

**TOWARDS AN AFRICAN PERSPECTIVE**



**EXPLORING CHALLENGES  
AND CONSIDERATIONS FOR  
DEVELOPMENT EDUCATORS**

**Research Commissioned By Africa Centre Ireland  
Researcher: Dr. Caroline Murphy**

# Towards an African Perspective

## Exploring Challenges and Considerations for Development Educators

Research Commissioned by Africa Centre Ireland

Researcher: Dr Caroline Murphy

## **Table of Contents**

### **Chapter 1 Reviewing Development Education**

1.1 Development Education and its Theoretical Roots.....	9
1.2 Global Education and its associations with Development Education.....	12
1.3 A Word on the use of the term Oppression.....	15
1.4 Media, Racial Stereotypes and Representations of the Poor.....	16
1.5 NGO Charity Advertising.....	19
1.6 Towards Defining an African Perspective.....	24
1.7 Summary and Research Aims.....	25

### **Chapter 2 Theoretical and Methodological Considerations**

2.1 Theoretical Considerations.....	27
2.2 Methodological Considerations.....	30
Design and Participants.....	30
Ethics.....	31
The Case for Qualitative Analysis.....	32
Procedure.....	33
2.3 Summary.....	34

### **Chapter 3 Findings and Analysis**

3.1 A Word on Data Analysis.....	36
3.2 Defining Development Education, the Terminology we Use and What We Do.....	37
3.3 Community Development.....	56
3.4 Civilised oppression and oppression: challenges for Development Educators in <i>acting otherwise</i> .....	58
Challenging the Charity Model of Development.....	59
Challenges in Relation to Funding Bodies.....	73
Challenges in Relation to Formal Education.....	76

3.5 Defining the African Perspective in Development Education and if it is applied to our work.....	81
3.6 Networking Beyond this Research.....	93
3.7 The Collapsed Themes.....	96

**Chapter 4 Discussion and Recommendations: Towards an African Perspective in Development Education**

4.1 Research Overview, with Limitations and Strengths.....	97
<i>Research Limitations</i> .....	98
<i>Research Strengths</i> .....	98
4.2 Safe Development Education.....	99
4.3 Radical Development Education.....	102
4.4 Defining and Positioning Ourselves.....	104

<b>References</b> .....	109
-------------------------	-----

<b>Appendices</b> .....	115
Appendix 1.....	115
Appendix 2.....	116
Appendix 3.....	119
Appendix 4.....	121

## **Abstract**

The aim of this project was to explore if, and how, Development Educators, on the island of Ireland, define and incorporate an African perspective within their work. The researcher sought to understand an African perspective within Development Education in line with postcolonialism, which was synthesised with Giddens' structuration theory together with Freire's 'Pedagogy of the Oppressed'. Overall, this theoretical framework was drawn upon to investigate the extent to which Development Education can be considered overtly political and radical, and challenge notions of White cultural supremacy that might exist, perhaps within the media portrayal of Africa, development NGOs, the formal education sector, and various funding bodies. This project was also designed to provide an overview of Development Education practice in Ireland, and to explore why Development Educators draw on a range of terminologies, such as Global Education or Development Education, to conceptualise their work. Subsequently, the extent to which such terminologies can, again, be considered overtly political and radical, and embed an African perspective, was explored and analysed.

This study comprised of conducting small group semi-structured interviews with fifteen Development Educators. Seven participants are based in Northern Ireland, and the remaining eight in Southern Ireland. Of the overall fifteen, five are male and ten are female, and four are based in ethnic minority led organizations. The remaining participants are based in various development NGOs. In this respect, this study is very small scale, and the researcher does not claim that the findings can be considered representative of the overall population of Development Educators based in Ireland. It nevertheless was an adequate sample to allow for consideration of variation according to the full range of factors presented above.

It was found that the participants need to grapple with the terminology they use, to clearly situate it within critical pedagogy and academic discourse, and highlight the implications of the usage of specific terms in relation to the extent it might limit, or maximise, embedding an African perspective within their work. It was also found that participants feel constrained by funding bodies, development NGOs, media and charitable representations of the poor, and the formal education sector, which purport the practice of 'Safe Development Education', which relegates Development Education to terms and action that promotes AID, Fair Trade and the MDGs. Thus, this limits the possibility of being overtly political and radical through action that addresses structural inequalities that perhaps have manifested from colonialism, and therefore, again, limits the capacity of embedding an African perspective in Development Education.

However, it was also found that the participants of this study show evidence that they are eager to network across the island of Ireland, in order to address all of the issues inherent in this research, and to continue working towards embedding an African perspective within their work.

This project also produced convincing data to help begin to address the lack of knowledge in Development Education research, and subsequently recommended steps to kick start larger scale projects, and further theoretical debates in relation to the movement of Development Education.

## **List of Abbreviations**

AFRI	Action From Ireland
CADA	The Coalition of Aid and Development Agencies
CGE	Centre For Global Education
DAF	Development Awareness Fund
DEA	Development Education Association
DOCHAS	The Irish Association of Non Government Development Organisations
DFID	Department for International Development
ECA	Ethnographic Content Analysis
IDEA	Irish Development Education Association
MDGs	Millennium Development Goals
NGO	Non Government Organisations
IMF	International Monetary Fund

## Chapter 1

### Reviewing Development Education

This chapter presents an overview of Development Education, and its theoretical roots. It argues that Development Educators should make more explicit how this theoretical underpinning informs their use of terminology, and subsequent practice. It is argued that Development Education is considered to be overtly political, radical, and should work to expose systems of oppression. Oppression is defined in terms of the global oppression of White cultural supremacy which leads to global injustices, and it is also defined as the civilised oppression which is evident in practices and systems, such as the media, that serve to ensure the reproduction of global inequality. It is suggested that Development Educators may be located in practices and systems, such as formal education and development NGOs, that serve to reproduce civilised oppression, and therefore it is essential that they make it explicit as to how they pose to be overtly political and radical within systems that perhaps reproduce assumptions of cultural supremacy. Drawing on the overall discussion, a definition of an African perspective in Development Education is offered as an initial framework to guide the study, and the aims of the study are set in context of the considerations presented in this chapter.

#### 1.1 Development Education and its Theoretical Roots

‘Development Education seeks to develop the necessary knowledge, skills and attitudes required so that people can participate actively in their own development and in the development of local and global communities (Ruane, 2000). It aims to awaken in people the need for action for justice (Tormey, 2003), and ultimately focuses ‘on social justice, human rights, poverty and inequality locally, nationally and internationally’ (Tormey, 2003, quoted in McCormack and O’Flaherty, 2010, p1333).

Irish Aid defines Development Education as,

An educational process aimed at increasing awareness and understanding of the rapidly changing interdependent and unequal world in which we live. It seeks to engage people in analysis, reflection, and action for local and global citizenship and participation. It is about supporting people in understanding, and in acting to transform the social, cultural, political and economic structures which affect the lives of others at personal, community, national and international levels (quoted in Khoo, 2006, p28).

The British based Development Education Association (DEA) view Development Education as helping people to gain an understanding of the wider world, and to encourage them to make connections between their own lives and issues of, for example, poverty and climate change (quoted in McCormack and O’Flaherty, 2010, p1333).

Ultimately, despite various definitions, Development Education aims to develop ‘critical thinking skills, analytical skills, empathetic capacity and the ability to be an effective person who can take action to achieve desired development outcomes’ (Tormey, 2003, quoted in McCormack and O’Flaherty, 2010, p1333). Development Education is interested in moving beyond simple understanding and knowledge to a process of thinking critically and active citizenship. Hence, it might be said that Development Education has roots in critical pedagogy. ‘Critical pedagogy is the label under which much social change education locates itself (Choules, 2007, p160). In essence, critical pedagogy encourages thinking critically in relation to socio-political lived experiences. ‘In this sense, critical pedagogy is grounded in the moral imperative of exposing systems of oppression’ (Alexander, 2005, p425). Critical pedagogy, therefore, could be considered to be compatible with Freirean liberation theory. Freire believes education that promotes critical thinking has a role to play in liberating people from oppression, and bringing about social transformation. ‘To be critical is, for Freire, not merely an option but an ontological vocation for all human beings’ (quoted in Roberts, 1999, p20).

In fact, ‘Freirean liberation theory underpins Development Education (Hogan & Tormey, 2008), promoting problem-based learning, dialogue and participation within a co-operative learning environment where the teacher engages in learning with the student, and the student engages with other students in addition to learning with the teacher’ (quoted in Chaib, 2010, p42). For Freire, human beings have ‘the capacity for creative thinking and, hence, potentially at least, the capacity to transform rather than merely adapt to reality’ (Blackburn, 2000, p5). In this respect, Freire is very much concerned with enabling people to think critically, in order to bring about social transformation. Indeed, Development Education strives to enable people to think critically, expose systems of oppression, and bring about socio-political transformation. Thus, it is such education, according to Freire, that is ‘capable of empowering students to respond thoughtfully to the social controls that undergird oppression’ (quoted in Van Gorder, 2007, p10).

Freire, however, argues against formal education, as he believes it to be an instrument for oppression. For Freire, such an education reduces children to passivity where they become ‘receptacles to be filled by the teacher’ (quoted in Cho and Lewis, 2006, p316). In other words, children are

reduced to empty vessels, whereby teachers deliver facts that students are expected to memorise. He terms such an education as *banking education*. 'Banking education, then, as Freire understands it, acts as a pillar maintaining an oppressive social order: the more students put their efforts into receiving and storing information deposited in them, the less they can attain the critical consciousness that comes from intervening in reality as makers and transformers of the world' (quoted in Blackburn, 2000, p6).

Therefore, rather than children remaining passive in the classroom, Freire argues for a dialogic form of education. Teachers, according to Freire, should pose authentic problems to their students, and subsequently enter into a dialogue with the students on how to solve such problems. He believes that teachers should inspire emancipatory knowledge that will enable students to better understand the world, and equip them to transform socio-political injustices. Subsequently, 'students, as they are increasingly faced with problems relating to themselves in the world and with the world, will feel increasingly challenged and obliged to respond to that challenge' (Freire, 1973, p54). In other words, this problem posing method facilitates a critical consciousness that challenges and encourages children to question their socio-political world. As Freire would argue, such a critical consciousness means reading the world as well as the word. Moreover, the problem posing method provides the means whereby students can enter into a dialogue with their teachers and become 'active agents engaged in the discovery and development of their own knowledge' (Smith-Maddox and Solorzano, 2002, p70). For Freire, this might encourage children to take on an active role in their lives, and transform their socio-political society. In this respect, 'action and reflection, theory and practice come together in what Freire calls praxis, an intersection that allows for the creation of human agency in which students and teachers become active subjects that can transform reality and create change' (Swartz, 1998, p168).

Indeed, as mentioned, Development Education is very much influenced by Freirean philosophy. For Development Education, as with Freire, dialogue can create critical awareness, and bring about action for socio-political change. As with Freire, Development Education has an anti-didactic stance towards formal education. In fact, 'central to the philosophy of Development Education is a student centred pedagogy, which places the student at the heart of the educational experience and ultimately Development Education should be about teaching differently rather than teaching more' (Haran & Tormey, 2002, quoted in McCormack and O'Flaherty, 2010, p1333). Indeed, Development Educators promote an anti-didactic stance by drawing on active participatory learning methodologies.

Ultimately, like Freire, Development Education is concerned with anti-didactic education methods to enable people to take an active role against oppression in order to bring about socio-political transformation. Development Education, then, located within this framework, might be considered an overtly political and radical movement.

As discussed below, however, there are questions as to the extent Development Education can bring about political and radical change, since it is becoming increasingly associated with the formal education sector.

## **1.2 Global Education and its associations with Development Education**

In recent years, Global Education has found a curricular mandate to increase ‘knowledge of foreign affairs, languages, and societies in a world of growing interdependence, and the way that a new commitment to global education might redress this serious gap between the global north and south’ (key documents include’ Council on International Educational Exchange, 1988; National Advisory Board on International Education Programs, 1983). Subsequently, many NGO Development Educators have been making efforts to work closely with the formal education sector ‘to provide resources and train teachers and this work has become more widespread in recent years’ (quoted in Bailey, 2010, p 59). In fact, many Development Educators prefer to use the term Global Education, Global Learning or Global Citizenship (see Bourn, 2009, p1).

However, there is a lack of academic debate as to why Development Educators draw on these varied terminologies to conceptualise their work. Furthermore, it is clear, from reading academic literature, that the term Development Education is not ‘well known within academic research and debate’ (Bourn, 2009, p8). Nevertheless, curriculum changes within education, in relation to Local and Global citizenship teaching, has resulted in a surge of academic literature in relation to the role of education in bringing about socio-political transformation through citizenship teaching. For example, in relation to understanding identity, ‘education for cosmopolitan citizenship is a concept that has been developed by Osler and Starkey (2002, 2003, 2005) in the context of their research with young people in Leicester and in South Africa’ (quoted in Starkey, 2008, p8). However, research conducted by Pykett (2007) claims that ‘multiculturalism is overdone in schools and that there is absolutely nothing political about citizenship education’ (quoted in Starkey, 2008, p6).

In this respect, it could be argued that Development Educators, particularly due to their increasing affiliation with the formal education sector and citizenship teaching, need to contribute to aca-

demic research and debate, and justify the terms they use to conceptualise their work. After all, Development Education is considered to be Freirean, overtly political and radical. Hence, this should raise the question as to how Development Educators propose to bring a radical perspective within a formal educational framework that might be considered to be structured within a system that perpetuates a divide between the global north and south, and subsequently promotes White Western supremacy. For example, Young (2010) points to the danger of, what she terms, two-worlds concepts in global learning.

From a teaching point of view, using a two-worlds concept as a basis has a tendency to lead to a focus on difference between ‘us’ and ‘them’. Making lists of opposites is always an easy teaching technique. However, using a two worlds lens can lead to activities such as ‘we live like this so how do you think they live?’ with the assumption being that it will be the opposite. It tends to lead to an idea of a homogenous and exotic other. Education needs to move beyond focusing on difference between ‘two worlds’ and recognise diversity within countries and similarities between people from a range of countries (Young, 2010, p101).

A further study carried out by Andreotti (2009), examined notions of poverty and development in one of England’s key curricular documents, using a post-colonial framework for analysis. ‘Broadly speaking, postcolonialism is a theoretical framework which makes visible the history and legacy of European colonialism, including the ways in which the wealth of the global North has been acquired and maintained through a history of exploitation, and examines how it continues to shape contemporary discourses and institutions (Rizvi, Lingard & Lavia, 2006, quoted in Bryan, 2008, p16). From such a perspective, Andreotti found that the document, ‘Developing a Global Dimension in the School Curriculum’ (GDGSC), has assumptions of White cultural supremacy where it emphasises ‘poverty or helplessness of the other, resulting from a lack of development, education, resources, skills, knowledge, culture or technology’ (Andreotti, 2009, p59). Indeed, such an emphasis ignores the legacy of structural inequality and exploitation caused by imperialism. Therefore, ‘from a postcolonial perspective, a logical implication is the reinforcement of stereotypes and, potentially, racism in, ironically, precisely the policy issues that aim to address these issues’ (Andreotti, 2009, p62). Moreover, it might be added, that ironically, from a postcolonial perspective, Development Educators, in their affiliation with the formal education sector, are located in a system that is potentially contributing to the reinforcement of cultural supremacy, which runs counter to the whole notion of being overtly political and radical. In this respect, Development Educators need to make it explicit as to how they pose to be overtly political and radical within an education system that perhaps reproduces assumptions of cultural supremacy.

In relation to the formal education sector, a further study carried out by Bryan (2008) analysed how the notion of development was constructed in texts for lower secondary school students in the Republic of Ireland. She found that ‘often contradictory meanings of development are at play in school texts, some of which rely on more traditional modernisationist and development-as-charity frameworks, while others draw on narratives which focus attention on the need for structural change, based on a reformulation of the global North’s political-economic relationship with so-called developing nations’ (Bryan, 2008, p75). Bryan argues that her findings raise questions about the portrayal of development within the curriculum which reinforce division between the global north and south, trivialise poverty, and lack an emancipatory knowledge.

In fact, ‘Global Education, with its emphasis on critical literacy, is supposed to empower’ (see Blaney, 2002, p268). However, from a postcolonial perspective, it could be argued that Global Education is becoming a method to simply empower our students as participants in the interpretation of global inequality between those of us in the *developed* North who believe our role is to know, think critically and act for the rest of the world, and those from the global South that we perpetually treat as objects of study and action. Again, so be it at a critical literacy level, this serves to reinforce the divide between the *haves* and the *have nots*, and by disempowering students relative to the rest of the world, we also decrease their capacity to engage in dialogue with the developing world, and create a genuine sense of shared solidarity with the global south (see Blaney, 2002, p268).

Ultimately, given all of the above debates, Development Educators need to make explicit their choice of terminology, reasons for being affiliated with the formal education sector, and how they propose to be overtly political and radical, and challenge notions of White cultural supremacy that may exist, perhaps as a *hidden curriculum* within the formal education system. A study carried out by Gleeson *et al* (2007) ‘revealed that school is the second most important source of information for students on the developing world, after the media’ (Bryan, 2008, p 64). Given the stereotypical media representations of the poor (see 1.4) it is further argued that it is essential that Development Educators work with teachers and students to embed Development Education within the curriculum from a postcolonial perspective. ‘Exposed to development issues through a postcolonial lens, students will be empowered with the skills, values and understanding needed to challenge the perception that the developing world is continually in need of saving or intervention, and that we in the global North have all the solutions’ (Andreotti, 2006, quoted in Bryan, 2008, p76). In fact, ‘as Andreotti convincingly argues in her PhD thesis (Andreotti, 2006), one research dimension that is yet to be fully explored in its added value for Development Education is that of postcolonial theory. In order to advance the theoretical grounding of Development Education, post-

colonial theory should be seen as both a method and a tool for a critical examination of existing notions of cultural supremacy and Eurocentrism' (quoted in Fiedler, 2008, p10).

Hence, it is argued that Development Educators need to make explicit how their theoretical framework underpins their practice, and as Andreotti (2006) argues, perhaps Development Educators should draw on postcolonial theory to contribute to academic debate and research on advancements in Development Education. Maybe, only then, will Development Education gain a foothold in academic research and debate, and provide evidence as to how their work is Freirean, political and radical, and how it exposes systems of oppression to bring about socio-political transformation in relation to global inequalities.

### **1.3 A Word on the use of the term Oppression**

Garvin (1987) defines oppression as 'the destructive effects of social institutions on people, when such institutions damage their identities, denigrate their lifestyles, and deny them access to opportunities' (quoted in Proctor *et al*, 2008, p44). Such a definition suggests extreme authoritarian institutional and social control over agency. Indeed, such control was evident during colonial exploitation, and can be argued to be continuing today through 'globalisation (the integration, to varying degrees, of all countries into a single world system) which shows remarkable continuity with colonialism...the attempt of the great powers to take over the wealth and raw materials of the world (Seabrook, 2009, p63), or, as Asante puts it, 'the globalizing ethos of White corporate capital that leads ultimately, it seems to me, to another form of enslavement and domination' (Asante, 2006, p654). Subsequently, global poverty, third world debt, unfair trade laws etc, are not a consequence of a lack of rich resources but are a result of the oppressive economic control of the rich countries. In relation to this research, it cannot be said that there exists such a level of oppression over the people who the Development Educators work with, for instance, teachers, students, youth groups etc. However, it might be argued that there exists a level of, what Harvey (1999) terms *civilised oppression*, which is oppression 'embedded in unquestioned norms, habits and symbols, in the assumptions underlying institutions and rules, and the collective consequences of following those rules' (quoted in Deutsch, 2006, p10). Indeed, it might be argued that civilised oppression, perhaps here in the global North is linked to the reproduction of more extreme oppression in the global South. Therefore, in using the term *civilised oppression*, in the context of this research, the researcher is referring to everyday norms, habits and symbols, systems and practices which may act as a prerequisite to maintain the more extreme oppression of the developing world. Therefore, both terms *civilised oppression*, and *oppression*, will be used in these contexts throughout the research report.

## 1.4 Media, Racial Stereotypes and Representations of the Poor

One system of, perhaps, civilised oppression that Development Educators aim to expose is the stereo-typical images and messaging that the media use to represent the developing world. ‘Much has been written and analysed on the theme of media images and the Third World, but it seems the media are, as David Cromwell and David Edwards claim (2005), unable or unwilling to tell the truth about the real causes of the problems facing us especially the underlying structural causes’ (quoted in Mahadeo and McKinney, 2007, p 14). Subsequently, the public are presented with, and therefore consume, stereotypical racial images and representations of the poor.

This is considered to be highly challenging for Development Educators, since Kellner (1995) assert that ‘media images help shape our view of the world and our deepest values: what we consider good or bad, positive, or negative, moral or evil’ (quoted in Glenn and Cunningham, 2009, p136). Thus, through *arm chair* viewing, the public are presented with media images and messages that perhaps serve to promote the White western culture as superior to the developing world. Indeed, ‘Edward Herman and Naom Chomsky’s *Manufacturing Consent*, show how the media convey information that largely promotes the power of the privileged’ (Fuller, 1993, p103).

In fact, through film, it is evident that media images present racial stereotypes as inferior to Whites. For example, representations are presented of Uncle Tom or the magical Negro with mystical powers who is there to assist his White hero, and hence promote the power of the privileged (see Glenn and Cunningham, 2009). Entman and Rojecki (2001) note that ‘the White character’s dilemma not the Black character’s gifts or spirituality serve as the primary focus in these films’ (quoted in Glenn and Cunningham, 2009, p138). Such stereotypes serve to promote Black characters as existing on the peripheral of the White characters’ experiences, and therefore reinforcing White supremacy which, might be argued, have stemmed from the colonial oppression. Welch (1987) argues that,

colonialism is by definition the institutional form whereby a nation exploits the riches and the labour of the people of another nation, holding back the social, economic and cultural progress of the latter for its own benefit. It is inherent in the system of colonialism to consider the inhabitants of the colonies as inferior beings, as uncivilised and primitive natives, lacking the social and cultural accomplishments of the Christian man of the West (quoted in Carey and Raciborski, 2004, p199).

Indeed, racial stereotypes of the black woman include images that reduce her to either mammy or jezebel. On the one hand the mammy is portrayed as being overweight with no sexuality and subservient to her white counterparts. The jezebel, on the other hand, is portrayed as having a highly sexualised appetite (see Brown *et al* 2005, Collins 2000, Davis 1983). Such ‘stereotypes act as

cognitive constructs that help people to explain phenomena related to their understanding of groups' (McGarty, Yzerbyt and Spears, 2002, quoted in Nunnally, 2009, p253). Although stereotypes can be either positive or negative, they historically have had a malignant effect on the characterization of Blacks, Latinos, Asian Americans, and American Indians, in part, because they 'otherize them as being inferior in comparison to Whites' (Pickering, 2001, quoted in Nunnally, 2009, p 253).

'For that reason, the media serve as a system of racialization in that they have historically been used to perpetuate the dominant culture's perspective and create a public forum that defines and shapes ideas concerning race and ethnicity' ( Littlefield, 2008, p677). Again, such a perspective could be seen to come from colonial attitudes of positioning the colonised as the *other* with the 'idea of the West as white, Christian, rational, civilized, modern, sexually disciplined, and the colonised as irrational, uncivilized, pre-modern, libidinous, licentious, effeminate and child-like...the European as superior, as having the positive *duty* to govern and civilize' (Rattansi, 2010, p482).

It could be argued that such *duty* to govern and civilize has become a *duty* to develop, and thus, we have a charitable instinct towards people from the developing world, where we view the developing world as dependent on our charity and aid.

We see mainly images of the starving child, Aids and disease; no traders except poor ones eking out a living; little education; no police except as enforcers of harsh regimes and mostly Africans as having no agency. They are basically bystanders in their own affairs, depending on our beneficence as benign aiding dispensing Westerners. This situation amounts to a continuation of colonial ideologies of the African Other. This can work to reinforce a power relation between the west and Africa that, by prioritising aid, masks the gross inequalities that keep a majority of the world's population in poverty (Dodd, 2005, quoted in Mahadeo and McKinney, 2007, p18).

Therefore, with the media, through civilised oppression, largely *branding* the developing world as 'existing in a permanent state of doom and gloom' (Mac Donnell et al, 2003, p16), it could be said that the general public continue to view the developing world in terms of *charity*, which is negatively related to concern for the developing world constructed around *servicing out help*, in pursuit of self-interest' (see Heerde and Hudson, 2010, p397). This approach presupposes that there will always be those who have and those who have not' (quoted in Renner et al, 2010, p44). In terms of development, it might be argued that, due to the *doom and gloom* media representation of the

developing world, *those who have* feel obliged, and have a self-interest, to share their standard of living with *those who have not*. As Seabrook puts it,

when the poverty of the world appears in the hectic media schedules of the rich, it does so as an appeal to their charitable instincts, to write a check, to sponsor a child, to make a life better. The appeal to a genuine and heartfelt altruism dissolves into the expectations of sentimentality – the fundamental relationships between privilege and poverty remain unchanged (Seabrook, 2009, p 21)

In other words, focusing on the *doom and gloom* of the *victim*, and ignoring the structural causes of poverty, a genuine sense of shared community and solidarity between the global north and south is ‘unlikely to evolve’ ( see Gil 1998; Gorski 2007; Kivel 2000), and post-colonial oppression and notions of White supremacy are likely to prevail.

In an attempt to counter the *doom and gloom* portrayal of the developing world, Development Educators, based in NGOs and other organisations, strive to foster a critical perspective on the structural causes of poverty, and expose the stereotypical media representations of the poor. They aim to create a sense of shared citizenship between the global north and south to inspire a global agency who will take action for social change, rather than simply continue to reinforce the charity model between the *haves* and the *have nots*.

Such an aim could be described as somewhat ambitious, and there exists little research evidence to prove that Development Education is reaching this goal. In fact, to investigate such a claim would likely prove to be beyond the confines of any research project, but at least efforts should be made to investigate and measure the impact of methods that Development Educators use to engage participants in such issues.

Furthermore, many Development Educators are based in NGO development organisations that are fundamentally concerned with tapping into the media *branding* of the global south to encourage the general public to offer financial support for their various projects based in the developing world. Whilst such projects are practical, they may reinforce the public view of the developing world as a *charity*, and therefore contribute to the reproduction of civilised oppression and subsequent oppression. In fact, DFID (1999), a major UK funder for aid and Development Education projects, suggests that tapping into individuals’ self-interest offers a potentially fruitful source of support for development assistance, and notes the ‘practical potential’ afforded by appealing to

self-interest when it reports that ‘polls show that the main motivation for [supporting] aid has been moral or humanitarian’ (Heerde and Hudson, 2010, p 390). Ultimately, ‘there is a tendency by DFID to frame development assistance to the poor in the language of *both* self-interest *and* morality’ (Heerde and Hudson, 2010, p 390). Again, this could be argued to be a form of civilised oppression.

Therefore, given the agenda of such major funders, and given the possible *charity* branding of specific NGO development organisations, to what extent can Development Educators challenge stereotypical images of the global south? What challenges do they face both within their organisation and amongst the general public? How do they propose to be overtly political, radical and expose such systems of civilised oppression, particularly within the very organisations that employ them? Again, there is a succinct lack of research evidence in relation to such questions. Nevertheless, the following section will attempt to present and discuss some of the challenges that Development Educators might face in relation to their organisation’s charity advertising campaigns.

### **1.5 NGO Charity Advertising**

Charity advertising has become increasingly a big business venture to fundraise and promote the brand image of charities (see Barnett and Hammond, 1999). Indeed, NGOs within the charity development sector strive to maintain public support and increase donors through their advertising campaigns, and often rely on marketing consultants to help ensure they get their share of public fundraising. In fact, Aldrich (2004) produced a guide to Effective Direct Response Television Advertising for Charities. Aldrich states that the classic structure of charity television advertisements should entail a problem, a solution and a call to action. Aldrich even details the importance of the choice of music and voice-over used in the advertisement, and suggests the use of celebrities or professional voice-over artists in the absence of a celebrity, but warns that ‘there is a skill to voice-over work that amateurs usually lack, and a poorly delivered voice-over can kill an advertisement’ (Aldrich, 2004, p140). An example, depicted below, is Concern Universal’s direct response television appeal currently airing in Ireland, and it is titled the ‘Cure Starvation Appeal’. The advertisement uses a well delivered female voice-over and soft music to effectively enhance the images portrayed on the screen.

