Policy & Practice
A Development Education Review

"The views expressed herein are those of individual authors and can in no way be taken to reflect the official opinion of Irish Aid."

Contents

Editorial

THE SHIFTING POLICY LANDSCAPE OF DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION

Su-ming Khoo

The contributions in this issue of *Policy and Practice* provide reflections on the state of development education and recent policy shifts in the UK and Ireland. This issue revisits the theme of the changing policy landscape, a theme initially covered in Issue 5, in 2007. At that point, the time seemed right to reflect upon a decade or so of great constructive change, increased government commitments and greater policy engagement. The policy environment for development education became more strongly linked with official aid policy after the UK and Irish governments issued White Papers on International Development. Substantial government funding and broad support for development education followed, resulting in development awareness and education activities becoming more programmatic, and aligned with government commitments. An ambitious agenda began to emerge around the mainstreaming, formalization and professionalization of development education. Academic support for development education increased (Bourn, 2007) and a tentative research agenda began to emerge in an atmosphere of greater engagement and dialogue between development education practitioners, academics, development practitioners and government.

This increased profile and policy engagement brought challenges and conundrums, as well as opportunities. Many of the articles in previous issues of this journal have documented, and reflected upon, the challenges and risks of increasing formalization and professionalization. Critical voices have worried about the problems and challenges for the development education sector, even as they documented its diverse efforts and achievements. Recent articles have questioned whether the governmental influence and professionalization have meant de-radicalization and the accommodation of dominant social and political ideas (Bryan, 2011), while pointing to a failure to engage with fundamental and systemic problems, such as sustainability or the current financial collapse and economic crisis (Selby and Kagawa, 2011; McCloskey, 2011).

The big issue: a policy reversal for Development Education?

The biggest concern overshadowing this particular journal issue is with the changes in funding and policy priorities on the part of both the UK and Irish governments. Economic crisis and budget cuts mean that development education has moved from an expansionary to a contractionary or survivalist mode. Existing tendencies towards managerialism have intensified, with an overwhelming emphasis on the need to demonstrate 'impact' and 'value-for-money'. In the UK, the transition in May 2010 from an established Labour regime to a new Conservative-Liberal Democrat Coalition meant sharp policy shifts. In his Perspectives article, Stephen O'Brien, the Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for International Development, explains the stance of the Coalition government towards development education. He begins by emphasising that DfID has maintained its commitment to the 0.7 per cent aid target for 2013, in the face of cuts for other budget sectors. This means that a 'double duty' must now be fulfilled: showing the benefit to the intended beneficiaries - the poor in developing countries - while delivering 'results', transparency, accountability and value for money to the UK taxpayers.

He also states that DfID has retained its support for development education. However, DFID's *Building Support for Development Strategy* (1999) was immediately re-appraised. Broad government support for public education and awareness-raising was replaced by an emphasis on evaluation, 'results' and 'development impact'. Some education projects were terminated, on the basis that they could not demonstrate development impact or value for money. No new funding would be provided for development awareness. From the perspective of one development education centre which had its grant terminated, the Con-Lib government's '...actions and communications have so far indicated a new and deep scepticism about development awareness: "the link between development awareness in the UK and poverty reduction overseas is at best unproven". So we are under no illusion; DfID's support for our work has changed' (Knowles, 2011).

These policy shifts were highly significant, yet the qualified support for development education and retention of the aid budget represented a less negative outcome than what pessimists had initially feared. O'Brien states that there will still be support for schools-based development education. The view is that children are the next generation of the workforce and should learn the 'bald facts of poverty and underdevelopment which face children their own age in other countries'. According to this view, global learning underpins a disposition to promote '...the potential of trade, wealth creation and economic

development to build a freer, more prosperous world'. The position reflects assumptions, intentions and approaches to education that are quite different to those implied by New Labour's efforts to stimulate and coordinate development education, which could be described as a Keynesian or 'demand-side' approach. The present UK government prefers deregulated 'supply side' activities, rolling back state direction to allow 'markets' (in reality, schools and teachers) to shape development education, for example through teacher-to-teacher networks, and popular activities such as school linking and volunteering.

Cathryn Gathercole's article assesses the transition from DfID's Enabling Effective Support (EES, 1999) initiative, which put in place relatively long-term (five to ten year) frameworks of support for schools to integrate the global dimension. This initiative brought not only funding, but also profile and status for global learning and development awareness. Gathercole sees the policy shifts as financial and ideological, reflecting a deeper philosophical and political reconfiguration. Cuts to development education are part and parcel of wider cuts in public spending, especially on education and an ideological opposition to 'centralised' and 'top-down control'. The UK government no longer positively endorses learning about global and sustainability issues. Instead, the understanding is that individual schools will make their own decisions about which activities to prioritise and decide how to fund them.

The major lesson for Gathercole is that government policy is liable to sudden and significant change. She rightly points out that these policy changes do not mean that everything has gone backwards. Significant capacity has been built for development education over the last decades and the challenge is how to build on this legacy. Gathercole sees the challenge for small educational charities like her own organisation, as one of how best to support educators' autonomy and ability to set their own agenda. Teachers' creative practice is the foundation, in her view, and the question is how to build capacity for creative teaching practice in both individuals and institutions within the education system. The key factors that she identifies include educators giving themselves permission to be curriculum makers and greater prioritization of learner- led activities, favouring a degree of risk over teacher control and relating learning to real life contexts.

Towards a constructive and critical approach?
The opening Focus article by Doug Bourn helps us to take stock and reflect on the changing landscape, by stepping back and surveying different understandings and interpretations of 'development education' that have

emerged over the past twenty-five or thirty years. He suggests that the sector as a whole needs to take a 'constructive approach' that connects theory and practice. He argues for more research and a deeper and more critical analysis, to better explain the variety of interpretations of development education that have emerged in different practice settings. A lack of such a constructive critical analysis could leave the sector vulnerable to politicization and unable to challenge dominant ideas.

In its early phase, development education was led by non-governmental organisations (NGOs) and inspired by Freire's ideas about popular education for social transformation. This embodied a challenging approach to dominant societal ideas, and optimism about the transformative potential of an alternative educational perspective and methodology. Bourn attempts to move past the current pragmatic concerns with 'relevance' and 'effectiveness' by dwelling upon a more fundamental distinction between 'learning about development' and 'critical global pedagogy' – a distinction which connects theory and practice. Drawing upon diverse global understandings of development education, Bourn broadens the debate, while making this distinction.

In South Africa, development education is primarily about 'promoting indigenous knowledges'. This can be correlated with Andreotti's theory of critical pedagogy, which is concerned with the voices of the dispossessed and excluded (Andreotti, 2010). In India, development education is rooted in dialogue and reflection, and influenced by the Gandhian critical humanist tradition. In the UK, Oxfam's version of development education emphasises universal goals around global citizenship (Oxfam, 2006) while in Ireland, Regan's 80:20 textbook makes the links to human development (Regan, 2006). Within theory and practice of global citizenship and human development, reflection, dialogue and critical questioning about the universality of human goals are also common concerns.

Public funding looms behind ideas of 'understanding and support for' and 'learning about' development. However, for practitioners the question can no longer simply be how to do more, or 'integrate' development education – what is needed is a debate about what development education means and the extent to which its practices are questioning and challenging dominant educational thinking. With regard to further and higher education, Bourn contrasts the largely uncritical agendas of 'global skills' and internationalization against critical global skills approaches that privilege complexity, difference and

uncertainty. The critical global skills approach is more open and demanding in terms of learning, requiring the learner to shift from accepting given knowledge to questioning and possibly shifting perspectives.

The state of Development Education in Ireland: constrained and 'safe'?

Annette Honan's article comments on the publication of a key piece of recent research, commissioned by Irish Aid: 'Mapping the Past, Charting the Future' (Bracken, Bryan & Fiedler, 2011). This research had two main aims: to document the history of the Irish government's involvement in development education (DE) and to undertake a meta-analysis of development education research in Ireland (north and south) which might provide 'a baseline from which future research strategy and priorities can be identified'. The meta-analysis finds that there are significant barriers to deep and comprehensive engagement with social justice issues through development education. These barriers are of three kinds: attitudinal: (lack of confidence to teach complex and controversial issues), structural (the low status of education for justice within the system) and curricular (lack of time and an over-crowded curriculum). The report implies that there is a heavy reliance on individual teachers' interest and capacity to bring in development education. At the post primary level, students 'are hindered by a system that marginalizes global themes, privileges recall and outputs over learning, and provides little time or space for self-reflective interrogation'.

Studies of in-service teachers point to 'somewhat superficial' and 'soft rather than critical versions of development education'. There seems little room for the sort of creativity Gathercole assumes for UK teachers, since there is little deviation from standard curricular content or evidence of active and participatory methodologies. Honan suggests that schools face three main challenges for development education: 1) regarding it as 'core business'; 2) understanding its contribution to classroom learning and school culture; and 3) that the teaching and learning methodologies in Irish classrooms are not generally conducive to educating for global citizenship. Honan essentially concurs with Gathercole's suggestions when she argues for a shift away from providing resources and information, and towards teachers - building up teaching methodologies and skills, with more time and space for reflective practice. However Honan also diverges from the broad lines of DfID's new 'supply side' assumptions for the UK, when she calls for DE practitioners in Ireland to be more active in influencing the 'demand side' in the form of broader curricular and educational changes that are coming down from the national curriculum authority.

For the non-formal sector, the report finds that there is a dearth of research. What there is focuses on attitudes and perceptions of development issues, rather than educational practice. Caroline Murphy's Focus article examines the perspectives of non-formal, NGO-based development educators. The participants in Murphy's study saw their DE practice as being constrained by the priorities of fundraising and charity, leading to the predominance of 'safe' development education, meaning 'fundraising or multicultural or whatever' – 'yes so it is all right for people to go and buy fair trade but not to lobby the government'. Safe development education is depoliticized and pays lip service to global justice. Murphy contends that this decreases educators' capacity to engage in dialogue and solidarity with the developing world.

The operation of 'civilised oppression' makes it difficult to embed an African perspective that engages with African voices beyond fitting into an agenda and tokenism. One of Murphy's educators thinks that funders and the government operate a deliberate policy to render development education 'a very harmless activity' with 'no real impact on the structures'. Even where development education privileges critical thinking and learning processes, the actual actions taken are more consonant with charity, fundraising and consuming. Murphy's participants all feel that functional, 'Safe Development Education' is not what development education should look like, but do not go so far as to make definite suggestions about what an alternative 'Radical Development Education' might look like. Murphy reaches out to a conception of 'visionary active citizenship' which 'is proactive rather than reactive, involving scoping alternative futures and finding better ways of doing things, and challenging the existing structures, values and power relations underpinning the existing society'.

Bryan's recent study of development education in southern Irish schools (forthcoming) finds that the official aspiration to build 'deep public understanding of the causes and complexities of poverty' is unlikely to yield the desired results in the context of the formal school curriculum. However, she remains hopeful that having a critical discussion which identifies such absences and contradictions opens up spaces for pedagogical practice. Critically reflexive, 'deeper thinking' citizenship can be enabled by educators who take on a more critical approach to *development*, for example by scrutinising the 'development industry' and our roles in relation to it.

Partnerships in development: where is the Development Education?

Since the 1990s, the dominant idiom for development has been 'partnership', most notably expressed in the Millennium Development Goal 8 to build 'a global partnership for development'. While there are common themes of equality, respect, reciprocity and ownership, the lack of clarity has led to criticisms of it being a 'feel good' panacea and a form of rhetoric that covers up power asymmetries. The theme of development partnerships is explored in two articles: Bailey and Dolan's Focus article looks at Irish-African teacher education partnerships, while McDevitt's Perspectives piece provides an example of a proposal to forge a development partnership between Northern Ireland and North-Eastern Uganda. International development is a 'reserved matter' in Northern Ireland, however the Northern Ireland Assembly has established an All Party Group on International Development (APGID), as lobby group without statutory powers, in order to influence policy on international development.

McDevitt's starting point is an assertion that Northern Ireland has a higher level of interest in international development than any other part of the United Kingdom (UK), and a long history of development work through faith-based and development non-governmental organizations (NGOs). Despite the perception of being a 'generous society', Northern Ireland's Assembly had not developed a specific, Northern Irish 'branded' development link, in contrast to other devolved assemblies in the UK. Scotland has strong links with Malawi, while the Welsh Assembly has links with Lesotho. The APGID therefore proposes to create 'an overseas development project branded from Northern Ireland' which will link Northern Ireland with north-eastern Uganda. The relevance of the link to 'development' or 'development education' is not yet entirely clear, in theory or practice, but there is an understanding that a defined link with the global South will enhance public engagement with global issues.

Development partnerships have been criticized for the one way flow of capacity from the North and an absence of genuine sharing (Nakabugo et al, 2010), even if there are benefits such as improved human or infrastructural capacity, or a greater voice for Southern partners. These issues were examined by Nakabugo and others in relation to Irish-African partnerships that have been emerging in the higher education arena (2010). Bailey and Dolan's article looks at teacher education partnerships that are part of this, such as the Centre for Global Development through Education (CGDE) and Zambian Irish Teacher Education Programme (ZITEP) projects which have enabled teacher educators from Uganda, Zambia and Lesotho to be placed in colleges of education in

Ireland. Their analysis implies that development education needs to bridge a formal-informal sectoral gap. Irish development educators could have benefited more from the higher education partnerships if the formal partnerships could work more closely and share resources (theory, practice, documented results) with the development education sector. However, this cooperation would require a common network or framework for development education across formal and informal education.

Alternative viewpoints

The previous survey of the changing landscape of development education in Issue 5 of 2007 mainly reflected professional and formalized approaches to development education, but I personally strongly recall one article, by Marina Sitrin (2007) about movements for direct democracy (*horizontalidad)* in Argentina following their 2001 financial crisis. This article documented spaces for reclaiming politics, pointing to similar developments across Latin America in Chiapas, Mexico and Brazil. Sitrin's discussion pointed to the potential importance of educational alternatives from below, and the role of informal, indigenous, adult and vocational visions of education in attempting to redefine development on alternative terms (such as cultural emancipation or indigeneity), directly challenging the dominant global neoliberal consensus (e.g. King, 1998; Fasheh and Pimparé, 2006). McCloskey's Viewpoint piece in this issue follows a similar vein, suggesting that the Cuban case and model of development should be used more often in development education as a concrete example of a development alternative.

In the resource reviews section, Byers reviews a film, *The Pipe*, which documents local resistance to the multinational energy giant, Shell in the West of Ireland. It follows local opposition to Shell's pipeline, carrying gas from the sea, through their village, to a nearby refinery at Ballinaboy in County Mayo. This unique campaign of communal resistance has fed into a heated national debate on the future ownership of Ireland's natural resources. *The Economics of Happiness* is a very different visual resource that makes sense of globalization's impacts on societies, local economies, cultures and ecosystems. Challenging the persistent use of economic growth as the yardstick for measuring human development, the documentary promotes a shift in emphasis towards community and cultural integrity, well-being and happiness. Education is seen as a key driver of change by many commentators and this could be re-rooted in alternative efforts to preserve local knowledge and lay expertise, especially in relation to local systems of food production that work with, rather than against, nature. What the reviewer finds appealing in this documentary is

its emphasis on cultural diversity and resilience in the face of globalization's negative effects. It is optimistic, and its attention to practical, bottom-up solutions makes it a particularly suitable tool for local, action-focused initiatives.

References

Andreotti, V (2010) 'Global Education in the '21st Century': Two Perspectives on the 'Post-' of Modernism', *International Journal of Development Education and Global Learning*, 2 (2):5-22.

Bourn, D (2007) 'Building academic support for development education' in *Policy & Practice: A Development Education Review*, Vol. 5, Autumn 2007, pp. 31-42.

Bracken, M, Bryan, A & Fiedler, M (2011) *Mapping the past, charting the future: a review of Irish government's engagement with development education and a meta-analysis of development education research in Ireland.*
http://www.irishaid.gov.ie/Uploads/Mapping%20the%20Past_Fiedler_Bryan_Bracken_2011.pdf

Bryan, A (forthcoming) 'Band Aid Pedagogy, Celebrity Humanitarianism, and Cosmopolitan Provincialism' in Wankel, C & Malleck, S (eds.) *Ethical models and Applications of Globalization: Cultural, Socio-Political and Economic Perspectives.* Hershey, Pennsylvania: IGI Global.

Bryan, A (2011) 'Another cog in the anti-politics machine? The 'de-clawing' of development education', *Policy and Practice: A Development Education Review*, Vol. 12, Spring 2011, pp. 1-14.

Fasheh, M & Pimparé, S (2006) *Emerging and re-emerging learning communities: Old wisdoms and new initiatives from around the world*, Paris: UNESCO November (ED-2006/WS/16), pp. 6-11.

King, L (ed.) (1998) *Reflecting Visions: New Perspectives on Adult Education for Indigenous Peoples.* Waikato: UNESCO: Institute for Education, The University of Waikato.

Knowles, E (2011) 'DFID's changing funding and policy priorities'. *Index: Irish Newsletter for Development Education Exchange.* Dublin: Comhlámh.

McCloskey, S (2011) 'Rising to the challenge: Development education, NGOs and the urgent need for social change', *Policy and Practice: A Development Education Review*, Vol. 12, Spring 2011, pp. 32-46.

Nakabugo, M, Barrett, E, McEvoy, P & Munck, R (2010) 'Best practice in North-South research relationships in higher education: The Irish African partnership model' in *Policy & Practice: A Development Education Review*, Vol. 10, Spring 2010, pp.89-98.

Oxfam (2006) *Education for Global Citizenship: A Guide for Schools*. London: Oxfam GB.

Regan, C (ed.) (2006) *80:20 Development in an Unequal World*. Dublin: 80:20 Educating and Acting for a Better World.

Selby, D & Kagawa, F (2011) 'Development education and education for sustainable development: Are they striking a Faustian bargain?' in *Policy & Practice: A Development Education Review*, Vol. 12, Spring 2011, pp. 15-31.

Sitrin, M (2007) 'Ruptures in imagination: Horizontalism, autogestion and affective politics in Argentina' in *Policy & Practice: A Development Education Review*, Vol. 5, Autumn 2007, pp. 43-53.

Su-ming Khoo is a lecturer in Political Science and Sociology, NUI Galway. She teaches and researches alternative development, postcolonialism and public activism and is involved in mainstreaming development education at NUI Galway.

Focus

DISCOURSES AND PRACTICES AROUND DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION: FROM LEARNING ABOUT DEVELOPMENT TO CRITICAL GLOBAL PEDAGOGY

Douglas Bourn

In this article, **Douglas Bourn** encourages a constructivist approach to development education that tailors its social and educational interventions to the particular pedagogical perspectives being addressed. He suggests that within the sector there needs to be greater debate and research on how development education approaches can be relevant and most effective. He particularly considers approaches addressing the challenge of the relationship of development education ideas and practices to the influences and needs of policy-makers and practitioners. The article urges development education organisations to reflect upon the particular contribution they can make to learning about global issues and above all ensure that they have clarity in their approach and theoretical basis.

Introduction

Development education (DE) has been a feature of educational practice in most industrialised countries for the past 25 to 30 years. Central to much of that practice, where it has been led by non-governmental organisations (NGOs), has been the goal of educational and social transformation. Inspired by the ideas of Paulo Freire, development education has been seen by both its supporters and opponents as an approach towards learning that not only challenged dominant ideas in society but offered an alternative perspective and methodology (Bourn, 2008; McCollum, 1996).

Policy and Practice in recent issues has begun to address the extent to which development education is still radical and transformatory or has become accommodating to dominant social and political ideas. This is in part due to the influence of government funding, for example the Department for International Development (DfID) in the United Kingdom (UK), or to a failure to tackle and relate development education ideas to broader discourses in

society, particularly recent economic developments (Selby and Kagawa, 2011; McCloskey, 2011).

This article, whilst noting these critiques, suggests that a constructive approach would be to reflect on the different interpretations of what development education is, to encourage the need for a closer relationship between theory and practice, and to undertake more research on how and what influences these forms of engagement within schools and further education. Research by the Development Education Research Centre (DERC) at the Institute of Education, University of London on schools (Bourn and Hunt, 2011) and further education (Bourn, 2008; Bentall, Blum and Bourn, 2009), for example, suggests that what is needed is to identify the particular pedagogical perspectives being addressed and then relate these to forms of social and educational interventions. Then clarify where and how development education approaches can be relevant and most effective.

What do we mean by Development Education?

Selby and Kagawa (2011) imply that development education needs to be much more critical of dominant economic discourses. Whilst this author would agree that a weakness of practices of non-government organisations (NGOs) in the UK has been their failure to address economic agendas such as corporate power (Egan, 2011), there is a tendency to criticise without analysing why this is the case or reflecting on the skills and expertise within the development education communities of practice. A starting point in this article therefore is to look at what are the differing traditions and approaches of development education and how they relate to broader movements and perspectives for educational and social change.

Firstly, development education practice in most industrialised countries emerged in response to the de-colonisation process. Secondly the vast majority of practice that has been promoted as development education has operated within the discourses, policies and funding of international development, whether from governments or international NGOs. This has meant that what has perhaps been missing from many of the debates in and around development education has been what is meant by development, and its relationship to global social change.

Some commentators on this area (Seitz, quoted in Hartmeyer, 2008) or NGOs such as Think Global, formerly the Development Education Association in the UK, suggest that the development concept is now outdated. Other

bodies such as the Global Education Network Europe (O'Loughlin, 2006) and bodies in Canada (Mundy, 2007) argue that you cannot divorce talking about development from talking about globalisation, human rights or sustainable development; and that the term global education is more appropriate in bringing together all of these issue based or adjectival educations.

Yet in Europe, at least, there continues to be strong support for the concept of development education as exemplified by the European Consensus Document on Development, first agreed in 2005, which has support from a range of stakeholders across Europe (European Consensus on Development). This document refers to development education as follows:

> "The aim of development education and awareness raising is to enable every person in Europe to have life-long access to opportunities to be aware of and understand global development concerns and the local and personal relevance of those concerns, and to enact their rights and responsibilities as inhabitants of an interdependent and changing world by effecting change for a just and sustainable world" (Ibid: 5).

Whilst variations of this term can be seen in different national strategies across Europe and within the mission statements of NGOs, the term does reflect some common underlying principles that reflect how many academics and policy-makers would summarise what is perceived to be 'good development education'. They are as follows:

- Understanding the globalised world including links between our own lives and those of people throughout the world;

- Ethical foundations and goals including social justice, human rights and respect for others;

- Participatory and transformative learning processes with the emphasis on dialogue and experience;

- Developing competencies of critical self-reflection;

- Supportive active engagement;

- Active global citizenship (Rajacic et al, 2010: 121).

However it is suggested that these rather laudable goals and aims mask some wider divisions as to how development education is interpreted and could also be seen as little more than aspirations. What is suggested here is the need for a more critical and deeper analysis as to how development education is interpreted. It is this lack of analysis and critical reflection that can lead to comments about accommodation to dominant discourses or being too political.

Interpretations of Development Education

If one reviews the landscape of development education in many European countries, the principles and themes outlined above could be said to summarise the aspirations of many NGOs. However if one reviews the detail of the practice a much more complex picture emerges. Recent reviews for the European Union (EU) (Rajacic et al) suggests that a great deal of educational practice is related to promoting or supporting aims of the government or NGOs or an emphasis on action and campaigning, with minimal attention given to deepening learning and understanding.

