



# United Kingdom

*Douglas Bourn*

# Introduction<sup>1</sup>

The UK is regarded as having a strong reputation in Global Education in Europe in terms of policy development, research and models of educational practice. This reputation has been built on a combination of the practices of often local initiatives in the fields of development, human rights, peace and Environmental Education; the influences of key pioneers such as Robin Richardson, Graham Pike, David Selby, and Dave Hicks, particularly in the 1980s and 1990s; the policy support at various times by UK government ministries responsible for international development; and until the late 1990s, significant support of Non-Governmental Development Organisations (NGDOs) such as Oxfam and Christian Aid.

This chapter will review how these influences evolved, their relative importance at points in time and the ways in which policies and programmes diverged with increased devolution in the four nations of the UK (England, Northern Ireland, Scotland, Wales). Finally, the chapter will note the increasing influence of academics and researchers, including through the creation of the Development Education Research Centre in 2006, the role of the Teesnet network of academics and practitioners and the changing fortunes of the coordinating bodies.

## From the 1920s to 1960s

### From Imperial Power to international Understanding

To understand the ways in which Global Education emerged and evolved in the UK, a starting point must be to recognise the country's international influence as an imperial power. Britain's imperial designs provided the impetus for acquiring, but also constructing knowledge about the world. As a publication on geography for schoolteachers in the 1920s:

*The function of geography in school is to train future citizens to imagine accurately the conditions of the great world stage and so to help them to think sanely about*

*political and social problems in the world around.*  
(quoted in Lambert and Balderstone, 2000, p. 19)

In addition to this imperialist outlook, several other factors emerged between the wars that contributed to increased support for learning about other countries. This included the popularity of the League of Nations as a subject of study and the need for an educated citizenship in response to the threat of fascism.

It was within this context that the Council for Education in World Citizenship emerged. Founded in 1939, it sought to promote international understanding, active citizenship and responsibility for 'our' future among young people and educators (Harrison, 2008). However, the extent to which this organisation and these themes in the inter-war period had an influence beyond private schools and education for an elite is perhaps open to debate.

Following the end of the Second World War and with the emergence of several international institutions including the United Nations and later UNESCO, the need for education to have a more international outlook was acknowledged in many industrialised countries including the UK. Nevertheless, the ways in which the Global South was portrayed in textbooks and the media suggests that even though the UK's influence in the world declined, a legacy of imperial thinking prevailed through the 1960s and 70s.

## Interest in Learning About Development Rises

As Harrison (2008, p. 43), has commented in his research on Oxfam and the origins of Development Education, it was the changing attitudes to poverty that led to increased consideration being given to learning about global issues:

*This shift in public attitudes must have influenced the way that young people were taught in schools to understand the changing world.*

The decolonisation process that took place during the latter part of the 1950s until the 1970s, increased the public's interest in the newly independent countries. Agencies such as Oxfam responded and stimulated such interest by publishing a range of 'country packs' that gave information about living conditions in different countries, such as India, Jamaica, Botswana.

Growing public and political interest led to the creation of the Ministry of Overseas Development (ODM) in 1964 by the Labour Government, with a seat in Cabinet.

Although its status was lowered in the 1970s under a Conservative government, it became a separate ministry again with a Labour government in 1974. It was during this period that initiatives to fund and support policies for increasing development awareness and understanding began to emerge.

Building on their initial country-based informational activities during the 1960s, the following two decades saw a major expansion of the work of development organisations. Many became engaged in promoting learning about development issues, including by setting up specific Development Education departments. (Oxfam appointed its first Head of Education in 1965). Many of the NGDO's activities relied on the voluntary involvement of local groups of agency supporters and that of national development campaigning organisations, such as the World Development Movement (founded in 1970).

What was emerging during this period, especially among NGDOs, was a growing demand for an approach to learning about development issues that transcended traditional geography lessons about distant places, emphasising instead participatory pedagogical methods and advocating for social action. The educational model moved from the provision of information to more engaged, participatory learning.

This, however, involved considerable debate about the ways development themes were being promoted and what should be the main elements of an education programme. For example, was its focus primarily on education *about* development (developing awareness and understanding, with the, often implicit, aim of creating public support for government and NGDO development programmes), on education *for* development (developing the public's skills that enable active personal and political engagement with overseas development), or on education *in* development (developing approaches to change and global development that started from the public's own existing interests, e.g. amongst teachers and their interests in pedagogy)? As early as 1968, the differing aims of NGDOs and policymakers were evident in an article in Times Educational Supplement by Oxfam's Education Officer, Og Thomas, who said young people needed to not only understand the wider world but help to change it for the better (quoted in Harrison, 2008, p. 48). In 1985 the Live Aid Concert, organised in response to a major famine in Ethiopia, played a major role in raising awareness about global poverty. However, it also led to considerable debate since the event's dominant message appeared to be about the Global North providing help to the poor in the Global South (Biccum, 2010; Kirby, 1994; VSO, 2002).

In an illustrative contribution to such debates, the Swiss educator Pierre Pradervand observed that "Vague and hazy thinking enhanced by the non-existence of any clear definitions of key concepts such as 'development', (not to mention 'education') does not make our task easier." (1982, p. 450)

# Influence and Engagement from UK Government and the Leading Development Organisations 1970–1980s

## Emergence of Development Education Organisations

The UK government through its Ministry of Overseas Development had established a networking body between the development NGOs and the ODM, called the Voluntary Committee on Overseas Aid and Development (VCOAD) which as early as 1969 had begun to use the term Development Education. During the 1970s, this body set up an Advisory Committee for Development Education and organised a series of conferences outlining how schools could promote the issues of the 'Third World'. One practical outcome of this was the government agreeing to fund and support a specific organisation to promote these themes, The Centre for World Development Education (CWDE), which later became known as Worldaware.

From the 1970s onwards, larger NGOs such as Oxfam and Christian Aid began to provide funding to support local organisations to work with schools and communities on Development Education. These developed into what became known as Development Education Centres (DECs). The first centre, established in Norwich, was supported by local church groups, while another early centre in Birmingham was supported by Oxfam and a number of local education authorities.

In other places too initiatives of local groups of NGO and development campaigning organisations led to the establishment of Development Education, World Education, and Third World Centres. By 1980 some 25 such centres had been established throughout the UK, and together, they set up the National Association of DECs (NADEC). Locally, most of the centres were active in both formal and non-formal education, offering a library, resources shop, and running information sessions, courses, and other events on a variety of development issues.

The lack of suitable education resources led some of the DECs – and the NGOs – to focus on the creation of education materials, providing teaching and learning ideas on a variety of themes and for use in various (primary, secondary and non-formal) education settings. In the days before the internet,

CWDE's various editions of 'The Development Puzzle' provided regular and up-to-date overviews of publications on various development issues, teaching approaches and subjects (Fyson, 1984).

Alongside this growth in Development Education, there were other initiatives that were helping to shape interest in areas such as education for international understanding, the environment, and human rights. For example, inspectors from the Ministry of Education who participated in the 1974 UNESCO Conference in Paris, where Recommendations on Education for International Understanding were agreed upon, decided that there was a need to support schools in this area. This led to an informal movement of organisations to promote the theme. The Council of Education for World Citizenship, still in existence, was well placed to play a leading role promoting this broader approach and they started to receive direct funding from the Ministry of Education.

To understand the relative importance of NGOs in the UK, a useful starting point is Stephen Arnold's paper on 'Constrained Crusaders'. This important paper summarised the landscape of the field in the 1980s, highlighting the contradictions within the practices of many of these organisations between securing a strong supporter base and promoting long-term educational change. Arnold, however, concluded that the British NGOs deserved credit for sustaining a movement on 'woefully inadequate resources' (Arnold, 1988).

Harrison notes that NGOs were particularly important for Global Education from the 1970s and the 1980s because of the relative lack of engagement by national policymakers. McCollum commented that in the 1970s and into the early 1980s, areas such as Development Education were viewed as a subversive force and the concepts and methods which Development Education embraced were new and largely unknown (McCollum, 1996).

Although there were gradual changes to learning approaches in the 1980s and into the 1990s, the perception of the field as outside of the mainstream was evident and, as will now be shown, based on political and ideological factors. With a Conservative government in power from 1979 to 1997, there was little political support for promoting learning about the wider world, although they did continue to support CWDE and a number of initiatives related to raising awareness of development issues within the media. NADEC did receive some government funding for a short period of time in the 1980s, but it was only with the establishment of the Development Education Association (DEA) that signs of a shift in political thinking in regard to GE emerged.

Before discussing the DEA however, it is relevant to note there were several significant developments in the 1980s that came from a Global Education perspective. The main elements of this were the initiatives on what was first called World Studies but later became known as Global Education, under the leadership of Robin Richardson, Graham Pike, David Selby and David Hicks.