**Problem** – an image of baby Sherif from Somalia suffering from starvation in his mother’s arms. A female voice-over comments that, “*Sharif’s mother felt no joy when he was born. He was born starving. For nine gruelling months she carried him, and now he is here, his body hardly fully formed with*

*little chance of survival. Thousands of these children die before their first birthday but you can help end this scandal”.*

**Solution** – the real problem is that the child is suffering needlessly and, with your help, supporting Concern’s appeal could prevent this suffering. The female voice-over comments *“but you can help end this scandal”.*

**Call to Action** – 7 euro a month will provide the child food to survive beyond a year or more. The female voice-over comments *“please give 7 euro a month to Concern’s Cure Starvation Appeal at concern.net. Make your concern work* (at this point an image of two well fed smiling children appear on screen). *You can feed a starving child* (at this point the image of baby Sherif reappears). *If you believe that no child should be born starving, please give 7 euro a month to Concern’s Cure Starvation Appeal”.*

The overall focus of the advertisement remains on baby Sherif, and how his survival and survival of children like him depends on the Irish public’s willingness to give 7 euro a month to Concern Universal. This, they claim, will help cure starvation. The idea here is ‘that persuasion is effected by bringing an audience into a state of emotion, where they are lured in to donate money (see Joffe, 2008, p 86). Twitchell (1996) argues that the impact of such advertising ‘is felt where we least expect it: in our nervous system, in our shared myths, in our concepts of self, and in our marking of time’ (quoted in Bishop, 2010, p 413).

Furthermore, according to Kogut and Ritov (2005) ‘depiction of an identified individual victim appears to be highly emotionally evocative and this may motivate distress and, consequently, donations’ (quoted in Joffe, 2008, p89). Such appeals, frequently contain depicting a person in need, and ‘are presumably designed to personalise the intended beneficiaries, enhance compassion, and motivate the responsiveness of potential donors’ (Chang and Lee, 2009, p2914). In fact, Small *et al* (2005) found that ‘people donate more than double when asked to give money for an individual about whom they have been given some personal information, compared to having been fed statistics, and that feeling and compassion diminish as soon as one starts to add more people’ (quoted in Joffe, 2008, p89). Indeed, Concern focus on baby Sherif as their identified individual victim to lure the public to give 7 euro a month.

However, it might be argued that the impact of such advertising may have negative implications for the people the charity is claiming to represent. For example, although it may help raise funds for the given charity, it may reinforce negative stereotypes of the people depicted in the *picture*. As Seabrook might argue, baby Sherif and his mother, for example, are ‘voiceless, apparently

struck dumb by their poverty, they have been forced into a vow of silence by the ventriloquial interpretations of poverty by the spokespersons of wealth' (Seabrook, 2009, p23). Such an approach 'tends to blame the victim – that is, it places the problem with the poor themselves, rather than on the structure that forces them to live a particular way: the growth of poverty is dependent on the growth of wealth' (Renner et al, 201, p45).

This could be considered challenging for Development Educators based in such NGOs, and perhaps it is necessary for these educators to state their case as to if and how they pose to challenge, within their own organisation, the use of 'marketing imagery which tugs at the heartstrings of potential donors at the expense of reinforcing negative stereotypes of beneficiaries' (quoted in Bennett, 2010, p133). In fact, ironically, it could be said that, NGO Development Educators are located in organisations that could be said to promote White cultural supremacy through its use of images that portrays the developing world as the *other* who are reliant on our charity. Or, in other words, NGO Development Educators are located in organisations who contribute to civilised oppression that reproduces the overall oppression that Development Educators might claim to expose.

Furthermore, given the extent of the NGO charity development sectors fundraising campaigning endeavours, one would at least expect a surge of Development Education research on the effects of the images used on the public's consciousness, and how such images impact public attitudes towards people in the developing world. However, research in this area remains limited. Incidentally, however, despite the growth of Global Education in schools, 'a recent study of knowledge, attitudes and activism among young people in post-primary schools in Ireland suggests that donating money is the most popular form of development activism in Irish schools, thus demonstrating the prevalence of the development-as-charity motif' (Gleeson, King, O'Driscoll & Tormey, 2007, quoted in Bryan, 2008, p73).

Nevertheless, although there is little Development Education research that investigates the effects of charity images of people from the developing world, research has been conducted on the effects of charity images of people with learning disabilities on public attitudes. For example, a study carried out by Doddington *et al* (2010) focused on showing 91 school children images from MENCAP posters. One poster image used was from MENCAP's highly criticised advertising appeal in the 1980s, and the other poster image was from their 1991 appeal. Indeed, it was found that the 1980s poster reinforced negative stereotypes of those with disabilities, and evoked feelings of guilt and pity amongst the participants. Subsequently, Doddington *et al* recommend that charities should exercise caution in the images they present of the people they claim to represent. Although,

as mentioned, this caution is in relation to people with disabilities, it might be argued that NGO development organisations have much to learn from this body of research.

It should be emphasised, however, that many NGO development organisations in Ireland do exercise *caution* in their use of images by signing up to the DOCHAS (Irish Association of Development Organisations) code of conduct (see appendix 1). In brief, the DOCHAS Code offers a guide to assist organisations in their use of images and messages to choose for public communication whilst maintaining full respect for the human dignity.

Nevertheless, many NGO development organisations choose to depict images of children as a vehicle to evoke public support. Chang and Lee (2009) tell us that ‘research has illustrated that a picture is worth a thousand words’ (Chang and Lee, 2009, p2914). In fact, research conducted by Eayrs and Ellis (1990) shows that people intend to give more money when presented with posters depicting children rather than adults, since images of children may evoke particular emotions, such as the distress (see Kogut and Ritov, 2005) which may play a role in intentions to donate (quoted in Joffe, 2008, p89). However, Eayrs and Ellis (1990) concluded that using such images which elicited guilt and sympathy were incompatible with images that might ‘enable people to lead culturally valued lives’ (quoted in Barnett and Hammond, 1999, p309). Hence, such research ‘has pointed to the potential damages which charities do to the various groups whom they purport to represent’ (Doddington *et al*, 2010, p207).

Although this research was conducted in relation to children with disabilities, it perhaps should inform NGO development organisations of the potential damage they might cause to their beneficiaries.

Indeed, a visit to development NGO websites and it is evident that charity organisations do adopt the approach, amongst other approaches, of focusing on pictures of single individual children to present case studies to encourage the public to donate money. For instance, ChildFund Ireland present, Chethana, a fourteen year old girl from Sri Lanka. In fact Chethana is presented as a testimony to encourage the public to sponsor a child for 22 euro per month. She is pictured with her Irish sponsor, Barbara from Sligo, who visited Chethana, and was reassured to know that ‘*14 year old girls worldwide are all the same – something pink with bling and sparkles and her first pair of jeans – her obvious joy will not be forgotten*’ (see <http://www.childfund.ie/testimonials.php>).

At this point, it should be mentioned that the above example was taken from an NGO development organisation website that is a member of DOCHAS, and therefore this organisations, as indeed all the other organisations, adhere to the code of conduct to exercise caution in their use of images. Hence, the researcher is not claiming that this image may have a negative impact on the people the development organisation is claiming to represent. Specific research would

need to be conducted in this field to contribute to this respective knowledge. In fact, the image used by this development organisation could possibly be described as a *positive* portrayal of a happy, smiling child that respects her dignity.

However, a critique of *positive* charity images, in relation to disabled people, also appears in research literature, and may be synonymous with development organisations. For instance, ‘the emphasis on positive images of the disabled is viewed suspiciously insofar as it focuses on individuals and not the disabling society in which we live (Campbell, 1990), and because it perpetuates the perception of disabled people as objects of charity’ (Hevey, 1992, 1993, quoted in Barnett and Hammond, 1999, p310). Maybe, likewise, the emphasis of NGO development organisations on *positive* images, or images that adhere to a particular code of conduct, should also be viewed suspiciously as it perhaps focuses on the developing world as objects of charity which is negatively related to concern for the developing world constructed around *servicing out help*, in pursuit of self-interest’ (see Heerde and Hudson, 2010, p397). In this respect, ‘Farmer (2004) suggests that the server operates *on* the served, using a deficit model i.e. they are intrinsically inferior’ (quoted in Renner et al, 2010, p44).

Therefore, as Barnett and Hammond put it, the validity of a perspective that characterizes particular images, or even aspects of them, ‘simply as being positive or negative might thus be considered of limited value. Positive for who would seem to be a reasonable question’ (quoted in Barnett and Hammond, 1999, p310). Perhaps a reasonable answer is that it serves as a form of civilised oppression, and thus is positive for the reproduction of White privileged power and oppression.

Here, if anywhere, lies a huge challenge for Development Educators. How are they overtly political and radical in challenging the public perceptions of people from the global South that their organisation perhaps reinforces? What is their perspective in relation to all of the above arguments, with regards to formal education, media representations of the developing world and NGO charity advertising? How do they expose, what might be considered, the systems of civilised oppression that are inherent within all of these systems? Furthermore, and fundamental to this research project, how do they subsequently expose the larger notion oppression? In other words, how do they, or do they, bring a Global South, or rather specifically related to this research, an African perspective to their work, and more importantly how do they define such a perspective, and what does it look like in practice?

## 1.6 Towards Defining an African Perspective

In commissioning this research the Africa Centre tendered the following,

The Africa Centre seeks to commission a research project that will explore an African Perspective in Development Education. Africa Centre invites expressions of interest from individual researchers, research organisations and third level institutions for this piece of research. Since its establishment in 2000, the Africa Centre has been engaged in addressing the need for an effective 'African Perspective' in Development Education (DE) in Ireland. The Africa Centre has undertaken significant reflection upon what is an 'African Perspective in Development Education'. It is more than just an African perspective expressing the same messages, but rather a process that challenges some of the perspectives still prevailing in Irish Society about Africa. Developing such a perspective involves a process of exploring African culture, seeking to identify methodologies of communication, learning, reflection and action used in different parts of Africa and adapting these as part of the methodologies of Development Education in Ireland today (see appendix 2 for complete tender).

On submitting a tender proposal to the Africa Centre, the researcher proposed to explore if and how Development Educators, on the island of Ireland, define and incorporate an African perspective within their work. Although the researcher was aware that the Africa Centre defined such a perspective to involve a process of 'seeking to identify methodologies of communication, learning, reflection and action used in different parts of Africa and adapting these as part of the methodologies of Development Education in Ireland today', she did not propose to explore, or specifically define, an African perspective to be synonymous with methodologies that are used in African cultures. Indeed, it is considered important for Development Educators to learn from such methodologies, and adapt them to the context of their own work. However, the researcher proposed that the definition of an African perspective, and how it might be understood in Ireland, should come from the Development Educators themselves.

Nevertheless, the researcher is aware that she needs to work towards defining an African perspective in order to provide a framework for the analysis, discussion and recommendations from the research findings. This is considered to be important since qualitative research is often criticised for being highly subjective. Such criticisms 'usually mean that qualitative findings rely too much on the researcher's often unsystematic views about what is significant and important, and also upon the close personal relationships that the researcher frequently strikes up with the people studied' (Bryman, 2001, p282). Therefore the researcher needs a framework, and thus needs to work

towards defining an African perspective, to ensure a level of objectivity is maintained throughout this research process.

Ultimately, in working towards defining an African perspective, the researcher is drawn to the Africa Centre's claim that 'it is more than just an African perspective expressing the same messages, but rather a process that challenges some of the perspectives still prevailing in Irish Society about Africa'. Indeed, as presented above, expressing the *same messages*, or rather messages that promote White cultural supremacy and reproduce manifestations of colonial oppression is evident in the media, NGO charity advertising, and perhaps the *hidden curriculum* in its approach to global learning. Subsequently, the researcher considers it to be important to investigate if and how Development Educators in Ireland challenge such perspectives prevailing in Irish society today. Or, as presented earlier, how do Development Educators remain overtly political, radical and expose systems of civilised oppression that lead to greater oppression? In this sense, an African perspective in Development Education could be defined as overtly political and radical challenges that aim to expose systems of civilised oppression and subsequent oppression. This definition is rooted in postcolonial theory which 'purports to constitute a form of anti-hegemonic discourse which critically addresses both the interpretation of the colonial past and its ongoing effects in the present, as well as manifestations of neo-colonialism on the part of metropolitan powers' (Lawson, 2010, p299). Indeed, as mentioned, such manifestations may appear in the media, NGO charity advertising and the *hidden curriculum*. Of course, although this definition will provide a framework to ensure objectivity in the analysis, discussion and recommendations of the research findings, the researcher believes that the participants should speak for themselves in defining an African perspective in Development Education. Subsequently, this approach should test the underlying theoretical notions, and hopefully better define an African perspective in Development Education 'from the perspective of the people being studied, rather than as though those subjects were incapable of their own reflections on the social world' (Bryman, 2001, p277).

## **1.7 Summary and Research Aims**

This chapter has highlighted many of the challenges facing Development Educators, in relation to them being overtly political, radical and exposing systems of civilised oppression and subsequent oppression. For example, the media, NGOs, and formal education sector were argued to be manifestations of civilised oppression, and due to Development Educators' close affiliation with NGOs and formal education, they may be located in systems that contribute to the reproduction of White cultural supremacy and global inequalities. It has been argued that Development Educators need to be explicit in how their theoretical underpinning, terminology and practice exposes and chal-

lenges systems of civilised oppression and the oppression evident in prevailing colonial attitudes. The very act of exposing and challenging such systems was put in context of a postcolonial perspective and subsequently defined as an African perspective in Development Education.

Therefore, in an attempt to contribute to knowledge and provide a stepping stone that may begin to address the lack of academic literature in relation to Development Education, this project aims to:

1. explore the terminology used by Development Educators and provide a general overview of Development Education work currently being carried out in Ireland
2. evaluate the opinions of Development Educators on the challenges they may face in relation to civilised oppression as outlined above
3. evaluate the opinions of Development Educators on what they define an African perspective in Development Education to be, and if they apply such a perspective to their work

As outlined in the initial tender from the Africa Centre (appendix 2), it is a requirement of this research to also compare and contrast the findings of the above aims with findings from participants from ethnic led minority organisations. However, it is beyond the scope of this small scale exploratory research project to conduct such an in depth comparative study. Nevertheless, participants from both ethnic led minority organisations and NGO organisations will be invited to participate in this project, and if any significant differences emerge between these groups, the researcher will indeed make this explicit in reporting the findings.

It should also be noted that it is an objective of this research process to enrich the quality of, and strengthen, relationships with NGOs and ethnic led minority organisations. Therefore, this research project is very much an intervention that aims to explore, with participants, the work of Development Education within Ireland, whilst creating possible NGO and ethnic led minority relationships that will network and continue to work towards implementing a model of good practice of an African perspective within Development Education.

## **Chapter 2**

### **Theoretical and Methodological Considerations**

This chapter considers how structuration theory may complement postcolonial theory in analysing the findings from the participants of this project. It is argued that structuration theory, with its emphasis on agency transforming structures of domination, will help contribute to the theoretical knowledge and understanding of the efforts of Development Educators in relation to mobilising agents for socio-political change. This chapter also sets out the research design, considers the ethics of conducting this research project, and argues the case for applying qualitative methodology. Finally, the researcher makes explicit the procedure for data analysis.

#### **2.1 Theoretical Considerations**

In Chapter 1, the researcher draws on postcolonial theory to discuss issues of civilised oppression, oppression, and subsequently to define an African perspective in Development Education. As mentioned, postcolonial theory ‘purports to constitute a form of anti-hegemonic discourse which critically addresses both the interpretation of the colonial past and its ongoing effects in the present, as well as manifestations of neo-colonialism on the part of metropolitan powers’ (Lawson, 2010, p299). It might be argued that such a theory should be central to the work of Development Educators, and the researcher agrees with Andreotti (2006) in her call for its value to be explored for Development Education (see Chapter 1). Indeed, this theory will be drawn upon in the analysis of the research findings, particularly in relation to exploring an African perspective in Development Education.

Nevertheless, the researcher wishes to make it explicit that she does not consider the participants of this study to be intentionally, or even unintentionally, contributing to manifestations of neo-colonialism, or the reproduction of White cultural supremacy. Although in Chapter 1, the researcher points out that Development Educators may be located in specific systems, practices and organisations that contribute to reproducing civilised oppression and subsequent oppression, it cannot be assumed that these educators are reduced to the environments they are located in, and therefore doomed to intentionally or unintentionally reproduce White cultural supremacy. In fact, such an assumption would run counter to the whole notion of active agency that is central to Development Education, and therefore the researcher considers it to be important to also theoretically fit with the Development Educators themselves.

As said, the researcher will draw on postcolonial theory throughout the research analysis. However, the researcher will also draw on Anthony Giddens' structuration theory. The main attraction of this theory is that Giddens recognises the extent that structure, or in this instance structures that purport White cultural supremacy, can dominate time and space. However, he also recognises the power of agency in bringing about change and transforming dominant structures. Giddens presents a very detailed explanation of the relationship between structure and agency. Essentially, for Giddens, structure and agency complement each other, and coexist in terms of a duality. To be precise, Giddens terms this coexistence as *the duality of structure*. 'By the duality of structure', writes Giddens, 'I mean that social structures are both constituted by human agency, and yet at the same time are the very medium of this constitution' (Giddens, 1976, p121). Giddens presents structure, as not existing over and above people, but as a mere manifestation of human agents' actions and discourse. In fact, for Giddens, it is the actions of agency that reproduces specific structures, for example, structures of White cultural domination. However, he is clear that the more such structures are reproduced by agency, the more the structure itself becomes constraining for agency to bring about transformation, resulting in domination of the people. This is evident in the unequal distribution of resources. 'Giddens considers two types of resources – allocative resources which generate domination over material objects, and authoritative resources which generate domination over human beings' (Liu, 2006, p510). As he puts it, 'it is true that the more institutions bite into time and space then the more resistant they are to manipulation or change by any individual agent' (Giddens, 1984, p171). Indeed, in relation to the discussions presented in Chapter 1, it could be argued that colonial manifestations have bitten into time and space, and through civilised oppression and oppression they continue to dominate allocative and authoritative resources.

However, Giddens maintains that people have the capacity to find new ways of *going on* in social life. Although he recognises the constraining elements in the reproduction of structures, he claims that it is within the potential of all agents to transform their society. Agency has 'the capacity to effect structural change as and when such change is desired' (Willmott, 1999, p8). However, Giddens provides no clues as to *when* this desire for change is likely to emerge. He argues that people can always reinterpret structure, and bring about socio-political transformation. However, he fails to indicate when this is likely to happen. He fails to indicate when people may be susceptible to creating structural change. Indeed, he fully explains the tendency of actors to continually reproduce the way of life they have always known. This is inherent in the recursive nature of the structures of legitimation and signification that people draw upon, but which result in the domination presented above. Very briefly, 'structures of signification invoke certain symbolic orders, modes

of discourse and language' (Schrodt *et al*, 2006, p745). Agents draw upon these structures in order to communicate with others, and thus create a sense of mutual understanding. 'Structures of legitimation invoke the sanctioning of certain behaviours afforded by legal and religious institutions, as well as by ethical standards and societal customs' (Schrodt *et al*, 2006, p745). Agents draw on these structures in order to instantiate acceptable moral behaviour, and to provide norms for social practices. Ultimately, drawing on such structures enable people to *go on* in social life with a sense of shared norms and values. Nevertheless, whilst Giddens highlights how drawing on structures is enabling for agency, he acknowledges that it can also constrain the agent. In short, as people draw on structures of signification and legitimation, they also instantiate structures of domination which subsequently bite into time and space and become difficult to transform.

However, for Giddens, agential socio-political reproduction also 'allegedly has its origins in basic anxiety-controlling-mechanisms' (Hodgson, 2007, p 104). For Giddens, actors have a deep need for ontological security, and therefore an *anxiety mechanism* renders them prone to structural reproduction. He argues that people develop a sense of trust that their world will remain constant. 'Trust is seen as a condition of self identity' (Groarke, 2002, p561). It might be argued that charity NGO advertising, for instance, is a manifestation of an identity narrative built on a culture of giving help, of doing good, or of sharing and caring. Indeed, if people invest so much trust in such a narrative, it might be difficult, and evoke a level of anxiety, to challenge this narrative as actually contributing to structures of domination. Nevertheless, as mentioned, Giddens believes that people have the capacity to, as he puts it, *act otherwise* and transform structures of domination. However, where, when, under what conditions, and how people do this is not addressed by Giddens.

In this sense, it might be considered interesting, to draw on structuration theory, to complement postcolonial theory, in analysing and discussing the findings of this research. Do the participants of this study view themselves as agents who *act otherwise*? Do they consider themselves as having the capacity, through their Development Education practice, to create the conditions to enable people to become transformative agents who take action against structures of domination?

As mentioned, the main attraction of structuration theory is that it recognises that structures can dominate people and resources, and the more such structures bite into time and space, the more resistant they become to transformation. However, Giddens also recognises the power of human agency to intervene, *act otherwise*, and bring about socio-political transformation. It is hoped that framing the research analysis from perspectives of both postcolonial and structuration theory will help contribute to the theoretical knowledge and understanding of the challenges Development Educators might face in relation to agents who possibly strive to *act otherwise* to create the condi-

tions for agency to transform dominant structures, or *act otherwise* to embed an African perspective within their work.

## **2.2 Methodological Considerations**

### *Design and Participants*

Given the fact, that this research is small scale and exploratory in nature, it is argued that a qualitative approach is most appropriate. It seems fitting that the researcher should take a naturalistic approach, in order to learn about the experiences of the participants. In this respect, it is important that the researcher gets ‘close to the situation in order to increase understanding, to generate a holistic description of the situation, to proceed inductively, and to study programs in their naturally occurring complexity’ (Patton, 1980, p43-44). Getting close to the participants is considered to be important, in order to allow participants to speak for themselves, and subsequently facilitate the emergence of data from their experiences of Development Education.

Therefore, the research design consists of small group interview discussions based on a Kreuger’s (1998) focus group format (see appendix 3 for detailed interview design). Although based on a focus group format the discussion groups are much smaller in size. In total a series of five tape-recorded discussions are conducted ranging from two to four participants per group. Having small group numbers in each discussion was considered to be important to encourage participants to engage in an honest discussion. However, the researcher initially planned to conduct a series of four group discussions with four participants per group. Nevertheless, due to work commitments, one of these groups found it impossible to arrange a time to suit everyone. Hence, the researcher, out of necessity, conducted a further two separate groups with two participants per group. This was considered to be important to accommodate the participants, who were keen to participate, and to ensure their voices were included in the research findings.

Participants were recruited from both the North and South of the border in Ireland, to give a scope of the range of Development Education practice on the island. However, this research is not intended to be a comparative study. Of course, if any significant differences emerge, the researcher will indeed report these in detail, but it is not the intention of this study to compare and contrast findings from Northern and Southern Ireland.

In Northern Ireland, the Centre for Global Education (CGE) was contacted, and they provided a list of Development Educators who are members of the Coalition of Aid and Development Agencies (CADA) sub group. The list comprised of twenty two members. Emails were sent to all

twenty two people, providing a synopsis of the research with an information sheet and consent form (appendix 4). Eight members responded to express their interest in participating in the research. However, due to illness, one member failed to attend the interview, thus reducing one of the groups to three participants. Therefore, as referred to above, in total a series of three group discussions were conducted in Northern Ireland. One of the participants is male and from an ethnic led minority organisation. The other six participants are based in NGO organisations, and are female.

In Southern Ireland, the Africa Centre provided a list of seventeen Development Educators who work for various development NGOs and ethnic led minority organisations. As with the north of Ireland, emails were sent to all potential participants, providing a synopsis of the research with an information sheet and consent form (appendix 4). Eight members responded to express their interest in participating in the research. Therefore, two separate group interview discussions were conducted with four participants per group. Three of the participants are from an ethnic led minority organization, two of these are female and the other is male. The remaining participants are NGO based, and three are male and the other two are female.

In total, then, this study comprises of fifteen participants, five of which are male and ten female. Four of these participants are based in ethnic minority led organizations. The remaining participants are based in various NGOs. In this respect, this study is very small scale, and the researcher does not claim that the findings can be considered representative of the overall population of Development Educators based in Ireland. It will nevertheless be an adequate sample to allow for consideration of variation according to the full range of factors addressed in Chapter 1 and earlier in Chapter 2. Furthermore, due to the exploratory nature of this study, this sample size will produce convincing data to help begin to address the lack of Development Education research, and subsequently recommend steps to kick start larger scale projects, and further debates in relation to Development Educators addressing civilised oppression, subsequent oppression, and embedding an African Perspective in their work.

### Ethics

‘Because of its similarity to everyday conversation, an interview (in this case a small group interview) needs to be planned and executed with ethical issues very much in mind’ (Dyer, 1995, p62). Dyer (1995) tells us that confidentiality and the right to withdraw from the research are two important ethical aspects that need to be considered carefully. The researcher also considered the right of informed consent, and the right of the participants to be presented with an overview of the results before publication. This was to ensure that the participants felt confident that they could not

be identified in any way, and it was also important so that the participants could confirm the validity and reliability of the analysis. Therefore, to ensure all of the above, the researcher;

- provided participants with a detailed information sheet (appendix 4) containing a consent form
- assured participants that pseudonyms would be used throughout the research report, and they would be presented with an overview of the findings before publication, so they could check for themselves that they could not be identified in the data analysis
- before commencing the interview, ensured participants had read the information sheet and were fully informed before signing the consent form
- before commencing the interview reminded the participants that they did not have to answer any question, and they had the right to withdraw at any stage without an explanation
- assured participants that all tape recorded data was merely used as an aid to help the researcher with transcription, and as soon as data was transcribed, the recording would be deleted

The researcher also clearly defined her role for the participants. This role is best described as, what Robson (1993) terms as ‘the participant as observer’. In this respect, ‘the fact that the observer is an observer is made clear to the group from the start. The observer then tries to establish a good rapport with members of the group, and also position herself as a participant. Hence, although the participants fully understood that the researcher was there to observe them, they also considered her to be fully involved with the group discussion. ‘This stance means that as well as observing through participating in activities, the observer can ask members to explain various aspects of what is going on’ (Robson, 1993, p197). This was considered to be important so that the researcher could, if necessary, converse with participants, and probe for more in-depth thick descriptive qualitative findings.

### *The Case for Qualitative Analysis*

As referred to in Chapter 1, qualitative research is often criticised for being less objective and reliable than quantitative studies which is subject to rigorous and statistical testing. It is criticised for being reliant on the researcher’s subjective and unsystematic views. Moreover, qualitative findings are criticised for being difficult to replicate in other studies. ‘Because it is unstructured and often reliant upon the qualitative researcher’s ingenuity, it is almost impossible to conduct a true replication, since there are hardly any standard procedures to be followed’ (Bryman, 2001, p282). Hence, as Strauss puts it, ‘how do I counter these often blunt criticisms’ (Strauss, 1987, p285)?

Firstly, in relation to this project, the research analysis is guided by postcolonial and structuration theory. Hence, this study does not solely ‘rely too much on the researcher’s often unsystematic views about what is significant and important’ (Bryman, 2001, p238). In fact, the researcher will approach the data systematically by employing qualitative content analysis, sometimes termed as ethnographic content analysis. ‘As described by Altheide (1987) and Kasworm (1990), this type of content analysis is guided by preliminary themes, categories or variables, later modified with new ones generated through an inductive process involving constant comparison and discovery’ (quoted in Hayes and Smith, 1994, p205). In other words, and in relation to this project, the analysis of the group interviews will be guided by preliminary categories derived from the aims presented in Chapter 1, which have been set in context of postcolonial and structuration theories to aid analysis. The researcher will later modify these categories with any emergent data that does not initially fit with them. Hence, although the researcher is concerned with investigating such theories in relation to the aims of this research (see 1.7), she is also open to correcting that theory with categories that emerge from the data itself. As Taylor and Bogdan state, ‘the goal of qualitative research is to make sure the theory fits the data and not vice versa’ (Taylor and Bogdan, 1998, p8). In short, it is an objective of this research to contribute to building better theory in relation to the practice of Development Education. Better theory, in this instance, can be defined as theory that finds ‘a better fit with the empirical world’ (Hammersley, 1989, p173).

