DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION: FROM THE MARGINS TO THE MAINSTREAM

Abstract
Development education has been a feature of educational practice in most industrialised countries for over 30 years. It has gone under different names at different times and in also variations due to linguistic interpretations. These terms have included education for development, of global education, global citizenship, themes such as the global dimension in education, or more recently global learning. This article will outline the evolution of development education and its relationship to these other terms. It will demonstrate why this area of education has emerged and what are its distinct features. It will conclude by suggesting that development education could potentially be seen as more than just another ‘adjectival education’ or as just a response to desire for support to development but also as an approach that has connections to critical pedagogy.

The Emergence of a Global and International Approach to Education
Learning about the wider world has been part of formal education in many industrialised countries for more than a century. What has dominated this learning historically has been the influence of colonialism and in some countries religious and missionary traditions. Knowledge in Europe and North America about continents such as Africa in both the nineteenth and for most of the twentieth century was influenced by a view of the superiority of the west and subjugation of the peoples of that continent (Lambert and Morgan, 2010).

A major influence on the break from that mould came in the post Second World War period with the emergence of a number of international institutions including the United Nations and later UNESCO who recognised the need for education to have a more international outlook. (Tye, 1999). In the United States whilst this interest in global and international education came under right-wing attack for being unpatriotic, through the work of academics such as Hanvery, Merryfield and Tye, a discourse
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emerged that has had influence around the world (Tye, 2009, Fusswood-Tucker, 2009). In the UK, Robin Richardson (1976,1990) was one of the earliest proponents of this global or world outlook approach to education. He became very influential in developing a methodology for teaching about world issues with a particular emphasis on active learning methods (See Starkey, 1994). With David Selby and Graham Pike (1998) and Dave Hicks (1990, 2003), this approach to ‘world studies’ or ‘global education’ had a strong practice-based focus around a child-centred and world minded approach to education that stressed the importance of attitude and skill development as well as the exploration of a range of global issues.

Elsewhere in Europe, notably in Scandinavia, Netherlands and Germany, and also in Japan, there is evidence from the 1970s onwards of approaches towards education that promote a more international outlook, under themes such as education for international understanding or inter-cultural learning. In some countries there was a strong influence from UNESCO, in others from the increased role of the European Commission or in the case of Japan a conscious move from its imperial past to a more outward looking view of the world (Harrison, 2008, Ishi, 2003,Osler,1994)

The ‘Adjectival Educations’
The emergence of the global education movement had linkages with other traditions that were also emerging in the 1960s and 1970s. These included environmental, peace, multi and inter-cultural, human rights and later anti-racist education. Whilst all of these movements have their own history they often emerged as a response to what was perceived as a weakness within formal education: the need to make connections between learning and society and above all to see education as a vehicle for some form of personal and social transformation (Greig, Pike, Selby,1987).

These traditions or ‘adjectival educations’ (Huckle and Sterling,1996) resulted in the growth during the 1980s, particularly in North America, Australia and Europe, of networks and organisations promoting their particular approach towards education. Recognising these trends, Pike and Selby, re-defined global education as an overarching term to incorporate these trends.

A variation on this concept of global education emerged in Europe in the 1990s, promoted by the Council of Europe, that has closer linkages to development education but aims to bring these adjectival educations together because of their perceived interconnectedness and sense of social justice. This definition of ‘Global Education’ emphasises the opening of people’s eyes and minds to ‘the realities of the world, and awakens them to bring about a world of greater justice, equity and human rights for all.’ It makes reference to encompassing development, human rights, sustainability, citizenship, inter-cultural and peace education (See Osler and Vincent, 2003, Hoeck and Wegimont , 2003).
The Development Agenda and Development Education

These traditions were influential to development education because they had similar goals and objectives around promoting a broader world-view with an emphasis on participatory forms of learning. Terms were used interchangeably. What in one country may be called global education or global learning may in another be called development education. In some cases this was for linguistic reasons, in others political but also it was because of a general lack of conceptual clarity as to what these terms meant.

