

1 Introduction

Douglas Bourn

A range of terms has been used to describe learning and understanding about the wider world including 'development education', 'global education', 'global learning' and 'global citizenship'. This introductory chapter aims to provide a historical context for these terms and how they have been interpreted and then summarise how the other authors in this volume have related their own conceptual framework to the need for further debate, dialogue and research.

Historical context

The term development education first emerged during the 1970s, in part in response to the growth of development and aid organisations and the decolonisation process, but also, as Harrison (2005) has commented, through the influence of UNESCO and the United Nations which in 1975 defined it as follows:

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

(United Nations 1975, quoted in Osler 1994)

By the end of the 1970s, however, the term was increasingly being used in a narrower sense, as governments and non-governmental organisations (NGOs) engaged in the development sector sought public support and involvement. In the UK, the Labour government of that period created an advisory committee on development education; the emphasis of their interest and funding was to support 'those processes of thought and action which increase understanding of worldwide social, economic, and political conditions, particularly those which relate to, and are responsible for, under-development' (ODA 1978).

During the 1980s, two broader influences began to have an impact on development education. The first was the thinking of Paulo Freire (1972) and the writings of Julius Nyerere, with their views on the relationship of education to social change. Alongside this was the influence of what Harrison (2005) calls the 'globalist' approach through the World Studies Project led by Robin Richardson and later Simon Fisher and Dave Hicks, and the work of David Selby and Graham Pike. This approach that emphasises an approach to learning about the world, rather than specifically about poverty, came to have considerable influence during this period (Fisher and Hicks 1985; Hicks 1990; Hicks 2003; Pike and Selby 1998; Richardson 1976).

Throughout the 1980s in the UK, and mirrored in other industrialised countries, development education was perceived as being closely allied to social democratic politics and an overtly political agenda. Funding therefore became related to the political outlook of the government. In the UK, development education, world studies and global education agendas came under political attack (McCollum 1996; Marshall 2005a). Similar debates were also taking place in North America (Cronkhite 2000) and it was only in countries such as the Netherlands and Sweden and in the European Commission that political support for development education grew during this period (Osler 1994).

It was therefore left to NGOs to play the leading role in promoting and delivering development education, particularly within schools (Arnold 1987, Sinclair, in Osler 1994). Key to the future, Sinclair

suggested, was the need for NGOs to work in partnership with teachers, to be more strategic and to engage in academic debate.

By the late 1980s in the UK, as in other European countries, networks of NGOs were emerging to share and coordinate practice on development education. This resulted in an emerging consensus on the most appropriate terminology to use.

Definitions of development education

In the UK the definition of development education that became the framework for this practice was the one initiated by the National Association of Development Education Centres (NADEC), which in 1993 became subsumed within the newly created umbrella body, the Development Education Association (DEA):

Development education is about:

- enabling people to understand the links between their own lives and those of people throughout the world;
- increasing understanding of the global economic, social and political environmental forces which shape our lives;
- developing the skills, attitudes and values which enable people to work together to bring about change and to take control of their own lives;
- working to achieve a more just and sustainable world in which power and resources are equitably shared.

(DEA 2006)

This definition remains as the underlying framework for NGOs not only in the UK but across Europe. However, in both the DEA and the European Development Education Network, the following descriptions are used to summarise their members' practice:

Development education is an active learning process, founded on values of solidarity, equality, inclusion and co-operation. It enables people to move from basic awareness of international development

priorities and sustainable human development, through understanding of the causes and effects of global issues, to personal involvement and informed action.

(Development Education Exchange in Europe Project (DEEEP) 2007)

Development education is an approach to learning that leads to a greater understanding of (global) inequalities, of why they exist and what can be done about them. It encourages learners of all ages to explore how global issues, such as poverty, link in with their everyday lives. By challenging stereotypes and encouraging independent thinking, development education aims to help people develop the practical skills and confidence to make positive changes locally and globally.

(DEA, no date)

A feature of both these definitions is the emphasis on a process of learning that is about understanding global inequality and promotion of action for change.