Hence, this study is ‘not an impressionistic, off-the-cuff analysis based on a superficial look at a setting of people’ (Taylor and Bogdan, 1998, p9). Rather, the project is systematic, in its analysis, by its use of theoretical categories in relation to the research aims.

A further task for the researcher, however, is to counter the charge that ‘it is almost impossible to conduct a true replication, since there are hardly any standard procedures to be followed’ (Bryman, 2001, p282). As Silverman argues, ‘unless you can show your audience the procedures you used to ensure your methods were reliable and your conclusions valid, there is little point in aiming to conclude research’ (Silverman, 2000, p175). Hence, it is important to clarify the research procedure, in order to facilitate future replication, and to highlight the extent of reliability and validity.

### Procedure

In approaching the interview data, the researcher employed qualitative content analysis, or what David Altheide (1987) terms ethnographic content analysis (ECA). ECA ‘is used to document and understand the communication of meaning, as well as to verify theoretical relationships’ (Altheide,

1987, p68). Indeed, the researcher considered meaning and theoretical relationships to be an important aspect to this project.

ECA uses pre-defined categories in order to identify themes. However, ‘although categories and variables initially guide the study, others are allowed and expected to emerge throughout the study’ (Altheide, 1987, p68). ‘The aim is to be systematic and analytic but not rigid’ (Chatziefstathiou, 2007, p61).

Drawing on postcolonial and structuration theory to investigate and analyse the aims set out in section 1.7, the categories that initially guide this study are;

1. Defining Development Education, the terminology we use, and what we do
2. Civilised oppression and oppression: challenges for Development Educators in *acting otherwise*
3. Defining the African Perspective in Development Education and if it is applied to our work
4. Networking beyond this research

All of the interview data was read and re-read, and grouped in relation to these categories. Unexpected data is firstly considered in relation to the categories. However, a new category emerged from this data. This is;

1. Community Development

All of the categories are constantly revised and reduced, and finally collapsed into two major themes. These are;

1. Safe Development Education
2. Radical Development Education
3. Defining and Positioning Ourselves

### **2.3 Summary**

This chapter argued that structuration theory should complement postcolonial theory in analysing the research findings. Due to the fact that this is a qualitative study, the research design and procedure are highlighted to ensure future replication of this project. Ethical considerations are addressed, and the case for applying qualitative methodology is discussed. Finally, to investigate the

aims of this project, the categories and themes that guide and subsequently emerge from the data analysis are presented.

At this point, before proceeding to the next chapter which presents the findings, the researcher wishes to remind the reader of the aims of this project. These are;

1. explore the terminology used by Development Educators and provide a general overview of Development Education work currently being carried out in Ireland
2. evaluate the opinions of Development Educators on the challenges they may face in relation to civilised oppression as outlined in Chapter 1
3. evaluate the opinions of Development Educators on what they define an African perspective in Development Education to be, and if they apply such a perspective to their work
4. highlight any differences that might emerge between ethnic minority led organisations and NGOs

As mentioned in Chapter 1, it is also an objective of this study to create possible NGO and ethnic led minority relationships that will network and continue to work towards implementing a model of good practice of an African perspective within Development Education.

## Chapter 3

### Findings and Analysis

#### 3.1 A Word on Data Analysis

As mentioned in Chapter 2, this study comprises of conducting small group interview discussions based on Kreuger's (1998) focus group format (see appendix 3 for detailed interview design). In total, a series of five tape-recorded discussions are conducted ranging from two to four participants per group. Each interview group is given a separate overall pseudonym. These are; Coffee, Tea, Sugar, Cocoa and Banana. Participants in each respective group are also given a specific pseudonym, for example, Coffee 2 or Sugar 1. The researcher transcribed the data from each group separately. These separate transcribed group interviews are available on request at The Africa Centre, as due to a large amount of data, it is not viable to include this information in the appendix of this report. Each group's transcribed data is categorised as set out in the procedure outlined in section 2.2. All of the categorised data from all of the groups is analysed collectively in presenting the findings. This is considered to be important, since the data from all of the groups complement each other, and when considered together it enriches the overall findings of this project, in relation to investigating the research aims outlined in Chapters 1 and 2.

As previously mentioned, and as outlined in the initial tender from the Africa Centre (appendix 2), it is a requirement of this research to also compare and contrast findings from participants based in NGOs with participants based in ethnic led minority organisations. As the researcher has already argued, it is beyond the scope of this small scale exploratory research project to conduct such an in depth comparative study. Nevertheless, the researcher argues that it will, at the least, be within the scope of the project to highlight any significant differences that might have emerged between these groups.

However, at this point, it is important to point out that no significant differences emerged between participants from ethnic led organisations and participants from development NGOs. Although, some of the participants based in NGOs feel challenged, or restricted, by the charity model of development portrayed by their respective NGOs, the participants from minority led organisations also face the same challenges in relation to the overall portrayal of such a model. Thus, whether the participant is based in an NGO or a minority led organisation they have a similar outlook to be *“the ones to rewrite what NGO charities have been doing for so many years, and the ones to say it stops with us, and question how development is done”* (Cocoa 1).

Due to the fact that no significant differences emerged between both these groups, the researcher feels it is not necessary to point out which participants are from ethnic minority led organisations, and which are from NGOs. This is considered to be necessary to protect the anonymity of the participants, particularly those from ethnic minority organisations who could be easily identifiable in the small field of Development Education in Ireland. To further protect the anonymity of the participants, the researcher does not use their pseudonym when referring to the specific projects they are involved in conducting, as this would leave them susceptible to being identified. Therefore, when discussing participant projects, the researcher will simply use the term Participant as a pseudonym. In total then, this study comprises of fifteen participants. Of these fifteen, five are male and ten are female, and four are based in ethnic minority led organizations. The remaining participants are based in various NGOs.

Each group interview lasted for approximately an hour and a half. All of the participants consented to participate, and have the interviews tape recorded. At the beginning of each interview, the researcher clarified her role, assured anonymity, and reminded the participants they did not have to answer any question they did not want to, or if they wished they could withdraw from the process at any stage. All of the participants were happy to proceed. The participants were also presented with an overview of the findings before publication, to ensure they were satisfied that their identity was protected, and also to strengthen the validity and reliability of the findings. All of the participants were happy that their identity was protected, and affirmed that they agreed with the how their data was assigned to the categories and themes as presented below.

### **3.2 Defining Development Education, the Terminology We Use and What We Do**

When asked to define Development Education, the participants were confident and clear in offering various definitions. As Cocoa 1 claims,

*“I see it as a way of people north and south of the globe kind of understanding the interconnected issues, you know, the interdependence, the things that connect us all, and Development Education encourages people to take some kind of action towards challenging injustice in the world, and working towards like more sustainable issues”.*

In this definition Cocoa 1 refers to interconnectedness, interdependence, taking action, challenging injustice, and sustainability. These themes are also referred to by other participants in their definitions. For instance the below responses refer to the importance of interconnectedness or interdependence.

**Tea 4** *“I think it is about interconnectedness and interdependence between people and countries, you know, and about the global effect...if something happens here, and the effect of that somewhere else in the world and everyone is kind of responsible for each other”.*

**Banana 1** *“I think that where we have to start from is that people have to know the inter-connections, and without that it is a waste of time, because we would just be educating about over there” (global south).*

**Coffee 1** *“...how we have an impact through our actions on how one country can have an impact on another”.*

**Tea 3** *“I think the local and global connections are important. Although, it is valued in different ways by different funders, but it is important for Development Education to make sure the problems are not seen as their (global south) issue”.*

As Tea 3 points out, interconnectedness is important to Development Education in order to *“make sure the problems are not seen as their (global south) issue”*, and Banana 1 comments that without emphasising interconnectedness Development Education would be a *“waste of time, because we would just be educating about over there”* (global south). In this respect, the participants are perhaps referring to the importance of Development Education in avoiding portraying the developing world in contrast to the global north, or to avoid Young’s (2010) ‘two-worlds concept’ which has a tendency to lead to a focus on difference between ‘us’ and ‘them’ (see Chapter 1.2). However, Tea 3 points out that interconnectedness *“is valued in different ways by different funders”*. In this instance, it seems that Tea 3 may be referring to restrictions by funders to curtail Development Educators from moving too far beyond the development-as-charity framework or too far towards highlighting that the problems are located in the global north, and are fundamentally our issues rather than *“their (global south) issue”*(Tea 3). This point will be addressed further in presenting findings in relation to funder restrictions on Development Education.

For now, however, the researcher argues that Development Educators should perhaps make more explicit how they define interconnectedness or interdependence. What exactly does it mean for *“people north and south of the globe to kind of understand the interconnected issues, you know, the interdependence, the things that connect us all”* (Cocoa 1)? How is everyone in the world *“kind of responsible for each other”* (Tea 4)? From a postcolonial perspective, do words like interconnectedness and interdependence suggest a mutual relationship between the global north and south living in one big global world, or *“the global effect...if something happens here, and the effect of that somewhere else in the world and everyone is kind of responsible for each other”* (Tea

4)? Or, again from a postcolonial perspective, should these terms be preceded with the word parasitic, and hence Development Educators should highlight the parasitic-interconnectedness or the parasitic-interdependence where the global north, the parasite, benefits at the expense of the global south, the host? Or as Tea 3 puts it later in the interview when defining an African perspective in Development Education;

*“I suppose it is a recognition, as well, that the locus of the problem is largely in the northern hemisphere where we live, and the major change needs to occur here, and the structures that create poverty are largely in the rich northern hemisphere. So maybe in a strange kind of way our focus needs to be on, to contribute to an African perspective, our focus needs to be on the north. So it is tackling the root of the problem which lies mostly in the north and we are in a position to do that”* (Tea 3)

Although this quote wasn't initially assigned to this category, the researcher feels that it is important to introduce it, at this point, to highlight the importance for Development Educators to define words such as interconnectedness and interdependence, and how these might *“contribute to an African perspective... in tackling the root of the problem which lies mostly in the north”* (Tea 3).

Nevertheless, in talking about defining Development Education or Global Education in general, Cocoa 1 comments that, *“we are so caught up in defining it and putting words to it... I think as well that they are just words”*. However Tea 3 states that *“I think it is important for us (Development Educators) to challenge the language and usage of our terms”*. Tea 1 agrees *“with Tea 3 too about examining the terms we use as they are all tricky terms”*. Banana 2 claims that *“you can get bogged down with terminology as well, but in some ways it's important as well to, I don't know”*.

Indeed, the researcher argues that in many *“ways it's important as well to...get bogged down with terminology”*, in order to contribute to the African perspective that Tea 3 refers to. From a post-colonial viewpoint Development Educators should perhaps make explicit how their definitions of interdependence and interconnectedness ‘purport to constitute a form of anti-hegemonic discourse which critically addresses both the interpretation of the colonial past and its ongoing effects in the present (Lawson, 2010, p299). Or, as the researcher put it earlier, where the global north, the parasite, benefits at the expense of the global south, the host. In fact, however, when describing a specific Development Education project with young people from a post-primary school, one participant describes how he or she attempts to highlight how interconnectedness or interdependence may be considered parasitic in its nature.

*“Also, we talk about the relations between aid and trade where we use another ratio of the 5/50/500 where we realise that the government contributes 50 billion in aid, followed by 5 billion contributed by charities, and then the global north takes back 500 billion through unfair trade, tax, and many ways in which these multinational companies take resources without actually paying just amounts for the resources, and then the contribution of the developing nations to the developed nations’ economy is more of a symbiosis but this symbiosis is not a fair one with the developed world getting all the resources, and this is never reflected in the global north, but it is always reflected about we’re (developing nations) helping them (developing nations), we are giving to them, but of course aid is given to the developing nations but a lot of that aid is taken up in administrative use and so on, and then a lot of conditions are attached to this aid where they (developing nations) have to spend it on such and such, no matter if it is needed. Then to show them (the students) how the developing nations have to actually impoverish developing nations...the likes of the world bank, the IMF, the world trade organisations and so on...these are some of the things we try to explore (with the students) as much as possible within the hour, and then also advise them (the students) of organisations and web sites where they can also go to for more information, and they should feel free to approach these organisations. Now I do as much in an hour as I can and this is basically it”.*

This participant does *“as much as possible within the hour”*, to highlight to the students, perhaps the parasitic interconnected relationship between the global north and south which *“is more of a symbiosis but this symbiosis is not a fair one with the developed world getting all the resources, and this is never reflected in the global north, but it is always reflected about we’re (developing nations) helping them”* (developing nations). Maybe this highlights the potential of Development Education for exposing *“that the locus of the problem is largely in the northern hemisphere where we live, and the major change needs to occur here, and the structures that create poverty are largely in the rich northern hemisphere* (Tea 3). Furthermore, from a structuration standpoint, Tea 3’s statement that *“we are in a position to do that”*, perhaps highlights the will of Development Educators to *act otherwise* to create the conditions for agency to transform dominant structures, or *act otherwise* to embed an African perspective within their work.

However, the extent to which Development Educators, through their education programmes, can actually affect change in *“the structures that create poverty which are largely in the rich northern hemisphere”* (Tea 3) would perhaps need to be made more explicit. Such structures that have created poverty, as Giddens might argue, have become embedded into time and space. Thus, as high-

lighted in Chapter 2, ‘it is true that the more institutions bite into time and space then the more resistant they are to manipulation or change by any individual agent’ (Giddens, 1984, p171). Even though Giddens argues that agents have the potential to *act otherwise*, and subsequently transform dominant structures, he recognises that the action may be restrained due to the nature of these very structures. Even Freire acknowledges that we are in many ways shaped by our structures, and will never have complete transformative control. In this respect, Freire resonates somewhat with Giddens’ notion of restraint. Hence, to what extent are Development Educators overtly political and radical in exposing and challenging these dominant structures? The researcher will address this point again in due course.

For now, however, as presented earlier, Cocoa 1 states the importance of “*encouraging people to take some kind of action towards challenging injustice in the world*”. As presented below, taking action, challenging and exposing injustice is referred to by other participants.

**Sugar 1** “*Development Education encourages people to take action for change*”.

**Banana 2** “*...the skills to empower people to actually take an action or whatever*”.

**Banana 1** “*Um, and it’s active and participative and all those other things...*”

**Coffee 3** “*I think the important thing for us, or for me is, um, not just giving the information, but being able to act, being able to translate what one has learned into practical action on the ground. I think that’s crucial...to move individuals and communities to act in the understanding of how global issues affect people*”.

**Tea 2** “*...and then about taking action, so you are trying to do something as well, and not just learn about the issues*”.

**Tea 1** “*...and not to be afraid of action but finding that action to be in wherever we are so that we ourselves are being quite genuine about our own thoughts. I think we as Development Educators should encourage all kinds of action, from children challenging attitudes in their family to local action here which is very much needed in Ireland*”.

**Sugar 3** “*Development Education exposes the inequalities that exist between the north and the south*”.

**Coffee 2** “*Well it is about responsibility as well, and taking responsibility for your actions, and having an understanding of the impact of those actions...the ripple effect around the world of every small action.*”

**Sugar** *“Development Education is about the empowerment of the educator to understand inequality and assist others to understand”.*

**Banana 2** *“I suppose the reason that we do it (Development Education) is because, um, in terms of why you do it, yes it is definitely to do with the justice but it is because, like a lot of people here just are so closed in and don’t realise the injustices, or they close themselves off to it or it’s so overwhelming that they just maybe don’t cope with it, if you know what I mean, so they just don’t want to know about it”.*

**Tea 2** *“Development Education is about exploring power and injustice around the world and in Ireland”.*

**Sugar 1** *“Development Education is about challenging global inequalities”.*

**Banana 1** *“Well I just, well it is funny because I have gone over it in my head so many times, but I see it as global justice, but global as incorporating the local. For me it is really about ways in trying to make the world fairer...but for me I always refer back to global justice, but not meaning global as out there but we are part of the global”.*

It seems that the above participant quotes are synonymous with Tormey’s (2003) definition of Development Education, which, for Tormey, aims to awaken in people the need for action for justice, and ultimately focuses ‘on social justice...nationally and internationally’ (Tormey, 2003, quoted in McCormack and O’Flaherty, 2010, p1333). Or, as Banana 1 puts it, *“global justice, but global as incorporating the local...but not meaning global as out there but we are part of the global”*. Similarly, as Tea 2 states, *“Development Education is about exploring power and injustice around the world and in Ireland”*.

In relation to taking action, Coffee 3 indicates, *“I think the important thing for us, or for me is, um, not just giving the information, but being able to act, being able to translate what one has learned into practical action on the ground”*. This, perhaps, highlights the emphasis that Development Education places on knowledge being transferred into action for change, or transformative action, as Giddens would put it. This implies that people can think themselves to *act otherwise* against civilised oppression and subsequent oppression, and that social change depends on *“trying to do something as well and not just learn about the issues”* (Tea 2).

However, as presented below, in describing their specific Development Education projects, it is not clearly evident that the action they themselves take, and also *“encourage people to*

*take...towards challenging injustice in the world” (Cocoa 1), is action which can be considered overtly political and radical in challenging structures domination.*

*“Ok, I will run by what I do. We did work on culture of origin and took that to the schools. Where I myself would go into the schools and talk about my country of origin and issues. It was very interesting for them (students) to know about my culture and they were asking some questions and all that and they were very interested”.*

*“We do lots of teacher trainer and have done for years now. We base it around the themes of the curriculum”.*

*“We do a lot of work with teachers and link into the curriculum to help them meet the aims”.*

*“We do teacher training. That just looks at the four main curriculum themes of local and global citizenship, and tries to get critical thinking skills where teachers can get critical thinking into the schools with their students”.*

*“Well, in our organisation’s work we are involved in so many things...training and...but I won’t go into all that and I will actually talk about what I do. There’s a workshop every week for 1 hour where we do a lot of Development Education with final year students from a secondary school. We bring in about twelve students of different groups every week but they are all final year students. The aims and objectives are to expose the issues of global justice or injustice and the impact on local communities in Ireland. We talk about issues related to the ratio 80/20 where 80% of the world’s population lives on 20% of the world’s resources and 20% of the world’s population lives on the 80% of injustice, and how we can make this more balanced is discussed (with the young people). We then try to empower them (the students) to take action, and not to feel that it (the action) has to be too big, but no matter how small your action is, even if it is challenging your family at the dinner table or whatever even about the images (of the developing world) on TV or whatever, and from there they are making their own contribution about injustice in the world”.*

*“We used street theatre, and had sort of theatrical interventions in public spaces and raised issues about local and global stuff, and that got a good response”.*

*“We worked with a women’s centre and explored the issue of sex trafficking and the local and global injustices around that”.*

Although it is not evident that the above projects are overtly political and radical, they at least indicate that Development Educators are attempting to generate an enthusiasm for social change. As one participant puts it, “*we then try to empower them (the students) to take action, and not to feel that it (the action) has to be too big, but no matter how small your action is, even if it is challenging your family at the dinner table or whatever even about the images (of the developing world) on TV or whatever, and from there they are making their own contribution about injustice in the world*”. Such action could possibly be described as authentic action, or an achievable action that a young person can take. However, in relation to these findings, whether or not such authentic action will result in young people becoming future activists who will be overtly political and radical in challenging structures of domination, or White cultural supremacy, is not a claim that can be made.

Nevertheless, it is evident that the participants of this project are at least attempting to foster a spirit for change, even if it is to simply train teachers to focus on critical thinking skills with their students. Also, Banana 2 refers to “*the skills to empower people to actually take an action or whatever*”. Perhaps, then, it is the skills that are the link between knowledge and action, and therefore fundamental to *encourage people to take some kind of action towards challenging injustice in the world*” (Cocoa 1), even if this action is “*challenging your family at the dinner table*”. Hence, it is through the specific skills that, ‘participants come to understand that if people want to make change, they must engage the problem and find solutions rather than hoping someone else might determine and enforce resolution’ (Howard, 2003, p220).

In fact, as presented below, participants refer to the importance of the skill of critical thinking, or questioning.

**Tea 2** “*An important thing is critical reflection and analysis and exposing the structural causes*”.

**Sugar 1** “*It (Development Education) promotes critical thinking*”.

**Tea 1** “*I think the idea of questioning, as rather than the idea of imparting onto whoever we are working with, I think for us to have a global awareness and pull it back to us because it is usually always very safe to look out*”.

**Tea 1** “*I suppose also not just being, um, in relation to this critical perspective to be critical of where knowledge itself comes from, and being very critical about the sources of information and the ways that we learn or understand things*”.

**Coffee 2** “*I think that what we (educators) try to do is just prompt the question. If they (young people) even have the awareness and the questioning, then gradually I think they will change and adopt different attitudes to things...*”

Indeed, the above quotes suggest that Development Education is very much rooted in critical pedagogy. Critical pedagogy invokes a language of critique and a language of possibility, in that it is ‘centred in the active body doing; the active mind knowing; and an active civic responsibility that collectivizes and promotes democracy and human rights’ (quoted in Alexander, 2005, p426). In essence, critical pedagogy encourages thinking critically in relation to socio-political lived experiences. ‘In this sense, critical pedagogy is grounded in the moral imperative of exposing systems of oppression’ (Alexander, 2005, p425), or as Tea 2 puts it, “*exposing the structural causes*”. Here, if anywhere, highlights perhaps the potential of Development Education to draw on structuration and postcolonial theory, to theorise how the skills they impart through practice helps create the conditions to enable people to *act otherwise* in the Giddens sense, and take action against structures of domination, or civilised oppression and subsequent oppression. Further, the researcher argues that Development Education should conduct research studies to test this suggested theory and measure the impact of “*just prompting the question*”, and how this leads to an “*awareness and the questioning, then gradually*” to young people “*changing and adopting...different...attitudes to things*” (Coffee 2), or studies to highlight how Development Educators “*pull it back to us because it is usually always very safe to look out*” (Tea 1). Perhaps such theorising, together with empirical research evidence, will enable Development Educators to be more specific in showing the extent to which their practice is overtly political and radical in challenging structures of domination, or White cultural supremacy.

Nevertheless, for now, the above findings might suggest that the object of Development Education is to arouse critical awareness and to, at least, generate an enthusiasm for *acting otherwise*, where ‘the game changes from being solely a concern for understanding, to an interest in social and personal change’ (Robson, 1993, p430) that encourages action, *and not to feel that it (the action) has to be too big, but no matter how small your action is...from there they (the students) are making their own contribution about injustice in the world*”.

As pointed out at the beginning of this section, by Cocoa 1 “*working towards like more sustainable issues*”, was also considered to be an important aspect of Development Education. Indeed, as listed below, other participants agree with Cocoa 1.

**Banana 1** “*Yes, I think Development Education is about how we can learn to live more sustainably, and I think nobody, nobody you know is a real expert in that, you know, but I think*

*we could definitely learn things from the rest of the world about how to live more sustainably”.*

**Coffee 2** *“I constantly try to raise the environmental leg of sustainability when we are talking about Development Education or Environmental Education or whatever. I think they are all one of the same thing. I don’t think that they can be divided, and I think that’s that...we have got to bring all three of the, um the environment, the people and the economy...I would be resolute in that because if we do not have a healthy environment for everyone, we will never have equality and we will never have justice because you can’t do it without having your environment in good condition”.*

**Banana 1** *“Development Education, what I always think is interesting, it’s as much about local development as it is about global development because it’s about how we all develop in a way that’s fair and sustainable”.*

**Banana 2** *“But at the same time I talk about how we can live in a sustainable way, but we can all do things to live more sustainably”.*

Banana 1 claims that in relation to sustainability, *“nobody you know is a real expert in that, you know, but I think we could definitely learn things from the rest of the world about how to live more sustainably”.* Banana 2 states that *“we can all do things to live more sustainably”.* For Coffee 2, *“Development Education or Environmental Education or whatever...are all one of the same thing. I don’t think that they can be divided”.* Indeed, the participant project presented below highlights the importance this specific participant places on environmental sustainability in relation to Development Education.

*“We do a global schools partnership programme and link students here with students in a country in the developing world, and they work on the theme of litter especially plastic, and they have been taking action to tackle this. This also provides computers and computer training so in the over sea country they can have a school website, and also promote an eco-trail initiative we have going”.*

Perhaps the above project highlights that environmental issues are a common theme that global schools partnership programmes draw on to create a dialogue between students from the global north and south. In fact, Coffee 1 argues that dialogue between the global north and south is central to perhaps bringing an African perspective to Development Education. *“When there isn’t a dialogue going in both directions”,* states Coffee 1, *“you know, when they (students) study in isolation, but if there is opportunity for dialogue between both countries (global north and south*

countries) *then I think it would be an opportunity to encourage the listening as well as critical thinking*".

Overall then, the above discussion presents and analyses the findings on how the participants of this study define Development Education in relation to interconnectedness, interdependence, taking action, challenging injustice, and sustainability. As Cocoa 1 sums it up, *"I suppose Development Education is people, and it's political and it's environmental, and um, it's like interactive as well"*. However, as presented above, the extent to which Development Education is overtly political and radical is not apparent in these findings. At best, the above findings indicate that these Development Educators attempt to arouse critical awareness and to at least generate an enthusiasm for *acting otherwise*. Whether or not this enthusiasm will lead to future activists who will transform structures of domination is not evident through this analysis.

Some participants, however, further described Development Education in terms of a process of personal development which perhaps might be argued is a prerequisite to politically *acting otherwise*, or as Coffee 1 puts it, *"I think I would put to encourage self awareness first...before moving to how we have an impact through our actions on how one country can have an impact on another"*. Hence, as Tea 4 states, *"Development Education makes it to me kind of more personal"*. Cocoa 1 also claims that *"in some ways I think Development Education is so personal and so spiritual, because you need to go through a process of personal development to kind of understand it"*. To further explain the logic for this process, Cocoa 1 states;

*"So it's not like a university lecture that's one way, but it's a process where everybody has some kind of knowledge, so we (Development Educators) try to somehow base it (Development Education) on what people already know, and then build on that to kind of all grow in a deeper understanding...We could just give out information and produce a television ad saying aid is not working, and we need loads and loads of other things, but that would be a shock factor which can be dis-empowering for people. So you have to develop relationships to grow up with people so we can together try to work it out"*.

As presented below, Banana 1 also describes such a process, but in terms of people finding their own path.

*"And to find their own path, their own journey, and I think that's the thing is that it's going to look different for every single individual because everybody is in a kind of different, their own world, their own perspectives so their paths for global justice will be different, you know, and I think we have to be careful that we're not...because it doesn't offer answers nec-*

*essarily, but maybe it supports people on their different paths to equality...and I never thought about it (justice issues) five years ago, you know what I mean, and that is just...I'm on a different stage of the journey. I am no smarter or anything than anybody else like, and I have a long way to go, but I just think, like when you see people along the journey...if we could try to see people with like...just having the opportunity to go on the journey”.*

Banana 2 agrees that;

*“that’s really right saying about everyone’s on a different path, because I think very often Development Education is seen as a bit self righteous and a bit like preaching that you should live your life in a certain way and that doesn’t work either, so you know...you know, I hope that I don’t preach...but there’s not necessarily a perfect model”.*

Perhaps this process, or path, that these participants are describing could be argued to be important for addressing the *anxiety mechanism* that Giddens refers to in his structuration theory (see Chapter 2.1). Maybe Development Education should draw on this theory to highlight that the personal process is essential to alleviate the anxiety-controlling-mechanism that renders people prone to the reproduction of structures of domination. Perhaps such theorising would highlight the importance of “*developing relationships to grow up with people so we can together try to work it out*” rather than “*just giving out information and produce a television ad saying aid is not working...that would be a shock factor*”, or perhaps would arouse a level of anxiety, “*which can be disempowering for people*” (Cocoa 1). Indeed, however, this would be difficult to prove, and would need extensive longitudinal studies to provide evidence that this personal process would lead to people finding the capacity to, as Giddens puts it, *act otherwise* and transform structures of domination. Nevertheless, theorising their practice in this context may at least provide a rationale to highlight that Development Educators, at the very least, attempt to create appropriate conditions to enable people to develop personally and politically, with the aim of “*finding their own path*” to becoming transformative agents who take action against structures of domination, or White cultural supremacy.

