students engaged in carefully considered, reflective writing, in more informal discussions, and in the online sharing of resources within and across cohorts and thus, also, between schools. In Makerere, where geographical distances are greater and roads are more poorly developed, some early initiatives are underway through sharing resources using CD-ROMs in order to circumvent problems with slow/non-existent internet connections.

The scale of the crucial need for qualified teachers in sub-Saharan Africa and the inherent major challenges (Buckler, 2011: 244), together with the rapid development of telecommunication networks across the continent in the early years of the twenty-first century, point convincingly towards an urgent need to use the power of ICT to provide teacher education on a much greater scale (Dladla and Moon, 2013; Unwin, 2005). Nonetheless, the practical placement, together with the opportunity and capacity for student teachers to learn through supported, legitimate and peripheral participation in individual schools, are seen to be at the very heart of learning to teach, from Antrim in Northern Ireland to Zomba in Malawi.
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GLOBAL LEARNING AND BREXIT

Douglas Bourn

Abstract: This article provides a development education perspective on Brexit. It assesses the real and potential impact of Brexit on concepts of globalism and identity, explores how the outcome relates to xenophobia and racism, and examines the implications for the attitudes of young people with regards to global citizenship. The article concludes by outlining how development education has an important role in combating insularity and isolationism in the wake of Brexit whilst addressing some the underlying reasons why many communities opted to vote Leave.

Key words: Global learning; Brexit; European Union; development education; racism.

The referendum vote in the UK in June 2016 that resulted in the majority of those who voted recommending leaving the European Union raises important questions and issues for those within education who are interested in promoting learning about the wider world. Development education practice in the UK has relied heavily on funding from the European Commission. Europe Aid has had a budget line specifically on awareness raising and learning about development issues. Many non-governmental organisations (NGOs), local authorities and higher education institutions have benefited from this budget line. More recently, other budget lines from the Commission including Erasmus and Horizon 20:20 have also provided opportunities for funding development education type activity. At a broader level, education at all levels within the UK has benefitted from the opportunities to share approaches towards learning, undertaking research and developing joint projects with partners elsewhere in Europe.

But perhaps even more important than the issue of funding is that the vote in the UK raises wider challenges to those within education about how best to respond to what is clearly a reaction to global influences, be they concerning refugees, economic migration or a growing sense of alienation
from society. How should those who promote development education and global learning respond in terms of their work with schools, young people and other educational institutions? This article will outline some of the issues that development educationalists need to consider in responding to the challenges of Brexit, addressing particularly themes related to globalisation and identities and the influence of racism within UK society.

What is clear is that within the UK, or at least within a large number of communities in England and Wales particularly, is resentment amongst many working people to the recent influx of economic migrants from Central and Eastern Europe. What is also evident is that since the vote in June, the rise of racist attacks reflects perhaps a more deep-seated and latent xenophobia in the UK that has perhaps not been discussed openly enough before. These themes reflect a broader dislocation from society particularly amongst many working class communities that is a direct consequence of the impact of globalisation and neoliberal policies on local economies. These trends therefore suggest that for those involved within development education and global learning, the referendum result identifies three major, albeit interrelated themes:

- The impact of globalisation on people’s sense of identity, place, employment opportunities and culture;
- The xenophobia and racism that exists in many communities needs also to be related to the postcolonial forces that are still ever present in British society; and
- The role that education can play in equipping young people to play an active role in society, to feel included, valued and listened to.

Globalisation and globalism
Globalisation has many interpretations but underlying most of them is recognition that societies and communities are becoming interconnected socially, culturally and economically (Beck, 2000; Giddens, 1991; Held and
McGrew, 2000). In much of the debate about the reasons for Brexit, the term globalisation has emerged as a major one, as a reason why many working class voters rejected the European framework (Elliott, 2016; Sharma, 2016). As Coyle has written:

“The UK’s ‘Leave’ vote could be seen as a vote against globalisation and its uneven impact on different parts of the country, rather than a vote specifically against the EU. The proportions voting for Leave were higher in the Midlands and North of England, where deindustrialisation struck hardest and where average incomes have stagnated. London, the UK’s only truly global city, saw growth and a high share of Remain voters” (2016: 1).

The economic changes that could be said to have influenced the referendum outcome go back to the Thatcher period in the UK and the consequent dominance of neoliberal economic strategies.

What globalisation has done is to accelerate these changes and increase the divisions in society between those who have access to stable forms of employment and those who do not. The consequences of these themes can be seen in terms of increased poverty, low self-esteem and within education, challenges in terms of role models and encouraging positive engagement in societies. As Younge (2010) suggests, globalisation has turned individuals into a ‘universal tribe of consumers’ who are ‘economically interdependent but isolated and impotent as citizens’. These changes suggest that the more people sense a loss of control and access to democratic levers, the more people retreat into distinct identities or tribes (Cantle, 2013. Martin Jacques, a UK journalist, commented in 2016 that Brexit is a classic example of populism, of a reaction to political elites, a feeling amongst people who ‘have lost out and been left behind…who feel dislocated by large scale immigration over which they have no control and who face an increasingly insecure and casualised labour market.’

This theme can be seen in numerous debates in and around globalisation. This sense of dislocation has been commented on in numerous
academic debates around globalisation (Dolby and Rizvi, 2008; Nayak, 2003). These trends relate to what could be called the rise of ‘identity politics’ and the erosion of traditional forms of democratic engagement in societies. A consequence of this retreat into distinct identities has also been the reluctance to engage with difference, cultures and outlooks other than their own. But there is a danger of merely equating globalisation with the impact of these social, cultural and economic forces. Ulrick Beck (2000) has commented on the complex nature of globalisation and that it should be seen in a wider context than just the domination of global companies and the marketisation. He uses the term globalism as incorporating the domination of the world market in both an economic and ideological sense (Beck, 2000:9).

Beck suggests on the other hand that globalisation could also be seen as globality; living in a world society where the totality of social relationships are not integrated into or determined by nation states (ibid.) This distinction is important because not only is globalisation here to stay, it has brought with it important openings and opportunities that can broaden one’s outlook, provide access to instant information and put you in direct contact with peoples and communities from around the world. Global forces have enabled the potential mobilisation of communities through forms of social networking and an opportunity to develop partnerships and solidarity with peoples beyond the nation state.

Therefore, for development education, globalisation is not a simple economic or social force that needs to be exposed and campaigned against. It is much more complex phenomenon that brings with it opportunities as well as challenges. One of the challenges of the Brexit vote is to show through education that globalisation can result in the opening up of minds, ideas and experiences to different viewpoints and perspectives from around the world.

Xenophobia and racism
The UK is often lauded as being a more integrated and cosmopolitan society than much of continental Europe. Whilst there may be some evidence to
support this, particularly in a city such as London (Block, 2006), there are deep ideological undercurrents that raise important challenges for global learning. Racism in the twenty-first century cannot be divorced from making reference to the influence of globalisation (Macedo and Gounari, 2016; Stavenhagen, 1999). There has been an assumption that increased social and economic mobility can and has led to a decrease in racist behaviours. There is certainly some evidence that access to a range of cultures can broaden peoples’ horizons (Fennes and Hapgood, 1997), and that travel and social mobility can lead to a decrease in stereotyping (Bamber, 2016). However, there is also evidence that increased global mobility can result in indigenous communities feeling isolated and resentful. Racism breeds on a sense of alienation, of dislocation from society. It can also become more prevalent when education in whatever form, fails to address underlying causes of racism (Stavenhagen, 1999).

The rise of racist attacks in the UK post-Brexit suggests there is a correlation between globalisation, racism and tribal identities. More than 3,000 allegations of hate crimes were made to UK police in the week before and the week after the 23 June vote, a year-on-year increase of 42 percent (Butler, 2016). These events however need to be seen as more than just short-term responses to Brexit but reflecting deep seated prejudices and views that have existed in UK society for a long time but were given a new air of legitimacy with the vote in June (Troyna, 1993). Britain, despite its outward appearance of being a tolerant, multicultural society, has deeply ingrained traditions of racism and xenophobia, running right through its modern history. The British Empire was built on a sense of racial superiority. Hostility to perceived outsiders has been a theme, from the ‘nineteenth century to the present day including anti-Semitism in the inter-war years, post-war racism towards Black and Asian people, and today’s Islamophobia and resentment towards Eastern Europeans.