## World Studies

In 1973 the Parliamentary Group for World Government and the One World Trust set up a curriculum project in London, the World Studies Project, led by Robin Richardson. Influenced by the growth in interest in Global Education, stimulated particularly by the writings of Robert Hanvery, this Project grew in the 1980s to have considerable influence within many local authorities. What distinguished this project from other initiatives such as those led by development NGOs was the bringing together of the themes of peace, human rights, environment and Development Education. A key early influence on the Project's activities was Learning for Change in a World Society (Richardson, 1976). Moving beyond solely learning about global problems and issues to presenting a pedagogical approach for social change marked a significant shift in the development of Global Education in the UK.

Building on Richardson's work, the World Studies Project focused on teachers of 8- to 13-year-olds, and produced a number of publications that aimed an approach to education that "promoted knowledge, attitudes and skills needed to live responsibly in a multicultural society and an interdependent world" (Fisher and Hicks, 1985, p. 5). By the end of the 1980s, this project had worked with over 50 local education authorities in England and Wales.

Alongside this project was the equally influential material produced by David Selby and Graham Pike (Pike and Selby, 1988) at the Centre for Global Education based at York University. Their five aims of Global Education were: systems consciousness, perspectives consciousness, health of planet awareness, involvement consciousness and preparedness, and process mindedness.

Both the Trust and the Centre for Global Education provided an approach that combined learning about the wider world with progressive teaching methods. There was also a strong emphasis on active global citizenship (Hicks, 2003). Whilst these points had already been made in materials produced by the Oxford Development Education Unit and by the DEC in Birmingham, the influence of Selby, Pike and Hicks was also in part due to them being based in universities, with a focus on teacher education that enabled them to secure support from commercial publishers.

In the 1970s and 1980s particularly, a number of local authorities had appointed multi-cultural education advisors in response to the changing nature of UK society. Many of these advisors worked closely with local DEC's and although their influence waned in the 1990s, their legacy could be seen in the close relations many local authorities had with DEC's, often being active members of their management committees.

## Political and Ideological Debates

The shift in how education's role was understood during the 1980s is evident in England and Wales, particularly through the impact of the 1988 Education Reform Act. This act introduced a state-controlled subject curriculum and reflected ideological influences from Margaret Thatcher's premiership, emphasising education's economic function, enterprise, and wealth creation. Scotland and Northern Ireland had their own curriculums and were less prone to influences of the ideological agenda of Margaret Thatcher in these countries.

This radical shift had direct consequences for the field of Global Education. World Studies came under ideological attack for being biased and for promoting areas such as peace studies (Scruton, 1985; Bevington, 2020). The defence of Global Education was weakened by internal perceived differences between those who took a more globalist view (World Studies Trust and Centre for Global Education), those who emphasised multicultural education (local education authorities), those who emphasised international outlook (CEWC), and those who focused more on learning about development issues and the Third World (Oxfam, and many members of NADEC).

## Emergence of the Adjectival Educations 1980–1990s

The themes identified in World Studies such as human rights, peace, citizenship, development, world, global, that later became known as adjectival educations 'spiralled in the 1980s' (CEE, 1993, p. 11). Grieg, Pike and Selby (1987, p. 30) had noted how development, human rights, peace and Environmental Educations are complementary, interdependent, and mutually illuminating. The term adjectivals was used by Huckle and Sterling (1996) as an umbrella term which captured their common concern with education for transformation, and there is evidence the term was also being used in other countries such as Australia (Gough, 1992; Gerber, 1990). In a similar vein, Robin Richardson wrote an influential article on Elephant Education during this period, in which he called for a more holistic approach (Richardson, 1985). Within each theme, specific networks emerged,



such as Education in Human Rights Network in 1987, the National Association of Development Education Centres (NADEC), and peace networks influenced by the increased interest in campaigns for nuclear disarmament. But it was those concerned with the environment and development which had the biggest influence on the direction of Global Education in the UK.

## Environmental Education

The term Environmental Education first emerged in the UK in the 1960s. The Council for Environmental Education in England was established in 1968 and gained influence as it began to secure government funding. Working alongside similar bodies in Scotland and Wales, the Council had by the 1990s ensured that Environmental Education was recognised as an important feature of educational practice. Another body, the National Association of Environmental Education, which was more of an association of individual teachers and advisors, had also emerged in the 1970s out of a body concerned with rural studies. Various curriculum guidance documents in England, Wales and Scotland contributed to the growing influence of the Council (CEE, 1993; Palmer and Neal, 1994), and its status was further enhanced by the UN Summit on Environment and Development in 1992 (the Rio Summit). As part of the process leading up to the Summit, a body of environmental and Development Education groups produced Good Earth Keeping (UNEP-UK, 1992), a document calling for an education strategy for a sustainable future. This influential document referred to themes such as global citizenship, the importance of NGOs and an emphasis on action for social change.

The Council alongside similar networks in Wales and Scotland began to have an impact on curriculum development, influencing policymakers and bringing together a wide range of environmental organisations towards a common focus.

## Development Education

Development Education did not have the same level of support from curriculum bodies in the 1980s and early 1990s as Environmental Education. Nonetheless, with the support of leading development agencies and the introduction of funding from the European Commission, the field of Development Education grew significantly, particularly at the local level. The national network of local Development Education Centres, NADEC was well established by 1990 and now had over 50 member organisations. The leading development agencies, conscious of the influence of the curriculum, also supported projects in England and Scotland to monitor opportunities in this area. By the early 1990s, the leading agencies and NADEC were able to fund and support a new combined umbrella association, the Development Education Association, which was launched in 1993.

The establishment of the DEA was an explicit strategic decision by the leading NGDO known as the British Overseas Aid Group (BOAG) – Action Aid, CAFOD, Christian Aid, Oxfam and Save the Children, and the NADEC membership. There was a desire to broaden the support NADEC had given to DECs to support all Development Education practitioners; develop more strategic lobbying of (local and national) policy decision makers, including curriculum bodies; be the national (and international) mouthpiece of the ‘movement’ and promoter of the work of the DEA membership.

The strength and influence of local provision for Development Education also manifested in the wealth of resources and projects the Centres developed, often in partnership with other bodies. A review of the field in 1994, part of a broader publication on European activities, identified a wide range of projects in the UK. These included an adult education project for women in Scotland in partnership with groups in the Global South run by SEAD; a community education organisation based in Scotland; a linking project using photographs run by Oxford and Aylesbury DECs; World Wise, a professional development programme for teachers with a European dimension; and Southern Voices, an initiative based in Manchester that involved overseas students to promote mutual respect and understanding between peoples from the Global North and the Global South (Kirby, 1994). This diversity of provision was becoming one of the main strengths of the field in the UK, covering all aspects of education and involving a wide range of organisations.

## **Development Education Comes to the Fore 1990–2000s**

### **Growth in Support and Engagement in Development Education in England**

The launch of the DEA in 1993 was an important milestone in the history of Global Education in the UK. One speaker at the launch was Baroness Lynda Chalker, the Minister for Overseas Development who had only two years earlier questioned the value of Development Education. In the early 1990s Overseas Development was part of the Foreign Office although it had a distinctive identity as the Overseas Development Administration (ODA). The Minister's change of heart reflected the extent to which the sector was becoming more accepted within both the education and development field. The development agencies played a major role in this evolution, exemplified by the head of Christian Aid serving as another keynote speaker at the launch. Major funding had been secured from the Rowntrees Trust with the support of the leading NGDOs to fund the establishment of this new Association. Securing ODA involvement in the event was the result of a lengthy period of dialogue led by the NGDOs, who saw value in gaining the support for the DEA for their own Development Education work. The event was attended by over 600 people and enabled the DEA to rapidly evolve into a membership body of over 250 organisations. It had already secured funding from the European Commission for a project entitled 'Building From Strengths'.

### **Initiatives in Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland**

To understand the increased divergence in approaches to Global Education across the UK from the late 1990s onwards, it is necessary to note that the Labour government from 1997 onwards ensured the emergence of devolved administrations in Wales and Scotland and an increased role for the Assembly in Northern Ireland.

This entailed the move from UK organisations to more nationally focused bodies. Alongside the creation of the DEA in England for example, similar network organisations emerged in Scotland and Wales. The IDEAS network in Scotland and Cyfanfyd, the Welsh network for Development Education in Wales, were both established in 1995. Both brought together a combination of NGOs, local DEC's and a range of voluntary organisations and professional bodies. In Scotland and Wales there were already well-established local DEC's, and the leading development agencies had a strong presence in both countries. What was also significant about the organisational and content context for the development of these networks was a close linkage between environment and development-focused organisations.

The situation in Northern Ireland was slightly different. There was a strong local Centre, One World Centre Northern Ireland (later called the Centre for Global Education), and what emerged was a grouping of interested bodies within the broader Council of Aid and Development Agencies Northern Ireland (CADA NI) to act as a working group to inform policy development. There was also a strong link between local and national organisations devoted to human rights, peace and justice and local groups engaged in Development Education.