These observations are not new. Arnold (1988) in his critique of development education in the 1980s noted distinctions between those approaches that emphasised transmission of information, those that promoted critical skills and finally those that saw mobilisation as the priority. Alongside these approaches, Arnold also saw three visions that cut across these approaches: charity, interdependence and empowerment. Krause (2010) more recently, noted that aspects of these past approaches still exist. For him development education could be seen as:

- Public Relations for development aid;

- Awareness Raising – public dissemination of information;

- Global Education – focussing on local-global interdependence;

- Enhancement of Life Skills - focussing on learning process and critical thinking.

What is noticeable about the difference between Arnold and Krause is the latter's recognition of one approach of seeing development education as closely linked to globalisation and global interdependence.

Whilst these categorisations have some value, it is suggested here that a much more complex picture exists if one looks at development education in a global context. The term, for example, is used in differing ways in South Africa (Hoppers, 2008) and India (Kumar, 2008). In the former, development education is seen as primarily about 'promoting indigenous knowledges'. Kumar, on the other hand, sees development education as fundamentally about dialogue and reflection, influenced by a critical humanist perspective in the Gandhian tradition. There are also approaches to development education that have a greater emphasis on: universal goals around global citizenship (Oxfam, 2006); more linkages with human development (Regan, 2006); and critical pedagogy, voices for the dispossessed and excluded (Andreotti, 2010).

Within the practices of organisations in many European countries for example, you see combinations of these differing influences and approaches. In the UK for example, several Development Education Centres make reference to the influence of ideas on universal values around global justice as well as promoting critical thinking and voices of the dispossessed.

Behind these differing interpretations looms the influence of public funding, from either national government departments on international development or foreign affairs ministries. In the UK for example two interpretations of development education could be seen:

-   Development Education as Development Awareness – based around building support for development, increased understanding and support for aid as exemplified by most governments who fund development education (DfID, 1998);

-   Learning About Development - that essentially sees development education as knowledge and concepts around development including the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), as perceived by the Coalition government in the UK, and some International NGOs (CIO, 2011).

It is suggested in this paper that there is the need for more debate, understanding and perhaps a deeper theoretical basis to some of these approaches. There is also the need to relate and develop these theories from a closer relation to practice.

Moreover there is a need to identify relevance of particular theories and approaches to educational environments. It is not about saying this is the right way or this is the wrong way. Rather, it is about recognising that these traditions and perspectives have different interpretations and goals. So for example a government funded programme on development education is very unlikely to see development education as about critical pedagogy. Also if it is focussed on influencing the public in the north it is going to be less interested in seeing human development as education in a global context. Some grassroots NGOs however, whose *raison d'etre* is about trying to change society, to question and challenge inequality in the world, are unlikely to accept an approach that is simply about learning about the Millennium Development Goals for example.

This however does not mean that an organisation engaged in development education practice merely responds to the funder agenda or the specific policy focus; what it means is that there is a need to debate and clarify how an organisation sees its contribution to broader policy goals and objectives. Marshall (2006), McCollum (1996) and Andreotti (2006) have suggested the need for development education to give greater consideration to theory. This does not mean ignoring funding priorities or goals. Andreotti, (with De Souza, 2008) for example, who has perhaps been one of the most influential writers on development education, developed a radical series of resources that have a strong postcolonial and Freirean background, with funding from the UK government (see www.osdemethodology.org.uk and www.throughothereyes.org.uk).

The questions any NGO needs to consider in looking at the opportunity for taking forward their ideas through publicly funded programmes are:

- Does the funding enable the organisation to explore and develop its ideas and practices?

- Are there spaces for creativity and innovation?

- To what extent is there an opportunity for learning that might question or challenge dominant viewpoints and ideas?

What is summarised below are some examples from recent research by the Development Education Research Centre, all funded directly or indirectly by the

UK government, which aim to demonstrate the different ways in which the principles and practices behind development education are being interpreted.

Engagement with Schools

In most industrialised countries where development education has some status, it is because of its influence within schools. It would not be difficult to find examples of development education in a school in the UK, Ireland, the Netherlands, Austria or Finland. This could take a variety of forms. Table 1 summarises some examples of engagement in schools identified from research with a number of secondary schools in England.

Table 1. Global Dimension engagement and activities across schools
(Bourn and Hunt, 2011: 28)

	Whole School Approach	Curriculum	Extra-curriculum	Professional Development
Mission Statements and strategies	International strategy	International Baccalaureate		
Staff member responsible for Global Dimension	Advisor for International work and sustainable development.	Curriculum advisor	Global Awareness Club	
School Assemblies	Speakers or talks on global poverty, climate change.			
International Partnerships	Long standing link with a particular	Using a link for specific curriculum projects e.g.	Involving local community and parents	Teacher visits. Attending GSP training

	school, promoted via whole school projects.	water, climate change.	in raising money for partnerships.	workshops.
Work with local community groups		Local people from refugee communities giving talks in English, Geography or History.	Cultural Festivals	
Award programmes	Fairtrade School. International School Award. Eco-School Award. UNICEF Rights and Responsibilities.	International School Award. UNICEF Rights and Responsibilities.	Eco-School Award	International School Award. UNICEF Rights and Responsibilities.
Working with NGDOs or DECs or other similar bodies	Red Nose Day	Working with organisations such as Red Cross on curricular projects. Running sessions in the classroom e.g. Red Cross, Plan UK, Practical	ActionAid's 'Send My Friend to School' programme.	Using local DE Centres for training sessions.

		Action.		
		Teachers within a school help an NGDO or DEC to produce curriculum resources.		
Pupil Based Initiatives	School Councils acting as focus for discussions and debates.		Supporting external campaigns on themes such as fair trade and climate change.	

These examples by themselves tell us only about activities. As Edge et al (2009) in their research on secondary schools stated, the term global dimension, used in most English schools to promote the principles behind development education, has been interpreted in a variety of ways:

- Awareness of and exposure to other and different cultures and the world context; and a sense of global social responsibility;

- Helping students to understand that they are citizens of the world and to demonstrate the interconnectedness of the world we are living in;

- Teaching about global issues and understanding the impact of our actions;

- Promoting and sustaining international links;

- Understanding the bigger picture and their place in it;

- Helping students to link their complex and different identities and their place in the world.

Behind these different interpretations are the motivations of teachers that relate closely to perceptions of development education. The following observations from teachers from secondary schools in England demonstrate first, a more charitable and development perspective; second, a more intercultural perspective; and third, a more critical approach:

"We've also got a link with a school/orphanage in Madagascar. That has really kind of opened people's eyes as well, like when we've set up pen pal contacts. If our pupils haven't received a letter recently and been complaining, we've told them there's civil unrest there at the moment, all the ports are closed, there's no import of food or fuel, not even any baby milk for the orphans" (Bourn and Hunt, 2011: 32-33).

"Because we want our pupils to understand that other people do have their different ways of looking at life, they have their own cultures, religions, lifestyles, etc. And we're helping them to be able to communicate with people from different cultures and backgrounds, and helping them to respect others that is not something they would automatically do, but to understand, to respect and be able to communicate with those people" (Ibid: 18-19).

"I am very concerned that the Global Dimension agenda is currently driven by NGOs, not teachers and their agendas have not been acknowledged. Rather than giving children a better picture of the world and their place in it, I'm worried we are confirming the perception that the Global South is a place of powerlessness and poverty. I'm also worried we are giving children the impression that they are more powerful than they are by over-emphasising campaigning" (Ibid: 24).

These viewpoints demonstrate that the issue is not about encouraging development education activities in the classroom, but rather about debating what it means and the extent to which the practices are questioning and challenging dominant educational thinking. This would mean including learning activities that moved 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 learning questioned, challenged assumptions

and stereotypes, and located poverty within an understanding of the causes of inequality and what people were doing for themselves.

Global Skills and Further Education

Further education is an area that has been tackled by few development education practitioners. A consequence of this has been that where references are made in either policy statements or research to themes such as 'global learning', 'global citizenship' or 'global skills', conclusions can easily be drawn without an understanding of the contexts of the usage of the terminology or how they are interpreted by practitioners. Selby and Kagawa (2011), for example, have criticised this author's work in this area, most notably his report on Global Skills (Bourn, 2009) for its failure to critique or address neo-liberal agendas and economic growth models. Whilst there is some validity in their comments, any engagement in the debates in this area needs to start from a recognition of where further education programmes are located in the UK and probably in most other European countries, in relation to equipping learners with the skills for employment. The question to pose for development educationalists is in what ways could one intervene in these areas of educational practice, and with what aims in mind? Some of these issues have been addressed in our Research Centre's report for Learning and Skills Improvement Service (LSIS) (Bentall, Bourn, Blum, 2010) and the aim here is to look at different areas and forms of intervention and the potential challenges this creates. Three different interpretations of the usage of global skills are suggested and suggestions are then made about potential areas for intervention by development education organisations.

The starting point has to be the usage of the term 'global skills'. A large number of small training providers are increasingly using the term partly as a way of marketing themselves but also because there is increasing recognition that new forms of skills are being required by companies. An example of this in the UK is The Global Skills College in London (http://www.lpi-global-skills.org.uk/workshop_schedule.php). This institution runs training workshops on areas such as teamwork, information technology (IT), conflict resolution, and problem solving skills. KPMG, the international audit company, state the following:

> "So what exactly are we looking for when we recruit new people? Naturally, we want you to have good technical skills, problem-solving abilities and commercial focus. We're also looking for people with a lot of integrity - good team workers who can build effective

relationships, learn from experience and bring out the best in others" (KPMG, 2008).

A second approach to the usage of the term within further education is one that sees global skills as about intercultural understanding and developing a more global outlook, often related to international experience. Whilst elements of this can be seen in some of the comments made from companies above, they have a distinct tradition and approach that is based on a broader humanistic approach towards education, linked to cross-cultural education and cosmopolitanism.

This tradition is rooted in discourses around intercultural education which is based on preparing learners to 'act as interpreters and mediators between different cultures on mutual bases' (Lasonen, 2009). In the context of further education, for example, this can be interpreted as adopting a 'co-operative and team-working approach as mediators, interpreters and active agents between different cultures' (Lasonen: 196). One of the main manifestations of this approach within further education is international partnerships between colleges. (see Bentall, Bourn, Blum, 2009)

The value of these international initiatives and exchanges have however been critiqued in relation to school education (Martin, 2007; Leonard, 2008). They question the extent to which this form of learning can merely reinforce existing dominant ideological perceptions of the partner country and culture. Rizvi and Lingard (2010) have noted in regard to higher education that there is little evidence that student exchanges and overseas visits challenge dominant orthodoxies between the rich and the poor in the world. They state that despite much talk about global interconnectivity and interdependence, 'international contact remains within globally differentiated cultural communities - the west versus the rest' (Ibid: 175).

Behind the strategies for partnerships and links is therefore the assumption that mere intercultural experience can help to gain greater understanding of the wider world. Based on evidence from Martin (2007) and Leonard (2008), it is suggested here that all too often these exchanges and experiences reproduce dominant notions of cultural superiority. Intercultural dialogue is not really dialogue, but rather a form of reproduction of cultural domination. Only when the exchange and the partnership is part of a broader process of learning and engagement with global issues and questions, and when

it addresses questions of power and domination, can such experiences lead to a broader and more questioning global consciousness.

A third approach and usage of the term within further education is one that sees it is as a way of promoting global perspectives and critical thinking. Here global skills can be seen as an approach that recognises complexity and critical thinking, and is linked closely to a values-based approach around social justice. Building on the work of Paulo Freire and Giroux (2005) this approach is based on recognition of an approach towards learning that is open, participatory but also deeply political, including recognition of power. Giroux (2005) talks about critical pedagogy starting, not with test scores, but with questions. He states that it is also about recognising competing views and vocabularies and the opening up of new forms of knowledge and creative spaces. This approach to global skills involves the following:

-       Recognising the value of learning about different perspectives and approaches;

-       Equipping the learner with the skills to question and develop the ability to enquire about and reflect critically upon a range of social, economic and cultural influences;

-       Emphasising the importance of positive social engagement and of seeking solutions;

-       Recognising the impact of globalisation on people's lives and the need to equip them with the ability to make sense of a rapidly changing world;

-       Making reference to the forces that shape societal and economic change.

It includes recognition of concepts and approaches using the first and second lenses outlined in this paper, but takes this to a new level in terms of critical thinking, understanding of and valuing different perspectives; and above all recognising the impact of globalisation on relations between people and communities around the world. It also acknowledges the consequential differentials in terms of power and access to resources and learning opportunities.

These influences can be seen in the work of the Lancashire Global Education Centre and the Development Education Association (DEA)'s 'Global Learning for Global College' initiative. A small voluntary organisation in Lancashire (England), the Lancashire Global Education Centre developed a three year programme for tutors in their local college linked to language skills, most notably for migrant communities where English was a second language. They did this through the production of resources and training materials that related learners' skills needs to their own experiences and global issues. Themes covered include Fairtrade, the Millennium Development Goals, What You Can Do and the Global Drugs Trade (Lancashire Global Education Centre, 2008)

Newell-Jones (2007) for the Development Education Association suggested also:

"That education and training for a global society should lead to the acquisition of skills is not in question. However unless this includes essential skills in critical engagement and also leads to the adoption of impact-orientated behaviours, learning will be ineffectual" (Ibid. 5).

The inclusion of linkage to understanding of global issues and questions of critical engagement bring the global skills concept back to the impact of globalisation on a person's life and how they make sense of the rapidly changing world around them - and have the confidence, knowledge and values-base to make a positive contribution to both the economy and society more widely. These elements could be summarised as:

- Understanding what globalisation means, particularly in relation to the individual, their community and their employment;

- Ability to understand and engage with global issues, such as climate change and poverty, in order to become a more informed and engaged citizen;

- Development of skills to understand and respect a range of cultures and values, and to be able to reflect critically upon one's own values base.

There is some evidence in England within further education of a desire to recognise this more person-centred learning based on critical thinking

perspectives, within strategies around global skills. One example is Regent's Park College in Leicester, England, which promotes itself as a Global Citizens' College. This outlook is summarised by the institution as follows:

> "The college is a diverse and successful learning community and this makes it the ideal setting to offer a broad education for global citizenship. Our students achieve excellent exam results and they also want to contribute to changing things for the better and to develop the confidence, knowledge and skills to make a real difference in society. They develop skills of leadership, co-operation, communication, questioning, critical thinking, problem solving and conflict resolution. They learn to understand global, local and individual perspectives and to critically examine all points of view; in other words to be informed, skilled and active global citizens" (quoted in Bourn, 2008).

This approach towards critical skills builds on the work of Andreotti and De Souza (2008) in posing the need to move from fixed content and skills that conform to a predetermined idea of society, towards concepts and strategies that address complexity, difference and uncertainty. It also means moving from an approach to learning that accepts given knowledge, to one that questions and moves positions and views. Finally this approach means moving from a universalist and ordered view of the world to one that recognises complex, multifaceted and different means of interpretation (Bourn and Neal, 2008).

There are therefore opportunities within the spectrum and forms of intervention in further education, but they pose questions around the extent to which you operate within the dominant discourses on globalisation and global skills, or seek a more radical and transformatory approach. Organisations engaged in development education practice could engage in further education, reflecting these different approaches. Their input would in part depend on the perspective of the organisation, but also on what opportunities, openings and above all spaces exist for more creative and transformatory approaches.

Conclusion

This paper has aimed to address the challenge of the relationship of development education ideas and practices to the influences and needs of policy-makers and practitioners. Development education is a well-established body of practice in many European countries but unlike areas such as environmental education it has found it difficult to effectively establish itself independent of government or NGO funding. Yet as this paper has aimed to show there is

now evidence in several areas of education of openings and opportunities that have demonstrated differing interpretations and understandings of learning about global and development issues. The extent to which these 'spaces' could be valuable for development education could only be measured by the extent to which they enable opportunities for participatory approaches towards learning, critical reflection and respect for different voices and perspectives.

Above all, what organisations engaged in development education need to consider is their particular contribution to learning about global issues and questions. It is not about identifying one universal approach but about clarifying what is feasible and possible, and above all ensuring that the organisation has some clarity about its own approach and theoretical basis. There are many interpretations of development education and what is needed is to debate what they are, which approach is most appropriate within a given educational arena and on what basis the pedagogy is introduced. Development education should not be seen as some form of monolithic approach to education but as a pedagogy that opens minds to question, consider, reflect and above all challenge viewpoints about the wider world and to identify different ways to critique them.

References

Andreotti, V (2006) 'Soft versus critical global citizenship education', *Policy & Practice: A Development Education Review*, Vol. 3, Autumn 2006, pp. 40-51, available: http://www.developmenteducationreview.com/issue3-focus4.

Andreotti, V (2010) 'Global Education in the 21st Century: two different perspectives on the post of postmodernism', *International Journal of Development Education and Global Learning, 2*, 2, pp. 5-22.

Andreotti, V and de Souza, L.M. (2008) 'Translating theory into practice and walking minefields: lessons from the project "Through Other Eyes"', *International Journal of Development Education and Global Learning, 1*, 1, pp. 23-36.

Bentall, C., Blum, N and Bourn, D (2010) *Learning and Skills in a Global Society - the contribution of Further Education and Training Providers*, London, LSIS.

Bourn, D (2008) Global Skills, London, Centre for Excellence in Leadership.

Bourn, D and Hunt, F (2011) *The Global Dimension in Secondary Schools* – DERC Research Report No.1, London, Institute of Education.

CIO (2011) *Review of Using Aid Funds in the UK to promote awareness of global poverty -* Review for DFID, London, DfID.

Department for International Development (DfID) (1998) *Building Support for Development.* London, DFID.

Edge, K., Khamsi, K. and Bourn, D. (2008) *Exploring the Global Dimension in Secondary Schools, Research report for DCSF.* London, DCSF.

Egan, A. (2011) 'Development Education and Corporate Power', Unpublished MA dissertation, Institute of Education, University of London.

Forghani-Arani, N. and Hartmeyer, H. (2010) 'Global Learning in Austria', *International Journal of Development Education and Global Learning*, 2, 2.

Giroux, H (2005) *Border Crossings.* New York, N.Y, Routledge.

The Global Skills College (London), available: http://www.lpi-global-skills.org.uk/workshop_schedule.php (last accessed 12 September 2011).

Hoppers, C (2008) *South African Research Chair in Development Education - Framework and Strategy*, Pretoria, South Africa, University of South Africa.

KPMG (2008) 'The Global Skills Convergence', available at http://www.kpmg.com/Global/en/IssuesAndInsights/ArticlesPublications/Documents/The-global-skills-convergence.pdf (last accessed February 19, 2010).

Krause, J (2010) *European Development Education Monitoring Report- Development Education Watch*, Brussels, European Multi-Stakeholder Forum.

Kumar, A (2008) 'Development Education and Dialogic Learning in the 21st Century', *International Journal of Development Education and Global Learning,* vol.1.1, pp. 37-48.

Lancashire Global Education Centre (2008) *Global Skills: Understanding the World Through English*, Preston, LGEC.

Lasonen, J (2009) 'Intercultural Education: Promoting Sustainability in Education and Training' in Fien, J, Maclean, R. and Park, M-G. (eds.) *Work, Learning and Sustainable Development,* Bonn, Springer.

Leonard, A (2008) 'Global School Relationships: school linking and modern challenges' in Bourn, D (ed.) *Development Education: Debates and Dialogues*, London, Bedford Way Papers.

Marshall, H (2007) 'Global education in perspective: fostering a global dimension in an English secondary school', *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 37 (3), pp. 355-374.

Martin, F (2007) 'School Linking: A controversial issue' in Claire, H and Holden, C. (eds.) *The Challenge of Teaching Controversial Issues.*, London, Trentham Books.

McCloskey, S (2011) 'Rising to the challenge: Development education, NGOs and the urgent need for social change', *Policy & Practice: A Development Education Review*, Vol. 12, Spring 2011, pp. 32-46, available: http://www.developmenteducationreview.com/issue12-focus4.

McCollum, A (1996) *On the Margins? An Analysis of the Theory and Practice of Development Education in the 1900s*. Ph.D. Thesis, Open University.

Mundy, K (2007) *Charting Global Education in Canada's Elementary Schools.* Toronto, ON, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (OISE)/UNICEF.

Newell-Jones, K (2007) *Global Skills and Lifelong Learning*, London, DEA.

O'Loughlin, E (eds.) (2006) *Global Education in Austria*, Lisbon, North-South Centre.

Rajacic, A, Surian, A., Fricke, H-J, Krause, J, Davis, P. (2010a) *Study on the Experience and Actions of the Main European Actors Active in the Field of Development Education and Awareness Raising - Interim Report*, Brussels, European Commission.

Regan, C (ed.) (2006) *Development in an Unequal World*, Dublin, 80:20.

Rizvi, F and Lingard, B. (2010) *Globalizing Education Policy*, Abingdon, Routledge.

Selby, D & Kagawa, F (2011) 'Development education and education for sustainable development: Are they striking a Faustian bargain?', *Policy & Practice: A Development Education Review*, Vol. 12, Spring 2011, pp. 15-31, available: http://www.developmenteducationreview.com/issue12-focus3.

Douglas Bourn is the Director of the Development Education Research Centre (DERC) at the Institute of Education (IOE) at the University of London. He can be contacted by email at: d.bourn@ioe.ac.uk

THE MEANING OF PARTNERSHIP IN DEVELOPMENT: LESSONS FOR DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION

Fiona Bailey & Anne M. Dolan

A number of partnerships between Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) in the global North and South have been developed in recent decades with the aim of bridging the North/South knowledge divisions which currently exist. Concurrently, the usage of the term 'partnership' has increased in a range of development co-operation policy documents and funding guidelines. While these arrangements have generated an improvement in human and infrastructural capacity, as well as a greater voice for Southern partners, partnerships have been criticised for the one-way flow of capacity from the North, and among other things, the absence of genuine sharing. In this article **Fiona Bailey** and **Anne M. Dolan** discuss the concept of partnership, particularly within development cooperation, higher and teacher education and other areas, providing a critique but also outlining good practice models. The need for more interaction between development education and development cooperation is a significant recommendation.

Introduction

Development co-operation arose in the context of the Cold War, the process of decolonisation and the on-going nature of globalisation. There has been a deliberate shift in the language of development co-operation over the last 50 years, which now encompasses terms such as 'participation', 'empowerment', 'poverty reduction' (Cornwall and Brock, 2006) and more recently 'partnership' (Crawford, 2010). Currently, the effectiveness of development co-operation is being widely debated in the context of the United Nations (UN) Millennium Development Goals (MDG), the global recession, the climate change debate and persisting levels of high poverty in the global South.[1] Development co-operation has been criticised, both in terms of its appropriateness (Moyo, 2010),

---

[1] The Global South refers to the countries most of which are located in the Southern Hemisphere. It includes both countries with medium human development (88 countries with an HDI less than .8 and greater than .5) and low human development (32 countries with an HDI of less than .5) as reported in the United Nations Development Programme Annual Reports. Most of the global South (some 133 countries) is located in South and Central America, Africa and Asia. The Global North refers to the 57 countries with high human development that have a Human Development Index above .8 as reported in the United Nations Development Programme Annual Reports. Most, but not all of these countries are located in the Northern Hemisphere.

and its perceived failure to address some of the global challenges which have greater implications for poorer nations (Lister, 2000). Development education itself is also largely funded through development co-operation budgets, and by development non-governmental organisations. Therefore, development co-operation and development education have an integral relationship, albeit with varying levels of congeniality contingent upon contemporary mutual perceptions of relevance and effectiveness.