These themes have been well documented in a range of reports in the UK, most notably the MacPherson Report in response to the murder of Stephen Lawrence, but where there has been less discussion is on the
undercurrents of xenophobia. This suggests that a neglected aspect of debates around these themes in the UK has been the relevance of postcolonial thinking. Whilst there has been some important recent work on postcolonial theories and development education and global citizenship, particularly through the work of Vanessa Andreotti (2012) and April Biccum (2010), there have few studies that have looked directly at the implications of racism and xenophobia for the practices of development education and global learning in the UK.

Young people and globalisation
The majority of young adults who voted in the referendum it appears tended to vote remain rather than leave. The reasons for this are probably numerous including being more socially and culturally mobile than their parents or grandparents, being more aware of wider world issues and above all recognising the integrated nature of UK within Europe and the wider world. It is likely that education has played an important role in this with considerable resources and opportunities being made available within formal education for cultural understanding and joint projects with partner schools elsewhere in Europe.

At a broader level, young people more than any other sector of society, have been the most direct recipients of globalisation (Furlong and Cartmel, 2007). This can be seen through the influences on their sense of personal identification, consumption patterns or use of social networking (France, 2007; Nayak, 2003). This influence of globalisation however does not automatically make young people global citizens. Many of them feel isolated, disenfranchised from decision-making processes and secure employment opportunities are by no means an option. Also, as a range of studies and research on global learning has shown, young people have also been influenced by the media and other forms of communication that perpetuate traditional and negative images about people elsewhere in the world (Brown, 2014; Cross et.al, 2010).
It is where development education and global learning has been well resourced, and provided opportunities for young people to develop their understanding about the wider world, that there is evidence of a global outlook and one that challenges perceptions and stereotypes (Bourn, 2015; Hunt, 2012). This evidence shows particularly that the impact is strongest and most long lasting where young people see their connections between this learning and their own lifestyles and personal situations.

**Role of and response from education**

Education is therefore an important response to Brexit. In purely economic terms, the UK education system has to address the challenge of Brexit by encouraging learning to look beyond the British Isles. ‘Insular isolationism is not a viable option and we need to be part of larger entities that have the reach and resources required to tackle global problems’ (Elliott, 2016). The benefits that the education system has gained from being part of the European Union must not be lost. Young people, teachers and schools need to continue to have access to learning about other cultures, understanding different perspectives on issues and recognising the value of broadening horizons beyond their own community and nation state.

The importance of these themes has been recognised by policymakers around the world through for example the planned PISA study on global competencies in 2018 and the inclusion of concepts such as global citizenship in the United Nations UN Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). Terms such as global and twenty-first century skills for example are not part of the vocabulary of educationalists around the world. Of course, globalisation has brought with it many negative consequences to education, including the emphasis on examinations and testing, measuring performance and promoting competition. But at the same time it has created opportunities for young people to have access to knowledge from a wide range of sources around the world, to be able to communicate with people and see that we live in an interconnected and interdependent world.
Development education and global learning and Brexit

A feature of development education and global learning practice over the past decade has been the promotion of an approach towards learning that moves beyond increasing knowledge about global and development issues to one that challenges assumptions, questions stereotypes and shows the underlying causes of inequality and injustice in the world. The growing popularity of terms such as global citizenship for example reflect this emphasis on making connections to the individual learners’ sense of place in the world.

As already mentioned, the work of Vanessa Andreotti has been particularly influential. However, the influence of postcolonialism has not always been translated through to making links and connections to themes such as power, inequality and the ideological influence of colonial forces within, say, British society. There may be a number of reasons for this including funding constraints and the priorities of NGOs, but this is clearly an area that needs to be addressed in the light of Brexit. Through the Global Learning Programme in England there has been a number of initiatives around the British values debate but this is, of course, framed within an approach in which it is difficult to address some of the more underlying causes of racism and xenophobia in UK society (Bowden, 2016). There has also been some innovative work looking at influences of postcolonialism on educational partnerships and study visits (Leonard, 2014; Martin and Griffiths, 2014).

Development education and global learning in response to Brexit therefore need to be based more on promoting learning that looks at the issues and causes of inequality, understanding power relations and the ideological influences that underpin much of the dominant political ideas in UK society. Too often development educationalists have tended to respond to the challenges of globalisation by encouraging action against the influences of multi-national companies and global forces. What this has done is to ignore the complex influences of globalisation and the conflating of globalisation with neoliberal forces. Whilst there is a danger of education being seen as the panacea for addressing these issues of racism and
alienation, there is no doubt that formal education particularly through schools can play an important role in promoting approaches towards learning what globalisation means, why there is economic migration from East to Western Europe and also the broader undercurrents in British society regarding a sense of superiority over other cultures. Merely encouraging and promoting cultural awareness it is suggested here is not enough. What cannot be denied is that some have perceived Brexit as permission for intolerance and racism in society. This makes schools’ role in promoting respect and mutual understanding that much harder.

**Concluding thoughts**

Brexit has laid down major challenges to educationalists throughout the UK and probably beyond. It has raised major issues and challenges in terms of the relationship between themes and viewpoints from within British society to what is taught within schools. To say that education should broaden horizons, encourage a sense of tolerance and cultural understanding whilst laudable in itself is perhaps not enough. Living in a complex, globalised world needs to be recognised within education but unless there is also a discussion about understanding why some communities feel left behind and excluded, then we are not equipping learners with the relevant knowledge and skills to make a positive contribution to society.

Development education and global learning theories and practices need to take far more account than they currently do of the complex influences on societies. Racism and xenophobia need to be tackled and debated within schools. But the issues need to be addressed in a way that connects with young people’s everyday lives and shows that the challenges many communities are facing need to be understood in the context of global forces and influences.
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My 350 on Brexit: Development Practitioners React to the Outcome of the UK Referendum on Membership of the European Union
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Douglas Bourn
Brexit has raised important challenges to those within education about how best to respond to what is clearly a reaction to global influences, be they concerning refugees, economic migration or a growing sense of alienation from society. The rise of racist attacks post-referendum reflects perhaps a more deep-seated and latent xenophobia in the UK that has perhaps not been discussed openly enough before. These themes reflect a broader dislocation from society particularly amongst many working class communities that is a direct consequence of the impact of globalisation and neoliberal policies on local economies.

However, for development education, globalisation is not a simple economic or social force that needs to be exposed and campaigned against. It is a much more complex phenomenon that brings with it opportunities as well as challenges. One of the challenges of the Brexit vote is to show through education that globalisation can result in the opening up of minds, ideas and experiences to different viewpoints and perspectives from around the world. Development education and global learning in response to Brexit therefore need to be based more on promoting learning that looks at the issues and causes of inequality, understanding power relations and the ideological influences that underpin much of the dominant political ideas in UK society.
Too often development educationalists have tended to respond to the challenges of globalisation by encouraging action against the influences of multinational companies and global forces. What this has done is to ignore the complex influences of globalisation and the conflating of globalisation with neoliberal forces. Whilst there is a danger of education being seen as the panacea for addressing these issues of racism and alienation, there is no doubt that formal education particularly through schools can play an important role in promoting approaches towards learning what globalisation means, why there is economic migration from East to Western Europe and also the broader undercurrents in British society regarding a sense of superiority over other cultures. Merely encouraging and promoting cultural awareness it is suggested here is not enough. What cannot be denied is that some have perceived Brexit as permission for intolerance and racism in society. This makes schools’ role in promoting respect and mutual understanding that much harder.

Douglas Bourn is Director of the Development Education Research Centre at University College London Institute of Education (UCL-IOE) and author of The Theory and Practice of Development Education (2015).

Frank Geary
Theresa May and the UK government have been repeating the mantra ‘Brexit means Brexit’, but no one seems capable or willing to define what Brexit actually means. One thing we can say is that for development education Brexit means uncertainty and a major challenge to our values.