## The Case for Development Education

The DEA had by 1995 begun to receive small amounts of funding from the ODA, which was then still technically part of the Foreign Office, initially for global youth work. Worldaware was at this time receiving considerable funding from the ODA, for work with schools and the media. In 1996 following a major debate on Development Education in the House of Lords, the Association launched a policy document titled *The Case for Development Education* (DEA, 1996). This document affirmed the commitment of the Labour Party to building greater public understanding of development issues, the work of the leading aid agencies, and the strength of local provision through the network of over 50 local Development Education Centres. The document further called for a Development Education Fund of £4 million per annum to be offered to NGOs. At this point in time the level of funding was £700,000 per annum, making it one of the lowest per capita among donor countries in Europe. This low level of funding from UK government compared unfavourably with that provided by the European Commission, which in 1995 had provided grants to the tune of £1.87 million to UK organisations, making it the second largest recipient in Europe for such funding. This discrepancy between national and European funding highlighted both the high regard for UK Development Education practice and strategy in Europe, but also the need for greater political support at UK government level.

## Building Support for Development

In 1997, with the election of a Labour government and the creation of a new government department, the Department for International Development (DFID), there was a rapid transformation in terms of both funding and policy support for the field of Development Education. The Department established a group of relevant stakeholders and leading players in the field, produced a strategy document, *Building Support for Development* (DFID, 1999) and began to establish close links with the education ministries around the UK. Significantly, the UK government, through its engagement via the DFID, recognised the need to promote a new approach to development that went beyond charity to recognising the interdependent nature of people's everyday lives.

The Development Awareness Working Group played an important role for five years in developing policies and strategies for work within formal education, trade unions, the media, and faith groups. A Development Awareness Fund was established providing grants for local and national organisations. Projects for the major fund could be up to £100,000 per annum for up to three years. Smaller grants were available for amounts up to £30,000 over three years. Funding was based on promoting knowledge and understanding of development, our global interdependence, poverty reduction and efforts to achieve the Millennium Development Goals (DFID, 2003). The following list of approved projects in 2003 gives an insight into the range of projects supported:

- Abantu for Development – Poverty has a Women's Face- Gender and Coffee links
- Fairtrade Foundation – Fairtrade towns and cities
- General Federation of Trade Unions – Globalisation and Development
- Leeds DEC – Just Linking Project
- National Youth Agency – Raising Global Awareness in the Youth Service
- One World Centre Northern Ireland – Bringing a Global Dimension into the Youth Service in Northern Ireland
- Powys Environment and Development Centre (Wales) Raising Awareness of Global and Development issues
- Scottish Catholic International Aid Fund (SCIAF) Project Partnership Programme.

A feature of this fund and wider Global Education practices in the first decade of the twenty-first century was the plethora of projects and initiatives not only

in formal education but in other areas such as adult and community learning, higher education and youth work. For example, funding was given to national youth agencies in the four jurisdictions in the UK to develop strategies on global youth work. Support was also given to trade unions and a special grants fund was established to support work with unions. Another example of a strategic initiative was with the Workers Education Association (WEA) through a major tutor training programme. In addition to this fund, DFID began to give strategic funding to the umbrella organisations, DEA, IDEAS and Cyfanfyd.

Although civil society organisations valued this increased funding, there was some unease about the extent to which bodies had to buy into a strategy essentially developed by government, which posed the danger of promoting development policies in an uncritical way. There was also concern that the aims of the strategy were rather nebulous (Hammond, 2002, p. 35), with the department blurring the distinctions between broader awareness raising and education. Measurable targets became difficult to identify, apart from seeking recognition of Development Education within the formal education curriculum. Cameron and Fairbrass, for example, suggested that DFID was "embarking on a process of colonising the Development Education community" (Cameron and Fairbrass, 2000, p. 23). They also suggested that through its funding, the DFID was de-politicising Development Education by not funding advocacy or direct lobbying work.

In 2001 a senior civil servant within DFID, reviewing their support for Development Education, stated there was a need to distinguish between education and advocacy:

*There is a strong and entirely proper tradition within the NGO movement of linking awareness-raising and advocacy. But for many teachers there is a natural nervousness about bringing advocacy and campaigning messages into the classroom. There is a need to be clear about what is education and what is advocating a particular message.*

(Calvert, 2001, p. 22)

This debate is one that has continued throughout the history of Global Education (Weber, 2012) but what was significant about the role of DFID at this time was its willingness to encourage open debate about these matters. There is no evidence of DFID trying to de-politicise the practice. Indeed, space was given to civil society bodies to develop strategies and programmes independently, free from any form of top-down policy.

## Embedding the Global Dimension 2001–2010

In 2001 the four networking organisations for Development Education in the UK published a lobbying document called *Global Perspectives in Education* which affirmed:

*Global perspectives and sustainable development should be at the heart of all educational and training provision.*

(DEA, 2001, p. 2)

The document noted the political support that existed within the four nations of the UK. Reference was made to not only support for the global dimension and sustainable development but also to recognising cultural diversity and the drive for raising standards. It was noted that by 2001, funding for Development Education had risen from £750,000 to £6.5 million per annum but there was a call for a further increase to £10 million by 2006. The extent of political support for Development Education could be seen in the DFID White Paper in 2006, which set out that the UK would:

*double our investment in Development Education, as we seek to give every child in the UK the chance to learn about the issues that shape their world.*

(DFID, 2006, p. 124)

By 2010 when the Labour government lost power, the funding had increased to £24 million per annum making it the largest government funder of Development Education in Europe.

Within formal education, DFID had already in 2000 begun the process of working with curriculum bodies in the four nations, resulting in a series of curriculum booklets. The themes of these booklets varied according to the dominant messages within the school curriculum. In Wales it was Education for Sustainable Development and Global Citizenship, in Northern Ireland it was Local and Global Citizenship and the Global Dimension, and in Scotland and England it was the Global Dimension. When the booklets were revised and updated in 2005, they were sent to all schools throughout the country.

The Global Dimension booklet in England and the similar ones produced in Scotland (LTS, 2007) and Wales (DELLS, 2006) reflected an approach that went beyond learning about development, further integrating the literature and ideas from the 1980s of Pike and Selby, the Oxford Development Education

Unit, and the work of the World Studies Project (Steiner, 1993). There were also similarities with the concepts developed by Oxfam in its framework for education for global citizenship, published in 1997 and revised in 2006 (Oxfam, 2006). For example, policy documents in this period were notably similar, consistently reflecting the same themes of interdependence, values, human rights, sustainable development, conflict resolution, diversity and citizenship. As Mannion et. al. (2014) has commented, this reveals the coming together of development, environment, and citizenship education under what they call the nodal point of Education for Global Citizenship.

Alongside this growing awareness, there was a parallel increase in the engagement and involvement of education ministries. In England, in 2004 *Putting the World into World Class Education* was published by the Department for Education. This booklet referred to the global dimension and stated that:

*We live in one world. What we do affects others, and what others do affects us, as never before. To recognise that we are all members of a world community and that we have the responsibilities to each other is not romantic rhetoric, but modern economic and social reality.*

(DFES 2004, p. 5)

However, a limitation of this booklet was that it reflected the contradictory aspects of the Labour government at this time. For instance, whilst it included goals such as "instilling a strong global dimension into the learning experience of all children" (Ibid., p. 6), it also referred to equipping employees with the skills needed for a global economy and to benchmark performance against world-class standards (Ibid., pp. 8–9). There was also reference to maximising the contribution of education to international trade. Whilst on the one hand it was promoting global social justice, it was on the other promoting the UK to the rest of the world in traditional neo-liberal and economic forms.

The global dimension in England had political support from the Ministry for Education, but also from the leading curriculum body, the Qualifications and Curriculum Authority (QCA). The global dimension became a cross-curricular theme in England which resulted in a booklet produced by the Curriculum body, the *Global Dimension in Action*. This publication is significant because it made the link to themes such as sustainability, while it also addressed major issues of the time:

*Education for the global dimension encourages learners to evaluate information and events from a range of perspectives, to think critically about challenges facing the global community such as migration, identity and diversity, equality of opportunity and sustainability, and to explore some of the solutions to these issues.*

(QCA, 2007a, p. 2)



As policies increasingly diverged in the four nations of the UK, it became evident that specific national strategies and terms would emerge to promote Global Education. DFID recognised this and alongside support for more regionally focused strategies in England, it introduced the five-year Enabling Effective Support programme. The aims of this programme were to:

- Provide a framework of support to teachers involving engagement of relevant local stakeholders;
- Implement a strategy of professional development support to teachers;
- Promote partnership ways of working including NGOs, professional associations and relevant local and regional bodies.

In the regions of England, coordinating groups were established with a specially appointed regional coordinator. In Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland, existing national bodies provided the basis for working groups involving relevant curriculum and assessment bodies (DFID, 2003). A significant feature of these programmes was that they spanned five years, going beyond the normal three-year cycle of funding programmes the Department tended to support. This reflected a desire by DFID to encourage more strategic thinking.

