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Abstract

International development non-governmental organizations (INGOs) in the United Kingdom and Canada have demonstrated a distinct withdrawal from education programming towards campaigns and fundraising. This study explores how the nature of INGO global education programming has shifted over time. The purpose of this research is to gain a better understanding of a) the place of INGO-produced global education within the context of international development and the field of global education, and b) what type of role (if any) INGOs have to play in future global education programming.

The shifts in INGO global education over time are identified through a comparative historical analysis of the socio-political and funding conditions affecting INGO-produced global education programming in Canada and the UK including the embedded case studies of two sister organizations, Save the Children UK and Save the Children Canada. This study looks broadly at the fifty year history of INGO global education, then focuses on the current experiences of two INGOs that are representative of conditions of INGO dependency within their country contexts. A conceptual framework based on the work on the educational typologies of Askew and Carnell (1998) and the ethical positionings of Barnett and Weiss (2008) is used to analyze, evaluate, explore, and describe the global education programming mechanisms prioritized by INGOs.
The trend of INGO global education programming as fundraising campaigns lacks the commitment to relationship building, and the acquisition of the knowledge, skills, and attitudes that are important for developing informed and capable constituencies who would understand systemic inequalities. This begs the question as to whether INGOs are satisfied with the short-term, socially regulatory outcome of fundraising when they have the potential to facilitate the dialogical, equitable relationships that can increase the possibilities for social transformation.
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Chapter One: The Shifting Nature of INGO Global Education Programming

Introduction

International development non-governmental organizations (INGOs) in the United Kingdom (UK) and Canada have been producing global education programming for domestic audiences since the late 1950s and late 1960s respectively. The purpose of this programming is twofold and interrelated: to increase understanding of the issues that create conditions of inequality globally, and for people to acquire the knowledge and skills necessary to make informed decisions and actions that will positively transform global society. This education work from the international development sector is important because it has contributed to the creation of global education learning paradigms that have facilitated awareness and understanding of global themes and issues both in the formal education sector (through programming at schools, colleges, and universities) and the informal sector (through community-based programming) for over fifty years. Through their education programming, INGOs, with their connections to people and organizations in the global South, have been able to facilitate learning relationships between people living in different global contexts. Furthermore, INGOs in the UK and Canada have connected the ethical imperative to address global poverty with learning frameworks that articulate the knowledge, skills, and attitudes necessary to carry out this work.

This thesis explores the shift in the nature of INGO global education programming from a sustained dialogical focus of learning towards programming that emphasizes the shorter-term outcomes of fundraising and advocacy campaigns. The UK and Canada were chosen as sites for this study because of their historical relationship with INGO global education programming. Both countries have, during certain periods, valued the educational contributions of INGOs. Global education support from the state, foundations, and within the sector itself encouraged longer-term participatory learning. The UK and Canada provide interesting contextual settings for this study due to the differences in their historical relationships with INGO global education. Comparatively, the UK has a history of relatively well-integrated INGO global education programming rooted in the formal education sector, while Canada has had a fractured history of INGO
global education marked by periods of both international recognition for its programming and a dearth of programming due to scarcity of resources. Despite the different contexts of support, INGOs in these two countries have similarly shifted away from models of dialogically-focused global education programming. This study aims to better understand the shifting nature of global education programming in INGOs and the political nature and implications of those shifts.

To provide deeper insight into the changes in INGOs’ global education programming, this study comparatively explores the programming within two sister organizations, Save the Children UK and Save the Children Canada, over the last decade (2000 to 2010) to illuminate the most recent shifts in INGO global education. These organizations were chosen as case studies primarily because each differs in terms of their funding contexts and levels of funding dependency. Save the Children Canada is heavily dependent on government funding while Save the Children UK has a wide range of funding sources besides government funding. Save the Children was established in the UK in 1919 while its Canadian sister committee was established in 1921. The nature of the relationship between Save the Children UK and Save the Children Canada are indicative of the relationships between the large founding INGOs from the UK (e.g., Oxfam and Plan International) and the United States (e.g., CARE and World Vision) and their smaller Canadian counterparts. Exploring sister organizations that have similar missions and mandates provides an opportunity to understand how the organizations’ experiences within different country contexts relates to decisions regarding their global education programming.

**Research questions**

This thesis compares the shifting nature of global education programming in INGOs in the UK and Canada from 2000 to 2010. The study focuses on INGO global education programming support mechanisms as well as the institutional and organizational frameworks within which INGO global education funding protocols are created and enacted. This study also explores how the support mechanisms and frameworks interact with the ideals of global education as conceptualized by global educators and their advocates. The purpose of this research is to gain a better understanding of a) changes in
INGO global education programming in the UK and Canada over time, and b) the tensions and complementarities among individual, organizational, and institutional perceptions of the purposes of INGO global education and how it should be enacted.

This study is framed by three overarching questions:

1. How has the nature of global education programming shifted in INGOs in the two international contexts of Canada and the United Kingdom? What accounts for these shifts?
2. How do conceptions of the purpose of INGO global education align among individual global educators and global education advocates, organizations, and institutions?
3. What are the implications for INGO global education programming?

Answering the first of these three questions highlights the broader contextual factors that have influenced shifts in INGO global education programming in the UK and Canada over fifty years. The second question narrows the scope to focus on individual global educators and global education advocates and how their ideals align or contrast with their perceptions of how global education is understood and enacted on organizational and institutional levels. The third question explores the wider implications of the study’s findings for INGO programming.

Conceptual framework

The conceptual framework for this study draws on two bodies of literature, global education and humanitarian ethics, as they relate to the work of INGOs. The first set of concepts, from the work of Susan Askew and Eileen Carnell (1998), provides a framework for how global education programming can be enacted within INGOs. The second set of concepts, drawn from the work of Michael Barnett and Thomas G. Weiss (2008), provides a typology of humanitarian ethical positionings, which is used to investigate INGO global education programming. Askew and Carnell’s (1998) research identifies four primary types of education: liberatory (educating for social change emphasizing the individual), social justice (educating for social change emphasizing the collective), client-centred (educating to maintain status quo emphasizing individual achievement), and functionalist (educating to maintain status quo through reinforcement
of social and cultural norms). These types are located on a social regulation–social transformation continuum (see Figure 1). Client-centred and functionalist methods can be tools for social regulation while liberatory and social justice methods can be tools for social transformation (Askew & Carnell, 1998, pp. 83-96). Although this educational type framework is not specifically a global education model, it offers a range of educational practices and approaches that are found within and applied to global education programming.

For this study, these educational types were considered in conjunction with Barnett and Weiss’ four humanitarian ethical positionings, which assist in illuminating the possible motivations behind INGOs’ choices for particular programming mechanisms. The four positionings are as follows: deontological (duty-based), consequential (the end justifies the means), virtue (the internal motivation, heroic journey), and situated (dialogical, long-term, contextualized) (Barnett & Weiss, 2008, pp. 43-48). These two models offer uncomplicated representations of the broader range of educational types and ethical positionings that can be used to analyze, evaluate, explore, and describe the programming mechanisms (global education, campaigns, advocacy, communications, and/or fundraising) prioritized by INGOs.

Methodology

In order to explore the shifting nature of global education programming in INGOs over time, a broad comparative analysis of the sociopolitical factors relating to INGO global education programming in Canada and the UK was conducted. The embedded comparative case studies of two sister organizations, Save the Children UK and Save the Children Canada, enabled this study to delve deeper into the experiences of individual organizations. Answering the first question, about how INGO-produced global education programming in the two regions compares, required building a thick description of two cases: Canada and the United Kingdom. The descriptions are based on data collected from documents (such as journal articles, government documents, and reports from UN agencies, INGOs and development education centres) and from informants who have had experiences with INGO global education dating back fifteen to twenty-five years. The contextual factors that led to the different approaches to INGO-produced global
education in the two regions were further explored through data from comparative case studies of Save the Children Canada and Save the Children UK. These organizational case studies focus on the past ten years (2000 to 2010) of global education programming. The case studies provide further insight into how changes at the macro-level have impacted programming choices of individual INGOs in Canada and the UK. The findings from the wider study and the case studies were analyzed using the conceptual framework of educational types and ethical positionings to better understand how trends of programming, policies, and priorities demonstrated inclinations or aversions towards either long-term social transformation or shorter-term social regulation.

The second question, regarding how conceptions of global education align and contrast among global educators and their advocates, organizations, and institutions is explored through findings from document analysis and interviews with twenty-eight informants. Informants were selected because they have worked either as an INGO global educator or with INGO global education programming and/or policy. Of the twenty-eight informants, four worked for Save the Children UK and four worked for Save the Children Canada. Three informants worked on the European Commission’s Development Education Exchange Europe Project (DEEEP). Data from Canadian informants were coded with a “C” and a number (e.g., C01, C02) while data from informants from the UK and Europe were coded with an “E” and a number (e.g., E01, E02).

Including data from informants who worked for organizations other than the Save the Children UK and Canada helped build the broader picture of INGO global education programming over time in the UK and Canada with the DEEEP informants providing valuable input as to how the European Commission’s support for global education has impacted the UK. Informants who worked for Save the Children provided valuable insights as to how the changes at the macro- and organizational levels have impacted their work. This part of the study focused on the informants’ global education ideals and their perceptions of a) how well their ideals aligned with their organizations’ frameworks and government/donors’ policies; and the perceived gaps between actual and ideal global education practice. The participants’ responses to how INGO global education programming is valued and enacted at the individual, organizational, and institutional level was analyzed using the conceptual framework of educational types and ethical
positionings to gain an understanding of how, and if, a longer-term, dialogical, socially transformative learning paradigm was valued and/or enacted on the level of individuals, organizations, and institutions. The final question, regarding implications of this study, draws on the findings from all areas of the study.

The research analyzed the shifting nature of INGO global education programming at three levels: the institutional level, the organizational level and the individual level. At the individual level, global education programming is enacted through the relationship among individuals’ global education ideals and organizational and institutional priorities and policies. Preceding the analysis of these interconnecting levels is the ongoing study of the principal areas of related literature highlighting the theoretical and methodological debates.

**Definition of terms**

Many key terms used in this study relate to INGOs. In this study, the term INGO refers to non-governmental organizations within the international development sector such as those providing overseas assistance and/or implementing development projects (e.g., Plan International, CARE, World Vision, Red Cross, Oxfam). The following characteristics apply to the INGOs in this study:

- Can be a group of voluntary individuals or an organization (frequently both);
- Are not affiliated with government;
- Provide a service or influence public policy (frequently both); and
- Are not-for-profit. (Brodhead, Herbert-Copley, Lambert, 1988, p. x and xiii).

In the UK and Canada, small, community-based centres that offered global education resources in the form of support to teachers and through community education were a crucial part of INGO global education history. These non-international NGOs whose primary function was to provide global education programming did not do overseas development work. In the UK these organizations are called development education centres (DECs). In Canada the centres were most commonly referred to as learner centres but also as “dev-ed” centres (Chaudhuri and Gundara, 1983) or development education centres (DECs). In Ontario they were collectively known as the global education centres of Ontario (GECcOs). In this study, the centres will be referred to as both learner centres and DECs.
Other terms integral to this study are those related to global education, advocacy, campaigns, communications, awareness-raising and fundraising. These areas of INGO programming overlap and compete for similar audiences and resources. For the purposes of this study *Global global education* encompasses a broad range of forms of education related international development and global issues. This usage of the term global education is borrowed from the model put forward by the North-South Centre of the Council of Europe and the European Commission. Their definition is based on the Maastrict Declaration of 2002, a collective vision of global education created by European Member state global education stakeholders from INGOs, the formal education sector, and government officials. In the Maastrict Declaration global education is defined as follows:

Global Education is education that opens people’s eyes and minds to the realities of the world, and awakens them to bring about a world of greater justice, equity and human rights for all.

Global Education is understood to encompass Development Education, Human Rights Education, Education for Sustainability, Education for Peace and Conflict Prevention and Intercultural Education; being the global dimensions of Education for Citizenship. (Maastricht Global Education Declaration, 15th-17th November 2002; O’Loughlin & Wegimont (eds), 2003, p.13; Cabezudo, Christidis, Carvalho da Silva, Demetriadou-Saltet, Halbartschlager, & Mihai, 2010, p.6)

In addition to the list of educations included in the North-South Centre’s definition, this study considers the following related forms of education within the range of how global education is named by INGO global educators: global citizenship education, cosmopolitan citizenship education, education for the global dimension, world studies, education for a global perspective, education for world citizenship, education for international understanding, third world studies, and peripherally, environmental education, critical multicultural education, and anti-racist education. These forms of education share the understanding that learning needs to occur if there is to be a better world.

In this study, the competing and overlapping INGO programming areas of campaigns, advocacy, communications and public relations, and fundraising are explored in relation to a shift away from global education programming that focuses on longer-
term social transformation. Within each of these programming areas (with the exception of fundraising) is the potential to provide learning practices that are socially transformative and/or socially regulatory. Campaigns are designed to address key issues and to convey specific messages to convince target audiences to respond through actions, such as encouraging others to support the idea behind the campaign and/or to contribute financially. Advocacy activities, like campaigns, encourage people to take a supportive course of action, typically to support changes in policy. While advocacy and campaign programming often overlap, advocacy does not directly involve fundraising. The areas of communications and public relations tend to be related to organizations’ and agencies’ brands and corporate image. Communications and public relations programming involves one-way messaging that relays information out to the public but does not demand anything of its audience other than awareness. Fundraising, the act of generating financial support, does not in itself resemble global education, campaigns, advocacy, communications or public relations, but is dependent on these activities to provide a context or a reason the public to contribute financially. Thus fundraising is a common area of overlap between these programming areas.

Background to study: Global education ideals in international development

Historically, funders and INGOs have disagreed regarding the political nature of global education. Government funders have typically requested political neutrality (Smillie, 1985; Christie 1983) while INGOs and development education centres (DECs) have insisted that political neutrality is impossible (Mooney, 1983; Belliveau, 1983). To this day, the political content of global education is monitored carefully by both the funders (particularly government funders) and the INGOs to ensure that charity laws are obeyed and that their private donor base is not alienated. Yet, when global education ideals are explored at the personal level, they are inherently political/ideological. Organizations and agencies (including governments) are staffed by individuals, many of whom are drawn to international development work because of their values and principles. Most international development humanitarian work – and global education work – is not a career move for those motivated by money. In an attempt to gauge the shifting nature of INGO-produced global education programming, participants in this study were asked to describe their
global education ideals and to reflect on their personal ideals in relation to their perceptions of the priorities of their organizations and institutions. This process illustrates how differences in ideals, priorities, and policies among the individual programmers, organizations, and institutions are reflected in the highly idealized yet highly constrained area of INGO global education programming.

INGOs take multiple approaches to global education programming. Exploring how INGOs prioritize the various types of global education programming reveals the shifting nature of INGO global education. INGO educational programs that focus on campaigning or fundraising carry an anticipated outcome, one that will directly benefit the INGO (e.g., support for aid assistance through funding or lobbying). Even INGO global educators who are against any connection between global education programming and fundraising are faced with the challenge that sometimes teachers, students and their various audiences want to fundraise. The point where education overlaps with communications, campaigns, advocacy and fundraising is often at the “taking action” stage, something that is considered to be an important learning goal for global educators in both the formal education and INGO sectors.

Some of the larger INGOs, more so those in the UK, which are often the head office internationally, have separate departments for each of the following areas: education, communications, campaigns, advocacy, and fundraising. However, as budgets tighten and INGOs attempt to get closer to meeting their mandate of poverty reduction, the lines get blurred between already overlapping areas of programming. An overall goal of the sector is to mainstream global education into schools. This highlights a number of struggles between the INGO and formal education sector and within the INGO sector itself, including the formal education sector’s interest in internationalizing education over engendering a global perspective; and, the internal conflict within INGOs over investing in education programming that has almost no immediate benefit to INGOs, or investing in campaigns that bring brand awareness and support for their work.

**Organization of this study**

This thesis is organized as follows. The second chapter provides a review of the global education literature as it relates to the following: values and ideals that have informed the
field; INGO global education as an expression of humanitarian ideals; institutional conceptions of global education; and the overlapping programming areas of campaigns, advocacy, and communications. The third chapter situates the subject of international development non-governmental organizations (INGOs) within the wider context of aid architecture. This chapter on INGOs discusses: INGOs within global aid architectures; terms and references; history of INGOs; INGOs size and scope; international development funding and policy trends; INGO dependency; INGO and accountability; and amount of overseas development assistance allocated to development awareness. The fourth chapter outlines the conceptual framework for understanding INGO global education motivations and methods as impacted by socio-political changes over time, the research design for this study, the methodological rationale, research process, data analysis, ethical considerations and study limitations.

The main findings of this study are discussed in Chapters Five through Eight. Historical overviews of the socio-political influences on INGO global education in the UK and Canada are presented in Chapters Five and Six respectively. The case studies of Save the Children Canada and the UK are compared in Chapter Seven. Chapter Eight explores how participants’ global education ideals align and contrast with their perceptions of global education approaches and policies at the organizational and institutional levels. The final chapter provides a comparative analysis of the findings that emerged from the wider historical study (Chapters Five and Six), the case studies (Chapter Seven), and the interactions between global education ideals and organizational and institutional policies (Chapter Eight). This chapter concludes with a discussion of the potential implications of this study for INGOs, an overall summary, reflection, contributions to the field, and suggestions for future research.
Chapter Two: Conceptions and Origins of INGO Global Education

Introduction

This chapter reviews the literature on the main fields of inquiry in this study: conceptions of global education and their origins, the relationship between global education and related programming areas (campaigns, advocacy, communications and public relations, and fundraising) within INGOs, and the ideals, values, and morals that have contributed to the normative framing of the field of global education. The utopian dimension in various iterations of global education needs to be more fully recognized and explored in order to understand how global educators’ ideals may contrast with organizational approaches and institutional policies.

The decision to use the term *global education* rather than any of the other currently used terms from Canada and the UK, such as *global citizenship education* or *development education*, is based upon an understanding of the history of the term, its relation to other forms of education (such as environmental education, peace education, cosmopolitan education, etc.), including the overlap amongst these strands of education. The most obvious challenge is the relative plasticity of the terms, as they have been used in various ways to suit the interests of organizations and practitioners in specific contexts.

Global education concepts have been borrowed, re-used, re-visioned and formulated into “new” definitions that have similar theoretical constructs and practices as “old” definitions. Delineations between terms such as development education, global education, global citizenship education, and cosmopolitan citizenship education have, over the years, blurred together as working groups borrow from the various terms in the field. This exploration draws on both Western and non-Western-based global education, philosophies, ideals and social movements, and popular practices that have informed the global education field. As global education tends to be “a value-laden construct which means different things to different people” (Tye & Tye, 1992, p.85) the study reflects on values and morals in both secular and non-secular traditions throughout history (to the beginnings of human memory) that have influenced global education theory and practice.
Global education: Values and ideals that inform the field

The field of global education has roots that date back to antiquity. Utopian dreams of peace, social order, and harmony were core ideals of the Stoics of the Greek and Roman empires in the 3rd century BC (Carter, 2001), as were a belief in a universal spirit and cosmopolitanism. Socrates’ declaration when asked where he was from was that he was neither Athenian, nor Corinthian, but that he was a “citizen of the cosmos” (Epictetus & Dobbin, 1998, Chapter 9). Diogenes of Sinope (412 B.C.) claimed that he too was a citizen of the world (Laertius & Hicks, Chapter VI, line 62-64). This concept of world, global, or cosmopolitan citizenship appears to begin with a denial of state citizenship and an embracing of the universal with the understanding that humans are directly aligned with God (direct descendants of), and thus connected to everything that God created: Ergo, citizens of the world. The dreams of peace and abundance were not exclusive to the Stoics. This ideal was found across many early cultures including the early nomadic peoples in the Middle East; the Norse people with their Utopian realm of Asgard; the Hindu and Vishnu’s restoration of goodness; King Hammurabi of Babylon and his Code of Laws for a beneficent social order; the teachings of China’s ancients, Lao-Tzu, Confucius, Mencius, and Mo Ti believed that humans could rise above their violent behaviours; and Indian Emperor Ashoka of 3rd Century BC who forsook war to focus on caring for the people under his rule (Boulding, 1988, pp. 7-10). The early ideal of universal citizenship appeared to involve non-violence, peace, the ethics of caring, and interconnectedness, all attributes highlighted in the more commonly used conceptions of global education.

Deeply embedded in the global education field are non-Western and Aboriginal philosophies and worldviews. For example, from the Far East, global education and related studies draw on Buddhist concepts of karma, mindfulness, and service to the community and Confucianist ideals of humanism, and social harmony. From South Asia, the meaning of the Indian Sanskrit phrase vasudhaiva kutumbakam translates as “the whole world is a single family” (Misra, 1997). The practice of zakat, sharing one’s wealth through alms-giving to those experiencing poverty and the connected practice of Sawm (fasting) as part of Ramadan are part of the five pillars of Islam. These two practices that help foster compassion for those less fortunate are rooted in these words by
the Prophet Muhammad, “feed the hungry and visit a sick person, and free the captive, if he be unjustly confined. Assist any person oppressed, whether Muslim or non-Muslim” (Qur’an).

From Africa, global education draws on the foundational principles of *Ubuntu*. Archbishop Desmond Tutu describes *Ubuntu* as

the essence of being human, it is part of the gift Africa will give to the world. It embraces hospitality, caring about others, being willing to go the extra mile for the sake of others. We believe a person is a person through another person, that my humanity is caught up, bound up and inextricable in yours. When I dehumanize you, I inexorably dehumanize myself. The solitary human being is a contradiction in terms and, therefore you seek to work for the common good because your humanity comes into its own community, in belonging. (Mulferno, 2000, pp. 57-58, cited in Wilkinson, 2003, p.356)

From Turtle Island (a First Nations’ term for North America), the Haudenosaunee or “Iroquois” confederacy introduced the concept of democracy to governments in North America and Europe. The Haudenosaunee’s message of the Peacemaker to the Mother of the Nations stated that “they shall be the Kanonsionni, the Longhouse. They shall have one mind and live under one law. Thinking will replace killing, and there shall be one commonwealth” (circa 14th century, cited in Childs, 2003, p.4). Global education draws on North American Aboriginal philosophy for its emphasis on embracing complexity. In the North American Aboriginal worldview

all things are animate, imbued with spirit, and in constant motion. In this realm of energy and spirit, interrelationships between all entities are of paramount importance, and space is a more important referent than time…The idea of all things being in constant motion or flux leads to a holistic and cyclical view of the world. If everything is constantly moving and changing, then one has to look at the whole to begin to see patterns. (Little Bear, 2000, pp. 77-78)

This philosophy is shared amongst America’s first peoples such as the Anishinabe, Iroquois, Cree, and Innu peoples in the North and the Maya, Garifuna, and Quechua peoples in the South. The environmental and planetary consciousness aspect of global education is deeply imbedded in Indigenous philosophies. For example, a Maori belief that is shared by many Indigenous groups, that land, *taonga tuku iho*, is to be treasured and is a direct link to the ancestors. This ancient philosophy is now the foundation of more recent Kaupapa Maori theory, emphasizing the deep connections to the land and
community process (Tuhiwai Smith, 2004, p. 125). The Aboriginal peoples of Australia and their concept of Dreamtime has also influenced the Western social justice/spiritual imaginary with its storyline. Like many first peoples’ of the Americas philosophies, they consider themselves to be at one with the land, the sky, and beyond and life and life’s purpose are understood through the accumulated wisdom of the elders from the beginning of memory. These concepts of the connection to all, the sacred, the complexity of world (of knowledge and knowing), and planetary consciousness are core elements of some global education theories. For example, the global education model of “worldmindedness” emphasizes planetary awareness, inner reflection, and the interconnectedness of all (Richardson, 1976; Hanvey, 1976; Selby & Pike, 2000, 1988; Merryfield, 1997).

Global education has been and continues to be greatly influenced by popular and social movements, including popular education and popular/political theatre practices in Latin America, Africa, and Asia. The leap of social consciousness in the late 1950s and early 1960s was in large part triggered by the decolonization process. As European colonizers pulled out of their occupied territories, and the world order began to shift, populations in newly independent nations in Latin America, Africa, and Asia, increasingly become more conscious of and angry about global injustices and inequities. Race, gender, faith, class, all became explosive issues. Burgeoning social movements and critical theorists and activists attempted to shape and lead the world into what they hoped would be a new, more equitable global paradigm.

Modern Africa’s political movements, as well as Black Power movements in North America and Europe in the late 1950s and early 1960s, were inflamed by injustices highlighted in the work of Frantz Fanon (The wretched of the earth, 1961) and Alfred Memmi (The colonizer and the colonized, 1957). Their works pushed critical boundaries on thinking about colonialism, race, class, and nationalism. In turn, Fanon’s work influenced other groundbreaking African postcolonial thinkers such as Ngugi Wa Thiong’O (Decolonising the mind, 1987), who attributes Fanon for helping him to see more clearly the depth and breadth of “the political struggles to move the centre” (Thiong’o, 2003, p. 52). These thinkers fanned the flames of indignation that were rising up from oppressed peoples in Africa, the Caribbean, Latin America, and the diasporic
communities in North America and Europe and contributed to the anti-racist, anti-imperialist/anti-colonial positioning that is prevalent in the moderate to critical versions of global education and related studies. These thinkers, events, and ideas have shaped post-colonial theory, which in turn has influenced various iterations of global education. Andreotti’s (2006) notions of soft vs. critical global citizenship is deeply informed by a post colonial lens, which demands attention to issues of identity and individual and collective responsibility for global inequities.

Popular education and popular/political theatre gained popularity during the anti-colonial/anti-imperialist struggles of the Americas from the 1960s onward, primarily based on the foundational popular literacy work of Brazilian Paulo Freire and his book *Pedgogy of the Oppressed* (1970). Unlike conventional education, popular education is purposefully political as it sides with those most marginalized in society, helping them to contextualize and overcome the systems that keep them in poverty. According to Kane (2001),

underpinning the political commitment of popular education is a radical dream, of a much better world. In Spanish and Portuguese this is often referred to by the word ‘utopía’ (with different people having ‘utopías’). Unlike its English equivalent, the Latin American usage generally implies a future which is possible, rather than unattainable. (p.10)

These radical utopian dreams were also mapped out using popular and political theatre methods. Political theatre has been an important means for communicating and exploring issues and is found in communities and urban areas around the globe. Brazilian Augusto Boal, who thought of himself as a son to Freire, developed one of the most famous popular theatre methods known as *Theatre of the Oppressed*. In the early 1990s, this method branched out into Legislative Theatre, a method that Boal used to obtain input from his marginalized constituency while serving as a Member of Rio de Janeiro’s Legislative Chamber. In the United States, small rural theatre groups influenced by the civil rights movement were established in the 1970s. One example of American grassroots political theatre is the Roadside Theatre located in the impoverished Appalachian Mountains, (Cohen-Cruz, 2005, p.52). Another example of the power of popular and political theatre in social movements is the South African Black Theatre Union in the 1970s collaborating with the black South African Students Association to
highlight the range of cultural production dismissed as “non-white” by the state and to promote political unity of Africans, coloureds, and South Africans of Indian descent under a banner of black identity. They challenged not only apartheid but also the presumption of well-meaning whites, especially students associated with the National Union of South African Students to lead the struggle against it. (Kruger, 1999, p. 129)

These examples of popular education and theatre were localized, but even at the grassroots level these methods spread from community to community and throughout the world between the late 1960s to 1980s. From the migrant Mexican farm workers’ El Teatro Campesino in California to Argentina’s Mothers of the Plaza de Mayo to trade union street theatre in India – theatre, pageantry, and popular education have been critical organizing and educating tools for the world’s most marginalized peoples. The ideas and actions within these practices have enlivened and enriched social movements such as Brazil’s Landless People’s Movement (MST) and the global anti-apartheid movement and in turn have provided some of the teaching strategies used in global and related educations. These popular movements in adult learning have greatly influenced global education both in theory (social movements and participatory citizenship) and in practice: transformative, student-centred (starting with learners’ experiences), participatory, and action-oriented learning are all found within the spectrum of global education attributes.

At the international level, Sweden’s Olof Palme, South Africa’s Nelson Mandela, and Guatemala’s Rigoberta Menchú are examples of individuals in positions of power who have embodied the global ideals that are part of global education. These global ideals include advocating peacefully for conflict resolution, critically analyzing complex issues, and challenging social injustices. Olof Palme stood up against the United States’ imperialist policies, especially in Vietnam and Central and South America, and was an outspoken advocate for nuclear disarmament and the anti-apartheid movement until he was assassinated in 1986. Nelson Mandela, the former president of South Africa, peacefully and tirelessly worked against apartheid and systemic racism: He spent 27 years in prison for the rights of racialized peoples of South Africa. Rigoberta Menchú brought international attention to the human rights violations committed against the Indigenous peoples of Guatemala and continues to mentor young women to become advocates for peace and human rights. These people are known for staying true to their ideals, despite being in positions of power that so often are the sites of moral depravity
and corruption. These leaders put their ideals into practice and, like the Jebb sisters, founders of Save the Children Fund, have demonstrated great courage in challenging social injustice.

**INGO global education as an expression of humanitarian ideals**

Global education and related INGO programming, like other forms of education, are value-laden. While the concept of universalizing and unifying humankind often raises suspicions that Western hegemony is hiding beneath the cloak of benevolent altruism, and that is not an unfounded fear, there does seem to be a core value, a kind of moral/ethical/value-laden glue that bonds people together to challenge the injustices of the world through INGO global education. The moral quandaries over how to address these inequities lead to two important questions for global educators: 1) If, through global education programming, inequitable situations are identified, is one morally obliged to take action? and 2) If yes, what are the ethical positionings that underpin the type of programming or the action taken?

The terms utopian and ideals inevitably come up when there is talk of world peace and a harmonious society. Although people often dismiss these terms as naïve, the convictions underpinning these terms are a core foundation of global education. For those coming to global education from the international development sector, the corollary to having these ideals is the determination to eliminate poverty. Over the years, the roots of humanitarian conduct and morals and values attached to the ideals of global education have gained further ground by being aligned with normative frameworks such as the Declaration of the Rights of the Child (1923) (which was written by Save the Children’s founder, Eglantyne Jebb) and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948). Human rights education, often existing in its own right, is considered a dimension of global education. Within programming areas with a citizenship focus, such as global citizenship education, human rights education is, in the most broad sense, a “moral enterprise” (Lister, 1994).

Global educators and international development workers are not, for the most part, drawn to these occupations for the promise of money and prestige. Often it is assumed that the people in these professions want to help others, to contribute to the
greater good, to change the world, and so on. Thus their work and philosophical positioning are considered to be inherently good and caring. This value judgment is based on what seems like sacrificial behaviour on behalf of global educators and international development workers, but what are the ethical underpinnings of their actions and behaviours? Regardless of whether or not global educators have worked in the field they tend to hold a similar sense of ethical imperative as do humanitarian aid workers. Barnett and Weiss (2008) identify four ethical positions of humanitarian aid workers that easily extend to global educators in answering the question “why” they are global educators and what their beliefs are.

One position is deontological or duty-based ethics, namely when an individual identifies intrinsically good actions and carries them out as a moral duty. “Humanitarian actors frequently articulate some sort of Kantian or duty-based imperative to act because of essential obligations that exist as a by-product of their collective humanity. Ethical action, in short, is defined by the act” (Barnett & Weiss, 2008, p.44).

A second position is consequential ethics, when one feels morally obligated to act in a way that will produce the best consequences. Barnett and Weiss (2008) point out that “four controversies surrounding this approach include trying to measure the following: consequences for whom; whether we should think in terms of the consequences of individual acts or rules governing domains of actions; the appropriate time horizon for evaluating consequences; and the uncertainty that surrounds any action and its possible effects” (p.44).

A third position is that of virtue ethics, how an individual’s actions reflect their character. “Observers who attempt to label or stereotype aid workers typically assume that their vocation reflects something about their inner character, and courage” (Barnett & Weiss, 2008, p. 45).

A fourth position is that of situated ethics, which holds that ethics are shaped by momentary interactions and by face-to-face encounters. Thus all ethics are situated, can only be understood in their historical specificity, and must actively include all those who might be affected by a decision (Barnett & Weiss, 2008, p. 45).

Of these four types of ethical positions, situated ethics is the only one that includes the experience and agency of the aid recipient, who is often the subject of the global educator’s programming. An argument against the first three ethical positions (duty-based, consequential, and virtue ethics) is that “they can generate detachment from
the object of their actions” (Barnett & Weiss, 2008, p. 45). To develop a relationship based on a situated ethics positioning there needs to be sustained and meaningful engagement between counterparts. This type of engagement is less likely to be present in the condensed communications activities required of campaigns, one-off leadership rallies for youth, and other outcome-driven activities without sustained dialogue. The potentially dynamic-shifting results that might be possible through authentic learning in the form of ongoing civic engagement between global South and North seem to require more resources and time than INGOs are willing or able to invest. Without the hero embellishment that the first three types of ethical positioning promise, will INGOs be able to entice people to act? Global educators working within INGOs might not believe in charity as the core value of their work. However, they must acknowledge and sometimes accentuate the role of charity in their programming, due to its prominence within most INGOs.

**Institutional conceptions of global education**

Various movements have contributed to shaping global education conceptions and frameworks. In this section, the conceptions are grouped loosely under the following institutional categories: United Nations’ international understanding; global education models from the education sector; the international development sector; and European and network models of global education.

These institutional conceptions of global education programming may be examined using the four educational types outlined by Susan Askew and Eileen Carnell (1998, pp. 83-96): client-centred, functionalist, liberatory, and social justice. These four educational frameworks exist on a spectrum of education for social transformation (or social change) and education for social regulation (maintaining the status quo). Client-centred education maintains the status quo while raising the potential of the individual; functionalist education maintains the status quo and ensures learners contribute to needs of the economy and society; liberatory education encourages social change through individual transformation; and social justice education encourages social change through collective responsibility for societal transformation. The following institutional
conceptions of global education are discussed in terms of their alignment with the four educational types.

**Figure 1: Askew and Carnell’s typology of models of education**
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**Radical Change**

**Liberatory**
- bringing about individual change as prerequisite for change in society
- facilitating interpersonal relationships
- curriculum based on developing skills of self-reflection and analysis of experiences, particularly relating to inequality

**Social justice**
- encouraging responsibility for changing society
- teaching based on radical analysis of social injustice in society
- curriculum based on developing skills of critical analysis and social awareness

**Client-centred**
- Developing individual potential
- Developing commitment to social and cultural norms through shared understanding of social values
- curriculum based on perceived needs and ability level of the individual

**Functionalist**
- Imparting objective knowledge and skills which are useful and practically applicable in society
- Reinforcing social and cultural norms through training and instruction
- curriculum based on perceived needs of economy and society or on perceptions of “worthwhile” knowledge

**Social Regulation**


**United Nations’ Education for International Understanding**

The United Nations’ *Education for International Understanding* program was one of the earliest incarnations of global education. In 1946, UNESCO launched and defended the idea of education for international understanding, two years prior to the adoption of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Education for International Understanding was tested in some experimental schools in the early 1950s. Twenty years later, in 1974 at UNESCO’s General Conference, the Member States adopted the “Recommendation
concerning education for international understanding, co-operation and peace and education relating to human rights and fundamental freedoms”. This educational programming area was not defined in any detail by UNESCO in the early years, but was taken to mean “to develop fraternal and positive attitudes conducive to mutual accord” and evolved to include teaching about the UN and human rights, and to address the problem of peace and other major world issues (UNESCO website, Educational Programs). In 1974, UNESCO used the term Education for International Understanding, Co-operation and Peace and Education relating to Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms. Then in 1994 UNESCO adopted the term education for peace, human rights and democracy (Heater, 2004a, p 228). Although the education for international understanding’s model was consider to be “radical” at the time as it sought to make peace and intercultural understanding an accepted social norm, the practice and theory may have been closer to Askew and Carnell’s (1998) client-centred and functionalist approaches which are associated with social regulation.

**Global education models from the education sector**

In the 1950s, the terms world studies and education for world citizenship evolved out of the education sector rather than the development sector, giving UK global education programming a valuable foundation in schools. Educating for global social justice, stability, and peace were not just considered “special” interests coming out of the international development sector. Education for World Citizenship is the UK’s oldest, still-existing, independent body for citizenship education, established in 1939 after the collapse of the League of Nations to promote the importance of political and civic engagement within and across national boundaries (Stratton, 2009).

World studies and world citizenship education encouraged learners to move beyond the international understanding paradigm and to take on a “world perspective” (Richardson, 1976, p.12 cited in Evans and Selby, 2003 p. 4). World citizenship was a term that created conflict, especially during and after World War II when national patriotism bordered on being virulent and people showing sympathy for other nations and peoples were considered highly suspect (Heater, 2004a, p. 228 and 232). Hicks (2008) notes that the term world studies was the equivalent of what was internationally known at
that time as global education; however Hicks makes a point of distinguishing global education and world studies as a specific field, rather than an umbrella term for issues-based educations, as he feels that the term global education is rooted in a specific time-frame and is not inclusive of all attributes of all issues-based educations (p.2).

The World Studies Project was the first initiative to provide published materials for educators. The project was directed by Robin Richardson, considered to be one of the most influential theorists and practitioners of global education in the UK during the 1970s and 1980s, (Hicks, 2008, p. 1). As part of the project conferences, workshops, and in-service training were provided for teachers, teacher educators, curriculum developers, and development educators from INGOs. The project also produced curriculum support documents\(^1\) that brought global development issues and theory together with a solid base of pedagogy (Hicks, 2008, p.2). The World Studies Project materials included a framework for teaching global education in schools, with curriculum case studies, whole-school experiences/learning, and teaching strategies (p.2).

Although drawing on the same themes and issues as development education and often working in collaboration with development educators, World Studies was considered decidedly different from development education because it was teacher-driven, curriculum-based programming developed specifically for educational purposes. While there was a desired possible outcome of creating students who understood the underlying structures of global poverty and challenged social injustices, there was no prescribed outcome of “taking action”, unlike materials produced by many INGOs. The World Studies model sought to enable learners to acquire attributes that might make it possible for individual and social transformation, but did not request the transformation.

In the United States, Educating for a Global Perspective took shape through the work of Robert Hanvey (1976) and the Mid-America Program for Global Perspectives in Education at Indiana University (Hicks, 2003, p. 267). Earlier, Lee Anderson (1968) argued that “a systems view was needed to understand global interdependence and that this should be reflected in the curriculum” (p.267). Education for a global perspective encouraged students to learn about what was going on in their community and the wider

\(^1\) These documents were Learning for change in world society: Reflections, activities and resources (Richardson, 1976b), Debate and decision: The school in a world of change (Richardson et al., 1979) and Ideas into action: Curriculum for a changing world (Fisher et al., 1980).
world in order to understand themselves better and to improve their “capacity to [make] effective judgments” (Hanvey, 1976, p.1). This model emphasized the principles of interconnectedness and individual responsibility. Practitioners in the United States used the term *global education* dating back to the 1970s, along with a number of terms used interchangeably including the following: “*education for world understanding; intercultural, international, global, or foreign affairs education; global perspectives in education, or transnational or planetary perspectives; or education for spaceship earth*” (Science Encyclopedia, n.d., para. 5).