Brexit is already creating uncertainty at the practical level of European Union programmes and funding calls. The European Commission’s DEAR (Development Education and Awareness Raising) grants call closed on June 21st, two days before the UK voted to leave the EU. It is unlikely that Brexit will have an impact on UK organisations engaged in the current DEAR call, as the UK remains part of the EU until the British government invokes Article 50. There will certainly be an impact on
UK organisation’s ability to engage in future European partnership programmes as well as on EU policy and practice on DEAR, although what that impact will be remains uncertain while the status and meaning of Brexit remains unclear. Brexit means Brexit and we are all none the wiser.

More fundamentally, the Brexit vote is a major challenge to values that inform development education, in particular to ideas of global citizenship and universalism. In 2015 the Sustainable Development Goals and the Paris Accord saw an unprecedented multilateralism as global political processes that grappled with global political, economic, social and environmental issues. One year later, with Brexit and protectionist responses to migration in Europe, we are seeing the opposite. Whatever your views on the merits of the EU, Brexit is a decision to withdraw from the multilateralism of the European project. It is a challenge to the assumptions behind global citizenship and universalism, the idea that we are ‘all in it together’. While some voters may have voted leave so that the UK would abandon a protectionist fortress Europe and exercise a more globally minded multilateralism, many others followed the isolationist rhetoric of Nigel Farage.

The Brexit campaign has mainstreamed and strengthened isolationist, protectionist and anti-immigrant rhetoric in the UK. Nigel Farage’s anti-immigrant posters sit alongside the rhetoric of Donald Trump and the strong-man nationalism we’re seeing in India, Philippines, Russia and across the world. These phenomena are a fundamental challenge to the values of development education. It is more important than ever for development education to be at these faultlines, addressing these challenges and creating spaces to air and explore these issues.

Frank Geary is the Director of the Irish Development Education Association (IDEA).
John Hilary
The British referendum decision to leave the EU offers an opportunity to rethink the principles on which we base our relations with the rest of the world. Do we wish to continue with the imperialist programme that has characterised European policy towards the global South for so many centuries? Or are we at last ready for a new approach? Since the adoption of the Global Europe strategy in 2006, the EU has openly committed itself to the most aggressive programme in its trade relations with other countries, relentlessly promoting the interests of transnational capital at the expense of labour, society and the environment. This agenda has made itself publicly known through the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP) under negotiation with the US. The fact that unelected EU bureaucrats have pursued TTIP in open defiance of public opposition was a standard complaint in every one of the debates that I took part in leading up to the referendum, and in comment pieces written on both sides.

Yet the TTIP agenda is not an aberration on the part of Brussels. It is the EU’s standard programme for all peoples, seen in the Economic Partnership Agreements forced on African, Caribbean and Pacific island states, and also in the EU’s other trade agreements with countries of the global South. The Leave vote means that the British people will no longer be party to EU trade agreements. Yet we knew that Brexit would bring us face to face with a UK political elite that has consistently championed the most extreme neoliberal positions on the European spectrum. We must ensure the British people’s decision to reject the EU cannot be twisted into a mandate to pursue the EU’s imperialist programme unilaterally.

The Leave vote was a rejection of the political caste. The fact that voters in many traditional Labour strongholds came out for Brexit must be seen as a call for a new kind of politics, here and overseas. Our task now is to help build the movement that turns this new politics into a progressive force for positive change.
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Gerard McCann

With the UK set to leave the EU in or around 2020, the implications of this move for international cooperation and development policies are complex and extensive. At the time of the referendum on 23 June 2016, the EU was party to 1,139 bilateral and multilateral agreements with countries outside the twenty-eight member states. This included formal international agreements on trade, development, common foreign and security policies. The breakup of the EU means revision and renegotiation of key development policies such as the Economic Partnership Agreements, the Cotonou Treaty, the Consensus on Development and a bank of other significant transnational policy arrangements.

The UK’s role in this architecture cannot be understated in that on accession to the European Economic Community in 1973 it had negotiated for development cooperation agreements that represented almost a third of the world, including overseas territories and former colonies. The Overseas Development Institute warned that the impact of Brexit for developing countries would be in the region of £3.1 billion in the first year. This contraction – if not mitigated – will effect trade, aid, developing markets, remittances and currency fluctuations. Indeed, £1.2 billion of the international aid budget from the UK per year is channeled through the offices of the EU. Will this be supplemented post 2020? Furthermore, the UK will, according to most financial analysts (Barclays, Bank of England, Morgan Stanley, Credit Suisse), go into recession in the period immediately after the exit.

The anticipated 10 percent drop in the UK’s Gross Domestic Product (GDP) will reverberate across the developing world. Risks are anticipated for former colonies, Commonwealth countries and overseas territories and include: exports from developing countries to the UK going down, commodity prices falling, wage depression, tourism dropping, infrastructure projects reducing, UK agri-food protectionism, investments being constrained and, as mentioned, with the pound falling in value, remittances to the developing countries being worth less. Problematically,
the most controversial aspect of post-EU Britain will be that of a migration policy which could collapse into a racially constructed mechanism to restrict movement to and from developing countries. International cooperation and development policies will invariably be impacted by Brexit. The countries involved and development agencies have a lot to get lobbying for over the next three years.

Gerard McCann is a senior lecturer in International Studies at St. Mary’s University College, Queen’s University Belfast.

Stephen McCloskey
The economist Paul Mason argued that: ‘The Brexit vote was an insurrectionary protest against neoliberalism, globalism and cultural contempt’. Perhaps, but it certainly reflected a deeply divided society along class, cultural and geographical lines; divisions accentuated by the post-2008 austerity politics that have largely targeted vulnerable communities and sectors of society. Brexit could, therefore, be viewed as further evidence of a growing chasm between the lived experiences of a state-neglected and increasingly alienated working class and the NGO sector which they no longer regard as a positive part of their lives. Concepts that are championed by international NGOs such as global citizenship and interdependence were, if anything, negatively configured in the Brexit debate suggesting that they are now largely disconnected from ‘leave’ communities.

A Charity Commission research report published recently suggests that overall public confidence and trust in charities has fallen to 5.7 (from 6.7 in 2015) out of ten. Overall, respondents said that they are more likely to trust small charities (57 percent) over large ones (34 percent) and charities that operate in the UK (61 percent) over those that operate internationally (31 percent). These are worrying conclusions for international NGOs and perhaps signal that the public regard the international non-governmental sector as part of the same institutional elite against which they were rebelling in the referendum vote.
Reflecting on Brexit, Oxfam’s Duncan Green asked: ‘Would it be better to pull back from the day to day trench warfare of Whitehall and go long term, working with youth, investing more in development education, working on public attitudes to race and ‘Otherness’?’ There can only be one answer to this question if the international development sector is to reclaim lost credibility and relevance in the communities that voted leave. Many leading international NGOs walked away from development education in the late 1990s and abandoned the kind of coalface global learning so clearly needed today. Why then be surprised at wholesale consumption in leave communities of stereotypes about migration and the global South? The international development NGOs need to re-embrace development education and support delivery in poor communities that should, after all, be their core constituency.

**Stephen McCloskey** is Director of the Centre for Global Education, Belfast.

**Susan McIntosh**

The shockwaves of the UK vote are still reverberating, but a key question still remains why did so many in the UK wish to leave the European Union whilst Scotland is being dragged kicking and screaming from it! What was the difference? My view is that education made the difference. Not just in schools (in fact not nearly enough in schools) but in communities up and down the country, at bus stops, in shops and in pubs, in fact anywhere people came into contact with each other. Scotland’s referendum on membership of the UK union in 2014 was called a full eighteen months before the actual poll, in contrast to the European referendum which was called with only four months’ notice. The UK referendum allowed for arguments to be developed and the case for and against to be fully debated. The grassroots movement which grew during the campaign, particularly on the ‘Yes’ side was unprecedented in modern Scotland.

This political awakening resulted in a growing dissatisfaction with the established political class and the two party rule which had prevailed for
so long at Westminster, although really just the one party, Labour, in Scotland. At the next General Election in 2015 Labour was all but wiped out, returning only one MP to the SNP’s 56! Scotland had an option and chose it, in England there was no such choice.