One of the most valuable and long-lasting initiatives during this period was the creation of the Global Dimension website, initially funded by DFID, which acted as the database of resources. Established in 2000 it became the first point of call for teachers and other educators looking for resources covering topics and themes related to global issues. By 2005 the database included nearly 700 resources, making it the main resources forum. Although no longer funded by the UK government, it still exists to this day.<sup>2</sup>

Political support for Development Education themes probably reached its height in 2008 when the then Prime Minister, Gordon Brown wrote the foreword to a DEA publication on case studies of practice:

*We live in a global society and I believe it is important that young people, wherever they are in the world, have an understanding of how their actions and choices impact on the lives of others – not only in different countries but also on different continents. From the food we buy to the way we get to work, our everyday decisions have consequences for the world around us and we need to understand those consequences if we are to build a fairer, more sustainable society.*

(DEA, 2008, p.4)

This political support for understanding and engaging with other countries had a strong emphasis on supporting international school partnerships. This area had been supported by the Conservative government in the 1980s and 1990s through the organisation Education Partners Overseas. Under the Labour government,

this body was absorbed within the British Council, and they then oversaw for the first two decades of the twenty first century a range of programmes promoting international school partnerships. As Minister for International Development in 1999, Clare Short stated:

*I want every school in the country to have the opportunity to develop a link with a school in the South.*

(Short, 1999, p.6)

This approach, whilst providing opportunities for schools between the UK and the global South to develop joint projects, did receive some criticism in that such initiatives could re-enforce paternalistic ways of working and re-enforce divisions between the Global North and the Global South (Leonard, 2008).

## **Broadening the Focus of Global Education 2004–2010**

### **Broadening Public Engagement**

DFID were not only interested in supporting GE within formal education, they were also interested in supporting broader public awareness of development issues, engaging faith groups and ethnic minority organisations. To this end they provided strategic support to a network of ethnic minority organisations and awareness raising initiatives in the form of specially produced booklets on development with a series of faith organisations. In 2004, to consolidate this broader approach, DFID established new strategic funding agreements with bodies as diverse as British Medical Association, Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy, Co-operative Movement UK, Trades Union Congress and network of local government bodies. Whilst much of this funding support was linked to broader public engagement, it did represent a desire by UK government to broaden support for international development.

This broad and rather loose interpretation of Development Education to include a wider awareness raising role came faced criticism for promoting an uncritical approach to understanding development issues (Biccum, 2010). The continued promotion of the term 'development awareness' by DFID, despite the ways in which it promoted the Global Dimension, did present a rather narrow interpretation of the field. It emphasised support for projects that promoted understanding of addressing global poverty at the expense of environmental,

human rights and peace education related themes, which tended to be ignored unless they had a direct reference to the Millennium Development Goals.

## Engagement of Ethnic Minority Organisations

Whilst Global Education from the 1980s onwards made reference to multiculturalism and anti-racist work, there had been justifiable criticism of the lack of involvement in Black and Southern organisations in the field (Graves, 2010). Conscious of these criticisms, the DEA undertook a major research project, with funding support from the European Commission and UK government, which resulted in the report *The World in Our Neighbourhood* (Ohri, 1997). From this research, a series of DFID-funded initiatives emerged, including a special fund for Black organisations, the establishment of a strategic body for Black organisations, Connections for Development, and a series of publications. These initiatives built on a rich tapestry of educational practice, often at a local level, and were based around educational practitioners from ethnic minorities. Projects ranged from promoting aspects of their culture within schools and community groups to distinctly anti-racist projects that challenged stereotypes and often engaged more recent migrants to the UK from the Global South, often from countries such as Nigeria, Ghana, Kenya, Chile, Columbia and Brazil.

DFID also provided some strategic funding to organisations which were more distinctly faith based, such as Islamic Relief and Hindu Aid. Whilst the funding was mainly related to a broad public awareness campaign within their respective communities on development issues, it did lead to some joint projects with other development organisations.

This funding was welcomed by many grassroots organisations but because it was only for a short-term, three-year basis, there were few opportunities for these bodies to develop any capacity and impact.

## Education for Sustainable Development

Alongside the increased political interest in Development Education, there were parallel initiatives on Education for Sustainable Development. In Wales, Education for Sustainable Development with global citizenship and an acronym ESDGC became a cross curricula theme (Norcliffe and Bennell, 2010). In Scotland,

sustainable development had been popular theme in teacher training for a number of years.

The high level of interest in this area provided a solid foundation of expertise and enthusiasm that the Scottish government drew upon when developing its Curriculum for Excellence, which featured sustainable development as a key component. In England, an expert panel was created which led to the production of a series of guidance material for all sectors of education and increased recognition of the term within the school curriculum. One consequence of this gradual evolution was the merging of the global dimension and sustainability education as a cross-curricula theme. Initiatives also included strategies for activity within further and higher education and youth work.

The development of the strategies in England had been based on support from both the government departments on environment and education. The ministry of environment had provided strategic and project funding for a range of initiatives on Environmental Education, but this changed in 2005 when leadership and funding moved to the education ministry. The main focus of the activities up to 2010 was on implementing a 2005 Action Plan which led to a sustainable schools' framework and a self-evaluation toolkit, a consequence of which was less direct funding for projects and strategic bodies leading to the closure of CEE.

## From Development to Global Education

Although it was the development ministry that funded much of the practice in the field of Global Education, what was evident was the increasing predominance of the term "Global Education" over the term "Development Education". DFID had recognised the need to adapt the language of strategies to specific educational priorities, but what perhaps had not been envisaged was the extent to which the changing language would lead to a broader conceptualisation of the field. Not only were initiatives such as global perspective in higher education, global youth work, and global dimension being used, there was increasing acceptance that the term Development Education was becoming difficult to defend as it no longer represented the themes and approaches being used. The term global citizenship was becoming increasingly popular, in part due to the work of Oxfam and their guidance on Education for Global Citizenship. There was also increased usage of terms such as Learning in a Global Society.

However, it needs to be noted that whilst the field of Global Education had since the late 1980s adopted a more critical approach to development, the necessity to secure funding often led to organisations initially adopting a narrower development-based approach. But as the field became stronger and more confident under a Labour government, and as DFID themselves recognised

the value of working in partnership with other government departments such as education, environment, culture and health, the usage of the term Global Education became recognised as one that would be more inclusive and connect more directly with the needs of UK society.

DFID was constantly looking at ways to strengthen support for its aid programme, but what engaged teachers particularly were the connections being made between development and issues such as tackling racism and broader social inequality. This underscored that support for development proved most effective when directly connected to overarching themes like social justice, rights, and responsibilities. This perhaps suggests that some of the approaches developed in the 1980s under the banner of World Studies had not been lost, and teachers felt they could revisit these areas (Scott-Baumann et al., 2003).

What the initiatives from Oxfam and their conception of global citizenship also showed was a return to the broader perspectives developed in the 1980s by Hicks, Selby and Pike. Hicks and Holden's volume on Teaching the Global Dimension included chapters based on the concepts from the DFES guidance and made reference to the antecedents of the progress made from the initiatives on World Studies and Global Education in the 1980s.

Accordingly, in 2008 the DEA decided to change its name to Think Global and to mainly use the term Global Learning for its work with schools. They defined Global Learning as education that puts learning in a global context, including an understanding of global issues, critical and creative thinking, and promoting a sense of optimism for a better world (DEA, 2008). This term was preferred by NGOs and educationalists, allowing them to engage more directly with the impact of globalisation, but it was also seen as a term that could engage wider groupings of educationalists, having greater relevance for teachers, youth workers and adult educators. The culmination of this change in terminology came in 2013 when a new strategic programme was introduced by DFID, called the Global Learning Programme which was in reality four distinct programmes, one for which each of the devolved nations of the UK. Before discussing this in more detail, it is necessary to review why the development awareness programme and core support for organisations ended in 2010.

## Public Awareness Campaigns

DFID funded the Rough Guide to Development (Wroe and Doherty, 2004) which became available in shops and retail outlets around the country. This public awareness campaign became also linked to the Make Poverty History initiative in 2005. Whilst the campaign may have raised some public awareness of development issues, there has been justifiable criticism of this initiative for its lack of depth (Andreotti, 2011; Biccum, 2010; Darnton, 2006; Hudson and Van Heerde-Hudson, 2010; McCloskey, 2022).

The evidence from a decade later shows that the vast majority of UK adults did not see global poverty as a pressing problem (BOND, 2015), but what did remain was increased knowledge and understanding of development and global issues. Whilst to date there has been no study of the long-term impact of the campaigns of the 2000s, within formal education at least there remained a desire among teachers to include themes such as global poverty, sustainable development and human rights in classroom activities.

Additionally, the shift in public engagement with development themes was influenced by the economic policies of the Conservative government. The period from 2010 to 2016 was characterised as a 'period of austerity' with major cuts in all aspects of public expenditure by UK government. There was less funding available for development and global issues. The leading NGOs were themselves having to make major cuts in funding their development and Global Education programmes.