In the last twenty years, the concept of 'partnership' has emerged as the 'new big idea' in development discourses (Kayizzi-Mugerwa, 1998: 220). The term 'partnership' in relation to development came to particular prominence in the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) (1996) report, *Shaping the 21st Century: The Contribution of Development Co-operation.* This argued that aid should focus on a limited list of poverty reduction and human development goals, a list which was later published as the MDGs.[2] The development of a 'global partnership for development' is the pledge of the eighth MDG. The development partnership approach was further endorsed by the *Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness* (2005)[3] and the *Accra Agenda for Action* (2008).[4]

---

[2] The Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) are eight international development goals that all 192 United Nations member states and at least 23 international organizations have agreed to achieve by the year 2015. They include eradicating extreme poverty, reducing child mortality rates, fighting disease epidemics such as AIDS and developing a global partnership for development.

[3] The Paris Declaration, endorsed on 2 March 2005, is an international agreement to which over one hundred Ministers, Heads of Agencies and other Senior Officials adhered and committed their countries and organisations to continue to increase efforts in harmonisation, alignment and managing aid for results with a set of monitorable actions and indicators.

[4] The Accra Agenda for Action (AAA) is an international agreement that aims to highlight the need for specific reforms in the aid sector to achieve improved aid effectiveness. The AAA resulted from the Accra Third High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness (24 September 2008) and is designed to complement the implementation of the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness. While acknowledging that improvements have been made since the signing of the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness, the AAA highlights three key areas where progress is required to ensure continued improvements in aid reform, including:
- strengthening developing country ownership of development;
- more effective and inclusive partnerships for development;
- delivering and accounting for development results.

Although development cooperation has been largely carried out by government agencies and non-governmental organisations (NGOs) for some time now, Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) have become more active in this area. In this sphere too, the term 'partnership' is used freely, but has rarely been examined in detail in relation to its content of objectives, although the concept of bridging North/South knowledge divisions has been mooted. Of course, the term 'partnership' enjoys popular appeal, but the fact that there is a continuum within partnership ranging from conservative to radical interpretations, and from full cooperation to one sided control, is seldom raised.

In this paper we examine how the term has evolved in development co-operation, higher education and teacher education, we highlight a number of principles for good practice, we examine one of the key aspects in the partnership debate, the location of power. Finally, we posit some observations for the development education sector. This research forms part of a doctoral study funded by Irish Aid through the HEA's Programme of Strategic Co-operation. More in-depth critiques and analysis will be presented during a later stage in the doctoral study. Key themes which have emerged from the development literature are outlined. A significant issue of the study is whether North-South Partnerships should remain the dominant approach for aid, development research and development co-operation?

Historical development of the concept of partnership in development co-operation

Partnership has become a central concept in development co-operation since the mid-eighties. As development theories have evolved so too have ideas about aid, co-operation, partnership and solidarity. During the 1960s and 1970s poverty was understood in terms of the non-existence of development. Thus, modernisation theories highlighted the goal of achieving a Western style package of development, complete with urbanisation, industrialisation and market economic progress (Giddens, 1991). Partnership approaches, informed by modernist paradigms emphasise its role in ensuring aid effectiveness and efficiency, the reduction of corruption, and the provision of assistance rather than mutual benefits and reciprocity (Crewe & Harrison, 1998).

More radical approaches informed by dependency theories argued that the act of development was actually the perpetuation of underdevelopment. Thus, industrialised economies keep developing countries in a subservient position often through economic sanctions and trading conditions prescribed by the World Trade Organisation, the World Bank or the International Monetary

Fund. A partnership model informed by critical development theories, addressing the structural political, economic, social and cultural causes of underdevelopment, is guided by principles of solidarity and challenging unequal power structures (Gunder-Frank, 1967 and Dos Santos, 2002). Post development theorists (e.g. Alvares (1992); Escobar (1992); Kothari (1988); Rahnema (1992); and others) argue that the assumptions and ideas which are core to development are problematic, and therefore the very idea of development itself is contested. According to Nederveen Pieterse (1998, 2000) post-development theory can be distinguished from other critical approaches to development (such as dependency theory, 'alternative development theory' and 'human development') by its insistence that development be rejected entirely, rather than implemented or altered in specific ways. In this context the aims and aspirations of partnership within development co-operation are also problematic.

Definitions of 'Partnership' and Principles of Good Practice

Partnership is a term which evokes much sensitivity with its implicit connotations of sharing and trust. While aid and charity may refer to a more unequal aid relationship, the term 'partnership' suggests equality, respect, reciprocity and ownership (Gutierrez, 2008). Yet, some partnerships can be abusive and unequal in practice, and the term continues to mean different things to different people, sectors and institutions.

The Oxford Dictionary defines partnership in terms of a relationship between people or organisations. Other associated words include *association, cooperation, collaboration, participation, joint decision making* and *long-term relationship.* Yet, there exists a lack of clarity surrounding what exactly is meant by partnership, and the principles which underlie a partnership approach.

At a conceptual level partnership is generally understood as a positive attribute. Mohiddin (1998: 5) refers to partnership as the 'highest stage of working relationship between different people brought together by commitment to common objectives, bonded by long experience of working together, and sustained by subscription to common visions'. Moreover, certain characteristics distinguish partnership from other relationships, such as cooperation or collaboration, and present partnership as a more superior working relationship. Typically, 'authentic' partnership is associated with the following characteristics; long-term, shared responsibility, reciprocal obligation, equality, mutuality and balance of power (Fowler, 2000). Core principles of reciprocity, accountability, joint decision making, respect, trust, transparency, sustainability and mutual

interests have been highlighted in the literature (Wanni, 2010; Dochas, 2010; Crawford, 2003).

According to Brinkerhoff (2002) equality of decision-making and mutual influence are the key characteristics distinguishing partnership from other types of relationship. Yet, in practice, developing a relationship characterised by a free and equal exchange of ideas is challenging because of language diversity, geographical constraints and differences in terms of how the relationship/partnership is conceptualised and interpreted. Principles for good practice can also be derived from an examination of the obstacles to success for educational partnerships. These include a resistance to sharing ownership and responsibility for the partnership: 'responsibility which needs to be shared in failure as well as success' (Mason, 2008: 18). In comparison to Northern universities, Southern universities face a range of barriers including: reduced funding for research; large enrolment numbers; heavy teaching loads; poor wages; the brain drain of some of their brightest academics; poor leadership; and an increased reliance on external funding. Other reasons include unequal access to resources including funding, Information and Communication Technology (ICT), infrastructure and administrative support.

Furthermore, the language tied up in the partnership debate has become somewhat simplistic and unchallenged. Malhotra (1997) argues that there has been an overstretched application of the term partnership in development cooperation, resulting in it becoming a 'something nothing' word. Fowler (2000) suggests that we refrain from using the term partnership to describe aid relationships which do not embody any of the principles of partnership, and stick to using more appropriate terms including cooperation and collaboration. Nonetheless, it is important to note that partnership is not a neutral term and partnerships which are poorly conceptualised and badly managed end up promoting dependency, ultimately doing more harm than good.

In an international context, partnership has been used as a strategic and political term to re-define development cooperation over the last few decades. Partnership has been embraced by a range of bilateral and multilateral agencies e.g. the UK government's *White Paper on International Development* (DFID, 1997) and the World Bank's *Comprehensive Development Framework* (World Bank, 1999). The World Bank's apparent commitment to partnership is noteworthy given its immense power. Recent development plans for Africa are also couched in the language of partnership e.g. the so-called Marshall Plan

for Africa is entitled New Partnership for African Development (NEPAD). Commentators such as Bradley (2008) argue that the nature and impact of the partnership model of development cooperation must be questioned and analysed. Haberman (2008) cites Brinkerhoff's (2002: 2) argument that partnership is 'in danger of remaining a "feel good" panacea for governance without obtaining a pragmatic grasp of the "why" and a clearer understanding of the "how" of partnerships'. Hence, partnership remains a contested concept, and while these definitions and principles promise so much, partnership often fails to deliver in practice (Brehm, 2001). Though benefits have generated an improvement in human and infrastructural capacity as well as a greater voice for Southern partners, partnerships have been criticised for the one way flow of capacity from the North and the absence of genuine sharing (Nakabugo et al, 2010).

Partnership and Power

While North-South links and partnerships have been identified as an important mechanism for building the human and institutional capacity of Southern higher education institutes, there are concerns that current conceptualisations of partnerships continue to promote top down models of governance. This raises the important issue of power relations within a partnership.

Partnerships between the global North and South are often characterised by a range of asymmetries between the two partners, in resources, institutional capacity and power (Gutierrez, 2008: 20). In other words, partnerships exist on an uneven playing field, with the partner controlling finances often determining the terms of the partnership. Gutierrez (2008) presents a theoretical analysis using Bourdieu's (1984) concepts of social field and capital (or resources) can be useful to show that "good will" is not enough to eradicate structural power asymmetries within North-South research partnerships. In reality, North-South partnerships still have a series of hurdles to overcome, particularly with regard to the problem of asymmetries – the lack of balance between Northern and Southern partners.

Some claim that partnerships are defined by power relations. For example, Crewe and Harrison (1998) suggest that partnerships are initiated without any 'meaningful reform of existing relations of power and hierarchy'. Likewise, Brinkerhoff (2002) claims that intrinsic power relations in international development make it impossible to exclude power from partnership. Other commentators argue more proactively that partnership is

about transforming power relationships in a positive and socially just fashion (Barnes and Brown, 2011).

Pender (2001) and Fowler (2000: 3) believe that partnership is used by development agencies as a means of legitimising their role in development and is in Fowler's terms 'a more subtle form of external power imposition'. This is supported by Crawford (2003: 155) who talks about the 'rhetoric of partnership'. He maintains that 'the power asymmetries within North-South relations, as expressed though the aid relationship, have not significantly changed, despite the current fad for the language of *partnership* and *national ownership'*.

Partnership in Higher Education
The vital role of African universities in Africa's economic and social development has been highlighted by the Commission for Africa (2005), and the Gleneagles Summit (2005). The recommendations of the *Second Decade of Education for Africa 2006-2015* (African Union, 2006), underlined the key role of higher education in sustainable development and poverty reduction. In the interests of revitalising African higher education, many universities and higher education institutions from the global North have engaged in a process of partnership with universities from the global South. Within a context of higher education development cooperation, partnership has been defined as:

> "...a dynamic collaborative process between educational institutions that brings mutual though not necessarily symmetrical benefits to the parties engaged in the partnership. Partners share ownership of the projects. Their relationship is based on respect, trust, transparency and reciprocity. They understand each other's cultural and working environment. Decisions are taken jointly after real negotiations take place between the partners. Each partner is open and clear about what they are bringing to the partnership and what their expectations are from it. Successful partnerships tend to change and evolve over time" (Wanni et al, 2010: 18).

The HEA/Irish Aid's Programme of Strategic Cooperation between Irish Aid and Higher Education and Research Institutes provides a recent example of the prioritisation of 'partnership'. According to the recent call for funding, the 'Programme of Strategic Cooperation between Irish Aid and Higher Education and Research Institutes' (hereafter referred to as the PSC) aims to promote collaborative partnerships for innovative research and

educational activities in support of Irish Aid's mission to reduce poverty and vulnerability' (HEA, 2011: 2). The aim of the PSC is to 'support Irish Aid's mission in reducing poverty through a programme of strategic cooperation within and between higher education and research institutes in Ireland and in partner countries'. Partnership has been identified as one of the key objectives:

> "To facilitate the *establishment of collaborative partnerships* within and between higher education institutions and research institutes in Ireland and in countries benefiting from Irish Aid support" (Irish Aid, 2007).

Higher education institutions applying for funding under this programme were and are required to demonstrate a commitment to and evidence of a partnership approach to education activities. However, it is not clear what is meant by partnership in this context, or what constitute its essential elements. Indeed, it may simply be another word for co-operation.

Partnership and Teacher Education

The issue of teacher quality in Sub-Saharan Africa has been highlighted in the literature (Mulkeen, 2010), and efforts to improve teacher quality are particularly challenging in light of the low status and poor working conditions of teachers, mitigating also against their recruitment and retention. Teacher quality is also an important issue in the context of the UN MDGs given their commitment to ensure that by 2015 all boys and girls will be able to complete a full course of primary schooling. The demand for qualified teachers has risen dramatically as a direct result of increased enrolment in schools. Large numbers of unqualified teachers are working in primary and secondary schools as a direct result of the shortage of qualified staff. Given this shortage, various initiatives, including a range of partnerships, have been devised to support teacher education in Africa. The launch of the *Programme of Strategic Cooperation between Irish Aid and Higher Education and Research Institutes 2007–2011* provided a new opportunity for supporting teacher education in Africa, through a partnership approach.

This Programme has provided funding for the Centre for Global Development through Education (CGDE), which aims to contribute to poverty reduction by enhancing the quality of basic education through capacity building in teacher education in Africa, using a partnership approach. The institutional members of the Centre who are represented on the Centre's Steering Committee are from various teacher education departments/faculties from other

higher educational institutions in the island of Ireland, including the university sector, colleges of education and some non-governmental organizations (NGOs).

The Centre's partners in Uganda are Kyambogo University and the Ministry for Education and Sports, Kampala, while its partners in Lesotho are the Lesotho College of Education and the Ministry of Education and Training, Maseru. CGDE primarily works with teacher educators and ministries of education in the South to enhance the quality of teaching, learning and educational research in teacher education. The Centre has a number of research projects involving both African and Irish researchers and, through Irish Aid and the HEA, it also supports a number of African and Irish PhD scholars.

Another teacher education partnership is the Zambian Irish Teacher Education Programme (ZITEP), funded by Irish Aid and the Department of Education and Skills (Ireland), aimed at improving the quality of teacher education in Zambia. Five teacher education colleges in Ireland are working in partnership with two teacher education colleges in Zambia on a comprehensive programme of mentoring and support in key areas of teacher training. A virtual intranet linked to the seven colleges has been developed as a key feature of the partnership, resulting in over 110 lecturers collaborating on-line between the two countries. This allows lecturers to collaborate, interact and share ideas, co-develop resources and discuss issues relevant to the teaching of their subjects. The intranet site also facilitates the joint management of the partnership and provides some useful insights into classroom management, assessment practices and teaching practice. The Zambia–Ireland initiative was designed to contribute significantly to the delivery and quality of education in Zambia. The principle objective of both CGDE and ZITEP is teacher education enhancement in Lesotho, Uganda and Zambia.

Development Education and Initial Teacher Education

Initial primary teacher education in Ireland has a long history of engagement with the international development agenda. Fiedler (2009: 2) notes how in recent years, at a European and Irish level, 'there have been major achievements in advancing development education in terms of research, integration into different areas of civil society and in youth work in general'. Specific development education initiatives in Ireland include the establishment of

programme/partnerships e.g. DICE[5] and UBUNTU,[6] and linking initiatives including student teacher placement programmes in developing countries. Recently, new institutional partnership programmes have been established between teacher education institutions in the global North and South, such as CGDE and ZITEP. While there is much in the literature concerning the partnership model in development cooperation, there is little consideration of the nature and impact of partnership within higher education, specifically within teacher education development cooperation. While CGDE and ZITEP are not development education programmes, they have collaborated informally with development education within the teacher education sector, albeit in a limited capacity.

Though there have been considerable achievements and success within the field of development education, the nature, quality and impact of this engagement has not been adequately examined to date. Andreotti (2006: 46) differentiates between 'soft' and 'critical' development education. According to Andreotti 'soft' development education does not question the role of the educator and the learner in the global North in participating in social structures (such as education, trade and climate change) that create and perpetuate poverty

---

[5] Development and Intercultural Education project (DICE): (http://www.diceproject.org/index.aspx). The DICE Project, funded by Irish Aid, has as a central objective to support the inclusion of development education and intercultural education perspectives as essential elements of initial teacher education. It seeks to develop positive attitudes and values in students such as peace, tolerance and a desire for social justice. The project promotes global solidarity, human rights and environmental awareness while also developing students' ability to recognise and challenge discrimination and inequality.

[6] Ubuntu Network (Teacher Education for Sustainable Development: Integration Development Education into Initial Teacher Education): (http://www.ubuntu.ie/) The Ubuntu Network supports the integration of Development Education (DE) and Education for Sustainable Development (ESD) into post primary Initial Teacher Education (ITE) in Ireland. The Network is made up of teacher educators from Dublin City University, Mater Dei Institute, the National College of Art and Design, Limerick School of Art and Design, National University of Ireland Maynooth, National University of Ireland Maynooth, St. Angela's College, Sligo, Tipperary Institute, Trinity College Dublin, University College Cork, University College Dublin, and the University of Limerick. Representatives of NGOs (Just Forests, Eco-UNESCO and Amnesty International) involved in DE and ESD sit on the steering committee, as do representatives from Mary Immaculate College, the DICE Project (Development and Intercultural Education at Primary level) and IDEA (Irish Development Education Association).

and misery in less-developed countries or the global South. 'Critical' development education is seen to involve building an understanding of the complex 'structures, systems, assumptions, power relations and attitudes that create and maintain exploitation and enforced disempowerment' (2006: 46). Critical development education therefore represents a form of "unveiling"; an examination of the ideological forces in North-South relations and how these prevent full public discussion on development issues.

Recent educational research indicates that development education tends to present global and justice issues in ethnocentric and uncritical ways which ignore how global processes and agendas are constructed and re-invented in different contexts (Bourn, 2008). To address this dilemma, Alasuutari (2011: 66-67) advocates the incorporation of critical literacy and ethical intercultural learning as 'a way to address the still dominant ethnocentrism and the lack of engagement with issues of power and representation in development and global education'. Critical literacy in terms of development education can be understood in terms of an educator understanding the connections between language, power and knowledge (Andreotti, 2007), and the application of this understanding to the practical perspectives related to development. Ethical intercultural learning is a lifelong process based on ethics and ethical relationships towards each other in a way which avoids cultural supremacy while aiming to encounter one's own and the other's knowledge system (Alasuutari, 2011).

There are major difficulties for people from the global South to engage in development education debates in Ireland and in the UK. Gyoh (2008) argues that the absence of a theoretical framework outlining development education's approach to development and the exclusionary nature of the educational approaches pose persistent barriers to the global South's participation in development education. He emphasises the need to explore the theoretical underpinnings of development education which define and articulate the approach to development advocated by development education initiatives. Gyoh (2008) argues that current theoretical principles in development education prioritise a highly structured elitist educational approach, rather than an approach which emphasises advocacy and challenging values. Hicks (2008) contends that there is a lack of critical understanding amongst students and staff of development issues including poverty, inequality, diversity, interdependency and power.

This view is endorsed by Bryan (2011: 4) who asks the 'thorny' question whether development education has been de-clawed or stripped of its original radical underpinnings. Byran highlights the tension which exists between the radical nature of development education and the 'more dominant instrumentalist approach to schooling'. It is our contention that partnerships experience similar tensions. Therefore, there is a need to interrogate notions of partnership in development cooperation and development education to clarify the role, purpose and philosophical underpinnings of such initiatives. Without critical engagement, development education initiatives such as partnership and linking programmes, including student placements in a developing context, run the risk of maintaining dependence and inequality, reinforcing rather than challenging negative stereotypes and unequal power relations (Disney, 2009; Martin, 2005; O'Keefe, 2006).

Are partnerships in teacher education a potential resource for Development Education?

This article has raised a number of preliminary issues relating to partnerships in higher education and teacher education specifically in relation to power, the inclusion of the Southern perspective, mutuality and reciprocity and perceived weaknesses. Development education in terms of its process, action component and conceptual framework has much to offer the process of partnership formation. Development educators have recognized facilitation and intercultural skills for dealing with the negotiation of power relations. In order to move beyond the 'rhetoric of partnership' (Crawford, 2003), it is imperative that partners openly address the issue of power in terms of ownership, decision making, funding, planning and evaluation.

Gyoh (2008) has highlighted the problematic nature of the inclusion of the Southern perspective in development education. Development partnerships have the potential to include this perspective in development education initiatives in Ireland. To date, CGDE and ZITEP have hosted many visitors from Uganda, Zambia and Lesotho to colleges of education in Ireland. If funding for partnerships stipulated greater co-operation with the development education community, development education planning could maximise opportunities provided by visitors to Ireland. Equally, the development education community could work with development partnerships in their planning to ensure effective cross-cultural planning and project design. While we are not recommending that funding should be dependent on co-operation with the development education community, it does make sense for both sectors

to work together in the interests of sharing resources and creating a broader network/framework for development education in Ireland.

Partnerships are theoretically committed to collaborative relationships based on mutuality and reciprocity. In reality, this is not always as straightforward as it appears. Indeed, partnership processes could benefit from adopting some of the systems of development and intercultural education. For example, some intercultural learning could help to clarify expectations, assist in creating greater levels of mutuality and reciprocity, help each partner understand the perspective of the other and develop basic cross-cultural communication. However, Alasuutari (2011) and Andreotti (2010) contend that in order to incorporate effective intercultural learning, it is important to analyse the learning process through a multi-spectrum lens including issues of power, social justice and post-colonial perspectives.

In response to weaknesses that have been identified in both sectors, the incorporation of critical literacy and ethical intercultural learning is needed to deal with issues of power, ethnocentrism and representation in development education and development partnerships (Alasuutari, 2011). Ultimately development education has the capacity to interrogate notions of partnership in development cooperation and development education. As stated earlier critical engagement in development education initiatives such as partnership and linking programmes is crucial, in order to challenge negative stereotypes and unequal power relations (Disney, 2009, Martin, 2005, O'Keefe, 2006).

The theory and practice of development partnerships as they are conceptualised, delivered and evaluated provide potential material for development education resources and support material. Valuable lessons continue to be learnt but these lessons need to be documented. While the lessons themselves provide contemporary material for development education, they can be documented in a range of development education journals, books and materials.

Conclusion

In light of the opening question as to whether North-South partnerships remain the dominant approach for aid and development co-operation, it is important to note that partnerships form a strong pillar in current development co-operation policy. However, it could be argued that commitments to partnership are tokenistic in some instances. Nevertheless, in the absence of any alternatives, it is likely that partnerships will remain on the development co-operation agenda

for some time. However, we have not yet arrived at firm research outcomes regarding the value of partnerships approaches, and whether they make any long term improvement in local or global terms. We do know that partnership approaches often fail to take into account issues of power in the relationship, and that the impact of power imbalances ultimately have an impact in the development of sustainable co-operation. The relationships developed by partners could benefit from some of the principles of development and intercultural learning. Conversely, development education has much to gain from development partnerships especially teacher education partnerships.

Further research is urgently needed to evaluate the essence of the 'partnership model'. One of the aims of the doctoral research upon which this article is based is to explore and evaluate the nature and impact of partnership as a tool in teacher education development cooperation, and in doing so, to inform and support the future development of global partnership collaborations within higher education, specifically teacher education institutions.