In Canada, the term *global education* became popular in the 1990s. The term started to be used in the late 1980s and gained popularity through the work of UK global educators Ian Lister, Graham Pike, and David Selby. Pike and Selby (1988) created the four-dimensioned model of global education which was popular within the formal and non-formal education sectors. The four dimensions are as follows: inner, spatial, temporal, and issues. Pike and Selby worked with Richardson on the World Studies Project and their model of global education built upon Richardson’s (1985) concept of “worldmindedness”, which emphasized the interconnectedness of everyone and everything. Pike and Selby’s model also drew from Hanvey’s (1976) “attainable global perspective” work on dimensions of global education. In Canada today, the term *global education* is often used interchangeably with *global citizenship education*. Similar to World Studies, the Pike and Selby’s global education model encouraged a liberatory and social justice perspective that promoted self-reflection and analysis but not necessarily social transformation.

In the 1970s to 1980s, alternative or issue-based educations such as *environmental education, peace education, and multicultural education* began to appear. *Peace education*, which was aligned with the anti-nuclear and anti-war movements, was strongly critiqued by the Defense sector in the 1980s when both the Thatcher and Reagan administrations were war-centric and staunchly pro-nuclear (Scruton, 1985).

*Environmental education* started to have a presence in the 1970s. Its roots were firmly entrenched in Rachel Carson’s *Silent Spring* (1962), a book that woke up the world to immediate dangers of pesticides. In the 1980s an increasing awareness of environmental issues, such as acid rain and the depletion of the ozone layer, made *environmental*
education a crucial learning area. Various governments attempted to stifle environmental education advocates as they believed environmental education promoted ideas and actions that would damage the government’s relationships with large corporations (Cunningham, 1986 cited in Lamy, 1990). In the 1990s the Ministry of Education in Canada and the UK introduced stand-alone environmental science courses and themes/strands into the formal curriculum. These courses and themes/strands included core elements of environmental and peace educations. Environmental Education is currently often referred to as education for sustainability.

Multicultural education was a form of education that emerged in the 1970s and 1980s. The Canada government adopted an official multicultural policy in 1971 (Kymlicka, 2010) while the UK government adopted a somewhat softer multicultural policy in the late 1970s (Shaw, 1988). These policies lead to an increased multicultural and anti-racist education policies in the 1980s. By the 1990s Boards of Educations, Learning Authorities, and often Ministries of Education included multicultural education in their equity policy, which resulted in broader policies affecting schools, classrooms, and curriculum in Canada and the UK.

The spectrum of multicultural learning ranges from the “softer” multiculturalism that includes awareness of cultural differences, such as clothes and food, towards a more critical multiculturalism. Critical multiculturalism, which overlaps with anti-racism and post-colonial studies, challenges the learner to delve deeper into individual identity and responsibility in relation to the establishment and maintenance of inequitable global and local systems and structures. These more critical forms of education align philosophically with critical global citizenship education, which challenges myths of cultural supremacy and domination of Northern and Western perspectives in the global arena (Andreotti, 2006a, 2006b; Tuhiwai Smith, 2004). These more critical forms of education clash with softer forms of global education that do not advocate for self-reflection and structural analysis. These related forms of educations, namely environmental education, critical multicultural education, peace education, anti-racism education, and critical global citizenship education, encourage individual and social transformation.

Cosmopolitan education and cosmopolitanism were not commonly used terms for describing global education between the 1950s and the 1990s despite the fact that
cosmopolitanism is the oldest of the global education related terms dating back to antiquity. The term cosmopolitan was frequently understood to refer to one who is urbane—a sophisticated, world traveler. The return of the Stoic ideal of cosmopolitanism, as in citizen of the world, began in the mid-1990s with Martha Nussbaum in the United States, who took meaning from the original Stoic ideals and the ethics of caring. In the early 2000’s, the work of Audrey Osler and Hugh Starkey in the UK began to popularize the term cosmopolitan education. By their definition, cosmopolitan education focuses on the plurality of identities, human rights, and responsibilities (Osler and Starkey, 2003; Heater, 2004a; Habermas, 2001; Archibugi, 2004). These ideas of cosmopolitanism as well as the way it is used by Held (1995, 2003), as democratic cosmopolitanism, are influenced by Kantian philosophy on peace—that in a true democracy a nation would never vote to go to war. However, a third understanding of cosmopolitanism, that of the economic cosmopolitan, is linked to the global free-market paradigm, and refers to an individual’s access to the global markets, and as a matter of course, wealth accumulation (Peters, Britton, & Blee, 2008, p. 4). The Kantian-influenced versions of cosmopolitan education encourage individual and social transformation through normative frameworks such as human rights, understanding identity, and taking responsibility. The model of economic cosmopolitanism is an example of client-centred and functionalist education for promoting social regulation.

The term international education is often used in relation to the concept of global education and is gaining ground in schools and higher education institutions because it is based on the free market value of “internationalized” education. This can mean having a large student body from overseas (which can translate into extra funds for an institution); an emphasis on students gaining international experience, languages and cultural, to increase their marketability; international exchanges between teachers and students with an academic ideal as the goal; and competition between higher education institutions to obtain the “best and the brightest” students from around the globe. Although many of the characteristics of international education, particularly language learning and cultural awareness, can be complementary to the goals of global education, the overarching premise of international education is to prepare citizens for competing in the global market, which as a value or ideal can be construed as being contradictory to the
predominant values and ideals of global education of, for example, cooperation, poverty alleviation, planetary consciousness, interconnectedness, and so on. This model is an example of the status quo orientation: client-centred and functionalist education for promoting social regulation.

*Global citizenship education* is a more current term, a hybrid of global education and citizenship education thought to reflect the rights and responsibilities that are inherent in any discussion of the nature and resolution of global issues. For some it is considered to be a response to globalization and means of enacting citizenship at local, national, and global levels in an interconnected way (Tsigidis, 2002). Although one of the most widely taken-up frameworks for global citizenship education was created by an INGO, Oxfam, it was developed for use in schools. Oxfam’s definition highlights the following qualities of an active/responsible citizen:

- Is aware of the wider world and has a sense of their own role as a world citizen;
- Respects and values diversity;
- Has an understanding of how the world works;
- Is outraged by social injustice;
- Participates in the community at a range of levels, from the local to the global;
- Is willing to act to make the world a more equitable and sustainable place; and
- Takes responsibility for their actions (Oxfam, 2006, p. 3).

Global Citizenship Education as it has been conceptualized in schools, and between schools and the development sector can encompass: global awareness and understanding; global dimensions in schools; international and intercultural understanding in schools (e.g. international exchanges); global civic culture; respect for diversity; and voluntary overseas service (Lister, 1994). Global Citizenship Education became more popular in the mid to late 1990s, as a result of the increased focus on citizenship education in the common curricula in the United Kingdom and Canada (and elsewhere) (Evans, Ingram, MacDonald and Weber, 2009). Global citizenship education frameworks tend to place emphasis on individual responsibility and participation towards
making the world a more just place, which relates to a liberatory and social justice approach for social transformation.

In the UK INGOs and DfID use the term *development education* more generally to describe their education programming, but since the late 1990s and DfID’s collaboration with the Department for Education (in 2000 called the Department for Employment and Education (DfEE)), the term used in schools in the UK is *educating for the global dimension*. The global dimension of the curriculum is divided into eight key concepts, only one of which is global citizenship. The key concepts are represented in a circle indicating that all aspects of the dimension are integral to the whole. The key concepts are as follows: global citizenship, diversity, human rights, interdependence, conflict resolution, social justice, values and perceptions, and sustainable development (Department for Education and Skills, 2005). This conceptual framework for global dimension in the curriculum, produced by the Department for Education and Skills (DfES) in collaboration with DfID, the Development Education Association, the Qualifications and Curriculum Authority, SureStart, and the British Council, is linked to the conceptual underpinnings of the National Curriculum Citizenship, but its intended use is across the curriculum. The framework demonstrates the overlapping nature of all eight key concepts by reinforcing ideas such as universal human rights, taking responsible action, racism, diversity and multiple perspectives, interconnections, environmental stewardship, and so on in multiple locations within the framework (see Appendix for full descriptions of the eight concepts). Conceptual frameworks like the educating for a global dimension model are so multi-faceted an educator using the model could take either a liberatory social justice leading to social transformation approach or a client-centred/functionalist leading to social regulation approach. The model is suggestive, but not prescriptive, allowing educators to decide which approach they want to take.

Neither the education nor the international development sector in Canada has developed a conceptual framework for global education learning, however some

---

2 The United Kingdom’s Department for Education has undergone many name changes between 2000 and 2010. In 2000 the department was called the Department for Employment and Education (DfEE). Between 2001 and 2007 it became the Department for Education and Skills (DfES). In 2007 the DfES was split into two departments, the Department for Children, Schools and Families (DCSF) and the Department for Innovations, Universities, and Skills. Then in 2010 it became one department again, the Department for Education.
Canadian academic studies have explored the area of *educating for global citizenship*. For example, Evans, Ingram, MacDonald, and Weber (2009) identified key components of educating for global citizenship from the literature. From their findings, they developed a set of working conceptual frameworks, which detail eight core learning goals, seven teaching and learning practices, and five orientations.\(^3\) Evans, Ingram, MacDonald, and Weber’s (2009) frameworks, which are similar to the DfID/DCSF model of Educating for the Global Dimension, represent a range of ideal teaching and learning practices, skills, knowledge, and ideological orientations that demonstrate many points of overlap and intersection between concepts.

### The international development sector

Several global education related terms have been developed by individuals within the international development sector. One such term is *development education*, which was also known as *third world studies* in the late 1960s to early 1980s. Early definitions of development education related to international development and INGO work focused on North-South and Third World issues. In its earliest form, development education was understood to include disseminating information, educating, and advocating with the aim of increasing learners’ development awareness and understanding.

In Canada, development education in its earliest form was “much more heavily influenced by development theory than educational theory” (Reimer, Shute, & McCreary, 1993). At that time there were two basic types of development education, one type for the formal education sector and one for the nonformal community sector (p.1). Reimer,

---

\(^3\) The multiple framework identified eight interrelated learning goals: understanding of global themes, structures, and systems; identity and membership through a lens of worldmindedness; diverse beliefs, values, and worldviews; rights and responsibilities; privilege, power, equity and social justice; controversial global issues and ways for managing and deliberating conflict; critical civic literacy capacities; and informed and purposeful civic action. In conjunction with the eight learning goals, seven interrelated teaching and learning practices were identified: respectful, inclusive, and interactive classroom/school ethos; learner-centered and culturally responsive independent and interactive teaching and learning approaches; authentic performance tasks; globally-oriented learning resources; assessment and evaluation strategies that align with learning goals; whole school, community learning; and the teacher as a role model. The third framework described five orientations found in the literature: preparing for the global marketplace; learning for worldmindedness; fostering cosmopolitan understanding; cultivating critical literacy and planetary responsibility; and encouraging deep understanding and civic action to redress global injustices (Evans, Ingram, MacDonald, & Weber (2009)pp. 20-25).
Shute, and McCreary (1993) identified three development education paradigms, with conservative and radical approaches apparent within each paradigm.

The first paradigm, “development education for amelioration”, is based on the modernization theory of development. This paradigm involves disseminating information about the developing world and requiring individuals to donate funds to cover the costs of basic needs for people living in poor countries. Reimer, Shute, and McCreary (1993) notes how the educational component within this paradigm “offers a shallow analysis of the causes of poverty” (p.4).

The second paradigm, “development education about interdependence”, is based on a dependency critique. This paradigm calls for a fairer distribution of goods; seeks to raise awareness; clarify the historical context; skills of analysis and organization necessary for political action; emphasizes interconnections; and participants expected to advocate for Third World counterparts.

The third paradigm, development education for transformation, stresses the need for social transformation and is based on “Another Development” concepts and Freire’s notion of conscientization (p.6). Within this paradigm individual citizens must assume responsibility for their own learning. This paradigm is considered to be “introspective” and “radical” in that individual (conversion) and social (transformation) change are necessary. This model requires “authentic solidarity and partnership across nations” (p.6). The methods are participatory, dialogical, process-oriented, and empowering (Reimer, Shute, and McCreary, 1993, pp. 3-6).

Within each of these three paradigms Reimer, Shute, and McCreary (1993) identify six approaches that exist: charity, self-help approach, structural critique, maldevelopment, empowerment approach, and conversion. They describe the movement from charity to “conversion” as moving towards an “increasingly holistic view of development” (p.6). This conceptual framework of development education aligns with Askew and Carnell’s charity as social regulation model moving to the participatory social justice education for social transformation model.

The Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) used the term development education until the mid-1990s. CIDA stopped using the term when the federal government of Canada terminated its financial support for development education
programming. After 1994, CIDA used the terms *global education* and *global citizenship* for formal education programming and *public engagement* to describe its general awareness, education, and engagement programming for people of all ages. In 1999 CIDA presented a 5-year strategy for Canadian public engagement, which defined public engagement as follows: “The continuum along which individuals move from basic awareness of international cooperation through understanding to personal involvement and informed action” (p.3.). (See Appendix 3 to view CIDA’s continuum of public engagement). The language of this strategy can still be found in Canadian INGO work, but is not officially endorsed by CIDA as the strategy expired in 2004 and has yet to be replaced. CIDA’s Public Engagement Continuum is a conceptual framework encouraged a progression from social regulation to participatory, social justice education for social transformation and is similar to the Reimer, Shute, and McCreary’s (1993) development education paradigms mentioned earlier.

In the UK, the term development education is still being used by the Department for International Development (DFID) and by INGOs. DFID uses the term to describe a broad reach of pedagogical understandings and practices, comparable to the term *global education* as used by the European Commission. (See CONCORD’s definition of Global Education and the Development Education Association’s definition of Development Education in the next section of this chapter.) While INGOs commonly use the term development education, they typically use different terms when discussing their work in schools. For example, Oxfam UK uses the term *global citizenship education* when describing its school-based work (as discussed in the Institutional conceptions of global education section of this chapter).

**European and network models of global education**

Many of the more recent working definitions of global education have been developed collaboratively by practitioners, policy-makers, and theorists in the field. The following are is an example of collaborative efforts used to define the global education related terms. In the UK, the National Association of Development Education Centres (NADEC), which was established in 1980, laid the groundwork for defining development
education. NADEC was subsumed by the Development Education Association’s (DEA) in 1993. According to the DEA, development education involves understanding interconnections and global issues, and developing the skills, attitudes, and values to contribute to informed decision-making and action (DEA 2006, cited in Bourn 2008, p.3).

Another example of collaborative efforts to define the term global education was agreement made by INGO, parliamentarian, and institutional global education stakeholders at the Maastricht Congress. During Global Education Week 2001 the North-South Centre of the European Commission hosted a Europe-wide Global Education Congress in Maastricht, the Netherlands. Attended by parliamentarians, members of the government, regional and local education authorities, and members of civil society, these attendees developed the following umbrella definition of global education:

Global Education is education that opens people’s eyes and minds to the realities of the world, and awakens them to bring about a world of greater justice, equity and human rights for all. Global Education is understood to encompass Development Education, Human Rights Education, Education for Sustainability, Education for Peace and Conflict Prevention and Intercultural Education; being the global dimensions of Education for Citizenship. (O’Loughlin & Wegimont (eds), 2003, p.13)

This broad umbrella definition of global education was created in order to bring some unity to the global education programming among the European Union Member States, but Member States continue to use their own terms and definitions for the global education programming in their own countries.

In the United Kingdom and wider Europe, awareness raising is a recognized approach to development education. According to a typology set out in the European Development Education Monitoring Report (“DE Watch”) awareness raising entails the public dissemination of information about wider development issues (e.g. sustainable development, peace & development, trade & development, MDGs), developing countries and development cooperation/policy; the awareness raising work focuses on cognitive information disseminated in a “top down” approach. (Krause 2010, p. 7)

Awareness raising is often the first part of a spectrum of engagement that moves to understanding then to action. The European Commission project called Development Education Exchange Europe Project (DEEEP), which exists primarily for the purpose of actively engaging and supporting development education activities of European Union members, uses the awareness to understanding to action paradigm. The DEEEP is housed
within the European INGO Confederation for Relief and Development (CONCORD). The following is DEEEP’s working definition of development education:

Development education is an active learning process, founded on values of solidarity, equality, inclusion and co-operation.

It enables people to move from basic awareness of international development priorities and sustainable human development, through understanding of the causes and effects of global issues, to personal involvement and informed action.

Development education fosters the full participation of all citizens in world-wide poverty eradication, and the fight against exclusion. It seeks to influence more just and sustainable economic, social, environmental, and human rights based national and international policies. (DEF and CONCORD, 2004 cited in DEEEP 2008, p.3)

DEEEP’s working definition is more descriptive than the Maastrict Declaration, emphasizing development education’s role in creating informed and engaged citizens who will challenge global injustice in order to eradicate poverty and is similar to CIDA’s Public Engagement Continuum in its emphasis on movement from awareness to informed action. With DEEEP there is a definite value-based outcome attached to development education. In these overarching umbrella definitions of global education from the DEA and the DEEEP, like the Public Engagement Continuum, there is a movement from client-centred education for social regulation to more engaged forms of participatory education leading to social transformation. The North-South Centre of the European Commission overarching umbrella definition alludes to a spectrum moving from awareness of injustices to social transformation rather than stating these intentions definitively.

**Overlapping characteristics of global education models**

One of the problems with using the term *global education* for describing education work in the INGO sector is that the international development sector has a current understanding of global education that is related to global access to primary and tertiary education. It is also called *Education for All*, referring to a global movement that seeks to provide the world’s children with access to education. This difference in understandings of the term global education is problematic because the definition is conceptually different from the related educations described in this chapter yet both terms are
commonly used within international development and INGO circles (see Chapter 4: Research Design and the Save the Children Case study). Using the term *global citizenship education* can make that distinction more clear. However, for the purposes of this study, the term global education will be used.

The difficulty in attempting to categorize the various terms and concepts related to global education is that there are no official definitions, most of the characteristics of these related programming areas overlap, and few of them are distinctive. While there are a number of common denominators among many of these definitions, such as a concern about poverty, the various approaches and philosophies can differ greatly – from global marketplace, to social justice activist, to an anti-oppression analysis. The main arguments against some of these terms is either that they are too narrow in scope (e.g. peace, environment, international development) or that they, especially the ones that include “citizenship” in the term, are interpreted by some as proposing a “universal” ideal. The concern that citizenship and its responsibilities might be universalized seems to cause the most disagreement among practitioners, theorists, and policy-makers (Mundy, Manion, Masemann, & Haggerty, 2007; Abdi & Shultz, 2008; Osler & Starkey, 2003).

In Mundy, Manion, Masemann, and Haggerty’s (2007) study of global education in the Canadian elementary classroom global education is conceptualized as a “composite ideal” consisting of six main orientations: interdependent world/systems; human rights and social and economic justice; equity and diversity; action oriented; child-centred pedagogy; and planetary/environmental. The authors discuss four major tensions that exist within the broader understandings of global education. They note the following: 1) differences between global education ideals, such as Oxfam’s (2006) outrage at social injustices and the values that parents might hold concerning preparing children to be internationally competitive (international education); 2) concerns about bringing the notion of “global citizenship” as it conflicts with national citizenship in the classroom; 3) the complexity of and potential for conflict when introducing systems-thinking/analysis to the classroom; and 4) the critiques against universalizing Western values-systems within the global education paradigm (pp. 9-11). These tensions continue to make global education a site for conflict among practitioners, policy-makers, and theorists, and are
indicative of the intensity that surrounds people’s engagement with “global education ideals”.

**Campaigns, advocacy, and communications: Programming areas that overlap with global education**

In the early 1980s, Canadian INGO global educators were grappling with the ambiguity of the development education programming area. Jean Christie (1983) summarized concerns into the following questions:

1. What do we mean by “development”? Is it necessary to understand the structural reasons behind underdevelopment, or sufficient to relieve the symptoms?
2. What do we mean by “education”? Can education occur without action? Is aid agency advertising education? Is disseminating information education? How should the content relate to the lives of the learners?
3. Are we discussing education about or education for development? Or both? Education for development will of necessity be a process of action and reflection. Education about development risks being abstract and passive though need not be either. (Christie, 1983, p. 16)

These questions focus on the underlying purpose of development education in relation to taking action: Should development education include structural analysis to identify systemic global inequities? Are education, campaigns, advocacy, and public relations/communications all development education?; What is the purpose of development education? Is it strictly for the learner’s edification, or is the outcome of development education to lead to global social change? These questions are central to the tensions between INGO programming areas.

Global education programming tends to be connected to the understanding that there are grave inequities in the world and a desire for global social change. Once educators begin to teach for a common learning goal such as “active global citizenship” there is movement towards programming areas of campaigns, advocacy, and communications. All of these areas have skills, knowledge, and attitude components, but their depth is highly dependent on which stage students end up joining the process and how they are involved. If learners (children, youth, or adults) are a part of the process of developing a campaign (either advocacy, awareness, or fundraising – or all three) there is a better likelihood that they have had an opportunity to critically assess the range of
perspectives that will influence their opinion of the issue. They will also be able to
acquire the skills involved in creating such programming (literacy, communications,
critical thinking, marketing, design, and so on). The impact of the campaign on learners
will increase with the amount of time spent learning within the global education
framework (critical analysis, equity-focused, learner-based inquiry, and so on) (Krause,
2010; Sireau, 2009; Blum, 2000 cited in Bourn, 2008) before creating and/or
participating in a campaign, advocacy, or communications activity.

Within the INGO sector there are four areas of programming that have been
included under the umbrella term global education: education, communications,
advocacy, and campaigns. Tensions have arisen over how and if programming should be
strictly delineated into the four areas of education, advocacy, campaigns and
communications or if there should be an allowance for overlap, and also with regard to
the level of interplay between fundraising and global education programming. For some
global educators, the requisite “ask” (whether for actual money or for support for a cause)
component of campaigns, advocacy and fundraising, needs to be differentiated from
global education as a learning endeavour, in order to maintain integrity in their work.

Education

Education programs are designed to expose learners to a range of ideas, issues, and
theories and provide resources that may help learners understand concepts, skills, and
attitudes that are associated with a particular discipline while using an international
development lens and including an analysis of global issues. Ideally, the concepts, skills,
and attitudes will lead the learner to taking informed and responsible action and the
acquisition of and/or mastering the associated skills, concepts, and attitudes. Education
programming, in theory, is a longer-term (ongoing) dialogue between learners with no
immediate benefit to the INGO or agency who developed the programming, but possibly
a medium to long-term goal of creating an informed and active citizen. The goal of
education programs is learning without specific outcomes that will benefit the INGO or
the international development sector.

Awareness raising, also called public awareness, and development awareness (the
term used in the United Kingdom) is closely related to education and can stand alone or
be included within an educational model, e.g., the awareness to understanding to action model. There is an aspect of the banker model or lecture-style pedagogy to this model, in that people are given the required information about development to increase their level of awareness of policies, programming, issues, etc., however there is not typically an opportunity for the recipient of the information to grapple with multiple perspectives and make their own hypothesis on the issue. Ideal outcomes from awareness raising is the increased engagement of the target audience, which could mean contributing funds, participating, supporting advocacy, and/or actively pursuing more information and understanding of development issues.

While there is an educative aspect about awareness raising, it can be a short distance away from public relations, which has a direct goal of garnering public support for foreign aid through a top-down approach (commercial communications) and could be considered to be “indoctrination” (Krause, 2010, p.7). The potentially positive outcomes for INGOs that might come from education programming require both a long-term commitment before seeing any outcomes and the recognition that there may not be any direct positive outcomes for the organizations. In contrast, campaigns, advocacy and communications are more immediate in their ability to produce potentially positive outcomes and the outcomes are tangible (e.g., rise in donations, more supporters for a cause, brand-awareness).

Advocacy and campaigns

Advocacy and campaigns are designed to provide enough information about an area of international development to convince people to take a supportive course of action (Scheunpflug & McDonnell, 2006). This activity of garnering support for policy change involves information sharing and awareness-raising, and could also be connected to learning activities; however its main function is to change policy. Advocacy is an activity that has caused conflicts of interest between funders and INGOs. Advocacy attempts to gain support for an issue or idea and campaigns lead towards a particular goal, e.g. Jubilee 2000 and debt relief. Advocacy or advocating for policy change is often the overarching goal driving a campaign.
Campaigns guide people to take action on a specific political goal and/or donate towards the related issue. Campaigns can also have an educational component. For example, Save the Children has created educational materials for its Rewrite the Future campaign, which focuses on children gaining access to education in areas experiencing conflict or emergencies. These educational materials, while containing learning activities, have a primary purpose of forwarding the goals of the campaign, specifically to convince people to raise awareness or lobby in support of the issue and/or contribute funds.

Campaigning and fundraising activities are often linked. Controversies related to campaigns are typically with regard to the type of messages or images that accompany the campaign. Historically, negative images and messages of helpless poor people have been thought to be the most effective means of inspiring people to support a charity (Hibbert, Smith, Davies, & Ireland, 2007). Save the Children and Oxfam’s starving children pictures during the First and Second World Wars encouraged an outpouring of donations from a British public who hitherto did not believe that such atrocities were occurring. However, studies have shown that these messages negate any possible solidarity, because people become less inclined to understand the underlying circumstances that caused the poverty (unfair trading practices for example) and instead view the people in poverty as helpless and incompetent, and while pitied, possibly deserving of their fate (Barnett & Hammond, 1999; Bozinoff & Ghingold, 1983; Doddington et al., 1994, Campbell, Carr, and MacIachlan, 2001, Bolitho, F. H., Carr, S. C., & Fletcher, R. B., 2007, Lim, 2008). Most INGOs have signed onto ethical agreements regarding images for their work. It takes considerable skill to produce campaigns that entice the public to donate while presenting a positive image of people living in poverty.

INGOs can take different approaches to advocacy and campaigns. For example, Amnesty International is an action-oriented organization that develops strategies for ending human rights violations to advocate for human rights. Their “ask” for advocacy campaigns tends to be for support in the form of awareness raising and lobbying. Plan International is a development organization that supports the rights of children and also does advocacy work, but it is not their sole focus. Plan International’s request for support
for its “I am a Girl” campaign puts equal emphasis on signing an e-petition, donating, fundraising, or shopping.

Communications

These activities tend to be one-way messaging that could be any of the following: mail-outs or emails to constituents providing information about the organization; media releases; advertisements; contests promoting the organization; and any other type of activity whose sole purpose is to raise the profile of the organization or government agency. Some of the larger INGOs and government development agencies such as CIDA and DfID have entire communications departments while others have a dedicated staff person. Communications can be used to maintain the status quo, but is rarely used to provoke action, although communications can support advocacy (Tibbett, 2007). Also referred to as public affairs or public relations, especially when coming from a government agency, communications can be used to keep the public informed on international development or foreign policy (Scheunpflug and McDonnell, 2008). Communications are not typically an invitation for the public to challenge a government agency or INGO’s policies or position, although organizations may release communications that provide information that might be the basis for people taking action against a policy or practice.

Fundraising

Fundraising is rarely, if ever, accomplished without some means of convincing the donor of the worthiness of the cause. This requires that the donor come to a certain level of understanding about the INGO that they would be supporting. Programming materials produced for education, advocacy, and communications often serve to prepare the donor to support the organization. Therefore fundraisers rely to a certain extent on successful implementation of information-raising programming, which could be educational, straightforward communications, advocacy, or a campaign. Campaigns are often accompanied by an “ask” for donations while communications and education may be more indirectly followed up with fundraising. Donating funds to an organization is for
many people one of the few ways they will “take action” on an international development issue.

**Chapter summary**

This chapter explored contemporary understandings of global education by tracing the historical relationship between global ideals and global education, and the ways in which the global education field has grown out of centuries of Utopian dreams from peoples all over the world. This overview emphasized the philosophical contributions that originated with first peoples such as the Aborigines of Australia and their concept of Dreamtime, moved into philosophical orientations of the East and the West, then drew connections between cultural values, ideals, and reflections on a Utopian world that are based on non-violence and an ethic of caring and how these concepts have been taken up in global education theory and practice. Connected to these orientations and deeply influencing the global education field, are the beliefs and practices that have evolved out of social movements and unions (e.g., anti-slavery, suffragettes, workers’ rights) and that are rooted in popular arts and pedagogy.

There is a distinct connection between the provenance of our modern day international development INGOs and classical and current examples of how ideals/morals/values (in this case the focus is on Western society - almost exclusively Europe and North America - and therefore predominantly Christian ideals) are operationalized in our society. INGOs, particularly the early incarnations of INGOs, are ideals put into practice. Understanding the idealistic drive and the values behind INGOs entails making a connection to the organizations’ founding principles and practices and to their founders’ philosophies.

Over the years, while practitioners and theorists have used different names (global citizenship education, cosmopolitan education, education for the global dimension, development education, and so on) their clusters of assigned attributes within their understandings has begun to overlap so much that a core group of attributes is beginning to emerge repeatedly in the various definitions and frameworks for global education. The elasticity of global education conceptual frameworks and how they have shifted over the
years helps set the theoretical and practical context of the field of INGO global education for this study.
Chapter Three: INGOs as Global Educators: History, Issues, and Challenges

Introduction

One of the purported goals of international development non-governmental organizations (INGOs) or charities is that they work to put themselves out of business. Their efforts should be so successful that there is no poverty to be alleviated nor injustices to be addressed. Alas, the grim reality is that there is no end in sight for global poverty or INGOs. Furthermore, INGOs have shifted from their early incarnations as loosely networked grassroots social movements advocating for change into a billion dollar industry, growing ever closer to the global institutions (the World Bank and the IMF) that have been cynically dubbed “the lords of poverty” (Hancock, 1994). The truth of the matter is that many INGOs consider themselves to be growth organizations and are not at all interested in being put out of business.

In general, INGOs are fixed in the public imaginary as highly temporal and focused on areas of greatest immediate need. The nature of INGO work requires them to constantly generate public support for both humanitarian emergencies (e.g., natural disasters, famine, war, etc.) and for longer-term development (infrastructure, education, governance, etc.). The responsibilities INGOs have to the world’s most vulnerable people are and should be their key priorities. However, funding from large state and international donors has facilitated the rapid growth of the INGO sector since the 1980s, and may have made the sector as a whole more accountable to large donors and their needs than to the people the INGOs are mandated to serve.

In turn, these accountability issues (from both within and outside the INGO sector) create tension in relation to INGOs’ domestic education/development awareness programming. Accountability questions arise when, in the eyes of the public, programming does not directly serve their mandates to alleviate poverty. Furthermore, education programming can highlight systemic causes of global poverty and attention to global inequities that may make the donor sector uncomfortable.

International development NGOs, the subject of this study, at one time were highly invested in producing global education programming that would increase the
capacity of domestic audiences to understand international development issues, but over the past decade they have shifted their focus towards campaigns, advocacy, and fundraising. This chapter looks at the evolution of INGOs, their placement within global aid architecture, and some of the conditions that preface and influence their changing relationship with global education.

One aspect of educating for development awareness is to understand where the collective work of INGOs fits within the hierarchy of the international development aid architecture. This chapter provides a review of the literature on INGOs and their role within global aid architecture, the historical trends of INGOs producing global education focusing on their relationship with funding, and the historical and current debates that have informed INGOs’ production of global education. An overview of the history of INGOs identifies and defines the terms most frequently associated with international development and INGOs, and provides some examples of the variation in size and scope of INGOs. The following sections look at funding for INGOs and how they are affected by larger international development trends, issues of dependency and accountability and support for global education programming.

**Situating INGOs within global aid architecture**

This section defines the key terms in this field and describes the role of INGOs within the global aid architecture, including their size, scope, funding base, and how they are affected by larger international development and funding trends. Particular emphasis is placed on INGOs and international institutions that affect the Canadian and British international development sectors.

**INGO terms and references**

In this study, the term international non-governmental organization (INGO) is used to refer to an organization that works primarily on overseas assistance and development projects e.g., Plan International, CARE, World Vision, Red Cross, Oxfam. Many of the NGOs that focus primarily on global education, called development education centres (DECs) are not considered INGOs because their work is primarily domestic.
The overarching umbrella term of international nongovernmental organization, INGO, tends to incite a debate similar to the one that ensues when trying to define global education. The following characteristics apply to the INGOs in this study, they:

- Can be a group of voluntary individuals or an organization (frequently both);
- Are not affiliated with government;
- Provide a service or influence public policy (frequently both); and
- Are not-for-profit.
- Meet human needs in poor countries;
- Stimulate awareness and support for international development among the public; and
- Promote public policies conducive to the creation of a more just and equitable world order. (Brodhead, Herbert-Coley & Lambert, 1988, p.5)

Some definitions loosely typify INGOs and civil society organizations (CSOs) as any organization that was not created by a government state, while other definitions recognize INGOs as not-for-profit, transnational actors that work under the principle of non-interference/neutrality and may work closely with the United Nations. Civil society and civil society organization are also terms that are used in conjunction with INGOs.

The World Bank defines the civil society sector as:

non-governmental and not-for-profit organizations that have a presence in public life, expressing the interests and values of their members or others, based on ethical, cultural, political, scientific, religious or philanthropic considerations. Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) therefore refer to a wide array of organizations: community groups, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), labor unions, indigenous groups, charitable organizations, faith-based organizations, professional associations, and foundations. (World Bank website, Defining Civil Society)

The term civil society organization (CSO) is used, at times, instead of the term INGO to denote the membership of an INGO within the civil society sector. However, INGOs are a subsector within the umbrella terms of civil society and civil society organization, which can have even broader interpretations. The World Bank also has an inclusive definition of the term INGO; however, it stays within the confines of not-for-profit humanitarian/environmental work, whereas the World Trade Organization’s
(WTO) definition is so expansive, it includes the Association of Swiss Bankers and the International Chamber of Commerce (Business and Sustainable Development cited in Hall-Jones, 2003).

In the UK, INGO development agencies are commonly referred to as charities, as they generally fall under the category of charitable organizations because the nature of their work (i.e. promoting the welfare of others, human needs and/or the environment) is not conducive to profit-making, therefore it is necessary for them to generate revenue through fundraising activities. It is the combination of “charitable” work and the concomitant need to fundraise that brings them under the purview of charity regulations. Charity laws in Canada and the UK exist to ensure that organizations allocate their resources towards their organizational mandates. These laws protect the donors (individuals, foundations, corporations, and so on) and the intended recipients of the organization’s services.

How well INGOs manage within a not-for-profit, charity paradigm in which funding sources are scarce depends on their resourcefulness in garnering public support, partnering with international development government agencies, and/or devising self-funding schemes. The following section includes two examples of organizations (an INGO and a development education centre, DEC) that have successfully bridged the private and public sector to gain financial independence for their organizations.

Hybrid-entrepreneurial INGOs and the branding of charity

Not-for-profit status and non-governmental status are two areas that are increasingly blurred for INGO development agencies. For the most part, the INGOs referred to in this study are fundraising not-for-profits, however, more recently a type of hybrid entrepreneurial INGO has emerged within the development sector. While the traditional INGO format was the trend in the 1980s and 1990s, now there is pressure for INGOs to become either social enterprises in order to self-fund and remain cutting edge, or for INGOs to partner with social enterprises (SustainAbility, 2003, p.50). Canada’s Free the Children is a well-known example of an INGO that is partnered with a social enterprise. Marc and Craig Kielburger, co-founders and celebrities of the international development scene, also created two for-profit companies that fund their charity work. With their
collective acumen in business and law, they founded their first for-profit company, Leaders Today in 2000, which hosted awareness trips, leadership training, and sold socially responsible products. In 2008 Leaders Today morphed into the globally known brand and wildly popular leadership program, Me to We. In 2003, the brothers founded a holding company, Kiel Projects Inc., to manage their earnings from speaking tours and books. Together, Free the Children, Me to We, and Kiel Projects have purchased twelve Toronto properties in the past five years. This real estate helps them leverage their income, as the properties are used as office space, as housing for the majority of their staff who are young interns, and can be sold when necessary (Wingrove, Globe and Mail, March 19, 2010, pp. F1, F6, F7). Free the Children has been so successful in saturating the Canadian school market (they have forays into US markets as well) and at setting a self-funding standard, that it is pretty much in a category of its own in terms of Canadian INGOs.

In the UK, development education centres (DECs) have the most problems diversifying their funding base because, unlike INGOs, they are not typical charities with a mandate for poverty relief. The Reading International Solidarity Centre (RISC) is an example of a DEC that has been able to increase its autonomy through self-funding. Their sustainability comes from their Global Cafe, renting out a meeting space (including equipment), providing educational programming, and the profits from an international fair trade shop. In 2009, RISC had an income of £775,980 of which £517,909 (67% of total income) was produced out of their charitable profit-making businesses, a notable achievement for an organization with a primary focus of global education (Charity Commission, 2009; RISC, 2010).

History of INGOs

The Anti-Slavery Society established in 1839 is thought to be the first iteration of what is now known as an international non-governmental organization or INGO. This organization, like many subsequent INGOs, drew on the collective concerns and energy

---

4 Craig has an Executive MBA from York University’s Shulich School of Business and Marc is a Rhodes Scholar with a law degree from Oxford
of social movements, in this case, the abolitionist movement to end the slave trade\(^5\) (Anti-slavery, 2007). Just over a decade later, the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) began to take shape. Its founding is largely attributed to a Swiss businessman, Henry Dunant, who travelled to Italy in the 1850s to meet with Napoléon III regarding business in Algeria and instead became caught up in tending to tens of thousands of wounded French and Italian soldiers who had little to no medical aid provided for them by their governments. Dunant advocated for the creation of a voluntary relief organization that would care for wounded soldiers during times of war and whose medics and nurses would be protected in the field by international neutrality treaties. His actions led to the first Geneva Convention in 1864 (Boissier, 1985). This concept of reaching out to others from beyond one’s national borders is a core global education ideal.