## The importance of research, evidence, impact and evaluation 2001–2010

A consistent theme in all areas of publicly funded Global Education has been the evidence for its impact. DFID had been aware as early as 2001 that a major challenge for funding Development Education was how to measure its value, effectiveness and impact. The DEA, with funding from DFID, began work on this issue in 2001 through the measuring effectiveness project. One outcome of this project was a publication (Bourn and McCollum, 2001) which outlined a proposed methodology based on the terms 'why', 'what' and 'how', examples of practice, and details of useful resources. A toolkit on evaluation was also produced alongside a range of conferences and events. Its impact was limited

however, despite its messages resonating with similar initiatives taking place elsewhere in Europe. One of the reasons for its lack of long-term impact was that DFID wanted to frame the impact of their support for Development Education within development terms. This meant that the educational value was either not fully understood or not seen as essential to their needs. As the authors of the measuring effectiveness project wrote at the time:

*A development education programme does not, and in most cases will not, have as its main objective changing attitudes and understanding of global poverty and international development. This is likely to be much more specific, such as improving the capacity of teachers to deliver effective programmes, or giving educators the tools and resources to engage with development issues.*  
(Bourn and McCollum, 2001, p. 27)

Secondly, the outcomes of the measuring effectiveness project never became fully integrated into development awareness activities by DFID. One reason for this was that DFID sub-contracted to a private company the monitoring of projects. The dialogue that had evolved around the measuring effectiveness project was never followed through or embedded within the Department.

However, there were a range of initiatives emerging within the UK that were consciously looking more directly at evaluation and impact. One of the most important of these was a development awareness funded project run by the Reading International Solidarity Centre (RISC) project, *How Do We Know Its Working?*, which took a research-based approach to addressing how children learn about global and development issues. Their research identified that learning about global and development issues may increase knowledge but not necessarily change attitudes. Through a series of structured activities which were closely monitored and reviewed, accompanied by a professional development programme for teachers, resources and support mechanisms were put in place to encourage potential evidence of progress. (Lowe, 2008, p. 64).

Another important initiative was a report produced by Think Global in partnership with the Charities Evaluation Service which looked at outcomes of projects to promote understanding about global issues (Charities Evaluation Service & Think Global, 2010).

By 2009 DFID was coming under increased scrutiny for its funding for Development Education. A review of their funding of the field stated there was a lack of evidence to substantiate the value of Development Education. The review identified that there was effective innovation and experimentation in some areas, notably in formal education, but it went on to note:

*Little is known about the overall effectiveness and impact since regular review and lesson learning were not effectively integrated into the programme [...] What has emerged is a fragmented programme that serves some better than others.*  
(Verulam Associates, 2009, p. 1)

The problem with this review was that it was framed still within development objectives. It did not look at the changes in support for the field since 1997 or engage in depth of analysis the wide range of projects that had been funded since 1999.

A further review in 2010 by the new Coalition government in the UK was even more critical:

*We are confident that raising awareness of development issues in the UK has contributed to reducing poverty overseas. However, the evidence is circumstantial and consequently we have been unable to prove conclusively that this is the case. We can make the argument that it does, but there are simply too many causal connections to be able to prove it.*

*Similarly we have been unable to prove that DfID-funded awareness raising projects have made a direct contribution to reducing poverty. In part, this is because DfID's historic approach to funding projects in this area has been unstrategic, and individual projects have not been properly evaluated.*

(COI, 2011, p. 4)

This review followed even more closely a development related model by trying to equate impact of the projects directly to addressing global poverty.

These criticisms helped a new sceptical coalition government to decide to end its grant funding programme, with the consequence that only three subsequent programmes, one on formal education, one on school linking, and one on international volunteering were funded by DFID.

Whilst there are some justifiable criticisms of government policies in both reports in terms of evidence being effectively reviewed and assessed, civil society organisations were so reliant on DFID funding that they were reluctant to undertake any independent evaluations that might expose their lack of impact.

## Building Research Capacity

During the discussions between the DEA and DFID following the measuring effectiveness project, an idea emerged of a Centre that could act as the necessary focal point for undertaking and promoting research in the field of Development Education. Unlike areas such as environmental or intercultural education, until 2006 there was no strong academic tradition in development or Global Education. Several local DECs had begun to develop links with universities, for instance Liverpool World Centre partnered with Liverpool Hope and John Moores University, RISC in Reading with their local university and centres in Cumbria and Lancashire with nearby universities.



However, on account of the three-year funding programmes during the period of the Labour government from 1997 to 2010, it was becoming difficult to develop any long-term view of the value of the field or to provide space for more reflective and theoretical debates.

To their credit, DFID recognised this and between 2004 and 2005 discussions took place between the Department, the DEA and the Institute of Education within the University of London which had a long-standing interest in Global Education. The result was the creation in 2006 of the Development Education Research Centre with core funding from the Department.

The rationale behind the establishment of the Development Education Research Centre (DERC) was to raise the profile of Development Education within the academic community, to secure recognition of its contribution to broader educational goals and to establish Development Education as an integral component of mainstream learning within formal education. Whilst there were few published articles or major books on Development Education before 2008, this did not mean there were no discrete themes or bases for the practice. What was needed was recognition of these themes, and a clearer conceptualisation into a sound pedagogical framework (Bourn, 2008).

From 2009 to 2010, as well as producing a range of research reports covering formal education, the Centre secured additional funding for project work in further education, higher education and teacher education. The outcomes of these projects included a range of publications academic articles and conferences (Bentall, C. et al., 2014; Murdan, et al., 2014; McGough, H. & Hunt, F., 2012).

Another feature of the work of the Centre was to develop research and evaluation programmes independent of the UK government. These included a joint project with Oxfam UK on young people's engagement in global issues (Hunt, 2017), international volunteering for Voluntary Services Overseas (VSO) (Bentall et al., 2010), school linking (Bourn and Cara, 2013) evaluations for European Union funded projects (Warwick et al., 2017) and research for UNESCO (Bourn et al., 2017).

One direct consequence of the establishment of DERC was that when the Global Learning Programme was launched in 2013, research and evaluation was one of its main components.

The Research Centre, as well as playing a central role in the GLP programme, began to play an influential role through regular production of research reports, organising of conferences, and in 2017 launching an international network for the field, Academic Network for Global Education and Learning (ANGEL).

## Teacher education and TEESNet

Teacher education had always been seen as an important area within Global Education. The World Studies Project in the 1990s had evolved into an initiative focusing on teacher education (Steiner, 1996). In 1997 just as the Labour government had come into power, a major national conference on Global Perspectives in Initial Teacher Education was held at the Institute of Education at which a leading government advisor, Professor Michael Barber, stated that learning needed to include understanding about the quality of society and democracy and the future of the planet.

During the lifetime of the Labour government from 1997 to 2010 several projects concerning teacher education were supported, including the Global Teacher Project which was managed by the World Studies project team. This interest in teacher education was helped by an annual conference organised for teacher educators by the TEESNet network on the theme of sustainability and global social justice. Initially coordinated by London South Bank University and later by Liverpool Hope University in partnership with Liverpool World Centre, this provided an important focal point for academics and educational practitioners to meet and share the outputs of their research.

TEESNet and other organisations in the UK such as WCIA and Sazani Associates in Wales, developed online courses in aspects of Global Learning, funded through the Connecting Classrooms Through Global Learning (CCGL) programme, discussed below. These drew together teacher educators from across all four UK regions, highlighting significant interest in and examples of initiatives taking place in ITE even where policy support was lacking (especially England). More recently Oxfam has funded delivery of a course, Teach Climate Justice, for student teachers. The short-term nature of the CCGL and Oxfam funding means these courses were not sustainable.

A small number of universities are focusing increasingly on climate change education and supporting schools, encouraged by the Department for Education Sustainability and Climate Change Strategy, but it is not clear how this will be funded and supported across wider institutions.

In Wales, the Welsh Government continues to 'seed fund' ethically informed citizenship training (as aligned to the new curriculum) and some teacher education funding such as the International Education Programme.

## The Changing Political Context 2010 onwards The Global Learning Programme

Although the Coalition government in 2010 decided to end direct funding to civil society organisations on Development Education, there was still sufficient support, particularly by the civil servants, to have some form of programme going forward. There had been a recognition in the previous decade by all stakeholders that there was a need to move to a more strategic approach. The Enabling Effective Support programme had been a start in this direction, but its impact was varied. The strategies in the regions of England were all very different, reflecting strengths of civil society organisations and educational priorities. The programme had also aimed to promote a new model of engagement with schools based on unlocking existing local educational resources. The model was also influenced by the broader international development practice of enabling communities to develop in their own form, a bottom-up rather than a top-down process.

Following a lengthy consultation with all relevant bodies, a new strategic programme was launched in 2012 with the aim of increased and improved delivery of Development Education in 50% of state schools in the UK. Within each of the four nations of the UK, there were slightly different objectives relating to the specific national educational objectives. The terminology used also varied, with Global Learning being the dominant term, but in Wales and Scotland there was a recognition of the usage of the term global citizenship.

The five-year programmes were distinct from previous activity in that all included an in-built research component, providing funding for action research by teachers, a major focus on professional development of teachers and wherever possible passing on the leadership and direction to schools and teachers. Whilst this seemed a natural progression of the field, the downside particularly in England and Wales was the lack of capacity within supporting local and regional civil society organisations; there was no direct funding for them. Also, one of the great strengths of the field had been its highly regarded educational resources. This provided opportunities for innovation and creativity. With no funding for this area of the work, several local Development Education Centres either significantly reduced their activities or closed altogether.