Whilst there may be a consensus amongst NGOs as to what constitutes the key themes of development education, the terminology used to articulate it or even promote it rarely uses the term 'development'. Terms such as 'global dimension', 'global citizenship' 'global education' or, in the context of specific areas of education, 'global youth work', 'global perspectives in higher education' and, within adult education, 'global learning' are all common. These terms have been used because they are perceived as being accessible and easier to understand within educational practice (Bourn 2003).

In this volume, a range of terms is used, including global education, global learning and education for global citizenship. In part they reflect the complex roots of development education, but they also reflect the lack of clarity as to its specific focus and contribution to broader educational debates. Even the membership of the DEA, in a survey conducted in April 2007, in answer to a question as to which terms best communicate what they do, in order of preference responded: Global Education, Global Citizenship and Education for Global Justice/Citizenship (DEA 2007).

Policy debates

The Department for International Development (DFID), the ministry in the UK that has given considerable resources to funding development education since 1997, has stated that its primary objective is to go beyond 'attitudes to development based on compassion and charity,' and to establish 'a real understanding of our interdependence and the relevance of development issues to people's everyday lives' (DFID 1998).

In Ireland, NGOs and policy-makers have also emphasised the relationship between development education and the broader development agenda.

These difficult questions (of inequality and injustice internationally) lie at the heart of the work that is now needed ... education for world democracy, for human rights and for sustainable human development is no longer an option. Education has a central role to play, especially if we are to build a widespread understanding and ownership of this (development) agenda.

(Development Education Ireland 2007)¹

These approaches however could be perceived as being at odds with that of the European Union (EU), a key funder of NGOs. Key to EU funding criteria for support 'is the mobilisation of public action and support in Europe for development'.²

McCollum (1996) and Marshall (2005a) have also suggested that the lack of clarity about development education is linked not only to the conflicting pressures of government funding, but also the needs of the education system and relationships with the South and the developing world.

The needs of the UK and other Northern-based education systems are being increasingly influenced by the impact of globalisation and the needs of a highly skilled economy. Tony Blair, for example, stated, 'Our young people must develop the competence, confidence and contacts which will secure their place and influence in an increasingly globalised society' (Central Bureau 1999).

UK government policy statements, whether on the narrower skills focus such as in the Leitch Review or the international education strategy, 'Putting the World into World Class Education' (DfES 2004), pose the debates in the context of people playing an active role in the global market. The Department for Education and Skills (DfES) strategy up to 2006 states that 'we can only create wealth through the knowledge, skills and enterprise of our people. We must measure our education and training performance against international benchmarks, learning from the best of international experience and sharing good practice' (DfES 2004).

The need for education to respond to the challenges of the global labour market were reinforced in the UK government's White Paper on the future of higher education: 'In a fast changing and increasingly competitive world, the role of higher education in equipping the labour force with appropriate and relevant skills, in stimulating innovation and supporting productivity and in enriching the quality of life, is central' (DfES 1999). Such economy-based policy responses obscure the wider issues posed by the challenge of globalisation for education. For the question which must be asked is whether the purpose of education is to equip people to work within the global economy, or to provide the knowledge, skills and values base to understand and interpret the changing world so that people can be more active and engaged citizens.

It would be difficult to argue against education being seen as essential to a competitive knowledge-based global economy. Yet, as Alexander (1998) has stated, even embracing this dominant view can pose major questions:

- How does the global economy work, and what can people do to influence it?
- What is and should be the relationship between global, regional, national and local economies?
- How does the global economy affect the environment and sustainable development?
- How does decision-making affect citizenship?

Whether or not such questions are addressed depends to some extent upon the educational approach adopted. Education in the early twenty-first century is inevitably linked to globalisation, but what form of education are we talking about?

Green (1997) has suggested that the scope for education to act as a socially integrative force in contemporary society is not necessarily diminished or impeded by the forces of globalisation and post modernity. He further suggests that the West has perhaps shown little support for the goals of social cohesion and solidarity.