In sum, then, and despite the above analysis, the findings at this point suggest that the participants of this study define Development Education in terms of a process, interconnectedness, interdependence, taking action, challenging injustice, sustainability, and indeed evoking skills such as critical thinking.

However, when the researcher asked if Development Education is the same as Global Education, participants seemed to indicate a lack of clarity and understanding in relation to the terminology

they use. As Tea 2 seems to capture, *“some people use Global Education and Development Education interchangeably and then other people think that Global Education is education about the world. So it wouldn’t have a more critical aspect to it. Um, but I think with any of these terms, people will say that they are doing Development Education, but then when you talk to them about what they are doing their understanding is different”*.

In fact, as presented below, this lack of clarity and understanding is highlighted as some participants, on hearing the term Global Education, re-defined Development Education in a totally different context from presented earlier above.

**Coffee 1** *“I think that I have felt that maybe Global Education would accomplice more social, economic, environmental, you know, all the issues. Um maybe, Development Education, may be perceived by people to me more sort of a one way, you know what we’re (global north) doing for the poor south, or even just students studying about another country without the other country studying about them. Yes that sort of one way thing. I like the term Global Education. With Development Education, I think a lot of people would be thinking aid”*.

**Sugar 1** *“But you could argue, for example, that the definition of Development Education is based on that there are parts in the world that are developed and underdeveloped. Almost everybody I know who works in Development Education would challenge themselves that model (divide between developed and underdeveloped) in the sense that, you know, your economy can perform poorly but culturally, environmentally, socially it might be well developed”*.

In this context, these participants are defining Development Education in terms that it portrays the developing world in contrast to the global north, or in relation to Young’s (2010) two-worlds concept which has a tendency to lead to a focus on difference between *us* and *them* (see Chapter 1.2). This is quite opposite to the earlier definition of Development Education where participants defined interconnectedness as central to avoiding the dichotomy between *us* and *them* *“to make sure the problems are not seen as their (global south) issue”* (Tea 3).

Banana 2, as highlighted below, also describes his or her *“issues with the term Development Education”*;

*“I did a course where we examined terminology and stuff and I always found it a bit strange because, so for me it was more that they called it Development Education when the main agenda was around developing people’s awareness so they would give money, and*

*then it did move to become something else to be more about developing and empowering people to take action, and I suppose the shift has been happening over decades so for me, and then I would have issues with the term development, because of like developing them (global south) and I think that the language just, you know is very unbalanced”.*

Here, Banana 2 is describing the historical context of Development Education when, ‘by the end of the 1970’s, the term was being used in a narrower sense, as governments and NGOs engaged in the development sector sought public support and involvement’ (Bourn, 2009, p2). However, this was before Freire’s writings began to influence Development Education. Nevertheless, Banana 2 has “*issues with the term development...the language just, you know is very unbalanced*”. Indeed it might be argued that the term development could be construed as a ‘*very unbalanced*’ extension of colonialism. As Seabrook argues, ‘since imperialism was identified with capitalism, the West had to produce a convincing alternative to a socialism which promised social justice and equality. This is how development was born...defined exclusively as economic development...and smuggled in the idea that underdeveloped countries were infants, their destiny was to grow up like those which had once cast themselves as mother-countries’ (see Seabrook, 2009, p63-65). From this standpoint, it is perhaps understandable that Coffee 1 states that “*Development Education, may be perceived by people to be more sort of a one way, you know what we’re (global north) doing for the poor south*”, and that Sugar 1 claims that “*almost everybody I know who works in Development Education would challenge themselves that model*”. Or, as Cocoa 2 asks, “*yea, I’m just trying to think. Do you (Cocoa 1) think that Development Education is more for the developed countries here? I mean, do you think Development Education works the same way as it does here...that people in the global south are aware of all the different problems?*” Indeed, in this respect, and in union with Cocoa 1 and 2 “*my question is where is Development Education coming from, and who is deciding*” (Cocoa 1)?

Nevertheless, it should be noted that the above issues with the term Development Education only emerged after the participants were asked if Development Education is the same as Global Education. Prior to this, participants appeared confident in defining Development Education in terms of Freirean notions of empowerment and action for social change.

Despite this finding, however, some participants, as listed below, held steadfast to their initial definition and preference of the use of the term Development Education as opposed to Global Education.

**Tea 3** “*Yes, Global Education could be just about learning about global issues but not in a critical way. It’s about learning about the world as it is and then more or less accepting*

*it as, um, you know looking at the world as a static reality rather than something we can change. I think Development Education at least should have that element of the critical dimension and be an education with a purpose and the purpose is to create change to structures”.*

**Tea 1** *“I think the term Global Education seems like a slightly more limited term to me because I can imagine Global Education going down the road of...let’s learn about all of them (developing world) out there sort of thing...and my understanding of Development Education would be to focus on interconnectedness and local/global. But, yes, um, sometimes when I hear the term Global Education I think, um, I see it as a potential hazardous term because it could sort of like be learning about something outside rather than about where we are at locally and how it affects the global”.*

**Tea 4** *“To me another element of Development Education is the skills you learn from it, you know like communication, interacting with other people in group work, and maybe in Global Education it is more about just thought rather than being part of a development process”.*

**Tea 1** *“Yes and creativity and creative methodologies is implied in, you know, that term Education for Liberation which is important for Development Education”.*

**Sugar 2** *“Well in Global Education if you are talking about trade, they talk about the interrelations of trade, and how the countries trade with one another, but in the case of Development Education, they look at it with more of a critical view on what are the causes and effect of trade from one part of the world to the other. For example, look at Fife bananas, which today is the largest exporter of bananas. They are based in Ireland. It’s an Irish company, the largest exporter of banana, and not one single plant of banana growing in Ireland. So on a Global Education course they would be talking about trade and the advantage of FIFE importing raw materials of banana, but in Development Education they would take a more critical look at it, and how in Ireland they take the whole profit by taking in the raw banana, and it is unjust”.*

**Sugar 2** *“I think Development Education focuses more on the impact of the economic and political decisions, like the global north decisions on the developing countries. It is like cause and effect. Because of the policies in the developed world there is an effect on the developing world. For example, when in Development Education you talk about trade, or trading arms from the developed nations to the developing nations, and then the effect of*

*this trade in arms in relation to war, famine and migrants, so then the effect of it is back on the developed nations”.*

It seems that these participants define the term Global Education as counterproductive to Freire’s notion of a dialogical form of education. Global Education, for these participants, reduces students to empty vessels where they learn facts “*about trade and the advantage of FIFE importing raw materials of banana*” (Sugar 2), or “*let’s learn about all of them (developing world) out there sort of thing*” (Tea 1). Hence, in this respect, “*learning about global issues but not in a critical way...learning about the world as it is and then more or less accepting it...you know looking at the world as a static reality rather than something we can change*”(Tea 3), is more conducive to Freire’s concept of ‘banking education’. As described in Chapter 1, ‘banking education, as Freire understands it, acts as a pillar maintaining an oppressive social order: the more students put their efforts into receiving and storing information deposited in them, the less they can attain the critical consciousness that comes from intervening in reality as makers and transformers of the world’ (quoted in Blackburn, 2000, p6). The term, Development Education, however, for these participants strives to enable people to think critically, expose systems of oppression, and bring about socio-political transformation. As Tea 1 puts it “*I think Development Education at least should have that element of the critical dimension and be an education with a purpose and the purpose is to create and change structures*”. Thus, it is such education, according to Freire, that is ‘capable of empowering students to respond thoughtfully to the social controls that undergird oppression’ (quoted in Van Gorder, 2007, p10).

On the other hand, as presented earlier, some participants view the term Development Education “*to be more sort of a one way, you know what we’re (global north) doing for the poor south*” (Coffee 1), which would likely deter the ability of students to *act otherwise* and respond to civilised oppression and subsequent oppression.

Hence, perhaps the findings from this study highlight that Development Educators, or if they prefer to be known as Global Educators, should grapple with the terminology they use to ensure it is clearly theoretically situated in “*you know, that term Education for Liberation which is important for Development Education*” (Tea 1).

In fact, the following exchange between the researcher and Banana 2, perhaps highlights how terminology is used within this field without an in depth consideration of the implications of the usage of such terms.

**Banana 2** *“So, yes, I think they are the same thing, and the term Global Education has only come about, like for example, in the subgroup, um, it was always a Development Education subgroup, and I think then, at a meeting a few years ago, we kind of decided to change it to Global Education. To be honest, we didn’t have a big kind of debate about it. I think a lot of people in their own heads had made a shift, so then I think then it was just let’s do it”* (change to the term Global Education).

**Researcher** *“Where do you think the shift came from that was in people’s heads?”*

**Banana 2** *“Well the people on the Development Education subgroup are from NGOs and that but I wouldn’t necessarily say the shift came from people higher up in those organisations. I think it was more from us (Development Educators) ourselves because of our work in education”.*

The above data seems to indicate that a shift from using the term Development Education to Global Education was made without *“a big kind of debate”*, but rather *“because of our work in education”*. It is assumed that the participant is referring to Development Education work in formal education. In this context it is argued that such a shift would have merited an intensive debate, due to questions raised in Chapter 1 in relation to Development Educators bringing a radical perspective to the formal education system, which might be considered to be a system that perpetuates a *hidden curriculum*, and subsequently promotes White Western supremacy. However, the researcher wishes to stress that she does not consider this finding to be representative of the Development Education subgroup quoted above. Nevertheless, the finding merits, at least, to be considered in relation to the importance of being rigorous in the use of terminology within this field.

Nevertheless, as presented below, some participants state that the terminology can be used interchangeably in different contexts, or they state that Global Education is the same thing as Development Education.

**Banana 1** *“...it depends who you’re working with because you don’t want to alienate people, and I feel like you want to work with people from where they’re starting from, so for example, teachers use Global Citizenship. You know I just use, depending on your audience I just use whatever term makes sense for them...It’s all just different gateways into the same field really”.*

**Banana 2** *“Like, can we not just say to teachers that we are supporting them in Global Citizenship because that’s what’s on the curricula or whatever because I just think teachers will go is this another term?”*

**Coffee 2** *“I think Global Education and Development Education really major very much on equality, justice, human rights, all those sorts of big issues”.*

**Sugar 1** *“Well, the Centre for Global Education in Northern Ireland would clearly use the term Global Education, and they clearly focus on the word global being the process of globalisation as increasing interdependence, but also on the need to decrease global inequalities between people which are the building blocks of Development Education”.*

**Tea 4** *“I think it is just all language we use, and at the end of the day I don’t think there is much of a difference”.*

**Coffee 3** *“I think Development Education is slightly wider, broader, um, but they’re very similar. It’s just all terminology, but they are trying to address the same thing in my view”.*

**Banana 1** *“I would say agree (that Global Education and Development Education is the same thing) only because I would use the term interchangeably but I can see why people would see them as different but...I think it depends on how it’s used. I think it depends on the facilitator that’s doing it... but I feel like I have it clear in my own head. Now, it maybe took me a wee while”.*

These participants appear to view Development Education and Global Education as *“just all terminology...trying to address the same thing”*, or *“just all language we use”*, or terms that can be used interchangeably *“depending on your audience”*. Indeed, as Banana 1 points out *“you don’t want to alienate people”*. Indeed it is important to *“work with people where they are starting from”*. In this respect, perhaps Global Education or Global Citizenship are terms that will avoid teachers feeling alienated, and provide *“gateways into the same field really”*. Perhaps, in relation to the question posed in Chapter 1, this is an indication of why Development Educators use a range of terminology in relation to their work. Perhaps, it is simply intended to gain access into the field of formal education in order to *“work with people where they are starting from”*, which again may be necessary to alleviate the anxiety-controlling mechanism that Giddens refers to.

On the other hand, however, is this usage of interchangeable terms indicative of the fact that ‘Development Education has been a movement which speaks only to itself, it has not located itself within a broader critical pedagogical discourse’ (McCollum, 1996, quoted in Bourn, 2009, p13)?

Hence, is Development Education a movement that has increasingly found itself located in formal education, without considering the theoretical implications of using terminology that might perhaps leave it open to the charge of aligning itself with a system that perpetuates a divide between the global north and south, and subsequently promotes White Western supremacy (see Chapter 1)? In this respect, it could be argued that Development Educators, particularly due to their increasing affiliation with the formal education sector and citizenship teaching, need to contribute to academic research and debate, and justify the terms they use to conceptualise their work. As Sugar 1 states, *“Development Education and Global Education share an awful lot of the same things, but I think sometimes we (Development Educators) allow ourselves to use the word global and we don’t actually interrogate what it means”*. Or as Cocoa 1 puts it, *“I think this terminology is so interesting, and even the term education implies that there is somebody who knows something and somebody else doesn’t, and for me that’s not what Development Education is about. It’s about that we all know something and will add to the pot, so I suppose we need to look at those words Development Education and Global Education and the assumptions that society has about those words”*.

This need to grapple with the terminology to conceptualise their work could also be considered to be important to alleviate the confusion that the below participants expressed in relation to the different terms.

**Cocoa 2** *“I think all the terms are just confusing for people, because then people think why development, why global?”*

**Banana 2** *“I’m not sure that, you know...has anyone ever classified them and defined them as being two different things? I think the problem is, it’s not, because if there was a clear definition it would help, and I think this is hard for the wider public to hear the different terms”*.

**Cocoa 1** *“This is a question I always ask myself, because I think there’s like with development, people think of economic development and think of developing and developed, and they think the way to stamp out poverty is through economic development, and that’s why I am hesitant about Development Education, but I think, I don’t know. You see Global Education for me is about connecting the local and global, but then sometimes it can be seen as out there, so maybe it should be Glocal Education instead, so I don’t know”*.

**Tea 4** *“I don’t know actually because to me Global Education entails Environmental Education, Development Education, you know, um, I don’t know, but sometimes people sepa-*

*rate Environmental Education and Development Education, and if you do both it then somehow becomes Global Education”.*

**Banana 1** *“Sometimes it gets frustrating, I mean so much, like at any Development Education conference you’re like please don’t ask about terms because it always goes round in circles”.*

Banana 2 asks, *“has anyone ever classified them and defined them as being two different things”?* Again this perhaps indicates the need for Development Education to *“go round in circles”* to ensure that the Development Educators themselves are not confused with the range of terminology, and are confident with defending the usage of such terms in relation to their theoretical position and broader critical pedagogical discourse that frames their specific terminology.

Perhaps the overall findings and analysis of this category indicate that if Development Education is to gain a foothold in the academic and research community, it needs to begin to address all of the issues raised above, and perhaps this will lead to greater clarity and evidence as to how their work is Freirean, political and radical, and how it exposes systems of civilised oppression and subsequent oppression to bring about socio-political transformation in relation to global inequalities. Perhaps, in fact, from a postcolonial perspective, it might be argued that this is essential for stating their position in relation to challenging White cultural domination, evidencing how their practice evokes students to *act otherwise*, and therefore possibly contributing towards defining an African perspective in Development Education.

### **3.3 Community Development**

As presented in Chapter 2, the researcher employed qualitative content analysis, or what David Altheide (1987) terms ethnographic content analysis (ECA), to code and categorise the research findings. ECA, as highlighted earlier, uses pre-defined categories in order to identify themes. However, ‘although categories and variables initially guide the study, others are allowed and expected to emerge throughout the study’ (Altheide, 1987, p68). ‘Community development and the local perspective’ emerged as an unexpected category within this study. The researcher views it important to present this unexpected data at this point in the analysis, as it emerged from the discussion concerning defining Development Education and Global Education. Thus, to analyse this data at this point, will better structure the chapter for the reader.

As listed below, some participants viewed Development Education in terms of Community Development.

**Cocoa 1** *“But you know, I think Development Education is more about community development. So if there is community development happening in Ethiopia or whatever, that means people are talking about their communities and what challenges they are facing, and how they can overcome those challenges, and I think this is something we can learn from on this side because I think Development Education is seen to be separate from all other local developments, so maybe we could learn how people are working locally within their communities in other parts of the world. But I think that is something we don’t explore enough, like what Development Education and Community Development looks like in the global south”.*

**Cocoa 2** *“Yes, and I think more of a focus on what is actually going on in different communities over the world, rather than on different countries north and south. Maybe if it centres on more community stuff all over the world and how connections are made there”.*

**Cocoa 1** *“Yes, focusing on community development both sides (north and south) could provide loads of opportunities for Development Education”*

**Sugar 1** *“Good Development Education is good local community work and youth work practice... And so that combined with a commitment that Development Education just doesn’t happen where we are based in Ireland, but actually youth work happens in other countries and if we are trying to promote Development Education in Ireland then we should be out there in other countries to learn about their youth work”*

For Sugar 1, *“if we are trying to promote Development Education in Ireland then we should be out there in other countries to learn about their youth work”*. Cocoa 2 refers to the importance of focusing *“on what is actually going on in different communities over the world...more community stuff all over the world and how connections are made there”*. Cocoa 1 further states that, *“Development Education is seen to be separate from all other local developments, so maybe we could learn how people are working locally within their communities in other parts of the world. But I think that is something we don’t explore enough, like what Development Education and Community Development looks like in the global south”*.

Community Development, or even Youth Work, nonetheless, is a wide area that depends on what form of active citizenship frames it. For instance, on the one hand, there is a settled form of community development based around social maintenance and defensive active citizenship, which operates within the existing power structures. For example, in context of Development Education,

taking action for fair trade, but not challenging the underlying unequal power relations, such as protesting against White western power structures. ‘An unsettled and edgy community development’, on the other hand, ‘requires critical, proactive, visionary, cosmopolitan and active citizens who are prepared to challenge the existing power relations’ (see Kenny, 2010, pp7-10). Nevertheless, “*what Development Education and Community Development looks like in the global south*” (Cocoa 1), is indeed an under researched area, and, in fact, there has been little related research of wider NGOs supporting community development in both developing and developed societies’ (see Kenny, 2010, p17).

Perhaps, the above findings indicate that there is a lot of unsettling to be done in relation to exploring the link between Development Education and Community Development, and to explore why “*Development Education, you know that we are not linking with community education or activist struggles*” (Tea 2). However, it should be noted that only four participants referred to the importance of Community Development. Nevertheless, it is considered an important finding, since this study comprises of fifteen participants in total. Thus, perhaps, due to the lack of exploration between Development Education and Community Development in both the global north and south, perhaps “*we are missing something there, you know*” (Tea 2), in relation to working towards being overtly political and radical in challenging unequal power relations inherent within White western supremacy.

### **3.4 Civilised Oppression and Oppression: Challenges for Development Educators in *acting otherwise***

Chapter 1 highlighted many of the challenges facing Development Educators, in relation to being overtly political, radical and exposing systems of civilised oppression and subsequent oppression. For example, the media, NGO development organisations, funders, and the formal education sector were argued to be manifestations of possible civilised oppression, and due to Development Educators close affiliation with NGOs and formal education, they may be located in systems that contribute to the reproduction of White cultural supremacy and global inequalities. Thus, this project aims to explore the views of Development Educators on these issues (see Chapter 1 for detailed outline), and investigate the challenges they face in relation to *acting otherwise* to transform, what Giddens would term, structures of domination that have bitten into time and space.

### *Challenging the Charity Model of Development*

As detailed in Chapter 1, one system of, perhaps, civilised oppression that Development Educators aim to expose is the stereotypical emotional images and messaging that the media use to represent the developing world. Furthermore, many Development Educators are based in NGO development organisations that are fundamentally concerned with tapping into the media *branding* of the developing world to encourage the general public to offer financial support for their various projects based in the global south. As Tea 3 explains;

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

Perhaps with some development NGOs *“pedalling that philosophy very strongly and reinforcing stereotypes”*, this may continue to contribute to the public view of the developing world as a *charity*, and therefore contribute to the reproduction of civilised oppression and subsequent oppression. Hence, for Development Educators, *“raising uncomfortable questions that we (global north) are part of the problem, that, um, is a more difficult message to get across”* (Tea 3).

To explore this area, as stated below, the researcher posed;

**Researcher** *“Um the first one is, it is difficult for Development Educators to challenge the charity model of development...amongst the general public...and I suppose what I mean about the charity model is images and messaging to give a pound to the poor starving children, you know that charity model stereotypical use of images and messages for public support?”*

In relation to challenging the charity model of development, participants highlighted many complexities that they face *“because the charity model has been portrayed for so long. I mean, I think we all remember it, and um, it is in people’s minds and you know”* (Tea 4). As Cocoa 2 explains;

*“I think I agree (that it’s difficult to challenge the charity model) although I think it’s harder for people to look at poverty and all these things without getting into the really sympathetic things of people dying and really skinny little black kids. So they have to see that (sympathetic images) so they can go – o, I have two pounds to spare to give. And if you show them another side they wouldn’t give two pounds. I think it’s challenging”.*

It seems that Cocoa 2 is referring to the fact that the charity model *“has an emotional factor, and it is also simple and it’s uncomplicated”* (Tea 3), in that the public are presented with images of poverty that inspires them to acts of charity. Therefore, *“I think it is so one sided, the charity model...it is like you give money, you feel good and you are helping these people”* (Tea 4). Moreover, *“if you look at images that have been used of Africans over fifty or sixty years, you know, that has created a lot of perceptions and stuff in the minds of people, and the colonial images are very disempowering, and stuff”* (Coffee 3). Thus, as Coffee 3 puts it, *“How do we now start to bring about a balance as to how people see somebody of an African background who is not poor, who is not starving, who is not ill with disease? How do we bring about that balance?”*

Indeed, bringing about such a balance could be considered highly challenging for Development Educators. The following participant responses further elaborate on such challenges, in relation to *“disempowering colonial images and stuff”*.

**Banana 1** *“Like when you see some of the perceptions that people have because of the mainstream view, like there is a huge ignorance. I think what we have to realise is that our mainstream media, our mainstream mindset at the minute...I feel like there is massive...any other view than the mainstream is seen as radical, and I feel that is what we are battling with, and it’s all the messages coming out in the media, even in films, so it’s coming from...that mindset is coming from that whole socialisation process we have been brought up with, and all this is a huge challenge...”*

**Cocoa 1** *“I think with the general public, like me and a colleague worked with people last week, and we shared the idea of 5/50/500. You know 5 billion is given in voluntary aid, 50 billion is given government to government aid, but 500 billion is taken back from the global south in things like losing their own resources and things like that, and we shared it with this really intelligent group of people, and they really found this so difficult, and that for me answers your (researcher) question. Like, you know, it is a lot easier for people to think that they’re (global south) so poor, and a lot more challenging, like when people are faced with challenging the charity model, and they have to think that – o my god what I am giving to charity is nothing when so much more is being taken back – this is so overwhelming for them”*.

**Cocoa 2** *“Yes, so they (Cocoa 1’s above group of people) were hit with a shock?”*

**Tea 1** *“I think it’s very pervasive definitely the charity model. I mean my experience would be almost entirely in schools, and certainly when we talk to students about action projects, the first thing that comes up is always a raise money project”.*

**Tea 4** *“You never hear the other side of the story on what people in particular countries are doing for themselves. You know, it is like if we don’t send money these people won’t survive like, or it is like that you know, you buy a goat for Christmas for example, but who is to say that that person wants a goat or they need a goat. You know you don’t know, and you never hear from the other side, you know, how they’re working for themselves, what they’re doing for themselves”.*

For Banana 1 *“any other view than the mainstream is seen as radical, and I feel that is what we are battling with, and it’s all the messages coming out in the media, even in films...and all this is a huge challenge...and that whole socialisation process that we have been brought up with”* (Banana 1). Such a *“socialisation process”* is perhaps evident in Tea 1’s experience of inviting students to participate in Development Education projects and *“the first thing that comes up is always a raise money project”*. Similarly, this is evident in Cocoa 1’s claim that the public find it *“a lot easier...to think that they’re (global south) so poor...like when people are faced with challenging the charity model...this is so overwhelming for them”*. Perhaps, *“any other view than the mainstream is seen as radical”* since inherent within *“that whole socialisation process”* (Banana 1), *“you never hear the other side of the story on what people in particular countries are doing for themselves. You know, it is like if we don’t send money these people won’t survive like”* (Tea 4). Thus, in relation to challenging the charity model, as Banana 1 puts it, *“that is what we are battling with...that mindset coming from that whole socialisation process...and all this is a huge challenge...”*

Although the above participants highlight the difficulties they face in relation to challenging the charity model, it is also indicated that *“I don’t think it is not doable, and you know what, sometimes when you’re doing Development Education work you can just see like people go...you can see teachers like you know just think, yes we never thought about that...”* (Banana1). Tea 1 claims that students also have a capacity to quickly realise that *“it can’t be just as simple as everybody out there is starving”*. As Tea 1 elaborates;

*“At the same time I think the charity model is pervasive, I think at the same time people are also very creative so it doesn’t take much to question that (charity model). So, for example, I was involved in a project...it didn’t take very much to open up the kind of door on critique on that charity model. So that was interesting to me because I do think it is everywhere, but*

*even within one session the young people were very open to kind of go...o that is actually a bit crazy and it can't be just as simple as everybody out there is starving, and you know they (students) would then come up with things and look at people here and poverty here and it is not enough just to give money. Now, all of that came up just in a two hour session".*

However, as Tea 2 responds, *"well I mean it is easy, well it's not easy but you can bring those issues up but it's what you do with it then"*. In other words, what actions might follow raising awareness of such *"disempowering colonial images and stuff"*, and as Tea 1 subsequently reflects, *"yes, and does it (bringing those issues up) really bring change?"* Nevertheless, Tea 1, and indeed Banana 1, both indicate that *"it didn't take very much to open up the kind of door on critique on that charity model"*. Perhaps this could be considered a positive finding in relation to Development Educators, at least, attempting to generate an enthusiasm for critique of the charity model of development. However whether or not, this enthusiasm for critique will lead to people, in the above instance teachers and students, *acting otherwise*, to take direct action against *"disempowering colonial images and stuff"* is not evident through these findings.

Actually, some participants indicate that challenging the charity model of development is, in fact, a *"grey area"* (Coffee 3). As Coffee 3 explains;

*"Um, it's very hard to say I agree or even disagree because to me it is a very grey area in terms of the implications of challenging the charity model. Um, what happens if we don't get the aid to the Third World countries? At the same time, what is it that the Third World countries actually need? Is it the aid or is it the trade as we call it, or is it both? So it's um, in a sense yes I would agree that it's difficult to challenge that model but at the same time we need to challenge the model to try to go, you know...try to get a balance, because there is an assumption that a lot of Third World countries need aid, and that has been pumped into people making collections and stuff, and maybe if there was investment or trade. Maybe that would, um, address the long term, um, issues, you know instead of just dumping money. Um, but it's a difficult one to either agree or disagree with. I think challenging the way it is (charity model) been done is probably useful but at the same time definitely if you have environmental disasters for instance, you can't challenge that. People need aid. People need support, so it's very, it's quite complicated and complex"*.

Coffee 3 indicates the implications of challenging the charity model in relation to aid, trade and investment in the developing world, and how it could impact what *"the third world countries actually need...is it aid or is it trade...or is it both?"* Moreover, *"what happens if we don't get aid to the third world countries"* that might actually need such aid? Furthermore, Coffee 3 refers to aid

for disasters, and states that *“you can’t challenge that”*. Coffee 2 agrees, and points out that *“where there is a natural disaster, or something like that, there has to be an instant response, and that response inevitably requires money, and I am fully supportive of that and I think that as a nation and a planet of countries we, I think we do help each other when that (natural disaster) happens. But that’s like a one off thing. That’s not an ongoing”*.

Perhaps, in relation to *“ongoing”* aid, *“the role of Development Educators is to encourage people to think critically about why we give”* (Sugar 1). In this respect, perhaps simply generating a critique for *“disempowering colonial images and stuff”* should not be done in isolation from *“why we give aid...and why we give aid is related to trade policies...and so on”* (Sugar 1). The challenge for Development Educators then, is *“not to hide behind the difficulty of this”* (Sugar 1), but to investigate ways in engaging the public in these issues *“that is not so overwhelming for them”*, or becomes too *“hard to see people struggle so much because whenever you’re faced with these things that you’re not used to people can feel a wee bit vulnerable because they’re kind of thinking that they were doing really good by giving to charity”* (Cocoa 1).