The women’s suffrage and the peace and disarmament movements were also forerunners to the current organizational structure of INGOs. Networks of activists organized throughout the Western world through committees, societies, and associations and took broader decision-making actions through international gatherings/conferences and communications. These movements and their responses to the First and Second World Wars brought in the first wave of INGOs, starting with Save the Children Fund right after World War One in 1919, established in Britain to help starving children in enemy countries. More INGOs were founded during and after the Second World War. In 1942, Oxfam, the Oxford Committee for Famine Relief, had a similar start to that of Save the Children, through a campaign to feed starving women and children in enemy-occupied territory (Oxfam, 2010). In 1945, 1200 INGO representatives present at a UN conference in San Francisco ensured the addition of Chapter X, Article 71 to the UN Charter, which recognized the role of INGOs within the UN system:

> The Economic and Social Council may make suitable arrangements for consultation with non-governmental organizations which are concerned with matters within its competence. Such arrangements may be made with international organizations and, where appropriate, with national organizations after consultation with the Member of the United Nations concerned. (UN Charter)

---

\(^5\) The Anti-slavery Society continues to advocate for human rights and to abolish modern slavery worldwide.
The UN’s Economic and Social Council granted INGOs participation rights between 1946 and 1950.

Between the 1960s and the 1980s INGOs began to find themselves in the middle of the ideological struggles demarcated by the Cold War between what were identified as socialist/communist/Marxist developing countries (most of Central and South America as well as parts of Asia), grassroots organizations and civil society organizations that supported social change, and donor countries (Bebbington, Hickey, and Mitlin, 2008, p.11). United States’ foreign policy during the 1980s, the Reagan Doctrine, provided weaponry to anti-communist forces in countries it deemed to be a communist threat and made INGO work in these countries both more necessary (as civilian casualties grew) and dangerous.

It was their ability to act as a bridge between grassroots autonomous groups in the global South and donor agencies in the global North that gave INGOs special status. In 1984, the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) announced that the Canadian Council for International Cooperation (CCIC), an umbrella organization of INGOs in Canada, would assist them with the planning and review of aid programs. CIDA’s President Margaret Catley-Carlson called INGOs,

“The avant-garde, the radar, the first indicators of new development efforts.” She has said that their flexibility allows them to “sometimes work effectively in sectors or places beyond the reach of government efforts. They have a special knack of making dollars stretch a long way, and for getting help to the grassroots, to the people who need it most (Ottawa Citizen, December 11, 1984, p. A9).

By the end of the 1980s the numbers of INGOs worldwide had increased exponentially. The estimated 6000 INGOs in 1990 grew to 26,000 by 1999 and millions of nationally-based NGOs had appeared (over 1 million in India alone) (Sustainability, 2003). It was during this period that donor country co-financing of INGOs to undertake international development projects on behalf of national aid agencies started to be the norm (Bebbington, Hickey, & Mitlin, 2008, p.13). Thus, at the peak of their growth in the 1980s and 1990s, INGO relationships were characterized by deep connections to the global South as well as insider status with official development and donor governments.
International development NGOs: Size and scope

There is wide variation in the size, scope, and complexity of INGOs. Some of the largest INGOs work in hundreds of countries around the world and operate with multi-million dollar budgets. The largest of INGOs have revenues “several times larger than several bilateral donors” and are just as influential (DfID, 2006, cited in Agg, 2006, p.3). At the same time, tens of thousands of smaller INGOs focus on one or two countries (or one region/community within one country) or a particular issue and work with budgets less than $100,000; sometimes much less. The scope of their work ranges from short-term emergency assistance addressing wide-scale disasters that focus on providing food, medical treatment, and shelter, one-off projects to build schools or dig wells, to long-term commitments with governments to develop infrastructure particularly in areas such as health and education, and contributing to and influencing political and economic structures. In some cases, large INGOs almost completely take over sectors of national government responsibility. The Bangladesh Rural Advancement Committee (BRAC), for
example, operates over 32,000 primary schools in Bangladesh and develops textbooks and programming that follows national curriculum guidelines. Almost four million children have graduated from their primary program with a 93% completion rate (BRAC.net, education, primary schools).

Globally, some of the INGOs with the largest range, budget, and brand recognition are CARE, World Vision, Oxfam, Save the Children, and the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) (SustainAbility, 2003; CARE, 2008; Save the Children Alliance, 2008; Oxfam International, 2008; World Vision International, 2008; ICRC 2008). The ICRC works in over 150 countries with a projected budget for 2010 of approximately 1.15 billion CHF (Swiss Francs) (ICRC, 2010 website). In 2009, World Vision USA’s revenue was $1.2 billion USD (more than the ICRC’s entire budget), and World Vision International (all the continental organizations put together) spent $2.634 billion USD on charitable programs. Oxfam International in 2008-2009 spent $771.75 million dollars on programming with more than 3000 local partners in approximately 100 countries. The Save the Children Alliance’s network of 29 sister organizations in over 120 countries had revenues of $1.3 billion USD in 2009. CARE International works in more than 70 countries and has 11,500 employees worldwide. Bangladesh Rural Advancement Committee (BRAC) is the largest INGO in terms of number of employees (94,000).

The global reach of these networked INGOs is extensive, making them recognizable brand names for humanitarian work in both “developed” countries and “under-developed” nations. As of 2003, the INGO sector was the eighth largest economy in the world, at that time tied with the state of California’s economy, worth upwards of $1 trillion USD annually and employing nearly 19 million (SustainAbility, 2003, p. 11). According to a SustainAbility survey conducted in 2009, INGOs are also the most trusted source of leadership (The Sustainability Survey 2009). There exists however, a growing list of arguments against the presence and dominance of INGO staff (especially those who are white and from the global North) who are often the beneficiaries and recipients of funds that could be directed toward local/regional expertise and field workers (Agg, 2006).
The network structure of INGOs within groups of sister organizations like the Save the Children Alliance or Oxfam International, and the umbrella groups of different INGOs at regional, national, and international levels enable them to effect change and increase their impact on the world’s stage. There are several global networks of INGOs, including the International Council of Voluntary Associations, ICVA, the World Alliance for Citizen Participation, CIVICUS (a network of civil society organizations including INGOs and trade unions), and other networks that focus on specific issues, such as the Global Campaign for Education for All. One of the primary goals of global networks, beyond the obvious strengthening of the sector’s work, is to establish an arena that provides greater opportunities for civil society organizations from the global South to engage with issues that affect their regions and constituencies.

Through these network structures INGOs have found a collective strength working with wider civil society to pressure governments into changing global policy, e.g. 1992’s Earth Summit in Brazil’s greenhouse gas emission agreements, 1998’s collective protest against the Multilateral Agreement on Investment (MAI), and the ecumenical-based global coalition of Jubilee 2000 that prefigured debt forgiveness in the poorest countries (The Economist, December 11, 1999). Collective INGO campaigns have also made an impact in a number of other areas including: fair trade and working conditions in transnational corporations such as Nike, GAP, among many others, genetically modified seeds/foods (Monsanto in particular), and human rights abuses by transnational corporations (e.g., Shell oil in Nigeria and Coca-Cola in Colombia).

**INGOs within global aid architecture**

While it is beyond the scope of this thesis to explore the power dynamics between states within global institutions, such as the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund, it is important to understand the role of INGOs in relation to these donor governments. Historically, INGOs relationships with donors have had high and low points. During the 1970s and 1980s the number of INGOs increased with the rise in availability of matching grants from government agencies that recognized their ability to raise public support for international development issues. INGOs are valued domestically for raising the profile of international development and for their in-the-field work as trusted (with exceptions)
conduits between local civil society organizations on the aid recipient side. Due to their on-the-ground relationships with partners in the global South, INGOs have been viewed as trustworthy delivery mechanisms for aid (emergency and development), but do not have the same respect as an influential collective body within decision-making circles as more economically powerful collectives such as the World Economic Forum.

To situate INGOs within the global aid architecture one needs to understand their relationship with global institutions, such as the World Bank, the United Nations, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), and the International Monetary Fund (IMF), that drive international development and funding trends. All of these agenda-setting institutions were formed after World War II to assist with rebuilding efforts in Europe and to aggregate the strengths of the Western allies against any future threats (the Cold War with Russia in particular). The changing world order, with the United States in its position of power over war-ravaged and poverty-stricken Europe (with a few state exceptions, like Sweden), took shape between 1944 and 1945 and was solidified through the establishment of these key global institutions. The United Nations replaced the League of Nations and carried on with some of its key sub-organizations, including the World Health Organization, the International Labour Organization, and the International Court of Justice. The United Nations Monetary and Fiscal Conference, better known as the Bretton Woods conference, established the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (one of five agencies that comprise the World Bank Group), the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (the GATT, which eventually became the World Trade Organization in 1995), and the International Monetary Fund, which oversees the macroeconomic policies of the global financial system. This can be seen as a critical period in history when the Western allies established controlling mechanisms for their global economic power.

The Bretton Woods conference and the institutions that evolved out of it ensured that market capitalism was the dominant ideology worldwide, but this was balanced by the more social democratic worldview of the UN organizations (Therrien, 1995). The economic bottom line espoused by market capitalists is deeply imbedded in the policies and practices of these key global institutions, and has been one of the major causes of imbalance and conflict between donors, global development policy-makers, many
INGOs, and development assistance recipients. For example, when donors use a predominantly free market enterprise lens as their normative framework, they argue that international policies and trade practices will affect global poverty positively. In the case of Poverty Reduction Strategy Plans (PRSPs), the focus is exclusively on political and economic factors within a nation and ignores the “global structures that reproduce deep inequalities between countries and regions” (Wallace, Borstein, and Chapman, 2006, p.25), effectively avoiding the root causes of poverty. Another example of this blinkered view of poverty held by some global institutions is their failure to create fair trade policies, despite the repeated campaigning efforts of INGOs like Oxfam and ActionAid and even global campaigns, such as Make Poverty History. Some are optimistic that pressure will eventually yield policy changes within global institutions, as evidenced by their eventual take-up of “pro-poor” policies (Sogge, 2002, p. 10), but it is challenging for INGOs to push back at these policies when their donors are the handmaidens of global governance institutions.

Nevertheless, some INGOs do push back. The collective and individual influence of INGOs, with dedicated Northern and often Southern constituencies, such as Oxfam, Amnesty International, and Greenpeace have been thorns in the side of global institutions and state governments. Working with social movements and civil society, these organizations have advocated for the release of political prisoners, wider access to essential medicines, protection of water and land, and the defense of many other human and environmental rights that have been denied in the pursuit of private free market enterprise. At the state level, acceptance and growth of these organizations is often highly dependent on government temperament: progressive social democrat governments have been known to support the social justice work of INGOs (e.g., Norway), and socially-conservative governments do not tend to support INGOs perceived to interfere with trade and economic interests, but will support INGOs that do not challenge the status quo (e.g. U.S. government support for World Vision).

The tremendous amount of work that INGOs and other civil society organizations have done towards setting the international development agenda has started to bear fruit. In 2008, 700 representatives of civil society organizations took part in the High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness in Accra, Ghana. This, according to the Canadian Council of
International Cooperation’s (CCIC) representative Brian Tomlinson, was unprecedented (CCIC, 2008, p.2). INGOs and other civil society members have played a key role in international aid structures as donors, channels or recipients of official donor assistance, and as watchdogs of the public good (CCIC, 2007, p.9).

**International development funding and policy trends**

There is an interplay between international development policy discussions at the global level and funding trends at all levels of development programming, including everything from wide-scale infrastructure projects to donor country domestic global education programs. The effects of global level agreements, such as the Paris Declaration, can be felt throughout the aid chain and ultimately have an effect on how international development and global issues might be packaged for education, communication, and marketing purposes.

The relationship between INGOs and government agencies gradually began to build in the 1970s until government funding for INGOs peaked in the 1980s because of the Ethiopian Famine. Unprecedented amounts of public donations came in, prompting governments to begin funding INGOs with matching grants. This influx of funding resulted in INGOs professionalizing and expanding both in scope and size (Green, 2008, p.357), which also changed their status in the development field. Donors’ preference for working with INGOs rather than recipient governments was based on INGOs as on-the-ground trusted partners of Southern civil society. As organizations have grown, accountability questions have been raised about whether or not they are truly more efficient and cost effective than local recipient governments. Donors have started to shift away from the project-based nature of INGO work towards a more broad-based approach to poverty reduction that lines up with good governance policy directions (Agg, 2006, p. 24).

Since the Paris Declaration, government agencies and donors have allocated their funds more directly to governments and civil society partners in the South and set up local offices to make connections with potential in-country partners. In many cases this has resulted in what Foreman (1999) called the “McDonaldization” of NGOs, in which Northern INGOs set up regional offices in recipient countries in order to compete with
local NGOs (LNGOs) for aid-delivery projects (p.193). Northern INGOs with their larger infrastructures are better able to prepare funding proposals (European Commission proposals can take up to two weeks of work to prepare) and tend to be chosen over their Southern counterparts who end up being ‘partners’ with Northern INGOs. These partnerships are hierarchical relationships in which Northern INGOs control the budget and manage the project, thus creating dissonance and accusations of Northern paternalism between LNGOs and INGOs (Agg, 2006, p. 21-22). In response to these problems development government agencies in the Netherlands and Norway do not fund Northern aid workers to work in the South. Development awareness and education programming has played a role in communicating these policy positions to their Northern constituencies. The tensions between Northern and Southern civil society is an area that a few INGO development educators have explored openly. The RORG network (development educators and INGOs) in Norway, for example, pays careful attention to its Northern governments’ funding relationships with the South and collaborates with Southern CSOs to assist with accurate portrayals of development issues in education and awareness materials (Nygaard, 2002).

**Official Development Assistance (ODA) between 1960 and 2010**

The aforementioned funding policy trends speak to some of the general changes in levels of INGO funding over the years. In conjunction with wider policy changes, such as the Paris Declaration, the data on Official Development Assistance (ODA) collected by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) helps present the bigger picture in terms of funding trends (OECD, DCD-DAC, 2010). The OECD takes two official measurements of ODA, one is its dollar value and the other is as a percentage of a country’s gross national income (GNI), which is how the official aid target of 0.7% is measured. According to dollar value measurement (in 2009 prices and exchange rates) of the OECD data, ODA has increased from $36 billion in 1960 to $127 billion in 2010, a 28% increase (adjusted for inflation). The largest five donors over that fifty-year period were the United States, Germany, Japan, France, and the United Kingdom. The United Kingdom dropped out of the top five a number of times during the late 1980s and 1990s, but the others remained consistently at the top, with the U.S. occupying either the first or
second place. The OECD chart “Net ODA disbursements, total Development Assistance Committee countries” can be viewed here: http://webnet.oecd.org/dcdgraphs/ODA history/.

The measurement of ODA according to GNI tells a different story. Looking at the OECD data of ODA according to GNI shows that contributions across OECD countries have decreased from a historic high of .51% in 1961, followed by a dip down to .28% in 1973 (OPEC oil crisis), then down to a historic low of .22% in 1997 and back up to .32% in 2010 (and a small bump up to .33% in 2005 after many of the international conferences), but have never come near the .7% target set by the Pearson committee in 1969. The top six donors according to percentage of GNI have changed over the years. France, Belgium, the UK, the US, Germany and the Netherlands led in ODA contributions during the 1960s. By the late 1970s the Scandinavian countries (Denmark, Norway, Sweden) were consistently in the top six up until 2010. Luxemburg joined the top donors per GNI in the 2000’s. The Netherlands remains one of the top donors throughout the fifty-year period.

From the late 1970s onward the Scandinavian countries and the Netherlands all donated above the .7% target. In the cases of Canada and the UK, throughout the 1970s Canada consistently remained in the top seven donors, dropped slightly in the 1980s, then in 1996 (right after the Canada’s severe federal budget cuts) Canada’s position dropped down to eleven and remained in the fourteen to sixteen range between 2003 to 2010. The UK through the 1970s to the late-1990s was mostly in the tenth to fifteenth range. In the late 2000s the UK’s ODA went above .5%. In 2010 the UK contributed .56% of its GNI, which is the most it has contributed since 1960. In contrast, Canada contributed .33% in 2010, during most of the 1960s contributed less than .15%, and made its largest contribution .52% in 1978.

This demonstrates that the top dollar value donors, U.S. and Japan, were consistently donating far below their capacities, while most of the Scandinavian OECD countries were donating at or above ODA targets. Corresponding with the OECD data, support for INGO global education programming is also higher in the countries that contributed a higher percentage of their GNI to ODA (See Figures 3 and 4).
Official support for INGOs

The amount of ODA each country donates is indicative of their overall support for international development work, but other data has to be interpreted to get a more complete picture of state support for INGOs. Catherine Agg’s (2006, pp. 16 - 17) analysis of ODA to INGOs calculates the core support to national NGOs, INGOs, and ODA channeled through NGOs using OECD-DAC statistics. Between 1980 and 2004 the net amount of ODA to the NGO sector climbed from a negligible amount to $4 billion. The proportion of ODA channeled through the NGO sector is determined according to the amount of bilateral aid administered by NGOs. A sharp increase in aid distribution via NGOs began in 1984, a direct corollary to the Ethiopian famine, which began in 1983.

Figure 3: Proportion of total ODA channeled through NGOs by percentage

Agg, 2006, p.17

---

6 Data on funding for INGOs is unreliable due to uneven reporting. For example some humanitarian emergency funds that go through INGOs are not counted. Thus the amount of bilateral aid given by a country to INGOs is somewhat indicative of their support (Agg, 2006, pp. 16-17).
Overseas development assistance funds tend to be distributed through two funding models: multilateral and bilateral. Multilateral funding joins up assistance from a number of donors and stakeholders and has more potential to fill a needs-based rather than donor-driven agenda. Bilateral aid gives donors opportunity to strategically choose which countries they support based on self-interest. INGOs are often the distributors of bilateral aid for a donor country. INGOs that rely on official aid agencies for core funding, (i.e. funding that supports INGOs’ administrative centres) are vulnerable to government dependency as bilateral aid contracts between INGOs and donor countries can give the donor country a means of controlling INGO practice. US Agency for International Development (USAID) contracts, for example, clearly reflect U.S. foreign policy, thereby negating the INGO’s ability to claim neutrality (Chikoto, 2009). Another related trend among donors is to earmark the funds they contribute for particular projects and countries rather than give out unrestricted funds to INGOs. According to the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) 2010 DAC Report on Multilateral Aid, this “reduces the predictability and increases the transaction costs of aid” (cited in Ellmers, 2010). This earmarking also contradicts the core principles of the Paris Declaration by decreasing “recipient country ownership” (Ellmers, Eurodad 2010).
The securitization of aid

Global developments during the period after the September 11, 2001 attacks on the United States created more work for INGOs due to increased military activity, but also shifted the relationships between INGOs and foreign affairs ministries. In a suspicious world on high alert, some governments’ relationships with these “on the ground” organizations had to be managed and looked at more strategically. Former U.S. Secretary of State, Colin Powell, announced his intention to ensure that INGOs were working towards the same interests as the U.S. government (Smillie, 2004, p.18). At the same time UK Development Minister Clare Short made it clear that INGOs railing against government policies did not represent the people - the governments did (Ibid); and President George Bush set up the website NGOWatch, related to Global Governance Watch, a project run jointly by two conservative think-tanks, the American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research and the Federalist Society for Law and Public Policy Studies (an organization of conservatives and libertarians). NGOWatch and another website, NGO Monitor, are particularly intent on ensuring that the UN agencies (not specifically INGOs, but they tend to line up with humanitarian-based ideals that are referred to in this study) do not infringe upon the rights of free market practices in the global arena (Smillie, 2004, pp18-19). In the U.S., INGOs working in Iraq were warned by the Administrator of USAID, Andrew Natsios, not to self-identify their organizations while on site, that they were “an arm of the U.S government right now” and any improvements in Iraqi standard of living were to be associated with the U.S. government not individual INGOs (Natsios cited in Smillie, 2004, p.19). This trend of using a 3-D approach (Defense, Diplomacy, and Development) to foreign interventions has humanitarian aid workers on edge, as it makes it impossible to separate their work and intentions from that of their government’s military, and therefore they become valid targets for attack. Furthermore, this blurring of the 3-Ds tends to align development policy with the more powerful foreign and defense policies.

Unofficial funding sources

While not directly related to regular funding channels, such as governments and foundations, a recent trend in billionaire ‘philanthrocapitalists’ is starting to make its
mark on the international development sector. Philanthrocapitalists, wealthy business people who are billionaires and philanthropists, are able to boost their image by using their celebrity or brand as leverage to encourage more funding or a change in existing policies. Billionaires who are celebrities, such as Microsoft founder Bill Gates (the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation) and Virgin’s Richard Branson (The Elders, the Virgin Earth Challenge), are corporate billionaires that have celebrity-status brands. A number of INGOs considered in this study, Save the Children included, have received funding from the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation and many INGOs rely on the popularity of celebrities to increase their support. This funding trend raises many questions about the ethics of wealth accumulation and wealth distribution.

Proponents in favour of philanthrocapitalism as the answer to alleviating global poverty argue that these entrepreneurial billionaires bring the following attributes to the table: a) many of them are only answerable to themselves, unlike INGOs, politicians, and CEOs, so they are able to take risks (Bishop and Green, 2008, pp. 12 & 283); b) they can leverage their wealth and brand to achieve maximum change; and c) they are among the world’s most successful problem-solvers (Bishop and Green, 2008, p. 29; Brainard and La Fleur, 2008, p.10)). Those who doubt philanthrocapitalism’s ability to challenge global poverty are concerned that a) capitalism as a means to correct the damages it has caused may be likened to “asking a man to pull himself out of a swamp by his own hair” (Edwards, 2008a, p.65); b) even companies with a triple bottom line (taking into consideration humanitarian and environmental issues) revert back to financial bottom line when “hard decisions have to be made, because businesses are legally structured to deliver shareholder return” (2008a, p. 68); c) it is hypocritical to acquire money through methods that often exacerbate poverty and then redistribute a portion of that money to ameliorate the poverty its acquisition has caused (Žižec, 2008, Edwards 2008a, 2008b); and d) these billionaire venture philanthropists do not pay much, if any, taxes and therefore circumvent the traditional democratic redistribution of wealth (Bishop and Green, 2008, p. 43; McQuaig and Brooks, 2010, pp. 194-197).

The limited amount of funding options makes offerings from philanthrocapitalists difficult to decline. However, this presents an ethical dilemma for INGO’s engaging in critical perspectives of global education and awareness programming (those that analyze
the structural inequities behind global poverty) accepting funding from these foundations that serve to boost that brand power of billionaires, who have benefited from inequitable global structures. The longer-term goal of education programming that would seek to eliminate global structural inequities is compromised by the short-term goal of securing funding for emergency and/or development projects. Thus leaving the INGOs in a situation in which they are supported by philanthrocapitalists such as George Soros, who accumulated his wealth through currency speculation that resulted in hundreds of thousands of job losses in South Asia. The wealth accumulated from this act of “abstract violence” is then redistributed to mitigate the damage of the inequitable global system (Žižec, 2008, p. 291). As such, the work of philanthrocapitalists will ensure that INGOs never run out of business.

**INGOs and dependency on Government**

In Canada and the Scandinavian countries, dependency on government funding is much higher, with INGOs receiving 50 to 90% of their budgets from government sources (Edward and Hulme, 1996, p.6). This dependency can affect INGOs by taking their focus away from their local/Southern constituencies, and “overemphasiz[ing] short-term, quantitative outputs” (p.8). Several authors have noted that in the United States, INGOs have experienced limitations to their capacity to campaign due to dependency (Smith, 1990; Salaman and Anheier, 1993; Smith and Lipsky, 1993) and are concerned about similar conditions in the UK inhibiting INGOs’ advocacy work (Fowler, 1992; Edwards, 1993). The literature on INGOs repeatedly warns of the dangers of dependency on funding, particularly government funding (Wallace Bornstein and Chapman, 2006; Salaman and Anheier, 1993; Smith and Lipsky, 1993; Brodhead and Lambert, 1988; Edwards and Hulme, 1996). The push towards social enterprise and diversified funding, while alleviating dependency issues to a certain extent, raises other concerns for INGOs, as NGOs invest in donor and hybrid (fund-raising plus services) national organizations, it can become far too easy to measure success in terms of fund-raising, number of donors, and diversification of revenue streams. (Foreman, 1999, p. 194)

A comparison of three INGOs, Oxfam, Save the Children, and World Vision, in seven countries gives insight into which countries provide the most financial support to
INGOs and which INGOs are the most financially independent. The data in this comparison is derived from the organizations’ 2008 annual reports and determined by the amount of funding received from the primary government donor (international development department or foreign affairs, e.g., CIDA or NORAD). The Netherlands and Canada are the countries in which the INGOs are dependent on government funding for a significant portion of their funding (approximately 50% or more). This does not necessarily mean that the governments of Canada and the Netherlands are giving more funding than other countries; in some cases it means that INGOs are less able to diversify their funding base. It is interesting to note that World Vision Canada is not dependent on Canadian funding (only 12%) while its sister organization World Vision USA, receives 25% of its funding from USAID. Oxfam America refuses to take government funding, stating on its website: “Oxfam America does not use US government funds or other sources that might limit our independence or restrict our ability to speak out against policies with which we don’t agree”. Oxfam’s sister organizations have differing levels of dependency. According to 2008/09 annual reports, Oxfam UK receives 3% of its budget from DfID in the form of the Program Partnership Agreement (PPA), Oxfam Canada receives 48% and Oxfam Quebec receives 63% of their funding from CIDA, and Oxfam Netherlands receives 71% government funding. In comparison, the 3% of Oxfam UK’s funding that it received from DfID (adjusting for 2008 conversion rates) is $20.496 million, while Oxfam Canada’s 48% is less than half of that amount at $9.99 million. World Vision USA’s acceptance of government funding might be related to its alignment in values with the U.S. government, although the organization does advocate for people living in poverty in the US, which could be considered controversial. This speaks to the differences in a) federal budgets, b) commitment to international development, c) the relationships between governments and their INGO sector, and d) the capacity of particular INGOs to fundraise from the public.
Figure 5: Comparing dependency: Percentage of budget from government sources in three INGOs in seven countries

![Bar chart showing percentage of budget from government sources in three INGOs in seven countries.]

2008/2009 Annual Reports for Oxfam, Save the Children, and World Vision from Hong Kong, the USA, Australia, Canada, the UK, Germany, and the Netherlands.

How government dependency impacts the work of an INGO really depends on the inclinations of the government. If governments are attempting to promote an open, democratic society that is enriched by citizen participation then INGOs can work transparently on meeting the needs of their Southern partners. This is the case in Norway where the INGO sector is represented by the RORG network, which is supported by NORAD (Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation). The RORG network pushed for Norwegian development education programming to be given a more prominent role in south policy and to be based on ‘a comprehensive north/south perspective’, contributing to improved north/south dialogue with the ultimate aim of achieving global sustainable

---

7 RORG is the acronym used for the NGOs and CSOs (including trade unions and churches) holding framework agreements with NORAD.
development, in accordance with the recommendations of the Brundtland Commission. (Our Common Future, 1987)

The RORG is the watchdog for Norwegian international development policy, and gives their government critical feedback in order to strengthen policies (RORG, 2006). Having said this, the Norwegian development education sector has not been without difficulties. Responsibility for development education has been fragmented over the years between the Foreign Ministry (who have the most say), the “G5”, which are the five largest INGOs in Norway with the biggest framework agreements, and NORAD. However, the Norway government’s level of openness to civic engagement and critique is a rare quality. Norway’s example provides the most holistic approach to INGO global education in that their programming is transparently dependent on a) a healthy and engaged civil society, b) responsive and participatory government, and c) an equitable relationship with Southern counterparts.

The politics of accountability

While partnerships between INGOs are encouraged by donors and admired by INGOs in theory, the funding paradigm tends to set up a competition between INGOs for government support, which is unlikely to encourage collaboration among INGOs (Miller, 1994; Covey, 1995). The level of competition for funding and the funder scrutiny contributes to a culture of fear that has built up in the INGO community. Collaboration with other INGOs is often “actively discouraged” by the organizations’ communications departments as it creates brand “confusion” when they are competing for “‘mindshare’ among target audiences” (SustainAbility, 2003, p.16). Increasingly donors are hiring private consultants, from companies such as Deloitte and PricewaterCooper, which adds another level of competition for development funds. This practice also leads to questions regarding the expense of hiring management consulting firms when presumably the needs of those experiencing poverty is the priority, not to mention the ethical implications of engaging transnational corporations that are likely culpable in committing the “abstract violence” of market speculation that creates global poverty.

8 Ethical guidelines for North/South-information in Norway (Adopted at the Annual General Meeting of the RORG-network May 24.th 2006)
Organizations are often unwilling to discuss failures in their work, as they fear repercussions from donors (Wallace, 2002, p. 3). Many will only discuss their work under strict assurance of anonymity. The changing relationship between INGOs and government has led to a gradual shift towards INGOs becoming more like private sector operators (Edward and Hulme, 1996; Brodhead and Pratt, 1994). While there is loose agreement that funding can and should come from government, it has been suggested that some of the more troubling dependency issues could be avoided if the funds are distributed through an independent public institution (p.18).

The focus on accountability in the current (1985 to present) funding paradigm has been attributed to the wider international/global donor community’s dissatisfaction with the results of international development projects. In particular, high transaction costs of working within a project framework, for which donors are then accountable to their national treasuries, as well as the lack of success with poverty reduction methods to date have been primary drivers for the emphasis on accountability. However, there is not much in the way of empirical evidence to support these claims (Wallace, Borstein, & Chapman, 2006, p.22). The development funding paradigm shift appears to have more to do with changes in political ideology to a market-driven economic theory as the primary lens for viewing the state of the world, and determining how evidence from the field is collected and assessed (Killock, 2004, p. 10 and 13).

In response to donor and trustee concerns about accountability, international development project management changed from requiring relatively minor reporting procedures to a heavily bureaucratic system with tight measures (Wallace, Crowther, & Shepherd, 1997, p.8). It was during the 1990s that the international development sector latched onto the results-based management (RBM) framework. Donors shifted to a heavily standardized system expressed in project management language, which entailed framing projects in terms of goals, activities, outputs, indicators, verification, and risk assessment. All these terms were, and remain, a requirement for discussions of international development - right down to the smallest INGOs. This language of accountability does not mesh well with “the language of participation for building strong local civil society, ownership and sustainability…conceptually or in practice” (p.8).

Reflecting on the managerial mindset that pervades the international development sector
gives us a better understanding of the challenges facing INGO global education programming – a learning paradigm that in theory and practice does not readily fit into a logical, RBM framework.

Critiques of INGOs usually fall into the category of accountability, with the most common being that they are said to be untrustworthy because they are unelected and unaccountable to the constituencies that they claim to represent. INGOs are not elected in a democratic process, but they have an obligation to be accountable to their own “membership and mandate, their principal donors, and the beneficiaries of their activities” (Schmitz, 2006, p. 16). Although this does not alleviate the stress that restrictive RBM-style accountability practices demanded by donors puts on INGOs, it does allow for INGOs to make the argument for focusing on their mandates of addressing the conditions of poverty.

INGOs put their energies into advocating on global development issues, but are wary of challenging the conditions of donor aid to the INGO sector. Power dynamics generate compliance and resistance all along the aid chain, starting with INGOs’ own relationship with their donors to the relationships between local INGOs and their communities (Wallace, Borstein, & Chapman, 2006, p.5). It is also the case that many INGOs are founded on deep-rooted belief systems and ideals, and that their staff and volunteers are expected to be committed to these ideals and the “greater good”. While organizations may have ideals as the basis of their normative framework (perhaps even in their mission and mandate) their focus is usually dominated by the need to secure relationships with donors, which often trumps developing relationships with their Southern partners, those experiencing poverty, and recipients of aid (Wallace, Borstein, & Chapman, 2006, p.15). Individuals within INGOs and the organizations themselves play very different roles. While individuals may see their work as exclusively being about poverty reduction, they are up against the function of the organization or institution, which is concerned with acquiring funds (Wallace, Borstein, & Chapman, 2006, p.7). Whether the acquisition of capital is in the name of poverty reduction or not, even with a triple bottom line mentality that places people and the environment before profits, the focus on acquiring, distributing, managing, and accounting for capital investment takes up a disproportionate amount of resources within development agencies.
With regard to ODA allocation for development awareness, even in the two countries (the Netherlands and Belgium) that are most supportive of development awareness (the term used by the OECD to broadly describe INGOs education, communications, campaigns, and awareness raising activities) this programming area receives just under 2% of the ODA budget. Those advocating for increased global education funding, for example in Canada, have asked the government to allocate 1% of ODA funds to global education and public engagement. Over the years, the Scandinavian countries, along with the Netherlands and Belgium have spent the most per capita on development awareness. As can be seen in the chart from McDonnell, Solignac-Lecomte, and Wegimont (2008) based on OECD figures from 2003 to 2005, the Netherlands, Sweden, Germany, the UK, and Denmark spend proportionally more on development education (learning is the primary goal of the programming) than on public information and communications (one-way information path with the goal of increasing awareness of organization or issue). This could indicate that these countries are more willing to invest in longer-term programming that does not have immediate benefits to the international development sector, but with continuity could lead to future generations with a greater understanding of and involvement with international development. Although, without a breakdown of how these countries identify development education versus public information and communication it is difficult to make a definitive assessment. Belgium, for example, spent 1.79% of ODA on information and development education in 2003 (a total of € 21 million), but the data they provided was a combination of information and education spending. However, it does indicate that development awareness and communicating with the public about international development issues was a priority of the government.
### Table 1: OECD/DAC donors expenditure on information and development education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country/donor</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Public Information and communication (€ million)</th>
<th>Development education (€ million)</th>
<th>Total spending (€ million)</th>
<th>Share of total ODA (%)</th>
<th>Expenditure per capita (€)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>2004/05</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.38</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>n.a.*</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>2.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Canada</strong></td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>7.09</td>
<td>8.57</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>1.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Commission (DG DEV)</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France **</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>6.28</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>3.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway ***</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>n.a.*</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>2.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain ****</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>7.58</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20.58</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>2.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>5.85</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>7.79</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>United Kingdom</strong></td>
<td>2004/05</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>9.01</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>83.16</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>120.71</strong></td>
<td><strong>203.87</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.26</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: *Development education budget could not be disaggregated from overall Public information and communications budget.
** includes budget for Ministry of Foreign Affairs (DGCID) and the Agence Française de Développment.
*** Budget of Ministry of Affairs only.
**** Rough estimation for expenditure in Spain from data reported to DAC under Code: 99820: “Promotion of development awareness”.  
(Source: McDonnell & Solignac Lecomte, 2008, p.4)

In the Netherlands, €60 million was spent on development education in 2004, which was almost six times the amount of the next highest allocation (Sweden € 13 million). In 2008, commitment to development awareness began to shift among the OECD countries and Ireland gave one of the largest allocations (see Figure 6 on Percentage of ODA to Development Awareness.).
 Chaptersummary

While the provenance of INGOs dates back to the early 1800s and is rooted in global and social idealism (e.g., Save the Children’s Fund and the International Committee of the Red Cross), contemporary INGOs do not all identify with the same global and social ideals. INGOs are not only diverse in their size and scope, but also in their organizational mandates, which in turn are linked to their ideological standpoint. In the earlier years INGOs acted as a conduit of support between the public in the global North who donated food and supplies and developed relationships with CSOs and communities in the global South. The INGO sector’s relationship with the South eventually began to be valued by Northern donor governments.

Overseas development assistance (ODA), which began in 1960 has trended downward in terms of gross national income (GNI) since the mid-1980s and upwards.
according to dollar value. The GNI better reflects each country’s commitment to ODA and for the past 40 years the countries that have contributed the largest percentage of their GNI towards ODA have been the Scandinavian countries and the Netherlands. The ODA trends demonstrate the change in funding that occurred in the mid-1980s around the time of the Ethiopian Famine. This crisis became known worldwide and sparked outrage and concern. This in turn pushed governments to become more deeply involved with humanitarian assistance. Governments began to offer INGOs co-financing, which instigated a sharp rise in the numbers of INGOs, a surge that continued up until the late 1990s into early 2000s. With these new co-partnered relationships came an overhaul of reporting and accountability structures towards ones that rely on a results-based or logframes for all aspects of international development work. The new language of accountability did not mesh with the language of participation used by many in the international development sector, and even less so for those needing to apply it to their global education programming. These new relationships with governments also greatly increased the size and scope of some INGOs and led to increased dependency on government funding for some organizations. This has led to two trends, some INGOs have become more autonomous through their ability to diversify their funding base and others, due to their dependency on state funding, have become subcontractors for state programs. Save the Children UK falls under the first category of INGOs who have achieved autonomy through a strong, diversified funding base. Save the Children Canada with its dependency on CIDA is more like a subcontractor of the state’s international development interests.

INGOs are an integral part of the international aid architecture, yet their relationships with both partners and aid recipients in the Global South and with donors and private donor constituencies in the Global North work both for and against their ability to produce global education programming. Their insider/outsider identity with both their partners in the North and South has a tendency to cause mistrust from both groups, with the Northern donors and institutions suspicious that INGOs are going to push for too many lenient pro-poor policies and Southern partners suspicious that the INGOs will not put their funding at risk to advocate for the structural change that will lead to a change in global wealth disparity. INGOs ability to navigate in these worlds of
global wealth and global poverty make them both the ideal organizations for producing global education programming, but also, potentially problematic as they have vested interests in the development agenda - not the least of which is their need to secure funding.
Chapter Four: Conceptual Framework and Research Design

Introduction

This chapter serves two purposes. The first is to present the conceptual framework I developed and used to understand the shifting nature of INGO global education programming in Canada and the United Kingdom. The second purpose is to describe the research design, including details on the methodological approaches, key terms, research sites and sample, data collection methods, data analysis techniques, ethical considerations, limitations of the study, and questions of validity.

Conceptual framework

The conceptual framework I developed for this study uses two sets of concepts. The first is based on a typology of four educational models and the second on four humanitarian ethical positionings. The educational models described by Askew and Carnell (1998) present the range of beliefs about the societal purpose of education. The ethical positionings, based on the work of researchers Michael Barnett and Thomas G. Weiss (2008), assist in analyzing the motivations behind INGOs’ choices for global education programming. These two conceptual areas give a more complete picture of the nature of and implications that follow choices for INGO global education programming. This conceptual framework provided the basis for analyzing the shifts in the nature of INGO global education programming over time.

Educational models

Educational researchers Askew and Carnell’s (1998) typology presents four primary educational models: liberatory, social justice, client-centred, and functionalist. These models are located on a continuum of social regulation (maintaining the status quo) and radical change (social transformation). Askew and Carnell draw on a range of literature on models of education including, but not limited to, Criticos’ (1993) work on experiential learning and social transformation, Grundy’s (1987) work on education as a dialogical, and emancipatory practice and UNESCO’s (1996) report on life-long learning.
Motivations: Why produce global education?