When it came to the referendum on European Union membership every area in Scotland voted to remain; they did not believe the largely negative messaging about Europe emanating from the media and had experienced 'project fear' before. Economic arguments and scaremongering about being overrun by migrants (often no distinction made or recognised between refugees, asylum seekers, economic migrants from the EU or elsewhere!) gained very little traction in Scotland and I would argue that this had everything to do with a population which had seen through the media spin and downright lies and knew that the establishment was peddling its own lines for its own ends!

This is what education can do and what Global Citizenship in particular is about, with critical thinking, media and political literacy being at its very core.

**Susan McIntosh** has been the Co-ordinator of Scotdec, a global education centre based in Edinburgh, for twenty years.
A LONG LOOK BACK: SOME CRITICAL REFLECTIONS ON DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION IN IRELAND AND THE UK

Neil Alldred

Abstract: This article examines development education (DE) from the perspectives of content, methodology and audiences, and looks at issues of funding and coordination, concluding with some reflections on how a review of past omissions and weaknesses may be of help to the sector in forging newer partnerships, innovative outreach delivery, and greater emphasis on activism and political engagement.
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The tenth anniversary of Policy and Practice in 2015 (http://www.developmenteducationreview.com/issue20) was a welcome event in the development education (DE) sector. As well as providing an assessment of current challenges and methodological issues, it also offered some exciting lines of enquiry and possible directions for future operations in the sector. This article will, however, leave the future to other – younger – students, teachers, researchers and activists, and concentrate on a personal reflection on over forty years’ engagement with development initiatives. Such a historical perspective may help shape thinking on current and future challenges and how best to respond to them in a rapidly changing world context.

Development perspectives
After World War II, Britain and France lost their empires and many colonies moved towards independence. As the drive to development took off, academic thinking in the West was a prisoner of the Cold War, with little effective challenge being offered to hegemonic paradigms of a free democratic West versus an enslaved, dictatorial East. The DE sector was born and grew up within those narrow perspectives and, whilst much
activism focused on the political independence of colonial Africa, there was little understanding of the importance of international relations or global economics in the elaboration of a broader perspective on development.

Indeed, as independent countries began to establish strategies for their own development, they engaged increasingly with economic issues but the DE sector was perceived to fit more readily with geography and cognate disciplines, leaving economic development to universities and colleges. This represented the beginnings of an important dichotomy between academic research on development and a schools-based DE which did not often incorporate the empirical findings and theoretical propositions of the post-school academic community. The school system – especially in Ireland – continued to ignore central issues of development such as power relations and inequality, and to concentrate instead on softer issues such as cross-cultural relations, charitable support to poorer peoples, and a continuing view of ‘their’ poverty being the problem rather than ‘our’ wealth.

Increasingly, the Cold War fostered different perceptions of development which the DE sector in Ireland and the UK appeared disinclined to challenge. As we look back over DE in the 1960s and 70s, the lack of any countervailing perspectives to the US-dominated worldview appears obvious. Much of our ‘evidence base’ was provided by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD, n.d.), or the World Bank and International Monetary Fund (IMF), especially in terms of statistics, but we often appeared unwilling to examine other perspectives. Young minds were hugely impressed in Africa by the free newspaper, China Today, detailing Chinese domestic and international nation-building efforts. The Soviets produced Sputnik – also a propaganda tool but important for offering people in developing countries different perspectives and ambitions. Cuba after 1959 produced Granma which also offered alternatives to Western worldviews.

The development initiatives of the Soviet Union were hardly enlightened but the fact that the DE sector here largely ignored them cannot
be considered an accolade. The Warsaw Pact archives are now available for research and one can see, for example, the huge number of scholarships offered to students from developing countries to go to the Patrice Lumumba International University in Moscow and return to their home country with internationally recognised qualifications to begin the task of nation-building. Much of the Soviet effort towards developing countries lay in armaments and ‘defence’ equipment but it would be both churlish and neglectful to ignore Soviet development initiatives, especially some of the more iconic and inspiring actions such as the saving of the Aswan High Dam in Nasser’s Egypt through the offer of a $1.2 billion loan, at 2 percent interest, in 1956. The role of Soviet and Cuban forces in Africa’s liberation struggles was hugely important and any balanced and nuanced picture of African development should include a deeper understanding of those important contributions.

China, of course, is now seen to be a major partner and champion of Africa. The economic importance of early Chinese flagship projects in Africa – for example, the TanZam Uhuru Railway, 1970-1975 – was huge and, at a time when China itself was not seen as prosperous, impressed Africans with a sense of altruism and real partnership that they had not seen in their dealings with Western nations.

As well as ignoring much of the development work conducted by ‘the other side’ in the Cold War, the DE sector appeared to bypass much indigenous development thinking and practice, especially from African political activists and politicians. President Julius Nyerere of Tanzania formulated a version of African Socialism, based on the Swahili term of ‘ujamaa’ (‘collective effort’). Kenya’s President Jomo Kenyatta embraced the concepts of ‘harambee’ (Swahili for ‘working together’) and ‘uhuru’ (‘freedom’) for effective popular mobilisation. Zambia’s President Kenneth Kaunda extolled a form of Christian social democracy which became known as African Humanism but – again – it didn’t make much impact on the DE sector here in terms of building a broad-based understanding of different people’s perceptions of what development could be (James, 2014).
There were, of course, myriad other development initiatives – from simplified exhortations in Mao Zedong’s *Little Red Book* and other writings, to the pan-Africanism urged on the continent by the likes of President Sékou Touré of Guinea or President Nkrumah of Ghana, in the heady, euphoric days of early post-independence. And what about the initiatives adumbrated outside the English language? Whilst peoples recently freed from an experience of British colonialism were pursuing ‘community development’, peoples in former French colonies attempted ‘animation rurale’ (Alldred, 1978) – rural animation, or an attempt to organise rural resources for a more autonomous, indigenous and community-focused development pathway. Was that not worth examining in our DE work, especially in comparison to the rich literature on community development?

Equally, the French concept of ‘assimilation’ (literally assimilation or integration), echoed by the Portuguese idea of ‘assimilação’, brings out wonderfully different perceptions of the goals of development, compared to British understandings. Few Britons sought to accept any of their colonised peoples as eventually being able to live and work in Britain, alongside British men and women, whereas French and Portuguese conceptions of development saw an ultimate goal of drawing those former subjects into equal citizenship rights beside former colonists. Such fundamental concepts, at the heart of the development experience of so many African and Latin American peoples in particular, should surely have found a place in the DE curriculum in Ireland and the UK (and even inform our collaborations with Francophones and Lusophones), but appear to have left very few traces.

Indeed, the Portuguese colonial experience is even less well understood among anglophone audiences than that of our French-speaking friends. In 1974, a revolution took place in Portugal, which sloughed off an obscene dictatorship and led to the rapid decolonisation of Angola, Mozambique, Guinea Bissau and the Cape Verde islands (Storey, 1976). It was impossible to fully understand the truly historic importance of the end of apartheid and the onset of black majority rule in South Africa without a basic understanding of the independence struggles in the former Portuguese
territories in Africa. If a proper grasp of economics – in the context of newly independent states seeking industrial and financial emancipation as well as political freedom – is poorly understood, how much more lacking is our grasp of the histories of those same newly independent countries? Histories of Africa may be fascinating in themselves but many are also instructive for understanding colonialist and imperialist phases of British and other European countries’ past – and how that has shaped the world we all inhabit today (see, for example, Arnold, 2005; Davidson, 1968; Hargreaves, 1979; MacMillan, 1938; and Oliver & Atmore, 1967).

It might be understandable that the sector concentrated both on Africa – our nearest developing continent – and on English-speaking Africa, but it may well be seen as a form of parochialism which should have been eschewed much earlier. We could have looked more profitably at other development experiences, too. In China, for example, the lessons of the revolution of 1949 were not readily examined, except by specialist researchers and sinophiles: the DE sector did not adopt in any meaningful sense an independent position from mainstream Western economic and political analysis sufficient to establish a better balance among the competing subjectivities surrounding development discourses.