Tea 2 further highlights the difficulty with moving away from the charity model of development, and *“towards the justice model”*. As he or she states,

*“I think it is also, if you are fund raising, it is hard to get away from the charity model even if it is for a local charity it is still from a charitable perspective rather than a justice perspective...if you are going towards the justice model, you are going towards - we are wealthy because we have exploited people in other countries so you are making people feel guilty, but also if you are explaining that you are trying to get into the issue of...well you live in a country that is really unequal, that dis-empowers you politically, you don’t have a voice. So that way, it is not fair to you. So it’s very complicated”*

Tea 3 further explains that,

*“the majority of resources are flowing from the south and we are living of those resources so in reality we are recipients of their charity but we don’t want to think of it like that. We are the benefactors and that’s not a message you would get through very easily”*.

Banana 1 also refers to the complexity of getting such a *“message through”*:

*“Totally, and if was about changes in this part of the world looking at trade policies and subsidies and all that stuff, and that’s all located here, and we keep banging on about that but*

*people are really uncomfortable with bringing it back here because then it's like...is it like guilty education because it's like you're the cause of the problem so get your act together? Well, we don't do guilty education but..."*

Maybe the above highlighted complexities are evident in Cocoa 1's claim earlier that the public find it "a lot easier...to think that they're (global south) so poor, and a lot more challenging, like when people are faced with challenging the charity model...this is so overwhelming for them". However, Cocoa 1 further states that "but, I think we (Development Educators) need to have more confidence in saying it is ok to give (to charity), but ask what are the implications of showing such charitable images and the implications of this in terms of both positive and negative implications".

Tea 2 adds that;

*"So, it is about to how to get people into the idea that you are doing this at the moment because what is happening is unfair, and one of the ways people can contribute is with money obviously if they have money, because it is one of the ways things are unequal, so if they have money and other people don't. So it is a fair just thing to do. But that takes quite a lot of explanation for people".*

Although the researcher does not pose any solutions for Development Educators in relation to challenging the charity model of development, the above findings do indicate that due to the complexities of such "a very grey area" (Coffee 3), this topic merits considerable further exploration amongst Development Educators. In fact, Banana 2 suggests "maybe we should be talking about maybe peer reviewing how each other does this (challenging images and messages and the charity model). I don't know how realistic that is but I think there is definitely something there that we can do more with". Indeed, this might be considered a positive step towards subsequent research explorations of models of good practice to be implemented in schools and with the general public. It is beyond the confines of this study, however, to conclude that these participants will actually take such a step, as a result of this research process.

Nevertheless, besides the difficulty with challenging the charity model amongst the general public, Cocoa 1 also points out that;

*"Sometimes before you even get to the general public, it is difficult within the NGO organisation which I think is set up in such a way that it is more beneficial to keep that perception (charity perception) because the NGO is linked heavily to fund raising, and in order to raise more money you need to have that sympathy or charity model. Um, because if people actually found out that banks are the problem and it is not focused on these countries then people*

*might choose to act differently, and it would be interesting to see what that would look like, but I think even before you get to the public there is a lot of challenges in terms of challenging it within the NGO”.*

In this instance, Cocoa 1 is highlighting the complexities that Development Educators face in challenging the charity model within NGO development organisations *“before you even get to the general public”*. Indeed, similar to Cocoa 1’s claim, Chapter 1 highlighted that, *“the NGO is linked heavily to fundraising, and in order to raise money you need to have that sympathy or charity model”*, and as Tea 3 put it earlier, *“some development organisations pedal that philosophy very strongly, and it does reinforce stereotypes”*. For Sugar 3;

*“that is where the difficulty comes from for them (Development Educators) because the Development Education unit is dealing with Development Education and working in schools and so on, but that is a separate unit from the campaigns and advertising and you know the fund raising unit, and o boy, you see that (fundraising) is about the most powerful unit in the whole office of NGOs”.*

Banana 2, as presented below, further describes the positioning of the Development Education unit in relation to the fundraising unit within the NGO.

*“I would say that, from my point, a lot of NGOs would view their Development Education as a lot lower down in their priorities and not their direct work. I can kind of see why that is because there is an immediate stuff that needs to happen, but if we are looking for a longer term change then it’s vital, and it should be further up on the agenda”.*

Sugar 1 and Banana 1 further state that;

**Sugar 1** *“Yes, then particularly in times of recession, these NGOs focus on protecting the fund raising unit and then Development Education becomes even more marginalised because the NGO wants to protect their core, and so their messaging will increase and become more traditional and so...it’s the other people who are making decisions around the organisation that have the more power and say well it’s all very well about images but we are out there to get a pool of funding coming in. So it really is a challenge for Development Educators”.*

**Banana 1** *“Totally, and it’s so controversial to challenge them, and that’s where my initial discontent came from. If you challenge your NGO, it’s like we need the money. How dare you challenge the money we need that’s going to help these children? I mean, you can’t go back at that. But it’s just a short term solution, and I can see like the moral imperative of*

*helping these children, so it's really hard to come round to thinking is there another way we can do this, but another way might not raise the money".*

Sugar 3 explains that,

*"you know, well it is difficult to actually say that organisations should basically stop showing images. You know, you can't really stop, but you can challenge it. We have challenged a number of organisations successfully...we challenged other images and they (the NGO using the images) do tone it down, and at times you will get a breakthrough at challenging these images but you won't end up being successful all the time".*

Sugar 2 adds that *"even if we are not successful all the time, we should still let them know that the messages are wrong"*. Perhaps this is a positive finding in relation to highlighting the desire of Development Educators to *act otherwise* and challenge development NGO organisations, *"even if we are not successful all the time"*.

Indeed, in describing their projects, some examples, as listed below, emerged from participants as to how they attempt to challenge NGOs and even government organisations on the images and messages that they present of the developing world.

*"We work on a project on images and messages of Africa, and basically we look at the way people use images to raise funds, the NGO sector especially, and the way they use photos and images of young people of Africa to do their marketing and raise funds, and we look at how this impacts on people's perceptions, and especially how it impacts on people coming over here from Africa, and how that impacts them on terms of power relations as well"*.

*"We would just work on a daily basis in terms of different things that happen across the country with organisations, and we will challenge their use of messages. For example, when the campaigns were being launched by DOCHAS to lobby the government and so on, we were asking difficult questions. What exactly are we lobbying for? Like we ask Irish Aid, what is your involvement in the Africa day celebrations for? Is it just to showcase stuff for tax payers to see how money is being spent, but it should be for you to showcase what you are doing in Africa positively and then we should also highlight from a different perspective the issues of Africa"*.

*"Well we are mostly about challenging the images and messages that are used because we believe that has a huge affect on how African people are perceived here in Ireland, and we provide an opportunity to show that it is not all war and disease that there are lots of other*

*things about the different countries, you know. We show how Ireland itself is particularly dependant on areas in Africa”.*

*“We designed a course for the staff at our NGO and looking at images and messages was a huge part of this”.*

*“We highlight the fact that there is a need for a balance in the way Africa is portrayed and we challenge the use of images and perceptions you know of Africa”.*

Perhaps the above examples highlight the potential for Development Educators to expose and challenge systems of civilised oppression that is perhaps inherent in development NGOs (see Chapter 1). Nevertheless, the findings also indicate that *“well it is difficult to actually say that organisations should basically stop showing images”* (Sugar 3), and *“it’s so controversial to challenge them”* (NGOs) which perhaps highlights a *“clash between Development Education and fundraising in NGOs”* (Banana 1). Indeed, the researcher directly posed the question;

*“OK, then...it is difficult for Development Educators in NGOs to do their wider work due to the clash of values between fundraising and Development Education... to be radical because of the clash of values between Development Education and fundraising. Agree or disagree?”*

In response, Banana 1 states that;

*“I agree about a clash between Development Education and fundraising in NGOs, but I don’t think that that means that there shouldn’t be a Development Education department in NGOs. Sometimes I think it is difficult for the Development Educators but they’re almost like the critical voice that needs to be there...You see I think if Development Education can have an influence on their NGO, I think that is really massive as well. The amount, if you look at the amount of work that different NGOs are doing, if Development Education can have an influence, that in itself, I think is like really important”*

Here, if anywhere perhaps highlights Giddens’ notion of the agent who may be located in dominant structures that have bitten into time and space, and subsequently these structures have become increasingly resistant to change. However, the agent, or in this case the Development Educator within an NGO, can exercise agency to intervene, *act otherwise*, and bring about transformation (see Chapter 2). Indeed, this is an analysis based on a grand theory. Nevertheless it is considered important to draw on such theory to contribute towards knowledge on how Development Educators might locate themselves within theoretical discourse.

Nevertheless, in responding to Banana 1, Banana 2 states that, *“I definitely feel what you’re feeling because you cringe about your organisation but if you say things it comes across like, o I know better than you, you shouldn’t be doing it that way. So it’s like how can we approach people in the best way to not to try to seem like we are devaluing the work that fundraising are doing, but...”* Tea 1 has similar concerns when he or she states;

*“Yes that’s (challenge NGO charity model) a really tricky one at any organisational level. I remember having a debate on when the rest of the staff of the organisation was coming to see the work we (Development Education department) do in action, and we thought o we are doing stuff that is very critical of NGO charity and there is a strong fundraising arm to the organisation and we wondered should we self censor”.*

As highlighted below, however, Cocoa 1 sees it as an opportunity to have *“a strong fundraising arm to the organisation”*, and similar to Banana 1, sees Development Education as *“the critical voice that needs to be there”* (in the NGO).

*“I think, because I struggle with, but I think I am at the point of trying to see it as an opportunity somehow, because with fundraising comes a lot of profile and supporter base, and a lot of people that might be influenced by the positive message, and I think by being an NGO, we can make choices about it...I mean we don’t have to be like everybody else, and we can try to break barriers. I think to have Development Education within an NGO is so important, because we are that critical thought that can second check things. Although we’re maybe seen as being really annoying all the time, but I think fundraising and Development Education have things to gain from each other, but it’s definitely a challenge, and takes lots of communication to try work it out”.*

Cocoa 1 further elaborates that;

*“I think if we (Development Educators) have enough faith in knowing that the problems are created here on our doorstep, try and relate that to other departments in your NGO, but I do think people would prefer you to go down the charity route looking at poverty as the focus, and that would be the easier thing to do and we would have more support from other departments. But I think it is difficult. It’s hard and really hard. But I think of it as more as a positive, because if Development Educators worked separately from NGOs, what benefit would that be because of the profile we get in the NGO? It wouldn’t benefit us (Development Educators) or fundraising so it’s more beneficial to stay together, and I think there’s so many...I think we are the ones to rewrite what NGO charities have been doing for*

*so many years, and we are the ones to say it stops with us, and question how development is done, and encourage the public to look at the real hard issues”.*

Cocoa I’s comment that, *“we are the ones to rewrite what NGO charities have been doing for so many years...the ones to say it stops with us, and question how development is done”*, is another important indication of the will to *act otherwise* to challenge civilised oppression and subsequent oppression. Furthermore, she or he sees *“benefit”* in Development Educators working within an NGO due to the *“profile we get in the NGO”*, and perhaps he or she is suggesting that by being located in NGOs provides Development Educators with an opportunity to *act otherwise* to affect change within their organisation. As he or she puts it, *“I think to have Development Education within an NGO is so important, because we are that critical thought that can second check things”*, or as Banana 1 states *“they’re (Development Educators) almost like the critical voice that needs to be there”*. *“But I think it’s hard”*, Cocoa 1 adds, *“It’s hard and really hard”*. In fact, Banana 2 claims that;

*“I don’t think half of them (other NGO departments) know what it (Development Education) is. I think they have in their head what they think it is and maybe that is what it used to be, but not what it is now. But even for me to keep up, it’s only from going to seminars, meeting other educators that I developed up in my head what it is, and it was a learning process for me, but like, you know, for other people in my NGO, and it’s probably the same for a lot of NGOs, they think it’s just about raising awareness. I think for people doing development in NGOs there is lots and lots of good intentions, but there is a massive ignorance, you know, and I think the ignorance is a massive problem”.*

For Banana 1;

*“That’s why Development Education has to be more noisy, and has to be slightly aggressive. Like, maybe aggressive is the wrong word, but confrontational, like I know from my experience how Development Education is very difficult to do right working in a charity, and me being very, you know, dissatisfied, but getting your voice heard for things to change is important. I mean, generally we (NGO colleagues) are all very nice people and we just get on with our work, but sometimes you just have to stop and say look this isn’t working, and why is it not working and put it out there. I think, with the best intentions, a lot of NGOs are not aware of the implications of what they are doing for Development Education”.*

Indeed the above findings indicate challenges for Development Educators who are based in NGOs that *“are not aware of the implications of what they (the NGO) are doing for Development Educa-*

tion” (Banana 1), or, in other words, the NGO is not aware that purporting a charity model of development is at odds with the whole underlying framework of Development Education, which claims to be overtly political and radical in exposing systems of White cultural supremacy that the NGO may actually be contributing to in their approach to development (see Chapter 1). Thus as Banana 1 puts it, *“that’s why Development Education has to be more noisy”* Banana 2 suggests, *“I just wonder, should NGOs be focusing their efforts, rather than on development projects, more on lobbying for changes, and then we (Development Educators) would sit far better with that”*. Indeed, this approach might *“sit far better”* with Development Education, and help *“rewrite what NGO charities have been doing for so many years...and question how development is done”* (Cocoa 1).

Nevertheless, the reality is that, for the meantime, NGO development organisations are *“focusing their efforts on development projects”* (Banana 2) that *“would prefer you (Development Educators) to go down the charity route looking at poverty as the focus”* (Cocoa 1), which perhaps leads to Development Educators *“being very, you know, dissatisfied”* (Banana 1). Nevertheless, *“getting your voice heard for things to change is important”*, and perhaps the above findings highlight that despite the many challenges, these participants have a desire to *act otherwise* to intervene to affect change within their NGO.

However, indication arose from a small number of the participants, that they can perhaps feel alienated within their organisation, due to the clash of values between Development Education and *“you know the fund raising unit, and o boy, you see that (fundraising) is about the most powerful unit in the whole office of NGOs”* (Sugar 3). As Banana 1 explains;

*“I do think it’s just about trying to keep challenging the NGO practice, but it wears you down, like, it really wears you down, and can see why people might not stay in a job like that (Development Education) for too long, but I still feel it’s important to just keep trying, but it’s really hard, and hard on you like, but I do think it’s really important. I feel that there is a major mindset to battle with”*.

Here, Banana 1 refers to *“a major mindset to battle with that really wears you down”*. Sugar 4 states that *“it is sometimes very difficult to challenge the charity, because if you want to challenge a campaign and all that, and sometimes other people in your organisation are not happy and you put yourself at risk of being pushed out”*. In this respect, perhaps this is *“why people might not stay in a job like that (Development Education) for too long... it’s just that sometimes they (the NGO) can’t see the connection with the work that you (Development Educator) do, and so you almost get taken up on what you do, and it is really hard on you”* (Banana 1). Banana 2 states that

*“I think the hardest thing is to challenge the NGO you’re working in, because if you’re working in an NGO, and you’re challenging it that’s the hard one. Do you know what I mean?”* Perhaps this suggests that due to the *“risk of being pushed out”*, or getting *“taken up on what you do”*, leads to Development Educators finding it difficult to directly challenge their specific NGO, and subsequently perhaps work in a manner *“doing stuff that is very critical of NGO charity”* (Tea 1). However, the extent to which this approach could be considered overtly political and radical is highly debateable. Indeed, from a postcolonial perspective, as highlighted in Chapter 1, the researcher proposed to investigate how overtly political and radical Development Educators are in exposing systems of civilised oppression that may be inherent within their NGO organisation. Nevertheless, the researcher feels that it is not justifiable, and would be insensitive to the participants who feel alienated, to draw conclusions about the above finding in relation to such theoretical discourse.

What might be highlighted from the above findings, though, is that, on the one hand, Development Educators as individuals located in NGOs, have *“a major mindset to battle with that really wears you down”* (Banana 1). On the other hand, the participants indicate a desire *“about trying to keep challenging the NGO practice”* (Banana 1), to be *“the ones to rewrite what NGO charities have been doing for so many years”* (Cocoa 1), and to *“still let them know that the messages are wrong...even if we are not successful all the time”* (Sugar 2). This should be considered to be an important finding for theoretical debate, in relation to positioning Development Educators as agents for change in the Giddens sense, who, despite having *“a major mindset to battle with”*, are at least aspiring to *act otherwise* to, as Cocoa 1 puts it, *“rewrite what NGO charities have been doing for so many years”*.

In fact, as listed below, some participants make recommendations on how they might perhaps collectively, as a group of Development Educators, *“battle with the major mindset”*, inherent in NGO practice, that, as Giddens might say, has bitten into time and space and therefore has become increasingly difficult to transform (see Chapter 2).

**Banana 1** *“But I think it can still be done (challenging NGO charity model) depending on the way you do it, and if you get strategic allies and people that are very well respected to come into your organisation”*.

**Sugar 1** *“I think because we are marginalised that we should more often talk to one another so we can come to an agreement as a group about the way forward, to address these issues”*.

**Sugar 4** *“So we need to support each other in this”.*

**Banana 1** *“I think that’s why we need the bit of solidarity with each other”.*

**Banana 2** *“I think that’s really important, and I think even the need for dialogue with each other is important too”*

**Banana 1** *“That’s right, because you need to be confident in what you are saying, and sometimes I’m not confident and nobody is going to listen to someone who doesn’t know what they are talking about”.*

**Banana 1** *“But because often the Development Education isn’t valued in the organisation, sometimes I think, NGOs and its Development Education aspect would benefit from other voices that would be board members to bolster up Development Education and stuff, because I feel that my voice alone isn’t considered important, but it’s not to say that it’s not listened to sometimes, but it’s trying to put it in a kind of way that it can be heard and sometimes that just needs the support of other people, and I think that’s where we need to use the people around us”.*

Perhaps, again, from a structuration perspective, these findings are positive in highlighting that people, or in this case the research participants, have the capacity to find new ways of *going on* in social life. Despite the constraining elements in the reproduction of structures, in this case the structures inherent in NGO charities, agents, or in this case the participants, have ‘the capacity to effect structural change as and when such change is desired’ (Willmott, 1999, p8). Perhaps, by implementing their own recommendations as presented above, the participants will create the appropriate conditions to collectively *“rewrite what NGO charities have been doing for so many years”* (Cocoa 1), and subsequently, from a postcolonial perspective, challenge civilised oppression and subsequent oppression. However, this is not a prediction the researcher can make.

Nevertheless, these participant recommendations could be considered under the category of ‘networking beyond this research’. However, since these findings arose naturally from the participants, prior to the researcher posing the question of networking, it is considered important to include these in the context of challenges to Development Educators *acting otherwise*, since it highlights the desire of these participants to, at least discuss, working towards, as Giddens would say, transforming dominant structures.

### *Challenges in Relation to Funding Bodies*

Participants of this study refer to the fact that *“there is a very deliberate attempt by funders to censor your action, especially if it was to highlight issues that would be embarrassing for the government here”* (Tea 3). *“Funders curtail Development Education, on the whole area of the action element”*, states Tea 4, *“like you might do training or a talk and it might stop there because you can’t campaign against it...yes so it is all right for people to go and buy fair trade but not to lobby the government”*. Indeed, much Development Education funding comes from government bodies, and therefore funding maybe depends on Development Education projects reflecting the political outlook of the government. DFID, for example in their Development Awareness Fund (DAF), which is currently no longer available, had an emphasis on Development Education promoting the MDGs, which of course emerged from 149 heads of state, the European Union, the International Monetary Fund and World Bank who resolved to halve the number of people living in extreme world poverty by 2015. However, Seabrook argues that, ‘when care for poor people is passed over to the agencies which have impoverished them the consequences are predictable...its purpose is to wrench any definition of the needs of the poor from poor people themselves and to reformulate them in terms that serve the interests of the rich (Seabrook, 2009, pp 80-81). Hence, from a post-colonial perspective, on the one hand, the rich continue to exploit the natural resources of the poor, but on the other hand, they conceal such exploitation in terms of AID and the MDGs ‘dressed up in the language of progress, modernisation, more efficient methods of farming, improved productivity – above all, development’ (Seabrook, 2009, p82). Subsequently, government funding for Development Education is based on awareness raising of aid and the MDGs, and as Tea 2 argues *“there is too much focus on aid and the MDGs, and a lot of Development Education looks at that and thinks that is the real issue to look at but it is actually not, but it is the acceptable thing to look at as you won’t get into trouble with your funders if you talk about aid”*. Tea 2 further states that; *“From funders there is a pressure to do safe Development Education...and if we don’t call individuals who do this type of work and the government out and say that this is not Development Education then there will be a delusion about what it is. People are of course going to chase the money or even market what they are doing in a certain way to hide what they are really doing to get the money, and I do think that is a difficult one because obviously it is great in a way that we are funded but if we do this we are moving further and further away from what we should be doing”*.

Tea 2 highlights that due to *“pressure”* from funders *“to do safe Development Education...then there will be a delusion about what it (Development Education) is”*, and a danger of *“moving further and further away from what we should be doing”*. Nevertheless, Tea 2 also acknowledges the

difficulty with needing to access funding, and that “people are of course going to chase the money or even market what they are doing in a certain way to hide what they are really doing to get the money, and I do think that is a difficult one because obviously it is great in a way that we are funded”. Sugar 1 further describes challenges in relation to funding bodies in stating;

*“I think the biggest challenge for us is that a lot of work we do is donor driven and funder driven so from that point of view it is difficult, and if someone makes a point of challenging the way we do Development Education you have these funders and other organisation departments to answer to. Like if you challenge the way things are done, you are told the funding won’t cover that. So there are definite challenges in the way we do the work we do because of funding...And then the practical issue is that the majority of funding for Development Education comes from the government through its aid programme, or from the actual charities where Development Educators are based, and if you are successful at challenging the charity model it will then have an ultimate effect on your resources you have to carry out your work. So it is risky, absolutely”.*

Cocoa 1, perhaps to avoid being “told that the funding won’t cover that”, highlights that she or he proposed a project to funders to “meet DFID aims, but we wrote it in such a way that we could really squeeze whatever we wanted into it. We had room to be quite critical and start from the young people’s voices, and I think we had room to do that because it was an open project”. Here, perhaps Cocoa 1 is referring to a skilfully written proposal that did not “call the government out” (Tea 2) to question, but which had scope to be critical, and “squeeze whatever we wanted into it”. Similarly Tea 1 states that;

*“I think the proposal was designed with aims to suit the funders, but we were able to be quite radical in the approach, but I think we will be able to write the report up to show we have met those aims (funder aims). So for the funders it just looked like nice creative methodologies for the children”.*

However, Tea 2 responds;

*“But you see you can fudge it and pretend with funders that that’s not (being radical, and critiquing the government) what you are really doing but then that is sort of mixing the message for the lobbying message that you are trying to get out there. So I think that’s another issue. Like if you pretend to funders that your Development Education is not doing that (being radical, and critiquing the government) then you are reducing the action element. Like we could pretend to funders that we are not actually lobbying on development issues*

*which might involve a critical analysis of government policy, but that is not showing that Development Education has identified issues that are unjust, and the thing is it has”.*

Tea 3 adds;

*“Yes...I think this is a good test for Development Education. If it is not embarrassing the government in some way, then maybe it (Development Education practice) is not right, and there should be some sort of critique that challenges the structures in our society”.*

Tea 3 also adds that *“funders are very unclear on what their definition of Development Education is. It is understood as critical thinking, linking the local and global and action. But it really is down to what action we take, and lobbying”.* In fact, as highlighted in the category of ‘defining Development Education and the terminology we use’, Tea 3 also points out that interconnectedness *“is valued in different ways by different funders”.* Overall Tea 3 seems to be suggesting that on the one hand, funders are *“very unclear”* that Development Education involves *“lobbying...embarrassing the government in some way”*, or as Tea 2 puts it, *“a critical analysis of government policy”.* On the other hand, funders seem to be clear that Development Education does involve *“critical thinking, linking the local and global and action”* (Tea 3), perhaps action which values interconnectedness *“in different ways by different funders”*, or values interconnectedness as action that involves *“people to go and buy fair trade but not to lobby the government”* (Tea 4).

Perhaps, it might be argued that Development Education conducted within the confines of such government funding bodies is indeed *“safe Development Education...and if we don’t call individuals who do this type of work and the government out and say that this is not Development Education then there will be a delusion about what it is”* (Tea 2). Maybe the findings presented in relation to funders captures the complexities and challenges facing Development Educators in relation to being overtly political and radical in exposing systems of civilised oppression and subsequent oppression. From a postcolonial perspective it might be argued that *“there is a very deliberate attempt by funders to censor your action”* (Tea 3) or *“curtail Development Education, on the whole area of the action element”* (Tea 4), in order to reify Development Education into a system that promotes White cultural supremacy. Subsequently *“safe Development Education”* is curtailed in being overtly political and radical, or in *“lobbying...embarrassing the government in some way”* (Tea 2 and Tea 3).

In presenting these findings the researcher is not suggesting that Development Educators should stop *“chasing the money or even market what they are doing in a certain way to hide what they*

*are really doing to get the money*” (Tea 2). Nor, on the other hand, is the researcher suggesting that Development Educators should *“suit the funders...be able to write the report up to show we have met those aims (funder aims)...so for the funders it just looks like nice creative methodologies for the children*” (Tea 1). What might be suggested from these findings, however, is that Development Educators should at least critique why *“there is too much focus on aid and the MDGs, and a lot of Development Education looks at that and thinks that is the real issue to look at but it is actually not”*, and to clearly define *“safe Development Education...moving further and further away from what we should be doing”* (Tea 2), and juxtapose this definition with a definition on *“what we should be doing”* in order to avoid a *“delusion about what it (Development Education) is”* (Tea 2).

Perhaps, in this respect, Development Education might have greater clarity as to the extent to which it can actually be overtly political and radical in exposing systems of civilised oppression and subsequent oppression whilst being affiliated with funders who might have a self-interest in the reproduction of White cultural supremacy, or as Seabrook might argue, when Development Education funding is reliant on ‘the agencies which have impoverished them (the global south) the consequences are predictable’ (Seabrook, 2009, pp 80-81). Its consequences, perhaps, is to relegate Development Education to terms and action that promotes AID, Fair Trade and the MDGs, and to wrench, from Development Educators, the possibility of being overtly political and radical through *“a critical analysis of government policy”* (Tea 2), and subsequent radical action. Thus, from a postcolonial perspective, it could be said that such funding terms serve the interests of the rich, and perhaps merely pay *lip service* to global justice, and subsequently ‘decrease capacity to engage in dialogue with the developing world to create a genuine sense of shared solidarity with the global south (see Blaney, 2002, p268), or, in relation to this research, decrease capacity of embedding an African perspective in Development Education (see Chapter 1.6)

### *Challenges in Relation to Formal Education*

It is highlighted in Chapter 1, that Development Education is increasingly becoming aligned with the formal education sector. Hence, and similar to what can be said of the findings presented above, this raises questions as to the extent Development Education can remain overtly political and radical working within such systems (see Chapter 1.2). For example, as presented in Chapter 1, and from a postcolonial perspective, it could be argued that Global Education in the formal curriculum is becoming a method to simply empower our students as participants in the interpretation of global inequality between those of us in the *developed* North who believe our role is to know,

think critically and act for the rest of the world, and those from the global South that we perpetually treat as objects of study and action.