References

African Union (2006) *Second Decade of Education for Africa (2006-2015)*.

Draft Plan of Action. Available at http://adea-comed.org/IMG/pdf/SECOND_DECADE_OF_EDUCATION_FOR.pdf (Accessed 1/9/2011).

Alasuutari, H (2011) 'Conditions for Mutuality and Reciprocity in Development Education Policy and Pedagogy', *International Journal of Development Education and Mutual Learning* 3 (3).

Alvares, C (1992) *Science, Development, and Violence: The Revolt against Modernity*. Oxford University Press, Delhi.

Andreotti, V (2006) 'Soft versus critical global citizenship education', *Policy & Practice: A Development Education Review,* 3, pp. 40-51, available: http://www.developmenteducationreview.com/issue3-focus4.

Andreotti, V (2007) 'An Ethical Engagement with the Other: Gayatri Spivak on education', *Critical Literacy: Theories and Practices*, 1 (1), pp. 69-79.

Andreotti, V (2010) 'Global Education in the '21st Century': Two Perspectives on the 'Post-' of Modernism', *International Journal of Development Education and Global Learning,* 2 (2), pp. 5-22.

Beneitone, P (2003) 'Some ideas about University Development Co-operation' in Beneitone, P, Hoivik, S, Molenaers, N, Obrecht, A & Renard, R. (eds.) *University Development Co-operation: Models of Good Practice,* University of Deusto Bilbao: Humanitarian Net. Available at: http://www.humanitariannet.deusto.es/publica/PUBLICACIONES_PDF/11%20Models%20of%20Good%20Prac.pdf (accessed 6/8/2011).

Barnes, A & Brown, W. G (2011) 'The Idea of Partnership within the Millennium Development Goals: context, instrumentality and the normative demands of partnership', *Third World Quarterly*, Vol. 32, No. 1, pp. 165-180.

Bourdieu, P (1984) *Questions de sociologie*, Paris, Minuit.

Bourn, D (ed) (2008) *Development Education: Debates and Dialogues*, Bedford Way Papers, London.

Bradley, M (2008), North South Research Partnerships; Lessons from the Literature. *Norrag News; The New Politics of Partnership: Peril or Promise?* 41. Available: http://www.norrag.org/issues/41.

Brehm, V. M (2001) 'Promoting effective North – South NGO Partnerships: A comparative Study of 10 European NGOs', *INTRAC: The International NGO Training and Research Centre Occasional Papers Series*, Number 35.

Brinkerhoff, J. M (2002) *Partnership for International Development: Rhetoric or Results?* London, Lynne Rienner Publishers.

Bryan, A (2011) 'Another cog in the anti-politics machine? The 'de-clawing' of development education', *Policy & Practice: A Development Education Review*, Vol. 12, pp. 1-14, available: http://www.developmenteducationreview.com/issue12-editorial.

Commission for Africa (2005) *Our Common Interest: Report of the Commission for Africa,* UK, Commission for Africa.

Cornwall, A & Brock, K (2006) 'What do buzzwords do for development policy? A critical look at "participation", "empowerment" and "poverty reduction"', *Third World Quarterly,* Vol. 26, No. 7, pp. 1043-1060.

Crawford, G. (2003) 'Partnership or Power? Deconstructing the "Partnership for Governance Reform" in Indonesia', *Third World Quarterly*, Vol. 24, No.1, pp. 139-159.

Crewe, E & Harrison, E (1998) *Whose Development: An Ethnography of Aid*, Zed Books, UK.

Department for International Development (DFID) (1997) *Eliminating World Poverty: A challenge for the 21ˢᵗ Century*, London, HMSO.

Disney, A (2009) 'The contribution of school linking projects to global education: Some geographical perspectives', *Geography Education*, Vol, 2, No. 2.

Dochas (2010) *Partnership in Practice; A Kenyan Perspective on the Nature of Relationships with Irish NGOs,* Dochas, Dublin, available: http://www.dochas.ie/Shared/Files/4/Partnership_in_Practice_Dochas_Kenya_research_report.pdf.

Dos Santos, T (2002) *La Teoría de la Dependencia: Balance y Perspectivas*, Buenos Aires, Plaza & Janes.

Escobar, A (1992) 'Reflections on "Development": Grassroots Approaches and Alternative Politics in the Third World', *Futures* 24 (5), pp. 411-436.

Fiedler, M (2009) 'Examining development education in testing times', *Policy & Practice: A Development Education Review*, Vol. 9, available: http://www.developmenteducationreview.com/issue9-editorial.

Fowler, A (2000) 'Beyond Partnership: Getting Real about NGO Relationships in the Aid System', *IDS Bulletin* 31 (3), pp 1-13.

Frank, A. G (1996) 'The underdevelopment of development' in Chew, S. & Denemark R. (eds.) *The Underdevelopment of Development*, London, Sage.

Giddens, A (1991) *The Consequences of Modernity*, Stanford, Cal; Stanford University Press.

Gleneagles Summit (2005) 'The Gleneagles communiqué on Africa: Climate change, energy, and Sustainable Development', available: http://www.unglobalcompact.org/docs/about_the_gc/government_support/PostG8_Gleneagles_Communique.pdf (accessed on 4 October 2011).

The Global Skills College in London (http://www.lpi-global-skills.org.uk/workshop_schedule.php)

Gunder-Frank, A (1967) *Capitalism and underdevelopment in Latin America*, Monthly Review Press, New York.

Gutierrez, D (2008) 'Beyond Disappointment: Transforming Ideology and Practice in North-South Research Partnerships', *Norrag News: The New Politics of Partnership: Peril or Promise?* 41, available: http://www.norrag.org/issues/41

Gyoh, S (2009) 'Structural constraints to global South actor involvement in development education in Ireland', *Policy & Practice: A Development Education Review*, Vol. 8, Spring 2009, pp. 41-48, available: http://www.developmenteducationreview.com/issue8-perspectives3.

Haberman, B (2008) 'Research Partnership: Charity, Brokerage, Technology Transfer or Learning Alliance?', *Norrag News: The New Politics of Partnership: Peril or Promise?* 41, available: http://www.norrag.org/issues/41.

HEA (2011) 'Programme of Strategic Cooperation between Irish Aid and Higher Education and Research Institutes', *Guiding Principles, Transition Phase,* available at http://www.hea.ie/en/node/120 (accessed on October 4th, 2011)

Hicks, D (2008) 'A futures perspective: lessons from the school room' in Bussey, M, Inayatullah, S & Milojevic, I. (eds.) *Alternative Educational Futures: Pedagogies for emergent worlds*, Sense Publishers, Rotterdam.

Irish Aid (2006) *White Paper on Irish Aid,* Dublin.

Irish Aid (2007) *Programme of Strategic Cooperation between Irish Aid and Higher Education and Research Institutes 2007-2011*, available at http://www.hea.ie/webfm_send/1768 (accessed 1 September 2011).

Kayizzi-Mugerwa, S (1998) 'Africa and the donor community: from conditionality to partnership', *Journal of International Development*, 12, pp. 219-225.

Kothari, R (1988) *Rethinking Development: In Search of Humane Alternatives*, Delhi, Ajanta.

Lister, S (2000) 'Power in partnership? An analysis of the NGO's relationship with its partners', *Journal of International Development,* 10, pp. 219-225.

Malhotra, K (1997) 'Something Nothing Words: Lessons in Partnership from Southern Experience' in Hately, L. C & Malhotra, K, *Between Rhetoric and Reality: Essays on Partnership in* Development, Ottawa, North-South.

Martin, F (2005) 'North-South linking as a controversial issue', *Prospero,* 14(4), pp. 47-54.

Mohiddin, A (1998) 'Partnership: a new buzz-word or realistic relationship?', *Development* 41 (4), pp. 5-12.

Mulkeen, A (2010) *Teachers in Anglophone Africa; Issues in Teacher Supply, Training and Management*, Washington, World Bank.

Mason, M (2008) 'The philosophy and politics of partnership', *Norrag News: The New Politics of Partnership: Peril or Promise?* 41, available: http://www.norrag.org/issues/41

Maxwell, S & Riddell, R (1998) 'Conditionality or Contract: Perspectives on Partnership for Development', *Journal of International Development*, 10, pp. 257-268.

Moyo, D (2010) *Dead Aid: Why Aid is not working and how there is another way for Africa*, London, Penguin.

Nakabugo, M, Barrett, E, McEvoy, P & Munck, R (2010) 'Best practice in North-South research relationships in higher education: The Irish African partnership model', *Policy & Practice: A Development Education Review*, Vol. 10, Spring 2010, pp. 89-98, available at: http://www.developmenteducationreview.com/issue10-perspectives1

Nederveen Pieterse, J (1998) 'My Paradigm or Yours? Alternative Development, Post-Development, Reflexive Development', *Development and Change*, Vol. 29 (1998), pp. 343-373.

Nederveen Pieterse, J (2000) 'After Post-Development', *Third World Quarterly*, 22 (4), pp. 479-489.

O'Keefe, C (2006) *Linking between Ireland and the South: Good Practice Guidelines for North/South Linking,* Dublin, Irish Aid.

Pearson, Lester B (1969) *Partners in Development: Report of the Commission on International Development*, Praeger.

Pender, J (2001) 'Structural adjustment to comprehensive development framework: conditionality transformed?', *Third World Quarterly*, 22 (3), pp. 397-411.

Rahnema, M (1992) 'Poverty' in W. Sachs (ed.) *The Development Dictionary*, pp. 158-176, London, Zed Books.

Wallerstein, I (1983) 'The Three Instances of Hegemony in the History of the Capitalist World-Economy', *International Journal of Comparative Sociology*, 24, pp. 100-108.

Wanni, N, Hinz, A & Day, R (2010) *Good Practices in Educational Partnerships Guide: UK-Africa Higher and Further Education Partnerships,* The Africa Unit, UK/Africa Partnerships in HE/FE, available at http://www.hea.ie/files/Good_Practice_Guide-1.pdf

World Bank (1999) *A Proposal for A Comprehensive Development Framework (a discussion draft),* available: http://www.worldbank.org/cdf/.

Fiona Bailey is a postgraduate research student with the Department of Learning, Society and Religious Education, Mary Immaculate College, Limerick. Through her doctoral research she is examining the theme of partnerships in teacher education between colleges in Ireland and partners in Lesotho, Uganda and Zambia. This research is funded by Irish Aid through the *Programme of Strategic Cooperation between Irish Aid and Higher Education and Research Institutes* and is administered by the Centre for Global Development through Education (CGDE) and Mary Immaculate College, Limerick.

Dr. Anne Dolan is a lecturer with the Department of Learning, Society and Religious Education, Mary Immaculate College, Limerick. Currently she teaches a range of methodology courses in primary geography, development and intercultural education. After working as a primary teacher for a number of years, Anne worked in the area of development studies in Ireland and abroad. She worked as a development education officer for NCDE (National Committee for Development Education), as director of the International Centre for Development Studies, NUI, Galway and as Chairperson of Comhlámh, the Association of Returned Development Workers. She spent two years in Lesotho with the Agency for Personal Service Overseas (APSO) working in the Lesotho College of Education (LCE) as a lecturer in development studies. Anne has conducted research and evaluation work for the Development Education Unit of Irish Aid, Trócaire, Comhlámh, 80:20 and the Curriculum Development Unit in Mary Immaculate College.

CHALLENGES AND CONSIDERATIONS FOR EMBEDDING AN AFRICAN PERSPECTIVE IN DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION

Caroline Murphy

In this article, **Caroline Murphy** presents some of the findings from a research project commissioned by the Africa Centre, Dublin in 2010. In commissioning the research, the Africa Centre sought to explore an African perspective within development education (DE) with the aim of promoting a more fair and balanced representation of Africa in DE discourse. The research explored how development educators on the island of Ireland define and incorporate an African perspective within their work.   It found that participants feel constrained by funding bodies, development non-governmental organisations (NGOs), the media and the formal education sector which limit the capacity for an overtly political and 'radical development education'. The research therefore has significant implications regarding the extent to which an African perspective is embedded within DE practice in Ireland.

Introduction

'Freirean liberation theory underpins Development Education, promoting problem-based learning, dialogue and participation within a co-operative learning environment' (Hogan & Tormey, 2008, quoted in Chaib, 2010: 42). 'Central to the philosophy of Development Education is a student centred pedagogy, which places the student at the heart of the educational experience and ultimately DE should be about teaching differently rather than teaching more' (Haran & Tormey, 2002, quoted in McCormack and O'Flaherty, 2010: 1333).   DE shares Freire's anti-didactic approach to education that enables learners to take an active role against oppression in order to bring about socio-political transformation.   DE, then, located within this framework, might be considered an overtly political and radical movement that works to expose systems of oppression.

This paper highlights some of the findings that emerged in relation to the extent that DE can bring about political and radical change, and expose systems of oppression due to factors that include; the formal education system, funding bodies, development NGOs, and media and charitable representations of the poor. It is based on research carried out by the author on behalf of the Africa Centre in Dublin and presents a summary of the findings.

Defining 'Oppression'

Garvin (1987) defines oppression as 'the destructive effects of social institutions on people, when such institutions damage their identities, denigrate their lifestyles, and deny them access to opportunities' (quoted in Proctor *et al,* 2008: 44). Such a definition suggests extreme authoritarian institutional and social control over agency. Indeed, such control was evident during colonial exploitation, and is arguably continuing today through 'globalisation (the integration, to varying degrees, of all countries into a single world system) which shows remarkable continuity with colonialism...the attempt of the great powers to take over the wealth and raw materials of the world' (Seabrook, 2009: 63), or, as Asante puts it, 'the globalizing ethos of White corporate capital that leads ultimately, it seems to me, to another form of enslavement and domination' (Asante, 2006: 654).

However, in relation to conducting research in Ireland, it cannot be said that there exists such a level of oppression over the people with whom development educators work, for instance, teachers, students, youth groups etc. It might be argued, though, that there exists a level of, what Harvey (1999) terms civilised oppression, which is oppression 'embedded in unquestioned norms, habits and symbols, in the assumptions underlying institutions and rules, and the collective consequences of following those rules' (quoted in Deutsch, 2006: 10). From a postcolonial perspective, it could even be argued that civilised oppression, here in the global North, is linked to the reproduction of more extreme oppression in the global South. 'Broadly speaking, postcolonialism is a theoretical framework which makes visible the history and legacy of European colonialism, including the ways in which the wealth of the global North has been acquired and maintained through a history of exploitation, and examines how it continues to shape contemporary discourses and institutions (Rizvi, Lingard & Lavia, 2006, quoted in Bryan, 2008: 16). It critically addresses the ongoing effects of colonial past which may be evident in systems of neo-colonialism that continue to prevail.

In short, from a postcolonial perspective, the term civilised oppression refers to everyday norms, habits and symbols, systems and practices which may act as a prerequisite to maintain the more extreme oppression of the developing world. For example, media representations of the poor, NGO charity campaigns, formal education and funding bodies may fail to foster a critical perspective on the structural causes of poverty (see Murphy, 2011), but rather view the developing world in terms of *charity*, which is negatively related to

concern for the developing world constructed around *serving out help*, in pursuit of self-interest' (see Heerde and Hudson, 2010: 397). Thus, by ignoring the structural causes of poverty, a genuine sense of shared community and solidarity between the global North and South is 'unlikely to evolve' (see Gil 1998; Gorski 2007; Kivel 2000), and postcolonial oppression and notions of white supremacy are likely to prevail.

Research Design and Procedure

The research study for the Africa Centre was small in scale and exploratory in nature, a qualitative approach was therefore considered appropriate. The research design consisted of small group interview discussions based on Kreuger's (1998) focus group format although the research discussion groups were much smaller in size. In total a series of five tape-recorded discussions were conducted ranging from two to four participants per group. Having small group numbers was considered to be important to encourage participants to fully engage in the discussion. Each interview group was given a separate overall pseudonym including Coffee, Tea, Sugar, Cocoa and Banana. Participants in each respective group were also given a specific pseudonym, for example, Coffee 2 or Sugar 1.

Participants were recruited from both the north and south of Ireland to ensure a range of perspectives on development education practice on the island. However, this research was not intended as a comparative study. In Northern Ireland, participants were recruited from the Centre for Global Education (CGE) who provided a list of 22 development educators who are members of the Coalition of Aid and Development Agencies (CADA) Global Education sub group. In southern Ireland, the Africa Centre provided a list of 17 development educators who work for various development NGOs and ethnic led minority organisations. Emails were sent to all potential participants, providing a synopsis of the research with an information sheet and consent form. Seven participants responded from Northern Ireland and eight from southern Ireland.

In total, the study comprised of fifteen participants, five of whom were male and ten female. Four of these participants were based in ethnic minority led organizations with the remaining participants based in various NGOs. Given the small number of participants, the researcher does not claim that the findings can be considered representative of the overall population of development educators based in Ireland. It was nevertheless an adequate

sample to facilitate discussion on a full range of factors that were addressed in the research report.

In approaching the interview data, the researcher employed qualitative content analysis, or what David Altheide (1987) terms ethnographic content analysis (ECA). ECA uses pre-defined categories in order to identify themes within the data. All of the categories were constantly revised and reduced (see Murphy, 2011) and finally collapsed into three major themes. The themes addressed in this paper are 'Safe Development Education' and 'Radical Development Education'.

Findings

Safe Development Education

One system of, perhaps, civilised oppression that development educators aim to expose is the stereotypical emotional imaging and messaging that the media sometimes use to represent the developing world. Furthermore, many development educators are based in development organisations that are fundamentally concerned with tapping into the media *branding* of the developing world to encourage the general public to offer financial support for their various projects based in the global South. As Tea 3 explains:

> "I think with the charity model, I think it has an emotional factor, and it is also simple and it is uncomplicated. Then some development organisations pedal that philosophy very strongly, and it does reinforce stereotypes, and then when you begin to raise uncomfortable questions that we (global north) are part of the problem, that, um, is a more difficult message to get across."

It was found that participants are challenged by the charity model of development that underpins their respective NGOs operations, and 'the hardest thing is to challenge the NGO you're working in' (Banana 2). As Cocoa 1 stated:

> "Sometimes before you even get to the general public, it is difficult within the NGO organisation which I think is set up in such a way that it is more beneficial to keep that perception [charity perception] because the NGO is linked heavily to fundraising, and in order to raise more money you need to have that sympathy or charity model. I think even before you get to the public there is a lot of challenges in

terms of challenging it within the NGO...I do think people [within a development NGO] would prefer you [Development Educators] to go down the charity route looking at poverty as the focus, and that would be the easier thing to do and we would have more support from other departments [within the NGO]."

Banana 1 claimed:

"If you challenge your NGO, it's like we need the money. How dare you challenge the money we need that going to help these children? I mean, you can't go back at that."

Overall, participants reported that development NGOs 'view their Development Education as a lot lower down in their priorities and not their direct work' (Banana 2), and view the fundraising and charitable aspects of the organisation with greater value. Furthermore, participants reported that their respective NGOs view DE as an awareness raising activity that should focus on educating the public about their international projects. As Banana 2 put it, 'I don't think half of them (other NGO departments) even know what it (DE) is...they think it is just about raising awareness'. In this respect, the researcher recommends that research is conducted with NGO fundraising departments and board members to investigate if their knowledge of DE is solely limited to a charity model of development as indicated by the participants of this study. This would provide greater clarity on the challenges of conducting DE whilst affiliated with a development NGO, as well as providing first hand evidence as to how other NGO departments view and value DE.

With regards to funding, and particularly government funding, participants reported that: 'there is a pressure to do safe Development Education that I would consider to be more about fundraising or multicultural or whatever' (Tea 2). Participants referred to the fact that 'there is a very deliberate attempt by funders to censor your action, especially if it was to highlight issues that would be embarrassing for the government here' (Tea 3). 'Funders curtail Development Education, on the whole area of the action element', states Tea 4, 'yes so it is all right for people to go and buy fair trade but not to lobby the government'. For the participants, this brings many challenges, and limits their capacity to be overtly political and radical in their practice since they are affiliated with funders who might have a self-interest in the reproduction of white cultural supremacy, or as Seabrook might argue, when DE funding is reliant on 'the agencies which have impoverished them (the global South) the

consequences are predictable' (Seabrook, 2009: 80-81). Its consequences, perhaps, are to relegate DE to terms and action that promotes aid, Fairtrade and the MDGs, and to wrench, from development educators, the possibility of being overtly political and radical through 'a critical analysis of government policy' (Tea 2), and subsequent radical action. Thus, from a postcolonial perspective, it could be said that such funding terms serve the interests of the rich, and perhaps merely pays *lip service* to global justice, and subsequently 'decreases capacity to engage in dialogue with the developing world to create a genuine sense of shared solidarity with the global South (see Blaney, 2002: 268), or, in relation to this research, decrease capacity of embedding an African perspective in development education through civilised oppression (see Murphy, 2011).

It should be noted that the researcher is not proposing that DE should or should not be associated with such funding bodies. It is considered beyond the confines of this research to draw such conclusions due to the small scale nature of this study, and limited investigation into the affiliation of DE with specific funding bodies. What might be recommended, however, is that DE research should provide a content analysis of funding proposals and evaluations, from a postcolonial perspective, to investigate the extent to which DE projects can be considered overtly political and radical, and to make explicit if the practice should be defined as 'Safe', due to the affiliation with specific funders.

In relation to the formal education, sector participants reported that they face challenges in relation to a lack of critical thinking. For example, citizenship teaching has become a subject matter with a disconnection between thinking and emotion, and an impulse for student actions to be situated within the charity model of fundraising. Subsequently, as Tea 3 stated:

> "the danger with Development Education as it becomes incorporated into curricula and so forth is that it just becomes part of the mainstream and part of an education system that is a major part of the problem. Therefore, we are contributing to the problem."

A study carried out by Andreotti (2009) pointed out how education is 'a major part of the problem' (Tea 3). Using a postcolonial framework for analysis, she examined notions of poverty and development in one of England's key curricular documents. Andreotti found that the document, *Developing a Global Dimension in the School Curriculum* (GDGSC), has assumptions of white cultural supremacy where it emphasises 'poverty or helplessness of the other,

resulting from a lack of development, education, resources, skills, knowledge, culture or technology' (Andreotti, 2009: 59). Indeed, such an emphasis ignores the legacy of structural inequality and exploitation caused by imperialism. Therefore, 'from a postcolonial perspective, a logical implication is the reinforcement of stereotypes and, potentially, racism in, ironically, precisely the policy issues that aim to address these issues' (Andreotti, 2009: 62). Moreover, it might be added, that ironically, from a postcolonial perspective, development educators, in their affiliation with the formal education sector, are located in a system that is potentially contributing to the reinforcement of cultural supremacy, which runs counter to the whole notion of being overtly political and radical. In this respect, development educators need to make it explicit as to how they pose to be overtly political and radical within an education system that perhaps reproduces assumptions of white cultural supremacy.

Overall, participants identified development NGOs' charity campaigning approaches, media representations of the poor, funding bodies, the government, and formal education, as contributing to development education becoming a 'sector that has been made very safe in recent years in particular, so it's, I think, it's a very deliberate policy by funders and the government to do this to Development Education so that it is a very harmless activity you carry out, and it has no real impact on the structures' (Tea 3). Throughout the research report (see Murphy, 2011) there is significant data from the participants that evidences the challenges they face in relation to conducting a more radical development education within these confines, since 'people would prefer you to go down the charity route looking at poverty as the focus, and that would be the easier thing to do' (Cocoa 1).