It could be argued that since 1997, in the UK at least, these goals are back on the agenda, in response in part to national and international events, and manifested in the introduction of citizenship education and the recognition of the importance of values within the school curriculum. But there is as yet little evidence or research, apart from the summary of the work undertaken by Asbrand in Germany (outlined in Chapter 3 in this volume), that begins to address where and how development education and global learning relate to globalisation.

Another theme suggested by McCollum (1996) and Marshall (2005a) that needs to be addressed is the relationship between the North and the South and its connections to debates regarding universalism versus multiple perspectives. As government policy-makers and funders increasingly promote the value of international partnerships, based on liberal notions of friendship and mutual learning (Harrison 2005; Leonard, Chapter 5 in this volume), it is necessary, as McCloskey has stated, to be 'receptive to and learn from the experiences and practices of the developing world' (McCann and McCloskey 2003).

Caserta, the coordinator of the European Development Education Network, suggests that partnerships between the North and the South are key to development education. He further proposes that it is through this model that the link to the global processes of development and eradication of poverty can ensure that development education is built on values of solidarity, inclusion and cooperation (Caserta 2005).

Academic debates on development education

The term development education is not well known within academic research and debate. When there has been academic discussion on the role and nature of development education, it was either during the 1970s and 1980s when it was linked to perceptions and roles of government and NGOs (Lemaresquier 1987; Brodhead 1986; McCollum 1996) or more recently in relation to debates on global citizenship (Marshall 2005a; Davies *et al.* 2005; Osler and Vincent 2002; Ibrahim 2005).

Audrey Osler's edited collection of essays *Development Education* (1994) provides an overview of development education across Europe. It is the only major publication in the past fifteen years that has specifically addressed the subject, although publications by Hicks and Holden (2007), Osler and Vincent (2002) and Steiner (1996) draw on development education perspectives and practices.

As support for development education began to increase, a number of research studies emerged that reflected on why progress and support for this area had been so difficult. McCollum (1996) suggests that a key issue was the culture of the practice of many people engaged in development education. Blum (2000) suggests that the roles and agendas of many NGOs were also problematic in terms of seeking predetermined conclusions. In the UK, with the election of a Labour government, several studies addressed the extent to which the independence and radical nature of much of earlier NGO practice was becoming compromised by government funding (Cameron and Fairbrass 2004; Hammond 2002).

Themes in this volume

The chapters in this volume, whilst recognising progress in the support and nature of practice since the 1990s, aim to address the relevance and contribution of development education and its related terms of global education, global learning and global citizenship to wider

educational debates. They further pose the need for research and evidence to be gathered to assess the contribution of development education to learning within a global society of the twenty-first century. Above all they aim to demonstrate that the issues raised by development education practice are key educational questions for today.

Some chapters are based on empirical research whilst others reflect ongoing debates within NGOs.

In Chapter 2, Annette Scheunpflug, Professor of Education at the University of Erlangen-Nürnberg, Germany, outlines why global education/learning is important for people living in a globalised world. Taking the ideas of Immanuel Kant on global social justice as a universal obligation and the importance of education in order to become an autonomous world citizen, Scheunpflug poses the implications of these perspectives for the theory and practice of global education/learning. In particular, she addresses: the need to make a distinction between learning and support for predetermined campaigns; and the view that the issues global education/learning pose are by their very nature controversial.

Gillian Temple and Anna Luise Laycock from Oxfam's Education and Youth Team in the UK take a different perspective in Chapter 6, using their 'education for global citizenship framework' to demonstrate the relationship between learning and action for change. They suggest there is a need to be more explicit in the agenda with young people, as a values-driven vision for change. They further suggest that active global citizenship means little unless it has a destination of a better world.

Barbara Asbrand, Professor of Education in Göttingen, Germany, outlines in Chapter 3 the main research findings of a qualitative research project on young people's knowledge about the world and their ability to act in a world society. Two main reasons are addressed: how young people respond and deal with living in a complex society, and the role that gender plays in dealing with uncertainty. She takes a different position from Temple and Laycock in that global education and global learning are not about teaching specific values but about enabling young people to find their own opinions.