However what came to distinguish development education was the relationship to development and consequent support from aid ministries and international non-governmental organisations with an emphasis on linkages between learning and action within a social justice based perspective. (Krause, 2010)

Development education emerged in the late 1960s and 1970s in Europe and North America in response to the de-colonisation process and the emergence of development as a specific feature of government and NGOs policies and programmes. Up until the late 1960s the dominant view in Europe about the ‘third world’ was that it was a problem best left to the churches to help the poor people. The dominant image was of helpless people who needed charity - giving money ‘for black babies’. This meant that in many industrialised countries the medium through which people often learnt about the ‘developing world’ had been via the church.

The de-colonisation approach meant that for countries such as UK, France, Netherlands and Belgium, their relationship to the former colonies would now to be based on economic, social and cultural ties. From the late 1960s onwards in countries such as Sweden, Netherlands, Norway, Canada and the UK, publicly funded programmes emerged to support aid. To ensure these programmes had public support, resources began to be given to ensure the public was supportive through educational programmes, production of resources and general awareness raising.

In addition to these influences, the drive for public support for aid from both governments and voluntary organisations needs to be added, alongside the promotion of a more internationalist outlook. Countries such as Sweden, Netherlands and Canada and later Japan (Ishii 2003) were some of the first to promote programmes on development education. Their specific relationship to the wider world through international development was a major factor in the decision to develop programmes on development education.

This linkage between an international outlook and the growth of development assistance programmes became an influence on both policy-makers and NGOs. In the UK for example the work of Oxfam, the development and aid agency, provides a typical example of how and why an NGO supported and became engaged in work within schools. These activities have been well documented by Harrison (2008) and behind
their motivation was ‘a desire to open up hearts and minds, as well as the purses, to the problem of poverty in countries overseas’.

However much of this practice as Hammond (2002) and others have commented was located within an approach that served to educate for support a ‘largely ignorant or disinterested public’ through an information-delivery model of learning. This practice of providing information and resources about third world problems became a feature of development education practice influenced particularly by a climate of ‘informed and committed opinion’ amongst returned overseas volunteers, teachers, schools, churches and academics throughout the late 1960s and 1970s (Starkey 1994).

The Emergence of a More Critical Stance and a Movement for Radical Change
From the late 1970s there is an emergence within this development education practice of more critical approaches. Practitioners were beginning to question the aid industry and often as a result of personal experience and volunteering were seeing the need for a more social justice based approach. (Harrison, 2008).

In a number of countries third world shops and solidarity groups emerged, partly as a response to political events in Latin America for example or struggles of peoples against continued Portuguese colonisation in Africa but also to hearing about radical educational approaches, notably the work of Paulo Friere. (Cronkhite 2000).

Similar observations can be found in Germany and Austria where OIE (the main development education organisation in the 1980s) questioned the banking method of education (Hartmeyer,2008), and promoted more affective and participatory forms of learning about development.

John Fien, a leading Australian academic in this field stated in 1991: ‘the whole purpose of development education is to promote social justice, to change the world, through understanding, empathy and solidarity with the patterns of life experienced by societies different from our own. In particular it is concerned with the lives and future well-being of the oppressed, the people who live in the Third World countries of the South or under Third World conditions in the North (Fien 1991, quoted in Starkey ,1994, p.28).

By the 1990s in countries such as UK, Canada, Germany, Netherlands and Japan, there were movements of educationalists, mainly working with NGOs, but with some support from teachers and academics, who were promoting an approach that primarily influenced by critical perspectives on development combined with the pedagogy of Freire (1972) and progressive classroom practices (Walkington 2000). As Regan and Sinclair, two leading figures within the development education tradition from Ireland and England respectively, commented:
From being initially concerned almost exclusively with the ‘third world’ and its problems, development education has now taken on a broader, wider world focus which is as much concerned with global awareness, understanding and political literacy in the developed world. (Regan & Sinclair 1986, p.27)

Development education had, as McCollum noted, relied still in the 1990s on the efforts of individual practitioners with minimal guidance and few resources. They had developed their own working practices by trial and error and by working in partnership with teachers and educationalists. Where funding existed it tended to be focussed on delivering outputs, materials and resources for teachers and educational groups. While this may have resulted in some well-received and high quality resources, the field did not have a strong theoretical basis or a high educational profile (McCollum, 1996, p. 22).