The question then is how can 'Safe Development Education' be defined within the context of the research findings, and to what extent does such a definition allege an African perspective? Firstly, this research has found that 'Safe Development Education' is education that is conducted in order to meet funder demands. It operates under the auspices of raising awareness and encouraging actions around aid, Fairtrade and the MDGs, but does not directly involve a 'critical analysis of government policy' (Tea 2), and does 'not embarrass the government in some way' (Tea 3) through subsequent actions.

It has also been found that 'Safe Development Education' is education aligned with the formal education sector that might manage to 'take them (students) to a critical thinking level but the actual actions from the schools is fund raising and fair trade, so they go through the critical thinking learning

process but the actual actions they take are a short term action' (Sugar 1). It has further been found that 'Safe Development Education' is education linked closely with development NGOs where 'people would prefer you to go down the charity route looking at poverty as the focus' (Cocoa 1). Thus, 'if you are fund raising, it is hard to get away from the charity model...it is still from a charitable perspective rather than a justice perspective' (Tea 2).

In considering all of the participant data in relation to 'Safe Development Education', the researcher proposes that education conducted within this context can be located within functionalism. Broadly speaking, functionalism, as a school of thought, presents society as a whole that is dependent on the functioning of separate parts to maintain the overall system. So, in relation to these research findings, if white cultural supremacy is considered to be the whole, it is dependent on the continued functioning of an NGO charity model of development, stereotypical media representations of the poor, funders who curtail actions to the MDGs, aid, Fairtrade, and an education system that could be argued to have assumptions of White cultural supremacy. Furthermore, as Banana 1 puts it in relation to the curriculum, 'I suppose it is a very neoliberal curriculum which is about economic focus'.

Indeed, the researcher is not proposing that actions around the MDGs, aid and Fairtrade should be abandoned by development educators. Nor is she proposing that development education should not be aligned with NGOs and the formal education sector. Furthermore, the researcher is not stating that development educators should not 'chase the money' (Tea 2) from particular funding bodies. What is stated, however, is that development educators should be clear that conducting their work within this context will limit the extent to which they can evoke active citizenship. Citizenship, in this respect, for example, might involve writing letters to politicians about their promises to implement the MDGs, raising money for development NGOs whilst understanding responsibilities to buy Fairtrade, and showcasing such citizenship as school action projects for funders. As Pretty (1995) and Cornwell (2008) argue, 'whilst oppositional, this type of active citizenship operates within the existing structures and it does not challenge unequal power relations, for oppositional activity does not necessarily mean contesting the existing distribution of power' (quoted in Kenny, 2010: 10).

So, how is an African perspective within this context considered? Significant findings emerged from this research that an African perspective involved engaging with African voices beyond 'fitting into our agenda', (Cocoa

1) and moving beyond tokenism. In fact, the Centre for Global Educations' 'Making Connections' project was evidenced as a model of good practice for engaging with minority voices beyond such tokenism and indeed this might be the case. However, is an African perspective in this context merely reifying minority voices into a functional or 'Safe Development Education' sector that does not directly challenge the prevailing power structures? Are these voices merely participating in an active citizenship located in a functional framework that maintains white cultural supremacy, despite effectively bringing African or minority perspectives to the field? Indeed, the researcher is not proposing that minority voices should not be engaged in the field of DE. What is being proposed, though, is that development educators should make clear the extent to which their overall work, including engaging with minority voices, results in overtly political and radical actions that challenge the prevailing white power structures.

In summary, then, the findings of this research indicate that, 'Safe Development Education' can be defined as a functional education that evokes oppositional citizenship without necessarily contesting the existing distribution of power through radical action. 'Safe Development Education', in this respect, is considered to be necessary to maintain white cultural supremacy by functioning within the confines of the NGO charity model of development, funders who curtail actions to the MDGs, aid and Fairtrade, and an education system that could be argued to perpetuate charitable perceptions of development, thus creating a two-worlds concept that focuses on difference between 'us' and 'them' (see Andreotti, 2009; Young, 2010). In short, 'Safe Development Education' is 'a very harmless activity you carry out, and it has no real impact on the structures' (Tea 3).

Radical Development Education
In contrast to 'Safe Development Education', 'Radical Development Education' emerged from participant data as a collapsed theme. The data within this collapsed theme complements a definition of 'Radical Development Education' that lies in postcolonialism (see Murphy, 2011).   From such a perspective, 'if people actually found out that banks are the problem and it is not focused on these countries (developing countries) then people might choose to act differently, and it would be interesting to see what that would look like' (Cocoa 1). However, although evidence emerged as to where a 'Radical Development Education' can be situated theoretically, no evidence emerged from the participants as to how a 'Radical Development Education' might look in

practice. Participants confidently stated what it should not look like, but provided no indication as to how it might be implemented.

It is suggested in the research that it is the business of DE 'to see what that would look like' (Cocoa 1). Development educators should collectively, perhaps through Dochas (the Irish Association of Non-Governmental Development Organisations), make explicit to development NGOs the difference between 'Safe' and 'Radical Development Education', as highlighted within the findings of this project, and invite the NGOs to discuss the overall implications of practicing a 'Safe Development Education' in relation to its impact on the developing world. The concept of a 'Radical Development Education' should also be explored within this context, with the aim of creating a model of practice that is realistic in its claims for affecting structural change.

Nevertheless, although, the researcher, at this point, cannot offer any definite suggestions as to what a 'Radical Development Education' might look like in practice, the findings of this study clearly indicate what it does not look like. In short, it does not look like the functional and 'Safe Development Education' as presented above. Rather, it should perhaps unsettle all of the functional parts that maintain the overall power structures, such as the NGO charity model of development, funders who curtail actions to the MDGs, aid and Fairtrade, and an education system that 'I suppose is a very neoliberal curriculum' (Banana 1). Furthermore, 'if it is not embarrassing the government in some way, then maybe it is not right', or in this case, not radical (Tea 3). A 'Radical Development Education' works to 'rewrite what NGO charities have been doing for so many years, questions how development is done, and encourages the public to look at the real hard issues' (Cocoa 1). It is 'more noisy, and slightly aggressive' (Banana 1) in moving active citizenship from the framework of helping the less fortunate through aid, Fairtrade, the MDGs, and the like, to a framework of, what Kenny (2010) describes as a 'visionary active citizenship' which 'is proactive rather than reactive. It involves scoping alternative futures and finding better ways of doing things, and challenges the existing structures, values and power relations underpinning the existing society' (Kenny, 2010: 10).

Conclusion
So how is African perspective in DE considered in this context? Tea 3 sums this up as,

> "I suppose it is a recognition, as well, that the locus of the problem is largely in the northern hemisphere where we live, and the major change needs to occur here, and the structures that create poverty are largely in the rich northern hemisphere. So maybe in a strange kind of way our focus needs to be on, to contribute to an African perspective, our focus needs to be on the north. So it is tackling the root of the problem which lies mostly in the north."

However, this project does not have any evidence that the participants are contributing to an African perspective by conducting DE that is subversive or radical in challenging the powerful structure of white cultural supremacy. All that this project can evidence is that the participants have produced data that indicates their understandings of the difference between 'Safe' and 'Radical Development Education', and their considerations of an African perspective within these contexts. Nevertheless, this project has very clear evidence of the challenges the participants face in their attempts to address the general view of development based around charitable perceptions, since 'any other view than the mainstream is seen as radical, and I feel that is what we are battling with' (Banana 1).

Overall, the project has also found that participants claim to be constrained by civilised oppression inherent in funding bodies, development NGOs, media and charitable representations of the poor, and the formal education sector, which support the practice of 'Safe Development Education', and relegate development education to terms and action that promote aid, Fairtrade and the MDGs. Thus, the participants evidenced that this approach limits the possibility of being overtly political and radical through action that addresses structural inequalities, and also limits the capacity of embedding a 'Radical' African perspective in development education. Furthermore, if an African perspective is to be located within a 'Radical Development Education' where all voices, whether black or white, work together to unsettle the functional system, it might be argued that the findings of this research indicate that there is a lot of unsettling to be done.

References

Altheide, D (1987) 'Reflections: Ethnographic Content Analysis', *Qualitative Sociology*, 10 (1), pp. 65-77.

Andreotti, V (2009) 'Development vs Poverty: notions of cultural supremacy in development education policy' in D Bourn (ed) *Development Education, Debates and Dialogues*, London, University of London.

Asante, M (2006) 'A Discourse on Black Studies: Liberating the Study of African People in the Western Academy', *Journal of Black Studies*, 36 (5), pp. 646-662.

Blaney, D (2002) 'Global Education, Disempowerment and Curricula for a World Politics', *Journal of Studies in International Education,* 6 (3), pp. 268-282.

Bryan, A (2008) 'Researching, and searching for, international development in the formal curriculum: Towards a post-colonial conceptual framework', *Policy and Practice: A Development Education Review*, Vol. 7, pp. 62-79.

Chaib, D (2010) 'Music Listening Circles: Contributions from Development Education to De-mocratising Classical Music', *Policy and Practice: A Development Education Review*, Vol. 10, pp. 42-58.

Deutsch, M (2006) 'A Framework for Thinking about Oppression and its Change', *Social Justice Research*, 19 (1), pp. 7-41.

Freire, P (1973) *Education for Critical Consciousness*, London, Sheed and Ward.

Heerde, J and Hudson, D (2010) 'The Righteous Considereth the Cause of the Poor? Public Attitudes towards Poverty in Developing Countries', *Political Studies*, 58, pp. 389-409.

Kenny, S (2010) 'Towards unsettling Community Development', *Community Development Journal*, 46 (1), pp. 7-19.

Krueger, R (1998) *Developing Questions for Focus Groups: Focus Group Kit 3*, Thousand Oaks, Sage Publications.

McCormack, O & O'Flaherty, J (2010) 'An examination of pre-service teachers' attitudes towards the inclusion of development education into Irish post-primary schools', *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 26, pp. 1332-1339.

Murphy, C (2011) *Towards an African Perspective: Exploring Challenges and Considerations for Development Educators,* Ireland: Africa Centre.

Proctor, K, Perlesz, A, Moloney, B, Mcllwaine, F, & O'Neill, I (2008) 'Exploring theatre of the oppressed in family therapy clinical work and supervision', *Counselling and Psychotherapy Research*, 8 (1), pp. 43-52.

Seabrook, J (2009) *The No-Nonsense Guide to World Poverty*, Oxford, New Internationalist Publications Ltd.

Young, H (2010) 'Naming the World: Coming to terms with Complexity', *Policy and Practice: A Development Education Review*, Vol. 10, pp. 99-104.

Caroline Murphy completed her PhD in Education at the University of Ulster in 2009. Her thesis focused on exploring active participatory drama methods for Key Stage 3 Local and Global Citizenship teaching. Caroline currently works with the International Non-Governmental Organisation, Children in Crossfire, as a Development Educator. She is also employed part-time by the Western Education and Library Board (WELB) as a Drama Tutor for Key Stage 3 and 4 students.

Perspectives

THE DEPARTMENT FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT'S APPROACH TO DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION

Stephen O'Brien

In this article, **Stephen O'Brien**, Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for International Development, outlines the position of the Coalition government toward development education. The UK government has recently commissioned a thorough review of DfID's full portfolio of development awareness work and an independent review to assess the case for this area of work more broadly. This article considers the results of the review and the government's policy for development education going forward.

Since taking office in May 2010, the Coalition government has paid particularly close attention to the question of whether aid money should be spent, for any purpose, in the United Kingdom (UK). Our starting point is that the Coalition government stands steadfast behind the decision to protect the aid budget and bring spending up to our target of 0.7 per cent of Gross Domestic Product (GDP). This imposes a double duty to ensure that aid funds are spent well. First our duty is to those this money is intended to help - the poor of the world living in developing nations. Secondly it presents a duty to taxpayers in the UK who fund our development work. In this time when across government budgets are being cut, we must ensure that we get the maximum value out of every pound of our aid funding. Results, transparency and accountability are our watchwords and guide everything we do. The Department for International Development (DfID) regards transparency as fundamental to improving its accountability to UK citizens and to improving accountability to citizens living in the countries we support. Transparency will also help us achieve greater value for money in the programmes we deliver and will improve the effectiveness of aid in reducing poverty.

The 2002 International Development Act permits aid money to be spent in the UK, but it makes a clear requirement that the Secretary of State must be '*satisfied that to do so is likely to contribute to a reduction in poverty*'. This government has addressed this requirement with great seriousness, and as

such, we have adopted a quite different policy on spending to promote awareness of global poverty in the UK. On entering office in May 2010, the Secretary of State immediately identified a number of development awareness projects that failed to demonstrate real development impact and value for money. The decision was taken to close these projects with immediate effect, saving the UK taxpayer over half a million pounds. The Secretary of State then launched a thorough review of DfID's full portfolio of development awareness work and an independent review to assess the case for this area of work more broadly.

The independent review by the Central Office of Information (COI), completed in June 2011, has been enormously useful in reappraising the arguments and assumptions that sit behind efforts to educate the public about, and promote wider awareness of, international development. The review challenged many of the arguments which were contained in the DfID's *Building Support for Development* strategy produced in 1999. That strategy contained an assumption that DfID's funding should be used to spread an awareness of global poverty in as many ways as possible - through faith and community groups, through non-governmental organisations (NGOs), informal and formal education, trade unions and businesses, and the media. The *Building Support for Development* strategy did not however give a clear indication of how it would measure success, nor did it set out what evidence to gather that would show whether all these activities benefited anyone in the developing world. We have therefore looked again at the case for funding development awareness work and we have used the conclusions of the COI review to set our policy for development education going forward.

The review concluded that while it is difficult to prove a direct link between DfID's investment in building support for development and a reduction in global poverty, there is a reasonable causal chain that can be used to justify future investment. This is because positive public opinion encourages positive actions such as donating money or purchasing Fairtrade goods, which cumulatively contribute to a reduction in global poverty. It is likely that DfID's investment has contributed to a reduction in global poverty in this way, however this contribution cannot be easily measured and DfID's investment is likely to have been one of many factors.

As a result, the Coalition government has adopted a new approach, deciding that there will be no new development awareness projects. The link between these programmes and poverty reduction is not strong enough to satisfy

our rigorous criteria for development impact. Ongoing projects will be allowed to continue to conclusion, but only if project reviews show they are achieving results.

However the COI report has shown that government spending can play a positive role in building awareness of global poverty when the interventions are carefully designed and well targeted. It highlighted notable successes of working through the formal education sector, by integrating the global dimension into the school curriculum. We will therefore continue our development education work in schools and will put all our formal education work on a strategic footing. Our starting point is that every child growing up in the UK should learn about the world around them, about the bald facts of poverty and underdevelopment which face children their own age in other countries, about the potential of trade, wealth creation and economic development to build a freer, more prosperous world. By working through the formal education system DfID will target the next generation of the UK workforce.

Schools across the UK are already delivering tremendous work to teach children about these issues. Many teachers are highly proficient in teaching international development themes, drawing on their own international experiences or their own research to teach inspiring lessons about the causes and solutions of global poverty. Britain's excellent international NGOs have also, for many years, been producing high quality resources to be used in schools. DfID has championed the use of these resources through funding the one stop website www.globaldimension.org.uk to provide easy access to educational resources from the many organisations that work on international development.

We are very much aware that the experience in schools and the resources produced by classroom practitioners is our best repository of development education expertise. Consequently, the best way to spread good practice will be through networks of schools, using teachers who have proficiency to train others who want to improve their skills. With the support of the Department for Education, DfID will establish a single programme that will work with schools in England at Key Stages 2 and 3 on a demand led basis to support teachers who have particular skills in teaching global issues to share their practice with other teachers. Outside England, support for schools will be delivered in collaboration with the relevant devolved authorities, thereby ensuring that teachers across the UK are supported.

We have also decided to continue to support the excellent work that goes on around the country to establish links between schools in the UK with similar organisations or groups in developing countries. We have a huge opportunity to share Britain's skills with communities in the developing world. Forging links between people around the world is a powerful way to build understanding and cooperation. Britain has a long history of links to developing countries and the Coalition government wishes to build on these strong foundations to strengthen our communities and achieve development results.

DfID has run a school linking programme for a number of years under the banner of the Global School Partnerships programme (GSP). This programme aims to motivate young people's commitment to a fairer, more sustainable world. Recognising that hard evidence is needed to test the impact of this work, DfID contracted the National Foundation of Educational Research (NFER) to complete an assessment of the impact of school linking. The study, which used a sample of over 8,000 students, and ensured that a matched control group provided a statistically valid comparison, assessed how much impact a link with a school in a developing country can make.

The report, which has now been published and is available on the NFER website, clearly shows that involvement in the GSP programme has a significant positive effect on pupil awareness of, and attitudes and response to, global issues at both primary and secondary school level. The most significant differences were observed in schools that had been linked for three years, where partnerships are well established and the principles and values promoted by the GSP programme have had time to become embedded in whole-school policy. Significant effects were also found in schools that have been linked for a shorter period of time.

We are also keen that school leavers take up the Prime Minister's International Citizen Service (ICS) initiative to volunteer in some of the world's poorest communities to fight poverty and tackle development issues. Those taking part will contribute their skills and enthusiasm while learning about the causes of, and solutions to, poverty and building connections across the globe. For more details, see www.dfid.gov.uk/ICS.

Overall, DfID recognises that development education through the formal education system can and should have a positive effect on young people's knowledge and attitudes to global poverty and international development. It is also a hugely exciting topic for young people to engage with, and we are very much aware that when teachers have the chance to develop the topic, they turn the issues of global poverty into powerful and compelling lessons. Government will no longer hand down directives that take autonomy away from schools. Decisions on whether to place emphasis on development education must be taken by schools themselves. Only they are able to tell what to prioritise for their pupils. But we have seen that the demand is there and we are determined to help schools and teachers realise their ambitions.

Stephen O'Brien is a Member of Parliament (MP) and Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for International Development

INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT IN A NORTHERN IRELAND POLICY CONTEXT

Conall McDevitt

Conall McDevitt is a Member of the Local Assembly (MLA) for the Social Democratic and Labour (SDLP) in South Belfast and affiliated to the Assembly's All Party Group on International Development (APGID). In this article, Conall discusses the recently launched strategy for the APGID and a new partnership in north-east Uganda. Although international development is a reserved matter in Northern Ireland the All Party Group is aiming to strengthen local links with the global South and enhance public engagement with global issues.

Introduction
There is no doubt in many people's minds that Northern Ireland has a higher level of interest in international development than any other part of the United Kingdom (UK). We have a long history of work throughout the world, through faith-based organisations and development non-governmental organizations (NGOs). Many of our public servants have also volunteered on a myriad of technical assistance projects through Irish Aid, the Department for International Development (DfID), the European Union, World Bank and Voluntary Services Overseas (VSO). Indeed, local aid agencies estimate that there are several thousand people from this region working in far-off parts of the world at any given time, dealing with essential healthcare, education and other important work.

A generous society
Jim Wells, Member of the Legislative Assembly (MLA) for South Down and vice chair of the Northern Ireland Assembly's All Party Group on International Development, often cites the following example in reference to local generosity to good causes. He is involved in a charitable group that is responsible for the maintenance of an orphanage in Timisoara, Romania. Three years ago they ran an appeal in Kent and in Northern Ireland, and he, as treasurer, had the job of receiving the donations. The part of Kent that was targeted was quite affluent, even by southern English standards. As the donations came in he found that the average amount donated from Kent was £31, and that from Northern Ireland was £90. As Jim is fond of pointing out, that minor example indicates that we, as a region, are extremely interested in overseas development and very generous when it comes to giving. Indeed, one could not help but notice the

vast contribution of over £1 million raised in Northern Ireland when the Asian Tsunami appeal was launched in December 2004, with even small events raising sums of £30,000, £35,000 or £40,000 in one day for that very deserving cause.

We have that interest, but, until now, as a devolved Assembly we have not had what could be called the 'made in Northern Ireland' or the 'Northern Ireland-branded product' in relation to overseas development. We have been conscious of the fact that our colleagues in Scotland have strong links with Malawi, whilst the Welsh Assembly has been very active in countries such as Lesotho in southern Africa. However, there has been very little that this devolved region could point to as being its own local contribution to that very important work outside of the centrally administered overseas aid programme at Westminster through the Department for International Development. Nonetheless, the Northern Ireland Assembly has established an All Party Group on International Development (APGID) to strengthen its work in this area and this is considered in the next section.

The role of the All Party Group on International Development

The APGID was formed in the first mandate of the Assembly by my predecessor in South Belfast, Carmel Hanna, whose personal commitment to overseas development drew in a dedicated group of MLAs with a similar interest and sense of global responsibility to those living in less-developed countries. Whilst the APGID has no statutory powers, the determination and commitment of Members has ensured that the group is an active and vocal lobby on overseas development which was reflected in the publication of an international development strategy in March 2011. This strategy has put the APGID firmly on the local political map as a persuasive and influential cross-party policy forum in relation to overseas aid and development. The group works closely with local aid agencies here in Northern Ireland, and often invites interested groups to the Assembly to present to the committee, as well as taking advice on matters pertaining to the delivery of an APGID strategy.

A Northern Ireland Strategy for Overseas Development

Of course, the main agency for the delivery of overseas development aid in the United Kingdom is DfID, and as international development is a reserved issue in Northern Ireland, it is an area of policy which has not been devolved to the local Assembly. However, we have discovered that it is possible for the Northern Ireland Executive and Assembly to make an immediate contribution to that work without infringing any of the legislation that surrounds overseas

development. I am pleased, therefore, that as a result of funding that we have received from NI-CO (http://www.nico.org.uk/), we have been able to produce a research document and a strategy for moving forward in this area locally, in association with the Coalition of Aid and Development Agencies (CADA), which offered the All Party Group an inside knowledge of development programmes already being delivered across the world by local agencies. The strategy was adopted by the Assembly following a debate on 1 March 2011 with unanimous support, and the APGID has since been lobbying the Executive to ask that the strategy is adopted as part of a wider international relations strategy within the Office of the First Minister and Deputy First Minister (OFM/DFM), which holds some responsibility for this area within our devolved government.

The strategy incorporates both a north-south (of Ireland) and east-west (UK) dimension, and seeks to find a role for Northern Ireland within already established links with DfID as well as Irish Aid, the Irish Government's implementation body for overseas development; two very significant players in the field of global development. With this in mind, we are taking very tentative steps towards creating an overseas development project branded from Northern Ireland. Following extensive consultation and discussion with stakeholders, north-east Uganda is the first area that we in Northern Ireland Assembly will work in partnership with as part of the new strategy. This undertaking is based in part on the levels of underdevelopment in this part of Uganda which has approximately 31 million inhabitants with an average life expectancy of just 50 years, compared to that of 78 years in the United Kingdom. The average income in Uganda is $300 a year while that in the United States is $38,200. In Uganda, 35 per cent of residents do not have access to clean drinking water which is a major cause of disease and illness.