The evidence produced from the programmes does however show significantly increased engagement by schools across the UK in learning about global themes. Although the programme lasted five years which gave opportunities for some ongoing activities, the direct funding for schools was short-term and the evidence of long-term impact is difficult to identify. What was significant however, and this was particularly the case in England and Northern Ireland from the evidence obtained, was the relatively successful impact of moving schools from thinking about global issues from a charitable perspective to one of social justice (Bourn, 2022; CGE, 2018).

The successes of the programme in Wales and Scotland were helped by the positive climate of the devolved administrations and curriculum bodies. In England, where there was little political education support, the Programme became very popular probably because it delivered something very different to what other bodies in government provided, with the latter focussing on school subjects, examinations and testing.

A feature of the programmes was building evidence from research. In each country there was participation from academics and researchers and a considerable body of material was produced which showed the ways in which schools engaged in global learning, the depth of support from teachers, and the challenges in ensuring ongoing support when there were conflicting priorities for schools (Bourn, 2022).

The evidence of impact in Northern Ireland showed considerable progress in teachers understanding of global and development issues. There was as a consequence greater pupil knowledge of concepts such as poverty, inequality, social justice and sustainable development (CGE, 2018).

There were some criticisms of the Programme, particularly the one in England and Wales, for involving private companies such as Pearson (Huckle, 2017) and a lack of real engagement from local DECAs. A negative outcome of this was that the bulk of funding went to Pearson, which brought in well-known figures from the Development Education movement but weakened long-term capacity building. But what is evident is that especially in terms of the professional development of teachers (Bentall, 2020), the programmes ensured increased level of understanding of Global Learning, allowing Global Learning to advance beyond one-off lessons and beyond the confines of subjects such as geography and citizenship.

McCloskey (2022, pp. 71–72), in reflecting on the strengths and weaknesses of the GLP, stated that it clearly helped to increase "the competence and confidence in delivering effective, critical Development Education to young people" but the action component often tended towards 'development as charity' activities.

## Connecting Classrooms Through Global Learning

In 2018 GLP ended and was replaced by the Connecting Classrooms Through Global Learning Programme which was administered by the British Council. This programme had a much stronger emphasis on supporting international school partnerships.

The Global Learning element was focused on professional development of teachers using the network of local DECs and some NGOs as the main providers. Whilst this programme had some success in engaging schools, it had nowhere near the breadth or depth of impact that the GLP had. It was also a global programme in terms of working with British Council offices in a range of countries with particular focus on Nepal, Kenya and Palestine that included promotion of school partnerships and training of teachers. It had far less funding and the lifetime of the programme coincided with the global pandemic which had a major impact on both professional development courses for teachers and international partnerships. There was also some funding for teacher-led research projects. The evaluation of the programme identified that its greatest impact was where schools participated in both training and international partnerships (Ipsos & Learn More, 2022). The level of support and engagement of policymakers varied from nation to nation depending on their interest in global learning themes. There was noticeable high-level support in Scotland and reasonable support in Wales and Northern Ireland but much less in England. The evidence gathered from school students showed that:

*Students demonstrated an increased understanding of global issues, increased empathy and an understanding of their similarities with other students in the UK and around the world, and their role and responsibilities in shaping the world. There was less evidence that they have built long-term relationships across boundaries with partner schools.*

(Ipsos & Learn More, 2022, p. 6)

There was also evidence that where there had been reciprocal visits between schools this had

*increased understanding of different teaching practices and challenged ingrained stereotypes. Teachers described how they could draw on these experiences in lessons and bring their teaching to life.*

(Ibid.)

The programme ended in 2022 and whilst the British Council continued supporting international partnerships there was no longer any form of direct funding from UK government for global learning.

## Decline of the Global Education Sector

The ending of the Global Learning Programme had already had a major impact on the field of Global Education. Whilst some local DEC's were able to receive a small amount of funding through the CGL programme, the coordinating bodies in Wales and England found it impossible to continue without core funding. Cyfanfyd had closed in 2015 in Wales and Think Global in England closed in 2018. Nevertheless, the Wales Alliance for Global Learning, an informal network coordinated by the Welsh Centre for International Affairs, emerged and has continued to play a leading role for the global learning in in Wales. In Scotland, IDEAS has survived because the Scottish Government supported themes such as global citizenship and Education for Sustainable Development and began to give a small annual grant to each of the local DEC's. This funding began in 2014. In Northern Ireland, a small number of Development Education providers has been sustained largely on the basis of support from Irish Aid, the arm of the Irish government responsible for ODA and Global Citizenship Education, the new preferred term for Global Learning. This decline in national funding had a major impact on the sector; while the decision of the UK to leave the European Union meant that there was no European source of funding for NGOs from 2018 onwards.

The leading development agencies became less inclined to support Global Education due to a combination of challenges in funding and policy re-alignments. Oxfam, Christian Aid, Save the Children and Action Aid significantly reduced their staffing and level of engagement in the field. Only CAFOD, the Roman Catholic development agency, and UNICEF UK could be said to be significantly resourcing the area in the early 2020s. For example, UNICEF UK's Rights Respecting Schools Programme receives funding in Scotland from the Scottish government. There has also been support for this programme from numerous local authorities in England and in 2024 the Mayor of London's office agreed to support all schools in Greater London engage with the award programme.

There was then a mixed picture across the UK for support to Global Education by 2024. In Wales despite severe funding constraints, Global Education and learning is embedded in revised curriculum, and Global Citizenship is a key indicator for the well-being of future generations. Curriculum materials make reference to fostering ethical and informed citizens of Wales and the World with themes that aim to show local, national, and global contexts.

In all four nations, because of the long-term impact of the work of both national and local organisations and programmes such as the GLP, there was a continued thirst for support for teachers on learning about global issues. Schools continued to seek support from organisations and there remained continued interest in a range of award programmes such as the Global Teacher Award and the Fairtrade School Award.

Scotland, as previously mentioned, is one area of the UK where Global Education and learning has broad political support. For example, global citizenship can be seen in the 2016 international development strategy. The Scottish Government in promoting its international development strategy emphasised the value of promoting global citizenship. The strategy stated that to enhance our global citizenship:

- By keeping good global citizenship at the very heart of our international development work for the “Common Weal”, an old Scots term meaning the collective wellbeing of all humanity.
- By taking a holistic “do no harm” approach to sustainable development, recognising that Scotland and the modern world are interdependent, and our choices and actions may have repercussions for people and communities locally, nationally and internationally.
- By inspiring communities and young people to realise their role as good global citizens in the wider world, passing on the baton to the next generation (Scottish Government, 2016, p. 9).

Anastasiadou, Moate and Heikkinen (2022) in their review of Global Citizenship within the Scottish Curriculum raised considerable criticisms particularly in terms of the overemphasis on individual action to the detriment of collective responsibility. Building on similar research and evidence by Swanson and Pashby (2016), they state that the Curriculum framework:

*Carries a futuristic agenda, shaped by economic rationalities influenced by neoliberalism, with an intrinsic tendency that focuses solely on national economic growth putting the global dimension aside.*  
(Anastasiadou et al., 2022, p. 398)

This evidence suggests that whilst Scotland remained a positive beacon of light for Global Education, there were still major challenges as to how it was being interpreted, supported and applied within the education system.

## Climate Change and Sustainability

The rise in interest in sustainability issues, especially climate change, has led to increased engagement in this area by educational bodies across the UK. The Sustainable Development Goals have had a profile within many educational bodies, although the UK government has been less direct in its engagement and promotion. This has included production of a range of resource packs for teachers. The World's Largest Lesson, an international education project that focuses on the Goals has been very popular in UK schools. In 2022 the English education ministry launched a strategy on climate change and sustainability education, which included some recognition of the desire for knowledge and engagement by young people in sustainability issues. There was particular mention of the importance of professional development for teachers, but the focus was mainly on the science subjects. Whilst the strategy noted a significant shift in UK government educational priorities, its priorities were focused on increased knowledge in specific subject areas, with a strong emphasis on increased understanding of the natural environment and the development of green skills. There was no mention of broader social justice issues or linking sustainability to broader educational goals identified at an international level including the SDGs (DFE, 2022).

This emphasis on sustainable development was clear in Scotland with global citizenship themes being seen as part of Learning for Sustainability programmes. In Wales, the knowledge, skills and values of Education for Sustainable Development and Global Citizenship (ESDGC) are now embedded throughout the Areas of Learning and Experience and the Progression Steps, as well as being reflected in the purpose of the curriculum to create ethical and informed citizens of Wales and the world. There remains no budget for implementation and teachers and schools are calling out for support in this area. Climate education can however be seen throughout the curriculum and there is professional development programme on anti-racism work called Diversity and Anti-Racist Professional Learning (DARPL) within which social justice is a strong theme.<sup>3</sup>



## Human Rights Education

An area across all nations of the UK which has becoming increasingly prominent within schools has been rights, particularly children's rights. One of the reasons for this, as mentioned, has been the leadership provided by UNICEF UK who have strategically invested in encouraging schools to join their programme. In both Wales and Scotland this support has been helped by children's rights being embedded within various legal provisions.