The second set of concepts, adapted from the work of Michael Barnett and Thomas G. Weiss on the ethical positionings that underpin humanitarian aid work, is used to analyze the motivations for producing INGO global education programming. Their work is aligned with the ethical frameworks that INGOs would use to determine the rationale behind developing their primary relief and development programming. By extension this rationale would also apply to INGOs’ global education programming, which typically is directly or indirectly related to their mandate of poverty alleviation. Within Barnett and Weiss’ interrogation of the ethical positionings underpinning humanitarian work they look at how INGOs engage with the interrelated concepts of power, authority, and social control. They see the concepts of power and authority as being housed within “the conceptual family of social control”. Additionally, they posit that the power dynamic inherent within the term “authority” is based on its “perceived legitimacy”, which leads to “deference” and/or “acquiescence” (2008, p. 39).

Barnett and Weiss outline four types of authority that humanitarian aid agencies/workers can possess: rational-legal authority, delegated authority, expert authority, and moral authority. Rational-legal authority is premised on “impersonal rules and objective decision-making procedures” such as those found in bureaucracies. Delegated authority is that bestowed upon another (through employment or appointment) and is in that sense “borrowed” authority. Expert authority is derived from the possession of “specialized training, knowledge, or experience”. Moral authority comes from the perception that a person is “speaking on behalf of the community’s values and interests” and/or “defending the lives of the weak and the vulnerable” (p.39). Barnett and Weiss assert that humanitarian organizations tend to wield authority that is based on their specialized expertise and moral positioning. It is through their moral authority that humanitarian organizations are most apt to demonstrate their “power”. They use “normative techniques” in their advocacy, campaigns, and communications in an attempt to influence the attitudes and behaviours of corporations, governments, and individuals in order to “improve the lives of the world’s poor and victimized” (p. 40).

In their work, Barnett and Weiss interrogate the power relations between comparatively wealthy INGOs and their Southern counterparts through a conceptual
framework based on four ethical positions that underlie and provide the primary motivations for humanitarian aid work: deontological, consequential, virtue, and situated. (Also discussed in Chapter Two.) Deontological or duty-based ethics are based on the Kantian notion that we are obliged to assist humanity, that some actions are “good” regardless of their overall consequences, e.g., giving to charity, but not addressing root causes of poverty. There is an essence of noblesse oblige in that it is the obligation of the privileged to help others who are less privileged. These “others” are often dichotomized abstractions (distant, impoverished, racialized, and in need).

In taking a consequential ethical position an INGO sees itself as morally obligated to act to bring about the best possible outcome – the end justifies the means. Often neither the process nor the outcomes are co-determined by the recipients of the action. Due to focus on outcome and taking the shortest/fastest route to an achievable goal, the actions may or may not cause harm along the way. INGOs working in conflict regions and in emergency situations for which decisions have to be made quickly, might be inclined towards this ethical positioning.

Virtue ethical positioning is based on the individual desire or moral imperative to do “good”, satisfying personal intentions and demonstrating “heroism, compassion, and courage”. Humanitarian workers are often perceived as being virtuous in nature.

The positioning of situated ethics is generated in collaboration with Southern partners and is contextual and dialogical in nature. The underlying premise of situated ethics is that conditions must be assessed with regard to their “historical specificity” and “all those who might be affected by the decision” must be “actively involved”. Decision-making through this positioning is by necessity carried out within a longer timeframe than the other ethical positions. Humanitarian programming that is based on a situated ethical positioning is inclusive and participatory, collaborative, complex, dialogical, and determined by the specific rather than a generalized context of humanitarian need (Barnett & Weiss 2008, pp. 44-45).
Educational models and ethical positionings in INGO global education programming

Used together, educational models and ethical positionings provide a means to analyze, evaluate, explore, and describe INGO global education programming mechanisms. The client-centred and functionalist approaches to education are a less likely ideological fit for long-term INGO global education programming. A client-centred ideology may favour short-term consequential approaches such as fundraising campaigns that function to ameliorate poverty. A functionalist or instrumentalist approach may have no connection to global education programming at all. Functionalist and client-centred approaches parallel the goals of international education, which focuses on improving the skills, knowledge, and marketability of the individual student, not on challenging the societal norms that perpetuate inequities. The liberatory and social justice approaches align with a situated ethical positioning and Reimer, Shute, and McCreary’s (1993) theories of development education about interdependence and development education as social transformation.

Methods: How do INGOs conceptualize global education?

While the educational models and ethical positionings address the question of what INGOs’ learning goals and motivations are, the choice of methods responds to how these learning goals and motivations are manifested within INGO global education programming. The following are six types of approaches to INGO global education: fundraising, communications/public relations, campaigns, advocacy, public engagement/civic engagement, and global education.

1) The purpose of fundraising is to generate financial support for a charity. Since people need to be convinced to donate to a charity, communications, campaigns, advocacy, or education methods are used to forefront the “ask” for funds. INGO global education programming that is produced for the primary purpose of fundraising is most likely to be liberatory, didactic, short-term, deontological, and/or consequential in nature.

2) Communications and/or public relations function to relay direct messages to the public about global issues and the work of the organization or agency. Public relations are communications with a distinctly positive spin on the organization or agency
meant to either build constituency or to increase the public’s confidence in the organization or agency. The indirect outcome of communications or public relations is support for the organization, agency, or issue. There is no “direct ask” for any particular kind of support. INGO global education programming in the form of communications is often functionalist, didactic, short-term, deontological, and/or consequential in nature.

3) The function of campaigns is to achieve a specific outcome related to the goals of the INGO. The information/messaging is typically direct and uncomplicated. Campaigns have finite timelines in which they ask for support in the form of sharing information, buying products, fundraising, or donating. Campaigns often have mixed purposes of raising awareness and/or funds, and influencing policy change through advocacy. INGO global education programming in the form of campaigns is most likely to be functionalist, socially regulatory, didactic, short-term, deontological, consequential, and/or virtue-based in nature, but depending on the context, campaigns can also display the characteristics of being socially transformative. For example, Oxfam America’s Right to Know, Right to Decide campaign advocates for extractive industries,

to respect a community’s right to decide if or how they want oil, gas, and mining development to take place in their community, and their right to know about the impacts and benefits of these projects. (Oxfam America, 2011)

This is an example of a long-term, socially transformative approach; however, it is also still somewhat didactic. Even if there is dialogue happening between the INGO and the people in the global South, it is not an open, participatory dialogue among campaign supporters, the INGO, and Southern participants. The campaign also appears to be deontological, and/or consequential in nature.

4) Advocacy activities have a specific desired outcome of policy change. Advocacy (often referred to as advocacy campaigns) imparts a direct message that is sometimes more complex than a straightforward campaign. There is typically a finite timeline during which INGOs ask for support in the form of sharing information, signing petitions, writing letters to officials, and other means that may influence officials to change policies. Like campaigns, INGO global education programming in the form of advocacy is likely to be didactic, short-term, deontological, consequential, and/or virtue-
based in nature, but also typically has a goal of social transformation and can be longer-term in nature.

5) Public engagement and civic engagement have a range of related learning goals and outcomes. The typical paradigm for engagement is moving the learners from awareness to understanding to action. Activities related to public engagement and civic engagement can involve providing information to the learner through awareness raising information along with opportunities to interact in a learner – facilitator dialogue. The learners increased knowledge and skills lead to potential partnership and participation in decision-making with the organization or agency. The longer-term goals are to create an engaged, participatory citizenry. INGO global education programming in the form of public engagement/civic engagement could be considered functionalist, didactic, short-term, deontological, and/or consequential in nature if it does not move beyond an awareness paradigm. However, this type of programming can extend to engage the learner with the longer-term, dialogical, situated, and socially transformative practices involved in achieving an informed, participatory citizenship.

6) Global education programming provides complex, multi-perspective information, without asking for any kind of support. The programming goals are to provide learners with the skills, knowledge, and attitudes to enable them to address issues related to global inequities. The longer-term and dialogical goals are to prepare learners to engage in multi-perspective learning and dialogue. The indirect outcome may be learners self-determining how and when they would like to take action. “Softer” forms of global education programming are comprised chiefly of attributes that are functionalist, didactic, short-term, deontological, and/or consequential in nature. The characteristics of “critical” global education programming are longer-term, dialogical, situated, and socially transformative practices that involve engaging in multiple perspectives and critical reflection.

If looked at in the form of a continuum, one end would represent educational models and ethical positionings that are the most short-term, didactic, and socially regulatory and the other end would represent those that are most long-term, dialogical, and socially transformative.
This study does not directly explore the motivations driving the development work of INGOs, instead it examines how the educational models and motivations of the INGOs are revealed through their choice of global education programming methods. INGOs choosing exclusively short-term, didactic methods (e.g., direct communications and fundraising campaigns) for their global education programming reveal motivations that are deontological, consequential, (needing to directly and quickly solve problems) or virtue-based (satisfy personal intentions to carry out heroic acts) in nature as well as socially regulatory (not challenging the status quo). The INGOs that invest in education programming without an “ask” component may also seek to engage learners in dialogical relationships with other learners. These relationships prepare the learners to make informed decisions about if, how, and when to address global issues. This type of INGO global education programming has the qualities of liberatory and social justice educational orientations rather than client-based and functionalist. The level of dialogue involved between stakeholders in the global South and North and the amount of time invested to ensure situated, contextually relevant solutions demonstrates commitment to creating long-term societal transformation. Analyzing INGO global education programming through these lenses assists in developing an understanding of the power relations that are present within the determining of “why” this programming is produced and “how” it is enacted.
Research design

The methods used in this study include a comparative historical analysis and case studies. The comparative historical analysis is of the socio-political and funding conditions affecting the support for INGO-produced global education programming in Canada and the UK. The case studies are of two sister organizations, Save the Children UK and Save the Children Canada.

This qualitative research strategy was used to answer the following questions:
1. How has the nature of global education programming shifted in INGOs in the two international contexts of Canada and the United Kingdom? What accounts for these shifts?
2. How do conceptions of the purpose of INGO global education align among individual global educators and global education advocates, organizations, and institutions?
3. What are the implications for INGO global education programming?

The focus of the research is to compare the shifting nature of global education programming in INGOs in Canada and the UK. I answer the overarching study questions on how the nature of INGO-produced global education programming has shifted and how individuals’ conceptions of INGO global education align and contrast with the approaches and policies of organizations and institutions through the comparative analysis and the case studies. This method allowed for access to information from a wider group of global educators in both countries and a smaller pool of global educators within the microcosm of two sister INGOs in order to get a thicker set of data.

Two key methods were used to collect data: semi-structured interviews and document analysis (web, policy, internal reports, and curriculum). The document analysis serves to illuminate the history of INGO global education programming as well as the socio-political context that influenced the supporting structures. Among the documents collected policy documents are used to develop a composite picture of organizational approaches to and frameworks for global education programming. The interviews capture individual perspectives on global education ideals and historical shifts in these ideals over the past 20 to 30 years (depending on the length of involvement of the participant). The interviews were crucial in capturing personal perspectives on the broader history of
INGO global education programming in Canada and the UK, giving the historical data more depth.

The research was divided into two stages. The first stage explored the institutional level, studying the context and national policies for INGO global education. The second stage focused on the organizational level, using the two case studies of Save the Children UK and Save the Children Canada to gather the standpoints of individual global educators working within two particular organizations. The ongoing study of the key related literature highlighting the theoretical and methodological debates underlies these stages.

**Approach**

To explore the way INGO global education activities are shaped by differences in governmental policies, this study takes a comparative case study approach (Yin, 2003) within an historical analysis (Mahoney and Rueschemeyer, 2003). The case studies are of the current (2000 to 2010) activities of two prominent INGOs: Save the Children UK and Save the Children Canada. The rationale behind focusing on the last decade of Save the Children UK and Save the Children Canada’s programming, as opposed to the full 50-year span of the wider study, is to illuminate how current socio-political factors have affected INGO global education in two particular INGOs. These two Save the Children organizations were chosen for the study because they are dramatic examples of the INGO global education experience in each of the two country contexts. Save the Children Canada’s experience is that of an INGO that is dependent on government funding and Save the Children UK’s experience is of an INGO that is not beholden to any one funder. These organizations belong to a “family” of INGOs linked through common membership in the international INGO, the Save the Children Alliance. A comparison of these cases enables an exploration of emerging global education practices and approaches and provides some illumination as to what accounts for the shifting nature of INGO-produced global education programming in the two countries.

Focusing on similar INGOs in different contexts enables the exploration of how variations in national contexts, both in terms of formal governmental policies and broader social political systems, shape the limits and possibilities for INGO global education
programming. The study not only compares the UK and Canadian contexts to one another, but it also contrasts the contexts within each nation during different time periods (e.g. comparing global education programming in Canada during the 1980s to global education programming in Canada in the first decade of the 2000s). The study of the relationship between types of programming that have existed and the conditions under which they have come into existence and evolved has shed light on the socio-political influences and the policies that can promote and limit global education itself.

The scope of this study required the consultation of the literature that addresses global education as it has unfolded temporally in two locations. This made it necessary to look at a broad range of academic, community-based, institutional, and INGO reports; INGO-produced curriculum; and government policy documents in order to get a sense of the contributing ideas and key actors that have shaped INGO-produced global education programming in Canada and the UK. The literature review in Chapter Two and Three reflect the main themes, arguments, and problematics over the fifty-year time period that this study covers.

While there has been research on the effect of fundraising on the autonomy of international development non-governmental organizations (Edwards & Hulme, 1996; Wallace, Bornstein & Chapman, 2006; Brodhead, Herbert-Copley and Lambert, 1988) and on INGO-produced global education programming (Osler, 2002; Pike, 1990) there have only been a few recent studies out of Europe on how the changes in autonomy might affect the area of global education programming within INGOs (Rajacic, 2010; Nygaard, 2009) and little to no research of this kind produced in Canada. The Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) commissioned the Canadian Council for International Cooperation (CCIC) to conduct a public engagement assessment among members (2004) and hired a consultant to review the work of the Provincial Councils overall (2006). UNICEF Canada commissioned a study produced in 2007 (Mundy et al.) that focused on global education in elementary schools across Canada. Beyond this, there has not been a broader survey of Canadian INGO global education programming since the early 1990s. There is little documentation on how the socio-political changes over the past two decades have affected shifts in the nature of INGO global education.
programming and no comparative studies examining this area of inquiry in Canada and the UK.

Stage one of the research process involved collecting information on the trends in national policies and institutional contexts that have influenced INGO global education programming over time. INGOs and global education organizations in Canada and the UK that have contributed global education programming anytime since the 1960s were identified in order to map out the levels of global education programming concentration within the different time periods.

This first stage of the fieldwork dealt with the research aim to locate, describe, and understand the dimensions of the field of international development INGO global education in Canada and the UK and concurrently the institutional and socio-political dimension that supported or hindered INGO global education programming. The exploration of the socio-political dimension is informed by both secondary sources and interviews with participants who had a history in the field. During this stage of the research a comparative historical analysis of support for INGO-produced global education and public engagement programming in Canada and the UK was conducted.

This process of comparative historical analysis maps out the contextual differences and similarities between the countries and provides a basis for understanding the outcomes of INGO dependency on government funding over a period of fifty years. Comparative historical analysis, as described by Mahoney and Rueschemeyer, is a process that uses theories to identify reasonably comparable cases, to “formulate orienting concepts” and to “suggest initial hypotheses”. In this type of research method, Mahoney and Rueschemeyer suggest that the “dialogue between theory and history typically goes through many iterations before final conclusions are reached” (p. 20). This method of analyzing the historical data allows the salient moments/actions that have most affected support for INGO global education to gradually emerge. Analysis occurs through an iterative, comparative, and reflexive process of surfacing relevant data, reviewing the content, and relating current and historically relevant theory to occurrences of support and/or withdrawal of support for global education.

At this stage of the study the goal was to sample across Canada and the United Kingdom. Due to the nature of global education in Canada, with much of its current and
historical knowledge in the international development sector, the majority of the Canadian participants were sampled from Ontario and the Ottawa area. Although the overall study covers the UK and draws on secondary data from countries within the UK all the interviews but one took place within England. The one interview outside of England took place in Brussels, Belgium with the European Commission’s Development Education Exchange in Europe Project (DEEEP) team. The sample was to include current and former global education practitioners from INGOs and development education centres/learner centres and people who had either worked on global education policy-related issues or funding of global education. In the UK eight participants who worked for six different organizations (including a government department) were interviewed. Most of the UK participants had worked with more than one organization involved with global education and could therefore provide perspectives on a range of organizational involvement with global education. In Canada I had greater access to a wider range of participants. The twelve participants had worked at twelve different organizations. As in the UK, most of the Canadian participants had worked in more than one organization that produced global education programming, so they could respond to questions about various organizational responses to global education during different time periods. The data collected from the Canadian government representative was excluded because the participant was unable or unwilling to provide any information beyond what was available in the government-produced literature.

Investigating key global education staff members at INGOs and collecting INGO-produced global education materials necessitated a heavy reliance on the Internet. Although specific policy documents were not always available online, global education programming material was often most easily accessed via the web. This was especially helpful when investigating organizations in the UK. Within organizations that are global education focused it was easy enough to identify contacts, materials, and hierarchies, however, none of the INGOs investigated prioritized global education work (only the DECs, learner centres, and global education focused networks did this). Therefore in many cases it was difficult to find anything more than programming materials and annual reports. Information about the internal structure of global education departments or specific global education staff persons was hard to find. Most of the key government
policies were available online, even historical documents. The goal in researching INGOs producing global education was not to cover all INGOs and their experiences, but rather to understand the global education programming of a range of small, medium, and large INGOs and how their programming has shifted in nature over time.

Stage two of the research process focused on INGO global education programming at the organizational level. This stage highlights the comparative case studies of Save the Children Canada and Save the Children, UK, their global education programming, related organizational policies, and fundraising practices over a 10-year period. Their programming and policies are looked at in conjunction with the government funding support made available to INGOs during the relevant time period. The data collected in the historical analysis framed the inquiry into the global education programming practices of the INGO case studies. The interviews focused on participants’ ‘ideals’ of global education, what they understood the organization’s global education framework and priorities to be, and how they felt that their ideals might be shaped by, or in conflict with the policies and approaches to global education of the government (international development and education departments).

In order to analyze the data I created a conceptual framework based on the educational models (client-based, functionalist, liberatory, and social justice) of Askew and Carnell (1998) and the four humanitarian ethical positionings (deontological, consequential, virtue, and situated) posited by Barnett and Weiss (2010). The framework was used to better understand the relationship between institutional policies, organizational approaches and priorities, and individual global educator and advocates’ ideals. Through the analysis process I explore how socio-political changes over time relate to: (a) support for INGO global education programming, (b) the humanitarian motivations (ethical positionings) and the educational ideologies underlying INGO global education programming choices, and, (c) the types of global education-related programming INGOs’ prioritize - education, campaigns, advocacy, communications, and/or fundraising. The comparative historical analysis illuminated the reasons behind the variances between the country contexts, case studies, and historical periods. The analysis also assisted in determining the room for maneuver that INGOs producing global
education materials have between their obligations to funders and their own fundraising activities and their global education ideals.

Stages one and two are linked through their common methodological research priorities and tools. Stage two focused on the Save the Children organizations in two countries and their experiences producing global education programming in connection to their campaigns, advocacy, and fundraising activities. The data was collected from secondary sources (Save the Children reports, policy documents, and curriculum) and drew upon the experiences of current and former staff working with global education.

**Research methods**

This section explains how the data collection took place, how the participants were sampled and interviewed, and how the case study was structured.

**Documentary analysis**

Multiple sources of secondary data were used to answer the research questions. To contextualize and historicize the interview data and assist in the exploration of the interplay between INGO global education programming and INGO dependency data were collected and reviewed: reports, global education programming materials, documents outlining criteria for funding proposals, funding reports, project evaluations, fundraising campaigns and other forms of communications from both global education producing INGOs and government agencies funding global education. The documents were used to collect information that gave deeper contextual features to the interview data, laying out the landscape of global education programming, particularly during the first four decades of the study period (1960s to 1990s). Interview data did not cover the 1960s or early 1970s. Participants with significant historical experiences with global education typically dated back as far as the late 1970s. They were more likely to report on a general scenario with a few specific incidents rather than recalling the distinct policy and socio-political context.
Interviewing

Participants were asked questions drawn from the same pool of interview questions. The term “global education” was used when interviewing Canadian participants while “development education” was used when interviewing participants from the United Kingdom. As explained in Chapter Two, participants in the UK understood global education to refer to INGO provision of education in the countries of Southern partners. The deviation from the study’s main term “global education” was to facilitate understanding in communications with contacts in the UK who, within the INGO sector, predominantly used the term “development education” and understood “global education” to refer to INGO provision of education in the countries of Southern partners.

Participants with extensive historical experience with global education programming were given leeway to stray from the protocol in order to relay stories of their experiences with global education programming during past decades. During these historical reflections participants were encouraged to elaborate on the socio-political factors that influenced the time period they were discussing and to connect these reflections with current issues facing INGO-produced global education programming. These historical reflections helped document how global education ideals have changed over the years, for the participants personally, and how they have seen values and priorities change (or not) institutionally and within wider society.

Many of the key individuals contacted for the interviewing process in the UK were found using snowballing or opportunity sampling techniques (Cohen et al., 2000; Brown and Dowling, 1998). Due to the small size of the INGO global education practitioner community in Canada there were specific people who were needed for the interviews that had to be directly contacted. In the UK, only snowballing technique was used due to the global education practitioner community being much larger than in Canada and my unfamiliarity with the key actors in the UK context.

Organizations, agencies, and participants

Many of the participants requested anonymity or partial anonymity, and therefore the decision was made to keep them all anonymous. To further protect participants’ anonymity only partial descriptions of the organizations they are affiliated with are given.
Participants are identified with codes consisting of letters and numbers. Canadian participants in both the Canada-wide and Save the Children Canada case study are identified with a ‘C’ and a number, e.g., C05. Participants in both the UK-wide (including those from European Commission project in Belgium) and Save the Children UK case study are identified with an ‘E’ and a number, e.g., E05.

Four of the participants (C07, C08, C15, and E08) reported mainly on organizations worked for between the 1970s and 1990s. In the case of E08 and C15 both historical and current experiences were relevant. International development network organizations were well represented among the participants as they were a source of policy information about global education. Additionally, the networks had an understanding of how the sector as a whole was impacted by changing levels of support for global education programming. In some cases the participants were board and committee members, or had previously been active in the umbrella organizations. From the UK and Europe, the British Overseas INGO for Development (BOND), the European INGO Confederation for Relief and Development (CONCORD), and the Development Education Exchange Europe Project (DEEEP), were represented by six of the participants.

The two sister organizations explored in this study: Save the Children UK and Canada, were of vastly different sizes and capacities demonstrating obvious variations in how they enacted a typically marginalized program area like global education. In the case of the Save the Children UK, at the time of the interviews there was a development education department with five staff members, three full-time and two part-time. At Save the Children Canada there was only one part-time staff member working on global education programming. The three others that were interviewed from the Save the Children Canada all were related to the global education programming in some way, but did not work with it directly.

**Interview protocol**

The interview protocol covered the following areas: personal global education ideals, organizational frameworks, and funder policies; global education programming; funding of global education programming; partnerships; fundraising, campaigns and global education programming; donor perspectives on global education; and global education
and INGO accountability. The rationale behind the construction of the protocol was to begin the exploration by first establishing what values and ideals the participants held about global education as an INGO practice. The series of questions that followed were concerned with how the participants’ personal ideals aligned with the organizational frameworks and the policies of institutional and government donors.

Once the attribution of global education’s values was established, then the interview turned towards the practical elements of the programming, such as how it fit into the organizational mandate, and what factors shaped and influenced the programming. The participants were then asked what kind of funding they received for global education programming and the criteria for the funding. This section explored participants’ perspectives on what they thought the programming would look like without the restrictions of funding. They were asked about partnerships and whether or not the organization works in partnership with other organizations or agencies to produce global education programming and if so, what those partnerships look like. They were then asked how fundraising and campaigns might be linked to global education programming. The final sections explored their perceptions of donor commitment to global education programming over the past 20 years, if they thought there was any connection between global education programming and INGO accountability charters, and how they understood the organization’s domestic programs connected to global education programming. (See Appendix 5: Interview protocol and Appendix 4: Participant Descriptions for more details.)

**Interviews with Save the Children UK and Save the Children Canada**

Most of the participants from the Save the Children INGOs were relatively new to global education programming. Four participants were previously teachers, one participant was formerly a youth volunteer who ended up working in global education programming and campaigns, and three participants from the Canadian side of the study did not directly work with global education but were connected to what was considered the one global education program – Rewrite the Future. One participant on the UK side had over 30 years experience in the global education sector. Four current and previous staff members at the Canadian location were interviewed and four current and previous staff members
were interviewed in the UK location. In the UK all the participants worked or had worked either fully or partially in the development education department. One participant worked predominantly in campaigns. In Canada, the one global education staff position was part time. The Canadian Save the Children participants came from a range of occupations within the organization and had some interactions with the organization’s only global education program.

Save the Children case study participants were given the same interview protocol as those in the stage one Canada and UK-wide part of the study. The interview protocol was divided up into sections that included these areas: personal global education ideals, organizational frameworks, and funder policies; global education programming; funding of global education programming; partnerships; fundraising, campaigns and global education programming; donor perspectives on global education; global education and INGO accountability; and connections between global education programming and domestic programs. The intent, similar to the stage one part of the study, was to begin the exploration by first establishing which values and ideals the participants held about global education as an INGO practice, then how the personal ideals aligned with the organizational approaches, and their perceptions of how institutional funders conceptualize global education.

The interview turned towards the practical elements of global education programming, how it fit into the organizational mandate, and what factors shaped and influenced the programming. Participants were asked what kind of funding they received for global education programming and what the criteria were for that funding. This section explored participants’ perspectives on what they thought the programming would look like without the restrictions of funding. They were asked about partnerships and whether or not their organizations choose to work in partnership to produce global education programming. They were asked how fundraising and campaign work might be linked to global education programming. The final sections explored their perceptions about: donor commitment to global education programming over the past 20 years, connections between global education programming and INGO accountability charters, and connections between their organization’s domestic programs and global education programming.
Analysis

The digital recordings of all the interviews were fully transcribed and coded by the researcher. No one else had contact with the recordings or transcriptions. The process of “data reduction” or the “selecting, simplifying, abstracting and transforming” of the data (Huberman & Miles, 1994, pp. 10-11) involved coding, which was done manually. Having first read through all the transcripts, they were read a second time to identify emerging themes. A second copy of all the transcripts was made and sentences, paragraphs, and often pages of data were cut out manually and then grouped into themes. Initially, there were thirty-two emergent themes, which were eventually filtered down to eight overarching themes with sub-themes. The initial themes were: global ideals (priorities and frameworks), advocacy and campaigns, funding, government relations, local to global issues, accountability, networks, and the professionalization of global education.

A qualitative thematic strategy was employed to organize information and then make judgments about the meaning of the data collected. The framework for working with the broader understandings of global education found in the INGO sector was used as a guide when reviewing and coding the documents and interview text. However, the research design was flexible to allow for new themes and interview questions to emerge from the study. Data was analyzed with the intent of building interpretive embedded case studies (Merriam, 1998). The cases included a thick description of the phenomenon studied and developed conceptual categories “to illustrate, support, or challenge theoretical assumptions held” prior to the data gathering (Merriam, 1998 p. 38).

The two case studies were compared and cross-case patterns were identified. A cross-theme analysis of the interview data and electronic document sources was completed for both the historical analysis and the embedded case studies. The findings were clustered according to the key themes. Differentiation was made in the coding to denote whether the interview responses came from Save the Children UK or Save the Children Canada. The documents were coded according to kind, (whether they were curriculum, policy documents, reports, correspondence, academic articles or personal notes); source (including, but not limited to, government, foundation, or INGO); and funding source.
The two case studies, the wider study, and the data collected on personal global education ideals and perceptions of organizational approaches and institutional policies were then analyzed against the conceptual framework of educational models and ethical positionings. This was done to gain a better understanding of the motivations reflected in INGOs’ choices of global education programming mechanisms.

**Ethical considerations**

This research project underwent an ethical review by the University of Toronto as per policy regarding research conducted with human subjects. This research was deemed to be of low risk, as it did not pose an emotional threat to participants. An information letter and consent form were brought to every interview for the participants to read and sign (see Appendix 6). The information letter contained: an explanation of the research, the principal researcher and university affiliations, the goals of the research, the potential risks and benefits to the participants, anonymity and confidentiality management, the ability to voluntarily withdraw at any point, the use of pseudonyms for participants, and what the research would be used for.

I decided that all participants would be anonymous in the study even though most had agreed on their consent forms to only be anonymous where indicated on the transcripts. If this were a larger field and more participants were interviewed then concealing the partial anonymity of some the participants, while revealing others, might have been possible. However, there is better opportunity for the addition of more revealing perspectives if the veil of anonymity is present even for the participant who wants to remain only partially anonymous. The interviews were digitally recorded and all participants were sent a transcription of their interview to read and edit. A few chose to make corrections and additions while others either gave their approval or asked to see only final quotes. All participants were contacted via email and invited to read through any sections where their opinions were represented and encouraged to edit as they felt necessary.
Study limitations

There are many challenges to open-ended qualitative research, starting with the subjective nature of research design. While the research design did enable me to answer the study questions there were problems with research quality in that the findings of this research and conclusions of this research were dependent on how I interpreted the interviews, as guided by my conceptual framework. The subject of the study, INGO global education, made it necessary that I interview people who had been INGO global educators, as well as people who had been in supportive policy and network roles. Additionally, because of the historical nature of the study there needed to be contributions from participants who had worked in the field before the 1990s. While the collective group of participants met these various criteria, representation on either side of the study was not even.

Due to my history of working with Canadian INGOs I had access to a wide range of Canadian informants, except for government. I interviewed three of the Canadian participants together, which on the one hand resulted in a rich dialogue, but on the other hand tended to blur some of the individual opinions of the three participants. To remedy this I attempted to ensure that each participant gave a response for each question. However, sometimes it seemed possible that they might have concurred with the group rather than stated their own opinion. A similar situation occurred when interviewing the DEEEP project team. On the UK side, I was less familiar with people in the INGO global education field and ended up gathering informants through snowball sampling while on two research trips to England in the spring and fall of 2008. Three people that were clustered (mentioned above) in with the UK side of the study were actually from Belgium, representing a project with the European Commission (EC). The UK INGO sector’s ties to the EC and the EC’s long-term support for global education made this a fruitful interview.

The two case studies based on Save the Children UK and Save the Children Canada also had their limitations. The two cases were not necessarily broadly representative of INGO global education programming. While SC UK had been providing global education programming since the 1970s and had rich history, SC Canada had an unclear history with global education programming and its current
programming was minimal. Should another set of sister INGOs have been chosen for the case studies, for example World Vision Canada and World Vision UK, a much different picture would have resulted from the case studies. The Save the Children case studies were therefore explanatory and descriptive, providing deeper insight into the INGO global education contexts of Canada and the UK, but the findings from these case studies were by no means definitive.
Chapter Five: INGOs and Global Education in the UK

Introduction to the histories of UK and Canadian INGO global education

Findings presented in the next two chapters serve to answer the following study questions: How has the nature of global education programming shifted in INGOs in the two international contexts of Canada and the United Kingdom? and What accounts for these shifts? To answer these questions, available documentation on INGO global education programming in the two countries was compiled, including existing research and programming documents for comparative analysis. Information from secondary sources is complemented by the experiences and understandings of the study participants who have worked in the global education sector with and within both INGOs and government bodies. Chapter Five looks at INGO global education programming and the socio-political impacts over the past fifty years in the UK and Chapter Six the same period of time in Canada’s INGO global education history. A comparative analysis of how support has impacted motivations and methods for INGO global education programming, across regions, embedded case studies, and historical periods can be found in Chapter Nine.

Introduction to Chapter Five

The recognition of the United Kingdom as a great power is due to its military strength and empire-building past. During the past half century, while still being recognized as a great economic power, the UK has demonstrated support for INGOs and global education, particularly when the Labour Party governed. The UK’s international cooperation department, currently the Department for International Development (DfID), was originally under the purview of the foreign office, initially two offices: the Foreign Office and the Commonwealth Office (a merger of the Commonwealth Relations Office and the Colonial Office in 1966). Over the past fifty years it has flipped back and forth from being an independent department that is supportive of global education when the Labour Party was in office and back to being responsible to foreign affairs and disinterested in (at times hostile towards) global education when the Conservative Party was in power.
Of the two national contexts in this study the UK provides the baseline for the comparison because of the foundational global education work that began there as early as the late 1930s. The UK’s case presents a flourishing independent INGO sector, which has taken a lead in advocacy on controversial structural issues such as aid and trade. INGO global educators, or development educators as they have been historically referred to by the UK’s international development sector, have ridden out the storms of partisan politics and emerged victorious in achieving one of their primary goals: to get global education in schools.

This chapter explores the historical obstacles and opportunities global education stakeholders have encountered that have led to shifts in the nature of UK INGO global education programming. Sources ranging from INGO documents, academic literature, and government records in conjunction with the personal accounts of people who have worked in the global education sector with and within both INGOs and government bodies were used to construct an historical overview of INGO global education programming in the UK. The chapter covers three main historical periods of INGO global education: the birth of global education (the post-World War II years), the rise of INGO global education from the 1960s to the 1980s, and the turning point from the 1990s to the 2000s. Within these timeframes INGO global education programming is looked at in connection with government policies and the influences of social movements. The chapter describes the main trends in global education programming (INGO as well as school-based), advocacy and campaigns, fundraising issues, and debates and tensions that arose in each historical period.

**The birth of global education**

The earliest iterations of the United Kingdom’s global education programming were school-based. Early programs were initiated through two organizations concerned with citizenship education, the Association of Education in Citizenship, which requested that schools include politics and economics courses in 1935 (Stephans, 1986, p. 121) and through the Council for Education in World Citizenship (CEWC). The CEWC, established in 1939, had the support of the Ministry of Education and through them access to several thousand member schools in the UK. During the 1940s and 1950s they
held conferences attended by schools from Belgium, France, Denmark, Netherlands, Italy and the USA (Stratton, 2008). The Council for Education in World Citizenship had the capacity to engage large numbers of teachers and students and attract prestigious hosts (politicians, archbishops, film stars and so on) (Harrison, 2008). They also assisted with the promotion of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization’s (UNESCO) recommendation from 1946 that Member States revise textbooks to include educating for international understanding orientation (UNESCO, 1948).

In the 1950s more school-based international awareness programming was supported, through the Ministry of Education recognition of United Nations Days in schools (Harrison, 2008, p. 68) and the establishment of the One World Trust in 1951 by the All-Party Parliamentary Group for World Government. The Trust was to promote research into and education about the “facts, principles and methods of planning and organizing on a world basis to the greatest advantage of the human species” (Burall, 2008, p. 2). The founders were concerned with the proliferation of nuclear weapons, the vulnerability of states, and general fragility of global governance during that period. The first INGO to start producing programming for schools was Oxfam and not until 1959.

Many of the original large INGOs that eventually started to produce global education programming were founded in the UK. After the Second World War public concern for global inequities grew resulting in many new charities that relied on campaigns, advocacy and public awareness programming to garner public support (Stephans, 1986, p.121). Christian Aid10, for example, held its first Christian Aid Week in 1957, which continues to be the UK’s largest door-to-door campaign, commonly known as the “red envelope” campaign. During the 1950s they built a replica of a refugee camp in the church of St Martin in the Fields in London and throughout the 1960s placed sustained effort into campaigning the government about its trade and aid policies (Christian Aid, 2009). In the 1950s Oxfam ran full-page ads in newspapers with shocking

---

9 Harrison notes that during the 1950s One World Trust’s materials did not mention INGOS (2008, p. 92).
10 Christian Aid is an agency originally established in 1949 as Christian Reconstruction in Europe and that is sponsored by 41 Protestant churches from Britain and Ireland.
pictures of starving babies to fundraise for famine relief. This campaign tactic was first used in 1919 by Eglantyne Jebb (founder of Save the Children) greatly influencing fundraising trends among INGOs from that period onward. In later years this practice became a controversial issue discussed among global educators (including Oxfam and Save the Children’s education departments) and the basis for recent INGO ethical codes around images.

Pictures of starving children were not the only way to encourage a response from the public. Well-written arguments and proposals to act also inspired citizens to engage with international issues as was the case, for example, with the campaign-based INGO War on Want. This INGO originated from a letter written by Victor Gollancz to The Guardian newspaper in 1951 calling for leaders to negotiate a peaceful end to the Korean War and “to turn swords into ploughshares” (See Appendix 7). Gollancz included his address at the bottom of the letter and asked people to send him a postcard with only the word “yes” on it if they were in agreement with his proposal and he would set about addressing the issue. After Gollancz received 10,000 postcards the Association of World Peace was formed and two months later a committee was struck to work on a plan for addressing world hunger and the basis of the charity, War on Want.

Political and socio-economic changes after World War II shaped global education. Economically the UK, although continuing to recuperate from the infrastructure damage and financial loss from World War II, still benefitted from what remained of its empire. As the economic stability of the 1950s began to take hold three changes occurred that impacted the rise of global education programming in the UK. The first change was the increase in non-European immigration. The Labour Party and some European INGOs were advocating for the UK to give its former colonies political independence and producing public awareness campaigns on immigration policies and world hunger (Smith, 1990, p.78). The second change occurred in 1956 when the UK opened the world’s first nuclear power plant that produced energy for commercial use, in total eleven nuclear plants. They also modernized the coal industry creating almost a quarter of a million mining jobs (Marr, 2007, p. 117). A critical mass of citizens, fearful of the rising Cold War tensions, rallied against the dangers of nuclear arms proliferation.
through the newly formed Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament (CND),\footnote{The CND definitely shaped tone of the 1960s with its peace symbol using the semaphore symbols “N” and “D” for nuclear disarmament (Marr, pp.182-183).} signaling a heightened understanding of interconnectivity between domestic interests and global inequities. Anti-nuclear and peace-themed global education material in the form of pamphleteering began to proliferate during this period. The third change occurred in 1957 when the combination of the expansion of the middle-class and the peaceful conditions domestically enabled young people to travel overseas to volunteer in developing countries with the British Voluntary Service Overseas.\footnote{The first few years it was just for young men recently graduated from secondary school to gain some experience abroad.} The volunteers would provide unskilled labour in exchange for accommodations and a stipend. This was the beginning of a whole new level of global awareness. Young people who had lived in communities around the globe under peaceful circumstances and returned to the UK wanted to share what they had witnessed and understood from experiencing global conditions of poverty.