In Chapter 4, Vanessa Andreotti, a Brazilian educator, uses a post-colonial framework to examine notions of development and poverty in relation to a critique of the 2000 edition of the UK government's 'Developing a Global Dimension in the School Curriculum' guidance document. Through a detailed contextual analysis of the publication, she addresses how terms like poverty are posed in relation to helplessness, and development in relation to economic and social progress. In comparison with Temple and Laycock, Andreotti questions the notion of a universal epistemology based around the goal of global citizenship education as an ideal.

Alison Leonard, a UK researcher on development education, in Chapter 5 uses the example of school linking to pose the need for critical reflection on the underlying power relationship between the North and the South in these partnership programmes. In reviewing the current debates and literature on the subject, Leonard identifies the need for major research in this area, particularly in the light of the UK government giving it a high priority, although there is little evidence yet as to its long-term value and impact.

David Hicks, Professor of Education in the UK, whilst welcoming the growth of interest in development education and the UK government's Global Dimension curriculum publication, suggests that a missing dimension is the notion of futures education. He outlines what he sees as the key concepts for this dimension and how it could contribute to the debates on images and perceptions young people have about the world. He poses the need for more research in these areas.

The chapters therefore identify, from a range of different perspectives, approaches and priorities, the following key issues:

- location of development education in relation to support for development and the needs of education systems in Northern countries;
- influence of universalist principles, multiple perspectives and postcolonial critiques of Western discourses;

- learning and action for social change;
- notions and perceptions of development, poverty and North–South relationships;
- role of gendered perspectives in understanding and support for development issues;
- inclusion of broader dimensions and concepts within development education debates, including a futures dimension.

Behind the lack of clarity within debates on the purpose of development education is the influence of conflicting policy drivers, particularly funding agendas.

Global citizenship

A major influence within NGO practice in the UK, and increasingly within schools, is Oxfam's framework of education for global citizenship, explored in relation to action for change by Temple and Laycock in Chapter 6. This framework brings together some of the debates around power relations, and promotes concepts of universal principles, linking them to action for change. For Oxfam (2006), the global citizen:

- is aware of the wider world and has a sense of their own role as a world citizen;
- respects and values diversity;
- has an understanding of how the world works economically, politically, socially, culturally, technologically and environmentally;
- challenges social injustice;

- participates in and contributes to the community at a range of levels from the local to the global;
- is willing to act to make the world a more equitable and sustainable place;
- takes responsibility for their own actions.

Questions as to what is 'global citizenship' have also been posed by Dower and Williams (2002) in relation to global social responsibility and the role of international structures. Key to the debate on global citizenship is the issue of universal values versus multiple perspectives, as outlined in this volume from different standpoints by Temple and Laycock (Chapter 6) and Andreotti (Chapter 4). Walker (2006) has posed this in relation to the 'apparent tension between diversity and our common humanity, the importance of intercultural understanding and the search for a set of universal values to unite humankind'.

Learning, action and social change

Finally, it is suggested that, in addition to issues regarding development and educational agendas, North–South relations and universal versus multiple perspectives, there is the need to address the constant underlying theme within development education practice of learning linked to action for change. The varying definitions of development education outlined at the beginning of this chapter suggest that from raising awareness to a process of learning, social action will somehow emerge because people will have gained a degree of consciousness based on a sense of emotional outrage at the levels of global social injustice and inequality. From a number of perspectives, this definition is challenged because it does not take sufficient account of the complex nature of how people learn and the relationships between learning, experience and personal action.

Development education practice by its very nature implies

approaches towards learning that challenge dominant ideological frameworks regarding the purpose, nature and form of education (Apple 2001; Marshall 2005b). A criticism often made of development education in the past (Arnold 1987; Smillie 1994) has been that it did not constantly seek to reflect upon its relationship to the dominant educational discourses of the time. As McCollum (1996) has stated, 'development education has been a movement which speaks only to itself, it has not located itself within a broader critical pedagogical discourse'. Today, as development education practice appears to be listened to more than ever by policy-makers, the relationship to learning and social change becomes even more critical.