Also in Scotland, human rights has been a key cross curricula theme (BEMIS, 2011, p. 15; Scottish Government, 2010). But as Struthers (2015, p. 69) has commented, there is a lack of clear guidance on what this means in practice. What is noticeable however within the policies and statements by the Scottish government is that human rights are seen to be closely linked to the promotion of global citizenship (Daniels, 2018).

## Promoting the Sustainable Development Goals including Target 4.7

Although the Goals have not enjoyed the high public profile that they have had in some other countries, they have been used particularly in Scotland, to justify and support initiatives around Global Education. In England, a coalition of civil society organisations recognising the challenges of securing political support for sustainable development and global citizenship, came together in 2019 to develop a strategy and build bodies of evidence to demonstrate levels of engagement and support for areas such as Global Education (Bourn & Hatley, 2022). This report noted that the main barometer of progress on the SDGs has been the Statistical Index provided by the Office of National Statistics by UK government. Both the 2019 review (UK Government, 2019) and the one in 2021 (DFE, 2022) make only minimal reference to Global Education-type themes with references to school linking and one NGO initiative Send my Friend to School.

While slightly different terminology is used, ESD is prominent throughout the Welsh curriculum. The Wellbeing of Future Generations Act and 7 wellbeing goals are aligned with the SDGs, enshrining sustainable development in law and the language of public bodies in Wales. Reference is made to the idea that

all children and young people should be "ethical, informed citizens who are ready to be citizens of Wales and the world". In Scotland, the SDGs became the dominant frame of reference concerning Global Education. Their Learning for Sustainability programme which had been a curriculum entitlement since 2011 brought together global citizenship, outdoor learning, and sustainable development as a right for every child.

## Conclusion

The UK has clearly been a major player in the field of Global Education since the 1970s. Evidently, despite changing political priorities towards the area, there has been consistent engagement in issues such as global social justice, environment, human rights, sustainability and understanding of development in many areas of education. One of the great historical strengths of the UK has been its educational practice particularly through the activities of both local and national organisations. This civil society engagement has clearly been one of its strengths. There has also been at varying times important political support, particularly between 1997 and 2010 which has continued to have an impact within all sectors of education through the training and professional development of educators that took place during this period. What is also evident, and the UK is not alone in this, is that Education for Sustainable Development has had increased influence in part because of the importance of climate change but also because of the connections to the Sustainable Development Goals.

The UK's contribution to Global Education in Europe can be seen in a number of areas. Within the country the influence of leading academics from the work of Selby and Pike up to the more recent work of the DERC needs to be recognised. It is the Centre that still acts as the leading body in Europe for promoting research in the field. Not only does the Centre coordinate the ANGEL network, staff within the centre act as editor of the very successful *International Journal of Development Education and Learning*, a range of key publications such as the *Bloomsbury Handbook on Global Education and Learning* (Bourn, 2020) and organiser of regular webinars and events.

The ways in which civil society organisations work in partnership with both policymakers and practitioners has been another of the UK's main contributions to European Global Education. The influence of bodies such as Oxfam and the Curriculum for Global Citizenship and the numerous projects run by local DECS have resulted in the field having considerable influence within schools.

From being swayed by government funding to focussing on development themes, organisations at a local and national level have noticeably increased their engagement with projects that have a more local and broader social policy focus. For example, Centres have become involved in projects related to refugees and migrants, anti-racist work and gender equality.

Above all however it is within schools today that one could see the most lasting impact of Global Education. The majority of schools throughout the UK make reference in their curriculum to areas such as the Sustainable Development Goals, children's rights, cultural diversity and climate change. Whilst it may be difficult to identify the exact influence within a specific school of the Global Education field, what is clearly evident is that from being on the margins of education, as suggested by Ann McCollum in her doctoral research in 1996, Global Education themes are much more mainstream than they have ever been.

## References:

- Anastasiadou, E., Moate, J. and H L.T. Heikkinen. (2022). Examining how global citizenship education is prefigured in the Scottish Curriculum for Excellence. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, 20(3), 388–400.
- Andreotti, V. (2011). *Actionable Postcolonial Theory in Education*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Arnold, S. (1988). Constrained crusaders? British charities and development education. in *British Charities and Education, Education Network Project* (5–34). Falmer, Education Network Project.
- BEMIS. (2011). *Human Rights Education: Theory and practices*. Available online: [https://www.bemis.org.uk/PDF/hre\\_theory\\_and\\_practices.pdf](https://www.bemis.org.uk/PDF/hre_theory_and_practices.pdf)
- Bentall, C. (2020). Continuing Professional Development of Teachers of Global Learning: What Works. in Bourn, D. (ed.) *The Bloomsbury Handbook of Global Education and Learning* (pp. 356–368). Bloomsbury.
- Bentall, C. Bourn, D., McGough, H. & Spours, K. (2014). Global Learning for Global Colleges: creating opportunities for greater access to international learning for 16–25-year-olds. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 38(5), 621–640. Available online: [https://discovery.ucl.ac.uk/id/eprint/1474859/9/Bentall\\_GLGC%20article%20after%20second%20revision%20jan%202013%20with%20table%20accepted%20version.pdf](https://discovery.ucl.ac.uk/id/eprint/1474859/9/Bentall_GLGC%20article%20after%20second%20revision%20jan%202013%20with%20table%20accepted%20version.pdf)
- Bentall, C. Bourn, D. Blum, N. (2010). *Returned Volunteers and Engagement with Development: Final Report for VSO Longitudinal study*. Development Education Research Centre, Institute of Education, University College London: London, UK. Available online: <https://discovery.ucl.ac.uk/id/eprint/1474867/>
- Bevington, T. (2020). *The Beautiful Risk of Peace in Education: an application of the Everyday Peace Indicators methodology in four English secondary schools*. [Unpublished Ph.D. thesis]. University of Cambridge.
- Biccum, A. (2010). *Global Citizenship and the Legacy of Empire*. Routledge.
- BOND. (2015.) *UK Public Attitudes Towards Development Attitude Tracker Summary*. BOND.
- Bourn, D. (2008) Development Education: Towards a re-conceptualisation, *International Journal of Development Education and Global Learning*, 1(1), 5–22.
- Bourn, D. (2015). *The Theory and Practice of Development Education*. Routledge.
- Bourn, D. (2022). *Education for Social Change*. Bloomsbury.
- Bourn, D. & Hatley, J. (2022) *Target 4.7 of the Sustainable Development Goals: Evidence in Schools in England. Research for Our Shared World*. DERC Research Paper no. 22. UCL Institute of Education.
- Bourn, D., Hunt, F., & Bamber, P. (2017). A review of education for

- sustainable development and global citizenship education in teacher education. [UNESCO GEM Background Paper]. UNESCO. Available online: <https://discovery.ucl.ac.uk/id/eprint/10030831/>
- Bourn, D. and Cara, O. (2013). School Linking – Where Next? Partnership Models between Schools in Europe and Africa. DERC Research Paper No. 10. IOE. Available online: [https://discovery.ucl.ac.uk/id/eprint/1489790/1/bourn%20and%20cara%202013School%20linkingREPORT\\_ART.pdf](https://discovery.ucl.ac.uk/id/eprint/1489790/1/bourn%20and%20cara%202013School%20linkingREPORT_ART.pdf)
  - Bourn, D. and McCollum, A. (2001). *Measuring Effectiveness in Development Education*. DEA
  - Calvert, R. (2001). Meeting the Challenge of Creating Real Understanding. *The Development Education Journal*, 7(2), 22–23.
  - Centre for Global Education (CGE) (2018) *Research Into the impact of the Global Learning Programme in Northern Ireland, 2016–2017*, Belfast, Centre for Global Education.
  - Council of Environmental Education (CEE) (1993) *Annual Review of Environmental Education, 25 Years of environmental education*. CEE.
  - Daniels, S.J. (2018). Global Citizenship Education and Human Rights in Scottish education: An analysis of education policy, *Citizenship, Social and Economics Education*, Vol. 17(2), 85–99.
  - Darnton, A. (2006) 'Mass action and mass education: Make Poverty History in 2005', *Development Education Journal*, 12(2): 3–5.
  - DEA. (1996). *The Case for Development Education*. DEA
  - DEA. (2001). *Global Perspectives in Education*. DEA/Cyfanfyd/IDEAS.
  - DEA. (2005). *Annual Report*. London: DEA.
  - DEA. (2008). *Global Matters Learning – Case Studies*. London: DEA.
  - DELLS. (2006). *Education for Sustainable Development and Global Citizenship: A Strategy for Action*. [DELLS Information Document No: -17-06]. Welsh Assembly Government.
  - DELLS (2006) *Education for Sustainable Development and Global Citizenship: a strategy for action*. Department for Education, Lifelong Learning and Skills.
  - Department for Education. (2021). *DfE Outcome Delivery Plan, 2021–2022*. HMSO
  - Department for Education. (2022). *Sustainability and Climate Change: a strategy for the education and children's system services*. DFE
  - DfES. (2005a). *Putting the World into World Class Education*. DfES.
  - DfES. (2005b). *Sustainable Development Action Plan*. DfES.
  - DFID. (1998). *Building Support for Development*. DFID.
  - DFID. (2003). *Development Awareness Fund: Guidelines and Procedures 2004/5*. DFID.
  - DFID. (2003). *Enabling Effective Support*. DFID
  - DFID. (2006). *Making Governance Work for the Poor*. HMSO.
  - Fisher, S. and D. Hicks. (1985). *World Studies 8–13 – A Teacher's Handbook*. Oliver and Boyd.