This apparent superficiality suggested by McCollum was, and remains a major challenge for development education. This superficiality could be argued to be a result of a reluctance to move beyond occasional references to a more critical and radical approach, when the main drivers and funders were governments with a public support for aid agenda.

There continued to be variations in political support depending on the shade of the government, but an emerging consensus in Europe at least emerged of the value of supporting educational programmes around development and global themes culminating in the 2002 Council of Europe declaration on Global Education. This called on all member states to give funding and to lobby educational bodies to promote learning about global issues (Hoeck and Wegimont, 2003).

The Changing Role of the Media and Emergence of a Campaigning Focus

Earlier in this chapter it was stated that development education first emerged in terms of raising awareness and support for aid and development but that it gradually began to take a more critical stance.

This critical stance has at various times since the 1970s been challenged and in some cases diverted by media campaigns on development issues, often generated by crises, such as famine or other disasters. This has meant that whilst development education has often strived to promote appropriate and positive images of people in continents such as Africa, media images have re-inforced traditional stereotypes. The media has also reduced issues to simple messages that might have helped NGOs and governments but not necessarily educationalists (Burnell, 1998).

An example of this was Live Aid in 1985 which based its approach on public perceptions and needs rather than the causes and the issues. Whilst there is some evidence that the raising of the profile of the Ethiopian famine did result in increased public concern for the poor of the world, development education organisations from...
the late 1980s onwards had a constant battle to challenge dominant perceptions of poverty (van der Gaag and Nash, 1987, McCollum 1996)

Peter Adamson writing in 1993 (Adamson, 1993) stated that whenever he gave a talk in a school or college, the dominant views of children were of poverty and starvation in the developing world because of the influence of the media. The role and influence of the media in understanding development has been the feature of numerous studies (Burnell, 1998, Manzo, 2006, Smith, 2004) and this area remains a major influence on peoples’ perceptions of third world countries. The perceptions of Africa, for example, as a continent of helplessness and ‘starving babies’ was still evident in the school classroom in the first decade of the twenty first century (Edge, Khamsi and Bourn .2008, Lowe, 2008)

The need to challenge dominant and negative views about the developing world following Live Aid had became a major concern of development and development education organisations. VSO (2002) noted in its report on public perceptions of development that the Live Aid legacy was still very prevalent in UK society. Whilst at a one level this led to resources and materials being produced for schools, it also led to increased emphasis being given to what became known as public education or communications strategies focussed on promoting messages and visual representations. From the 1990s onwards therefore around Europe there has been increased emphasis on resources been given to media related materials and initiatives encouraging the public to be supportive and engaged in development. As a consequence less attention and resources were given to debating from a more critical perspective the role and contribution of aid and development to combating global poverty.

This move from education to awareness raising, communicating messages, public engagement and campaigning can be seen in both the practice of NGOs and the role and focus of governments. For example terms such as ‘development awareness’ became commonplace in Europe, including the UK where in 1997 a new Labour Government, committed to development education, put equal emphasis on communications and media engagement with development (DFID, 1998).

These trends and a growing desire by NGOs to encourage greater active involvement in development culminated in the Make Poverty History initiative of 2005. However this took the practice away from learning and understanding about development and global issues to a focus on action and political engagement (Darnton, 2006). Development and aid were accepted with perhaps a radical tinge around global social justice.