These statistics give some indication of the huge disparity in incomes between sub-Saharan Africa and Western Europe. Many aid agencies represented by the Coalition of Aid and Development Agencies in Northern Ireland (CADA) are active in this country and we also have significant involvement through Irish Aid. These strong 'on the ground' links have focused our attention on Uganda. I recently had the opportunity to travel to the country and will soon be reporting back to the APGID on the next steps in terms of developing links with Uganda and the north-eastern region in particular. One dimension of the programme will hopefully include a specific development education programme for local schools that seeks to enhance their knowledge and understanding of Uganda and the links with Northern Ireland. We look forward to working with those already involved in development

education over the coming years as well as celebrating some of the existing projects on global issues which local schools have been involved with for some time.

Conclusion

The All-Party Group aims to build on the Northern Ireland public's traditionally strong financial commitment to developing countries and develop a deeper and more sustainable relationship with a specific region in the developing world. This relationship will be built on shared learning, mutual respect and closer links between political and non-governmental institutions in the two regions. Effective development work goes beyond overseas aid and includes addressing the underlying causes of poverty and injustice in the developing world. Development education can play an important role in building this understanding and mobilizing the Northern Ireland public in actions that can bring about positive change and social justice in Uganda and other countries in the developing world.

References

NI-CO is a not for profit, public body dedicated to the pursuit of building efficient, accountable and sustainable public sector institutions capable of managing donor aid effectively and implementing positive change. Over the past two decades NI-CO has supported counterpart administrations in 60 countries through the design and delivery of 300 institutional capacity building and training contracts. Visit http://www.nico.org.uk/

The All Party Group on International Development strategy was published in March 2011 and is available from the APGID Secretary Anna McAlister; phone (00044) (28) 90 68 3535 or email c.mcdevitt@sdlp.ie

Conall McDevitt is the Social Democratic and Labour Party (SDLP) MLA for South Belfast. He succeeded Carmel Hanna on 21 January 2010 and was returned to the Northern Ireland Assembly in May 2011. He is the SDLP's Education Development spokesperson sitting on the Education Committee, and he is also a member of the Policing Board. Born in Dublin, he spent his formative years in Malaga, Spain. He was Director of Communications for the SDLP in Northern Ireland from 1996 to 1999, a time that included the negotiations running up to the Good Friday Agreement, subsequent referendum and Assembly

elections. He served as a Special Advisor in the first Power Sharing Executive in the north of Ireland, advising the Minister for Agriculture and Rural Development.

MAPPING THE PAST, CHARTING THE FUTURE: A REVIEW OF DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION RESEARCH IN IRELAND AND ITS IMPLICATIONS FOR THE FUTURE

Annette Honan

In this article, education consultant **Annette Honan** reflects upon the outcomes of a recent study commissioned by Irish Aid which examined the Irish government's engagement with development education (DE) and carried out a meta-analysis of DE research in the island of Ireland. The article points to significant progress in engaging interest in global justice issues over the past decade but also points to significant gaps and opportunities in relation to future research that should not be ignored by the development education sector.

Introduction

A valuable piece of research, entitled *Mapping the Past, Charting the Future* (Bracken, Bryan & Fiedler, 2011), was published earlier this year. The research is broken into two distinct components – the first looking at the history of the Irish government's involvement in development education (DE) and the second providing a meta-analysis of existing development education research in Ireland (north and south) aimed at providing 'a baseline from which future research strategy and priorities can be identified'. This article provides a personal perspective on some of the main findings of the meta-analysis, considers its implications for the development education sector, and makes some suggestions that might inform future practice.

The meta-analysis is based on 57 development education studies produced between 2000 and 2010 and therefore does not claim to provide an exhaustive survey of all the DE research undertaken in this period. However it does provide useful insights into the current state of development education in Ireland and as such the picture it paints is one that cannot be ignored by those of us interested in promoting a global justice agenda within education.

What's the state of Development Education?

Broadly, the report shows that there is a lot of interest in global justice issues and teachers generally express support for bringing the social justice dimension into teaching. However they also point to barriers that inhibit a deeper and more comprehensive engagement with development education. These barriers can be broadly summarised as attitudinal (I don't feel confident enough to teach

about complex and controversial issues), structural (I feel education for justice has a low status within the system) and curricular (I don't have time for this due to the pressures of time and an over-crowded curriculum). The report also suggests that 'the presence of development education within the classroom appears largely dependent upon the willingness or capacity of individual teachers to bring development in'.

So, what are the key messages coming through in the research in relation to each sector of education? While research in relation to development education within early childhood and primary education settings is scant, this report suggests that 'young children have the capacity to engage with global and justice issues provided the strategies employed are appropriate to their age and cognitive development, and that they are capable of empathy with others' feelings and needs when presented in familiar realms'. On the other hand, the research also suggests that young children still carry stereotyped and charity-based views about 'poor people' and 'developing countries' and there is limited evidence of critical thinking amongst younger children. While there is a lot of research which looks at the nature and status of development education within primary and post-primary education, the picture it presents is at best mixed. Some research highlights the gains and opportunities for development education within the curriculum and affirms the fact that 'development education has come in from the cold'. Other research concludes that there is little evidence to suggest that development education is recognised as an integral part of students' formal educational experiences'. In fact, post-primary teachers surveyed in one piece of research 'tended to see development education as an underdeveloped or underexploited dimension of the curriculum and ultimately 'up to individual teachers whether they chose to integrate development themes or not'. Research findings also suggest that development education opportunities (within post-primary) 'are hindered by a system that marginalises global themes, privileges recall and outputs over learning, and provides little time or space for self-reflective interrogation'.

Looking to pre-service teachers' attitudes and experience of development education provides little comfort as the report states that pre-service teachers 'seem to possess a somewhat superficial understanding of the causes of global poverty – understandings that are reflective of "soft" rather than critical versions of development education'. They noted that while 'the majority of student teachers appeared open to and supportive of integrating development education into their teaching practice and made considerable effort to create interesting and detailed lesson plans...difficulties did emerge around

student teachers' willingness or capacity to deviate from standard curricular content or implement active and participatory methodologies'.

Finally, the survey highlights the dearth of research into development education within the non-formal sector with most research in the adult and community sector focused on attitudes and perceptions of development issues rather than examining the practice of development education itself within the non-formal sector.

Some personal reflections on the research

So the meta-analysis presents at best a mixed picture and begs the question what has been achieved in embedding development education within Irish education over the past 50 years? It also challenges us to consider new and more effective ways of working. This is not to devalue the real progress and impact that *has* been achieved particularly in the following key areas.

Inroads in the curriculum

Opportunities for engaging in global education are clearly stitched into the formal curriculum from early childhood to senior cycle education.   Of equal importance is the fact that the vision and values of education being articulated at policy level are consistent with the values of development education such as equality and inclusion, justice and fairness, freedom and democracy.   These values underpin the proposed 'Framework for a new Junior Cycle Education' (NCCA) and are also evident in the 'Early Childhood Curriculum Framework' (Aistear).

Initial teacher education

All colleges of education and education departments within universities are now offering courses in citizenship and/or development education to pre-service teachers. However the research suggests that many teachers starting out on their career are more concerned with sustaining employment than with innovating. They therefore may be reluctant to deviate from the standard curriculum and ways of teaching and hence 'teacher development on such areas as development education may work best within an in-service rather than a pre-service context'.

Increased professionalism of the development education sector

Those engaged in development education are now becoming increasingly skilled and professional in their work and are also working more effectively together to share good practice, influence policy and evaluate the work. The role of IDEA in supporting the sector in these areas must be acknowledged.   However, these

and other achievements must be considered side by side with the challenges that remain. I suggest that the three main challenges are as follows: development education is still not regarded as the core business of most schools; development education is still not understood as a process that will enhance classroom learning and school culture; and teaching and learning methodologies in Irish classrooms are not generally conducive to educating for global citizenship (Cosgrove et al, 2011 and Gilleece et al, 2009).

Implications arising from the research

In order to move from a situation whereby development education is dependent on the goodwill and interest of individual teachers I propose that a new model of professional development is needed – one that involves working on a whole-school approach or failing that with teams of teachers within a school. Schools must be seen as sites for change ('Leading and Supporting Change', NCCA, 2010) and supported with over time to see how development education content and methodologies can enhance all aspects of teaching and learning. The old model of plucking individual teachers out of school for a few hours and expecting long-term impact must be questioned. Embedding development education within schools (both at the level of the formal curriculum and the hidden curriculum) requires a long-term commitment and sustained support over time.

Teachers need time to try out new ideas and methodologies, reflect on what they are doing, talk to their peers, and then go back to the classroom and try it out again (NCCA, Key skills reports 2009; 2010). Through a process of reflective practice they can become more skilled and confident in development education and recognise the benefits for themselves and their students. In addition, I propose that the focus of professional development needs to shift from providing resources or information to teachers to building up their repertoire of teaching methodologies and skills. Finally, I suggest that DE practitioners need to take every opportunity to influence the changes in curriculum and in education more broadly that are coming down the line. There is a genuine desire to engage the partners in education in decisions relating to future developments. The development education sector needs to be involved in these consultations to point out the moral purpose of education as one of social transformation and counter the positions which promote an instrumentalist view of education.

On a positive note, I think the time is ripe for change as many recent consultations point to the need for a fundamental renewal of teaching and

learning. Teachers, students, parents and other stakeholders in education all agree that change is needed. I believe that development education practitioners are well placed to support schools and the wider system in working towards a different vision of education.

Conclusion

While this research study has provided useful 'food for thought' it also points to gaps and opportunities in relation to future research. One obvious gap is in the area of adult and community development education, as very little DE research has focused on this sector to date. Research tools needs to be developed which can be used by all groups engaged in development education to gather baseline information on participants' attitudes, practices and understanding. These baselines could then be followed up to assess the short or medium term impact of the different educational interventions. In the context of groups increasingly needing to demonstrate impact and justify funding for their work it seems to me that such research tools could have a broad use. On a broader level, I would suggest that the ways in which evidence is gathered needs to be broadened. Surveys provide one useful tool but perhaps there has been an over-reliance on questionnaires and interviews in development education research. It would be useful to gather evidence of what *is* working through videos and case-studies.

The overall conclusion that I would draw from surveying the research is that if we want different results then we cannot keep doing things the same way. If we are brave enough to take up this challenge of working differently then when a review of progress in development education is undertaken in 2020 we can all look forward to a more positive picture emerging.

References

Aistear is the 'Early Childhood Curriculum Framework' for children aged for birth to six years in Ireland. Further details are available from the National Council for Curriculum and Assessment (NCCA) web site at the following link: http://www.ncca.ie/en/Curriculum_and_Assessment/Early_Childhood_and_Primary_Education/Early_Childhood_Education, Bracken, Meliosa, Bryan, Audrey, Fiedler, Matthias (2011) *Mapping the Past, Charting the Future – A Review of the Irish Government's Engagement with Development Education and a Meta-Analysis of Development Education Research in Ireland*, Irish Aid, Limerick.

Cosgrove, J, Gilleece, L & Shiel, G (2011), *International Civic and Citizenship Study (ICCS): Report for Ireland*, Dublin, Educational Research Centre. Gilleece, L, Shiel, G, Perkins, R, & Proctor, M (2009), *Teaching and Learning International Survey (2008): National Report for Ireland*, Dublin, Educational Research Centre. Both of these reports suggest that teachers in Ireland made much less use of what they called 'student-oriented

practices' and active learning than teachers in other countries. These activities related to group work, students planning their own learning, and conducting extended projects.

National Council for Curriculum and Assessment (NCCA) (2010) 'Leading and Supporting Change in Schools – A discussion paper' available at http://www.ncca.ie/en/Publications/Consultative_Documents/Leading_and_Supporting_Change_in_Schools_A_Discussion_Paper.pdf

National Council for Curriculum and Assessment (NCCA) (2009: 2010). To access documents on how successfully employed methodologies have helped to embed key skills in the teaching community visit: http://www.ncca.ie/en/Curriculum_and_Assessment/PostPrimary_Education/Senior_Cycle/Key_Skills/

National Council for Curriculum and Assessment (NCCA) (2009: 2010). An example of a recent consultation pointing to the need for a fundamental renewal of teaching and learning is the recently published 'Summary of Junior Cycle Consultation Findings' available at http://www.ncca.ie/en/Curriculum_and_Assessment/Post-Primary_Education/Junior_Cycle/Junior_cycle_developments/Report_on_JC_consultation_.pdf

Annette Honan works as an Education Consultant with the National Council for Curriculum and Assessment (NCCA) and with a number of Development Education organisations. Most recently she has been working with the NCCA in leading and supporting changes within senior cycle and junior cycle. She represents the NCCA on the Development Education Advisory Committee (DEAC) and is author of numerous articles and research reports on development education. Previously she worked as Head of Education and Campaigns with Trócaire.

Viewpoint

Cathryn Gathercole

In this article, **Cathryn Gathercole** draws comparisons in the educational policy environment under the previous British administration and the new government at Westminster. She assesses the impact and challenges arising from changes in educational policy-making, particularly in the formal sector, drawing upon the work of her own organisation, Tide~ global learning.

Introduction

In 2003, I was appointed Co-ordinator for the East Midlands Network for Global Perspectives in Schools. The network was the East Midlands' response to the Department for International Development's (DfID) Enabling Effective Support (EES) initiative. EES was a strategy developed by the Department to provide support to schools in delivering the global dimension across the UK. One of the first events I attended as Co-ordinator was a development education conference held at Stoke Rochford Hall in Lincolnshire. A contribution to one of the debates, which has stayed with me since, referenced a quote on the back of the DfID Enabling Effective Support publication, which stated:

> "Enabling Effective Support will succeed when it manages to unlock the creative potential from within the education sector so that the agenda concerned with preparing young people to understand and feel able to shape the changing world will be set by educationalists themselves" (DfID, 2003).

The contributor asked who had locked up the creative potential in the first place? Eight years later, the statement still offers a powerful vision for the education sector which is worth pursuing – and in order to pursue it, we must consider seriously the question given our experiences in the intervening years.

In this reflective piece I use 'we' to mean Tide~ global learning which is a teachers' network that supports creative work to meet young people's educational entitlement to global learning. But I hope that others may feel that

the comments have resonance with and relevance for their own educational contexts. While the article draws upon discussions within the Tide~ network, most recently at a seminar titled 'Where next for global learning?' held in July 2011, it forms part of an on-going debate within Tide and the wider education sector.

The article begins by outlining some of the changes in the educational policy environment under the previous British administration, and draws comparisons with the current context in England drawing particular reference to education and international development. I will then share some thoughts about the implications for Tide~ global learning as an organisation seeking to achieve the objective stated in the EES document, thereby examining how the creative potential may have been locked up, so to better understand how to unlock it.

The Policy Environment (2003-2010)

In the period 2003 to 2010, a series of policy initiatives at Westminster created an environment within the English education system which was conducive to enhance the practice of global learning. Citizenship was introduced as a stand-alone subject; the global dimension and sustainable development were included as one cross curricular dimension for Key Stage 3 pupils; the Sustainable Schools initiative gave greater prominence to sustainability issues across the curriculum, school grounds in tertiary education and the wider community; and the Office for Standards in Education, Children's Services and Skills (OFSTED) inspections included community cohesion as a key criterion. These initiatives brought with them some funding and more importantly profile and status within the curriculum and among teachers. Over the same period, DfID increased the amount of funding available for development awareness activities, and formally extended support for EES from the initial five year agreements to ten years. Collectively, these initiatives amounted to a positive environment for global learning in regard to funding, profile and a potential UK-wide structure for learning and collaboration.

The situation has changed significantly since the election of the Conservative-Liberal Democrat coalition government in May 2010, following a series of policy changes and initiatives. The drivers for these changes have been both financial and ideological; financial in the sense that there have been significant cuts in public spending including on education provision; ideological in that changes have been driven by a conviction that 'centralisation and top-down control have proved a failure' and 'that the time has come to disperse

power more widely in Britain today' (*The Coalition: our programme for government*, 2010: 7).

The Ideological Shift

The impact of the financial side has been relatively easy to see, with significant reductions in government funding mainly affecting the public and voluntary sector. However, the impact of the ideological changes has been more difficult to discern. The concept of the 'Big Society' still appears to be unclear in many people's minds, and even more slippery in their reality. The ideological shift represents a need to readjust thinking in terms of the role and expectations of central and local government. In the meantime, there appears to be something of a vacuum, with new ways of thinking yet to be established, or practices proved fit for purpose.

The ideological shift is also reflected in the schools White Paper *The Importance of Teaching* published in November 2010, which will bring about major changes in the English education system. Among the identified priorities in the White Paper is an emphasis on teacher-to-teacher professional development; the creation of schools outside of local authority control with greater autonomy over their curriculum, such as free schools or academies; a shift towards schools becoming the principle provider of initial teacher education; a curriculum review with the intention of reducing statutory elements; and the introduction of the English Baccalaureate as one measure of success for secondary schools.

Alongside this, bodies such as the Qualifications and Curriculum Development Agency (QCDA) are being disbanded; local authority support is significantly reduced; and initiatives such as Sustainable Schools no longer receive central funding or promotion, driven largely by non-governmental organisations such as the Sustainable Schools Alliance. The education policy and funding environment has changed from one which positively endorsed learning about global and sustainability issues, to one where individual schools make decisions about which activities to prioritise, and how to fund them - becoming 'active consumers' of the myriad of support options available to them.

In contrast to the cuts within many government departments, DfID's budget has increased in line with the commitment to spend 0.7 per cent of the UK's gross national income on international development, due to be realised in 2013. Although the international development budget has been ring-fenced the new government commissioned a 'Review of using aid funds in the UK to

promote awareness of global poverty' with the outcomes published in May 2011. The report concluded that although it was not possible to establish a direct link between awareness raising activities within the UK and poverty reduction globally, it was likely that it did so. DfID has restated its commitment to development education, and prioritised the formal education sector as the focus for activities through four Global Learning Projects in the UK – one each for Scotland, Wales, Northern Ireland and England, alongside continued support for school linking programmes.

Implications of Policy Changes

So how will these policy changes impact on a small education charity like Tide~global learning? And more importantly, how will they impact on the education system with the continuing challenge to 'unlock creative potential'?

There is no doubt that the creative potential is there within the education system given the plethora of projects and resources developed over the last eight years. Nor is there any doubt that many teachers are passionate about ensuring that their lessons include learning about the wider world and all that that entails – the number of participants in professional development activities and the use of resources supports this view. What is a matter of discussion, however, is how best to support a process of autonomous agenda setting by educationalists. We know from recent experience that government policy is liable to sudden and significant change, with a knock-on impact for funding, support and profile. It is always necessary to seek influence, and of course it is preferable to have a supportive policy environment, but national policy and influence can only ever be part of a process of change, not the finished article.

Conclusion: responding to change

So where are we now as we seek to make sense of the new environment, and respond to the opportunities and challenges which this presents? Our starting point has to be a recognition that we have not simply reverted to the situation as it was in 2003. There is now a significant legacy in terms of capacity, experience, resources and profile, but we need to build on this legacy, while recognising that only the inevitability of change is certain in the coming months. And just as inevitable is the recognition that if an organisation is to not only survive but also thrive in times of change, it must be resilient, adaptable and with a clear sense of purpose. In this case our purpose is re-affirmed as the desire to meet the needs of learners growing up in a changed and changing world, so that 'global learning' simply becomes accepted as what is after all the core business of schools – learning.

So what is the best way to meet those needs? Well, not just the best way, but the only way to meet these needs is through the actions of teachers. Expectations and behaviour are transient if they are only ever cultivated in response to an externally generated agenda. Sustainable change happens when it is driven from within, with a strong sense of ownership from those who are responsible for implementation – in this case teachers. Hence the focus of our activities has to continue to be on building capacity and creative practice with individuals and institutions within the education system, accepting that change is incremental and takes time.

Tide's recent work with groups of teachers in the West Midlands for the 'Bill Scott Challenge' identified some key factors which support the process of educational change. These factors included: giving ourselves permission to be curriculum makers responsible for developing the right curriculum for our learners and recognising that this may mean less teacher control; greater prioritising for learner led activities; taking risks within a disciplined framework; and relating learning more closely to real life contexts. There have always been spaces for creativity and independence although the confidence and opportunity to make the most of them have been lacking. At Tide~ we have sought to: create those spaces where teachers come together in teacher groups to learn from each other; work collaboratively in a professional environment; create new ideas and develop new ways of working; innovate for themselves; take control of their own development; identify and feel able to respond to the needs of their learners; and use their talents and trust their judgements.

That is why we are a teachers network; why we will use the opportunities of greater curricular autonomy for schools; why we will work with the new wave of training schools; why we will support the emphasis on teacher to teacher collaboration; why we will seek to be involved in and influence the DfID supported Global Learning England Programme – because ultimately we believe that this is the only way to '...unlock the creative potential within the education sector so that the agenda concerned with preparing young people to understand and feel able to shape their changing world will be set by educationalists themselves'.

References

The Coalition: our programme for government (May 2010), HM Government, available:
http://www.direct.gov.uk/prod_consum_dg/groups/dg_digitalassets/@dg/@en/documents/digitalasset/dg_187876.pdf

The Department for Education (November 2010) 'The Importance of Teaching: The Schools White Paper', available: https://www.education.gov.uk/publications/eOrderingDownload/CM-7980.pdf

Department for International Development (DfID) (2003), *Enabling Effective Support: responding to the challenges of the global society - a strategy of support for the global dimension in education*, DfID, London, available: http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/+/http://www.dfid.gov.uk/pubs/files/enablingeffectivesupport.pdf

Department for International Development (DfID) (May 2011) 'Review of using aid funds in the UK to promote awareness of global poverty', available: http://www.dfid.gov.uk/Documents/funding/rev-using-fnds-prom-aware-glob-pov.pdf

For more information about Tide~ global learning visit: http://www.tidec.org

For an introduction to Sustainable Schools please visit: http://www.se-ed.co.uk/sites/default/files/resources/Framework%20Resource.pdf

Cathryn Gathercole is the Director of Tide~ global learning

CUBA'S MODEL OF DEVELOPMENT: LESSONS FOR GLOBAL EDUCATION

Stephen McCloskey

In this Viewpoint article, **Stephen McCloskey** argues for a more balanced perspective on Cuba in development discourse and the wider English-language media.   For too long Cuba has been subjected to clichés and stereotypes concerning its socialist model of development which have prevented a wider and meaningful discussion on its social achievements at home and humanitarianism overseas.   He argues that Cuba's real achievements in health, education, climate change and international aid provide potentially rich opportunities for learning and partnership for international development agencies and global educators. With the neo-liberal model of growth that prevails in much of Western Europe in a state of crisis, it is time for development practitioners to look at alternative models based on clear development principles.

Introduction
Few countries have been subjected to as much stereotyping and caricature as Cuba has been in Western Europe and the United States (US) over the past 52 years.   The public's perception of Cuba has largely been shaped by a regularly lax mainstream media content to run superficial stories informed by easily congestible stereotypes.   Regular features of English-language media reportage are old standbys like the 1950s' American cars on Cuban roads or decaying buildings on Havana's Malecón, the broad esplanade running along the coast-line, symbolizing a society trapped in the past.   Articles of this nature regularly gloss over or ignore entirely Cuba's hugely impressive social achievements in creating unprecedented advances in the context of the developing world in health and education. Cuba also has an astonishing record in its contribution to international solidarity and aid around the world by dispatching doctors and nurses to the most acute points of humanitarian need no matter how treacherous the environment or how high the cost.   Cuba's cultural contributions are also rich and varied in fields such as dance, music, film and art. Its achievements in sport relative to the size of its population and national wealth are outstanding and have yielded consistently impressive performances in international competition over the past five decades.