Key to moving the debate forward therefore is a recognition, as Jarvis suggests, of the relationship between learning and personal interaction: human learning only occurs when individuals are consciously aware of a situation and respond, or try to respond, meaningfully to what they experience; and then seek to reproduce or transform and integrate the outcome into their own biographies (Jarvis *et al.* 2003).

If learning also implies change, as the Campaign for Learning stated – 'a process of active engagement with experience' and what people do 'to make sense of the world' (quoted in Dillon 2003) – then development education needs to look much more at questions of identity, personal involvement and motivations for action. As Dillon (2003) suggests, learning is not about transmission of knowledge and skills in a passive manner; rather we build (construct) knowledge through social interaction. Beck (2000) states that in addressing the needs of a rapidly changing society, learning must be about seeking to understand and to be critically aware of the things being studied.

Stimulus for debate and dialogue

As the following chapters demonstrate, there is a need for more debate on where and how development education locates itself in relation

both to policy changes on education and development and to theoretical questions regarding learning and social change.

It is not intended here to pose any conclusions as to what development education should be in the future, but rather, at a time of rapid economic and social change, to invite reflection on the relevance of development education's themes and perspectives to education today.

It is hoped that these contributions by a range of academics, researchers and practitioners will stimulate more research, debate and dialogue on an area of education that has potentially much to offer, but is still perceived as being in the margins of academic discourse.

Development education needs above all to be located in an approach to learning which is about reflection, sharing and testing new ideas, providing conceptual inputs and learning from practice and experience. It needs to move away from being a list of noble intentions or even a series of bodies of knowledge, skills and values towards being an approach to learning. This means that debates and discussions should be contested; there should be critical dialogue and debate and space for a range of voices, views and perspectives.

Conclusions

Development education and its related terms of global learning, global education and global citizenship emerged initially as a response to political and NGO calls for learning and understanding about the wider world. As the practice has evolved, issues have continued to emerge about the relationship between learning, action and social change. This is a theme that is developed further in this volume. Similarly, what and how young people learn about global and development issues and the relationship of this learning to broader social and cultural influences are also considered. Finally, how development education relates to broader questions of learning, in particular in challenging dominant educational orthodoxy, is addressed. If development education is to have an impact on the academic and research community it needs to

begin to grapple with these wider questions. This volume offers a contribution to this debate.

Notes

1 These ideas are developed further through a very informative website:

<www.developmenteducationireland.ie>

2 For background to European Commission funding see:

<www.ec.europa.eu/europeaid/projects/ong_cd/ed_page_en.htm>

References

Alexander, T. (1998) 'Are we ready for the Age of Global Learning?' *Development Education Journal*, 5.1, 32.

Apple, M. (2001) *Educating the 'Right Way': Markets, standards, God and inequality*. London: Routledge/Falmer.

Arnold, S. (1987) *Constrained Crusaders: NGOs and development education in the UK*. Occasional Paper, Institute of Education, University of London.

Beck, U. (2000) *What Is Globalisation?* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Blum, N. (2000) 'Doing development at home: education as a tool for social change'. MA dissertation, University of Sussex.

Bourn, D. (2003) 'Towards a theory of development education'. *Development Education Journal*, 10.1, 3–6.

Brodhead, T. (1986) 'Development education and Northern governments'. In *Development Education: The state of the art*. Geneva: NGLS.

Caserta, A. (2005) 'Development exchange in Europe'. *Policy and Practice*, 1, 38–45.

Cameron, J. and Fairbrass, S. (2004) 'From development awareness to enabling effective support: the changing profile of development education in England'. *Journal of International Development*, 16, 729–40.

Central Bureau (1999) *Annual Report*. London: Central Bureau/British Council.

Cronkhite, L. (2000) 'Development education: making connections North and South' In D. Selby and T. Goldstein (eds), *Weaving Connections*. Toronto: Sumach Press.

Davies, I., Evans, M. and Reid, A. (2005) 'Globalising citizenship education? A critique of global education and citizenship education'. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 55.1, 66–89.