The increased economic stability domestically and growing awareness of economic disparity and environmental degradation both locally and globally did lead to conflicts in conscience for many citizens as well as a broader engagement with a range of complicated and controversial development issues, but there was also resistance to global education’s egalitarian ideals. During this Cold War period The Council for Education in World Citizenship (CEWC), for example, was twice accused of their programming being too “left-leaning” (specifically communist). The first accusation was via a letter from the United Nations Association (UNA) in 1947, the second, in the mid-1950s from Enoch Powell, a Conservative MP who later became known for his 1968 River of Blood anti-immigration speech (Marr, 2007). The Ministry of Education kept files on these accusations and reduced CEWC’s funding and subsequent reach considerably (Harrison, 2008, pp. 81-82). Oxfam also confronted resistance both internally and externally when it began to expand and develop its global education programming. Oxfam’s education programming was caught between the limitations of the UK’s strict charity laws (at the time) and the difficult task of establishing itself in the midst of the politically-charged atmosphere of the UK’s education sector (p.101).
The rise of INGO global education: 1960s to 1980s

Between 1960 and into the 1980s school- and INGO-based global educationalists sought to get global education recognized as a legitimate area of study in schools. This was a primary goal for many groups in the UK including the World Studies movement and citizenship associations and those in the INGO sector. The UK had built a base in international understanding and world citizenship in school settings through organizations such as the Council for Education in World Citizenship (CEWC), One World Trust, and the UNESCO schools program and therefore an environment existed that was open to INGO global education and awareness programming.

In 1964 the Labour Party created its first separate international cooperation office, although still within foreign affairs, the Ministry of Overseas Development (ODM). The ODM would administrate humanitarian aid and technical assistance initiatives, taking over the Commonwealth Office’s responsibilities for former colonies and aid. The ODM and the Foreign Commonwealth Office had been loosely supportive (little in the way of funding) of the Freedom from Hunger Campaign during the 1950s. It was not until 1964 that the ODM formally supported INGOs’ work in education. The Ministry for Overseas Development offered to support INGOs’ efforts to produce development education curriculum for schools and encouraged eight large INGOs to set up the Voluntary Committee on Overseas Aid and Development (VCOAD) in 1965 (Worldaware, 2005, p.1). The organizations represented a variety of orientations and approaches to development education. Christian Aid, Oxfam, and Save the Children’s Fund worked in schools and the Catholic Institute for International Relations, War on Want, and the United Nations Association (UNA) were more focused on public awareness and campaigning (the UNA had an affiliation with CEWC’s work in schools) (Harrison, 2008. p. 96). The Freedom from Hunger Campaign’s work was absorbed by (VCOAD) (Ibid). One of their more successful collaborative efforts, The Development Puzzle, ran to seven editions. This resource guide for teachers highlighted the work of all the cooperating agencies (Worldaware, 2005, p.1).

Global education programming in schools continued to be a priority in the 1970s with the establishment of several new global education programs. The World Studies Project was initiated in 1973 by the All-Party Parliamentary Group for World
Government and primarily funded by the Joseph Rowntree Foundation\(^{13}\) (E07). The project held conferences, workshops, and in-services for teachers, teacher educators, curriculum developers, and global educators from INGOs, and produced curriculum support documents\(^{14}\) (Hicks, 2008, p.2). The director of this project, Robin Richardson, had a long-lasting impact on the global education sector as he is credited with introducing the ‘worldmindedness’ and ‘child-centred’ approaches to global education. In 1977 the Centre for World Development Education (CWDE) came into existence and took over the work of VCOAD. This Ministry of Education-approved charity ended up being one of the only development education organizations funded through ODA during the lean Conservative years. In 1980 the World Studies Project 8 – 13, an initiative that focused on children in middle school, came out of Robin Richardson’s earlier work with the project. World Studies was defined as education “which promotes the knowledge, attitudes and skills that are needed for living responsibly in a multicultural society and an interdependent world” (Hicks, 2003, p. 237).

Independently INGOs continued to work on their education programs. Oxfam, for example, was one of the first INGOs to attempt to analyze the broader structural issues behind poverty, both with their global partners in the field and domestically through development education programming. When Oxfam initially began to work with schools in 1962 it was with the dual purpose of facilitating learning about world poverty and to fundraise. It was during this period that tensions began to arise between the conflicting interests of education programming and that of campaigns and fundraising. Once the Education Department was established in 1964 a continued effort was made to distance the education programming from the organization’s fundraising needs (Harrison, 2008, p. 101).

Development education centres (DECs) began to proliferate in the 1970s, starting with centres in London, Birmingham, Manchester, and Leeds (Hicks, 2008, p. 3). One of

\(^{13}\) The foundation is the legacy of Joseph Rowntree, who was a Quaker and co-owner of the Rowntree confectionary company. He established foundation in 1904 to tackle the root causes of social problems (http://www.jrf.org.uk/about-us). E07 noted that “influential Quaker roots in formation of many development co-operation, anti-poverty and ‘peace’ organizations and initiatives in the UK, e.g., Oxfam, QPS, and the Cadbury confectionary company, which also has grant making trusts that have supported development education projects and activities”.

\(^{14}\) These were *Learning for Change in World Society: Reflections, activities and resources* (Richardson, 1976b), *Debate and Decision: The school in a world of change* (Richardson et al. 1979) and *Ideas into Action: Curriculum for a changing world* (Fisher et al.1980).
the study participants, E07, said that the DECs were always initiated through a small group of “independent-minded” people who had experience volunteering overseas, and were most often teachers with connections to the work of INGOs. These groups did all the foundational work setting up the DECs (finding a location, fundraising, determining the core programming). This participant described the educators working within DECs as “opportunists” who supported teachers in local schools and through professional development workshops. They assisted teachers in the following ways: filling the information gap by expanding on the more complex identities of developing countries, demonstrated how to use new learning methods such as simulation and role play, and by compiling collections of up-to-date and educationally-sound resource materials for teachers to use in their classrooms.

The growth of INGO education programming and the establishment of DECs coincided with the Labour government’s decision in 1977 to support global education programming through an ambitious funding scheme. The Overseas Development Ministry (ODM) set up the ‘Development Education Fund’ in 1978. The fund was to “ensure better understanding among people in Britain of the country’s interdependence with the rest of the world, and particular of its relationships with the developing countries” (Walker, 1982, p. 505). There was to be an annual allocation of £2.7 million to the fund. Up until 1979 approximately £1.7 million was spent on over 240 projects (Stephans, 1986, p.122). The ministry also offered block grants to the three largest INGOs, Christian Aid, the Catholic Overseas Development Agency (CAFOD), and Oxfam (Save the Children was added in 1985). These block grants made up 70% of the funds available within the Joint Funding Scheme for all INGOs, and Oxfam, up until 1985, received the largest portion of the block grant (more than all the other agencies put together) (Robinson, 1991, p. 164). Receiving a block grant meant that the INGO did not have to go through a protracted application process and was able to work relatively independently (E07). These block grant practices caused the non-block grant funded INGOs to lobby to be included.

This period of overt support for development education ended as soon as Thatcher’s Conservative government was elected in 1979. The budget was cut off, although they did pay for existing commitments. Of the funds available, approximately
£50,000, 3/5 of the total was allocated to the Centre for World Development Education (CWDE) and a small amount set aside to assist DECs (Stephens, 1986, p.123). The government did not cut the previously allocated block grants to the largest INGOs, which enabled the INGOs to fund global education programming within DECs and other smaller INGOs. With almost no government funds during this period, in one year alone (1987/88) the “big four” INGOs spent £7 million funding global education programming. INGOs also received funding for global education from the European Commission (over a 10 year period, approximately £4 million in matching grants) (Stephens, 1986, p.174). Due to the support of the INGOs, the numbers of DECs increased from five in 1979 to over 40 in the 1980s, despite limited government support.

**Campaigns and advocacy**

In the UK, campaigning activities, closely related to INGO global education programming, have led the way for and worked alongside global education. In recent years, however, global education and campaigns have competed for space within the organizations. Campaigning has a long history in the UK. The anti-nuclear campaigns were clear cases of political campaigning, but other organizations, eager to turn the public’s attention to global issues, were doing this through less controversial means, such as the case with the War on Want’s exhibition in 1960 and the Freedom from Hunger Campaign in 1963. War on Want collaborated with the Council for Education on World Citizenship (CEWC), which secured elite sponsors including Eleanor Roosevelt, and invited multinational companies that worked in poorer countries to exhibit along with a handful of other aid agencies, such as Oxfam and UNICEF (Harrison, 2008, p. 85). The United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization’s Freedom from Hunger Campaign was a major influence on the global education sectors in a number of Western nations. This campaign of 1963 inspired development INGOs, community groups, churches, labour and other organizations relating to food and/or poverty to pool their efforts in a combination awareness raising/public education and fundraising drive that collected donations in cinemas and had the support of the royal family. The campaign succeeded in attracting a large pool of supporters for the participating relief organizations. The Freedom from Hunger campaign involved 76 organizations, including the aid agencies,
War on Want, UNICEF, Save the Children, Christian Aid and Oxfam among many others, labour organizations, religious organizations, and local food and poverty organizations (Rootes, 2007, p.3; Tweedle, 1962). The campaign also spawned new relief agencies as there was demonstrated public interest in addressing “Third World” poverty.

The campaigning done by War on Want was more palatable to officials than some of the more controversial advocacy and campaigns that British INGOs wanted to engage in. In the 1960s INGOs were restricted by the Charity Commission’s regulations that forbade them from engaging in any advocacy activities. To get around these regulations, a group of aid agencies and churches that were dissatisfied with the way the Charity Commission restricted the scope of their work launched a public campaigning arm called Action for World Development in 1969. This allowed INGOs to bring increased attention to world poverty without breaking any of the charity laws that prohibited agencies from taking part in political campaigns. The following year Action for World Development became the World Development Movement (WDM) narrowing its focus exclusively to campaigns and advocacy on issues of global social justice. The WDM organized a mass rally against the government’s spending cuts to aid in 1983. Although the government did not reinstate any of the budget it had already cut, it also did not make any annual cuts to the aid budget over the next few years (Mitchell, 1991, pp. 150 - 151). In 1985 the WDM organized another mass rally to lobby parliament to increase humanitarian aid. This time double the number of supporters showed up (20,000) and one month later the government announced an additional £47 million to the aid budget (p. 153). More WDM campaigning in 1988 resulted in the government allocating an additional £80 million to contribute to the aid budgets for the following two fiscal years (p. 156).

The growth of global education infrastructure despite the lack of state support

During the Thatcher years government policy, both foreign and domestic, was largely aggressive. Thatcher tied the UK’s defense policy to US President Reagan’s by taking an offensive position in the Cold War in support of the “Reagan Doctrine” and stockpiling nuclear weapons. In 1983 Thatcher led the UK into war with Argentina over the Falkland Islands and allowed the US to position cruise missiles in England, instigating massive
anti-nuclear rallies. The Conservative government faced an economic crisis at home and having built its platform on massive reforms to state spending proceeded to cut back the ODA budget, 14% the first year and 10% the next. In 1979 aid went from “being the fastest growing area of public expenditure to one of the fastest shrinking” (Mitchell, 1991, p. 146). In 1980 the government announced that aid policy would shift to prioritize “political, commercial, and industrial interests” (p. 146). Release of the widely read Brandt Report which laid out an irrefutable argument as to why wealthier states should take responsibility for global poverty along with the worldwide attention to the Ethiopian famine kept development assistance in focus. Although the famine kept development on the government agenda it was perceived by one informant to have done “huge damage to the development education work being undertaken up to that time to try and revise the image that people had about Africa” (E07). The pervasive images of Africans as helpless, feeble and poverty-stricken countered the more progressive work global educators had done to diminish damaging stereotypes of people in developing countries. While the increased attention to global poverty kept development assistance a government priority, state funding for development education continued to dwindle.

Even though state support for global education programming from the late 1970s through to the mid-1990s was severely limited growth of the sector continued due to (a) the support of the large INGOs (often referred to as BOAGs – British Overseas Aid Groups), foundations, and the European Commission, and (b) the formation of the National Association of Development Education Centres (NADEC). The large INGOs (Oxfam, Christian Aid, the Catholic Agency for Overseas Development (CAFOD), Save the Children) continued to receive block grants from the Ministry of Overseas Development (ODM) allocating a percentage of the funding to provide grants to DECs and smaller INGOs with global education programs. These large INGOs also supported their own regional offices around the UK to do education work. The National Association of Development Education Centres (NADEC) started out as a network of local centres in 1980 that grew from six to 46 DECs throughout the UK and from 30 to over 100 affiliated organizations. The establishment of this network of support for global education coupled with the financial support of the large INGOs accounts for the strength of the UK’s global education sector.
Tensions within the global education sector between the 1960s and 1980s

Despite the support from INGOs and the growth of the sector, global educators faced numerous challenges throughout this period. In the 1960s VCOAD’s consortium of agencies had to negotiate their differing views on development learning, which caused friction within the association. These internal tensions increased due to the expectation on the part of the Ministry of Overseas Development that the committee would assist in raising public support for development assistance (Harrison, 2008, p.97). This was in contravention of the strict Charity Commission law created in 1962 that forbade propaganda, advocacy, and solidarity work (Barnett, 2011, p.128). The committee continued to aggravate the Charity Commission after they published the booklet *Power to End Poverty*, which advocated for wealthier states to end poverty through changes in trade and aid policies (Worldaware, 2005, p. 1).

From the 1970s into the 1980s, tensions arose between the various alternative educations, specifically between the proponents of global education and those of multicultural education. The UK’s population became more diverse, sometimes almost over night. Ugandan dictator Idi Amin’s expulsion of African South Asians in 1972 brought one of the largest mass immigrations: Almost 30,000 people were admitted into the UK in just two months time. The UK accepted increasing numbers of asylum seekers. These mass immigrations caused race relations to become a pressing issue in schools and communities. To address the increased racial tensions multiculturalists were attempting to build communities of mutual respect between the indigenous white British and the newer and older immigrant communities. However, the global education model with its emphasis on the poverty, disaster, and need in many of the immigrants’ countries of origin was felt to have a negative impact on any attempts at improving these relationships. The multiculturalists felt that the global education model had the potential to create feelings of pity, guilt, and/or superiority among the white Britons and would dash the confidence of the immigrant populations (E07). As the Thatcher economic and social reforms began to have an increasingly negative impact on already economically-depressed communities race relations eventually turned into a series of violent race riots across the UK in 1981. The immediacy of the volatile domestic situation shifted attention
away from international perspectives towards a critical multiculturalism, political education, anti-racist, and anti-sexist framework (Stephans, 1986, p. 123).

Internal debates began to arise over education’s role within INGOs. One argument was whether or not education and fundraising should be linked at all. The other tension was whether campaigning for increased ODA was a better use of organizational resources than was education programming (Harrison, 2008, p. 117). Concerns were also raised about education programs that shed light on politically sensitive domestic issues. In the case of Oxfam, a local antipoverty project with the Manchester Housing project in the 1970s that attempted to link local poverty to global poverty through experiential learning was met with resistance. “Action, particularly on local issues, was seen as dangerously political in a climate where teaching children about their rights was not encouraged” (p. 115). This is a telling example of the political quagmire that has ensued when global education organizations have attempted to link local issues to global issues.

As the 1980s progressed, the Thatcher government’s pro-nuclear, aggressive military, anti-welfare, and pro-privatization stance continued to ramp up. Relations between the government and the INGO sector were tenuous to say the least.

If I go back 20 years to the last Conservative government, there was a deal done during the days of Thatcher, which was essentially that if the NGOs kept quiet and didn’t make public criticism of development, the money would still flow. What we had was a government hostile to development, but with Ministers who were very sympathetic. People like Chris Patten and Linda Chalker in different ways were very sympathetic and supportive of development, but they couldn’t afford to be criticized. As soon as their heads went above the parapet they’d just get shot off. And that would be the end of the funding. So, there was a high level of collusion. Essentially what that meant was that the government didn’t want development education talked about very much. (E06)

Despite receiving the disdain of the Thatcher government global education was being talked about and programming (formal and informal) continued to flourish. As global education gained a wider audience, it also attracted more criticism. In 1985, Roger Scruton published *World Studies: Education or Indoctrination* attacking the feminist, anti-racist radical positioning of the World Studies movement in particular and global education in general. The World Studies Movement was accused of appropriating resources and using them to “oppress and hamper the defenders of educational values” (p.25). Scruton was particularly upset about the “asinine games” designed to illustrate
“the destructive potential of modern weapons and alternatives to the arms race” (p.29).

He strongly critiqued using the little funding left in the budget for global education arguing that it was, “anti-British, anti-capitalist, anti-Western and primarily revolutionary propaganda” (p.50). Additionally, he argued that global education was anti-Christian and that it would lead to the same oppressive communist regime as the one in Czechoslovakia. Scruton’s opinions aligned with those of the Thatcher government and were echoed, albeit in less inflammatory language, 25 years later by the International Policy Network’s “Fake Aid” report as the political atmosphere in the UK shifted once again.

The 1990s to 2000s

Through the Conservative government years and into the early 1990s, global education’s allied sectors, labour and education, were on the receiving end of Thatcher’s increasingly heavy-handed policies. If not for the support of the larger INGOs the development education centres (DECs) may not have survived the Conservative administration as there were only small amounts of funding for the centres. Education reforms left little room for teachers to address global social issues.

As the UK moved towards its peak years for global education (1997 to 2002), the supporting foundations for global education were taking shape. Along with the critical INGO support, the other key factor that ensured the rise of global education in the UK was the consolidation of the National Association of Development Education Centres, (NADEC), originally formed in 1980 (Hicks, 2008), and the Joint Agencies Network (a youth work network) into the Development Education Association (DEA) in 1993. The DEA coordinated the network of approximately fifty independent, local development education centres (DECs). The DEA’s 250 member organizations include INGOs, DECs, local education authorities, youth groups, universities, and media organizations (DEA, n.d.). This network of global education stakeholders, through their consultation and advocacy on behalf of global education practitioners, enabled global education to establish a solid foothold in the early 1990s.

There were no changes to state support for INGO global education during the last seven years (1990 to 1997) of Conservative leadership under John Major. Immediately
after the New Labour government came into power in 1997 it began to demonstrate the increased recognition of the “valuable role that INGOs were playing in raising public awareness” (E07). The Labour government created the Department for International Development (DfID), separated it from the Foreign and Commonwealth Office, and reduced the amount of tied aid policies. Part of DfID’s new mandate was to “make global development a national priority and to promote to audiences in the UK and overseas” (DfID, 2009). In their 1997 White Paper, DfID called for every child to be educated about development issues. The following year DfID invested £1.5 million in what they would call “building support for development”. They produced a Building Support for Development Strategy paper in 1999 that focused on supporting awareness programming in four main areas: 1) formal education, 2) the media, 3) businesses and trade unions, and 4) churches and faith groups (DfID, 1999, pp. 4- 6).

The Development Education Association (DEA) was an early recipient of development education funding as the DEA. Its sub-associations acted as regional coordinators for development education project funding. They assisted with managing DfID’s two new competitive development education funds: the Development Awareness Fund (DAF) (up to £100,000) and the Mini Grants Scheme (up to £300,000). Through the peak of funding period between 1997 and 2002 INGOs and DECs had access to unrestricted funds from sources such as the National Lottery. During that time many of the INGO education departments increased their staff to be able to keep up with the calls for production of classroom-ready teacher packs on global issues and in-services and workshops for teachers. Oxfam, with the largest education department of all the INGOs, released *A Curriculum for Global Citizenship*, with the popular reference to being “outraged by social injustices” (Oxfam 1997) and later began to produce an annual catalogue with the best (vetted through an INGO education committee) global education resources from all the INGOs.

In 2000-2001 DfID created a new funding mechanism for its key partnerships with INGOs called the Partnership Programme Agreement (PPA). The PPA was a replacement for the block grants that provided unrestricted funding to the larger INGOs – the funding criteria now included global education as one of the four required project themes. It has been estimated that approximately 60% of INGOs receiving PPA funding
do some kind of “building for support for development” programming, however the area is not documented well enough to be accurate (PricewaterhouseCoopers, 2009, p. 20). For most of the decade INGOs were able to determine how much and how they would spend their PPA funding on global education. By the fall of 2008 DfID had made it mandatory that INGOs spend 25% of the funding on development education. However they did not put any accountability mechanisms into place to ensure this requirement was indeed being fulfilled (E08, E06, E07), which explains the difficulty in finding data to corroborate how much of the PPA funds the INGOs were actually allocating to education programming.

**Global education and the “brand-awareness stakes”**

Even with the tremendous increase in funding specifically for global education (by 2010 there were 27 INGOs receiving PPAs) campaigns and advocacy programming took priority over education programming within INGOs. For INGOs the line between education, campaigns, and advocacy is a blurry one. Most of the education departments in the larger INGOs were (or are) sub-departments within the larger campaigns departments. Even within INGO financial statements submitted to the Charity Commission there is no distinction made between expenditures on campaigns, advocacy (also called awareness), and education programming.

The primary sources of global education funding (DfID, Big Lottery, and Comic Relief) were considered flexible as they do not have stringent criteria for reporting, but according to one informant, they do ask that organizations are “doing education and not political campaigning or advocacy” (E06). A former director of development education programming (E08) was concerned that since there is no real criteria for the funding, what should be education programming could easily translate into communications and media campaigns. This informant believed that, with the economic downturn, INGOs will turn their attention to “getting more supporters” or doing “public relations” for their work rather than putting their efforts into the long-term, low payback commitment of education programming. The two study participants who worked at large INGOs (both with PPAs) (E06, E07) did not feel that there was any overlap between their education and campaigns departments and argued that the two programming areas were funded by completely
different sources. However, as is the case in many large INGOs, one participant’s organization housed their autonomous education department within the campaigns department.

The delineation between education, campaigns, and advocacy programming and even fundraising becomes “fuzzy” when it comes to “taking action” (E08). The action component of global education is considered an important learning outcome for both teachers and non-formal global educators, even within the Enabling Effective Support program.

For me, an essential part of global education is what the person does with it, you can be the most well-read, the most well-taught person, but for me unless education leads to action, then we’ve missed a trick. (E09)

For INGOs doing education work in schools teachers’ and students’ eagerness to take action on global issues can conveniently segue into either an INGO campaign and advocacy activity, and/or fundraising. Because of this, participant E08 felt that the bigger INGOs were definitely moving away from education towards fundraising campaigns and advocacy and that it was due to this grey area of taking action. Another participant (E07) whose organization has a large education program commented on the desire of teachers and students to do fundraising as a follow up action. Part of the work of this participant’s organization was to assist teachers in thinking through whether fundraising was the most appropriate response to their learning.

At the time of data collection for this study there had been concern that with the changing political winds in the UK, and with what was looking like an inevitable Conservative win ahead that DfID would begin to start using Enabling Effective Support (EES) and its other global education programs to promote itself. Participants in the study did not report any evidence of any messaging about the development aid budget and the DfID brand within the EES program, instead it was mentioned that the agency’s support for teaching about the global dimension was about a “far broader learning process” that linked in with equity issues at the local level (E08). What did seem to be a concern was the INGO “brand-awareness stakes” that was happening in schools (E06). Now that the global dimension was in schools the focus now for INGOs was to quickly and successfully build their constituencies of young people and schools, which meant
designing and implementing dynamic and attractive campaigns and communications targeted for the youth market.

Global education in schools: Winning the argument

Getting global education into schools continued to be the primary thrust for DfID and the allied INGO global education sector. More opportunities for INGOs and DECs to work in schools opened up when the Department for Employment and Education (DfEE)\(^\text{15}\) published *Developing a Global Dimension in the School Curriculum* in 2000 and DfID introduced the Enabling Effective Support (EES) program in 2003. The EES program was eventually introduced to eleven regions across England, Scotland, Northern Ireland, and Wales to support local strategies and encourage partnerships between sectors to increase teachers’ abilities to bring a global dimension to their classrooms (DfID 2003). Through the EES, each of the regions received £160,000 per year from DfID. With this amount each network was expected to engage all the schools in its catchment area, typically five to six local authorities. The local authorities vary in size from region to region, some with as few as twenty-one schools to over two thousand schools. This initiative was a major push on DfID’s part to encourage a range of stakeholder support for global education, particularly support from the Department of Education. The idea was to build capacity within the educational structures so that delivery of education for a global dimension is sustainable, which meant “influencing key decision makers such as OFSTED, our education inspection body, and the QCA, Qualifications in Curriculum Authority” (E09). The EES was introduced as a five-year initiative, renewed in 2008 for five more years, and then cancelled in 2010.

The Department of Schools, Children, and Families (DSCF) (the Department for Education) had been increasingly involved with both global education and international education. One of the department’s goals was to see that “all the schools in England, by 2010, will have been enabled to be in a sustainable, international partnership with another school or schools overseas” (E05). The Joint International Unit (JIU) within DSCF worked intra-departmentally and with other ministries to bring the global dimension into

\(^{15}\) Over the past decade the UK’s Department of Education has changed titles several times. During the primary data collection period for this study between 2008 and 2009 the department was called the Department for Children, Schools, and Families (DCSF).
schools. It brought forward the agenda of the Department for Business, Innovation, and Skills, and “provides support, advice and guidance to Ministers and policy makers on the international dimension in education” (BIS, 2009). The global dimension is not an educational policy that receives much funding but the British Council (UK’s international cultural relations body) has responsibility for the management of the Global Gateway website (a one-stop-shop resource site for teachers wishing to bring the global dimension into their teaching) which was funded through a grant from the JIU. While many schools have taken up the challenges of working internationally and introducing the global dimension, the inspectors had not yet seen that the global dimension was, “raising children’s standards of education” and “increasing their future effectiveness as global citizens as adults in the working world” (E05). These were not written down as targets, but they were priorities through the vehicle of the British Council and the Joint International Unit as an integral part of the government’s education department.

The Department for International Development (DfID) supports the Department for Education’s global education goals through its Global Schools Partnerships Local Authority Grants (2003) designed to create international partnerships with a focus on global education. They also offer Global Student Forum funding that enables students to attend conferences (Dominy, Goel, Larkins, & Pring, 2011, p. 13). Formal education programming at the tertiary level receives some support, especially for programming that impacts initial teacher education, e.g., one recipient of funding is the Development Education Research Centre (DERC), a research base at the Institute of Education at the University of London (Dominy et al., 2011, p. 13). Some tertiary level programming beyond international development and education is also supported, as in the case of Skill Share International’s global awareness program with the University of Leicester’s medical school.

Through the first decade of 2000 DfID demonstrated a clear determination to finally get school-aged children in the UK learning about the global dimension of their world. The department’s goal was to get the various stakeholders within the education sector to pick up some and eventually most of the financial responsibility. Bodies such as the British Council have invested in the global dimension, but mainly in support of programming that supports international education. Although complementary,
international education and global education tend to come from a different place ideologically. E09, who worked with the EES program described the differences

International education is being aware of different countries’ approach to education, or knowing the policies of different institutions, but global education is really thinking about the relationships, the power relations, the injustices and then thinking, as active citizens, well what can we do in the way that we lead our lives to try and challenge that imbalance.

Once again the learning to action paradigm is identified in global education practice, but not within international education programming. For some educators, the action component is one of the key differences between global education and international education. International education emphasizes individual student achievement and future success through cultural awareness, language learning, and international experience, learning areas that increase the student’s value with marketable skills for a globalized world. Differences in approaches, whether leaning more towards international education or global education vary from school to school and classroom to classroom, depending on the educators’/schools’ learning priorities, as well as which organizations are available to support the particular region. The Department for Education has given the global dimension legitimacy by making it part of the educational policy, but their financial resources for priority areas in schools are stretched and will have to continue to rely on outside organizational support (DfID, INGOs, DECs, the British Council and so on).

For 30 years the sector had been struggling to get the global dimension in schools and now the formal education sector has taken it up. The global dimension in the curriculum is reinforced through Department of Education and Qualifications and Curriculum Authority policy documents. The Enabling Effective Support program was supporting schools and teachers throughout England, Scotland, Wales, and Northern Ireland. Once the push to get the formal education system to take on global education finally gained some traction INGOs began to contemplate the importance of education programming to their organizations. The economic downturn in 2008 increased INGOs’ scrutiny of their budgets, leading many of them to ask questions about whether or not they would put resources into their own education programming, which does not have a direct impact on their immediate mandate of poverty reduction, or instead direct those resources into campaigns and advocacy.
Leaning towards dependency

Many of the large INGOs in the UK were originally established in the UK and have grown with public support rather than government grants. Some of the INGOs run charity shops, a popular fundraising technique first used by Oxfam then widely copied by other charities. Trade activities, as the charity shop activities are called in the financial reports, provide a modest boost in income. A substantial output of funds is required to make a profit. In 2008, Oxfam made £77.7 million gross in trading activities at a total cost of £60.6 million leaving them with a net trade income of £17.1 (Oxfam Annual Report, 2008). Their gross income for 2008 was £308.3 million and almost 46.7% of that total (£144 million) was raised through trading (shops), gifts in kind, and public donations. Most other INGOs have chosen to promote online shops rather than the ‘jumble shop’ model that requires a great deal of investment to make any income. What the online shops do not get is the brand awareness that comes with charity shops being located in communities around the country. The shops are a venue to promote programs while interacting with the community members who donate and purchase used items and fairly traded goods.

The larger INGOs (2008) on average had an approximately 50-50 balance of income sources. Half of their income was raised from public donations, gifts, investments, and trading activities and the other half from institutional grants, from government (regional, national, and European level), foundations, and other INGOs. Most INGOs had a variety of institutional income sources leaving them less than 10% dependent on DfID funding. A few INGOs are 30% or more dependent on DfID funding (VSO, CARE, Skillshare, and UNICEF).
Table 2: UK INGO Government Funding Dependency Rates for 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UK NGOs</th>
<th>Revenue (CAS m)</th>
<th>Expenditure</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Fundraising</th>
<th>Campaigns and Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>% Government Funding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ActionAid</td>
<td>109.53</td>
<td>Df* 23.59 (23%)</td>
<td>226.2</td>
<td>11.12</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amnesty</td>
<td>20.13</td>
<td>Df .25 (1%)</td>
<td>33.44</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>CAFOD</td>
<td>Df 6.8 (8%)</td>
<td>75.69</td>
<td>9.23</td>
<td>9.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARE</td>
<td>54.68</td>
<td>Df 26.4 (48%)</td>
<td>53.44</td>
<td>5.94</td>
<td>.263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EC** 14.28 (26%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian Aid</td>
<td>141.8</td>
<td>Df 14.46 (9%)</td>
<td>152.29</td>
<td>28.64</td>
<td>24.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EC 11.04 (7%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxfam</td>
<td>498.26</td>
<td>Df 25.04 (8%)</td>
<td>514.91</td>
<td>32.00</td>
<td>34.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EC 42.34 (13%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan UK</td>
<td>67.4</td>
<td>Df 5.15 (7%)</td>
<td>61.79</td>
<td>11.49</td>
<td>3.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EC 6.42 (9%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Save the</td>
<td>349.1</td>
<td>Df 28.6 (8%)</td>
<td>336.37</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>16.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children UK</td>
<td></td>
<td>EC 13.57 (3%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill Share</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>Df 4.2 (47%)</td>
<td>8.77</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td></td>
<td>EC 13.57 (3%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>105.05</td>
<td>Df 32.3 (30%)</td>
<td>104.8</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>7.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VSO</td>
<td>79.24</td>
<td>Df 44.8 (57%)</td>
<td>77.61</td>
<td>6.04</td>
<td>19.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Vision</td>
<td>93.56</td>
<td>6.74 (7%)</td>
<td>94.66</td>
<td>16.39</td>
<td>6.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Annual Reports from 2008 and the Charity Commission
* Df = DfID
** EC = European Commission

With the exception of the previously mentioned INGOs receiving 30% or more of their budgets from DfID, dependency on government sources (or at least on one branch of government) is relatively low among the larger INGOs. However, the education programming within INGOs is, to a certain extent, dependent on DfID funding. While global education programming remains a priority for PPA funding those INGOs with PPAs are contractually obligated to produce it, but if the obligation was not there would the INGOs continue to fund their own domestic education programs? Historically UK INGOs have been the champions of global education, ensuring that DECs and small INGOs had resources to produce programming. Now that the “argument has been won” for global education to be mainstreamed into schools it appears that while INGOs still take responsibility for increasing development awareness among the public through campaigns, advocacy, and communications, formal education no longer needs to be part of their purview – except as a target audience for campaigns, advocacy, and fundraising materials.
The Enabling Effective Support (EES) program also exacerbated dependency issues because the program itself became dependent on DfID funding. The EES program was supposed to become sustainable by leveraging support out of the various global education stakeholders in each of the regions, but only a few of the regions managed to bring in extra funding. In 2000, the year EES was initiated, global education funding was at its peak with the larger INGOs contributing, lottery funding, and multiple local sources, but that funding all began to dry up by 2003 (E08). DfID was left to fund almost the entire EES 10-year initiative, because the local authorities and other global education stakeholders had no room in their budgets to contribute (E08, E09). This meant that instead of having a true partnership situation, the power in the relationship was heavily weighted towards DfID as the primary funder.

The plentiful global education funding from DfID has been a boon to the INGO sector, but the lack of criteria and follow up for specifically education programming does not hold INGOs accountable to creating exclusively global education programming with the funds. The Development Education Centres’ (DECs) primary interest is in education programming and they are more likely to be advocates for strict criteria for the education funding. However, they were once dependent on the large INGOs and now many are dependent on DfID funding (ranging between 40 to 50% for most of them) in addition to being involved with the EES, so their ability to lobby the government for changes has become compromised (E08). In contrast, one informant (E07) from a large INGO commented that their organization received PPA funding from DfID, but was not dependent on funding from any one government source and was even able to allocate a portion of their funding to advocate for more government support for development education. Smaller global education focused organizations (the DECs) were less likely to have a diverse funding base and more likely to be dependent on government funding. Larger INGOs tended to have diverse funding bases and even though they received substantial amounts of funding from a variety of government sources they were able to fundraise half or more of their total revenues. Whether or not the INGOs wanted to spend their funds on education programming was the most pertinent question.
An ideological shift

Funding for global education increased to £5.4 million by 2004 from £700,000 in the final year of the Thatcher government (McClosky, 2005, p. 12) and increased sixteen-fold between 1999 and 2010. Even with this demonstrated and ongoing support for global education programming world events did impact government priorities, which in turn impacted global educators. The September 11, 2001 and July 7, 2005 attacks on the US and London increased the profile of domestic security as a desired outcome of humanitarian aid and poverty reduction. In 2005 DfID produced a paper entitled “Fighting poverty to build a safer world. A strategy for security and development”, which made a clear link between aid and security issues. While examples of the three ‘d’ (defense, diplomacy, and development) joined up policy in practice exist on the international level in overseas assistance projects, domestically DfID encouraged global educators to link up with Community Cohesion policy. This policy on the surface was about civic engagement and getting people more involved at a local level. It was also quite clearly meant to address domestic terrorism by rooting out extremism born out of the nationalist groups such as the British National Party and from the religious extremist recruitment within British-born Muslim populations. For global educators wanting to connect to local conditions this policy was an opportunity to acknowledge the ghettoization and exploitation of both immigrants and of indigenous British peoples living in poverty.

Later in the decade the UK’s ideological shift was felt more tangibly by the INGO global education sector. Participants in the study and media predicted a Conservative win. During the lead up to the election (2009) negative media about DfID’s spending began to appear and the target was global education. The source of most of the criticism was the International Policy Network, a self-proclaimed “think-tank” and “educational” organization. They released the “Fake Aid” report, which lambasted the sector for spending more money on domestic propaganda then on tangible items such as vaccinations for children in poor countries. The arguments against global education and

---

16 The International Policy Network has received over $400,000 USD of funding from ExxonMobil while claiming to be an impartial group lobbying against environmental policies aimed at reducing carbon emissions.
awareness although less vitriolic and ad hominem in nature than Scruton’s 1985 attacks, have a certain similarity to their tone

DFID seems to enjoy using our school system to spread propaganda – already, 86 per cent of Fund's resources are aimed at shaping the views of children, adolescents or university students. Several grants even make a point about how easy it is to influence nursery and pre-school children, and claim to teach them about “global citizenship”. (Boin, Telegraph, 2010)

As the election drew near, these criticisms, although not substantiated, were published in popular newspapers such as The Daily Mail. Attacks on DfID’s spending held sway with citizens worried about the economy. Public censure against the Labour government grew and DfID’s global education funding structure went under review. Participant E09 relayed the news that the EES program was on the chopping block and eventually cut altogether, raising concerns that the ten-year growth of local infrastructure the initiative produced will disappear.

UK INGO global education case summary

During the UK’s post-war years people were concerned about maintaining peace and security. The INGOs that had appeared during the wars, Save the Children, Oxfam, Christian Aid, and others gained increased support from a population that was beginning to feel more economically secure and was eager to ensure that peace was maintained. The trend of INGO campaign weeks, which continue to be popular today, began in the 1950s with Christian Aid Week (the Red Letter Campaign). Even before World War II citizenship organizations, also concerned with peace, developed school-based programming focusing on notions of world citizenship. UNESCO promoted international understanding in UK schools starting in the 1950s. As economically-challenged post-World War II Britain let go of its former colonies, for both financial and moral reasons, non-European immigration from ex-colonies began to increase. Anti-immigration, racist sentiments grew, challenging global educators to address the local-to-global impacts of colonialism. The UK built the first nuclear power plants in the world and increased coal mining. These actions caused energy use to soar, which increased employment. As Cold War tensions escalated, fears over nuclear weaponry also grew. These concerns fuelled the anti-nuclear peace movement, whose concerns were represented within global
education programming. The middle class during peacetime created optimal conditions for first VSO programming at the end of the 1950s leading to the returned volunteers who would later become global educators.

The period from the 1960s to the 1980s in the UK saw the beginning of the flip-flopping between Labour and Conservative governments. Labour governments would create an international development office that was independent of the foreign affairs department. When the Conservative governments would come into power they would place the international development portfolio back within the foreign office. In the 1970s the Labour government demonstrated support for INGO global education programming by establishing dedicated funding envelope. At the end of the 1970s Thatcher’s Conservatives came into office and promptly cut the funding to global education. Public support for INGOs remained high and government support for the larger INGOs continued in the form of block grants. The INGOs had enough public support and financial resources to support and grow the global education sector. Development education centres, DECs, proliferated during this period with little to no government funding.