Whilst many NGOs and ‘grassroots’ development education practitioners wanted to retain a more critical stance towards development, the dominant narrative of ‘public support and engagement with development’ and the lure of public funding resulted in
some countries in less critical practices and projects emerging (Hartmeyer, 2008, Cameron and Fairbrass 2004, Cronkhite 2000). There is however a danger of overplaying this because there are numerous examples of projects and programmes in UK, Ireland, Austria, and Netherlands particularly that take a critical stance towards development and global issues and not mere deliverers of government agendas (DEA,2010,Regan,2006, O’Loughlin and Wegimont,2005,2006)

The critical perspectives that did emerge were influenced by discourses outside of development particularly in relation to debates around globalisation and the changing role of learning in a global society.

**Growing Influence of Globalisation and Learning in a Global Society**

During the 1990s the term ‘global’ became to be seen as a more appropriate than development. Programmes, projects, resources and initiatives in countries such as UK, Canada, Germany, Australia and Finland began to refer more to global than development. This was in part for tactical reasons: people no longer, if they ever did, understand what development education actually meant.

There was also increasing use of the term global in response to recognition by policymakers and practitioners of the influence of globalisation. In Germany for example, Klaus Seitz in 1991 used the term ‘global learning’ in response to globalisation and the needs of a global society. He argued against the ‘third world’ being added to the curriculum. There was a need, he said for a wider horizon for the promotion of a world that had global connections. (Hartmeyer,2008,p.45)

Annette Scheunpflug (2008, with Asbrand, 2006), a key influential figure in this field has challenged the value of the term development education. She states that with the moves towards a more global society, development is no longer an appropriate term. For her, there are still power centres in the world but their location is less and less defined, The world is much more complex and for her a more appropriate term is ‘global learning’ which she defined as the pedagogical reaction towards a world society with social justice at its heart. Scheunpflug also questions the traditions within development education of promoting individual action for social change (Hartmeyer, 2008)

In a number of countries like USA, Canada, Australia, Finland, Sweden, Germany, Austria, Switzerland and Netherlands the term ‘global education’ or ‘global learning’ was by the first decade of the twenty-first century, the dominant term within which the discourses around learning and understanding about international development could be found. In some cases like in Central Europe this was due to a combination of the influences of the views of Seitz and Scheunpflug and also by the work of Council of Europe and its recommendations of closer linkages between development, human rights, environment and intercultural learning. In North America and Australia it was
also to do the leading influences coming more from academic discourses and particularly the influence of Selby and Pike, rather than political influences.

In the UK the response to the debates on terminology were in part tactical, the term global being more accessible than development, there was also a need to re-think the whole tradition of development education within the context of globalisation. Examples of these changes can be seen in the publications of the Development Education Association (DEA), the umbrella body for the sector in England (DEA,2002, Damiral and Mackenzie,2002) and publications sponsored by government (DfES,2005, QCA,2008), ‘Learning in a global society’ became a common phrase.

This questioning of the term development took on a new turn when the DEA in 2008 decided to effectively drop the term development education and replace it with global learning. Whilst this was initially a tactical decision about moving on from a term that was becoming increasingly unfashionable, it provided the space for the Association to re-conceptualise the whole tradition. DEA defined global learning as education that puts learning in a global context, fostering:
‘critical and creative thinking; self-awareness and open-mindedness towards difference; understanding of global issues and power relationships; and optimism and action for a better world’ (DEA,2008).

Other influences that led to some partial re-alignments have been the rise in influence of sustainable development as one of the adjectival educations, bringing together environment and development and the increasing emphasis on global citizenship.

These evolving debates around terminology were also increasingly influenced by closer proximity in thinking and practice to similar traditions to adjectival educations already mentioned with a new coming together of these movements around sustainable development and global citizenship.

Education for Sustainable Development (Scott and Gough, 2004) has in a number of countries (notably Japan, Germany, Sweden, Netherlands) become a major influence on re-aligning development and global education. Global citizenship is another term that has become a popular manifestation of these practices, particularly in North America (see Abdi and Shultz, 2008) and the UK (Oxfam, 2006). This term is often used to make connections to rights and responsibilities but also to demonstrate the global and interconnected lifestyles many people in the Global North.