To explore this argument with the participants, the researcher posed;

*“Well then, the next one is...It is Global Education serves to empower students to simply critically think about the developing world and act for them, and this portrays the global south as objects of study and could reinforce stereotypes and division, and the fact that Development Education is becoming more aligned with mainstream education then this could be said of Development Education too”.*

Tea 3 responds;

*“I don’t think that is the problem of critical thinking but it might be about what people actually get you to critically think about. I mean if you are doing Development Education and just looking at what is going on in other countries, then that could happen, but you should be encouraging people to look at what’s happening in Ireland and how we are connected to that. So I don’t think it is the skill (critical thinking) itself but it is what you apply it to”.*

For Tea 3, it seems the skill of critical thinking is a skill that is not problematic in itself, *“but it is what you apply it to”*, that could reinforce stereotypes and a divide between the global north and south, particularly *if you are doing Development Education and just looking at what is going on in other countries*. Coffee 2, however, sees *“no problem when studying another county, wherever it is in the world, you know, and finding out more about it in depth. I think it needs to be a balanced impression of it. So I think it’s how you sort of, how the young people are probed to think”*. Indeed, *“how the young people are probed to think”*, has resonance with Tea 3’s comment that *I don’t think it is the skill (critical thinking) itself but it is what you apply it to*. Sugar 3, however, in relation to the notion of the skill critical thinking, states that;

*“What I understood from the statement (researcher’s statement) is that Global Education does not end up causing developing countries to become automatically just a subject matter where it becomes something for a discourse or a discussion in school or whatever, and ultimately that is where it ends. But what actually needs to happen is to generate the desire of people in the North to challenge actions that lead to situations down in the south”.*

In this respect, Sugar 3, is perhaps referring to the possibility that the skill of critical thinking may not necessarily lead to students taking action, or *acting otherwise*, to transform structures of civilised oppression and subsequent oppression.

Tea 1 elaborates on critical thinking and subsequent action, and states that;

*“But there is something, isn’t there, in critical thinking about, um, over ruling the emotional and soul based response, and I think that is a very tricky area because the charity thing really connects to the emotional. Like there is a picture of a starving child, and as a human being you do have an emotional reaction to that image, and then if everything becomes completely purely about critical thought there can be kind of an intellectualism about that, that maybe doesn’t allow for how these issues make people feel. So maybe critical thought can get rid of an emotional connection to these issues, and then I think it can turn everything into an interesting kind of debate that becomes about well I have an even more critical perspective on your critical perspective, and no one is doing anything because it is not really cool. It is only cool to show how critically aware you are”.*

Sugar 1 adds that;

*“Yes, even if they (students) are critically thinking about the injustice, you need the emotion to change, because you don’t think critically about your emotions, you tend to just respond. An example, like Development Education in Ireland, I think a large body have been trying to bring it into the curriculum. I mean this might take them (students) to a critical thinking level but the actual actions from the schools is fund raising and fair trade, so they go through the critical thinking learning process but the actual actions they take are a short term action so there is something there about a disconnect between the critical thinking part of the actual process and the actual actions that people take”.*

Perhaps, in this respect, Development Educators should be cautious of critical thinking ‘as a tool for clarifying values without also accommodating the affective domain: and that unless this emotional factor is taken into account the work will have a restricted impact...It is the premise here that facilitating such emotions is a critical factor in determining whether or not a practitioner in an educational setting can engage participants in effective learning’ (McCully, 2006, p52), and in his instance, effective radical action.

Nevertheless, in relation to the curriculum, Cocoa 1 states that,

*“Yes, I don’t think the curriculum is really even getting them (students) to critically think about the developing world, and then they learn about it and act for it, and usually that action will be fundraising”.*

Thus, perhaps the *“actions from the schools is fund raising and fair trade”*, not because *“there is something there about a disconnect between the critical thinking part of the actual process and the actual actions that people take”* (Sugar 1), but rather because, *“I don’t think the curriculum is really even getting them (students) to critically think about the developing world”* (Cocoa 1), consequentially *“causing developing countries to become automatically just a subject matter”*(Sugar 3).

Banana 2 further comments that;

*“Like a lot of schools would do fundraising with no education involved, and the young people don’t even know what they’re fundraising for half the time, Ok, like there’s no denying that organisations need fundraising to run for their projects abroad, you know money so they can survive to do what they’re doing, but, um, but...”*

*“But at what cost?”* asks Banana 1. In relation to such a charitable fundraising perspective *“with no education involved”* (Banana 2), Cocoa 1 further states that;

*“I think we need to ask questions of ourselves as NGOs in what are we doing to reinforce that (fundraising without critique of charity model), and how can Development Education become more critical in our work with teachers and students to get them to think about development not just in charity terms”.*

Sugar 3, as highlighted below, suggests how students should be encouraged to look at fundraising *“from a critical point of view”*.

*“I hear a lot of people here say about when they were growing up they used to give the pennies to church for the poor black babies and so on. So that for example, if schools looked at it from a critical point of view, they would know they are going with a perception that was created about people thinking they helped by giving a few pennies, but the critical question is where did those pennies go? Did those pennies in actual fact achieve the purpose for which they were being collected – number 1? Number 2 – Did the people who were giving the pennies really understand the true details of the issues that they were giving the pennies for? Critically they need to understand what they are doing, you know, because if they are just giving the pennies thinking well we are saving the children, they really don’t understand the*

*deep details. So, it becomes more of finding a solution or remedy that isn't even permanent rather than looking for a way of stopping the real causes that might actually be originating closer to home".*

Banana 1 points out that;

*"That's what's interesting about the curriculum is that the charity part isn't part of the curriculum but is more in the school's values about doing good and that, and then the curriculum, I suppose is a very neoliberal curriculum which is about economic focus, but I do think there is space in it, and I do think that there are teachers who can have a wider perspective to challenge it".*

Banana 1 refers to a "neoliberal curriculum", where critiquing "the charity part isn't part of the curriculum but is more in the schools values about doing good and that". However, Banana 1 also mentions "that there are teachers who can have a wider perspective to challenge it", but later states that;

*"the teachers that are really committed to global justice will say that they are so restricted by the assessment situation. Everything has to be assessed, examined and inspected, and I see that teachers who are really committed to global justice do feel squeezed, you know, and it's really hard for them to keep that critical angle".*

Nevertheless, as Cocoa 1 puts it, "how can Development Education become more critical in our work with teachers and students to get them to think about development not just in charity terms?" Cocoa 1, as presented below, further elaborates on such a challenge for Development Educators.

*"So I think the critical is missing for sure, and even within the curriculum there's so many other things like looking at the media and other things that will reinforce this idea that we are doing development for the global south rather than with".*

Perhaps, as argued in Chapter 1, this raises the question as to how Development Educators propose to bring a Freirean and radical perspective within a formal educational framework that might be considered to be structured within a system that perpetuates a divide between the global north and south, and subsequently promotes White Western supremacy (see Chapter 1.2). Maybe, this highlights Andreotti's (2006) point that 'postcolonial theory should be seen as both a method and a tool for a critical examination of existing notions of cultural supremacy and Eurocentrism' (quoted in Fiedler, 2008, p10), and it might be added that postcolonial theory should be seen as a method and a tool for Development Educators "to ask questions of ourselves as NGOs in what are we doing to

*reinforce that (fundraising without critique of charity model), and how can Development Education become more critical in our work with teachers and students” (Cocoa 1). Or even, postcolonial theory should be seen as a method and a tool for Development Educators “to ask questions of ourselves in what we are doing” positioning ourselves within the formal education sector, in the first instance. Indeed, the researcher is not suggesting that Development Education should not be associated with formal education. All that is being suggested is that these findings merit, at least, a critical examination and justification of why the movement of Development Education aligns itself with formal education, and also this critical examination could be considered essential in relation to justifying receiving funding from government bodies. As Tea 3 sums it up;*

*“I think the danger with Development Education as it becomes incorporated into curricula and so forth is that it just becomes part of the mainstream and part of an education system that is a major part of the problem. Therefore, we are contributing to the problem. So I think the Development Education sector has been made very safe, in recent years in particular, so it’s, I think, it’s a very deliberate policy by funders and the government to do this to Development Education so that it is a very harmless activity you carry out, and it has no real impact on the structures. So it is important that we continue to be critical and subversive and that it should challenge very strong and powerful structures”.*

Indeed, it is considered important to *“continue to be critical and subversive...and challenge very strong and powerful structures”* of civilised oppression and subsequent oppression, and expose systems of White cultural supremacy which are located in the global north. *“So maybe in a strange kind of way our focus needs to be on, to contribute to an African perspective, our focus needs to be on the north”* (Tea 3).

### **3.5 Defining the African Perspective in Development Education and if it is applied to our work**

In Chapter 1.6, the researcher drew on postcolonial theory to define an African perspective in Development Education as any overtly political and radical challenges that aim to expose systems of civilised oppression and subsequent oppression. Postcolonial theory, as argued earlier, ‘purports to constitute a form of anti-hegemonic discourse which critically addresses both the interpretation of the colonial past and its ongoing effects in the present, as well as manifestations of neo-colonialism on the part of metropolitan powers’ (Lawson, 2010, p299). Indeed, as argued in Chapter 1, and as the findings seem to confirm, such manifestations may appear in the media, NGO charity advertising, government funding bodies, and the within the formal education sector.

Thus, as the findings highlight, and from a structuration viewpoint, these manifestations, that have bitten into time and space, bring challenges to Development Educators with regards to the extent that they can *act otherwise* to expose systems of civilised oppression and subsequent oppression, and encourage radical action focused on *“lobbying...embarrassing the government in some way”* (Tea 3).

It could be argued that the findings, to date, have confirmed the underlying theoretical notions presented in Chapter 1, in relation to defining an African perspective in Development Education. Thus, from both the perspective of the participants being studied and from a postcolonial framework, it could be concluded that an African perspective in Development Education is any overtly political and radical challenges that aim to expose systems of civilised oppression and subsequent oppression. However, since *“the Development Education sector has been made very safe, in recent years in particular...so that it is a very harmless activity you carry out, and it has no real impact on the structures”* (Tea 3), the findings have no significant evidence that an African perspective, defined in the above context, is applied to the work of these participants. Thus, in order for Development Educators to apply such an African perspective, and effectively challenge civilised oppression and subsequent oppression, it could be argued that *“it is important that we continue to be critical and subversive and that it should challenge very strong and powerful structures”* (Tea 3). In fact, such an approach might not solely apply to Africa, but rather to all countries in the developing world that have been colonised and exploited by rich western powers.

Nevertheless, with regards to an African perspective in Development Education, although the researcher could conclude, at this point, that the findings confirm the theoretical notions presented in Chapter 1, to further test the theory the researcher directly posed to the participants;

*“Well, I think we could move on to the crux of it, and then we should be finished soon. It is just, o this is another hard question, but see if you can come up with a definition of what you perceive an African perspective in Development Education to be. How would you define it? What is it? What does it look like in your practice?”*

Initially, as presented below, some participants viewed an African perspective in Development Education, within the context of Development Education being conducted in Africa.

**Cocoa 1** *“The same as a northern or European perspective but it just happens to be from somebody in the south, possibly. I think that would have different skills and lens brought to it but there hasn’t been enough exploration of Development Education in Africa for us to really know what it looks like...I think Development Education probably does happen in the*

*global south, but maybe not to the extent as here, as we maybe would have more funding this side (global north) to do this thing called Development Education, and maybe in the global south the same thing happens, but maybe the people just have more natural conversations about the issues. But in terms of written material, Development Education is more based here. You know it is more theoretically based here”.*

**Coffee 3** *“I think an African perspective in Development Education is just the same thing as here. I think maybe people in Africa are doing Development Education but they are just not aware of it...I don’t think you can come up with an African definition of Development Education. I think we can definitely put an African angle or perspective on Development Education, but not to come up with a totally different definition. I don’t know. I don’t know how that can be done”.*

If this research was to pose a definition of an African perspective within the context of Development Education models of practice in Africa, then, as Cocoa 1 puts, *“there hasn’t been enough exploration of Development Education in Africa for us to really know what it looks like”*. Hence, *“I don’t know. I don’t know how that can be done”* (Coffee 3), in relation to this research project. It might be posed, however, that defining an African perspective within such a context would require a large scale comparative study between the practices of Development Education in Africa and in Ireland. Nevertheless, such a large scale study is beyond the confines of this research, which is merely an exploration of Development Education in Ireland, and how it considers defining and embedding an African perspective within their work, which might be more about *“putting an African angle or perspective on Development Education, but not to come up with a totally different definition”* (Coffee 3).

With regards to *“putting an African angle or perspective on Development Education”* (Coffee 3), some participants, as listed below, considered this in terms of bringing African voices to the field.

**Banana 1** *“I think maybe African people living locally that could inform your work, that would be interested, because there is an assumption that everybody from Africa is interested in talking about justice issues but just I think there is such a lack of that voice, because we all know that it’s all White and female, but then how do you change that and engage people that are interested in that kind of work without forcing an agenda onto them?”*

**Coffee 2** *“Maybe we should actually start with our African colleagues (in minority led organisations) to come in at the design stage to be an integral part of the project. It’s almost that we need to take a step back and keep asking ourselves questions. You know, like what is*

*this looking like and why am I doing it? What way could I do this differently to enhance it with an African perspective? So I think maybe the onus is on us to have an examination of ourselves and our action”.*

**Coffee 3** *“One hundred percent, I totally endorse that. Ideally, it is best to bring African colleagues in from the design stage of the project and do lots of consultation and stuff”.*

**Sugar 1** *“I believe there is a value in Development Education currently having that perspective of people living in the global south, but there is also recognition that there is actually quite a large number of people from migrant backgrounds and so on already living in Ireland and we (participant organisation) take that perspective”*

**Cocoa 1** *“In my opinion I think it needs to start from groups like the Africa Centre based in Ireland for example, and to work with them to ask like what does their definition look like, and to ask people from the global south living in Ireland to explore with us together to see what we all think Development Education should look like, and then we can bring all of our different perspectives together, but you see this is a hard question to answer in isolation, but I think it a really good question but”.*

For these participants, engaging with *“African people living locally that could inform your work”* (Banana 1), and *“to bring African colleagues in from the design stage of the project and do lots of consultation and stuff”* (Coffee 3), and *“to start from groups like the Africa Centre based in Ireland for example”* (Cocoa 1), are all important aspects to embedding an African perspective within Development Education. Banana 1 states that *“I think there is such a lack of that voice (African voice), because we all know that it’s (Development Education sector) all White and female, but then how do you change that and engage people that are interested in that kind of work without forcing an agenda onto them?”* Similarly, as detailed below, Cocoa 1 refers to *“an agenda”* in engaging with *“somebody from Africa”*.

*“Like we could do a project and bring on somebody from Africa, but is it fitting into our agenda? So I think I have a lot of questions about it really...questions about how we have been doing it in Ireland somehow”.*

In this sense, Cocoa 1 seems to be referring to the possibility that *“fitting African voices into our agenda”*, might be merely tokenistic, rather than *“engaging people that are interested in that kind of work without forcing an agenda onto them”* (Banana 1). Similarly, Tea 3 states that *“you know that (engaging African voices) is not simple either because that could be just tokenism rather than being representative of the issue”* (Tea 3). Tea 4, as detailed below, further considers how bring-

ing African voices to the field of Development Education, and how even using African methodologies, might reinforce stereotypical viewpoints of African people.

*“This is one I actually struggle with because it might be thought that it is about using African methodologies. You know so, that can look like most of the time as drumming and dancing and then the problem then is that creating more of the stereotype that people often think, so I am wondering do we sometimes enforce that stereotype if we use that as an African perspective? Or is an African perspective having someone from Africa speaking or is that contradictory to Development Education?”*

Tea 2 responds that;

*“Well I think it is past the methodologies and more about what you want people in the workshops to learn, and if you bring in someone from Africa their perspective isn’t just African it’s very specific. It’s where they’re from, what class they’re from, what they experienced, what they’re doing here, you know. Again it is back to the skills where you want to get people to think critically about everybody’s perspective on something and what informs it, and the idea that you need to analyse your own perspective on something. If you get a perspective from someone else, you need to analyse that and try to understand it. Although you might never be able to completely understand another point of view. You know, there is a danger in multicultural stuff reinforcing stereotypes”.*

For Tea 2, to avoid tokenism and reinforcing stereotypes, an emphasis should be placed on *“the skills where you want to get people to critically think about everybody’s perspective...to analyse your own perspective”*, rather than an emphasis on *“drumming and dancing...creating more of the stereotype...if we use that as an African perspective”* (Tea 4). To further highlight such tokenism, Tea 2 adds, *“just bringing in an African person can be very tokenistic and people can forget to analyse it and think about where it is coming from”*. It seems that the above findings highlight various complexities for engaging African voices within the field of Development Education without, as the above participants put it *“creating more of a stereotype”*, or being *“very tokenistic”*.

In fact, to further explain such complexities, Cocoa 1 draws on the researcher as an analogy to show how *“we (Development Educators) could do a project and bring on somebody from Africa, but is it fitting into our agenda?”* He, or she, states that,

*“I think it’s even at critically looking at ourselves on how we bring on African voices generally. Who is asking for the voices, and have we already written...like have you (researcher)*

*already written your research and looking for us to reinforce what you've written because you have the power as the researcher, so what does it really look like to bring on voices?"*

Indeed, this calls into question the whole notion of the construction of knowledge, where the 'ontology of facts becomes the privileged domain of expert discourse, it becomes the property of those who would wield power' (Rigby, 1996, p90), or as Cocoa 1 puts it, "*because you have the power of the researcher*". However, as presented earlier in Chapters 1 and 2, this is a small scale exploratory qualitative study, and although the researcher has indeed framed this study with theoretical definitions, she is also aiming to correct that theory with data that emerges from the participants themselves. In other words, rather than "*looking for us to reinforce what you've written because you have the power as the researcher*" (Cocoa 1), 'the goal of qualitative research is to make sure the theory fits the data and not vice versa' (Taylor and Bogdan, 1998, p8).

Nevertheless, in relation to directly researching African cultures, there is an argument to be had that there is a 'massive assault upon peoples of African descent in the Western world by well funded research being conducted by particular groups of White, predominantly male intellectuals on the other' (see Rigby, 1996, p84). Nevertheless, this research is not a direct study upon peoples of Africa, but rather a small scale direct study on Development Educators based in Ireland, and their understandings of an African perspective within their work. Even in this respect, though, it still might be argued that "*you know, maybe it's a bit patronising that we attempt to assume an African perspective because we don't have it...I don't think we can specify a particular African perspective as I think that is reverting to the worst kind of colonial things of the past*" (Tea 3). However, it might be argued that whether or not defining an African perspective "*is reverting back to the worst kind of colonial things of the past*", depends on the theoretical context that such a definition is located, and where and how the movement of Development Education clearly situates itself within such a context.

Nevertheless, all of the above data can be said to highlight that the participants are, at least, aware of the complexities of engaging African voices, which could be considered merely as "*tokenism or fitting into our agenda*" (Cocoa 1), "*forcing an agenda onto them* (Banana 1), or "*enforcing that stereotype*" (Tea 4).

In fact, in considering how an African perspective in Development Education might be defined, Banana 1 commented that;

*"It would be great if the field of Development Education was diverse just in its nature, but it's not. So that's why you need this terminology (definition of an African perspective) to*

*challenge why it's all White, but if it was naturally diverse then we wouldn't be talking about African perspectives, so we need maybe to look at why Development Education is all White. You can understand why it was like that years ago because in Ireland we are all White. There should be as many people involved in this work from all backgrounds”.*

Tea 3 adds;

*“There is something about us involved in this sector, being mostly White Europeans anyway, speaking about the issues, but the reality is people from other countries are actually living among us, and there is a question about how we relate with those people and how we integrate their presence into our work. But I think it (the research question) it does raise questions about who peoples the Development Education sector and whether or not that should be changed. I think it's in danger of becoming an exclusive club”.*

Tea 3 states that by being *“mostly White Europeans...Development Education...it's in danger of becoming an exclusive club...it does raise questions about who peoples the Development Education sector and whether or not that should be changed”*. Banana 1 claims that, *“if the field of Development Education was diverse just in its nature...then we wouldn't be talking about African perspectives”*. However, perhaps this, again, depends on the theoretical context where a definition of an African perspective is located. For example, from a structuration perspective, if the field of Development Education *“was diverse just in its nature”* would this necessarily result in a Development Education movement that is overtly political and radical and *acts otherwise* to challenge dominant structures of, perhaps, colonial manifestations that have bitten into time and space?

Nonetheless, in relation to bringing *“black and minority ethnic voices into the Development Education sector”* (Cocoa 1), some participants, as listed below, refer to a model of practice in Northern Ireland where *“The Centre for Global Education have people who have gone through the Global Educators course”* (Coffee 3).

**Cocoa 1** *“Well like one programme I always think of is, and it is amazing, is the Global Educator's Programme in Northern Ireland. The programme was about how to bring black and minority ethnic voices into the Development Education sector. O like when that started, it seemed like we are going to set up a programme to integrate these black and minority voices, and for me that was o no, and like it is still separated (global North and South), and again like we have our agenda for Development Education written and we are inviting voices to bring in to it like, but what the Programme Coordinator did is that she wrote a*

*Global Educator's course that could be delivered to me or you, or could be delivered to people from the global south living here, and it was just basically a global issues course, and she invited people from minority ethnic backgrounds to participate in the course with the acknowledgement that I have my lens coming from Ireland, and you may have a different lens coming from somewhere else and the wealth of diversity in Ireland is really such an amazing thing, so we don't have to think too much about it".*

**Banana 2** *"The Centre for Global Education's Making Connections project did that (engaged with minority voices). Like it wasn't just for ethnic minority communities but it had begun to engage those non-White and non-NGO community based, you know, Black ethnic minority organisations and stuff, and engage with them a bit more, so that's a start at least".*

The above participants are commenting on the delivery of 'The Making Connections Project', a three year DFID funded project carried out by the CGE, which aimed to build Development Education capacity in the Black and Minority Ethnic sector in Northern Ireland. *"So that's a start at least",* states Banana 2, and *"what the Programme Coordinator did is that she wrote a Global Educator's course that could be delivered to me or you, or could be delivered to people from the global south living here, and it was just basically a global issues course, and she invited people from minority ethnic backgrounds to participate in the course"* states Cocoa 2. Indeed, the recent report on the evaluation of 'The Making Connections Project', claims that, 'the legacy that will be left will be massive especially in terms of having a pool of trained Global Education trainers (multipliers) from diverse backgrounds, the strengthened partnerships, the contribution of intercultural working and the reminder to non government organisations that addressing global dimensions should be a routine part of their work' (Chauhan, 2011, p6). It may be evident from this report that 'The Making Connections Project' was successful in engaging and training members from the Black and Minority Ethnic sector in Development Education, or what the report terms Global Education. However, to report that 'the legacy that will be left will be massive' might be considered to be a premature prediction, particularly since the report later states that, 'the main issue of discontent for participants related to a sense of frustration that the opportunities to apply the skills learnt were limited, leaving some participants to wonder, now what?'"(Chauhan, 2011, p20).

Nevertheless, it is not the intention here to critique this report, thus, for now, and from the perspectives of the above participants, 'The Making Connections Project' is *"a start at least"* (Banana 2) and *"was about how to bring black and minority ethnic voices into the Development Education sector"* (Cocoa 1). Hence, this could be considered a model of good practice that moves beyond

engaging African, or minority, voices merely as “*tokenism or fitting into our agenda*” (Cocoa 1), “*forcing an agenda onto them*” (Banana 1), or “*enforcing that stereotype*” (Tea 4).

Furthermore, in discussing engaging African voices, some participants referred to the importance of those voices becoming embedded in the wider NGO. As Banana 1 states;

*“I think definitely for a start the NGOs need a range of perspectives on their boards and, you know, in terms of minority groups, because I think that needs to be happening up there as well as with us, because I think our organisation would benefit greatly from that. If we had somebody on our board, like, who had a really good critical perspective, so there is an onus on us to think about how we do that in a way that is meaningful”.*

Similarly Sugar 1 claims;

*“If you have support and have people from minority led organisations on your advisory group for the overall NGO, it will help bring that perspective to inform the overall organisation. Yes, right down to your projects on the ground you need to have that advice and it shouldn’t be something that organisations just write into a plan for a code of conduct. It needs to happen in practice.”*

Here, again, from a structuration perspective, perhaps highlights the will, or desire, of these participants to *act otherwise* and “*think about how we do that in a way that is meaningful*” (Banana 1), to “*help bring that perspective to inform the overall organisation*” (Sugar 1).

In this context, Banana 2 adds;

*“I wonder how much the work that NGOs actually do is actually informed by an African perspective, because they do say that they have partners in other countries but who has the power. Are these partners just saying what they think the NGO wants to hear since they’re dependant on the funding?”*

Banana 1 responds;

*“At the end of the day the NGO is a funder, so I think that changes the relationship, and it is not really a partnership, but in actual fact the NGO is a funder, and I know how I work with funders. I definitely don’t tell them what I’m really thinking because I know I won’t get any money. So how do you get a real perspective that’s not scared of saying the wrong thing because the power balance isn’t right?”*

Banana 1 draws on an analogy of how he or she “works with funders” in order to highlight that “the power balance isn’t right” between NGOs and their over sea partners in specific projects who might be “just saying what they think the NGO wants to hear since they’re dependant on the funding” (Banana 2). Banana 1 states that, “I definitely don’t tell them (funders) what I’m really thinking because I know I won’t get any money”. Indeed, this statement could also be considered important in relation to the earlier findings around the issue of funding bodies, who apply pressure “to do safe Development Education”, thus “people are of course going to chase the money or even market what they are doing in a certain way to hide what they are really doing to get the money” (Tea 2). Subsequently, such “safe Development Education” is curtailed in being overtly political and radical in “lobbying...embarrassing the government in some way” (Tea 2 and Tea 3). As indicated in the earlier findings, “if we don’t call individuals who do this type of work and the government out and say that this is not Development Education then there will be a delusion about what it is... if we do this (safe Development Education) we are moving further and further away from what we should be doing” (Tea 2).

Nevertheless, Banana 1, in this instance, is merely highlighting that “at the end of the day the NGO is a funder, so I think that changes the relationship, and it is not really a partnership, but in actual fact the NGO is a funder”. Subsequently, this calls into question development NGO claims that they are working in partnership with people from their over sea projects who might be “just saying what they think the NGO wants to hear since they’re dependant on the funding” (Banana 2). Hence, for Banana 1, to include African voices, or in this case an African perspective, then “definitely for a start the NGOs need a range of perspectives on their boards and, you know, in terms of minority groups, because I think that’s needs to be happening up there (NGO board level) as well as with us (Development Education), because I think our organisation would benefit greatly from that”. Perhaps, again, this is an indication of the desire to *act otherwise* to affect change “up there as well as with us”, and subsequently to work towards becoming “the ones to rewrite what NGO charities have been doing for so many years...the ones to say it stops with us, and question how development is done” (Cocoa 1).

In relation to all of the considerations and complexities inherent in the above findings, Tea 4 commented that, “sometimes, you know, I am starting to wonder is an African perspective everything that I don’t think we (Development Educators) should do”.

To attempt to describe “what we should do”, some participants, as listed below, defined an African perspective in Development Education as “tackling the root of the problem which lies mostly

*in the north and we are in a position to do that” (Tea 3). This might be considered to confirm the researcher’s proposed definition of an African perspective in Development Education, which was derived from postcolonial and theory.*

**Tea 1** *“I think maybe for us here a genuine African perspective would really be about us looking at the trickiest issues at this part of the world. So maybe it is not about us claiming to have a perspective that none of us can really claim to understand. We can push ourselves to imagine but we can never really see the world from someone from Africa’s perspective. So is it more about how our issues here impacts that part of the world in general”.*

**Tea 3** *“I suppose it is a recognition, as well, that the locus of the problem is largely in the northern hemisphere where we live, and the major change needs to occur here, and the structures that create poverty are largely in the rich northern hemisphere. So it is tackling the root of the problem which lies mostly in the north and we are in a position to do that”.*

**Coffee 3** *“I think the African perspective discourse or debate would be things around aid and trade. What do they really need as a developing country? Do they need aid or do they need trade? Are people here listening to the needs of these people or are they assuming what they need is aid, and just donate and donate and donate because they want to be seen as good and generous, but are people here really asking the questions about what these countries in the developing world actually need, so that would be where the African perspective lies. I think where we (Development Educators) come in, in my view, is to show the need for dialogue to take place to discuss the needs of the people in Africa, rather than what we think they need. So maybe around these issues we could come up with a clear definition that includes the need for dialogue”.*

**Tea 2** *“In terms of the African perspective, I do think to get people to realise what they know about development is from the mainstream perspective that is informed by the media and the government, and who is controlling those points of view and how that informs what you think”.*

**Tea 3** *“I think we should not try to speak on behalf of Africa but create a total awareness of global issues and the inequalities that exist because of the structures here”.*

These participants seem to all agree that an African perspective in Development Education lies in *“tackling the root of the problem which lies mostly in the north” (Tea 3), which focuses “more about how our issues here impacts that part (Africa) of the world” (Tea 1). Thus, rather than “people here assuming what they (African countries) need is aid, and just donate and donate and*

*donate...we (Development Educators) come in to show the need for dialogue to take place to discuss the needs of the people in Africa, rather than what we think they need*" (Coffee 3). Tea 3 adds, *"I think we should not try to speak on behalf of Africa but create a total awareness of global issues and the inequalities that exist because of the structures here...and we (Development Educators) are in a position to do that"*. Thus, rather than speaking *"on behalf of Africa"*, perhaps Development Educators should speak with Africa *"to discuss the needs of the people in Africa, rather than what we think they need"* (Coffee 3), and highlight *"that the locus of the problem is largely in the northern hemisphere where we live, and the major change needs to occur here"* (Tea 3).