The content and materials of our DE work could have usefully looked at such fascinating concepts as ‘ubuntu’. In the UK and Ireland, Archbishop Desmond Tutu’s formulation is perhaps the best known: ‘My humanity is caught up, is inextricably bound up, in yours’ (1999: 186). Similarly, we could have examined Africa’s experience of village palavers as a better means of achieving community consensus rather than the divisive oppositional politics fostered in the West by voting on yes/no alternatives. Indeed, anthropology – like history – has been piling up huge resources that point the way to constructing theories based on the lived experience of developing countries, rather than the imposed schemas of Western academics (see Balandier, 1957; and Lévi-Strauss, 1955).
Development theory
The DE sector has often tried to recognise and to reconcile the global facts of inequality and the comfortable, privileged position most of us enjoy. Ha-Joon Chang puts it pithily in his wonderful deconstruction of capitalism: ‘The wage gaps between rich and poor countries exist not mainly because of differences in individual productivity but mainly because of immigration control’ (Joon-Chang, 2010: 23). People in rich countries are beneficiaries of structured inequality across the world. If we do not have a theory of development sufficient to grasp that, and to inspire us into positive collective action to change that, we cannot be effective in helping others understand global social and economic forces.

It remains an unforgivable blot on the history of DE that the sector rarely challenged the Bible of capitalism’s apologetics – Walt W. Rostow’s *The Stages of Economic Growth: a non-communist manifesto* (1960). An economic historian with no track record of theoretical elaboration, Rostow was a zealous cheerleader for the American way of life and formulated ‘modernisation’ as the recipe for development. His simplistic, ahistorical and unempirical contention that the US evolved through five stages and that every other country can and must go through those same essential stages has been handed down as gospel to generations of scholars, students and pupils. We hardly challenged with any serious intellectual rigour the ideological notion of Rostow and his fellow apologists that capitalism represented the only way forward for developing countries.

Rostow’s ‘one-size-fits-all’ approach to development does not even faithfully portray the history of the United States itself – where are the references to expropriation of lands from native Americans, or the extermination of entire peoples, or the European invasion of the western hemisphere? A more faithful reading of US history would perhaps, instead, offer a blueprint for European colonisation of Africa and Asia. This was not development theory but Cold War propaganda – the clue is in the book’s subtitle – barely passing as academic literature. Allowing the educational sector in the UK and Ireland, and the media, as well as business and political elites,
to continue to parrot this empty and damaging paradigm for so long remains a grave failing of the DE sector over the last fifty years.

With the arrival of theories of underdevelopment in the mid-1960s, the sector had empirically-based and theoretically strong constructs for principled opposition to Rostow’s ideas – but we rarely made serious attempts to articulate, develop and propagate them. We struggled to generate consistent, continuous DE narratives that challenged capitalism – that same capitalism that often financed comfortable positions for DE teachers in the top economies and societies in the world. We lacked a good balance between voices from the global South and the dubious postulations of our leaders and elites which were clearly articulating a narrow national interest, which was also our own self-interest. Joris Luyendijk (2015: 184) puts it more eloquently in his book, *Swimming with Sharks*: ‘How do you agitate against a practice that you are taking part in yourself?’ Or Upton Sinclair’s ‘It is difficult to get a man to understand something, when his salary depends upon his not understanding it!’ (1994: 109).

In Latin America, development theory produced a wealth of ideas, evidence and analysis, which remained marginal to most teaching concerns in these islands. Re-reading in the past 4-5 years the works of Raul Prebisch, Andre Gunder Frank, Illich, Freire and even Dom Helder Camara has been a wonderfully liberating experience, although emphasising once again how little development theory (broadly defined) has progressed from the 1960s and 1970s. Samir Amin in Egypt, and Franz Fanon in Algeria and then in France, offered us some brilliant insights and analysis, but little else that emerged from Africa compares to the wealth of robust theory or evidence-based analysis that came out as Latin American activists and engaged thinkers, researchers and teachers developed the fundamental concept of ‘underdevelopment’ and Dependency Theory (see, for example, Amin, 1977; Câmara, 1971; Fanon, 1971; Freire, 1970; Gunder Frank, 1966; Illich, 1973; Prebisch, 1950).
The West has encouraged us all to look at the creation of wealth but we have rarely been exhorted to look at the factors, structures and processes which create poverty. The academic community has produced impressive work on the failings of Western economic models of development – to the extent that the hallowed status of Gross Domestic Product (GDP) is now seriously undermined. The fact that the King of Bhutan offered his nation a National Happiness Index in 1971 – and was mocked the world over for his naivety in ignoring the primacy of GDP – has been followed, forty years later, by the Sarkozy Commission on Wellbeing, or former Prime Minister Cameron’s short-lived commitment to wellbeing, and the New Economics Foundation’s (NEF’s) Happy Planet Index. The fixation on ‘free trade’ for developing countries has now been seen to be yet another failure of Western economic nostrums and policies pronounced by nations and elites that themselves benefitted from anything but free trade. The desire of early African leaders, post-independence, to pursue import substitution strategies – so harshly condemned and extirpated in the 1970s and 1980s – is now recognised as being an appropriate strategy for many developing countries. Merely to articulate the idea that every nation state has a unique selling point, a comparative advantage that it can use to grow its way to prosperity, is to call attention to the poverty of theory that has been the hallmark of Western elites for so long, and which has been so abjectly accepted by the DE sector (see, for example, Senghor, 1959).

Over forty years or more, the Western development community has flirted with a rash of fads and fashions – felt needs, basic needs, rural development, integrated development, participatory rural appraisal, the capabilities approach, the rights-based approach, etc. Donors have insisted on monitoring and evaluation, on gender equity, on institutional learning, and so on. The HIV/AIDS pandemic in the late 1980s onwards saw donor agencies insist that almost every single project had an HIV/AIDS component, whether relevant and helpful or not. Indeed, the shaping of development pathways – intellectually in places such as the UK and Ireland, and practically in ‘developing’ countries – by the insistence of funding agencies on following inappropriate Structural Adjustment Programmes (SAPs) or
Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs), has pushed the DE sector on to the back foot.

If we are to understand fully the structural causes of poverty creation and the burgeoning inequality in all countries, we need to have a strong intellectual foundation, in order to arrive at a robust and action-oriented theory of social change relevant to issues of international development. There is little obvious evidence suggesting that the DE sector has achieved much in this area.

Audiences
It has been fascinating to follow the shifting focus of DE, especially in the UK and Ireland since the founding of the then Ministry of Overseas Development in 1964 and of Irish Aid in 1974. In recent years, the Department for International Development (DfID) has become loath to fund initiatives aimed at development education work within the UK, and Irish Aid has trimmed its expenditures on awareness-raising within Ireland. As with education for sustainable development, policy makers have decided that primary school children should be the main focus and the main beneficiaries of most teaching initiatives. This didn’t used to be the case: faith groups, trade unions, young peoples’ groups, sports clubs and many other civil society organisations engaged in many activities that helped members of the public understand the broader issues of wealth, power, inequality and international solidarity.

Today, Trócaire largely concentrates on the Catholic community in Ireland whilst Christian Aid and Tearfund largely concentrate on the Protestant communities (mainly in the North), but most of their work focuses on fund-raising: the days of church officers campaigning fearlessly (à la Father Huddleston against apartheid) appear long gone, except on rare occasions such as the Make Poverty History campaign in 2005. The Coalition of Aid and Development Agencies Northern Ireland (CADANI) and Dóchas (the Irish Association of Non-Government Development Organisations), still try to mobilise consensus views on important
development-related issues, and there are a small number of university-located initiatives (such as TIDI – the Trinity International Development Initiative) but the idea of aiming to educate the public on international development themes and priorities appears to be yesterday’s challenge. Nationwide campaigns that were articulated through a loose network of One World Centres or Fair Trade shops, or through churches or pubs or community centres, have all but disappeared.