    What makes these achievements all the more laudable is the fact that they have been delivered in the context of economic blockade approaching its

50th anniversary imposed by the US, Cuba's near neighbour, and the dominant economy in the hemisphere. Cuban society has not just survived but evolved over the past half-century despite Washington's interventions and ongoing efforts to derail the revolution. This article will consider some examples of media stereotyping of the Cuban revolution and outline many of the island's achievements that deserve a wider airing. It will go on to argue that global education should draw upon the Cuban model in their practice as a means of discussing alternative models of development. It is suggested that this debate is particularly needed in the present context of social unrest evident in many liberal democracies, like that recently witnessed in Britain, which has accompanied the global financial crisis. The article concludes that it is time for a mature debate on Cuba in the context of global education that eschews the Cold War attitudes to the island and considers the lessons we can learn from its many achievements.

Cuban Clichés

During the recent Communist Party Congress in April 2011, Cuban President Raúl Castro announced new economic reforms to help the island address the effects of the global slowdown on growth and lighten the state's burden of expenditure. The 300 measures ratified at the Congress included plans for 170,000 new licences for small businesses like hairdressers, restaurants and taxi services that will operate in a non-state sector to help stimulate growth and reduce dependence on state support. The reaction to these measures highlighted the normally jaundiced view of Cuba that peppers the mainstream press. Rory Carroll, a persistent critic in the *Guardian*, suggested that Cuba's 'creaking economy' was headed 'on a gradual path to Vietnam-style capitalism in all but name' (19 April 2011). In the *Associated Press* President Barack Obama criticized the pace of change in Cuba suggesting that 'the communist-run island has not been aggressive enough in opening its economy or its political system' (12 September 2011). For the *Financial Times* the economic proposals were part of efforts by Raúl Castro 'to dismantle one of the last surviving Soviet-style systems and punch holes in the ideology and taboos that support it' (19 April 2011).

Thus Cuba is either caving to the inevitability of the free market and making concessions to capitalism or dragging its feet and adhering to tried and failed centrally planned economics. A minority view from Jonathan Glennie in the *Guardian* offers a different narrative to Cuba's economic measures suggesting that it has pursued 'egalitarian policies' which placed a heavy burden on the state. He suggests that in Cuba 'the extremes of opulence and misery are

banished in favour of a generalised level of wealth, best described as "enough to get by"' (5 August 2011). Glennie adds that if Cuba continues to move forward without 'undermining its most impressive achievements' it will 'merit the attention of development theorists and practitioners seeking proven means to eradicate poverty' (Ibid).

Alas, most commentators on Cuba fail to look beyond the clichéd conception of the island as a troubled Caribbean paradise with sinister socialist overtones and a moribund leadership. Typical of this sort of treatment is a travel piece written by Cordelia O'Neill for the *Irish News* (9 October 2010) in which she describes the island's 'intoxicating salsa rhythm' to which 'tall palm trees seemingly swing in time'. She goes on to suggest that 'reminders of the tough regime under which Cubans live are plentiful' but provides scant analysis of Cuba's socio-economic context in the developing world. In a similar piece for the *Irish Times* (9 October 2010) Frank McDonald meditates on the possibilities of life in Cuba post-Fidel (Castro) which he describes as a bit like 'Waiting for Godot'. A favourite pastime of Cuba's critics has been speculating on the revolution's demise when Fidel Castro stepped down as president. In fact, the former Cuban leader had left public office in February 2008, long before McDonald's article appeared in October 2010, without any significant impact on public support for the revolution or Cuba's governance.

The article mostly derides Cuba's tourist industry which views foreign visitors as 'walking wallets'. McDonald acknowledges some restoration work completed in parts of Havana '[b]ut walk inland just a few blocks and you're confronted by crumbling buildings on pot-holed streets stinking of bad sewers, and scrawny dogs scouring the rubbish from overflowing wheelie-bins'. The article mentions the US blockade of Cuba briefly in the last paragraph and suggests that the longevity of Cuba's revolution is due to the climate: 'because it never gets cold; "socialism in the sunshine" made it possible for Castro to survive as long as he has'". This kind of slack and sour reportage is not untypical of how Western correspondents cover Cuba and contributes to a very narrow, shallow and often inaccurate view of the island.

This is not to suggest that the Cuban revolution is beyond reproach or criticism. Mistakes have been made over the past 52 years and this was accepted at the very highest level of the Cuban government by President Raúl Castro at the recent Congress. He pointed to an inefficient economy with inadequate salaries and social inequalities arising from unequal access to hard currencies. He rejected past 'dogmas' and 'failed schemes' and targeted what he

described as 'excessive, idealistic and egalitarian paternalism' (*Cuba Sí*, summer 2011: 10). Castro also strongly criticised the political and managerial elites whose 'violations' and 'mistakes' had not been confronted and resulted in a stifling of initiative and excessive centralisation. He even rounded on the state's media for its 'triumphalism, stridency and formalism' that resulted in the broadcasting of content that was 'boring, improvised and superficial material' (Ibid). This very candid assessment of weaknesses in Cuban society and economic planning and the measures agreed at Congress came on the back of a three month nation-wide consultation process involving nearly 9 million citizens. The government has listened to concerns that reforms should be phased in gradually to monitor their impact as it strives to carry out a delicate balancing act of maintaining free access to education, health care and social services while reducing state expenditure in other areas. It is the social achievements of the revolution that are discussed in the next section.

Cuba's Development Model

From the outset of the Cuban revolution in 1959 education has been a priority for its leaders. In 1961 Cuba launched a year long literacy campaign to address the high levels of illiteracy that were part of the social neglect characteristic of the pre-revolutionary period under US-sponsored dictator Fulgencio Batista. The literacy campaign was a great success and in 2011 the United Nations Education Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO) revealed that the 'Cuban Literacy Program' was implemented in 12 other Latin American states with plans to expand this model to other regions (*Cuba Sí*, summer 2011:6). UNESCO also praised Cuba's expenditure on education which according to the United Nations *Human Development Report 2010* was 13.8 per cent of Gross Domestic Product (GDP) compared to 5.2 per cent in Brazil and 4.9 per cent in Argentina in the same period; countries with much bigger economies in the American Hemisphere. Cuba's commitment to education as an essential human right available to all citizens means that it is available free at the point of delivery. Education in Cuba is not a privilege, particularly at third level, available only to those who can afford to pay for it as is the case in Ireland and Britain.

Cuba has a similarly socialised approach to healthcare with just under 10 per cent of GDP spent on health (UN, 2010) compared to 6.1 per cent in Ireland, 6.9 per cent in Britain and 7.1 per cent in the United States. As a result Cuba can boast of a 'developed world' life expectancy rate of 79 years which is just behind that of the US (79.6) Britain (79.8) and Ireland (80.3). But the success of Cuba's health system is more than just a matter of statistics

and free access; it is built upon an effective public model that Barry and Lynch suggest is 'a protective and supportive system for Cuban citizens, run by the state, but in a decentralised and integrated system' (2008: 156). The preventative component of the Cuban health system is key and is constructed around an effective primary care programme which not only prevents illness but promotes healthy lifestyles. As Barry and Lynch argue:

> "[h]ealth is viewed as enabling people to achieve their full capacity, irrespective of age or ability, and with full cognisance of the wider determinants of health, such as housing, education, nutrition and exercise" (2008: 157).

However, the benefits of Cuba's system are felt well beyond its own borders. In 1999 Cuba established a Latin American School of Medicine which trains doctors and medical personnel from other parts of the Americas, including the United States, and Africa. Almost 10,000 students from 29 countries are enrolled in the school with students committing themselves to return to their countries and work in communities lacking adequate healthcare (Medical Co-operation with Cuba, 2011). Cuba itself now has as many doctors servicing its 11 million citizens as there are in Britain meeting the needs of 60 million people. Michael Tynan, Emeritus Professor of Paediatric Cardiology at King's College, London has been engaging in medical exchanges with Cuba since 1987 and found that 'Cuba's commitment to public health has been the heartbeat of their socialist programme – both domestically and internationally – since their struggle against Batista in the 1950s'. He adds that '[c]onsidering the intensification of the blockade, Cuba's achievements in the field of healthcare – particularly in the areas of infant mortality, life expectancy and internationalism – are nothing short of miraculous' (*Cuba Sí*, summer 2011: 30).

Cuba's internationalism includes the Henry Reeve Brigade, a specialist medical team of 1,200 personnel set up in 2005 to respond to humanitarian emergencies and disasters anywhere in the world. In 2005, it was the first team on the ground following the Pakistani earthquake in Kashmir and six months later the last to leave. More recently, Cuba's medical personnel were the first on the scene in the Haitian earthquake in 2010 because they already had a 350-strong team on the ground which immediately went to work in 'providing primary care and obstetrical services as well as operating to restore the sight of Haitians blinded by eye diseases' (*Aljazeera*, 16 February 2010). This team was later strengthened by Cuba after the earthquake struck and treated 30,000

cholera patients between October and December 2010 (*Independent*, 26 December 2010).

It was notable that, while the efforts of Western development agencies in Haiti were highly praised, the work of the Cuban medics was largely ignored by the media. *Aljazeera* was one of the few news organisations to highlight Cuba's efforts in Haiti noting that 'their pivotal work in the health sector has received scant media coverage' (16 February 2010). The London *Independent* also acknowledged the media's sidelining of Cuba's medical work in Haiti with a piece titled 'Cuban medics put the world to shame'. It placed Cuba's work in Haiti in an international context noting that '[a] third of Cuba's 75,000 doctors, along with 10,000 other health workers, are currently working in 77 poor countries, including El Salvador, Mali and East Timor' (Ibid). In addition to the work of the Henry Reeve Brigade, Cuba's medical efforts have included an international programme called 'Operation Miracle', which 'began with ophthalmologists treating cataract sufferers in impoverished Venezuelan villages in exchange for oil. This initiative has restored the eyesight of 1.8 million people in 35 countries, including that of Mario Teran, the Bolivian sergeant who killed Che Guevara in 1967' (Ibid).

What is characteristic of the Cuban model of development is the island's internationalism and concept of solidarity which included the deployment of combat-troops, at the request of the Angolan government, to repulse a major invasion from the apartheid regime in South Africa in October 1975. In an intervention that ultimately amounted to 50,000 troops from 1975-91, Cuba helped play a decisive role in 'forcing South Africa to the negotiating table' (*Morning Star*, 4 November 2005). Nelson Mandela praised Cuba's support for the anti-apartheid cause:

> "The Cuban people hold a special place in the hearts of the people of Africa. The Cuban internationalists have made a contribution to African independence, freedom and justice unparalleled for its principled and selfless character. We in Africa are used to being victims of countries wanting to carve up our territory or subvert our sovereignty. It is unparalleled in African history to have another people rise to the defense of one of us. The defeat of the apartheid army was an inspiration to the struggling people in South Africa!" (Quoted in *Morning Star*, 4 November 2005).

Cuba's intervention came well before the anti-apartheid movement became a global campaign and Western nations became reluctant supporters. This kind of internationalism has been a source of inspiration to activists and communities around the world. The Cuban Institute for Friendship with the Peoples (Instituto Cubano de Amistad con los Pueblos – ICAP) is responsible for developing international solidarity links between Cuba and the world. In 2010, ICAP celebrated its 50th anniversary and announced that it now enjoys relations with 2,000 solidarity organizations in 152 countries (*Granma International*, 29 December 2010) which is a staggering achievement for a small island nation on the periphery of the US.

But why is Cuba's model of development relevant to global education practitioners in Western Europe? And how can Cuba inform the development practice of agencies and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) that work overseas? These questions are addressed in the next section.

Cuba and Global Education

While Cuba has its detractors in western government discourse and policy, it has nonetheless persuaded many organizations and individuals at a grassroots level that 'another world is possible' to the neo-liberal, market-driven development model which has spectacularly unraveled since being hit by the global financial crisis of 2008. Indeed, Cuba has been at the hub of efforts within Latin America to swing the tide against the market-driven hegemony of the US which created the conditions for the 'shock economic' treatment of the 1970s and 1980s which created debt and economic destablisation throughout the continent (Klein, 2008). For example, we have seen the emergence of the Bolivarian Alternative for Latin America or ALBA (Alternativa Bolivariana para las Américas) which is a proposed alternative to the US-sponsored Free Trade Area of the Americas. ALBA differs from the latter in advocating 'a socially-oriented trade block rather than one strictly based on the logic of deregulated profit maximization' (Arreaza, 30 January 2004). With new alliances and institutions, socialist and social democratic governments in Latin America are charting a different path to development based on local needs and agendas. Socially progressive institutions like ALBA could usefully inform global education practice, particularly in stimulating debate on how we can manage the global economy on the basis of social need while ensuring the sustainable stewardship of the natural environment.

Global education is practiced largely in Western Europe and derives its theoretical origins from Paulo Freire and his *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (1972)

which was nothing less than a manifesto for changing unjust social relations and 'breaking the cycle of poverty'. Bryan (2011: 1) has considered some of the 'paradoxes and contradictions' that characterise contemporary global education practice 'in an era of neo-liberal shaped globalisation'. She asks why

> "the development education sector endorses, tacitly or otherwise, the very ideologies and political-economic arrangements that are responsible for producing or exacerbating conditions of poverty and injustice, while simultaneously encouraging people to take action against this poverty and injustice" (2011: 1).

An example of what she sees as a 'declawing' of the global education sector is its 'detached stance on crucial policy issues' and reluctance to engage in debate on development issues at a local level. The sector has been wrestling with the problem of how to deliver transformative education within an education and policy environment that appears circumscribed by the values and agendas of neo-liberalism. This dilemma was succinctly captured by Selby and Kagawa when they asked if global education and related sectors are in danger of 'striking a Faustian bargain so as to achieve some purchase and influence over educational directions, a bargain that brings short-term gains at the expense of transformative goals?' (2011: 15).

Freire regarded education as an empowering, transformative instrument of social change that enabled individuals to move beyond learning to action toward justice and equality at local and global levels. Given its longstanding commitment to social policies that have been genuinely transformative at home and overseas, the Cuban model of development offers rich learning opportunities that global educators can introduce to their practice. Since the end of the Cold War we have been encouraged to think about economic development through one dominant narrative; the neo-liberal model of deregulation, privatisation and state retrenchment. This model is clearly failing us and in crisis given the level of upheaval in the European Union (*Guardian*, 29 September 2011) and the United States (*New York Times*, 5 August 2011). With international financial institutions unable to plot a course out of the financial mire and uncertainty as to how long the current crisis will last, there has rarely been a more apposite time for global education to present viable alternatives that have worked.

Just as there is no silver bullet to resolve the current financial crisis nor is there is one development template that can or should be imposed on other

nations. The role of global education is to explore the alternative models that are available to us and discuss how we can learn from their strengths and successes. For example, how is it possible that Cuba with a per capita Gross National Income (GNI) of $5,747 can sustain a subsidized health and education programme for 11 million people? Ireland with a per capita GDP figure of $38,768 (in 2010) is by contrast labouring to educate its young people. A Pisa/OECD study into educational standards revealed in December 2010 that Ireland has slipped from 5th place in 2000 to 17th place – the sharpest decline among 39 countries surveyed. Moreover, almost one-quarter of Irish 15-year-olds are 'below the level of literacy needed to participate effectively in society' (*Irish Times*, 27 December 2010). These contrasting statistics are worth probing in some depth and the debate has acquired a real urgency given the crisis that has unfolded in Ireland following the collapse of its banking sector (*Irish Times*, 28 November 2010).

From a development co-operation and overseas aid perspective, Cuba's longstanding commitment to international development through health and education initiatives makes it an obvious partner to Western development agencies. Cuba has been a provider of development services throughout the 50 years of revolution and that experience could be shared with NGOs in the development sector across the world. There have been independent initiatives by doctors in the west to create links with the Cuban health system like that of Dr David Hickey at Beaumont Hospital in Dublin (Boyle and McCloskey, 2011) who has facilitated exchanges between Cuban and Irish medics. However, there have been too few formal relationships initiated by development agencies and national governments who could really benefit from such exchanges.

The need to explore new models of development

The political managers of the current economic crisis insist that financial austerity, combined with a massive recapitalisation of the banks that created the financial contagion in the first place, will arrest the alarming contraction in national and global economies. According to the National Audit Office, the total amount spent to bail out Britain's banks since 2009 is £456.33bn, which comprises £123.93bn in the form of cash transfers from the government to the banks and a further £332.40bn offered in guarantees should circumstances demand further ballast against the recession (*Guardian*, 12 September 2011). But these statistics tell only part of the story of how the recession and the neo-liberal economic regime are impacting on societies like Britain that have been

wedded since the 1980s to deregulation and the dismantling of state support to core public services like transport, utilities, health and education.

The riots that erupted in London in August 2011 and subsequently spread to several other English cities suggest that there is a deep-rooted malaise within English society that Prime Minister David Cameron seems reluctant to accept. He labelled the riots as 'criminality pure and simple' (*BBC News*, 11 August 2011) and appeared unwilling to countenance other factors that may have contributed to the unrest.   For example, the riots were triggered by a protest organised in response to the killing of a black youth by a police officer in a society where '[b]lack people are 26 times more likely than whites to face stop and search' (*The Observer*, 17 October 2010). Also, the area in Tottenham where the riots started has the highest unemployment rate in London and has suffered unduly from the erosion of services like youth work provision (*Guardian*, 10 August 2011). Moreover, the city of London has become one of the most socially polarised in the world with the very wealthiest citizens worth 273 times more than the poorest (*Guardian*, 21 April 2010).

While it is premature to come to facile conclusions about the summer riots in England, they raise real concerns about the degree of detachment that many citizens now feel from their political representatives and system of government. In a letter to the *Guardian* responding to the riots Neil Alldred suggested that they were 'symptomatic of the breakdown of the social contract'. He noted 'the increasing gap between elites and ordinary people' in England following scandals involving senior police officers, members of parliament and media executives. He added that 'those elites now need to work hard to make a social contract attractive once again to individual men and women. If they don't make efforts towards greater social justice, the future is not very difficult to discern' (*Guardian*, 9 August 2011). In a similar vein, Seumas Milne suggests that [i]t's already become clear that divided Britain is in no state to absorb the austerity now being administered because three decades of neoliberal capitalism have already shattered so many social bonds of work and community' (*Guardian*, 10 August 2011).

There have been serious, in-depth studies of poverty and inequality in Britain by Dorling (2010) and Wilkinson and Pickett (2009) that have probed the causes and effects of social marginalisation.   These works consider the impact of materialism and polarisation on social wellbeing particularly our mental health, educational performance, physical health, social and community relations, and level of social mobility. They find that inequality and elitism is

bad for everyone including the elites and that equality, not wealth, is a much stronger determinant of the 'relaxed social contract and emotional satisfaction we all need' (Wilkinson and Pickett, 2009: 3). These works seem to suggest that models of development that prioritise social justice and economic equality over wealth creation and elitism, like that in Cuba, are more likely to result in poverty eradication. Cuba's model of development is one that should command much closer scrutiny in the development sector as NGOs and civil society groups consider how to rebuild societies in Western Europe that have become socially divided and economically depressed on the back of an untrammelled adherence to neo-liberalism.

Conclusion

Cuba has consistently wrong-footed those critics in Western governments and international finance bodies that have incorrectly predicted the demise of the revolution at several stages of its development. There is no doubt that Cuba has been tested many times over the past fifty years with perhaps the greatest challenge being the collapse of the Eastern bloc in the late 1980s and the 'loss of more than 50 percent of Cuba's oil imports, much of its food and 85 percent of its trade economy' (Quinn, 2006). Cuba's collapse was widely anticipated at the end of the Cold War but it was a serious miscalculation by western powers to bracket Cuba with the satellite states of the old Soviet bloc. Cuba always plotted its own socialist course and, as Hamilton suggested:

> "redefined itself in the world by actively emphasising its independence from both the US and the Soviet Union, and placing itself as the revolutionary vanguard of Latin America and the 'Third World' more generally, a position most clearly reflected in its leading role within the Non-Aligned Movement" (2009: 88).

Cuba has also created a revolution in which the majority of its people are stakeholders and supporters. As Antoni Kapcia, professor in Latin American studies at the University of Nottingham, suggested in the context of the recent Communist Party Congress:

> "a condition of understanding the nature of a Cuban party congress is to accept the perhaps uncomfortable notion that debate has been characteristic of Cuba since 1959 and fundamental to the processes of involvement and decision-making" (2011).

Another feature of the revolution has been the innovation with which its leaders and people have responded to crises like the loss of favourable trading terms with the Soviet Union. In the 1990s Cuba made the transition from being a highly mechanized, industrial agricultural system to one using organic methods of farming and urban gardens. As the rest of the world has debated and fudged the issue of climate change Cuba has successfully reduced its oil consumption and moved to sustainable methods of food production, a story well documented in the film *The Power of Community: How Cuba survived peak oil* (2006).

But Cuba's greatest achievement over the past half century has been to sustain its socialised approach to health and education and refuse to compromise on this keystone of the revolution despite the economic duress caused by the US blockade. For 20 consecutive years the United Nations General Assembly has voted in favour of lifting the US blockade of Cuba with the most recent vote in October 2011 showing 186 countries calling on Washington to end the blockade and just Israel voting on the side of the US (*Washington Post*, 25 October 2011). Cuba estimates that the blockade has cost its economy $751 billion (Ibid) at the dollar's current value given that the US not only refuses to trade with Cuba but denies trading rights to countries that also do business with the island. Amnesty International has urged the Obama administration 'to take without delay the necessary steps towards lifting the economic, financial and trade embargo against Cuba' (2009).

Despite the blockade Cuba has sustained its domestic social programme and maintained its commitment to humanitarianism overseas. It is a model of development that global educators should study closely and incorporate into their learning programmes to facilitate discussion on alternatives to the prevailing model of growth that is in such difficulty. This is not to suggest that other countries could or should attempt to apply the Cuban template to their own societies. Every country needs to find its own path to development rather than have a model foisted upon it; a methodology disastrously applied by the International Monetary Fund and World Bank in Latin America from the 1980s onward.

What is suggested here, however, is that development NGOs and global education practitioners should examine Cuba's many successes in prioritising social needs above economic growth. Cuba's humanitarianism is an inspiring case study that is often lost among the clichés and stereotypes applied to the island by English-language media outlets. In moving beyond the Cold

War rhetoric and attitudes, there are rich learning opportunities for development theorists, educators and practitioners which have been ignored for too long. A recent bi-lateral co-operation agreement between the UK and Cuba signed in July 2011 (*Cuba Sí*, summer 2011: 7) is a step in the right direction and follows similar initiatives in Ireland, France and Spain. We need this thawing in diplomatic relations to be extended to the European Union as a whole to facilitate greater linkages and co-operation at a political level that reflect the robust and dynamic solidarity links that already exist at a grassroots level across the world.

References

Aljazeera, 'Cuba's aid ignored by the media?' 16 February 2010

Amnesty International, 'The US Embargo Against Cuba: Its Impact on Economic and Social Rights' is available at: http://www.amnesty.org/en/library/info/AMR25/007/2009/en. (accessed 10 November 2010).