Moving from the margins to the mainstream
Regardless of discussions around terminology, it cannot be denied that the first decade of the twenty first century witnessed the biggest ever expansion of interest in and engagement with learning about global and development issues in the leading industrialised countries (Wegimont and Hoeck,2003; Krause,2010). There were four main reasons for this:
Firstly at a policy level the launch of the UN Millennium Development Goals in 2000 put an onus on governments to demonstrate impact and influence (Schuenpflug and McDonnell). The support of the public for these goals became a political priority for many countries. This drive for support for development goals was given a major boost by the 2005 campaign around Make Poverty History.

Secondly the wider world and developing countries in particular no longer seemed in the Global North to be far away. Globalisation, instant communications, the impact of climate change and the support for campaigns around fair trade for example made learning about global issues part of everyday learning. Examples can be found from a number of countries of educational programmes that recognise the globalised nature of societies and the need for education to respond through changes to the curriculum and in new approaches to learning (Peters, L, 2009, Mundy, K 2007, DfES, 2005, Rasanen, 2009).

Thirdly policy makers and practitioners were beginning to demonstrate the value of learning about development issues not only in terms of public support for development but also in educational terms. Therefore in a number of countries such as Australia (AusAid, 2008) Austria, (Forghani-Arani and Hartmeyer, 2010) and Portugal (IPAD, 2010) strategies emerged under the label of development awareness, global learning or global education that were owned not only by ministries responsible for aid, but also by ministries of education, with engagement of civil society bodies.

Fourthly, educational institutions were referring to equipping learners for living and working in a global society (Bourn, 2009, Edge, Khamsi, Bourn 2008, Abdi and Shultz, 2008). Schools, for example, referred to learning about global issues through links with schools in developing countries as part of creating a global mindset (Edge and Jaafar, 2008).

What remains less clear is what constitutes the main elements of development education today and whether the use of other terms such as global learning, global citizenship or global education suggests a radical shift in the focus and forms of delivery of this area of learning. Above all has the ever-changing terminology been just a response to a tactical or political need to more effectively communicate a body of practice or a fundamental re-alignment of practice linked to the adjectival educations and the challenges of globalisation.

It is suggested here that regardless of the twists and turns in the use of terminology and alignments to broader educational traditions and social influences, there is need to explore the key principles and practices that could constitute a distinctive pedagogy of development education.
Development Education and Critical Pedagogy

Development education could be seen as one of the adjectival educations if you see it as an area of educational practice that is located within and around discourses of development. It could also be seen as an approach towards learning that once had value but should now be subsumed within concepts such as global learning, global education, global citizenship or education for sustainable development.

There is another interpretation of development education that it is a methodology and approach that has relevance to broader theories of learning, particularly critical pedagogy.

The rationale for this third interpretation is that if one looks at the practices of organisations in many countries in the Global North there are some common factors that suggest that development education still has connections to the ideas of Paulo Freire and his emphasis on continuing reflection, questioning of knowledge and dominant orthodoxies, of empowerment and social change (Freire, 1972, Darder, Baltodano and Torres, 2009).

Henry Giroux suggests that critical pedagogy needs to create new forms of knowledge and break down disciplinary boundaries (Giroux, 2005). McLaren (2009) in defining critical pedagogy emphasises not only the importance of forms of knowledge but also dominant and subordinate cultures and consequent influences of power and ideology. This questioning of dominant myths and ideas, to go beneath the surface and look at root causes and social context lies at the heart of critical pedagogy (Shor, 1992).

These theoretical viewpoints relate closely to the practical manifestations of a ‘critical development education’ in terms of making sense of understanding the global forces that shapes one life.

Firstly a key theme of development education practice is the promotion of the interdependent and interconnected nature of our lives, the similarities as well as the differences between communities and peoples around the world (Regan and Sinclair, 2000, DEA, 2002).