The Trade Union Congress (TUC) still produces its monthly Development Matters bulletin. The Irish Congress of Trade Unions (ICTU) used DfID and Irish Aid funds for successful DE work for a few years but has now reduced its activities to offering basic support to trade unions’ own Global Solidarity campaigns. There is a Global Learning Union Group offering trade union learning and activism that does focus on international development issues. But where are the large campaigns, the summer schools, the online courses offering help to those who express an interest? Perhaps the DE sector has followed the money a little too closely so that, when the money dries up in one area, the sector abandons that audience. Far too little is on offer to the general public, who are instead exposed to stronger media presentations of global issues, through the lenses of commerce, self-interest or partisanship.

There still remains the obstacle that much DE work assumes that ‘here’ is somehow developed and ‘there’ is somehow underdeveloped. We cheerfully teach our primary school children that people in developing countries have the same rights as us and should therefore – morally speaking – be able to benefit from the same great conditions of daily life as we are able to enjoy. The fact that our history, our current lifestyle, our hegemonic domination (through soft power), are themselves problematic, needs to be addressed. That Norway can receive around 70 percent of the value of its oil and gas by way of royalties, but Zambia took more than eight years of struggle against Western corporations, backed by Western governments and institutions, to move its own royalties on copper up from 3 percent to 6 percent, should also feature in our development ‘education’ (Hill, 2016).
Those better understandings, and their implications for action, need to be brought before newer, wider audiences.

**Methodologies**

Education has long been synonymous with the school system. The DE sector has been accustomed to what used to be called ‘chalk and talk’ – using the blackboard to inform the class about some of the teacher’s expertise. The advent of ICT, PowerPoint and Prezie updated those tools but left the modus operandi unchanged. Fortunately, we have had a few exemplary innovations such as Beyond Skin’s podcasts on development themes; Northern Vision’s television documentaries; occasional – but almost always superb – RTE documentaries (although a disappointing output from the BBC’s many channels and services). The Centre for Global Education’s (CGE) Global Issues seminars and published collections have been really helpful in bringing development themes and perceptions to a wider audience – and this journal is another excellent example of DE adapting its methodology to changing circumstances.

We sometimes pay lip service to the old adage that ‘In Africa, an old man [or woman] dying is like a library burning down’ but we don’t often embed that idea in our teachings. We still rely on books and DE ‘resources’ – but what about using the experience of people from developing countries who live and work here? And what about the myriad other opportunities not seized, the many other channels of engaging with the public in today’s 24/7 society? In schools and colleges, and online, language classes could be used to help explore other regions: Spanish teaching could use films from Latin America to explore issues of poverty, trade, freedom and gender rights; French teaching could use films from Senegal, Mali or Burkina Faso to explore similar themes but also slavery, oral history and environmentalism. Indeed, cinema has massive potential for bringing development issues to new publics. Pudovkin’s *Storm Over Asia* (1928), Kalatozov’s *I am Cuba* (1964), Pontecorvo’s *Battle for Algiers* (1966), Alea’s *Memories of Underdevelopment* (1968), Sembene Ousman’s *Xala* (1975), Niccol’s *Lord of War* (2005), Zwick’s *Blood Diamond* (2006), Iñárritu’s *Babel* (2006) are...
all important, commercially mainstream films that explore themes of development, inequality and global poverty with sensitivity and compassion. Economics and business studies could achieve their goals using a wider range of examples and examine global value chains, the elements of pricing policy, ‘free’ trade, local and global labour migrations and so on. Maths classes could teach basic arithmetic skills by focusing on how an item of clothing is priced in Dunnes and Primark, compared to M&S or Next, or on how profit margins are calculated on different products, or elements of SROI (Social Return on Investment), etc.

Those are just some of the possibilities of educating in formal, structured sessions that the DE sector hasn’t yet turned to its advantage. What about methods of teaching other audiences, in other situations? Many people appear to believe that campaigning is somewhat old-fashioned, that demonstrations in the street, or writing to MPs, are not the best ways to engage people, or that they are inefficient. Online petitions may be more acceptable and social media should surely be used to much greater effect than they have so far, but there may be still other ways of generating interest and commitment. Towns and boroughs ‘twin’ with one another, so why not have more North-South twinnings – such as that between Coleraine and Zomba, Malawi? If African governments are possibly corrupted by Western corporations, why not focus on African local government as a target for local, responsive and effective development work?

Activism on development issues is surely an important method of development education – as well as a resource, a means of mobilising concerned citizens, and a funding source. A strong case could be made for suggesting that the 2005 Make Poverty History campaign and buying Fair Trade have both done more to anchor development issues and values in ordinary citizen’s minds and behaviours than any amount of pedestrian development education. *Occupy Belfast* (or Toronto, New York, London, etc) was an opportunity to engage in wider debates and discussions about the kind of society we wish to see emerge from the ruins of current socio-economic failures, yet the DE sector did not engage meaningfully with them.
as a way to advance its own educative and transformative agenda. The August 2011 riots throughout England were decried by (then) British Prime Minister David Cameron as ‘criminality, pure and simple’ but other voices should surely have been raised to examine parallels with other instances of popular disaffection and indignation.

The hopes that were raised – and dashed – by the Arab Spring, and the implications of popular discontent as expressed in Syntagma Square (Athens) or Tahrir Square (Cairo) or in the rise of Podemos in Spain, seem to me to suggest that social, political and economic change does not come about in classrooms and seminars but in populations actively contesting current paradigms and contemporary mythologies, and in trying to formulate new visions, new practices and new social forces (see, for example, E. P. Thompson, 1963).

**Funding**

Until the 1980s, much DE was financed by organisations seeking support from their own constituencies (church congregations, trade union members, pub customers, sports clubs and community associations’ supporters, etc). In the 1990s, development NGOs concentrated efforts increasingly on DfID and Irish Aid. That led to a dependency on those two institutions and – following the dramatic decline in funding which set in after 2007/8 – those same development NGOs are increasingly desperate to diversify their funding for all types of development initiatives, and, once again, they allow themselves to believe successive government pronouncements to the effect that spending overseas has to be more important than spending in the UK or Ireland.

It would be really interesting to offer a consortium of development NGOs £1 million (or €1 million) to be spent only in agreed developing countries and designed to have maximum impact on the development situation there; and then to offer a different consortium the same amount of money to be spent wholly and only within Ireland and/or the UK and with the remit of generating maximum impact on the development situation in developing countries. Would ‘projects’ offering polio vaccinations, or
gender rights training, or disability mainstreaming, or tax collection improvement – in those developing countries – always and irrevocably offer poor people in poor countries better outcomes than monies spent on lobbying policy-makers in London, Dublin or Belfast, or on promoting fairer trading relationships through better monitoring of global supply chains, or on educating the public here on its global position, responsibilities and opportunities?

In December 2016, DfID will cease funding through its PPAs (Programme Partnership Agreements). The removal of these guarantees of unrestricted funding of development NGOs, provided a number of agreed outcomes are achieved, will inevitably hamper DE work. The sector thus needs to escape its dependency on UK and Irish government funding and seek instead revenue streams of its own. Fair Trade outlets, One World Shops, second hand bookshops, coffee shops and community centres need to reimagine activities that engage, inspire and challenge new audiences in new locations using new methods and new funding arrangements.

Management and coordination
There are perhaps some strong arguments against the DE sector having too formal a structure or too rigid a form of organisational control, since the flourishing of civil society does not require uniformity or single-mindedness of purpose. In the UK and Ireland, there have been three consistently important co-ordinating bodies – BOND, Dóchas and CADA. Each of these platforms is essentially an opportunity for individual development NGOs to share best practice, and to build collective strength among the development NGO community. For the DE sector, these respective collaborative associations have not really offered significant advantages. Indeed, their primary responsibility is not to development education per se and so there is little reason to expect them to deliver major benefits to the sector. In a world where DFID now has a budget upwards of £12 billion a year but fewer staff than in 2010, there is huge pressure to disburse monies in ever larger amounts in order to keep contract management operations within reasonably manageable limits. This means that the UK Alliance of National Networks
for International Development has become focused on ensuring that those monies are disbursed by member organisations and – increasingly – by coalitions and consortia of members.