However, as the findings to date highlight, the extent to which *"we are in a position to do that"*, is stifled by manifestations of, what might be considered, civilised oppression inherent in NGO development organisations, the media, government funding and the formal education sector. Furthermore, since Development Education 'has not located itself within a broader critical pedagogical discourse' (McCollum, 1996, quoted in Bourn, 2009, p13) to theoretically position itself as to how it proposes to be overtly political and radical, and challenge all of the manifestations of civilised oppression presented in the findings of this project, then the extent of embedding an African perspective, or perhaps a southern perspective, within Development Education is in jeopardy of becoming obliterated in a *"Development Education sector has been made very safe...and it has no real impact on the structures"* (Tea 3). Indeed, there is no significant evidence within the findings of this study that the participants apply an African perspective to their work, whether in the context of engaging African voices within the field, or in the context of being overtly political and radical in challenging civilised oppression and subsequent oppression.

Nevertheless, as presented earlier, the findings of this project do have some indication that the participants indicate a desire to, at least discuss, working towards, as Giddens would say, transforming dominant structures. Whether or not such a desire will lead to the participants actually reconsidering how they theoretically position their work, justifying their use of terminology, and clarifying their positioning in relation to NGOs and the formal education sector, is not evident in these project findings. What is evident, however, and as Tea 3 puts it, is that, *"it is important that we continue to be critical and subversive and challenge very strong and powerful structures"*, in order to embed an African perspective in Development Education, as defined in the theoretical context presented above. Furthermore, if an African perspective in Development Education is considered around terms of including and engaging African voices within this field, then it might be argued that it is important that this is situated in a practice that is not merely *"tokenism or fitting into our agenda"* (Cocoa 1), *"forcing an agenda onto them"* (Banana 1), which might result in *"enforcing that stereotype"* (Tea 4). However, as referred to earlier, it might be asked, does en-

gaging and including African voices, beyond tokenism, necessarily result in a Development Education movement that is overtly political and radical and *acts otherwise* to challenge dominant structures of, perhaps, colonial manifestations that have bitten into time and space? Or, might these African voices, or African perspectives, become merely embedded, or perhaps indoctrinated, within a “*Development Education sector which has been made very safe...and it has no real impact on the structures*” (Tea 3)? Thus, again it could be argued that, whether or not the field of Development Education “*was diverse just in its nature*” (Banana 1), “*it is important that we continue to be critical and subversive and challenge very strong and powerful structures*” (Tea 3).

Indeed these points will be considered in greater detail in the discussion and recommendations chapter. For now, however, it appears that the findings highlight that the participants of this study view an African perspective in Development Education both in terms of including and engaging with African voices, and recognising “*that the locus of the problem is largely in the northern hemisphere where we live, and the major change needs to occur here*” (Tea 3).

### **3.6 Networking Beyond this Research**

As highlighted in Chapter 1, it is an objective of this research process to enrich the quality of, and strengthen, relationships with NGOs and ethnic led minority organisations. Therefore, this research project is very much an intervention that aims to explore with participants the work of Development Education within Ireland, whilst creating possible NGO and ethnic led minority relationships that will network and continue to work towards implementing a model of good practice of an African perspective within Development Education. Hence, in order to explore the potential of such possible networking the researcher asked;

*“Can you see any other ways we could incorporate then, I suppose taking into consideration all we have talked about, an African perspective in our work, or any way we can network about all of this?”*

In response to this question, as listed below, some participants recommend that Development Educators on the island of Ireland, should network more closely.

**Coffee 1** *“I think as an island as whole we should create more opportunities to network across the island”.*

**Coffee 2** *“I think here in Ireland we need to network with each other too, but I mean there has been a lot of networking going on in Northern Ireland with Global Dimension in*

*Schools, and teacher training and so on that brought a lot of Development Educators together. I think too environmental and development organisations could link more closely. We do have umbrella bodies for environmental and development but they could interact more. Environmental issues should be central to Development Education”.*

**Coffee 3** *“IDEA had a meeting in Dublin and they are currently exploring having a north and south (of Ireland) forum, and I think they are trying to collate a data base of Development Educators north and south. This is to share good practice and so on, so there is potential and opportunities for us to continue this debate. Like and once your (researcher) research is done and stuff it would be good to share it with these other people”.*

The above participants recommend that *“we should create more opportunities to network across the island”* (Coffee 1), *“environmental and development organisations could link more closely”* (Coffee 2), and when this *“research is done and stuff it would be good to share it with these other people...through IDEA”* (Coffee 3). From these findings, the researcher cannot predict that such networking will increase as a result of this research. All that can be presented is that the participants see value in networking, and, indeed, in the next chapter the researcher can make recommendations for the sector based on these findings.

Banana 1 and 2 also discuss the importance for Development Educators to *“get together to keep learning”* (Banana 2). However, the discussion again raises challenges for Development Educators to actually network and work in partnership, since *“working in partnership is seen in the overall NGO as dangerous or compromising...Then to go to these things, you have to justify it to your NGO to get out of the office”* (Banana 1).

**Banana 2** *“Yes, and it’s important for us to get together to keep learning, and go to seminars and stuff. If you don’t go to things like this...you are always learning and you have to make sure you’re always learning...a space for dialogue is really important”.*

**Banana 1** *“Definitely....The most I have ever learned is from the partnership work we’ve done, you know, because you can’t do it in isolation, but that’s interesting too because sometimes working in partnership is seen as...well NGOs are so competitive now for funding...partnership is key to Development Education I think, but working in partnership is seen in the overall NGO as dangerous or compromising, where it is the opposite...Then to go to these things, you have to justify it to your NGO to get out of the office, but like you need to be allowed the space in your organisation to go to these things, because in our role we still have to do Development Education ourselves to be challenged and be in the debates”.*

Banana 2 adds that, *“I think partnership is key for the overall NGOs too and not just us Development Educators, because they (NGOs) should be having a major discussion about how they do development, you know”*. In this respect, for Banana 2, rather than NGOs viewing partnership work *“as dangerous or compromising”*, since they *“are so competitive now for funding”* (Banana 1), they should actually be working together, and *“be having a major discussion about how they do development”*. Again, however, the researcher cannot predict that this might happen, but simply report that the participants view this as important in relation to networking for embedding an African perspective, not only within Development Education, but within the wider NGOs.

Sugar 2, as depicted below, refers to the importance of networking with minority led groups.

*“Well I think with this research we are talking about how we should do the African perspective and it is important for us now to actually do it in our work. We need to bring the different groups together like minority led and NGO groups to collaborate and work together”*.

Again, the researcher can only present this as a finding, and perhaps report that it indicates a desire to *act otherwise* to *“do the African perspective...for us now to actually do it in our work”* (Sugar 2). Whether, or not, *“minority led and NGO groups collaborate and work together”* (Sugar 2), is not a claim the researcher can make, but solely a recommendation.

Cocoa 1, as highlighted below, claims that conferences and programmes such as ‘The Global Educator in Residence’ are important in relation to networking, and that *“there needs to be a lot more written about it (African perspective in Development Education)...it is important to share that learning”*.

*“So it is really about what that networking could look like. I think that there have been quite a few conferences. I saw that IDEA had a conference, and DOCHAS was it, had the Global Educator in Residence Programme, so things like that there are really good, and it is important to share that learning. There needs to be a lot more written about it. Because like I have been actively looking for stuff because I know you (researcher) are doing this research. So I have been looking through different e-bulletins and every now and again you get a report like from The Centre for Global Education, but very often there is not a lot written about it or whatever, and there is so much going on as well that could be written about”*.

It seems that Cocoa 1 is referring to a lack of literature in relation to an African perspective in Development Education, which perhaps might, in fact, be indicative of a lack of research knowledge in relation to Development Education in general. Again, this perhaps highlights the importance for

the movement of Development Education to gain a foothold in the academic and research community, and begin to address the extent to which their choice of terminology and overall practice is Freirean, political and radical, and how it exposes systems of civilised oppression and subsequent oppression to bring about socio-political transformation in relation to global inequalities. Furthermore, and as argued earlier, from a postcolonial perspective, this could be considered essential for Development Educators in stating their position in relation to challenging White cultural domination, and therefore possibly contributing to knowledge on an African perspective in Development Education.

### **3.7 The Collapsed Themes**

In reading and re-reading all of the research data, the researcher identified 3 collapsed themes. These themes are;

1. Safe Development Education
2. Radical Development Education
3. Defining and Positioning Ourselves

All of the data initially categorised as ‘Defining Development Education, the terminology we use, and what we do’, is collapsed under theme 3 as presented above. ‘Community Development’ is also collapsed under theme 3. Data that was assigned to the category of ‘Civilised Oppression and Oppression: Challenges for Development Educators in *acting otherwise*’, is collapsed either in theme 1, 2 or 3 above. Similarly, ‘Defining the African Perspective in Development Education and if it is applied to our work’ is collapsed either in theme 1 or 2. Finally, the category of ‘Networking beyond this research’ is collapsed under theme 3. Any data that refers to participant ongoing Development Education projects is collapsed under theme 3.

At this point, the researcher wishes to point out that due to the large number of data, it is not viable to list within the body of the following discussion and recommendations chapter, every single participant comment that was collapsed into each theme. Therefore, the researcher will refer to selected participant data throughout the discussion and recommendations. However, as with the initial transcribed, coded and categorised data, the data assigned to each collapsed theme can be viewed on request at the Africa Centre.

For now, however, the researcher wishes to point out that the collapsed themes will be defined and discussed in the next chapter, with a particular focus on how an African perspective within Development Education might be considered within these contexts. Recommendations will also be suggested in relation to each of the collapsed themes.

**Chapter 4**  
**Discussion and Recommendations**  
**Towards an African Perspective in Development Education**

**4.1 Research Overview, with Limitations and Strengths**

Firstly, the researcher wishes to remind the reader of the specific aims in undertaking this research project. This research set out to;

1. explore the terminology used by Development Educators and provide a general overview of Development Education work currently being carried out in Ireland
2. evaluate the opinions of Development Educators on the challenges they may face in relation to civilised oppression as defined and outlined in Chapter 1
3. evaluate the opinions of Development Educators on what they define an African perspective in Development Education to be, and if they apply such a perspective to their work
4. highlight any differences that might emerge between ethnic minority led organisations and NGOs

The above aims were met by conducting small group tape-recorded interviews, in order to collect, code and categorise data from fifteen participants who are in the field of Development Education. Research validity and reliability were strengthened by sending all of the initial coded and categorised data to the research participants to consider and validate.

With regards to aim 4, and as addressed in the previous chapter, no significant differences emerged between participants from ethnic minority led organisations and participants from NGOs. Furthermore, it was also an objective of this study to create possible NGO and ethnic led minority relationships that will network and continue to work towards implementing a model of good practice of an African perspective within Development Education. Although, the participants indicated a desire to network, the researcher cannot predict that they will actually carry this out in practice.

Throughout this study, the researcher sought to understand an African perspective within Development Education in line with postcolonialism, which was synthesised with Giddens' structuration theory together with Freire's 'Pedagogy of the Oppressed'. Overall, this theoretical framework was drawn upon to investigate the extent to which Development Education can be considered overtly political and radical, and challenge notions of White cultural supremacy that might exist, perhaps within the media portrayal of Africa, development NGOs, the formal education sector, and

various funding bodies. Again, this theoretical framework will be referred to throughout this chapter.

### *Research Limitations*

The study is limited by the varying numbers of participants in each group interview. For example, the groups of two participants might have produced very different data if they were interviewed in a group of four participants. Hence, this could have an effect on the reliability of the findings. Nevertheless, as already stated, the researcher sent all coded and transcribed data to each participant, in order for them to confirm and validate, thus increasing the reliability, as well as the validity of the findings.

The study is further limited by the possibility of a *social desirability effect*, where participants adopt the strategy of responding with answers that are socially acceptable, and tend to put them in a favourable light with the researcher, or perhaps, more significantly in relation to this project, with their peers. However, the researcher took steps to establish individual and group rapport with the participants, and ensured complete confidentiality, thus, reducing the possibility of the *social desirability effect*.

Finally, however, it is acknowledged that this study is very small scale, and therefore is limited in being able to claim that the findings are representative of the overall population of Development Educators based in Ireland.

### *Research Strengths*

Despite the above limitations, this study was an adequate sample to allow for consideration of variation according to the full range of factors presented in Chapter 1, and to subsequently meet the aims of the project, and offer recommendations. The quality of this research lies in the fact that it has produced convincing data covering a wide range of topics, to help begin to address the lack of knowledge in Development Education, and subsequently recommended steps to kick start larger scale research projects. A further strength of this study lies in its attempt to situate Development Education within theoretical and academic discourse, which has been criticised for being ‘a movement which speaks only to itself, it has not located itself within a broader critical pedagogical discourse’ (McCollum, 1996, quoted in Bourn, 2009, p13). In short, although small scale, the strength of this study is in the fact that it provides a stepping-stone to help address the gap in Development Education research knowledge in general.

The below discussion and recommendations around the collapsed themes (see Chapter 3.7) will address further the strengths inherent within this study.

## 4.2 Safe Development Education

In reading, and re-reading the research findings, and when all things were considered, the researcher identified 'Safe Development Education' as a collapsed theme. By the end of this section, a definition of 'Safe Development Education' will be derived from the findings and situated within a theoretical context.

For now, however, Tea 3 stated that,

*"I think the Development Education sector has been made very safe, in recent years in particular, so it's, I think, it's a very deliberate policy by funders and the government to do this to Development Education so that it is a very harmless activity you carry out, and it has no real impact on the structures...I think the danger with Development Education as it becomes incorporated into curricula and so forth is that it just becomes part of the mainstream and part of an education system that is a major part of the problem. Therefore, we are contributing to the problem".*

Cocoa 1 stated that,

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

The above participants identified development NGOs, funders, the government, and formal education, as contributing to Development Education becoming *"a very harmless activity you carry out, and it has no real impact on the structures"* (Tea 3). Indeed, as highlighted in the previous chapter, there is significant data from the participants that evidences the challenges they face in relation to conducting a more radical Development Education within these confines, since *"people would prefer you to go down the charity route looking at poverty as the focus, and that would be the easier thing to do"* (Cocoa 1).

For instance, in relation to Development NGOs it was found that participants are challenged by the charity model of development that NGOs purport, and *"the hardest thing is to challenge the NGO you're working in"* (Banana 2). With regards to funding, and particularly government funding it was found that, *"there is a pressure to do safe Development Education that I would consider to be more about fund raising or multicultural or whatever"* (Tea 2). Furthermore, it was found that funders reduce the action element of Development Education to fair trade, aid and the MDGs. Finally, in relation to the formal education sector, and as Tea 3 stated above, most of the participants

conduct “*Development Education*” that is “*incorporated into curricula*”, where they face challenges in relation to a lack of critical thinking, citizenship teaching becoming a subject matter, a disconnect between thinking and emotion, and an impulse for student actions to be situated within the charity model of fundraising.

The question for discussion now then, is how can ‘Safe Development Education’ be defined within the context of the research findings, and to what extent does such a definition allege an African perspective?

Firstly, this research has found that ‘Safe Development Education’ is education that is conducted in order to meet funder demands. It operates under the auspices of raising awareness and encouraging actions around aid, Fair Trade and the MDGs, it does not directly involve a “*critical analysis of government policy*” (Tea 2), and does “*not embarrass the government in some way*” (Tea 3) through subsequent actions. It has also been found that ‘Safe Development Education’, is education aligned with the formal education sector that might manage to “*take them (students) to a critical thinking level but the actual actions from the schools is fund raising and fair trade, so they go through the critical thinking learning process but the actual actions they take are a short term action*” (Sugar 1). It has further been found that ‘Safe Development Education’ is education linked closely with development NGOs where “*people would prefer you to go down the charity route looking at poverty as the focus*” (Cocoa 1). Thus, “*if you are fund raising, it is hard to get away from the charity model...it is still from a charitable perspective rather than a justice perspective*” (Tea 2).

In considering all of the participant data in relation to ‘Safe Development Education’, the researcher proposes that education conducted within this context can be located within the functionalism school of thought. Broadly speaking, functionalism presents society as a whole that is dependent on the functioning of separate parts to maintain the overall system. So, in relation to these research findings, if White cultural supremacy is considered to be the whole, it is dependent on the continued functioning of an NGO charity model of development, stereotypical media representations of the poor, funders who curtail actions to the MDGs, Aid and Fair Trade, and an education system that ‘has assumptions of White cultural supremacy where it emphasises poverty or helplessness of the other, resulting from a lack of development, education, resources, skills, knowledge, culture or technology’ (Andreotti, 2009, p59). Furthermore, as Banana 1 puts it in relation to the curriculum, “*I suppose is a very neoliberal curriculum which is about economic focus where everything has to be assessed, examined and inspected, but I see that teachers who are really com-*

*mitted to global justice do feel squeezed, you know, and it's really hard for them to keep that critical angle."*

Indeed, the researcher is not proposing that actions around the MDGs, Aid and Fair Trade, should be abandoned by Development Educators. Nor is she proposing that Development Education should not be aligned with NGOs and the formal education sector. Furthermore, the researcher is not stating that Development Educators should not "*chase the money*", (Tea 2) from particular funding bodies. What is stated, however, is that Development Educators should be clear that conducting their work within this context will limit the extent to which they can evoke active citizenship. Citizenship, in this respect, for example, might involve writing letters to politicians about their promises to implement the MDGs, raising money for development NGOs whilst understanding responsibilities to buy Fair Trade, and showcasing such citizenship as school action projects for funders. As Pretty (1995) and Cornwell (2008) argue, 'whilst oppositional, this type of active citizenship operates within the existing structures and it does not challenge unequal power relations, for oppositional activity does not necessarily mean contesting the existing distribution of power' (quoted in Kenny, 2010, p10).

So, how is an African perspective within this context considered? Significant findings emerged from this research that an African perspective involved engaging with African voices beyond "*fitting into our agenda*", (Cocoa 1) and moving beyond tokenism. In fact, the 'The Making Connections Project', carried out by the CGE, was evidenced as a model of good practice for engaging with minority voices beyond such tokenism. Indeed, this might be the case. However, is an African perspective, in this context, merely reifying minority voices into a functional or 'Safe Development Education' sector that does not directly challenge power structures, but rather operates within the existing structures, so be it at an active citizenship level? Nevertheless, this active citizenship is contained within the functional purpose of maintaining the existing White cultural supremacy, despite effectively bringing African or minority perspectives to the field. Indeed, the researcher is not proposing that minority voices should not be engaged in the field of Development Education. What is being proposed, though, is that Development Educators should make clear as to the extent to which their overall work, including engaging with minority voices, results in overtly political and radical actions that challenge the prevailing White power structures.

In sum, then, the findings of this research indicate that, 'Safe Development Education' can be defined as a functional education that evokes oppositional citizenship without necessarily contesting the existing distribution of power through radical action. 'Safe Development Education', in this respect, is considered to be vital to maintain White cultural supremacy by functioning within the

confines of the NGO charity model of development, funders who curtail actions to the MDGs, Aid and Fair Trade, and an education system that ‘emphasises poverty or helplessness of the other, resulting from a lack of development, education, resources, skills, knowledge, culture or technology’ (Andreotti, 2009, p59). In short, ‘Safe Development Education’ is *“a very harmless activity you carry out, and it has no real impact on the structures”* (Tea 3).

### **4.3 Radical Development Education**

In contrast to ‘Safe Development Education’, ‘Radical Development Education’ also emerged from participant data as a collapsed theme. The data within this collapsed theme complements a definition of ‘Radical Development Education’ that lies in postcolonialism. ‘Broadly speaking, postcolonialism is a theoretical framework which makes visible the history and legacy of European colonialism, including the ways in which the wealth of the global North has been acquired and maintained through a history of exploitation, and examines how it continues to shape contemporary discourses and institutions (Rizvi, Lingard & Lavia, 2006, quoted in Bryan, 2008, p16). Subsequently, from such a perspective, *“if people actually found out that banks are the problem and it is not focused on these countries (developing countries) then people might choose to act differently, and it would be interesting to see what that would look like”* (Cocoa 1). The researcher, at this point, recommends that it is the business of a ‘Radical Development Education’ *“to see what that would look like”*. Although, the researcher cannot offer any definite suggestions as to what it could *“look like”* in practice, the findings of this study clearly indicate what it does not *“look like”*.

In short, it does not look like the functional and ‘Safe Development Education’ as presented above. Rather, it should perhaps unsettle all of the functional parts that maintain the overall power structures, such as the NGO charity model of development, funders who curtail actions to the MDGs, Aid and Fair Trade, and an education system that *“I suppose is a very neoliberal curriculum”* (Banana 1). Furthermore, *“if it is not embarrassing the government in some way, then maybe it is not right, or in this case, not radical (Tea 3). A ‘Radical Development Education’ works to “rewrite what NGO charities have been doing for so many years, questions how development is done, and encourages the public to look at the real hard issues”* (Cocoa 1). It is *“more noisy, and slightly aggressive”* (Banana 1), in moving active citizenship from the framework of helping the less fortunate through aid, fair trade, the MDGs, and the like, to a framework of, what Kenny (2010) describes as a ‘visionary active citizenship’

Visionary active citizenship is proactive rather than reactive. It involves scoping alternative futures and finding better ways of doing things, and challenges the existing structures, values and power relations underpinning the existing society (Kenny, 2010, p10).

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

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

Tea 1 claims that, *“I think maybe for us here a genuine African perspective would really be about us looking at the trickiest issues at this part of the world”*. Hence, as evidenced in the findings chapter, in order for Development Educators to apply an African perspective in this context, *“it is important that we continue to be critical and subversive and challenge very strong and powerful structures”* (Tea 3). In fact, as stated earlier in this report, such an approach might not solely apply to Africa, but rather to all countries in the developing world that have been colonised and exploited by rich western powers.

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

#### 4.4 Defining and Positioning Ourselves

As just stated above, all that this project can evidence is that the participants have produced data that indicates their understandings of the difference between ‘Safe’ and ‘Radical Development Education’, and their considerations of an African perspective within these contexts. Although the participants described some of their ongoing projects, the researcher cannot position them as either ‘Safe’ or ‘Radical’. This would require a more in depth investigation of each particular project, including a content analysis of funding applications, project reports and evaluations. Only then would it be possible to define and position the work of these participants as either ‘Safe’ or ‘Radical’, and measure the extent to which an African perspective is embedded in such work. In fact, it is recommended that it is important for Development Educators to conduct a content analysis of each of their projects, in order to define and position themselves as to the extent to which their work is overtly political and radical in addressing civilised oppression and subsequent oppression.

Furthermore, this study has found that the participants indicate a lack of clarity and understanding in relation to the terminology they use to describe their work. For instance, terms such as Global Education and Development Education are used interchangeably without an in depth analysis of whether or not these terms purport ‘Safe’ or ‘Radical’ active citizenship. As Tea 2 seems to capture,

*“some people use Global Education and Development Education interchangeably and then other people think that Global Education is education about the world. So it wouldn’t have a more critical aspect to it. Um, but I think with any of these terms, people will say that they are doing Development Education, but then when you talk to them about what they are doing their understanding is different”.*

Thus, it is recommended that Development Educators need to grapple with the terminology they use, to clearly situate it within critical pedagogy and academic discourse, and highlight the implications of the usage of specific terms in relation to the extent it might limit, or maximise, active citizenship, and a subsequent African perspective within their work. In fact, McCollum (1996) has stated that, ‘Development Education has been a movement that speaks only to itself, it has not located itself within a broader critical pedagogical discourse’ (quoted in Bourn, 2009, p13). However, due to the large amount of data that the researcher collapsed under the theme of ‘Defining and Positioning Ourselves’, there is indication from these findings that Development Education may have yet to actually speak to itself, never mind attempting to locate itself in academic discourse. Therefore, it is recommended that Development Education should, in the first instance,

speak to itself, in order to clearly define how the terminology it uses is situated in relation to 'Safe' and 'Radical' education. It should speak to itself, to explore the extent to which the movement can be considered Freirean and overtly political in challenging civilised oppression and subsequent oppression. If by speaking to itself, it is discovered that the movement is located in a functional or 'Safe' framework, then Development Education should make explicit how its work purports a reactive rather than a proactive citizenship, and produce empirical evidence to highlight the impact of such work. Perhaps, only then will the movement of Development Education begin to define and position itself in relation to academic discourse, and clearly state the extent to which their work is overtly political and radical, and if, in practice, an African perspective lies within a 'Safe' or 'Radical' framework. As stated earlier a 'Safe' framework can be considered within a functional school of thought, and as argued throughout this research, a 'Radical' framework is considered within postcolonialism. This project has found that the challenge for Development Education is to work towards locating itself in relation to these frameworks, and subsequently evidence the impact of the overall movement.

This project has also found that participants claim to be constrained by funding bodies, development NGOs, media and charitable representations of the poor, and the formal education sector, which purport the practice of 'Safe Development Education', and relegates Development Education to terms and action that promotes AID, Fair Trade and the MDGs. Thus, the participants evidenced that this limits the possibility of being overtly political and radical through action that addresses structural inequalities, and also limits the capacity of embedding a 'Radical' African perspective in Development Education.

Although the participants did not provide any solid evidence as to how a 'Radical Development Education' might look like in practice, they at least indicated a desire to *act otherwise*, to transform the functional and dominant systems where they are presently located. In fact, from a Giddens viewpoint, this study indicates that systems such as development NGOs, government funding bodies and formal education, have indeed bitten into time and space and subsequently have become resistant to change. For Giddens, however, people have a capacity to affect change to such systems by *acting otherwise*. Giddens, though, does not provide any clues as to where, when and under what conditions people are successful at transforming dominant systems. Nevertheless, this research provides evidence that the participants, at least, have a desire to *act otherwise* to move Development Education from a 'Safe' activity to a 'Radical' activity. However, as already stated there is little evidence that clearly defines what a 'Radical Development Education' might look like in practice, but lots of evidence describing what it should not look like.

Although the researcher cannot predict that the participants of this study will actually *act otherwise* to bring about a more ‘Radical Development Education’, recommendations can be made with regards to Development Education defining and positioning itself within the context of a ‘Safe’ or ‘Radical’ framework. Thus, from the findings of this study, it is recommended that;

- Development Educators should consider in depth the terminology they use to define their work, and critically examine how such terminology is located within a ‘Safe’ or ‘Radical’ framework
- Development Educators should clearly rationalise their affiliation with the formal education sector, and highlight if or how they propose to unsettle formal education as, perhaps, a functional part of the overall system of White cultural supremacy
- Development Educators should clearly define what they mean by active citizenship, and if such citizenship is functional or radical
- Development Educators should network across Ireland with minority led groups to clearly locate if an African perspective lies within the context of a ‘Safe’ or ‘Radical’ framework
- Development Educators should peer review the methods they use to address images and messages of people from the developing world
- Development Educators should provide a content analysis of their funding proposals and evaluations, from a postcolonial perspective, to investigate the extent to which their projects can be considered overtly political and radical
- Development Educators should make explicit if their projects are ‘Safe’ due to their affiliation with specific funders
- Development Educators should collectively, perhaps through DOCHAS, make explicit to development NGOs the difference between ‘Safe’ and ‘Radical Development Education’, as highlighted within these findings, and invite the NGOs to discuss the overall implications of practicing a ‘Safe Development Education’, in relation to its impact on the developing world
- Development Educators should explore how a ‘Radical Development Education’ might look like in practice, and be realistic about their claims in relation to affecting structural change

- Development Educators should collectively, perhaps through DOCHAS, pose that critical and radical voices are included on development NGO boards
- Development Educators should provide empirical evidence to contribute to knowledge about the impact of their work, whether it is conducted within a ‘Safe’ or ‘Radical’ framework

Indeed, the above recommendations are suggested to kick start a process of Development Education ‘speaking to itself’ and others within development NGOs, to eventually define and position Development Education within academic discourse and debate, and explore thoroughly the extent to which the movement can be overtly political and radical in exposing systems of civilised oppression and subsequent oppression. Furthermore, the above recommendations should help Development Educators work towards defining and practicing an African perspective that is either considered ‘Safe’ or ‘Radical’. The researcher does not claim that Development Educators should be ‘Radical’ rather than ‘Safe’, or vice versa. What is important from the research findings, though, is that Development Educators should clarify as to which framework their practice is situated, and clarify the extent to which they propose to unsettle or reproduce the functional systems described earlier.