- Fyson, N.L. (1984). *The Development Puzzle (7<sup>th</sup> edition)*. Hodder & Stoughton.
- Gadsby, H. and A. Bullivant. (eds.) (2010). *Global Learning and Sustainable Development*. Routledge.
- Gerber, R. (1990) Geography in Australian Education. *Geo Journal*, 20(1), 15–234.
- Gough, A.G. (1992). Sustaining Development of Environmental Education in National Political and Curriculum Priorities. *Australian Journal of Environmental Education*, 8, 115–131.
- Graves, J. (2002). Developing a Global Dimension in the curriculum. *The Curriculum Journal*. 13(3), 303–31.
- Greig, S., Pike, G. and Selby, D. (1987). *Earthrights: Education as of the Planet Really Mattered*. World Wildlife Fund and Kogan Page.
- Hammond, B. (2002). 'DFID's invisible hand: a challenge to development education?' [unpublished dissertation for MA]. UEA.
- Harrison, D. (2008). *Oxfam and the rise of development education in England from 1959 to 1979*. [unpublished PhD, Institute of Education]. University of London.
- Hicks, D. (2003). Thirty years of global education. *Education Review*. 55(3), 265–275.
- Hicks, D. (2004). Global Education: what does it mean? In Kent, A. and A. Morgan (eds.) *The Challenge of the Global Dimension in Education: Lecture series 1* (pp. 3–12). IOE.
- Huckle, J. (2017). Becoming Critical: A challenge for the Global Learning Programme?. *International Journal of Development Education and Global Learning*, vol.8(3), 63–84.
- Hudson, D. and J. van Heerde-Hudson. (2010). 'A Mile Wide and an Inch Deep': Surveys of Public Attitudes Towards Development Aid. *International Journal of Development Education and Global Learning*, 4(1), 5–24.
- Hunt, F. (2017). *Schools for Future Youth Evaluation Report: Developing young people as active global citizens*. DERC Research Report 17. UCL Institute of Education.
- IPSOS and Learn More. (2022). *Connecting Classrooms Through Global Learning – Evaluation of Impacts*. British Council.
- Kirby, B. (ed.). (1994). *Education for Change: Grassroots Development Education in Europe*. DEA.
- Lambert, D. and Balderstone, D. (2000). *Learning to Teach Geography in the Secondary School*. Routledge.
- Leonard, A. (2008). Global School Relationships: school linking and modern challenges, in Bourn, D. (ed.) *Development Education: Debates and Dialogues* (pp. 65–98). Institute of Education.
- LTS. (2007). *The Global Dimension in the Curriculum: Educating the global citizens*. Learning and Teaching Scotland.
- Lowe, B. (2008). Research Reports: Embedding Global Citizenship in

Primary and Secondary Schools: developing a methodology for measuring attitudinal change. *International Journal of Development Education and Global Learning*, 1(1), 59–64.

- Mannion, G., Bietsa, G., Priestley, M., H. Ross. (2014). The Global Dimension in Education and Education for Global Citizenship in Andreotti, V.(ed.) *The Political Economy of Global Citizenship Education* (134–147). Routledge.
- McCloskey, S. (2022). *Global Learning and International Development in The Age of Neoliberalism*. Routledge.
- McCollum, A. (1996). *On the margins? An analysis of the theory and practice of development education in the 1900s*. [PhD thesis]. Open University.
- McGough, H. and Hunt, F. (2012). *The Global Dimension: A Practical Handbook for Teacher Educators*. DERC. London: IOE. Available online: <https://discovery.ucl.ac.uk/id/eprint/1474180/>
- Marshall, H. (2007). 'Global education in perspective: fostering a global dimension in an English secondary school'. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 37(3), 355–374.
- Murdan, S., Blum, N., Francis, S., Slater, E., Alem, N., Munday, M., Taylor, J. and Smith, F. (2014). *The Global Pharmacist*. UCL School of Pharmacy and the Development Education Research Centre, Institute of Education, University of London. Available online: <https://discovery.ucl.ac.uk/id/eprint/1475338/1/Global%20Pharmacist%20-%20FINAL.pdf>
- Norcliffe, D. and Bennell, S. (2011). Analysis of views on the development of Education for Sustainable Development and Global Citizenship policy in Wales. *International Journal of Development Education and Global Learning*, 3(1), 39–58.
- Ohri, A. (1997). *The World in Our Neighbourhood*. DEA.
- Osler, A (ed.) (1994). *Development Education*. Cassell.
- Peterson, A. and P. Warwick (2015). *Global Learning and Education*. Routledge.
- Osler, A. and Vincent, K. (2002). *Citizenship and the Challenge of Global Education*. Trentham Books.
- Oxfam. (2006). *Education for Global Citizenship*. Oxfam.
- Palmer, J. and P. Neal. (1994). *The Handbook of Environmental Education*. Routledge.
- Pike, G. and Selby, D. (1988). *Global Teacher, Global Learner*. Hodder & Stoughton.
- Pradervand, P. (1982). Would you please empty your teacup? Epistemological and conceptual aspects of development education. *International Review of Education*. 28(1), 449–455.
- Qualification and Curriculum Authority. (2008). *The Global Dimension in Action*. QCA.
- Richardson, R. (1976). *Learning for Change in World Society*. World Studies Project.
- Richardson, R. (1985). Elephant Education: A cautionary tale. in Fisher, S.

- and D. Hicks, *World Studies 8–13 – A Teacher’s Handbook*. Oliver and Boyd.
- Scott-Baumann, A., Holden, C., Clough, C. and Hicks, D. (2003) The Global Dimension in Education. *The Development Education Journal*, 10(1), 15–18.
  - Scruton, R. (1985). *World studies: education or indoctrination*. Institute for Defence and Strategic Studies.
  - Short, C. (1999). *Education and Our Global Future*. [speech by Clare Short at the annual conference of Secondary Heads Association]. DFID.
  - Steiner, M. (ed.) (1996). *Developing the Global Teacher*. Trentham Books.
  - Steiner, M. (1993). *Learning from Experience- world studies in the primary curriculum*. Trentham Books.
  - Sterling, S. (1992). *Good Earth-Keeping, Education, Training and Awareness for a Sustainable Future*. UNEP-UK.
  - Sterling S. and Huckle, J. (eds.) (1996). *Education for Sustainability*. Earthscan.
  - Struthers, A. (2015). Human Rights Education: Educating about, through and for human rights. *International Journal of Human Rights*, 19(1), 53–73.
  - Swanson, D., and K. Pashby. (2016). Towards a Critical Global Citizenship? A Comparative Analysis of GC Education. Discourses in Scotland, and Alberta. *Journal of Research in Curriculum and Instruction*, 20, 184–195.
  - Scottish Government. (2016). *Global Citizenship: Scotland’s International Development Strategy*. Available online: <https://www.gov.scot/binaries/content/documents/govscot/publications/strategy-plan/2016/12/global-citizenship-scotlands-international-development-strategy/documents/00512161-pdf/00512161-pdf/govscot%3Adocument/00512161.pdf>
  - Verulam Associates. (2009). *Review of Building Support for Development*. DFID.
  - UK Government. (2019). *Voluntary National Review of progress towards the Sustainable Development Goals*. Available online: [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/818212/UKVNR-web-accessible1.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/818212/UKVNR-web-accessible1.pdf)
  - VSO. (2002). *The Live Aid Legacy*. VSO.
  - Weber, N. (2012). *A comparative study of the shifting nature of international non- government organisation global education programming in Canada and the United Kingdom*. [unpublished PhD thesis]. University of Toronto.
  - Warwick, I., Costa, F., & Bourn, D. (2015). *Makutano Junction Project – Research Evaluation Report*. UCL Institute of Education. Available online: <https://iris.ucl.ac.uk/iris/publication/1114909/1>
  - Wroe, M., Doney, M. (2004). *The Rough Guide to a Better World*. DFID.

<sup>1</sup> This chapter has been produced with the input and comments from Nicole Blum, Andrea Bullivant, Charlotte Dwyer, Harm Jan-Fricke, Cathryn MacCallum, Stephen McCloskey, Scott Sinclair, and Susie Ventrisfield.

<sup>2</sup> <https://globaldimension.org.uk>

<sup>3</sup> <https://darpl.org>