So the DE sector articulates its specialist concerns through ‘trade organisations’ such as the Irish Development Education Association (IDEA) and Think Global. In Ireland, IDEA has had some impressive successes in a number of areas. Colm Regan’s blog (2016) lists some of the strengths, some of the weaknesses and some of the challenges that need to be addressed. His principal conclusion is that the DE sector has lost its original vision and has, to some extent, allowed its pursuit of professionalisation and respectability to cloud its original aims of activism, social change and political engagement. Perhaps thirty or forty years ago the DE sector was too amateurish, hoping that zeal and enthusiasm alone would compensate for any lack of organisation, polish and efficiency. But in its drive towards good governance it has allowed professionalisation and what Regan calls the ‘academisation’ of DE to set in, much to the detriment of the sector and to those it aims to serve and support.

Perhaps what is required is a new constellation of partnerships, in which schools and educators link up with faith groups, trade unions, community groups, sports clubs, youth organisations, consumer groups, activists, local government organisations, disabled peoples’ organisations (DPOs) and others in order to capture new energies, perspectives and inspirations.

**DE and the fight against global poverty and inequality**

Development education has long been seen as a noble, morally-elevated endeavour whose right-mindedness shines through. It may be more helpful to see it as victim of its own niche role within an overall development sector that is itself increasingly compromised. Just as the trade mandate entered the Department of Foreign Affairs (DFA’s) portfolio in 2011, so DfID’s own mandate has thrown development down to the third priority – after defending the departmental budget, and working with other Whitehall departments to
ensure that the UK establishes a new place in the world following the decision by the British people to leave the EU (DFID Alumni Association, 2016). In this fast-changing context, the DE sector needs to redefine its relationship to the wider development community and to communities across the world suffering from the failings of economic orthodoxy and political stasis.

Many people despise politics and politicians and prefer to stay in the morally clearer waters of DE, or fundraise for ‘worthy’ causes, or offer help in one-to-one settings such as child sponsorship, participation in gap-year or summer vacation development projects, etc. Just as buying Fair Trade is a necessary but not a sufficient condition for empowering workers in poor countries, so those individual initiatives are laudable and necessary, but they are not sufficient to effect systemic social change. Perhaps concentrating on the plight of the poor in Chile, Cameroon or Cambodia is more compelling than analysing the social problems of people in our local communities here in Ireland and the UK, but it is far from certain that we will thereby contribute more, or more effectively, to the global change that all communities need, in all parts of the world.

If we believe that all action for change must be circumspect, reasonable and tolerant, maybe we need to re-read Marcuse’s essay on Repressive Tolerance (1965), or Fanon’s On Violence (1971). Maybe we need to seek the advice of those who have already sloughed off colonial and other imperialist dominations. The Marxist notion of praxis – of practice informed by theory, and theory tempered by practical experience – may be relevant here: DE has become too complacent, too comfortable, too bourgeois, and needs a much stronger dose of activist political engagement. Marx noted in his Theses on Feuerbach (1845) that ‘Philosophers have hitherto only interpreted the world in various ways; the point is to change it’. Development education in Ireland and the UK has perhaps achieved a pass mark in understanding the global community, but has failed so far to mobilise for a more just international polity.
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Resource reviews

DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION IN THEORY AND PRACTICE: AN EDUCATOR’S RESOURCE

Review by Douglas Bourn


Educational resources related to the themes of development education and for third level or higher education activities are rare. The vast majority of educational materials produced in the field of development education are aimed at formal education and schools and, whilst some can be adapted for work, say, with university academics and students, having one that specifically focuses on this sector is welcome. This publication has come out of a Europe Aid funded project led by organisations in Cyprus, Ireland and Slovakia. The publication is based around twelve themes, each with a conceptual piece followed by activities outlining methods for teaching the theme. The themes include a general introduction to development education and global citizenship education followed by topics such as poverty, inequality, governance, migration, sustainable development, climate change, food, health, human rights and civil society activism.

Whilst the publication has some value to any academic or student interested in applying development education approaches to higher education, it has serious shortcomings and reflects perhaps a lack of understanding about, and evidence gained, from those working in the sector. The shortcomings and problems with the publication can be seen in the lack of clarity as to who it is aimed at within higher education. The themes identified reflect a traditional approach towards development. However
Eilish Dillon in her valuable introductory piece reflects on the relationship between development education and development studies. She rightly notes that development studies tends to operate within an accepted norm of the development discourse whereas development education does not. She rightly criticises much of development studies teaching as based on a ‘banking style of education’ but what is not clear from her piece or from others is what is different about a development education approach.

There are numerous examples of a development education pedagogical approach in higher education, particularly in areas such as engineering and health (Bourn and Neal, 2008; Willott et al., 2012) but they are not referred to within this publication. In defence of the publication, in many European countries, learning about development issues is only an emerging subject within higher education and there has been a call for publications and resources that aim directly to address knowledge about development themes. This can be seen not only in the teaching tools but also the conceptual pieces that accompany them. For example, the chapter on poverty, whilst providing some valuable data on absolute and relative poverty, could be found in many articles and publications. What would have been more useful for higher education audiences would have been to look at how poverty is perceived and is relevant to areas of learning. The topic is presented as about ‘poverty in distant places’ and not in terms of its social and educational relevance to students.

Development education can make an important contribution to higher education if it is seen as a pedagogical approach that encourages critical reflection, looking at the world through different viewpoints, making connections between local and global issues and, above all, recognising that many professional disciplines such as engineering, law, health, education and architecture are global and can only be effectively taught by recognising the impact of globalisation and global issues to their subject area. In this publication there are some useful activities including discussions on different interpretations of the terms development, sustainable development and climate change. But they have been produced in too prescriptive a format.
through a very structured educational process with timings against each activity. Above all what the publication lacks is any clear sense of how an academic or even someone within a university with a staff development remit would use such a publication. There is a lot of literature on what global citizenship means to higher education (Jones, 2010; Lewin, 2009; Schattle, 2008; Shiel, 2007), yet, I see no evidence of engagement with these debates in this publication.

What these publications refer to is how concepts like global citizenship or global perspectives are part of the language and practices of many universities around the world and can be used as a way of critiquing dominant assumptions about human development and global forces. As Shultz (2010: 19) has noted, ‘using global citizenship as a platform to resist institutional structures’ can provide ‘educators with discursive and pedagogical space to engage the immensely complex issues related to global knowledge and learning’. What many in higher education who are sympathetic to the traditions and practices emanating from development education are looking for are educational materials that question dominant Western discourses, that promote ethical and social justice, and above all demonstrate approaches towards teaching and learning that recognise and respond to the needs, outlooks and interests of their diverse student base.

These themes are recognised by academics from the countries involved with producing this publication. For example, Svitacova and Mravcova (2014) in reviewing the implementation of development education themes within their university in Slovakia, note the importance of promoting ‘global dimensions’ in a range of subjects and that it should be seen as interdisciplinary and not as a separate subject. So how does this publication compare with such other resources as 80:20’s (Regan, 2012) excellent and popular resource on development? I may well use some of the ideas within some of the activities outlined in the publication for discussions with students who are interested in making connections between themes such as global citizenship to their subject but only in terms of using examples of specific bodies of knowledge or a particular pedagogical approach.
The publication reflects the challenges within higher education of the relationship between development studies and development education. Academics responsible for teaching development studies themes might find some of the activities in here useful particularly where there are approaches that are not lecturer-led. The ‘Prisoner’s Dilemma’ activity and role play in Section 5 on Local and Global Governance is one example of this. But unless there is a broader staff development section aimed at academics, say, in development studies as an example that poses different forms of teaching and learning, promoting a range of theories and approaches, lecturers will pick and choose some activities but not necessarily engage with the intended themes promoted in the publication.

For academics in other disciplines or those engaged in more interdisciplinary studies, again, there are likely to be specific activities that could prove useful. The teaching tools on education in a globalised world for example do pose some questions for debate such as critical thinking, self-awareness and open-mindedness to difference, action and participation. What was needed was for these themes to be much more central to the entire publication.
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CHILDREN’S RIGHTS, EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND THE UNCRC: PAST, PRESENT AND FUTURE

Review by Benjamin Mallon


The 2014 European Conference on Education Research, organised by the European Educational Research Association, provided a network of members concerned with children’s rights with the opportunity for a discussion of the past, present and future of educational research in Europe. The seven chapters in this edited volume provide a valuable exploration of the themes and debates which emerged from this academic forum. Together, they seek to provide a critical analysis of how, in various contexts, the Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC) as adopted by the United Nations in 1989, and ratified by the majority of countries that makeup the international community, has informed past and present educational research and may inform future work.