As mentioned throughout this study, this research has been small scale, and does not claim that the findings are representative of the overall Development Education sector in Ireland. Nonetheless, this study has produced convincing data covering a wide range of topics. From this study, further research can be recommended to explore these topics at a larger scale. Hence it is recommended that;

- Research is conducted on the images and messages that development NGOs, who are associated with DOCHAS, use. A content analysis of development NGO websites could be carried out to investigate the manner to which they market people from the developing world, and the extent to which their images can be considered *positive* as discussed in Chapter 1
- Larger scale research is conducted investigating further the terminology that Development Educators use, and the extent to which they understand it as terminology for either ‘Safe’ or ‘Radical’ pedagogy
- Research is conducted with development NGO fund raising departments to investigate in depth if their understanding of Development Education is limited to a charity model of de-

velopment, as the participants of this study have indicated

- Research is conducted with development NGO board members to investigate their understandings of Development Education, and how they perceive an African perspective within this context

Overall, the recommendations from this research are considered essential if Development Educators are to have greater clarity as to the extent to which their work is Freirean, political and radical, and how it exposes systems of civilised oppression and subsequent oppression. Furthermore, the recommendations should provide greater clarity as to the extent to which an African perspective is considered and practiced within the field. For instance, is it an African perspective that genuinely incorporates minority voices, but are those voices being simply reified into a functional and ‘Safe Development Education?’ Or, from a postcolonial perspective, is an African perspective located within a ‘Radical Development Education’ where all voices, whether Black or White, work together to unsettle the functional system, and subsequently challenge structures of White cultural supremacy? In this context, it might be argued that the findings of this research indicate that there is a lot of unsettling to be done. Nevertheless, this study has found that the participants, at least, strive to *act otherwise* to address all of the issues inherent in this research, including embedding an African perspective within their work. Whether or not the participants will actually *act otherwise*, and address the recommendations, challenges and considerations within this report is a claim that the researcher cannot assert.

## References

- Aldrich, T. (2004) "Do-It-Yourself DRTV: A practical guide to making direct response television advertising work for charities", An International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing, 9 (2); 135-144.
- Alexander, B. (2005) "Performance Ethnography: The Re-enacting and Inciting of Culture" pp. 411-441 in N Denzin and Y Lincoln (ed) The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research, Thousand Oaks, Sage Publications.
- Altheide, D. (1987) "Reflections: Ethnographic Content Analysis", Qualitative Sociology, 10 (1); 65-77.
- Andreotti, V. (2009) "Development vs Poverty: notions of cultural supremacy in development education policy", pp 45-63 in D Bourn (ed) Development Education, Debates and Dialogues, London: University of London.
- Asante, M. (2006) "A Discourse on Black Studies: Liberating the Study of African People in the Western Academy", Journal of Black Studies, 36 (5); 646-662.
- Baily, N. (2010) "Does Development Education fit into Adult Education?: Offering Adult learners to engage with Development issues", Policy and Practice: A Development Education Review, 10; 59-77.
- Barnett, J. and Hammond, S. (1999) "Representing Disability in Charity Promotions", Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology, 9; 309-314.
- Bennett, R. (2010) "Agency Termination Decisions by Small to Medium-Sized Charitable Organisations", Journal of Marketing Communications, 5 (3); 131-142.
- Bishop, R. (2008) "From a Distance: Marginalization of the Poor in Television Ads for Goodwill Industries", Journal of Poverty, 12 (4); 411-431.
- Blackburn, J. (2000) "Understanding Paulo Freire: reflections on the origins, concepts, and possible pitfalls of his educational approach", Community Development Journal, 35 (1); 3-15.
- Blaney, D. (2002) "Global Education, Disempowerment and Curricula for a World Politics", Journal of Studies in International Education, 6 (3); 268-282.
- Bourn, D. (2009) "Introduction", pp 1-17 in D Bourn (ed) Development Education, Debates and Dialogues, London: University of London.

- Braun, V. and Clarke, V. (2006) "Using Thematic Analysis in Psychology", Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3; 77-101.
- Brown Givens, S. and Monahan, J. (2005) "Priming mummies, jezebels, and other controlling images: An examination of the influence of mediated stereotypes on perceptions of a Black woman", Media Psychology, 7(1), 87-106.
- Bryan, A. (2008) "Researching, and searching for, international development in the formal curriculum: Towards a post-colonial conceptual framework", Policy and Practice: A Development Education Review, 7; 62-79.
- Bryman, A. (2001) Social Research Methods, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Chaib, D. (2010) "Music Listening Circles: Contributions from Development Education to Democratising Classical Music", Policy and Practice: A Development Education Review, 10; 42-58.
- Chang, C. and Lee, Y. (2009) "Framing Charity Advertising: Influences of Message Framing, Image Valence, and Temporal Framing on a Charitable Appeal", Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 39 (12); 2910-1935.
- Chatziefstathiou, D. (2007) "The History of Marketing an idea: The Example of Baron Pierre de Coubertin as a Social Marketer", European Sport Management Quarterly, 7 (1); 55-80.
- Chauhan, V. (2011) Making Connections – Staying Connected: Report of the external evaluation of the Centre for Global Education's Making Connections Project, Northern Ireland: Centre for Global Education.
- Cho, D. and Lewis, T. (2006) "The Persistent Life of Oppression: The Unconscious, Power, and Subjectivity", Interchange, 36 (3); 313-329.
- Choules, K. (2007) "Social Change Education", Adult Education Quarterly, 57 (2); 159-176.
- Collins, P. (2000) Black feminist thought: Knowledge, consciousness, and the politics of empowerment, New York: Routledge.
- Davis, A. (1983), Women, race, & class, New York: Vintage Books.
- Denzin, N. and Lincoln, Y. (2005) "Introduction: The Discipline and Practice of Qualitative Research", pp. 1-32 in N Denzin and Y Lincoln (ed) The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research, Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

- Deutsch, M. (2006) "A Framework for Thinking about Oppression and It's Change", Social Justice Research, 19 (1); 7-41.
- Doddington, K, Jones, R. and Millar, B. (2010) "Are Attitudes to People with Learning Disabilities Negatively Influenced by Charity Advertising? An Experimental Analysis", Disability and Society, 9 (2); 207-222.
- Doornbos, M. (2010) "Researching African Statehood Dynamics: Negotiability and its Limits", Development and Change, 41 (4); 747-769.
- Dyer, C. (1995) Beginning Research In Psychology: A Practical Guide To Research Methods And Statistics, Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.
- Fiedler, M. (2008) "Teaching and Learning about the world in the Classroom: Development Education in culturally diverse Settings", Policy and Practice: A Development Education Review, 7; 5-17.
- Freire, P. (1973) Education for Critical Consciousness, London: Sheed and Ward.
- Fuller, A. (1993) "The Alternative Peace Press", Peace Review, 5 (1); 103-108.
- Gibson, F. (2007) "Conducting Focus Groups with Children and Young People: strategies for success", Journal of Research in Nursing, 12 (5); 473-483.
- Giddens, A. (1976) New Rules of Sociological Method, London: Hutchinson & Co Publishers Ltd.
- Giddens, A. (1984) The Constitution of Society, Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Glenn, C. And Cunningham, L. (2009) "The Power of Black Magic: The Magical Negro and White Salvation in Film", Journal of Black Studies, 40 (2); 135-152.
- Groarke, S. (2002) "Psychoanalysis and Structuration Theory: The Social Logic of Identity", Sociology, 36 (3); 559-576.
- Hammersley, M. (1989) The Dilemma of Qualitative Method: Herbert Blumer and the Chicago Tradition, London: Routledge.
- Hayes, E. and Smith, L. (1994) "Women in Adult Education: An Analysis of Perspectives in Major Journals", Adult Education Quarterly, 44 (4); 201-221.
- Heerde, J. and Hudson, D. (2010) "The Righteous Considereth the Cause of the Poor"? Public Attitudes towards Poverty in Developing Countries", Political Studies, 58; 389-409.

- Hodgson, M. (2007) "Institutions and Individuals: Interaction and Evolution", Organization Studies, 28 (1); 95-116.
- Howard, A. (2004) "Speaking Theatre/Doing Pedagogy: Re-Visiting Theatre of the Oppressed", Communication Education, 53 (3); 217-223.
- Joffe, H. (2008) "The Power of Visual Material; Persuasion, Emotion, and Identification", Dio- genes, 217; 84-93.
- Kenny, S. (2010) "Towards unsettling Community Development", Community Development Journal, 46 (1); 7-19.
- Khoo, S. (2006) "Development education, citizenship and civic engagement at third level and beyond in the Republic of Ireland", Policy and Practice: A Development Education Review, 3; 26-39.
- Krueger, R. (1998) Developing Questions for Focus Groups Focus Group Kit 3, Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Liu, S. (2006) "Towards an analytical theory of social change: the case of China", The British Journal of Sociology, 57 (3); 503-520.
- Littlefield, M. (2008) "The Media as a system of Racialization: Exploring Images of the African American Woman and the new Racism", American Behavioral Scientist, 51 (5); 675-685.
- McCormack, O. And O'Flaherty, J. (2010) "An examination of pre-service teachers' attitudes towards the inclusion of development education into Irish post-primary schools", Teaching and Teacher Education, 26; 1332-1339.
- McCully, A. (2006) "Practitioner perceptions of their role in facilitating the handling of controversial issues in contested societies: a Northern Irish experience", Educational Review, 58 (1); 51-65.
- McDonnell, I, Lecomte, H. and Wegimont, L. (eds) (2003a) Public Opinion and the Fight Against Poverty, Paris: OECD/North-South Centre.
- Mahadeo, M. and McKinney, J. (2007) "Media Representations of Africa: Still the same old Story?" Policy and Practice: A Development Education Review, 4; 14-20.
- Miles, M. and Huberman, A. (1994) Qualitative Data Analysis, London: Sage.

- Nunnally, S. (2009) "Racial Homogenization and Stereotypes Black American College Students' Stereotypes about Racial Groups", Journal of Black Studies, 40 (2); 252-265.
- O'Dell, L. (2008) "Representations of the Damaged Child: Child Saving in a British Children's Charity Ad Campaign", Children and Society, 22; 83-92.
- Patton, M. (1980) Qualitative Evaluation Methods, Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.
- Proctor, K, Perlesz, A, Moloney, B, McIlwaine, F. and O'Neill, I. (2008) "Exploring theatre of the oppressed in family therapy clinical work and supervision", Counselling and Psychotherapy Research, 8 (1); 43-52.
- Rattansi, A. (2010) "Postcolonialism and its Discontents", Economy and Society, 26 (4); 480-500.
- Renner, A, Brown, M, Stiens, G, and Burton, S. (2010) "A Reciprocal Global Education? Working towards a more Humanizing Pedagogy through Critical Literacy", Intercultural Education, 21 (1); 41-54.
- Rigby, P. (1996) African Images; Racism and the end of Anthropology, Oxford: Berg.
- Roberts, P. (1999) "A Dilemma for Critical Educators?", Journal of Moral Education, 28 (1); 19-30.
- Robson, C. (1993) Real World Research: A Resource for Social Scientists and Practitioner Researchers, Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.
- Seabrook, J. (2009) The No-Nonsense Guide to World Poverty, Oxford: New Internationalist Publications Ltd.
- Schrodt, P, Baxter, L, McBride, M, Braithwaite, D. and Fine, M. (2006) "The divorce decree, communication, and the structuration of coparenting relationships in stepfamilies", Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 23 (5); 741-759.
- Silverman, D. (2000) Doing Qualitative Research: A Practical Handbook, London: Sage Publications.
- Smith-Maddox, R. and Solorzano, D. (2002) "Using Critical Race Theory, Paulo Freire's Problem-Posing Method, and Case Study Research to Confront Race and Racism in Education", Qualitative Inquiry, 8 (1); 66-84.

- Starkey, Hugh. (2008) "Diversity and citizenship in the curriculum", London Review of Education, 6 (1); 5-10.
- Strauss, A. (1987) Qualitative Analysis for Social Sciences, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Swartz, P. (1998) "Paulo Freire in the Composition Classroom", Journal of Gay, Lesbian, and Bisexual Identity, 3 (2); 167-172.
- Taylor, S. and Bogdan, R. (1998) Introduction to Qualitative Research Methods, New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Van Gorder, A. (2007) "Pedagogy for the Children of the Oppressors: Liberative Education for Social Justice Among the World's Privileged", Journal of Transformative Education, 5 (1); 8-32.
- Willmott, R. (1999) "Structure, Agency, and The Sociology of Education: rescuing analytical dualism", British Journal of Sociology of Education, 20(1); 5-21.
- Young, H. (2010) "Naming the World: Coming to terms with Complexity", Policy and Practice: A Development Education Review, 10; 99-104.

## Appendices

### Appendix 1 DOCHAS Code of Conduct Guiding Principles

#### Guiding Principles

Choices of images and messages will be made based on the paramount principles of:

- Respect for the **dignity** of the people concerned;
- Belief in the **equality** of all people;
- Acceptance of the need to promote **fairness, solidarity and justice**.

Accordingly, in all our communications and where practical and reasonable within the need to reflect reality, we strive to:

- Choose images and related messages based on values of respect equality, solidarity and justice;
- Truthfully represent any image or depicted situation both in its immediate and in its wider context so as to improve public understanding of the realities and complexities of development;
- Avoid images and messages that potentially stereotype, sensationalise or discriminate against people, situations or places;
- Use images, messages and case studies with the full understanding, participation and permission of the subjects (or subjects' parents/guardian);
- Ensure those whose situation is being represented have the opportunity to communicate their stories themselves;
- Establish and record whether the subjects wish to be named or identifiable and always act accordingly;

Conform to the highest standards in relation to human rights and protection of the vulnerable people.

<http://www.dochas.ie/Code/Default.aspx>

## **Appendix 2 Research Tender from Africa Centre**

### **Africa Centre: Invitation to tender for research project on exploring an African Perspective in Development Education**

The Africa Centre seeks to commission a research project that will explore an African Perspective in Development Education. Africa Centre invites expressions of interest from individual researchers, research organisations and third level institutions for this piece of research.

Since its establishment in 2000, the Africa Centre has been engaged in addressing the need for an effective 'African Perspective' in Development Education (DE) in Ireland. The Africa Centre has undertaken significant reflection upon what is an 'African Perspective in Development Education'. It is more than just an African perspective expressing the same messages, but rather a process that challenges some of the perspectives still prevailing in Irish Society about Africa. Developing such a perspective involves a process of exploring African culture, seeking to identify methodologies of communication, learning, reflection and action used in different parts of Africa and adapting these as part of the methodologies of Development Education in Ireland today. This has previously led the Africa Centre to develop methodologies such as its series of 'Moonlight Talks', lectures, musical nights and courses.

#### **The core aims of the initiative delivered by the Development Education team are:**

Promoting and facilitating education led by Africans who have experience of living in Africa and can bring this authentic voice to the educational experience as a southern perspective to others

Sharing knowledge which is based on experience of some of the complex topics in relation to African development (such as African history, politics, culture) to which the Africa Centre can bring a lived experience and understanding

A critical perspective on the use of images of Africa, on which the Africa Centre has already carried out work and which will be further developed through the coming three years

Use of diverse African education methods, such as story-telling, music and dance, which the Africa Centre will train educators to use effectively in relation to development and promote among development educators in Ireland

#### **Scope of Research**

As previously mentioned the Africa Centre has undertaken significant reflection upon what is an 'African Perspective in Development Education'. It is more than just an African perspective expressing the same messages, but rather a process that challenges some of the perspectives still prevailing in Irish Society about Africa.

Integrating a Southern perspective in Development Education has become a common ambition of many projects, programmes and activities organised in the Development Education sector in Ireland. Most recently the Irish Development Education Association (IDEA) developed a Global Educator in Residence programme which aimed to contribute towards creating a fair and equal dialogue between the Global North and South and to challenge the assumptions and preconceptions of educators working in Ireland from a Southern Perspective. Furthermore Dochas the umbrella organisation for NGOs based its Conference around the theme ‘New Voices in Development’ which brought together established and emerging development organisations (though with less southern voices), representatives of the private sector, philanthropy and academia.

Despite attempts being made the Africa Centre argues that organisations are failing to incorporate the Southern/African perspective into Development Education in favour of an imbalanced fundraising agenda. In commissioning this research the Africa Centre seeks to strengthen its relationship with NGOs to create a more fair and balanced representation of the Africa in the development education discourse.

### **Aim of Research**

The overall aim is to have a common understanding of Southern/African perspectives in Development Education to enrich the quality and strengthen relationships with other NGOs who want to raise awareness on global issues.

The research will specifically target NGOs involved in Development Education.

### **Objectives:**

- To provide a general overview of Development Education work currently being carried out in Ireland
- To evaluate the opinions of NGOs on what they define a Southern/African perspective in Development Education to be
- To establish if NGOs apply a Southern/African perspective in their work and methodologies
- Compare and contrast finding with ethnic led minority organisations

### **Research Outputs**

The research outputs will include:

- Design data collection tools according to the specifications of the research aims
- The submission of a draft and final report outlining the research process, research findings and a series of recommendations for going forward

## **Researcher requirements**

We will require an outline of the following from the tenderer: Relevant research/third level qualifications;

- Knowledge of conducting qualitative and quantitative research approaches and methodologies
- Your track record in undertaking similar work
- Your proven ability to work with the target population and any experience in development education
- A proposal and plan of your methodological approach to the research which demonstrates an understanding of the objectives of the work and detailing your capacity to carry out the work within the agreed timescale
- How you will identify and target NGOs for inclusion in the research

**Deadline for Submission: Friday 24th September 2010 @ 5.00pm**

**Budget: €2,500.00**

## **Timescale and Schedule:**

- The successful researcher will meet with the Development Education Team on the 4<sup>th</sup> October 2010 to discuss the research.
- The actual research will be from 18<sup>th</sup> October to 18<sup>th</sup> December 2010
- Draft findings submitted to the Development Education team by the 17<sup>th</sup> January 2011.
- The final report of the report is expected by the 31<sup>st</sup> January 2011.

**For further information please contact:** Mbemba Jabbi, Africa Centre 9c Lower Abbey Street , Dublin 1, email [mbemba@afriacentre.ie](mailto:mbemba@afriacentre.ie) or phone 01 8656951

### **Appendix 3 Discussion Interview Group Design**

In developing questioning route for the discussion groups, this study will draw on Krueger's (1998) model on categorising focus group questions.

The sessions will begin with introductions. The researcher will summarise the structure of the discussion interview and explain to the participants that their opinions are valued as they are here to help in the research, and any contributions they make will be greatly appreciated. If necessary, the researcher will invite the participants to begin with an important ice-breaker to 'create a relaxed environment, promote group cohesiveness and possibly influence the quality of discussion that follows' (Gibson, 2007, p478).

Krueger argues that introductory questions should be open-ended questions to allow participants to 'tell about how they see or understand the phenomenon under investigation' (Krueger, 1998, p24). The participants, one at a time, will be asked to make any statement at all in relation to defining Development Education, without judgement from the rest of the group. Participants can volunteer statements at random, and the exercise can continue until the participants feel they have expressed all of their opinions. This is considered to be important to gain a wide range of perspectives on the concept of Development Education, and to help establish a safe space where the participants feel they can express themselves without judgement.

Transition questions will then help participants 'envision the topic in a broader scope' (Krueger, 1998, p25). Thus, the participants will be asked to agree/disagree and discuss the following statements:

1. It is difficult for Development Educators to challenge the charity model of development
2. Development Education and Global Education can be defined similarly
3. Emphasis on critical thinking simply serves to empower people to critically "think about" the global south. This portrays the global south as an object of study, and again reinforces division
4. It is difficult for NGO Development Educators to do their work, since there might be a clash of values between the fundraising department and Development Education department

The participants will be further asked to think about their own Development Education practice, and will be invited to discuss the factors that contributed to the design of their Development Education projects. This discussion will focus on factors such as funding bodies, curricular require-

ments, their specific NGO agendas and any other factors that might emerge. The researcher will encourage the participants to discuss whether such factors have a positive or negative impact on their Development Education work.

‘Key questions drive the study’ (Krueger, 1998, p25). These questions will be designed to investigate how participants define an African perspective in Development Education, and to establish if they apply an African perspective to their work. This will then be discussed, and the researcher will ask the participants to explain how they incorporate, or see the potential of an African perspective to be incorporated within their practice. The participants will also be invited to explain any difficulties they might have, or foresee, in incorporating their definition of the African perspective within their work.

A well structured ending ‘brings closure to the discussion, enables participants to reflect on previous comments, and are critical to analysis’ (Krueger, 1998, p26). Drawing on, what Krueger terms the ‘all things considered question’, participants will be invited ‘to reflect on all comments shared in the discussion and then to identify which aspects are most important, most in need of action, etc’ (Krueger, 1998, p26). The participants will also be invited to offer suggestions for possible future collaboration and networking, in order to attempt to meet the overall objective of this project to intervene for NGOs in Ireland to continue to work with the Africa Centre, and other minority led groups, towards effective Development Education beyond the span of this project.

At the end of the focus group, the participants will be thanked for their participation, and the researcher will affirm confidentiality in relation to using pseudonyms in the writing up of the research.

## **Appendix 4 Participant Information Sheet and Consent Form**

### **Who is commissioning this research?**

The Africa Centre is commissioning this research that will explore an African perspective in Development Education. Since its establishment in 2000, the Africa Centre has been engaged in addressing the need for an effective ‘African Perspective’ in Development Education (DE) in Ireland.

### **Why is the researcher doing this study?**

Integrating an African perspective in Development Education has become a common ambition of many projects, programmes and activities organised in the Development Education sector in Ireland. Most recently the Irish Development Education Association (IDEA) developed a Global Educator in Residence programme which aimed to contribute towards creating a fair and equal dialogue between the Global North and South, and to challenge the assumptions and preconceptions of educators working in Ireland from a Southern Perspective. Furthermore Dochas the umbrella organisation for NGOs based its Conference around the theme ‘New Voices in Development’ which brought together established and emerging development organisations (though with less southern voices), representatives of the private sector, philanthropy and academia.

Despite attempts being made, the Africa Centre argues that organisations are failing to incorporate the African perspective into Development Education in favour of an imbalanced fundraising agenda. In commissioning this research the Africa Centre seeks to explore an African perspective within Development Education and to strengthen its relationship with NGOs to create a more fair and balanced representation of Africa in the Development Education discourse.

### **Why have I been chosen?**

You are invited to take part in a group interview with other Development Educators. You have been asked to take part so that you can help me explore if and how Development Educators, on the island of Ireland, define and incorporate an African perspective within their work.

It is up to you to decide whether or not to take part. Please read the information below so that you have a clear understanding about the research. You can contact me to ask any questions that you might have. Thank you for taking the time to consider this invitation.

## **Do I have to take part?**

You do not have to take part. If you do decide to take part you will be asked to sign a consent form, and you can keep this information sheet. If you do decide to take part, you can change your mind at any time. You do not have to provide any explanation.

## **What will happen to me if I take part?**

- You will join up to 4 other Development Educators for a small group interview.
- I will tape record the interview, and you have the right to ask for the recorder to be switched off
- For group work, we will begin with an ice breaker, if the group feels the need for this
- You will be invited to define Development Education
- You will be asked to agree or disagree with the following statements
  1. It is difficult for development educators to challenge the charity model of development
  2. Development Education and Global Education can be defined similarly
  3. Emphasis on critical thinking simply serves to empower people to critically “think about” the global south. This portrays the global south as an object of study, and again reinforces division - *‘Global education, with its emphasis on critical literacy, is supposed to empower’ (see Blaney, 2002, p268). However, it could be argued that global education is becoming a method to ‘simply empower our students as participants in the interpretation of global inequality between those of us in the “developed” North who believe our role is to know, think critically and act for the rest of the world, and those from the global South that we perpetually treat as objects of study and action. Again, so be it at a critical literacy level, this serves to reinforce the divide between the haves and the have nots, and by disempowering students relative to the rest of the world, we also decrease their capacity to engage in dialogue with the developing world, and create a genuine sense of shared solidarity with the global south (see Blaney, 2002, p268)*
  4. It is difficult for NGO Development Educators to do their work, since there might be a clash of values between the fundraising department and Development Education department
- You will be invited to describe your current Development Education projects

- You will be invited to discuss the factors that contributed to the design of your Development Education projects. This discussion will focus on factors such as funding bodies, curricular requirements, specific NGO agendas and any other factors that might emerge. The researcher will encourage the participants to discuss whether such factors have a positive or negative impact on their Development Education work
- You will be asked to define an African perspective in Development Education, and if you apply an African perspective to your work
- You will be invited to explain any difficulties you might have, or foresee, in incorporating your definition of the African perspective within your work
- You will be invited to suggest ideas for future networking amongst Development Educators of Ireland, with regards to ensuring the African/Southern perspective becomes embedded in development education

### **Are there any risks?**

Confidentiality and anonymity are assured. Your participation is entirely voluntary. You are free to refuse to answer any question. You are free to withdraw from completing the group/individual interview at any time.

### **What are the benefits in me taking part?**

In taking part you will help to research how to effectively bring an African perspective to the work of Development Education. You will help obtain the following objectives;

- To provide a general overview Development Education work currently being carried out in Ireland, and contribute to theoretical debate in relation to Development Education practice
- To evaluate the opinions of NGOs on what they define an African perspective in Development Education to be
- To establish if Development Educators apply an African perspective to their work and methodologies
- Highlight any contrast in findings with ethnic led minority organisations, and also highlight general challenges that Development Educators may face

### **Will my taking part be confidential?**

You will not be named in the writing up of the research. Pseudonyms will be used to protect your identity.

### **What happens at the end of the study?**

At the end of the study, I will carefully watch the tape recording and take notes of all that you speak about. I will analyse these notes, and write up the results in a report. This will then be submitted to the Africa Centre.

### **Who is reviewing the research?**

The research is being reviewed carefully, and approved ethically, by the Africa Centre. If you need more information, or have any complaints, you can contact the persons below.

**Mr. Mbemba Abdulie Jabbi**

**Programme Officer**

**Africa Centre**

**9c Abbey Street Lower**

**Dublin 1**

**Ireland**

**Tel/Fax: 00353-1-865 6951**

**[mbemba@afriacentre.ie](mailto:mbemba@afriacentre.ie)**

**[www.afriacentre.ie](http://www.afriacentre.ie)**

**Dr. Caroline Murphy**

**Education Researcher and Development Educator**

**[mc.gallagher@email.ulster.ac.uk](mailto:mc.gallagher@email.ulster.ac.uk)**

**CONSENT FORM**

**Title – An African Perspective in Development Education**

**Researcher – Dr. Caroline Murphy**

- ❖ I have read and understood and been given the information sheet, and all my questions have been answered  
(    )
- ❖ I understand that my participation is voluntary, and I can withdraw at any time without giving a reason  
(    )
- ❖ I understand that the researcher will hold all information and data collected securely and in confidence and that all efforts will be made to ensure that I will not be identified and I give the researcher permission to hold relevant personal data  
(    )
- ❖ I agree to take part in this study  
(    )

**Name of Participant taking consent.....**

**Signature.....**

**Date.....**

**Researcher Signature.....**



Published by Africa Centre and supported  
by European Commission, Concern and Trocaire

[www.africacentre.ie](http://www.africacentre.ie)



**CONCERN**  
worldwide

**TROCAIRE**