Campaigning continued to grow and became established INGO practice through dedicated campaign weeks and funding drives endorsed by high profile figures, such as members of the royal family. In the early 1960s INGOs banded together to circumvent charity laws so they could do advocacy through the creation of the World Development Movement, an arms-length organization that has continued to successfully advocate on behalf of the INGO sector. Immigration from ex-colonies continued in large waves and escalating racial tension coincided with late 1970s to early 1980s economic recession and employment scarcity. Race relations deteriorated in the early 1980s and riots broke out across England. Critical multiculturalists and anti-racist educators were concerned about how global education was impacting race relations in schools, that global education was causing self-esteem issues with children from developing countries and tensions with white children who felt pity, guilt, and superiority (E07). As tensions around sensitive domestic issues (poverty, race, nuclear interests) mounted, extreme nationalists (Scruton) attacked global education programming.
The 1990s signaled a turning point for UK INGO global education. Earlier in the 1990s a network of global education stakeholders had formed, NADEC, the National Association of Development Education Centres, which later became the Development Education Association (DEA) an expanded network of global education stakeholders from the INGO sector, formal education sector, and media. The formation of these associations strengthened the bargaining power of global education stakeholders enormously. When the Labour party got back in office in 1997 plans to strengthen INGO global education programming began to roll out immediately. Up until the early 2000s funding for INGO global education flowed from a variety of sources: the UK government, the European Commission, Big Lottery, other INGOs, and foundations. By the mid-2000s, the focus on schools became even stronger. DfID partnered with DCSF to promote the global dimension in schools and the Enabling Effective Support initiative was launched. As global education became more entrenched in schools via curriculum policy, INGOs, while still interested in schools as sites for increasing support, moved to programming that better impacted their bottom lines: campaigns and fundraising. The UK INGOs were not dependent on DfID, but since DfID was the primary supporter for global education, in that sense INGO global education programming was dependent on DfID. The development education centres and VSOs were the most reliant on DfID funding. The 2008 economic recession and the impending 2009 federal election accelerated an ideological shift towards fiscal and social conservatism that was felt in the INGO global education community. The Labour government’s spending on global education programming through DfID was called into question with nationalist critics once again calling ‘global citizenship’ programming in UK schools propaganda and a poor use of taxpayers money.
Chapter Six: An Historical Overview of INGOs and Global Education in Canada

Introduction

One of the key differences between Canada and the UK is their ranking in the global arena. The UK is one of the great powers, one of the few countries that has a permanent seat with veto power on the UN Security Council. Canada, like the Nordic countries, is considered to be a middle power internationalist. These are countries that are more interested in playing a cooperative and humanitarian role than that of aggressor (Pratt, 1990). Canada was one of the first countries to actively pursue this status through its role as a progressive diplomatic state. In 1956, External Affairs Minister, Lester B. Pearson, anchored the middle power diplomat status for Canada by proposing a solution that averted the Suez Canal crisis and looming world war. After Pearson’s tenure as prime minister he wrote the Commission report for the World Bank called Partners in Development (1969), which famously asked for all developed countries to commit 0.7% of their gross national product (G.N.P.) to official development assistance; the clarion call for global campaigns such as Make Poverty History and a centre piece for public awareness and global education programming. Pratt argues that Canada’s middle power internationalism works with a strand of humane internationalism, which “has moved beyond a pursuit of immediate national interests to embrace a concern with the development needs of the Third World” (Pratt, 1990, p.144). The engagement with this middle power identity started in the 1960s, which is where the story of Canadian INGO global education begins. The dramatic rise and fall of Canadian INGO global education programming is linked to the shifts in the Canadian government’s approach to its role in the world and to INGOs’ dependency on government funding.

This chapter highlights the history of Canadian INGO-produced global education programming and the surrounding socio-political influences. Documentary sources (INGO documents, academic literature, and government records) were used in conjunction with the personal accounts from people who have worked in the global education sector with Canadian INGOs and the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) to highlight the context and influences on INGO global education programming in Canada. The two main sections focus on the rapid uptake of INGO
global education from the 1960s to the 1980s, and the crossroads from the 1990s to the 2000s. INGO global education is examined in connection with the government policies that supported global education programming and the influences of social movements. Canada’s global education programming (INGO as well as school-based) is surveyed and discussed in relation to advocacy, campaigns, and fundraising programming; government relations; and the key debates and tensions that have affected the field.

**Early INGO and global education-related programming in Canada**

Before the 1960s Canada’s INGO sector mainly consisted of sister organizations and committees of head INGO offices based in the UK and the United States. An early example of INGO work in Canada is that of the Canadian Save the Children Fund Committee, which dates back to 1921. Their work was to engage Canadians with a campaign to support famine relief efforts in Russia. According to Save history the Canadian committee was inspired by the work of the Friends Service Committee in the United States, established in 1917. The committee members were dedicated pacifists whose work initially involved protecting conscientious objectors to war, but grew to include providing relief to victims of famine (Save the Children, 2005). Some of the teachers’ unions had long histories with international solidarity. The British Columbia Teachers Federation (BCTF) for example, had established a Goodwill Day "to advance world peace and to promote international good-will." in 1923 (BCTF, 2011). However, it was not until 1950 when Canada joined the Colombo Plan, an early cooperative effort among Commonwealth countries to support international development in Asia and the Pacific region, that the Canadian government became involved with international development. From 1950 to 1960 Canada’s efforts to support international development were scattered, but continued to build momentum with a small technical assistance program (Morrison, 1998, p. 28).

Unlike the UK where efforts to educate about international understanding date back to the mid-1930s Canada’s history with INGO global education is rooted in the nonformal education practices that took place in labour unions, churches, and with relief organizations like the Red Cross and the Canadian branch of the Friends Service Committee, and the work of social movements (Christie, 1983, p. 8; Mundy et al., 2006).
Citizenship education was taught in schools across Canada, but for the most part focused almost exclusively on nationalism and assimilation (Evans et al., 2009, p. 25; Hodgetts, 1968). Among the few early examples of school-based learning of global perspectives was the UNESCO Associated Schools Network with twenty-six schools participating in the project starting in 1955 (UNESCO, 2002).

In the 1960s the volunteer-sending overseas sub-sector began to take shape. World University Service of Canada (WUSC), originally a relief organization established post-World War I, started sending university students and professors to the Middle East and Asia in the 1950s (WUSC, 2009). A few years later the Canadian University Service Overseas (CUSO) program, soon to be the undisputed darling of the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA), got started in 1959. These volunteer sending programs, were a catalyst for the surge of global education programming in the following decade.

**Canada as a champion of global education: 1960s to 1980s**

Canadian INGO global education programming grew rapidly during the period between the 1960s and the 1980s. In 1960 Canada opened an External Aid Office, which spent $558 million on overseas aid in its first five years. By the late 1960s the Canadian government had helped support volunteer-sending organizations to send over 6000 Canadians overseas (Smillie, 1985). Returned overseas volunteers were integral to encouraging INGOs and the international development sector as a whole to provide educational programming about the “developing” world to domestic audiences. It was a case of providing education, information, and awareness programs in what could be considered a vacuum, as global education programming prior to the mid-1960s was limited.

During the 1960s Canadian international development organizations multiplied in number, collectively raising upwards of $34 million for overseas initiatives. Since the INGOs had demonstrated that the Canadian public was eager to support overseas development projects, the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA), established in 1968, created a special branch just for INGOs that offered them matching grants (Smillie, 1985, p. 263). It was through Maurice Strong’s work within CIDA (and
External Affairs before that) from 1966 to 1970 that the agency’s relationship with INGOs became interwoven. During his time as President many returned CUSO volunteers and young people with international experience became part of the agency’s bureaucracy and strengthened the organization’s ethos of valuing authentic learning and engagement with the Canadian public (Hunt, 1987).

The first Canadian umbrella organization for international development, the Overseas Institute of Canada (OIC), was established in 1962. The OIC brought citizens and stakeholders together to discuss Canadian aid. This organization was the forerunner to the Canadian Council for International Cooperation, (CCIC), which was established in 1968 with funding from CIDA to coordinate the work of INGOs and to increase public engagement with Canada’s international cooperation programming (Morrison, 1998, p. 70; CCIC, 1982, p.19; Christie, 1983, p.10). With the combination of a government that was encouraging of public participation in international development policy and the newly returned volunteers eager to teach Canadians about the developing world, the global education sector began to take shape.

Canada’s close relationship with the INGO sector began with the volunteer-sending organization, CUSO. In the 1960s when CIDA first started funding INGOs, CUSO and its forerunner, Canadian Overseas Volunteers, were the initial and only recipients. In 1966 the External Affairs Office gave CUSO $500,000. In 1968 after CIDA was established the INGO funding program allocated $3 million to Canadian INGOs. Of that $3 million, $2.3 million went to CUSO (Morrison, 1998, p.70). For CIDA CUSO’s volunteer placements overseas were very cost efficient, each volunteer costing approximately $5000. The annual (later upgraded to multi-year) financial agreements were based on an estimate of potential volunteer placements. In 1972 CUSO received 90% of its funding from CIDA. This was not the case for other INGOs, some of whom questioned the fairness of CUSO’s arrangements with CIDA (Smillie, 1985, pp. 264-265).

Learner centres and regionalized global education programming

The catalyst for Canadian global education programming can be traced back to the summer of 1965 when the first cohort of 150 Canadian University Service Overseas
(CUSO) cooperants, who had just served two-year placements in fifteen countries, returned to Canada. These volunteers were eager to share their new understandings of the world with fellow Canadians, who had little exposure to international development issues. Part of CUSO’s Development Charter was “To Serve and to Learn” and eventually that was extended into a global education department, but not until the early 1970s (Smillie, 1985, p. 123). Prior to the establishment of an actual education department CUSO compiled development information in their Ottawa office and had produced an international journal, but felt that they did not have the necessary reach. The next step was to collect the resources into a “Mobile Learner Centre”, which went on to be the cornerstone of Canada’s global education movement in the 1970s (p. 130).

The rapid growth of learner centres across Canada in the 1970s can be attributed to the London Learner Centre’s success. It provided the prototype for the centres that would follow. Many of the larger aid agencies such as the Canadian Catholic Organization for Development and Peace, Oxfam Canada, and CUSO all set up regional offices across the country, primarily to establish a local presence and to do outreach and global education programming (Gallagher, 1983, p. 37). The global education network strengthened as the regional offices and CCIC “joined forces with and supported the nascent learner centres in each region” (Christie, 1983, p.13). Participant C08, who worked with Oxfam in the 1970s, recalls that

they all had these various offices across the country who would collaborate with the development education centre in the communities or province where they were located. So you had this informal synergy at a local level that was beyond just the local development education centre.

Oxfam became one of the first Canadian INGOs to have a global education program that was primarily in schools. They also started to advocate for more radical change in the development sector, holding awareness-raising sessions on Apartheid in South Africa, lobbying the government on trade and aid policies, and supporting Canadian Native rights initiatives (Atkinson, 1989, p.16). There were also a number of major contributions, besides the learner centres and INGO regional offices, to Canada’s development education scene. One of those contributions was the Anglican, Catholic, Lutheran, Presbyterian, and United Churches of Canada’s project GATT-Fly (1973) created to collectively challenge unjust economic structures. GATT-fly spun off into a
global education program called Ten Days for World Development\textsuperscript{17} (Christie, 1983, p. 11-12), which had vestiges in Canada up until the early 2000s.

**CIDA support for global education**

It was support from CIDA that allowed this rapid growth in global education structure to happen across Canada. In 1971 after convincing the Treasury Board to agree, CIDA launched the Development Education Program fund. The Canadian Council for International Cooperation (CCIC) was the first recipient of these matching funds for the Development Education Animateur Program (DEAP). Seven development education animateurs across the country were funded. At the same time CUSO’s “Mobile Learner Centre”, also funded by CIDA, visited eight cities across Canada.

Between the work of CCIC’s animateurs and CUSO’s mobile learning project, over a dozen learner centres\textsuperscript{18} appeared over the following year, also financed by CIDA’s matching grants (Smillie, 1985, p. 131; Morrison, 1998, p. 128). The CCIC’s animateur program was supplemented with funds from the larger aid agencies (such as Oxfam, CARE, and Foster Parents among others) and churches. Once the four-year funding period (for the CIDA matched grant) had ended CCIC set up regional and provincial councils to carry out the global education work. The learner centres’ original purpose was that of a distributing resources about the ‘Third World’, primarily to teachers and students. Then later in the 1970s the centres began to develop community programming (Christie, 1983, p.12).

The global education movement in Canada during the 1960s and 1970s, while locally-developed, depended almost exclusively upon international development-related federal sources. The Development Education Program (the following year it was institutionalized and renamed the Public Participation Programme) provided $600,000 the first year (1971-1972) for global education programming (Hollingsworth, 1983, p. 24). This fund grew to upwards of $3 million a year by the end of the 1970s, which at the

\textsuperscript{17} Ten Days for Global Justice was a 10-day period of education and action on global issues.

\textsuperscript{18} IDERA in Vancouver, The Arusha Centre in Calgary, The Edmonton Learner Centre, One Sky in Saskatoon, IDEA Centre in Winnipeg, Thunder Bay Learner Centre, The Ottawa-Hull Learner Centre, The Cross Cultural Communication Centre in Toronto, SHAIR in Hamilton, Global Community Centre in Kitchener, St. Mary’s International Centre in Halifax, and the Oxfam Centre in St. John’s (Christie 1983, p. 11).
time, was more than any other country’s contribution to global education programming (Smillie, 1985, p. 132). By 1987 this amount had grown to $11.1 million allocated to 306 initiatives through 138 organizations (Hunt, 1987, p. 67; Atkinson, 1988; Smillie & Helmich, 1998, 1999). The agency as a whole had a $2 billion budget and over 1000 employees, a substantial growth since 1966 (Smillie, 1985, p. 272). The funding for the PPP increased as it was a priority for the agency to raise public understanding, even though the global education sector was critiquing CIDA and Canada’s international policies (p.170).

**Table 3: CIDA-PPP Disbursements in 1971-7, 1980-81, and 1985-86**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>1971-72</th>
<th>1980-81</th>
<th>1985-86</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Amount Disbursed</strong> ($ thousands)</td>
<td>600.1</td>
<td>3,438.1</td>
<td>9,080.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Clients Funded</strong></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Disbursement per Client</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Dollars ($ thousands)</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>64.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant (1981) Dollars($ thousands)</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>49.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The desired PPP outcomes were as follows:

- to raise awareness of development issues among Canadians;
- to encourage active public interest and involvement in international development (e.g., volunteering and fundraising)
- to increase Canadian support for development assistance (through private donations and support for ODA). (Hunt 1987, p. 67)

The fund was open to any non-governmental, non-profit organizations that had the capacity to carry out the proposed project, and the organizations did not have to have a mandate to carry out international development work (Hunt, 1987, p.67). One of the study participants, C06, worked for an INGO in the 1980s that was looking for support for a global education curriculum initiative project from their primary funder, the United Church. However, the organization eventually gave up on the church’s bureaucratic structure and turned to CIDA. The Agency gave them $15,000 with comparatively little red tape. Organizations had to contribute at least a third of the costs, which could be in-kind contributions, with middle-sized to larger organizations expected to contribute on a one-to-one basis, but the funding formula was flexible (p.68).
One of the contributing factors to this era of peak support for global education was the staffing at CIDA. Lewis Perinbam became the head of CIDA’s NGO branch in 1967. He was CUSO’s founding executive secretary and had a keen interest in engaging Canadians in international development.

Unless Canadians could have a sense of participation, this whole thing would seem very remote from them. Participation was also a means of building enlightenment and informed support for the whole international development endeavour. (Perinbam cited in Morrison, 1998, p.69)

By the early 1970s CIDA increased its support of INGOs from $9.2 million in 1971 to $42.2 million in 1977 (Morrison, 1998). They also realized the need to increase Canadians’ support for international development and to strengthen the sector. With this in mind, Romeo Maione was appointed head of the NGO Division (Perinbam became vice-president of Special Programs). Maione was an “experienced labour activist” who strengthened the NGO Division’s connections with “organized labour, Canadian-based community organizations, and francophone institutions” (Morrison, 1998). During INGO global education’s peak in Canada key positions in CIDA were staffed with people who valued the notion of Canadians becoming informed and engaged within the international development sector.

In the early 1980s funding was directed at locally-developed projects. Later on in the decade the funding was increasingly allocated to the regional and national INGOs, providing encouragement for these INGOs to start global education programs, but at the same time inhibiting the growth of local programs (Morrison, 1998, p.67). Canadians in every province (although very limited in the Yukon and Northwest Territories) had access to global education programming of some kind - public engagement and awareness raising, non-formal adult education/community-based learning, and/or programming specifically for schools and universities. The caveat to this was that the programming was still mainly available in urban centres.19 Servicing rural areas was high on the priority list of the learner centres and INGOs, but not within their budgets. The many church networks that were involved with global education programming did allow some people in rural areas the opportunity to engage with development learning.

---

19 Atkinson notes that “some of the active and innovative development education was happening in mid-sized provincial cities like Saskatoon and Regina or St. John’s and Halifax” (1989, p.9).
Socio-political shifts and Canadian global education peaks

Politically, the mid-1980s marked the beginning of a period in which Canada began aligning itself policy-wise with its neighbours to the south and east. The Cold War tensions that Reagan and Thatcher kept aflame were playing out violently in Central America. Conservative Prime Minister Mulroney lined up with the corporate sector to support the free trade agreement and gave Canadian corporations carte blanche to write their own rules of engaging with the state. In 1985 the Business Council on National Issues (BCNI) wrote a new version of Canada’s competition law that did not allow for class-action suits against corporations, and prosecutions were reduced from criminal to civil courts. According to Newman (1998), “it was the only time in the history of capitalism that any country allowed its anti-monopoly policy to be written by the very people it was meant to police” (p.156).

Although the era of the Liberal party’s humane internationalists as leaders had ended and social policies began to rapidly shift towards free market economics, Canada’s diplomatic role and the welfare state stayed close to status quo for most of the 1980s. The bureaucratic, CUSO-infused core of CIDA did not change much either, so the learner centres that critiqued government and corporate policies were still being funded.

That was the Progressive Conservatives at the time, a government that you would never recognize if you never lived through that epoch. It was very different, slightly to the right, but clearly in the centre and also had individuals within it that were just as progressive as anything in the progressive arm of the Liberal party. It depended a bit on the minister, but I can’t recall any real shift that occurred as a consequence of a change of government. But it wasn’t political in that end. (C08)

Canadian global education peaked during the 1980s. In 1986 the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) ranked Canada second out of fourteen OECD member countries for the amount of funding allocated to global education programming and fourth on a per capita basis (Atkinson, 1988, p. 11). This growth in the global education sector attracted outside interest in Canada’s programming. The Australian Council for Overseas Aid (ACFOA), wanting to strengthen its own global education programming, commissioned two studies on Canadian global education. The

---

20 The Business Council on National Issues (BCNI) spent $20 million lobbying the government to accept the free trade agreement (Newman 1998, p.156)
first study, conducted by Janet Hunt in 1987, compared fifteen learner centres in the U.S.A. and twenty-nine in Canada.\textsuperscript{21} The next study was conducted by Jeffrey Atkinson in 1989 and followed-up on some of these organizations. In Hunt’s (1987) report she notes the three main trends of the period

1) The network of learner centres had adjusted from being solely resource centres, to becoming community organizing bodies creating their own development education materials;

2) National aid agencies regionalized their programs and linked with the local learner centres as they realized that interests varied greatly from region to region; and

3) It was necessary to draw on the independent research initiatives of INGOs and churches to supply the network with up-to-date information about Canada’s role in development. (p. 5)

The reports give a snapshot of the time period, one in which the Canadian government recognized the importance of having a joined-up global education system that connected local experiences and learning needs to international experiences, issues, and resources.

\textbf{Tensions}

As the decades progressed a range of issues began to impact the sector, starting with the ideological rifts within and among INGO global educators that threatened their relationship with federal funders. Political movements such as the Black Power movement from the late 1960s and to the early 1970s brought about a whole new level of awareness in the international development sector and influenced global educators and the way they practiced. A critical mass of INGOs and learner centres in particular crossed ideological boundaries that would alienate them from their allies at CIDA. One of the first organizations to get their global education funding pulled by CIDA was CCIC. During the World Food Conference in Rome in 1974 CCIC was linked to relaying information about the Agency’s work and accused of “threatening to worsen the Agency’s own political security within government” (Morrison, 1998, p.129). This conflict did not appear to permanently damage CCIC’s relationship with CIDA.

Global educators with more radical leanings ran into difficulties in the mid-1970s. Global education learner centre networks in Halifax and Quebec both delved into issues

\textsuperscript{21} Another researcher prepared a report on Sweden, the Netherlands, and Britain.
that made the government decidedly uncomfortable. The Halifax groups were already splintering over ideological differences. Some wanted to break entirely free of CIDA, others wanted to take a more moderate approach. One group produced a publication that attempted to link the underdevelopment issues in the Atlantic Region and Angola. They connected the government-subsidized and collapsed Gulf Oil refinery in Nova Scotia to the deep impoverishment in Angola that existed despite the high profits made by foreign-owned Gulf Oil in the region. Similarly, Quebec global education groups launched a campaign entitled “Zones of Liberation” aligning Quebec nationalism with the exploitation in Angola. Coincidently, CIDA’s Public Participation Program (PPP) funds for both these regions were cut down to approximately a third of their original amount, while all the other regions received the same or more as in previous years (Belliveau, 1983, p. 68).

Other aid organizations also found that they had put their funding at risk by supporting liberation movements, both in terms of private donations and CIDA funding. In 1973 Oxfam Canada, like its sister organization in the UK, began to support liberation movements in the global South and to shift away from a “charity/relief approach to one based on a radical political analysis” in order to focus their work on “transforming the attitudes of Canadians which effectively support injustice at home and abroad” (1973 White Paper on Political Affairs cited in Atkinson, 1987, p. 16). Internally these social change goals conflicted with fundraising goals within Oxfam, but also ended up alienating their constituency, collapsing their donor base, and creating distance and tensions with the wider INGO community (Smillie, 1985, p. 133; Atkinson, 1987, p. 16). This rift over ideology ended up splitting Oxfam Canada and Oxfam Quebec, with Quebec choosing to take an apolitical stance.

The Canadian University Services Overseas (CUSO), which received upwards of 93% of its funding from CIDA, was also almost on the chopping block in the 1970s over an ideological rift between CUSO and its sister organization (they were legally connected) in Quebec, SUCO (Service universitaire canadien outre-mer). In 1977 the Executive Director Robin Wilson was lambasted during an interview with CITY-TV’s Morton Shulman over a pro-Palestinian Liberation Movement/anti-Israel pamphlet produced by the SUCO office. Shulman challenged Wilson over the organization’s
supposed non-governmental status, yet almost complete reliance on government funding (Smillie, 1985, pp. 135-136). It might have been the death of another organization, but CUSO managed to weather the storm with its funding intact.

A national study conducted by the Coopérative et de Consultation of Montreal in 1981 outlined the discrepancies between the “priorities and criteria” of CIDA and the interests of the INGO global educators. The report noted that CIDA was encouraging greater public awareness by increasing the PPP budget, but at the same time CIDA had a “lot of power over” the organizations they funded.

Development educators provide the Canadian public with a concept of development that is not necessarily tied to Canadian economic interests, that in fact criticizes and challenges certain government policies and Canadian corporate practices. However, this is the inevitable and necessary price of raising public consciousness. (Hollingsworth, 1983, p.25)

At the time, an alignment with liberation movement and solidarity work was a natural draw for the INGO global education sector. Participants C08, C15, and C06, who had all either worked on or participated in global education initiatives in the 1970s, 1980s, and/or early 1990s, spoke about their connections to local solidarity networks in Canada that linked to international issues. In the 1960s natural gas reserves were found in the Beaufort Sea and oil companies were eager to get the rights to construct a pipeline that would transport oil and gas from the North West Territories through the Yukon to Northern Alberta. The pipeline was proposed to go through ecologically sensitive areas and lands with settlements of First Nations peoples, which led to the Mackenzie Valley pipeline inquiry/Berger Commission and a critical synthesis of local-to-global solidarity among community-based and international development organizations. Participants C06 and C08’s work on the No Pipeline Now Coalition linked them with local (Canadian) indigenous issues. “Issues in terms of indigenous rights in the North were comparable to the rights of people living in colonial conditions in Africa at the time” (C08).

During the 1980s the heated conflicts in Central America drew members and the staff of INGOs, such as Oxfam and CUSO, to work informally together with solidarity networks from Central America. Participant C08 describes the work as not being a part of the mandate of their organizations necessarily, but they were able to, “align with initiatives like the People’s Food Commission”. C08 attributed their inclination for
solidarity work to their roots in the anti-war movement and felt that this work is less likely to happen now because organizational finances are much more tightly controlled.

A ‘democratic summer’, wrote Michael Belliveau, a former labour organizer and solidarity worker, is a term Bolivian development workers use “to depict periods when the surveillance and demands of the State seem to relax, so that it is possible to do some development education work” (Belliveau, 1983, p.69). According to Belliveau, Canada experienced a kind of ‘democratic summer’ between 1967 and 1975 when the Canadian government financed all kinds of progressive initiatives (the Black United Front, the Unions of Indians, Acadian groups for development projects, welfare rights groups, civil liberties groups, cooperatives and so on). However, “the Democratic Summer turned to autumn and the CIDA PPP unit reflected the shift, which in turn corresponded to a downturn in the economy, an inevitable outgrowth of problems at the Imperial center in America” (Belliveau).

**INGO global education in schools: 1970s to 1995**

The CIDA-funded and INGO volunteer-run learner centres that had sprung up across Canada had evolved in a very localized way that depended on the political-leanings of the volunteers running the particular centres and the interests of local teachers and students (Smillie, 1985; Christie, 1983). Many of the early learner centres were established by former CUSO cooperants (volunteers). In light of a disastrous Peace Corp incident\(^\text{22}\) that resulted in an anti-American protest and the eventual expulsion of the program, CUSO was extremely cautious to ensure that their cooperants understood the complexity of the worlds they would be entering. The pre-departure training included anti-colonial, anti-racist programming. Some training was facilitated by black activists who at times discouraged white cooperants from even participating, particularly if they were not being clear with themselves about their intentions for volunteering overseas (Smillie, 1985, p. 126). While not every CUSO cooperant came back to Canada a radical most were

---

\(^{22}\) A Peace Corp volunteer living in Nigeria accidentally dropped a postcard describing the conditions as poverty-stricken and primitive. The card was copied and distributed around the university, resulting in an anti-American demonstration as well as anti-American sentiments. These sentiments festered for seven years until the Nigerian Government kicked the Peace Corp out of the country (Smillie, 1985, p.125).
transformed in some way by their experiences, which parlayed into their global education practice.

Despite their sometimes radical leanings, the intention of CUSO’s earlier efforts was to get global education programming into Canadian schools. However, the global education efforts remained distinctly regionalized. CUSO, Oxfam and other INGOs with global education programming had hoped to get into the school system, but had limited success for several reasons. INGOs and learner centres were not able to establish global education programming in schools because (a) it was too complex with education in Canada being a decentralized, provincial, rather than national responsibility, and (b) because of that decentralization, provincial and territorial ministries of education were often highly regionalized. It stood to reason that instead of wasting efforts trying to get global education programming into schools across Canada the already localized learner centres and INGO regional offices could develop programming to accommodate regional differences (Christie, 1983, p.13)

Creative tension has persisted, between the need for autonomous and relevant community and regional programs on the one hand, and the strategic value of (and sometimes national agency desire for) a country-wide content focus or campaign, on the other. (Christie, 1983, p.13)

Encouraging global education in schools over non-formal global education programming was another means of centralizing the programming, and ideally the formal education sector would share the costs involved. Even though prior attempts had been unsuccessful, CIDA wanted the sector to become more strategic in terms of its target audiences and started to direct more support towards the public school system in the 1980s (Gallagher, 1983, p.41). The term “global education” rather than development education (the term used by INGOs up until the mid 1990s) was used when working with schools (Hunt, p.70). This redirection of CIDA’s attention encouraged more INGOs to connect with schools. For example, Inter Pares hired professional educators to work on the “Common Heritage” Programme that would produce teacher in-servicing and curriculum. Eventually Inter Pares stepped aside and the program continued to run on CIDA funding (Hunt, 1987, p.48). However, as noted by Christie (1983) the program ended up demonstrating the importance of locally-developed resources, as teachers surveyed across the country felt that the materials were designed for somewhere else
within Canada and not useful for their own regional contexts (Atkinson, 1989, p. 48). While there was a push from CIDA and an interest sector-wide in getting global education into schools, Canadian INGOs made few in-roads into schools compared with their counterparts in the UK.

A schism still existed between the 1970s form of adult education, community organizing style of the learner centres and the “professionalization” of global education of the 1980s that led to certified teachers being hired to prepare classroom-ready curriculum. There were two areas of disjuncture affecting INGO global educators working with the schools. From the formal education side global educators were criticized for not having any or enough understanding of curriculum needs or pedagogical practices. From the global educator side there were issues with fundraising as a follow up to the global education lessons. Participant C06’s organization had wanted to keep the two separate, but in the feedback on their education kits teachers were demanding that fundraising activities be attached to the materials. This difference in approach to fundraising is indicative of some of the ideological struggles that INGO global educators were faced with when trying to meet the interests of teacher and schools (Mooney, 1983).

**Canadian INGO global education at a crossroads: 1995 to 2010**

The 1990s marks a change of fortune for Canada’s INGO global education programming sector. The funding bubble burst for Canada’s global education programming in 1995 destroying most of the infrastructure built up through the 1970s and 1980s. Then the early years of the 2000s brought changes in aid policies, an increased emphasis on aid effectiveness, and a move towards the securitization of aid post 9/11, all of which had repercussions for global education programming and the development sector in general.

The global education sector continued to flourish in Canada up until the mid-1990s. Learner centres and INGOs diversified to incorporate more schools-based programming, which was an area that CIDA favoured over the loosely structured community education programming that so often included advocacy and a stinging critique of Canadian aid, trade, and domestic policies. The 1990s saw the end of Mulroney’s Conservative leadership in 1993, but not until after he had made considerable changes to the Canadian political landscape. The Conservative government avoided
getting too close to the Reagan Doctrine and the Cold War-related foreign policy issues plaguing Canada’s international solidarity network. However, the government’s position became more blatant in opposition to global solidarity work when it demonstrated its preference for the privileges of corporations over the rights of vulnerable peoples through its clear support for the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), the General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS), and the Multi-lateral Agreement on Investment (MAI). These controversial agreements allowed wealthy states and large corporations to protect their profits through circumventing labour, environment, and other in-country regulations that protect human rights.

In 1992 David Selby and Graham Pike, who played foundational roles in global education with their multidimensional theory of global education in the UK, moved to Canada to start the Centre for Global Education at the University of Toronto. At that time Canada was viewed internationally as being progressive in its range of global education programming (Hunt, 1987, Atkinson, 1989) and as having one of the most global education-supportive international development agencies (Smillie, 1985; Smillie and Hemlich, 1998). Unbeknownst to Pike and Selby, a lean state agenda similar to the one that cut out government support for global education programming in the UK throughout the 1970s to early 1990s, would appear in Canada within three years of their arrival. Budget cuts at federal level affected funding for INGOs. The federal budget cuts in turn put an increased load on the provincial budgets, and in some provinces, such as Ontario, literally wiped out the INGO global education community.

The 1995 budget cuts: INGO global education decimated

Budget cuts to Overseas Development Assistance (ODA) and other international development programs during the economic downturns in the 1970s and 1980s, left the Public Participation Program (PPP) and INGO decentralized funding untouched until 1995. In 1993 Jean Chrétien’s Liberals swept into power with a majority win and set about reducing Canada’s $42 billion deficit almost immediately. It was these deficit-reducing measures, put into place by Finance Minister Paul Martin in 1995, that caused the almost overnight disappearance of Canada’s once renowned INGO global education sector.
It was apparent that by 1995 CIDA was almost a completely different agency than the one of the 1970s and 1980s when it was staffed with former CUSO volunteers: people with a deep and politicized commitment to international development and by extension global education. By the mid-1980s this cohort of ex-CUSO cooperants began to retire and CIDA’s bureaucracy shifted towards “professional management”. The CIDA of 1995 was staffed by people who were not necessarily hired for their commitment to and understanding of international development.

You could be working in Statistics Canada and get a job in CIDA, as long as you could pass the management test. So you get this combination of lack of knowledge, that would be just by definition, you didn’t have a chance of having that knowledge, but also lack of experience and commitment that generally comes from early experience. (C08)

Starting in 1994 André Ouellet, as Minister of Foreign Affairs, took a close interest in the workings of CIDA to ensure that the agency followed the Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade’s (DFAIT) policy. Throughout that year (1994) the Liberal government went through an extensive process of gathering Canadian multi-sector input into foreign policy. Out of the process came what the Special Joint Committee saw as “two alternative visions of Canadian foreign policy”, one was a “Global Market agenda” and the other a “Global Commons agenda” the two visions differentiated between the desire for economic competitiveness and the desire to alleviate global poverty (Morrison, 1998, p. 387). The committee backed the INGO position of CIDA’s primary work being humanitarian efforts (Global Commons agenda). The committee requested a minimum allocation of 25% of Canada’s total ODA budget to be spent on basic human needs, that the Public Participation Program (PPP) be made a priority, and that CIDA’s work should clearly be about aid, “not to promote Canadian trade” (Morrison, 1998, p. 388).

The Liberals, however, reconfigured the government’s aid policy to line up more clearly with Canada’s foreign policy priorities, which included Canadian financial and business opportunities, e.g., stating that they would take a “softer line on human rights” as it may interfere with trade relations (Morrison, 1998, p. 394-5). The process for making CIDA’s work more accountable focused on results-based management and paid “scant attention to established forms of public outreach” (Morrison, 1998, p.420). The Liberal government chopped CIDA’s budget across the organization while changing
Canada’s foreign policy to more obviously reflect the self-interests of Canadians (the Global Market agenda), rather than aid recipients (the Global Commons agenda), and downplayed ODA and any reference to meeting the 0.7% target. Global education funding was completely cut. The Public Participation Program (PPP), which accounted “for only 4.5% of the voluntary-sector budget, absorbed 24.7% of the reduction to that budget” (Morrison, 1998, p.416). Approximately 90 learner centres across Canada received PPP as the core part of their budget. The Global Education Program, a fund distributed through teacher federations to infuse global education into the curriculum was also terminated.

Ouellet insisted that they were not abandoning public participation, but instead the work would be carried out by INGOs. The funding mechanism he was referring to, however, was not a dedicated global education program fund. Rather it was the option for INGOs to spend up to 10% of their overall development overseas funding on public engagement activity. This change in the funding apparatus participant C08 described as being “an accounting trick”. The INGOs also had their budgets slashed. They lost the funding that had helped cover the costs of decentralized regional offices that had carried out global education and awareness activities with communities across Canada. The idea that the INGOs could take up even a small portion of global education work that was abandoned after the bulk of the learner centres closed down was not based on a reasonable assessment of Canada’s global education programming needs.

Cranford Pratt offered three related reasons why the government defunded development education

1) There was a general de-funding of what were considered to be oppositional activist groups that were formerly valued for their contributions in the late-1960s to 1980s;

2) There was friction coming from within CIDA over “politicized NGOs critical of the Agency’s neo-conservative drift; and

3) CIDA had moved away from pluralistic to top-down decision-making processes. (Pratt cited in Morrison, 1998, p. 417)

The Canadian government of the 1970s, the one that was less resistant to critical citizen input, no longer existed in the 1990s. This new government would not tolerate the collective voice of the global education community (and other marginalized groups) who potentially stood in the way of seamless policy integration from above. Participants in the
study also remarked on this change in CIDA’s practice. Participant C08’s account of difference in government relations over the years focused on a “shift in the notion of the role of the state combined with the state’s obligation to encourage citizen engagement” and that

Trudeau’s notion [was] that the government does actually have an obligation to ensure ways that citizens are fully engaged in their own communities and in change processes around issues of justice. More than any other donor at the time, CIDA was the leader in all this.

Despite the public outcry that was much larger and more vocal than CIDA had anticipated, only a bit of transitional funding was offered. Participant C15 recalled a parliamentary assistant telling him that they had, “received more letters in the shortest period of time about the cut to learners’ centres than we did for anything else up to that point”. The learner centre that C15 worked for received 3-to-1 matching funding from CIDA before the cuts. They were offered a transition fund, but it was difficult to access eventually we just kind of gave up. Which is what I suspect CIDA was hoping would happen. Little ragtag pain-in-the-ass organizations wouldn’t get funding. In part it was because of the centralization thing. I heard senior bureaucrats once again talking about “I don’t want to have to deal with fifteen little organizations. I want to deal with three”, because of the administrative burden (C15).

The mid-1990s in Canada were dark days for those working in the development sector, especially for those who were doubly impacted by cuts on the provincial and federal levels. In Ontario, massive budget cuts affecting areas of education and health created unmanageable workloads for the nonprofit and voluntary sector. The few learner centres still in operation had to rely on volunteers and small pockets of funding to do global education programming in Ontario, British Columbia, and the Atlantic provinces. Teachers in Ontario who had once regularly used learner centre resources and made space in their classes for global issues were now facing reforms to the education system that reduced the amount of time and resources they could spend on programming that was not officially part of the curriculum. Other provinces, Saskatchewan, Manitoba, and Quebec, continued to receive provincial funding, administered by their provincial and regional councils (SCIC, MCIC, and AQOCI) enabling them to continue with modified regional global education programming.
The Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Trade

Hearing on Development Education

There was an official response to the cuts. A hearing was held on April 18, 1996 in front of the Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Trade, chaired by MP Bill Graham. The purpose of the meeting was to “explore together how we can do our work better as Canadians in understanding a much more complicated, integrated world” (FAC, 1996, p.1). The Minister for International Cooperation, the president of CIDA, the vice-president of Partnership Branch (CIDA department that works with INGOs), representatives from two INGOs, a representative from a research group, Environics, a journalist, a public policy officer and Ian Smillie, formerly of CUSO and Inter Pares, attended the meeting.

Stuart Wulff, from the South Pacific Peoples’ Foundation of Canada, made the following observations about Canada’s global education program: that it was viewed very positively and was well-studied, that the challenges of the Canadian global education context started with the inability of the centres to extend their reach, and that tensions existed because more attention (funding) was given to smaller grassroots organizations. Wulff argued that the smaller organizations built close ties to local communities, whereas a coordinated effort at the national level would have a strategic focus and perhaps make a bigger impact. At the same time Wulff acknowledged that other countries that had focused mostly on the nationally-based programs were too diluted to truly garner strong public support (FAC, 1996, p.39). Other speakers at this hearing identified that the public, youth in particular, in that period (the mid-1990s), were lacking optimism, were inwardly focused, worried about their own futures and not as willing or interested in working collectively on social justice issues as they were in the 1970s and 1980s (FAC, 1996, p.40). Towards the end of that day’s hearing the idea was raised that perhaps the global education efforts needed to be focused in secondary schools, woven into the compulsory history and geography course (FAC, 1996, p.57).