- Department for Education and Skills (DfES) (1999) *The Learning Age*, London: HMSO.
- (2004) *Putting the World into World Class Education*. London: HMSO.
- (2005) *Developing a Global Dimension in the School Curriculum*, revised edition. London: DfES.
- Department for International Development (DFID) (1998) *Eliminating World Poverty: A challenge for the 21st century*. London: HMSO.
- Development Education Association (DEA) (no date) *Development Education Association: Promoting change through education*. London: DEA.
- (2006) Annual Report. London: DEA.
- (2007) Report of views on priorities of future work of DEA. Online. Available HTTP: <<http://www.dea.org.uk/consultations>> (accessed 1 July 2007).
- Development Education Exchange in Europe Project (DEEEP) (2007) Definitions of development education. Online. Available HTTP: <<http://www.deeep.org/whatisde/definitions>> (accessed 30 June 2007).
- Development Education Ireland (2007) Definitions of development education. Online. Available HTTP: <<http://www.developmenteducationireland.ie>>
- Dillon, J. (2003) 'On learners and learning in environmental education: missing theories, ignored communities'. *Environmental Education Research*, 2.3, 215–26.
- Dower, N. and Williams, J. (eds) (2002) *Global Citizenship: A critical introduction*. New York: Routledge.
- Fisher, S. and Hicks, D. (1985) *World Studies 8–13*. Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd.
- Freire, P. (1972) *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Green, A. (1997) *Education, Globalisation and the Nation State*. Basingstoke: Macmillan.
- Hammond, B (2002) 'DFID's invisible hand: a challenge to development education?' Unpublished MA dissertation, University of East Anglia.
- Harrison, D. (2005) 'Post-Its on history of development education'. *Development Education Journal*, 13.1, 6–8.
- Hicks, D. (1990) 'World studies 8–13: a short history, 1980–89'. *Westminster Studies in Education*, 13, 61–80.
- (2003) 'Thirty years of global education'. *Education Review*, 265–75.
- Hicks, D. and Holden, C. (eds) (2007) *Teaching the Global Dimension*. London: Routledge.

- Ibrahim, T. (2005) 'Global citizenship education: mainstreaming the curriculum?' *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 35.2, 177–94.
- Jarvis, P, Holford, J. and Griffin, C. (2003) *The Theory and Practice of Learning*. London: Kogan Page.
- Lemaresquier, T. (1987) 'Prospects for development education: some strategic issues facing European NGOs'. *World Development*, 15, Supplement, 189–200.
- Marshall, H. (2005a) 'The sociology of global education: power, pedagogy and practice'. Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Cambridge.
- (2005b) 'Developing the global gaze in citizenship education: exploring the perspectives of global education NGO workers in England'. *International Journal of Citizenship and Teacher Education*, 1.2, 76–92.
- McCann, G. and McCloskey, S. (eds) (2003) *From the Local to the Global*. London: Pluto.
- McCollum, A. (1996) 'On the margins? An analysis of theory and practice of development education in the 1990s'. Unpublished PhD thesis, Open University.
- Osler, A. (ed.) (1994) *Development Education*. London: Cassells.
- Osler, A. and Vincent, K. (2002) *Citizenship and the Challenge of Global Education*. Stoke-on-Trent: Trentham.
- Overseas Development Administration (ODA) (1978) *Development Education: Report of Advisory Committee*. London: HMSO.
- Oxfam (2006) *Education for Global Citizenship*. Oxford: Oxfam.
- Pike, G. and Selby, D. (1998) *Global Teacher, Global Learner*. Sevenoaks: Hodder & Stoughton.
- Richardson, R. (1976) *Learning for Change in World Society*. London: World Studies Project.
- Smillie, I. (1994) 'Changing partners: Northern NGOs, Northern governments'. *Voluntas*, 5.2, 155–92.
- Steiner, M. (1996) *Developing the Global Teacher*. Stoke-on-Trent: Trentham.
- Walker, G. (2006) *Educating the Global Citizen*. Saxmundham: John Catt.