A second theme is about ensuring the voices and perspectives of the peoples of the Global South are promoted, understood and reflected upon along with perspectives from the Global North. (Budgett-Meakin, 2001, Ohri, 1997, Patel, 2010) This means going beyond a relativist notion of differing voices to one that recognises the importance of spaces for the voices of the oppressed and disposed (Andreotti, 2008).

Thirdly development education seeks to encourage a more values based approach to learning with an emphasis on social justice, fairness and the desire for a more equal world (Osler, 1994, Abdi and Shultz, 2008).
Finally, development education promotes the linkage between learning, moral outraged and concern about global poverty and wanting to take action to secure change (Oxfam, 2006).

If you went into a school classroom in most European countries, at some stage during a school year there would be examples of learning about development issues or some form of activity or project about global issues.

What would firstly distinguish this activity as a ‘development education’ activity would be the extent to which it was moving beyond a traditional view of seeing the Global South as ‘just about poor people’ who were helpless and needed aid and charity. Positive examples would be where there was learning that questioned, challenged assumptions and stereotypes and located poverty within an understanding of the causes of inequality and what people were doing for themselves.

This move from a ‘charity mentality’ to one of social justice remains an underlying theme of development education in practice in schools. A development education perspective would question the emphasis a school might give to raising money unless it was located within broader learning. It would also mean that central to learning would be the promotion of positive images, often through the use of photographs and personal stories.

Secondly development education practice would often include giving space to stories and perspectives from people from the Global South. This would lead on to looking at issues through different lenses. Examples of this are two web-based programmes that have emerged from the work of Vanessa Andreotti (2006). Open Spaces for Dialogue and Enquiry (OSDE, 2006) is a methodology produced by UK based development educationalists that supports the creation of open and safe spaces for dialogue and enquiry about global issues where’ people are invited to engage critically with their own and different perspectives’ (OSDE, 2008). Through Other Eyes, a development of this approach, aims through a range of educational methods to ‘enable educators to develop an understanding of how language and systems of belief, value and representation affect the way people interpret the world’ (Andreotti and De Souza 2008, pp. 23-24).

Thirdly development education learning would as Oxfam (2006) has suggested, encourage ‘a sense of moral outrage’, of wanting to take the learning forward through some form of follow up activity.

Finally and central to all development education practice would be the encouragement of participatory learning methodologies (DEA, 2000) with clear echoes of the influence of Freire and other radical educationalists from the 1970s and 1980s.
Conclusion
This article has suggested that development education has become an important component of learning for the twenty first century. However the funding driven agenda has resulted in a chequered history within many industrialised countries and a consequent tendency to operate within dominant discourses of development. While political influences and NGO agendas have contributed to the slow development of (or failure to develop) an independent discourse, there is evidence from the practice of many organisations that a more open and independent approach can be undertaken. At a time when societies are increasingly globalised and interdependent, learning and understanding about the causes of increased divisions in the world could be argued to be even more important than before. As international bodies such as the UN, G8 and the European Commission put increased emphasis on ‘combating global poverty’, the need to engage the public in these debates becomes ever more important. However unless this engagement is based on opportunities for critical reflection on development and global inequalities development education could be reduced to being the ‘mouth piece’ of policy-makes or large NGOs a major learning opportunity will be missed.

Some commentators (Scheunpflug and Asbrand 2006, Hartmeyer, 2008) have argued that the answer to these challenges has to be a re-conceptualisation of the debates within a new discourse around global learning. Andreotti (2006, 2010) recognises the importance of understanding postcolonialism and poses questions about what form of knowledge based society is needed for the twenty-first century. What cannot be denied is that around the world, educational bodies are addressing global themes and issues more directly. The challenge for proponents of development education is whether it merely follows and responds to these opportunities or sees its engagement as part of a broader ideological debate challenging the influences of dominant neo-liberal agendas with education. If proponents of development education look to theories related to ‘critical pedagogy’ then there is the option of a linkage to a theoretical framework that could take the practice beyond the agendas of policy-makers and NGOs.
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