This hearing represented the end of the global education’s heyday in Canada. Its infrastructure across Canada had been dismantled. Most of the learner centres had to close down and the INGOs had to close their regional offices. Whether or not INGO global education programming happened would be up to individual INGOs to decide. It
would be a matter of determining how much of their already reduced overseas projects budgets the INGOs would be willing to cut into to provide education and awareness programming. Areas of Canada that received provincial funding could keep some of their global education programming going. Provinces with governments that did not support international development, such as Ontario, also tended to be the same provinces facing severe budget shortages and labour strife within their education, health, and welfare sectors during this period. This made it difficult for the teachers in those provinces to support the marginalized area of global education programming. The government would determine the parameters of the next iteration of global education in Canada.

**CIDA’s public engagement paradigm**

In late 1990s CIDA abandoned the use of the term development education, which portended the term’s disappearance within the INGO sector. CIDA’s Partnership Branch developed a new conceptual framework for INGOs doing global education programming: the Public Engagement Continuum. This was a five-year strategy designed to guide the public through awareness to action in terms of international development engagement. The continuum had a heavy emphasis on citizen engagement, encouraging citizens to share governance with CIDA and to become partners with them. This model proposed by CIDA seemed to be evidence that the Canadian government was looking, once again, for wider citizen engagement with international development issues. However, while the continuum continues to be referenced by INGOs and the councils for their public engagement work, it is no longer recognized by CIDA and a replacement strategy has not yet surfaced. CIDA still uses the term public engagement, but does not acknowledge the continuum.

In CIDA’s release of its 2002 statement, *Canada Making a Difference in the World: A Policy Statement on Strengthening Aid Effectiveness*, the Minister of International Cooperation claimed that

CIDA’s approach to strengthening aid effectiveness must address the role of civil society in Canada’s aid program and in development more generally, and second, many expressed support for a stronger public engagement program on development issues as essential to buttress CIDA’s programs to improve aid effectiveness and to build support among Canadians for renewed funding for development cooperation. (p.10)
What was most apparent during this period was CIDA’s strengthened commitment to accountability and aid effectiveness, which INGO global educators and teachers experienced through the rigorous results-based management process that was often ill suited to education initiatives. Four years later (2006) CIDA increased its financial commitment to supporting the public engagement work of the provincial and regional councils, but still did not produce a public engagement strategy.

CIDA decided to fund the provincial and regional councils again, after letting them flatline between 1998 and 2000. Starting in 2002, the Provincial Councils were provided $50,000 each to cover both operation and programming costs. By 2006 that funding increased to $150,000 per council, $50,000 of which was to be used strictly for public engagement activities. The Stand Alone Public Engagement Fund, SAPEF, also through Partnership Branch, was a competitive fund for INGOs that sought to “increase awareness, understanding, and engagement of Canadians”, “increase support for Canada’s international assistance program” and “create opportunities for meaningful participation in international development activities” (CIDA, 2007). This fund paid up to $150,000 in a 3-1 match and encouraged INGOs to partner up. While appreciated by the organizations wanting to do more public engagement work, the one-off nature of the funding made it difficult to gain any momentum with programming. Furthermore, the SAPEF was assessed using the RBM framework, which demands immediate, accountable results. In the economics-based paradigm of the 1990s global educators, development workers, and teachers all shared the difficult task of having to provide quantitative evidence of their success.

**Short-term “voluntourism”**

As the economy began to improve in the late 1990s to early 2000s and CIDA’s new public engagement paradigm was gaining traction, the trend of “voluntourism” began to receive increased support. The concept of sending Canadian volunteers overseas still held the same advantage to the Canadian government as it had thirty years before when CIDA’s preferred INGO was CUSO. It was a means of asserting, peacefully, Canada’s presence in the world and having returned volunteers who would be vocally and actively supportive of Canada’s Overseas Development Assistance (ODA) program. During the
1970s and 1980s CUSO focused on the quality of the global educators trying to ensure that cooperants got enough support and training before leaving and upon their return (Atkinson, 1989, p. 21-22). The difference was that now CIDA was mainly interested in sending people, predominantly young people, over for short-term volunteer placements (ranging from a year to a few months to several weeks). The longer-term overseas volunteer placements from the 1960s to the early 1990s required a commitment on behalf of the sending organization to provide both sensitivity training and orientation before participants left and debriefing sessions when participants returned.

The payback for this programming, according to Imagine Canada’s 2007 study on overseas volunteer-sending was that not only do returned volunteers have a “broadened global outlook and heightened cross-cultural sensitivities”, but that nearly two thirds of the returned volunteers “regularly volunteer in Canada” (Kelly & Case, 2007, p. 30). Offering shorter-term placements with less training and debriefing allows for greater numbers of volunteer placements, “you can count bodies that you’ve sent overseas and the number of countries and the number of placements and call it Canada’s contribution to the world” (C07). However, the focus on global education was diminished. As opportunities and demand for short-term overseas volunteer placements increase concerns have been raised about how the programming highlights both the self-interest of the Canadian government in promoting itself, and in young people looking to put an international experience on their resume (Moore, 2011; Rodrigue, 2010). International development educators such as Rebecca Tiessen have expressed concerns about the “pedagogical component of study/volunteer abroad programs”, which could serve to facilitate “cross-cultural understanding and the breaking down of stereotypes and racisms”. She believes that the experiences abroad need to be framed in a broader educational experience that enables students to think critically about their own experiences and contributions as well as the motivations of, and contributions to, Canadian foreign policy. (Tiessen, 2011, p. 83)

These concerns contrast with the descriptions of volunteer-sending overseas programming from the 1980s, described by C07. At that time “we represented the program as a development education alternative learning program”, which was well supported by the local learner centres that offered invaluable resources, such as a space to
gather and to engage with the community and importantly, to critically reflect on one’s interconnections with the global South.

**INGOs, dependency, and mission drift: The lost generation**

The dependency on CIDA funding that began in the 1960s with CUSO and the learner centres was merely worrisome in the 1970s and 1980s, but left INGOs in a compromised position from the mid-1990s and beyond. Before the 1990s there were warnings and a possible loss of funding, as in the case of the Halifax and Quebec learner centres and the Angola triangle, but this was nothing compared to the “nervousness” (C07) that pervaded the INGO community post-1995. The INGO sector’s dependency on CIDA funding became more problematic because the essential nature of the relationship between the INGO sector and CIDA had changed. Participants C15 and C08 had both commented on the change in the CIDA bureaucracy. In the late 1980s the senior bureaucrats with humane internationalist leanings were starting to retire, then in the mid-1990s the mid-level bureaucrats with CUSO and INGO experiences overseas disappeared after the budget cuts. The new people joining CIDA were hired on for their “professional management” backgrounds rather than experience with development (C08). Participant C15 referred to this change of CIDA’s character and the disappearance of INGO allies as the “lost generation”.

The Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) partnered with INGOs in the first place because of their capacity to raise public funds, indicating that these organizations could pique public interest and support for Canada’s international development sector in general. Thus CIDA had a strong rationale for supporting the learner centres and regional INGO offices that would advance Canadian’s awareness of international development issues. In the mid-1990s CIDA was still looking for increased public support and awareness, but had honed its target for public support through a strengthened communications department and business model. The communications angle was to promote a positive Agency message, rather than to rely on the hit and miss techniques of education and awareness-raising that also had the tendency to stir up criticism of the government’s foreign policy and trade practices. From the mid-1990s, with the abrupt termination of all INGO global education, to the early 2000s CIDA was
non-committal and extremely cautious in its approach towards anything to do with global education.

During that period funding for INGOs had decreased technically making them less dependent on CIDA, but the way the relationship between the INGO sector and the Agency had changed made INGOs more wary about losing their funding status. The INGOs fell from a position of trusted partners to that of a pool of competitors vying for reduced amounts of resources. As competition between the INGOs increased, INGOs fought to corner their part of the global poverty market through branding and campaigns. Yet at the same time CIDA was asking INGOs to work together on similar goals. The economic competition paradigm does not marry well with that of the former paradigm that was closer to development sector solidarity. The Agency also encouraged INGOs to become more sustainable through engagement with the private sector (e.g., corporate sponsorships or social enterprise). In 2008 - 2009, the time of data collection, the social enterprise option was just starting to get some traction in the INGO sector. Of the three least dependent INGOs looked at in this study, two of the INGOs achieved independence through their ability to raise public funds through child sponsorship schemes and the other through a combination of successful recruitment of school-aged fundraisers along with a profit-making business arm.

The three least dependent INGOs (in 2008) looked at in this study, Free the Children, World Vision, and Plan International, received under 10% of their funding from federal sources. In the case of World Vision over 85% of their income came from public donations and gifts. Plan International received over 68% of their income sources from donations, 8.7% from government grants, and the rest from sources outside Canada. World Vision and Plan International raise the bulk of their public donations through child sponsorship. Free the Children received the least amount of funding from the federal government, 1.5%. Their income came from fundraising campaigns led by school-aged children (60%), corporations (11%), foundations (18%), adult supporters (8%), and the rest from speaking engagements. In 2008 the Free the Children founders, Craig and Marc Kielburger, established the social enterprise Me to We, which profits from a variety of

---

23 These were the three least dependent INGOs investigated in this study, not necessarily the least dependent of all INGOs in Canada.
global education-related products and services, including: awareness trips to the Global South, camps, Me to We Day, books, motivational speakers, and so on. The Me to We franchise donates half of its profits to Free the Children.

The larger INGOs that were most reliant on CIDA funding tended to be among the older organizations (UNICEF 43%, Oxfam Canada 42%, and KAIROS 39%). The volunteer sending organizations, were on average were 10% more dependent than the most dependent INGOs (Oxfam Quebec 59%, Canadian Crossroads International 56%, Canada World Youth 52%, CUSO 48%). Participant C07, who had worked with a volunteer-sending organization in the past, described how INGOs faced with drastic budget cuts in 1995 began to look more to the private sector for funds. C07’s organization experienced “vision and mission drift”, compromising their organizational values in order to chase after what ended up being relatively small amounts of corporate funding ($10,000 to $20,000). The corporate funding did not contribute much financially to the organization, but C07 felt that it had served the corporations well by providing inexpensive promotion for branded products through the young participants.

Among the most dependent organizations looked at in the study were the provincial, regional, and national councils for international cooperation, which ranged from 26 to 55% dependent on CIDA funding (Quebec, Manitoba, and Saskatchewan) to 70% to 89% dependent on CIDA funding (Canada, the Atlantic Provinces, Ontario, British Columbia, and Alberta). The two councils with the least amount of federal funding had more dependency on provincial funding. The Quebec council, AQOCI (Association Québécoise des Organismes de Coopération Internationale) received 59% of its funding from the Ministère des Relations internationals and MCIC (the Manitoba Council for International Cooperation) received 54% of its income from the Manitoba government. The provincial, regional, and national councils as umbrella organizations have little to no capacity to fundraise compared to their INGO members and would consider themselves to be in competition and therefore a conflict of interest with their members if they did. Provincial and regional councils, unless they have supportive regional and provincial governments, are dependent on CIDA for funding.

The organizations that the participants worked with ranged from currently being almost 90% reliant on CIDA funding to organizations from the 1970s and 1980s (C07,
C08, C15) that were heavily reliant on CIDA at the time to current INGOs that were under 50% funded from CIDA, closer to 40% for participants C16 and C17’s organizations and less than 10% for C14’s. Of the two organizations that are 50% or less dependent on CIDA funding one (C16) used their Partnership Branch financial agreement for up to 25% of their education and engagement programming. The other participant (C17) did not believe that CIDA funds were used for education in their organization, that the proposals to CIDA were specifically for project work in the South.

Table 4: Canadian INGO Government Funding Dependency Rates for 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of INGOs</th>
<th>Revenue (CAS m)</th>
<th>Expenditure</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Government Funding</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amnesty International</td>
<td>11.13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUSO</td>
<td>14.04</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dev and Peace</td>
<td>29.82</td>
<td>F* 11.25, p** .2</td>
<td>31.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineers Without Borders</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>F .62</td>
<td>2.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamaica Self-help</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free the Children</td>
<td>15.68</td>
<td>F .021, P .3</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxfam</td>
<td>11.57</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan</td>
<td>106.53</td>
<td>F 8.7, P .165</td>
<td>107.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Cross</td>
<td>325.33</td>
<td>F 87.44, P 119.62</td>
<td>415.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Save the Children</td>
<td>13.45</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>13.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>71.63</td>
<td>F 5.78, P .008</td>
<td>71.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>War Child</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>F .92, P .88</td>
<td>5.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Vision</td>
<td>374.77</td>
<td>F 13.34, P .11</td>
<td>372.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Annual Reports from 2008 and Revenue Canada
* Federal funding – Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA)
** Provincial or regional government funding

**INGO global education in schools: 1995 to 2010**

As noted in the recommendations from the 1996 Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Trade’s Hearing on Development Education, CIDA was interested in having more Canadians aware of and engaged with Canada’s international development
program and, as in the UK, was looking to pass the responsibility for providing global education to the public school systems. The Canadian Teachers’ Federation was contracted to assess the existing global education resources and to determine what “new educational tools” would be necessary for CIDA’s launch of the Global Classroom Initiative (GCI) (CIDA, 1999, Slide 24). Funding for global education programming, which had been open to all INGOs and learner centres doing global education programming since the 1970s, would now become a smaller pool of funds only available to the formal education sector.

Later in 2001, the Canadian Teachers’ Association wrote a summary report on global education in Canada, *Education for a Global Perspective: Current Trends and Future Possibilities*. The 37-page report looked at related trends (work of the Council of Ministers of Education Canada (CMEC), CCIC, UNESCO, INGOs, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, University of Toronto’s International Institute for Global Education, and the Department of Heritage) in Canada, curriculum connections, teaching resources, networks, and compiled profiles of the work in each province and territory. The report made three main recommendations, aimed mainly at CIDA, for going forward with global education programming in Canada

1. In articulating a program, CIDA should be clear as to what it means by educating for a global perspective and should identify the vision, goals and objectives of the program. The program should be provincially based and should be given a five-year mandate with provision for a further five years.

2. In order to maximize the impact of a program aimed at educating for a global perspective and to avoid the fragmentation, redundancy and waste which often results from the competition rather than co-operation between agencies that share a common goal, CIDA should consult with and establish a program that includes UNESCO, the CMEC, the CEA, Environment Canada, CCIC and other relevant agencies.

3. Before CIDA can decide what framework would best suit its purpose, it must first decide if it wants to concentrate its efforts in certain schools or in courses. If the decision is made in favour of courses it must then decide whether it will focus on specific courses or units, adopt an infusion approach aimed at placing a global spin on all relevant courses or support the teaching of broad themes through interdisciplinary planning and teaching. (Canadian Teachers’ Association, 2001, pp. 36-37)
Despite the effort to compile the data for this comprehensive report, CIDA did not take up any of the Canadian Teachers’ Association’s recommendations for future Canadian global education programming. Resources for global education in schools were limited to the Global Classroom Initiative.

The difficulties involved in trying to make school’s timelines and accountability structures fit with those of CIDA, not to mention the complexities of working with a provincially rather than federally-based education system, caused this program to have a challenging start. There was no other federal support for global education initiatives except for the Global Classroom Initiative (GCI) and only small pockets of funding at the provincial level (through teachers’ federations and some school boards), so the GCI was one of the few funding options for determined global educators.Navigating CIDA’s bureaucracy took efforts beyond what busy teachers were willing to put forward, so INGOs tended to have to lead the project from behind. Eventually CIDA realized this and allowed INGOs to lead the project as long as they had a strong partnership with the formal education system. The fund also came with requirements that educators found odd.

In our schools program all of the teachers always mention that it’s very weird that one of the things that they’re required to do with that money is teach about how Canadians are doing great international development. That’s one of the things that they have to report on, even if they’re doing women and HIV AIDS. “Are you more aware of the role that Canadians play in international development?” That’s what we have to ask everyone in our evaluations and stuff like that. That always seems very weird to them, because that’s not what they set out to do. (C9)

The GCI was housed within CIDA’s Communications Branch, and therefore had the dual mandate of meeting the expectations of formal educators while providing a venue for positive messaging about CIDA’s international development programs.

The GCI fund provided a much needed “in” for INGOs to access schools, but even with the new fund they have not gained much access to the formal education sector. In 2005, UNICEF contracted the Comparative International and Development Education Centre (CIDEC) at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (OISE), University of Toronto to conduct a study on global education in elementary schools. This is one of the few formal studies conducted on global education in Canada since the early 1990s. From the sampling they did in schools across the country they found that INGOs were not engaging with schools in any kind of consistent manner (Mundy et al., 2007, p. 97).
Larger organizations such as UNICEF were mentioned the most frequently, but often in the cases of schools out in the rural and regional areas no INGOs (or any other external partners) were mentioned at all (Mundy et al.).

During the mid to late 1990s most INGOs who were more dependent on government funding were not able to advance their global education programming, but those organizations that were more financially independent, for example World Vision and UNICEF, were able to maintain global education departments. Also around that period, the Kielburger brothers\textsuperscript{24} founded Free the Children in 1995, which does exposure tours, global education, and public engagement with youth. Their Me to We profit-making arm (established in 2008) expanded rapidly with its clubs, programs, and educational resources found in schools across Canada and in some schools in the United States (endorsed by media mogul, Oprah Winfrey’s philanthropic project “Angels”). The INGOs that once led global education programming in the previous decades, especially Oxfam, have a diminished presence in schools. The predominance of the Me to We franchise in schools has edged many of the other INGOs out of the picture. The teachers that participant C17’s organization worked with said that the school board had “basically given carte blanche to the teachers if they want time off to do Me to We stuff, the board has endorsed it and they’re free”, but if teachers want to attend C17’s organization’s events they have to “jump through hoops” to get permission. Thus the pressure to market one’s INGO brand within schools has increased in this highly competitive atmosphere.

\textbf{From solidarity to professionalization and alienation}

The participants who had been working in the sector longest noticed the impact of professionalization on INGO global education. Participant C08 attributed the federal budget cuts and the centralization of the major INGOs that once had numerous regional offices across Canada to the trend of INGOs professionalizing the global education position into one, preferably teacher-trained, staff person. Participant C15, who worked for a learner centre, also emphasized the notion that since the mid-1990s the global education sector had shifted away from being a somewhat marginalized part of wider

\textsuperscript{24} Craig Kielburger, at the age of 12, managed to bring child labour practices to the attention of Canadians, including Prime Minister Chrétien.
solidarity movements to being even more marginalized with no particular base, neither the INGO sector nor the education sector. Youth and teachers in the early 1990s would use C15’s organization as a resource centre to hold meetings, organize conferences, and to get some guidance to carry on with projects of their own. In 1995 the cuts at the federal level to the learner centres coupled with the cuts at the provincial level (Ontario) to the education sector left teachers “really atomized” (C15). They lost both time and the intellectual freedom within the school system to pursue global education initiatives and the infrastructure once available in the community through the learner centres and the INGO regional offices were all gone.

I think the government has created the conditions for its own inability to sell overseas development assistance by not creating an authentic foundation in communities around those issues where there are people there who care and are interested in promoting them. (C15)

As the sector became more professionalized and the role of the global educator was narrowed down to one or two staff members with teacher training, global educators within INGOs became more isolated within their organizations. They were hired to make connections with the formal education sector and in order to meet the needs of teachers and schools they had to prioritize the teaching and learning goals of teachers over the bottom-line action goals (fundraising, advocacy and campaign support) of their organizations. This placed INGO global educators in a grey area where they were more aligned, understood, and valued by their teacher connections than by their co-workers within the INGO.

Campaigns, advocacy, and fundraising

Most of the informants’ contributions regarding the interaction and connections between campaigns, advocacy, fundraising, and education were focused on campaigns, particularly the Make Poverty History campaign initiated in 2005. The Make Poverty History campaign is a global coalition of INGOs and civil society organizations taken up and individualized by various countries around the world to address the 8th Millennium Development Goal regarding aid, trade, and global justice. Participant C07’s organization swung a considerable amount of the organizations communications resources towards the campaign, resulting in somewhat of a “gap in theory to practice”. C07 and C08 both
commented that Canada does not have much experience with campaigning, particularly in comparison to the United Kingdom, which was taking the lead on the MPH campaign. C08 spoke about past solidarity work on initiatives like the Jubilee debt forgiveness campaign, describing them as struggles that would go on forever, not achievable goals with finite timelines. The issue with campaigns was that

almost by necessity you distort reality, because you have to break it down into manageable bits that speak to achievable goals, so-called, and then you put all your efforts to do that. Now that might be fine under certain circumstances, but clearly it’s not fine if you’re doing that on behalf of counterparts in the South that don’t get to actually have a voice in your campaign. (C08)

This participant expressed concern that the global education movement in Europe was really just a lot of massive global education campaigns, which made C08 wonder, “if you say all the resources go to [campaigns] then who are you taking it away from?”. These comments highlight the ways in which INGOs’ focus on campaigns can be construed as an avoidance of the more time-consuming, dialogical, North-South relationships that need to be built in order for a co-determined, collaborative effort at poverty alleviation to take place.

C14’s organization moved more towards advocacy and campaigns after 2005’s Make Poverty History activity and noticed an increase in donations around that period. As the campaign carried on after its supposed end date and became “more institutionalized” with no real leadership, C14 started to be concerned about how much time to invest in the “collective” versus the organization. People in this organization were noting that the current (Harper) government was viewing Make Poverty History “as a left-leaning special interest group that they can just ignore” and advised that the organization was better off focusing on nurturing the few relationships they had with MPs in Ottawa.

The overlap between fundraising and education also caused headaches for global educators. C16, from a smaller INGO, was from a tradition that did not mix education and fundraising, While starting to become more open to the idea of people doing a bit of fundraising after they have learned about an issue they are concerned about, C16 still felt that education and fundraising should be kept apart. After a restructuring in C17’s organization fundraising is sharing a department with communications. C17 felt that
education worked well with communications and advocacy, but alluded to some tensions with combining fundraising into these departments. C14 spoke about organizational tensions between education and fundraising, but that they were trying to work out that relationship, “even if we’re [education] still seen as just a value-add to a more core program – we’ll work with that and get in there”.

Post-September 11th development policy

Even though CIDA retained its separate identity from the Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade (DFAIT), and the Department of National Defence (DND), it is evident that Canada’s foreign policy and defence priorities were being forefronted in CIDA’s public engagement and global citizenship education programming criteria. The three ‘d’ - development, diplomacy, and defence – joined-up approach to international affairs, that has become the norm in the United States and Australia, was happening in Canada and the UK (Brown, 2008). Canada’s 2005 International Policy Statement (never officially adopted by CIDA) contains a quote from the UN Secretary-General's High Level Panel on Threats, Challenges and Change:

 Development has to be the first line of defence for a collective security system that takes prevention seriously. Combatting poverty will not only save millions of lives but also strengthen States' capacity to combat terrorism, organized crime and proliferation. Development makes everyone more secure. (CIDA, 2005)

International Cooperation Minister Aileen Carroll also remarked on the domestic security threats that result from poverty in Canada’s International Policy Statement:

 Increasingly however, such poverty also poses a direct risk to Canada and our allies. We understand there are links between acute poverty and state failure, and between state failure and global security. (CIDA, 2005)

The federal government’s 3-D policy approach did not align well with the approach suggested by participants (C13, C14) who spoke about Southern partners wanting Northern INGOs to educate Canadians about the systemic issues related to poverty, so that Canadians can advocate for changes in trade and aid policies. As Canada increased the presence of troops in Afghanistan after 2001, the government had different ideas about which themes and viewpoints it wanted to forefront. Participants (C09 and C11) commented on CIDA’s encouragement to project a positive image of Canada’s
work in Afghanistan and more generally how there were recommended themes for public engagement programming that lined up with Canada’s foreign policy interests (C10).

In 2010, the dangers of being dependent on CIDA funding became a grim reality for two organizations, KAIROS and the Canadian Council for International Cooperation (CCIC). KAIROS Canadian Ecumenical Justice Initiatives received approximately 40% of its funding from CIDA during the late 2010s. In the spring of 2009 KAIROS submitted a proposal for a 4-year funding request. After waiting eight months for a response to their proposal they were called and told that their proposal would not be funded because their proposal did not align with CIDA priorities: Thus ending a 35-year relationship between KAIROS and CIDA (KAIROS Canada, 2011). A few weeks later the Minister of Immigration and Citizenship, Jason Kenney, announced at a gathering in Israel that the government defunded KAIROS because they were anti-Semitic (The Toronto Star, Saturday, December 19, 2009).

The Agency was under intense scrutiny after the images of the KAIROS contract had been released. The contract, which read as though the proposal was to be approved and even recommended for increased funding, was negated through a handwritten “not” inserted into the sentence recommending funding to the organization. Controversy arose as to how a contract that had quite obviously been drawn up in agreement to fund the INGO had been negated with a last-minute, handwritten “not” by the final signatory, the Minister of International Cooperation, Bev Oda. The Canadian Council for International Cooperation’s support of KAIROS during this period, along with its role of “critical friend” to CIDA led to CCIC also being defunded by CIDA. Their relationship had spanned 40 years. The fear that pervaded the INGO sector was no longer dismissed as paranoia; the government was practicing “punishment politics” and “message management” (CCIC, 2010). In recent years, since primary data collection for this study, even more organizations have been defunded including Rights and Democracy, the Canadian Catholic Organization for Development and Peace, and the Mennonite Central Committee. All of which raises serious questions about the state of citizen engagement with international development issues in Canada.
Canadian INGO global education case summary

In the years prior to the 1960s global education programming was non-formal and under the purview of churches and labour unions. While there was some interest in the international dimension of citizenship education, global education programming had little to no presence in schools. Canada’s signing onto the Colombo Plan in 1950 signalled the beginning of the country’s involvement with international development. The INGO global education sector was influenced by the humane internationalism introduced by Lester B. Pearson in the 1950s and carried through by the Trudeau governments up until the late 1980s. The Canadian International Development Agency’s early relationship with CUSO was based on the realization that sending Canadians overseas was good for Canada’s image in the world and lead to CIDA supporting global education programming for over 20 years.

From the mid-1960s into the early 1990s Canadian global and social justice educators were supported by a like-minded government with an inclination towards humanitarianism. The Canadian International Development Agency’s (CIDA) bureaucracy and president were tightly aligned with the INGO sector and supported the creation of one of the most highly regarded global education programs among the OECD countries. Even with the recession in the 1980s, the Cold War mentality, and increased corporatization of Canada, the INGO global education sector continued to flourish. Eventually, the outspoken critiques of Canada’s international policies from INGOs and learner centres were curtailed through threats to cut funding.

The decentralized nature of Canada’s education system made it too difficult to get global education into schools. Instead, the learner centres and INGO regional offices focused their efforts on developing localized programming for their regions. They were able to create innovative, responsive, and contextual programming. However, the global education organizations’ loose network across Canada was extremely vulnerable to the budgetary decisions of CIDA upon which most of them were heavily dependent. The INGO global education sector started to shift away from a local to global solidarity paradigm to one of professionalization in the early 1990s. Global educators were mostly formally trained teachers by this period who began to feel isolated within their international development organizations. The federal budget cuts across Canada in the
mid-1990s hobbled the INGO sector and decimated the once vibrant community of learner centres across Canada.

Since the massive budget cuts of 1995 the INGO global education sector has not been able to gain much traction with CIDA. The almost complete dependency that the learner centres had on government funding made them easy to “disappear” when they became too critical of the government and were not providing enough tangible outcomes. The problem for CIDA was that they destroyed nearly all the INGO global education infrastructure in one stroke. An increased awareness of international development among Canadians was desirable for the Agency, but they became nervous and outright resistant to the idea of possibly funding organizations that might be critical of their work. At the same time, INGOs that had a bit of budgetary discretion to spend on public engagement were internally conflicted about whether or not to produce education material or to focus on campaigns, advocacy, or even fundraising activities that more directly related to their organizations’ mandates.

In the early 2000s CIDA began to dedicate some funding to public engagement through the provincial and regional councils and opened a funding scheme to support global citizenship education programming in schools. Re-igniting the INGO global education community after the government razed it in 1995 proved to be challenging on many levels. An INGO sector dependent on government funding is legitimately nervous about critiquing Canada’s international development policies. Coordinating federal-level programming through the provincially-based education systems has always been challenging in terms of consistency and communications. Due to further economic downturns global education was considered an extravagance. These were the hostile conditions surrounding global education programming in Canada at the end of the first decade of the 2000s.
Chapter Seven: Case studies of Save the Children in the UK and Canada

Introduction

This chapter examines two sister organizations in the UK and Canada to gain a better understanding of how the nature of INGO global education programming in the two countries has shifted. Unlike the wider study, which covers fifty years of INGO global education programming, these case studies focus primarily on a decade of Save the Children Canada and Save the Children UK’s global education programming from 2000 to 2010. This section of the study seeks to respond to the research questions, “how has the nature of global education programming shifted in INGOs in the two international contexts of Canada and the United Kingdom?” and “What accounts for these shifts?”

The comparison begins by looking at the organizations’ early shared history as a solidarity movement. The organizations’ current forms, their size, structure, budget, and overseas programming and how they compare to other Save the Children (SC) sister organizations around the world are discussed. The Save the Children is then explored through its Alliance structure. The organizations’ education, campaigns, and advocacy programming are analyzed and discussed in terms of how they align with the study’s conceptual framework of educational typologies and ethical positionings. The chapter concludes with a short comparative analysis of the two sister organizations, their organizational and institutional influences, and how the educational models and ethical positionings map onto Save the Children Canada and Save the Children UK’s choices for global education programming. An analysis of the two organizations is included in the analysis of the wider study provided in Chapter Nine.

History of Save the Children

Save the Children is a particularly interesting INGO to study for many reasons. To begin with the organization predates most of the other big international development charities (with the exception of the Red Cross founded in 1859). It is also an organization founded by women. Eglantyne Jebb and her sister Dorothy Buxton co-founded the Save the Children’s Fund in 1919. For their era, these women demonstrated a surprising amount of understanding around issues of gender, race and class and tolerance regarding sexual
orientation, ability, and faith. Throughout the interviews for this study (including those interviews outside of SC) the idea that in order to have a global education program that worked an organizational “champion” was needed, surfaced repeatedly. Eglantyne Jebb, seen in Figure 8, was a champion for human rights in general and children’s rights in particular.

**Figure 8: Eglantyne Jebb, founder of Save the Children**


Eglantyne and her sister put themselves in the line of fire by going against government mandates during a period of virulent nationalism, by travelling into war-torn areas, and by speaking out amidst public scorn for “feeding the children of the enemy”. The sisters and their colleagues were champions for unpopular causes, demonstrating progressive attitudes towards gender, race, creed and class.

In this study people’s “global ideals” are an important overarching connection between the global educators working with INGOs and the approaches of their organizations and the institutions, foundations, and other powerful stakeholders in international development. It is therefore of interest to trace the genesis of the global
ideals of one of the key actors in this narrative, Eglantyne Jebb. According to the biographers, Francesca Wilson (a woman who was moved by the work of SC while doing her own relief work with Quakers in Vienna 1919) and more recently Save the Children UK’s Clare Mulley (2009), Eglantyne grew up in a loving and socially progressive gentry family. “She was brought up in an environment, not uncommon among the leisure classes of the nineteenth century, which at its best was fruitful in producing social reformers” (Fuller, 1951, p. 19).

The extended Jebb family were part of social circles that included social and political figures such as: former British Prime Minister and novelist, Benjamin Disraeli; Calvinist Thomas Carlyle; the utopian socialist William Morris; poet Robert Browning; Alfred Lord Tennyson; actress Ellen Terry; William Thackery; George Eliot; and Mark Twain (Eglantyne’s uncle was married to an American woman). Eglantyne was friends with the Keynes family (she worked for the mother of famous economist Maynard and was close friends with the daughter Margaret), the Darwins, and George Bernard Shaw, among others, who later became great allies for her social justice work. As well, she had strong female role models including her feisty Aunt Bun who ensured that Eglantyne and her sisters went to university at a time when it was generally considered unbecoming for a woman to do so. Her worldview and determination to challenge social injustices was inspired by “women like Elizabeth Wordsworth, Charlotte Toynbee and Florence Keynes not only with their service in social welfare but also their reform work in the civic sphere, in education and local government” (Mulley, 2009, p. 96).

In 1903 Eglantyne worked for the Charity Organization Society in Cambridge, England. She created an official list of Cambridge charities resulting in the publication, *Cambridge: a Social Study* (1906). The organization surveyed the poverty in Cambridge noting the quality of the housing, the overcrowding, lack of plumbing, lighting and other areas of neglect. The publication raised many pressing social concerns and recommended labour exchanges, raising the school age, apprenticeships for young boys, and a proposition of a Working Men’s College. Eglantyne also raised concerns about the lack of urban gardens and green space. The rapidly increasing population since 1830 had resulted in haphazard city planning (or none at all) and the propagation of slums.
The wretchedness of the urban poor can no longer be taken for granted, or their circumstances be regarded as unalterable….We have created them ourselves and are responsible for combating them. (Jebb, 1903, p. 105)

Eglantyne put out an urgent call for voluntary workers. Producing this study gave her deeper insight into the conditions caused by abject poverty, which provided foundational training for her future work with Save the Children Fund. Around the same period, inspired by the work of her sister Lill, Eglantyne took a tour of agricultural cooperatives in Denmark (Mulley, 2009, p.176). She was impressed by the “moral aspect: people working together, instead of against each other” (Wilson, 1967, p. 160). This was the inspiration behind her later encouraging the Macedonian Relief Fund to help the refugees build cooperative farms on land rented from the government, rather than just hand out money. In 1914 when Lill became the Governor of the Agricultural Organization Society (AOS) she recruited Eglantyne to be the editor of its journal. Their cousin Gem, a member of the Board of Trade, remarked that Eglantyne had turned the periodical into “a most attractive guide to a new moral and economic order” (Mulley, 2009, p. 176). By 1917 the Buxtons (her sister Dorothy and her husband) had become Socialists, joined the Independent Labour Party, and were members of the Society of Friends (Quakers), a religious organization well known for its social activism. Eglantyne, although not formally a part of these organizations, shared their beliefs and practices. Eglantyne was also deeply influenced by her own increasingly fervent, religious beliefs.

During World War I Eglantyne and Dorothy, both pacifists, began some of their most ground-breaking work. They along with many others were appalled by the “blatantly propagandist tone and jingoistic reporting” in British newspapers during the war (Mulley, 2009, p.209). The reporting served to keep the British public angry with their dehumanized enemies. The sisters believed that the citizens of these enemy countries wanted peace just as much as British citizens did and sought to prove it. Between 1915 and 1920 Dorothy imported papers from Germany as well as other extracts from the foreign press (allied, neutral, and enemy). Eglantyne was charged with reviewing the French, Swiss, Italian, and Russian papers for excerpts to be published in the Cambridge Magazine. The magazine had readers all over the world who were desperate for a variety of perspectives. Dorothy Buxton had managed to get a license to purchase twenty-five enemy papers despite the censorship at the time. Overall they
imported over 100 papers, reporting on peace discussions, reprisals, treatment of prisoners, and results of war on social conditions. This university journal had one of the largest circulations worldwide and was even read in the United States, though unfortunately in Britain the pro-war, nationalist sentiments kept many booksellers from selling it (Mulley, 2009, p.219).

It was the starving people in Central Europe during and after World War I that pushed the sisters even further into action. Thousands of children and adults in the enemy countries of Austria and Germany were facing death by starvation due to the Western allies-enforced economic blockade. The sisters organized the Fight the Famine Council in January 1919, gathering the support of professors, economists (including Maynard Keynes), bishops, deans, politicians, and writers and artists such as, George Bernard Shaw, Sir Arthur Quiller Couch, Eden Philpotts, Arnold Bennet, John Galsworthy, John Masefield, and Amedeo Modigliani. They gave speeches around the country trying to rally the British public into convincing their government to raise the blockade against Austria and Germany. The situation in Austria, Germany, Poland, and Russia was dire. It was estimated that one million German children had died of starvation by the following spring (1920) (Mulley, 2009, p. 239). The Jebbs’ speaking tours were not particularly successful. The government raised some of the blockades, but not to Germany, Austria, and Russia. Even where the blockades were lifted the infrastructure was broken down and the people were impoverished, so the starvation continued. This made Eglantyne and Dorothy decide that they needed to also fundraise to provide food aid, leading to Eglantyne setting about finding money to start the Save the Children’s Fund while her sister continued working with the Fight the Famine Council.

The Save the Children’s Fund had its initial breakthrough in fundraising when Robert Smillie, President of the Miner’s Trade Union, collected funds for the first big donation of £35,000.00. Eglantyne used a portion of the funds to print up handbills with pictures of starving Austrian (enemy) children on them (See Appendix 8 for photo of one of the original handbills). This was the first time images of starving children had been used to influence public opinion. While this practice is currently considered unacceptable and unethical by most INGOs, at the time, because of the blockades and the heavily biased media, few people outside of the enemy countries knew the extent of the atrocities
occurring. Children were especially vulnerable. If they did not perish from hunger, cold, and related diseases, they were imprisoned for stealing, driven to prostitution, and many committed suicide. Mothers killed their newborn babies rather than have to face starving them to death. The death toll of children was far greater during the blockade than during the war, it was estimated that 800 Germans were dying every day (Mulley, 2009, p. 238–239). For all intents and purposes this was a genocide perpetrated by the Allied nations.

Even with the photos of starving children on the handbills people were still skeptical about the extent of the famine despite the fact that the International Red Cross confirmed the reports. The nascent Save the Children Fund had to say that the donations they were collecting from the British public were going to “friends” not making any mention of Austria or Germany. These handbills caused Eglantyne to be arrested for treason and fined £5, but she still managed to solicit a donation for the cause from the prosecuting attorney (Save the Children, 2005). Less than a week later the sisters made their first appeal to establish the Save the Children’s Fund. In 1920, for the first time in charity history, Eglantyne “keen on ‘introducing the business methods into philanthropy,’” (Mulley, 2009, p.263) took out a full-page ad in the newspaper (the Times) appealing for donations. It turned out to be a good investment. Each full-page advertisement brought in approximately ten times its cost. “The problem is not money, but attitude of mind, Eglantyne concluded. ‘We have to find a way to devise a means of making known the facts in a way as to touch the imagination of the world” (Mulley, 2009, p. 263). Save the Children reports that one of the ads placed in “the Daily News brought in £7,000 over just two days, and another was clipped and returned anonymously with a cheque for £10,000 pinned to it” (Save the Children, 2005). They were able to fundraise £400,000 (equivalent to $18.5 million today) in that first year, enabling them to work throughout Europe and the Baltic States.