Arreaza, T (2004), 'ALBA: Bolivarian Alternative for Latin America and the Caribbean', http://venezuelanalysis.com/analysis/339 (accessed 29 September 2011).

Associated Press, 'Obama: Cuban economic reforms are not enough', 12 September 2011.

Barry, J and Lynch, U (2008), 'Public Health Governance in Cuba: makes *health for all* a reality' in Stephen McCloskey (ed) *Development Reader: An Introduction to International Development Issues*, Centre for Global Education, Belfast.

BBC News, 'England riots: Cameron says police admit to wrong tactics', 11 August 2011.

Boyle, A and McCloskey, S (eds.) (2011), *The Activist's Handbook: A Guide to Activism on Global Issues*, Centre for Global Education, Belfast.

Bryan, A (2011) 'Another cog in the anti-politics machine? The 'de-clawing' of development education' in Policy & Practice: A Development Education Review, Vol. 12, Spring 2011, pp. 1-14, available: http://www.developmenteducationreview.com/issue12-editorial.

Cuba Sí, spring 2011, Cuba Solidarity Campaign, London, visit http://www.cuba-solidarity.org.uk.

Cuba Sí, summer 2011, Cuba Solidarity Campaign, London.

Dorling, D (2010) *Injustice: Why Social Inequality Persists*, Policy Press, Bristol.

Financial Times, 'Cuba approves landmark economic reforms', 19 April 2011.

Granma International, 'Always open to the hearts of friends', 29 December 2010.

Guardian, 'Cuba: A development model that proved the doubters wrong', 5 August 2011.

Guardian, 'Cuban communist party keeps old guard in power', 19 April 2011.

Guardian, 'Bank reforms: how much did we bail them out and how much do they still owe?' 12 September 2011.

Guardian, 'London's richest people worth 273 times more than the poorest', 21 April 2010.

Guardian, 'These riots reflect a society run on greed and looting', 10 August 2011.

Guardian, Neil Alldred letter to the editor, 'Breakdown of the social contract', 9 August 2011.

Independent, 'Cuban medics in Haiti put the world to shame', 26 December 2010.

Hamilton, D (2009) Review of 'Cuba in Revolution – A History Since the Fifties' in *Policy & Practice: A Development Education Review*, Vol. 9, Autumn 2009, pp. 86-88, available: http://www.developmenteducationreview.com/issue9-reviews2.

Irish News, 'Crazy Cuba emerges from Fidel's shadow', 9 October 2010.

Irish Times, 'Cuba waits on Castro', 9 October 2010.

Irish Times, 28 November 2010.

Irish Times, 27 December 2010.

Kapcia, A 'Cuba, Politics in Perspective', *openDemocracy*, 22 June 2011 available at http://www.opendemocracy.net/antoni-kapcia/cuba-politics-in-perspective (accessed 4 October 2011).

Klein, N (2008) *The Shock Doctrine: The Rise of disaster capitalism*, Allen Lane, New York.

Latin American School of Medicine: for further information visit: http://www.medicc.org/ns/index.php?s=10&p=0 (accessed 28 September 2011).

Morning Star, 4 November 2005, http://emba.cubaminrex.cu/Default.aspx?tabid=16014 (accessed 29 September 2011).

New York Times, 'Political Roots in U.S. Economic Crisis', 5 August 2011 http://www.nytimes.com/2011/08/06/opinion/americas-economic-crisis-has-political-roots.html (accessed 29 September 2011).

Pickett, K and Wilkinson, R (2009) *The Spirit Level: Why Equality is Better for Everyone*, Penguin Books, London.

Quinn, M 'The power of community: How Cuba survived peak oil', 25 February 2006, available at http://www.energybulletin.net/node/13171 (accessed on 3 October 2011).

Sarmiento, N 'Cuba and the South African Anti-Apartheid Struggle' in *Links: International Journal of Socialist Renewal*, http://links.org.au/node/1485 (accessed 29 September 2011).

Selby, D and Kagawa, F (2011) 'Development education and education for sustainable development: Are they striking a Faustian bargain?' in *Policy & Practice: A Development Education Review*, Vol. 12, Spring 2011, pp. 15-31, available: http://www.developmenteducationreview.com/issue12-focus3.

The Observer, 17 October 2010.

United Nations *Human Development Report 2010*, visit http://hdr.undp.org/en/ (accessed 28 September 2011).

Washington Post, 'UN member states condemn US embargo of Cuba for 20th consecutive year', 25 October 2011.

Stephen McCloskey is the Director of the Centre for Global Education and Chair of Cuba Support Group, Belfast

Resource Reviews

THE ECONOMICS OF HAPPINESS

Review by Henrike Rau

The documentary *The Economics of Happiness* by Helena Norberg-Hodge, Steven Gorelick and John Page was released in 2011 by the International Society for Ecology and Culture (ISEC) and has since attracted considerable attention. It combines footage from diverse places affected by globalisation, such as the Ladakh region in northern India whose culture has been extensively studied by Helena Norberg-Hodge, with commentaries by other prominent advocates of an alternative approach to economics that is both culturally sensitive and local in scale. Thought-provoking analyses offered by social scientists and activists such as Juliet Schor, Vandana Shiva, Bill McKibben, Andrew Simms and Rob Hopkins, amongst many others, combine to offer a nuanced picture of the challenges and chances of a 'new economy' based on localisation.

The Economics of Happiness covers key impacts of globalisation on societies, local economies, cultures and ecosystems around the world, focusing in particular on the effects of recent changes in the production and consumption of food. It provides ample evidence of the social and environmental costs of industrialised agriculture and the carbon-intensive global circulation of food, especially for farmers in developing countries. Pressing economic issues such as forced competition and de-regulation, growing indebtedness and the continued subsidisation of unsustainable agricultural practices are highlighted throughout the documentary. Challenging the persistent use of economic growth as the yardstick for measuring human development, the documentary promotes a shift in emphasis towards community and cultural integrity, wellbeing and happiness.

Education is seen as a key driver of change by many commentators. Current efforts to preserve local knowledge and lay expertise receive attention throughout the documentary, most notably in relation to localised systems of food production that work with rather than against nature. For example, Vandana Shiva stresses the need to involve older people in education to ensure the survival of local knowledge and practices. In addition, the documentary

introduces viewers to the idea of 'reality tours' – that is, excursions that give members of non-Western cultures the opportunity to experience key institutions and patterns of everyday life in the west and that aim to promote cultural reflexivity and critical awareness of cultural differences. There is some interesting footage of two Ladakhi women on a 'reality tour' with Helena Norberg-Hodge that includes visits to a nursing home, a supermarket and a municipal waste dump.

One of the most appealing features of *The Economics of Happiness* is its emphasis on cultural diversity and resilience to the negative effects of globalisation. This is an often neglected area that deserves much more attention in academic and popular literature and in the media than has hitherto been the case. The question of what makes some cultures more resilient to the pressures of modernisation and the 'growth logic' of global capitalism than others is a very pertinent one. Footage from Ladakh reveals that existing cultural conventions and traditions may equip communities with strategies and practices that help them maintain their cultural identity, at least to some degree. On the other hand, the documentary shows many places that have suffered from the negative impacts of economic and cultural globalisation, including rural communities in India and Peru that have come under pressure to either modernise their system of agriculture or abandon farming altogether.

The Economics of Happiness is a very welcome addition to the existing pool of recent documentaries that deal with the social, economic and ecological consequences of globalisation and possible sustainable alternatives. It is a very suitable teaching tool for courses on sustainability and development in schools, organisations and higher education institutions. The material is presented in a clear, concise and engaging manner. Importantly, the overall tone of the documentary remains optimistic and there is a firm focus on practical bottom-up solutions. This makes it particularly suitable as a tool for action-focused initiatives such as the Transition Towns movement or local food initiatives. Community screenings of *The Economics of Happiness* have already taken place throughout Ireland following its release in early 2011.

The website that accompanies the documentary – www.theeconomicsofhappiness.org – provides detailed information about the production of the film and its key message. There is potential for further enhancement of the website through the inclusion of materials for teachers and trainers, such as freely downloadable worksheets for in-class exercises and discussion cards that could be used in conjunction with the film.

The Economics of Happiness will appeal to teachers, practitioners, campaign groups and non-governmental organisations that work on sustainability and development issues. It makes a very significant contribution to current sustainability debates because of its strong focus on the cultural consequences of globalisation and its emphasis on localisation as a potential alternative pathway to development and human well-being.

Anielski, Mark (2007) *The Economics of Happiness: Building Genuine Wealth*, Philadelphia: New Society.

Dr Henrike Rau is a lecturer in Political Science and Sociology at the National University of Ireland, Galway. Her current research focuses on socio-cultural and political aspects of consumption, especially with regard to (un)sustainable transport patterns. Her other areas of expertise include environmental sociology, social-scientific and interdisciplinary sustainability research and cross-cultural studies.

THE PIPE

Review by Seán Byers

"Be moderate", the trimmers cry,
Who dread the tyrants' thunder.
"You ask too much and people By
From you aghast in wonder".
'Tis passing strange, for I declare
Such statements give me mirth,
For our demands most moderate are,
We only want the earth. (James Connolly, 'We only want the Earth', 1907).

In issue 13 of *Policy and Practice*, Andy Storey briefly highlighted the parallels between the plight of the Ogoni people of the Niger Delta and that of the Rossport locals, county Mayo. He noted how shared experiences between the global North and South – 'state and corporate abuse' of vulnerable people in this instance – can and should lay the foundations for a more widespread critique of the socio-economic status quo in Ireland (2011: 80-81). Indeed if development education (DE) at home is to succeed in meeting its objectives in adverse ideological and financial conditions, then its proponents need to find effective and accessible resources to employ in relaying their message to students, activists and practitioners. *The Pipe* is one such resource; documenting one local chapter of what is very much a global story of social mobilisation against a financially superior transnational corporation (TNC) attempting to impose its will on a small community.

The opening scene of this powerful film pans across what is a picturesque and tranquil landscape, and this footage is interrupted by images of Gardaí (Irish police) clashing with residents of the village for dramatic effect. We are then introduced to Monica Müller and Willie Corduff, both farmers, and Pat 'The Chief' O'Donnell, a fisherman, who are in consensus about the problem they face: the proposed laying by the oil corporation Shell of an inland pipeline taking gas from the sea, through their village and to a nearby refinery at Ballinaboy. The main objections of the residents relate to environmental sustainability, safety concerns, and a clear lack of consultation in general. These three locals explain that they have been making a sufficient living off the land for decades; but the high-yielding, yet short-term Shell project threatens to destroy that very way of life by disrupting the natural world in which they work. They are also adamant that a comprehensive health and safety assessment has

not been carried out, fearing that the project could have serious ramifications for future generations. Lastly, as Willie Corduff laments, '[t]hat's what they did at the beginning – they came telling us what they were going to do. They never asked us at any stage for permission'.

The sentiments of this isolated community, abandoned by its government (the phrase 'out of sight, out of mind' is apt here), are expressed through a series of protests. A sit-down demonstration which aims to block the path of a Shell convoy, for example, is physically removed by Gardaí, whose occupation of the Rossport in large numbers is one of the more bizarre aspects of the film. Violent confrontations with baton-wielding officers are commonplace in the adolescent stage of local resistance and Willie Corduff is arrested on at least two occasions. The most striking and disconcerting feature of this fraught relationship, though, is that the locals are often dealing with Gardaí whom they know in a personal capacity. This creates discord in the local community despite faint traces of humanity and compassion in the conciliatory approach of some individual officers. This is evident in how the Gardaí deal with local activist Pat O'Donnell when he tries to take on the huge Shell vessel *Solitaire* with his fishing boat – but these instances are more the exception than the rule.

While it would appear on the surface that *The Pipe* is an account of insolent antiquity resisting a natural process of modernisation, it soon becomes clear that the *Shell to Sea* campaign – the name initially adopted by the residents for their collective action – is much more complex in two main ways. First, though their resources to challenge Shell pale in comparison to the energy giant, a number of Rossport residents have familiarised themselves with more sophisticated measures of resistance. These have included brushing up on the legislation, taking out injunctions, lobbying the European Parliament on social and environmental grounds, and engaging in non-violent forms of civil disobedience. Second, and a direct consequence of these developments, a bitter division has materialised in the *Shell to Sea* camp, between the pragmatists and the hardliners. The first group, the pragmatic majority, are concerned with making the project a sustainable development and are quite happy for an energy market to develop in Mayo, so long as the pipeline is diverted to an uninhabited area. The hardline group – hostile to any negotiations – is led by schoolteacher Maura Harrington, who is clearly very passionate, but whose obstinance seems to stand in the way of progress.

A small community like that in Rossport cannot afford such divisions when confronting a corporate power with the resources of Shell. Through coercion (the use of unnamed private security guards, supported by dozens of Gardaí), legal manoeuvring, financial incentives (compensation for fishermen who agree to relinquish their territory, for example) and sheer audacity, Shell have begun to lay an alternative pipeline and have effectively taken control of local waters. The detrimental effects of this process are, as initially feared, quite extensive, and the camera catches several instances of environmental degradation. The most damning indictment of Shell's behaviour and the Irish government's inclination towards clientelism, however, is the treatment of fishermen who refuse to accept limited compensation in return for their livelihoods. Pat O'Donnell and his son Jonathan, who hopes to inherit his father's vocation, are cases in point. But, without giving too much away, their defiance seems to bring with it a great convergence of ideas and solidarity in action with which to conclude the documentary.

The people of Rossport have become accustomed to the vilification they have suffered at the hands of the 'mainstream' media, a theme not addressed in the documentary but highlighted elsewhere (Cotton, 2009). This misrepresentation has given way to a pervasive silence as the global economic crisis takes centre stage. Yet there is still hope that their voice will be heard. While the community has been excluded from the democratic decision-making process concerning the laying of the pipeline, it has found a source of empowerment elsewhere. The *Shell to Sea* campaign has spawned both a Solidarity Camp in nearby Aughoose (see www.rossportsolidaritycamp.org) and a support group in Dublin (www.dublins2s.com). Moreover, it has successfully weaved its communal campaign into the fabric of an increasingly passionate national debate on the future ownership of Ireland's natural resources (see *Irish Times*, 16 August; 18 August; 19 August; 23 August 2011). If this debate progresses with the same vigour that it has thus far, then the residents of Rossport can count on having further opportunities to attach their relatively small social movement to a more widespread political agenda.

As an educational resource, *The Pipe* is a great example of how awareness of global development issues can be heightened by initially focusing attention on analogous cases at home. The central subjects addressed by the film – sustainable development; the absence of popular participation; state complicity in the morally and economically questionable actions of a powerful corporation; and the economic system that propels growth in Ireland and other liberal democracies – all point towards a better understanding of global

interdependence. Just as events in the Niger Delta have informed those in Rossport, *The Pipe* can be used by development educators to provoke and subsequently build on interest in the aforementioned issues at home. The content of the film lends itself to an adult and community audience and, indeed, *Shell to Sea* encourages educational practitioners at a community level to organise screenings and invite members of the campaign to address meetings. This is the very essence of development education: education and activism at a local level on an issue with global resonance.

References

Cotton, M (2009), 'Irish Media failing over Rossport', *Village Magazine*, June 2009.

Irish Times, 'Let's make Norway joint owner of our oil and gas', 16 August 2011.

Irish Times, 'Oil firms will shun us if we have Norwegian-style taxes', 18 August 2011.

Irish Times, Letters to the Editor, 'Sharing energy with Norway', 19 August 2011.

Irish Times, 'Bad politics behind great gas and oil giveaway', 23 August 2011.

Storey, A (2011) 'One World: Why Irish development educators should court controversy at home', *Policy & Practice: A Development Education Review*, Vol. 12, Spring 2011, pp. 80-86, available:http://www.developmenteducationreview.com/issue12-perspectives7

The Pipe (2010) [Film], O'Domhnaill, R; Scannáin Inbhear; Underground Films; Riverside Television, 80 mins, available for purchase at www.thepipethefilm.com

Seán Byers is an intern with the Centre for Global Education and a PhD candidate at the University of Ulster.

INSIDE JOB

Review by Stephen McCloskey

While most of us have a vague notion as to the origins of the global financial crisis, the detail remains a mystery to those outside the financial sector and not conversant in economic speak. Among the many attributes of this distinguished documentary, winner of the 2010 Academy Award for 'Best Documentary Feature', is its capacity to deconstruct the complex and often nefarious operations of the private financial sector and make them accessible to the 'outsider'. It more than matches its claim to trace 'the rise of a rogue industry' and unveil 'the corrosive relationships which have corrupted politics, regulation and academia'. What emerges in a compelling narrative, worthy of any thriller, is a jaw-droppingly corrupt sector driven by bottomless greed and impervious to its impact on wider society. Perhaps the most depressing aspect of the story is the absence of any sense of lessons learned or evidence of remorse for the tens of millions of people who have lost their jobs, savings and homes as a result of the crisis.

The story begins in Iceland, a stable democratic society described as almost attaining 'end of history status'. This small, prosperous state of 320,000 people became a basket case almost overnight when its three main banks were privatised and began borrowing three times the country's Gross Domestic Product with the capital mostly accumulated to incredible levels by bankers. In a scenario repeated in Ireland, Britain and the United States (US) the financial regulators failed to raise the alarm or halt the reckless borrowing and, in the case of Iceland, one-third of the regulators went to work for the banks. The story then moves to the US and the collapse of Lehman Brothers in 2008 that sent shudders through the financial markets and sparked a global downturn that would shed 30 million jobs.

Like all good documentaries, *Inside Job* contextualises its subject and traces the origins of the 2008 collapse to the unravelling of financial regulation in the US initiated by the Reagan administration but continued by his successors irrespective of party affiliation. The financial sector is likened to an oil tanker with separate compartments to afford protection and prevent disaster. Thus speculative investment compartments were separated from savings and pensions to ensure the security of depositors' money but also the probity and liquidity of financial institutions. From the 1980s onward deregulation dismantled the 'compartmentalisation' of the sector, most lucratively in the

housing sector, which experienced a huge acceleration in mortgage approvals to borrowers who were out of their financial depth.

The financial bubble that led to the collapse in 2008 resulted from a breakdown in the 'securitisation food chain' which was the traditional practice of borrowers securing a loan for a mortgage and then paying it back to a financial institution over a specified period with interest. In the post-Reagan period of deregulation the investment banks or lenders sold the loans to investors who in turn gambled trillions of dollars on the unregulated market. When loans are off-loaded to the private sector, the lender is no longer concerned as to the quality of the loan or the borrower's capacity to repay. Thus, from 2001-2007 the financial sector in the US was a 'ticking time bomb' as the number of loans accelerated exponentially and banks continued to borrow recklessly 'buying' loans that could not be repaid.

This borrowing bonanza and credit bubble was facilitated and abetted within the sector by Alan Greenspan, the chair of the Federal Reserve, America's central bank, who resisted the regulation of derivatives – the selling of loans to investors – and refused to downgrade the credit rating of banks on the brink of collapse. Lehman Brothers, for instance held a 'double A' rating when it failed and the mortgage lender Fanny Mae and Freddy Mac held a 'triple A' rating at the time of the collapse. Further negligence was evident in the leverage of the largest banks which is the amount borrowed relative to the banks' own money. In some cases this ratio was 33:1, meaning that some banks were borrowing 33 times their own holdings leaving them hopelessly over-extended when the bubble burst.

In addition to the failings of the sector to regulate itself, *Inside Job* identifies two other factors crucial to the financial collapse and the failure to prevent it. First, there is what one witness describes as a 'Wall Street government', which pro-actively removed the layers of government scrutiny of the sector and its means of protecting account-holders and lenders. This is largely the consequence of key government appointments being offered to high-ranking sector insiders. For example, President George Bush Jr's Secretary of the Treasury Henry Paulson was a former Chief Executive Officer (CEO) with investment bank Goldman Sachs. Second, the documentary rightly excoriates the academic community in the US which, like the government and the banking sector, became a cheerleader for deregulation and refused to expose the growing liabilities of the banks and the risks to their stakeholders, mostly ordinary Americans with savings, loans and pensions.

Two of these 'academics' are put to the sword on film. Fredric Mishkin was on the Federal Reserve Board as the crisis broke and resigned to 'edit a textbook'. He is reduced to gibberish nonsense when trying to explain payments from private financial institutions for academic papers that conflicted with the realities of the sector before the crisis. Another unrepentant academic, Glenn Hubbard was Chief Economic Advisor to George Bush Jr and Dean of Columbia Business School. As the documentary points out academics and the financial sector have 'corrupted the study of economics itself'.

Inside Job is lucidly narrated and effectively combines graphics and witness accounts to help us traverse the turpentine path followed by the financial institutions. The witnesses are both a strength and a weakness. It's useful to hear from the horses' mouths how this catastrophe unfolded with helpful analysis from politicians, authors and economic specialists. What we lack, however, are more perspectives from 'outsiders' who have a greater ideological distance from those working within the economy. *Inside Job* does not question the fundamentals of capitalism and how they can result in boom and bust cycles that derail generations of young lives and exacerbate social inequalities. This is a film appealing for a return to sounder economic stewardship and tighter regulation rather than searching for alternative models of managing our economies. Indeed, such is the range of perspectives offered by *Inside Job* that the International Monetary Fund (IMF), the co-author of the debt crisis in many developing countries since the 1970s, is proffered as a voice of sanity and financial soundness amidst the surrounding madness. Indeed, former IMF chief executive Dominique Strauss-Khan and his successor Christine Lagarde are among the witnesses interviewed.

The film also needed to offer more of a voice to those who have been rendered homeless and penniless by the banks. We see a tented city in Florida now home to many Americans left homeless after six million foreclosures in 2010 with another ten million predicted for 2011. *Inside Job* is undoubtedly at its best when probing the banking sector and the 'type A' personalities that led it to collapse. These impulsive and risk-taking Wall Street tyros often extended their amoral behaviour to using prostitutes and cocaine believing themselves to be invulnerable to any form of legal or moral accountability. This ultimately proved to be the case with not a single criminal prosecution reported of any of the financial executives complicit in the financial collapse. The legacy of the collapse is that inequality is higher in the US than any other developed society and many of the banks, like JP Morgan, are bigger now than before the crisis through a process of consolidation. Meanwhile, President Obama's treasury

team is almost entirely drawn from the financial sector and is headed by Timothy Geitner, who, as President of the Federal Bank Reserve during the crisis, ensured that Goldman Sachs received '100 cents in the dollar' for all the bets it lost speculating against mortgages.

The cool analysis of this film with its expert, dispassionate questioning of some very unsavoury insiders will leave the viewer boiling with anger but much better informed as to how the bottom fell out of the global economy, particularly that of its leading player. The narrative is never over-whelming and will arm the viewer with a useful understanding of how the global economy operates. The film was made with an adult audience in mind and at third level would strengthen the delivery of courses in sociology, politics and economics particularly those focused on the global economy and globalisation. It is excellent in mapping the relationship between the financial, political and academic sectors and the need for greater oversight within all three. *Inside Job* would also benefit community and adult education classes as a form of economic and development literacy. It will generate immense debate and questions on a story that sadly maintains a growing relevance and topicality to our everyday lives.

Inside Job, Sony Pictures, Director Charles Ferguson, 2010, 1hr, 44 mins.

Stephen McCloskey is the Director of the Centre for Global Education