The introduction to this volume identifies three key themes, derived from existing children’s rights (CR) research, which run throughout this publication. Firstly, there is a focus on the participation of children which is deeply connected to emergent conceptualisations of children as social actors. Secondly, the relationship between children’s rights and family or parental rights is afforded specific attention. The third theme concerns the challenge of connecting the broader theoretical debates on CR to contextualised empirical research.

In the first chapter, John I’Anson provides a historical background to the relationship between educational research and children’s rights. As a legal framework, with universal appeal and inherent obligations, I’Anson identifies that the CRC has been mobilised in extra-legal contexts, and in
doing so raises important implications for educational research, in particular as to how and why such ‘translation’ occurs. Upon this critical foundation, I’Anson provides an analysis of a series of key themes which have dominated educational research in children’s rights, before exploring a number of important tensions. I’Anson makes a series of arguments with relevance to future research practice. In particular, he questions approaches which divorce children and their rights from specific cultural contexts, and makes a compelling argument for the development of more nuanced interpretations of children, childhood and children’s rights. I’Anson also argues for a deeper consideration of what he describes as the ‘neglected articles’ (24), some of which form important themes developed in later chapters. Finally, I’Anson suggests that employing approaches such as ‘counterpoint’ (Brown, 2005) might offer critical perspectives on the limitations but also the strengths of children’s rights research and practice.

The next two chapters focus on children’s rights education. Louise Gwenneth Phillips provides a critical analysis of the various approaches to the promotion of the CRC through Human Rights Education (HRE), including a number of international programmes and national initiatives focused on the promotion of CRC to children. Despite the objective of Article 42 to make ‘principles and provisions of the Convention widely known’ and the recognised intrinsic and foundational benefits of rights-based learning, Phillips argues that the CRC remains relatively unknown by adults and children. Locating this discussion alongside historical and contemporary conceptualisations of childhood, Phillips suggests that conceptions of childhood innocence frame the enactment of the CRC, and provide barriers to the widespread knowing of the CRC. Phillips argues for a shift in attitudes towards children, for developments in teacher education and the creative use of media as a means of promoting the CRC.

In the third chapter, Nina Thelander focuses on another international initiative, the World Programme for Human Rights Education, to provide the conceptual framework for her qualitative exploration of HRE within a Swedish primary school. Focusing on knowledge and skills, values and...
attitudes and behaviour, Thelander provides a useful discussion of the developments in policies surrounding children’s HRE within an international and regional context. Thelander then explores the perceptions and experiences of two Swedish primary school teachers as they embark on the collaborative planning and eventual implementation of a series of lessons on children’s rights. This research provides insight into the challenges faced by teachers in relation to gaining familiarity with the CRC, furthering appreciation of its background and in particular its universality, and developing the skills to integrate themes from the CRC within lessons.

Drawing on aspects of a broader research study, Reeta Niemi, Kristiina Kumplainen and Lasse Lipponen provide an illuminating exploration of the enactment of children’s rights to both agency and voice through an action research programme within a Finnish primary school. The research employs an illuminative conceptual framework which considers theoretical models developed to illustrate the various conceptualisations of children’s participation. Amongst other approaches, the study developed an innovative methodology which engaged students in participatory classroom practices and provides insight into innovative means of enacting Article 12 (concerned with the child’s right to express views in matters which concern them) in relation to classroom and whole-school practice. The chapter considers the enactment of national educational policy within the classroom through children’s participation, and suggests how possible future practices could be explored. This chapter also makes important reflections on the constraints to the participation of children with formal education systems, but also on how the space within the Finnish system can provide the opportunity for meaningful engagement with classroom practices which support the enactment of children’s rights.

Set against the backdrop of austerity and social and economic hardship for families and children in Portugal, Joana Lúcio and Fernando Ilídio Ferreira explore how children’s right to citizenship is limited within situations of social and economic fragility. With a focus on provision, protection and participation, Lúcio and Ferreira explore the perceptions of
pre-service teachers on their role in the civic development of children. Drawing on the narratives of these teachers, Lúcio and Ferreira make important observations about the extent to which teachers are prepared to implement rights-based approaches within the classroom, but also about the potential of a rights focus to illuminate the impact of social and economic vulnerability on children, and the need to strengthen the social and cultural aspects of initial teacher education.

In the penultimate chapter, Gordon Tait and Mallihai Tambyah provide a thought-provoking exploration of Article 16 and children’s right to privacy, with a particular focus on the Australian context. Recognising the gaps between the CRC, domestic law and practice, Tait and Tambyah provide an important critical analysis of the right to privacy, firstly in relation to a historical consideration of natural rights, and then to Australian law. Tait and Tambyah then begin an illuminating exploration of children’s privacy. Within the context of the home, tensions between privacy and protection come to the fore. Within the school context, limited expectations of student privacy are enacted through physical and data surveillance. Privacy here is further limited by concerns surrounding the sexualisation of children and the threat of legal liability. Tait and Tambyah provide important insights into the complex idea of privacy and reveal the impact of surveillance on childhood. Furthermore, this chapter illustrates how a lack of legal backing presents serious constraints to the enactment of children’s right to privacy. Whilst recognising that the UNCRC does not provide a remedy for breaches of this right, Tait and Tambyah make a compelling argument that the UNCRC provides an important lens through which children’s right to privacy should be considered and further explored.

In the final chapter of the volume, Jenna Gillett-Swan and Vicki Coppock explore the means by which the UNCRC may shape the methodological aspects of research in children’s rights, particularly in relation to rapidly expanding digital technologies which represent important yet complex spaces in the lives of young people both inside and outside of school. Once again provision, participation and protection are recognised as
important components of the conceptual framework and it is around these themes that Gillett-Swan and Coppock explore the relationship between children’s rights and digital technologies within an educational context. Where participation rights may be enhanced through digital technologies, a consideration of protection rights, and in certain cases privacy rights, reveals the dominance of approaches which seek to guard against the risks associated with online activity. Within the realm of digital technologies, Gillett-Swan and Coppock provide important grounds for reflection on children’s rights, and in particular the relationship between participation and protection. Finally, Gillett-Swan and Coppock offer suggestions of useful frameworks and specific resources which may support educational research to engage with digital technologies in a manner which respects the rights of children. They highlight that whilst the ethical conundrums posed may become increasingly complex, an engagement with these issues may illuminate related themes within wider educational research and may also offer important interpretations of the wider social world.

The conclusion brings together the resonating aspects of each chapter, before the epilogue draws out some of the key findings of educational research in the field of children’s rights. These include the value of children’s participation and collaboration, the need for integrated yet multiple approaches to children’s rights, and the potential of empowerment through the enactment of children’s rights in educational research. In its entirety, the volume provides a critical exploration of a range of themes and intersects with a number of Articles from across the CRC. Although each chapter provides a highly contextualised account of children’s rights policy and practice, it should be noted that, unsurprisingly considering the origins of the publication, the geographical diversity is limited to Europe and in one chapter, Australia. Reflections on the sociological study of childhood resonate throughout the volume. Certainly, for those interested in the sociology of children and childhood, this volume may offer important perspectives on the topic through the lens of children’s rights.
In pursuing a thematic and contextual focus which transcends the past, present and future the volume asks a great deal from the contributors, yet each author offers those interested in children’s rights and associated educational research much in this regard. Through a focus on the past, this edited volume provides an opportunity to engage with how international, national and regional policies have framed the provision of children’s rights within specific contexts. In exploring a range of current educational practices which engage with rights, the volume provides some important snapshots of existing approaches to teaching and learning about and for children’s rights. With an orientation towards the future, the volume raises important questions as to how educational research, policy and practice can be best developed to support children’s rights.
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