Eglantyne’s appeal eventually became popular with the churches. She initially went to the Archbishop of Canterbury for support, but he declined and did not believe that the Pope would help out SC either. Eglantyne ignored the Archbishop and went ahead and drafted an appeal to the Pope to issue an encyclical asking all the Catholic Churches around the world to collect money for the children of Europe. The Pope agreed to do it. Once the Catholics got involved the Archbishop changed his mind and asked the
Anglican churches to do the same. Later Eglantyne paid a visit to the Pope who listened to her stories of the children for over two hours, contributed £25,000, and promised to issue a second encyclical in 1920. Afterwards, Free Churches and Orthodox Churches followed suit and it became an ecumenical effort.

In 1921 the Save the Children’s Fund launched a new appeal to address the conditions of mass starvation in Russia. Once again SC became the object of scrutiny when the media began criticizing the organization for wasting funds abroad on a “dubious famine” (the Daily Express, November 1921) rather than focusing their efforts on the needy at home. The situation became quite tense as unemployed men demonstrated outside the SC office and threatened to throw SC fundraisers (they sold flags on the street) into the Thames. Eglantyne responded by hiring a photographer from the Daily Mirror to film the famine conditions. The films, shown in movie theatres and private gatherings, shocked the British public with “heart-rending images of starving and dead children huddled together, and bodies being buried, as well as soup and milk kitchens in operation and children recovering their strength and health” (Save the Children, 2005). The criticism ended there and the donations began to pour in. Their feeding program for children was able to carry on and feed up to 300,000 children per day. Nineteen countries and numerous relief agencies ended up working in collaboration on this feeding program, an unprecedented level of international cooperation for humanitarian assistance.

The next year (1923) Eglantyne wrote the first Declaration of the Rights of the Child for the International Save the Children Union

1) The child must be given the means requisite for its normal development, both materially and spiritually.

2) The child that is hungry must be fed, the child that is sick must be nursed, the child that is backward must be helped, the delinquent child must be reclaimed, and the orphan and the waif must be sheltered and succoured.

3) The child must be the first to receive relief in times of distress.

4) The child must be put in a position to earn a livelihood, and must be protected against every form of exploitation.

5) The child must be brought up in the consciousness that its talents must be devoted to the service of its fellow men.
These points would be adopted by the League of Nations (precursor to the United Nations) in 1924 as the Declaration of the Rights of the Child, which later became the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child, adopted in 1990. This declaration of children’s rights became the foundation for Save the Children’s work, as well as UNICEF’s and many other organizations with mandates to look after the needs of children. For all the incredible work that Eglantyne did on behalf of the welfare of children, she was not particularly fond of being around children. She was, however, a preeminent campaigner and fundraiser and had figured out how to get the public to understand the extent of the atrocities that the blockades were causing. Eglantyne also had many prestigious friends that supported her work and was highly capable at securing support from high profile figures, among them, Sigmund Freud, Albert Einstein, and Thomas Hardy. George Bernard Shaw provided Save the Children with one of its most effective quotes: “I don’t know about you, but I don’t have any enemies under the age of 7” (Mulley, 2009, p.265).

Even though Eglantyne spent a good deal of her time working long hours under considerable stress and visited regions where there was little in the way of infrastructure (lack of potable water, proper shelter, food, and so on), her health was actually frail. She was diagnosed with Grave’s disease, and regularly troubled by thyroid-related issues necessitating surgery and long recovery periods away at sanitariums. Just before her death in 1928 Eglantyne launched a study into the conditions of African children whose dire conditions were created and ignored by the colonizers. Eglantyne was not initially this progressive. Earlier encounters with racialized people were tainted by her intolerance. She also had many lofty ideals about dismantling the oppressive class system, but found it difficult to be in close proximity to people of lower socio-economic status. However challenging Eglantyne found it to entirely embody her ideals she continued to fight for them. At the end of her life Eglantyne ensured that the affected African people themselves would take part in carrying out the survey. The results of the study led to the first conference on the condition of the African child in Geneva in 1931. “The recommendations of the conference included the recruitment of more African doctors and nurses, the education of African children to encourage ‘the development of
their personality, and the progress of their race’, and legislation to protect child labourers” (Save the Children, 2005).

In the early years Save the Children launched committees and sister organizations in some of the British colonies, Australia (1919), Canada (1921), and in allied countries in Europe, such as Finland (1922). By the 1930s Save the Children had started working in the United States (1932). At this point it gets difficult to summarize the work being done across the organizations as they were all addressing the conditions of children both at home and abroad. The organizations and committees took a position of impartiality while helping the children in Spain affected by the Spanish Civil War in 1936. During the Depression most were running food and milk programs within their schools and communities. The Save the Children in the United States launched one of the first sponsorship programs, at this point not per child, but for one-room schools in the Appalachian area. Despite the Depression, Save the Children organizations were sending assistance to children in China, Czechoslovakia, and Spain. During and after World War II Save the Children organizations focused on children in Europe. The amount of work that needed to be done within Europe instigated a period of growth for the organization. Save the Children Norway and Denmark were established during that time, later growing to be two of the largest sister organizations in the Alliance. Save the Children collected and redistributed clothing, organized safe play centres for children, and established nurseries and nursery schools to care for children while mothers worked for the war effort. Later they were one of the first organizations providing relief in Germany, setting up orphanages and children’s hospitals as well as feeding programs in all affected countries. Save the Children Canada and US began sponsoring war-affected children for $96 per year.

In the 1950s the various Save the Children organizations worked in Lebanon, Greece, China, Korea (providing emergency shelter and doctor training), Italy, with Aboriginal Australians, and Algerian refugees in Morocco. In the 1960s they set up a local committee in Hong Kong and in the mid-1960s began programming in Vietnam (evacuating in 1975, but work carried on by locals and Save staff returned in 1986). Into the 1970s the organizations worked throughout Latin America, Africa and the Middle East.
In 1971 Princess Anne became the President of Save the Children UK, adding to the organization’s already impressive pedigree of supporters. Save the Children worked with child soldiers, refugees, and many people who have been impacted by natural disasters over the years – too many projects and countries to account for in this brief historical summary. By the year 2010 there were twenty-nine independent Save the Children organizations working in over 120 countries: an impressive result of the visionary work of sisters Eglantyne Jebb and Dorothy Buxton.

**Figure 9: Save the Children Fund Appeal from 1947**
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An overview of Save the Children Canada and Save the Children UK

Save the Children UK and Save the Children Canada originated from the same place: the vision of peace that Eglantyne Jebb and Dorothy Buxton worked for in post-World War I Britain. Canada’s Save the Children started out as a committee in 1921 that was a branch of the founding Save the Children UK office. As sister organizations they share the same mission, that of the Save the Children Alliance formed in 1977 based on upholding the rights of the child. The following vision, mission, and values statement is present in both Save the Children Canada and Save the Children UK’s communications during the 2000s

- **Our vision** is a world where every child attains the right to survival, protection, development and participation.

- **Our mission** is to inspire breakthroughs in the way the world treats children, and to achieve immediate and lasting change in their lives.

- **Our values:**
Accountability: We take personal responsibility for using our resources efficiently, achieving measurable results, and being accountable to supporters, partners and, most of all, children.

Ambition: We are demanding of ourselves and our colleagues, set high goals and are committed to improving the quality of everything we do for children.

Collaboration: We respect and value each other, thrive on our diversity, and work with partners to leverage our global strength in making a difference for children.

Creativity: We are open to new ideas, embrace change, and take disciplined risks to develop sustainable solutions for and with children.

Integrity: We aspire to live to the highest standards of personal honesty and behaviour; we never compromise our reputation and always act in the best interests of children. (SC Canada website and SC UK Website)

The organizations are encouraged to focus on global campaigns that are determined at the Save the Children Alliance level. During the time of the data collection the Save the Children Alliance had one global campaign: Rewrite the Future (launched 2006). This campaign was the Alliance’s first global campaign and involved all twenty-eight (2008 figure) sister organizations. It focused on obtaining equal and quality education for children who are unable to attend school due to conflict. In 2006, the estimated number of primary-aged children impacted by these conditions was 115 million and as of 2011 this number has been reduced to 72 million.

Although the organizations in the Alliance share the general premise of the mission statement and they adhere to and promise to uphold the tenants of the Declaration of the Rights of the Child, each organization until recently has worked somewhat autonomously. The logo of Save the Children is shared among the English speaking sister organizations with some variations among non-English speaking organizations. The focus of child rights is common to all, but the way each country approaches the work is unique. Canada and the UK have the obvious difference of size, scope, and capacity and also differ in the way Save the Children is marketed in each country and the way in which issues related to child rights (locally and globally) are highlighted.
Save the Children UK

The comparison of Save the Children UK and Save the Children Canada begins with the recognition that Save the Children UK is the largest of all the national offices. The UK office employs 5,430 (2008 numbers) full-time staff members, making up over a third of staff for the total Save the Children Alliance. Most of Save the Children UK’s full-time employees are citizens of the country in which they work. There are 456 in Save the Children’s London office (Save the Children UK Annual Report, 2009, p. 59). Save the Children UK also relies on the efforts of 9000 volunteers that support the organization in countless ways, including running the charity shops, fundraising, and doing public awareness work.

Programming

Save the Children UK focuses its work in five areas, four of those areas are promoting children’s rights to be free from hunger, to protection, to education, and to health. The other area is information, campaigning, and awareness. Their programming addresses these issues globally in countries and regions where the world’s most vulnerable children live and also addresses child rights in the UK. The organization drew up a ten-year plan in 2007 called Change for Children that committed the organization to enacting the following changes in the world by 2017

- It would no longer be acceptable for children to die before their fifth birthday from preventable causes at the rate that’s tolerated today – one every three seconds
- every child, even those caught up in disaster or war, can expect a basic education
- in the UK, one of the world’s richest countries, a million children no longer live in severe and persistent poverty
- orphans and other children at risk are protected and cared for in their own communities, not put in institutions
- children and their carers have a real say in what we do and how we do it, and can hold us to account. (Save the Children UK Annual Report 2009, p. 6)

According to Jasmine Whitbread, then Chief Executive of Save the Children UK (2005 – 2010), the organization had made clear progress in meeting these goals in 2008. She listed their achievements according to the following numbers:
• children reached through Save the Children UK programming (7.25 million, 20% more than the previous year); people that have signed up for their newborn and child survival campaign (400,000);

• children in conflict and crisis areas with improved access to education (10.6 million);

• amount that Save the Children advocacy efforts increased the British Government’s contribution to end child poverty (£1 billion, but notes that the recession of 2009 made children even more vulnerable); headway made towards goal of becoming “world’s leading emergency agency for children” (responded to 30 disasters and spent £88.7 million);

• advocated for pro-child policies on the global and national levels (represented their issues at a range of high-level meetings); and

• income increased (by £55.2 million income and 17% more from supporters than in the previous year) (Save the Children UK Annual Report, 2009, p. 4).

Organizational structure

Save the Children UK is governed by a Board of Trustees. The Chief Executive reports to the Board and leads a team of executive directors in the primary programming areas (including finance and general operations). Around 2008 the organization had six primary areas: Campaigns and Communications, Global Human Resources, Policy, Global Programmes, Supporter Relations and Fundraising, and Philanthropy and Partnerships. Between these areas there was considerable overlap, which was reorganized during a restructuring process requested by the Alliance and overseen by the Chief Executive. By 2010 the main departmental areas had been pared down to: Global Programmes, Marketing and Communications, Fundraising, and Policy and Advocacy.

Funding and budgets

According to their 2008–2009 Annual Report Save the Children UK receives restricted and unrestricted funding from a range of funders. Their total income in 2008-2009 was £216 million out of which 47% was raised through donations (including legacies and gifts-in-kind), 4% from their charity/jumble shops, another 47% is institutional grants (from the UK government, Irish government, the United Nations, the European
Commission, and many other international sources)\(^{25}\), the rest through investments (1%) and rentals (1%). In 2008 they received £19 million in grants from British and Irish governments. Out of that total £17,696,000 was from DfID and of that amount £7,515,000 was for Save the Children’s Partnership Programme Agreement (PPA fund). The PPA fund is a block grant of unrestricted funds out of which 25% was supposed to be allocated to global education as per DfID’s request. Their emergency programming in 2008 (mostly in Myanmar after the cyclone hit) had a £26.4 million budget supported by donations from the British public (£2 million), the Disaster Emergency Committee (£900,000), DfID (£3.5 million), contributions from 17 Save the Children Alliance members (£6.4 million) and the United Nations World Food Programme (£3.3 million).

**Figure 10: Save the Children UK annual income 2008-2009**
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Save the Children also receives funding (in 2008-2009 £11.8 million) from twenty-one charitable trusts and foundations (including the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation) and over sixty-five corporate funders. The corporate funders include financial institutions (Bank of America, Barclays Group, Standard Chartered, American Express Europe, among others) big pharmaceutical companies (GlaxoSmithCline), law firms, and range of other corporations (IKEA, Tesco, Bulgari, Twinings, and so on). They have had a partnership with FirstGroup bus operators since 2007 who have donated £410,000 worth of advertising space (in and outside of the buses) to Save the Children UK and its Born to Shine campaign. These advertisements appear in 7000 buses around the country and according to Third Sector (an online and print publication for voluntary and not-for-profit sector) sources the partnership between Save the Children and FirstGroup has generated over £4.5 million in gifts-in-kind donations (mostly advertising space) over the past four years (Little, Third Sector, September 20, 2011).

### Save the Children Canada

In the 1980's Save the Children Canada expanded programs to areas in Canada, Asia, Africa, the Middle East and South America, and in 1988 formally changed its name to Save the Children Canada. A decade later the Save the Children Fund of British Columbia legally merged with Save the Children Canada. In stark contrast to the London office, Save the Children Canada is only a fraction of the size with 35 full time staff members (2008 numbers), eight of which worked as regional and country directors in the organization’s primary regions: Haiti, Nicaragua, South America, Kenya, Colombia, Ethiopia, West Africa, and Afghanistan. Save the Children Canada has seventeen volunteer branches across the country: four in British Colombia, two in Alberta, three in Saskatchewan, one in Manitoba, and seven in Ontario. The number of volunteer branches is down from twenty-three in 2006 when there were branches in Quebec, Nova Scotia, and New Brunswick. In 2008 they also ran seven university clubs, one in Nova Scotia (Cape Breton University), five in Ontario (McMaster University, University of Guelph, University of Toronto, University of Western Ontario, and York University) and one in Alberta (University of Calgary).
Programming

Through their website, Save the Children Canada announced that they “work in Canada and 120 countries overseas to bring immediate and lasting improvements to children's lives through the realization of their rights” and that their key programming areas are: HIV and AIDS, Exploitation and Abuse, Conflict and Disaster, Child Participation and Child Rights, and Education (Save the Children Canada website 2011). The organization works in collaboration with sister organizations in the Save the Children Alliance to work in 120 countries. Save the Children Canada focuses its efforts in a smaller number of countries while making financial contributions to sister organizations working in other countries. In the 2008-2009 period Save the Children Canada contributed to children’s welfare through four key programming areas: education, HIV and AIDS, emergency relief, and child protection. They worked in fourteen countries that year (Afghanistan, Bolivia, Burkina Faso, Canada, China, Colombia, Guinea, Haiti, Kenya, Mali, Myanmar, Nicaragua, Republic of Congo, and Sudan). In Afghanistan, Colombia, Haiti, and Sudan they support ongoing education programming through the Rewrite the Future campaign. Their educational work assisted over 165,013 children and 198 schools in eight countries including Canada, where they partnered with the Institut culturel et éducative montagnais to produce nine books in Innu-aimun language for children in preschool. Their HIV AIDS programming assisted 550 people in Kenya, and in Bolivia and Nicaragua they trained children and youth to be peer health educators and advocate for changes in the health care system.

Save the Children Canada’s emergency relief work included the following regions and activities:

- the provision of educational support after the earthquake in Sichuan, China (11,579 children and 363 teachers received school supplies and equipment);
- the provision of household items to more than 12,400 families in the aftermath of the Haitian earthquake;
- distribution of education supplies to twenty schools in war-affected Kenya benefiting 20,073 children; and assisted over 500,000 people in Myanmar after Cyclone Nargis;
- provision of school kits to 6,600 children in the Republic of Congo and accelerated learning classes for 720 children who were at risk of being recruited as child soldiers;
• provision of emergency water, sanitation and nutrition in West Darfur; and,
• provision of care for malnourished children (benefited 4,230 children) and training for 700 staff and volunteers with the support of the European Commission’s Humanitarian Aid Office (ECHO).

Their child protection work was concentrated in five countries, in:

• Burkina Faso, Guinea, and Mali they supported an anti-trafficking project which benefited over 18,000 children;

• Bolivia they helped child labourers to organize and to lobby the government to change child protection legislation (it was approved in national referendum); and

• Haiti introduced 46 child rights clubs with 4,337 children gaining increased awareness of their rights, skills in leadership and project management, extracurricular activities including sports events, and the collaborative development of Codes of Conduct for schools. (Save the Children Canada Annual Report, 2008-2009, pp. 4-7)

There is no mention in their public documents (website and annual reports) of global education, communications, and/or public engagement being priority programming areas. There were ongoing efforts within the organization to re-ignite their awareness, education, and engagement programming with Canadians, including attempts to secure CIDA’s Global Classroom Initiative funds to expand their burgeoning Save the Children Canada’s School program based on their Rewrite the Future work. Additionally, the fundraising manager who oversaw the university clubs was working on expanding their presence on Canadian campuses.

The key areas of work are shared by the entire Save the Children Alliance, but how they are relayed to the public demonstrates the differences between the sister organizations. In the case of Save the Children UK and Save the Children Canada it is telling that the areas of foci listed on their websites are the same except that Save the Children UK also lists climate change as an issue that impacts the lives of children and Canada makes no mention of climate change. It is perhaps no coincidence that the Canadian government has been criticized internally and internationally for not addressing climate issues (The Tar Sands Group and Climate Action Network, 2009, p.4).
Organizational structure

Save the Children Canada is governed by a Board of Directors, and led by four executive directors and the Chief Executive Officer. The four departmental areas are: Finance and Administration, Business Development and Knowledge Management, Programs, and Philanthropy. In 2007-2008, Save the Children Canada went through an organizational restructuring process. They participated in the Alliance’s Unified Presence program (ongoing), which works to cut administrative costs in the national offices by having the offices work more closely in order to eliminate overlapping efforts. That year Save the Children Canada was unified with offices in Bolivia and Haiti. Administration was cut along with the entire Canadian program, a programming area that was important to a portion of the donor sector that prioritized local issues. Informants indicated that the organization had the intention of restoring Canadian programming in the future. In general, informants felt that the organizational restructuring was a sensitive issue and were reluctant to comment on its specific impacts. The Alliance’s unifying and cost cutting measures have continued into 2011.

Funding and budgets

Save the Children Canada’s largest donor was the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA), providing 52% of the budget in 2008 - 2009. Their total income in 2008-2009 was $20,455,138. Other grant funding came from other Save the Children branches and the Alliance, from corporate donors (IKEA and two anonymous donors giving the most funds), and foundations. Save the Children Canada also has a long-standing relationship with Axis Pharmacy. Donations and bequests made up 26% of their income. More recently (from 2009 onward) Save the Children Canada has had relationships with the MasterCard Foundation (via Save the Children U.S.) and Frigidaire (donated $100,000 to a Canadian program for First Nations mothers and their newborn babies) (Save the Children Canada Annual Report, 2010, p. 18).
Summary

This look at the two sister organizations is a good indicator of differences between the Canadian and UK INGO playing field as it is a fairly typical picture of an INGO with an original office in the UK and sister organization in Canada. Save the Children Canada is 1/10 of the size of Save the Children UK and relies heavily on a single institutional source, CIDA. While both raise a similar percentage of donations, Save the Children UK 26% and Save the Children Canada 22%, those amounts translate into $102.9 million (Cdn 2009 currency) and $4.5 million respectively. The contrast in resources and programming capacities is vast, with Save the Children UK drawing on a long history of relationships with the royal family, celebrities, major corporate donors, and over the past decade a strong strategic direction with a director whose expertise lies in marketing and public relations. In contrast, Save the Children Canada, while a respected organization in Canada, has not managed to become an indelible part of the Canadian INGO landscape.
### Table 5: Comparing Save the Children UK and Save the Children Canada

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Save the Children UK</th>
<th>Save the Children Canada</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staff</strong></td>
<td>456 in London</td>
<td>27 full-time, 7 part-time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4974 working regional offices</td>
<td>8 working in regional offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9,000 volunteers</td>
<td>arrangement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Budget</strong></td>
<td>216,008,000 (£)</td>
<td>388,814,400 (CAS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20,455,138 (CAS)</td>
<td>arrangement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Work/Regions</strong></td>
<td>49 countries, including the UK.</td>
<td>Haiti, Nicaragua, Bolivia,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Afghanistan, Albania, Angola**, Bangladesh,</td>
<td>Colombia, Ethiopia, Kenya,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bosnia &amp; Herzegovina, Brazil, Chad, China,</td>
<td>Burkina Faso/Mali, India,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Colombia**, Côte d’Ivoire, Democratic People’s</td>
<td>Bangladesh, Pakistan, Chad,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of Congo,</td>
<td>Sudan, and Lebanon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, India, Indonesia**, Iraq,</td>
<td>arrangement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kenya, Kosovo, Kyrgyzstan**, Lebanon, Liberia,</td>
<td>arrangement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique**, Myanmar</td>
<td>arrangement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Burma)**, Niger, Nigeria, Occupied</td>
<td>arrangement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Palestinian territory, Pakistan, Peru**, Rwanda, Serbia,</td>
<td>arrangement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sierra Leone, Somalia, South Africa, South Sudan, Sri</td>
<td>arrangement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lanka**, Sudan, Swaziland, Syria, Tajikistan**, Tanzania</td>
<td>arrangement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em><strong>, Thailand, Uganda</strong>, United Kingdom, Vietnam</em>*,</td>
<td>arrangement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
<td>arrangement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Core Program Areas</strong></td>
<td>Children’s rights to be free from hunger, to</td>
<td>HIV and AIDS, Exploitation and Abuse, Conflict and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>protection, to education, and to health, Information,</td>
<td>Disaster, Child Participation and Child Rights, and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>campaigning, and awareness</td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Based on March 31, 2009 conversion rates.

** Countries with more than one Save the Children organization working in unified programs. There are twelve such countries.

**Save the Children Alliance**

Soon after the first Save the Children Fund was founded in 1919, sister committees and organizations began to appear. The first Save the Children branch to be established was in Melbourne, Australia in 1919. A few years later committees were set up in Canada (1921), Finland (1922), and the United States of America (1932). After World War II many more countries set up committees and branches, Denmark (1945), Norway (1946), New Zealand (1947), and Korea in the 1950s. In 1976, Save the Children organizations from Norway, Austria, USA, Canada, England and Denmark joined forces to create a “red-tape-free” cooperation arrangement under the name of the International Save the Children Alliance to help coordinate work among the different countries (Save the Children Denmark website). Twenty years later, a permanent administrative office was

---

26 “Save the Children Australia was Save the Children's first international branch and was established in Melbourne in the same year that it began in Europe, 1919” (http://www.savethechildren.org.au/about-us/history).
formed, the Save the Children Secretariat, but continued to function mainly as a decentralized federation of the independent organizations around the world.

For the past 33 years the Save the Children Alliance has worked within this loosely connected structure. The sister organizations were joined by their adherence to upholding the tenets of the Declaration of the Rights of the Child and the shared mandate of the Alliance. They joined forces to work on projects on an ad hoc basis and tried not to overlap with one another’s work. Each sister organization has worked, for the most part, autonomously as can be seen by the vast differences between the organizational capacities and programming of Save the Children UK and Save the Children Canada. Dependency on government funding among Save the Children Sister organizations is highest in the Netherlands at 69%, and is relatively high in the Scandinavian countries (Demark 44%, Norway 40%, and Sweden 30%) and in Canada at 52%. Hong Kong and the United States’ Save the Childrens have the lowest dependency at 5% each, and the UK is next lowest at 11% (Figure 11).

**Figure 12: 2008 Government funding for Save the Children in ten countries by percentage**

Save the Children annual reports from 2008

Over the past decade the Alliance has been working towards bringing the work of the sister organizations together, and in 2009 a strategy was put in place to merge all of Save the Children’s international programs. By 2010 Save the Children International was a $1.4 billion (US$) organization with 14,000 employees. Another change for the
Alliance or Save the Children International is that it is now under the leadership of its first international chief executive officer. The person chosen for this position is Jasmine Whitbread, former Chief Executive of Save the Children UK (2005 – 2010). Whitbread’s skill in marketing, public relations, and sales led her to be hired as Save the Children UK’s Chief Executive in the first place. Her background included two years doing a Volunteer Sending Overseas (VSO) placement in Uganda and later six years at Oxfam (three years in West Africa as a Regional Director then three years at the head office in Oxford as International Director). Before and in between her work in the international development field Whitbread did public relations work for Rio Tinto (a mining group with a controversial history). She later worked for in sales for Thompson Financial, an information technology group. Before Whitbread, Save the Children UK’s Chief Executive was Sir Michael Aaronson, formerly with UK’s Foreign Office. He had made some drastic changes to the UK office resulting in the organization feeling more “corporate” which alienated a portion of their supporters. Whitbread was brought in to increase the organization’s visibility as it had fallen off the radar of the British public. During the period that Whitbread was Chief Executive, Save the Children UK increased its revenues from £148.4 million in 2006-2007 to £291.5 million in 2009-2010 (£37.6 million attributed to emergency donations for disasters in Haiti and Pakistan).

Save the Children Canada and UK’s Education, Advocacy and Campaigns Programming 2000-2010

Unlike Save the Children’s global campaigns, which are determined collectively by the Alliance with some flexibility in approach at the regional organization level, education programming has been under the purview of each individual sister organization. There has not been a unified approach to education programming across the sister organizations in the Save the Children Alliance until recently. The latest trend appears to be that campaign themes guide the education materials and that campaigning and fundraising activities are included in the materials produced for schools. These materials were studied to understand how Save the Children UK and Save the Children Canada’s global education programming reflected the shifting nature of INGO global education programming. They were examined in relation to the conceptual framework of
educational models (social regulation to social transformation) and ethical positionings (longer-term contextual, dialogical to shorter-term didactic).

Save the Children UK’s global education programming

The eleven resources reviewed for this study were as follows:

1) *Families Pack: Stories, Activities and Photographs for Approaching Citizenship through the Theme of Families* (1999);

2) *Partners in Rights: Creative Activities Exploring Rights and Citizenship for 7 to 14 Year Olds* (2000);

3) *Time for Rights (by UNICEF and Save the Children UK): Activities for Citizenship and PSHE for 9-13 Year Olds* (2002);

4) *Young Citizens: Children as Active Citizens around the World: A teaching pack for key stage 2* (2002);

5) *Get Global! A Skills-based Approach to Active Global Citizenship* (by ActionAid, CAFOD, Christian Aid, Oxfam, DfID, and Save the Children UK) (2003);

6) *Emergency Darfur Appeal: Teacher Resource* (2003);


8) *What Makes Me Happy (film) and teaching guide* (2006);

9) *Children’s Rights: A Teacher’s Guide* (2006);

10) *Rewrite the Future - Learning about Children Affected by Conflict in Sudan and Southern Sudan* (2006); and


Save the Children UK has a twenty-five year history of producing education programming. Their resources are all from a child’s rights-based perspective. A common format for the resources is media (print, video, photos) that allows students to look at the lives of children in different regions around the world as well as children in different socio-economic contexts (working and working class children) within the UK. Their education materials fall under two broad categories: global children’s rights education and local/domestic children’s rights. Materials produced for the “global” category include discussion about the lives and conditions of children in different parts of the world. These
are typically produced by Save the Children UK’s development education department. It is evident from these materials that the education team at Save the Children UK and their partners have conscientiously and respectfully represented children’s lives, illuminating the multifaceted nature of a child’s life that has been affected by poverty, conflict, and/or natural disasters. Through the learning materials students explore their understandings of children’s rights and responsibilities on the individual, local, national, and global levels. Between 1999 and 2008, Save the Children UK published a new global education teaching pack almost every year.

Eight of the eleven global Save the Children UK resources looked at for this study were produced prior to 2007 and had four distinct qualities:

1) There was infrequent mention of the Save the Children organization and projects;
2) If fundraising was mentioned it was not an emphasized activity and was generic (Save the Children was not mentioned);
3) If campaigning was mentioned it was as a generic activity to be driven by students’ interests; and
4) If a comparative country study was undertaken, then the UK was also included and looked at in terms of relative poverty.

Furthermore, two of the resources (Time for Rights and Get Global!) were produced in collaboration with other UK INGOs.

Two resources deviated from Save the Children UK’s other educational materials, they were Emergency Darfur Appeal – Teacher Resource (2003) and Rewrite the Future - Learning about Children Affected by Conflict in Sudan and Southern Sudan (2006). These teaching resources blurred the lines between fundraising campaigns and educational materials. In these materials a clear background message is given about the affected regions and the emergency situation itself. Activities ranged from gaining a better understanding of the geographical area, to imagining oneself as a humanitarian aid worker in the affected region, to fundraising. Unlike the aforementioned education materials these resources explicitly highlight the work of Save the Children UK. Children

---

27 There were also emergency teaching resources on the tsunami in South Asia that would have been produced in 2005 and that also likely fall under this same category.
are encouraged to empathize with other children and families in emergency situations and to imagine themselves as potential humanitarian aid workers, supporting the efforts of Save the Children UK by campaigning and fundraising within their schools and communities. One of the activities, Activity 4: Create a board game, is introduced with the following scenario:

A wealthy person with a big heart has challenged different international organizations, including Save the Children, to embark on a cross-country trek from the UK to Sudan. Any organization that gets a group of people to complete the trek will receive a donation of £10 million to rebuild schools, train teachers, and give many more the chance to go to school. (Save the Children UK, 2006, p.13)

While the nationality of the generous donor is not revealed, there is a sense that resources for providing education for the global South come from the global North (North America and Europe). The sense of reciprocity and equitable learning partnerships between children in the UK and in other parts of the world that is emphasized in the aforementioned eight teaching packs is not evident in the emergency teaching resource documents. Learning materials produced prior to 2007 were based on a longer-term educational journey, “education for the sake of education” as one participant (E01) put it. However, these dialogical, equity-based documents are no longer produced. The more recent learning materials are predominantly short-term, didactic, client-centred methods that no longer see children as “agents of transformation”, but as virtuous “donors or volunteers” who will ameliorate poverty (social regulation) (Reimer, Shute, & McCreary, 1993, p.16).

In 2007, Save the Children UK sent teachers an invitation, *Stand Up and Speak Out: Get More Involved*, to take part in activities related to the Rewrite the Future campaign. They offered an Save the Children resource pack on ‘education in countries affected by conflict’ and invited teachers to collect quotes from students regarding the impact conflict has on children’s ability to access education, and to choose one or two students to be interviewed. There is the possibility that students’ quotes or the interviews might be chosen to be presented in the media. Another activity invited students to write to their MPs about children’s education in conflict-ridden countries, and/or to “mingle with the stars”, by hosting a visit from a celebrity or pop star accompanied by photographer or camera person. They encouraged teachers and students to take part in a Guinness World
Record breaking activity - *Stand Up and Speak Out on 17 October* (International Day for the Eradication of Poverty) – to stand up together for one minute and to speak out with quotes or messages that will be sent to the UK government. While there are some links to education activities here, this is mainly a campaign and advocacy program. This activity clearly demonstrates the crossover potential between education, campaigns, advocacy and fundraising as a means for Save the Children UK to meet its short-term goal of gaining more support for their campaigns.

None of the domestic UK materials looked at for the study, *Think of Me, Think of You – An Anti-discrimination Training Resource for Young People by Young People* (2004), *Something to Say: Listening to Children* (2005), and *Leave It Out: Developing Anti-homophobic Bullying Practices in Schools* (2008) made mention of fundraising or campaigns. Whether due to a perceived lack of empathy among students towards children’s issues domestically or because of the potential awkwardness of children raising funds for their peers, it is unclear why children’s rights issues from developing countries and conflict regions began to be treated differently in the teaching resources from the ones dealing with children’s rights issues within the UK. The education materials that focused exclusively on domestic children’s rights issues were produced by educationalists within Save the Children UK’s UK department, not by the development education team – although they have collaborated on anti-bullying and anti-racist work in the past (E04). Domestic issues are controversial areas for global educationalists (particularly critical multiculturalism and anti-racism) as they are often not viewed by administration and donors as being the purview of development education. In terms of being able to address global-to-local issues of immigration, refugees, and other impacts of globalization on the UK the connection between the development education team and the UK department had been a useful one. Up until 2008 the development education team was housed within the UK department and had a mandate to work with school children from the most marginalized communities in the UK.

Prior to 2007, education resources that emphasized branded fundraising campaigns were the anomaly among Save the Children UK’s education materials. They appeared only during emergencies or within materials that were exclusively for campaigns, not as a hybrid of teaching materials and campaign/fundraising. After 2007
the motivations and programming mechanisms presented in the global education material took a distinct turn. The teaching pack produced in 2007, *Welcome to My World, Exploring the lives of children in Ethiopia, India, Peru and Vietnam*, unlike its predecessors, was distinctly branded with frequent references to Save the Children UK projects and programming within the activities (one activity was about Save the Children UK’s scheme to buy farm animals for families in developing countries). The focus of the regional comparison was exclusively children in “developing” countries, the UK was no longer included (this resource only considered absolute poverty, not relative). Finally, the students in the UK were not sharing stories with the children in other countries, but rather they were preparing themselves for roles supporting these other children – through fundraising and awareness raising campaigns.

The UK children moved from being learners ‘with’ children from around the world, and being equal partners in inquiry with children from poor countries, to being learners ‘about’ children in poverty in order to support campaigns, fundraising, and have a possible future as humanitarian aid workers. The new short-term, didactic programming provided limited opportunity to engage in situated learning.

**Funding for Save the Children UK’s global education programming**

Save the Children UK has a Partnership Programme Agreement (PPA) with DfID. In the 2008 – 2009 fiscal year, the organization received £7,512,000 in PPA funding. At that time the expectation of DfID was that recipients of the PPAs were to use one quarter of their funds for DfID’s priority theme, development education. In Save the Children UK’s case, if they were using one quarter of those funds for development education that would contribute £1.878 million to the development education team’s budget. The total revenue for Save the Children UK 2008/2009 was approximately £216,008,000. They spent £10,166,000 on Information, Campaigns, and Awareness, under which education fell (Save the Children UK Annual Report 2008-2009, p. 34). Within their 2008-2009 annual report’s financial statement, they included this description of their information, campaigning and awareness category,

> Save the Children’s information, campaigning and awareness activities have several key objectives, including:
• informing our supporters and the wider public about the reality of children’s lives throughout the world, based on our experience in around 50 countries

• influencing key decision-makers on social and economic policies affecting children, drawing evidence for our advocacy and campaigning work directly from our global programme

• educating children and young people in the UK through initiatives that reflect our programme, which brings global perspectives to the curriculum and youth work by promoting the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child. (Ibid, p. 42)

Save the Children UK’s 2008 development education review process

Between 2005 and 2008 the formerly solid development education department began to experience changes. In 2005 there was a head of development education programming, Andrew Hutchison, who had been with Save the Children UK since the 1980s, and a youth education program with two staff members. The work with the formal education sector had two dedicated staff members, a team coordinator, consultants from time-to-time, a resource administrator, and a young person’s writer who worked on magazines for children and youth (E01). There were up to eight permanent staff plus consultants around the 2005 period. By 2008 dedicated staff for development education programming were down to three, and two part-time. Another change for development education team was their move out of UK Programs and into the Campaigns and Advocacy department in the spring 2008. This move impacted the direction of the development education programming, “…we’re now looking more at involving schools in learning about the issues about which our campaigns are based around” (E01). Overall education programming was described as having been a “low priority until recently with a dramatic push towards engaging young people and schools” (E01). This push seemed to be coming both from the government, DfID, and from the Save the Children Alliance, which was promoting the Global Children’s Panel to actively engage school-aged children from around the world (in areas where Save the Children worked), in the decision-making processes for the Alliance’s work. In addition, there was internal pressure to increase the participation of children in the UK in fundraising and campaigning activities.

In 2008, Save the Children UK decided to review their programming that involved schools, children, and young people. This meant looking at their education,
campaigns and advocacy, and fundraising activities. Other INGOs (UNICEF, Oxfam, Comic Relief, and ActionAid) were going through similar reviews that year. During this time when INGO global education programming was well supported and encouraged by DfID, these leading UK INGOs were rethinking their commitments in this area. By the fall of 2008, a proposal for the restructuring of Save the Children UK’s programming was on the table that recommended having a campaigns and advocacy team (13 people) and a children and schools team (2 people) that would both report to the Director of Campaigns and Communications. The children and schools team would have overseen all the work relating to children, schools, and young people in all the various areas: campaigning, fundraising, education, and so on. By December members of the existing development education team were made redundant. In January 2009 the management decided that there was no room in the budget for the Children and Schools Team either. Save the Children UK’s work in schools would now focus on campaigns, advocacy, and fundraising. It is unclear how this change in strategy was justified to DfID in relation to Save the Children UK’s PPA funding agreement.

**Save the Children UK’s campaigns**

Campaigns and advocacy have become a top priority for Save the Children UK office. Their Newborn and child survival campaign was launched on November 30, 2008 inviting the British public to follow the plight of an eight-hour old Liberian baby named Prince. That first year of the campaign encouraged 400,000 people in the UK to take action through donating funds and persuading the governments and international bodies to make policy changes that will positively impact child survival rates. This campaign would roll into the upcoming global Every One campaign to be launched by the Save the Children Alliance, a joint effort among all 29 (2011 figures) members (Save the Children UK Annual Report, 2008-2009, p.12). Save the Children UK also continues to play a key role in the Save Children Alliance’s Rewrite the Future campaign.

In 2009 the organization demonstrated its newfound prowess in this area through its award winning ‘Enough is Enough’ campaign. Launched in January 2009 via full-page newspaper advertisements, the campaign urged people to speak out about the escalating violence in the Gaza region by texting the word ‘ceasefire’. In less than a week
183,380 people had responded, the equivalent of one text per second. The campaign pushed the UK government to call for an immediate ceasefire between Israel and Hamas. The government acknowledged that the campaign had an impact at the highest level and Save the Children UK won the Gold Medal for Best Charity and Voluntary Sector Campaign at the New Media Age Effectiveness Awards. An additional 6,000 new regular donors signed on as result of the campaign (Save the Children UK website, Save the Children UK Annual Report, 2008-2009, p.7).

Save the Children UK continues to refresh the Every One campaign on the national level. In January 2011 they launched No Child Born to Die as a mass media campaign to support the Every One global campaign. The organization cleverly hitched their wagon to the popular British television show ‘Born to Shine’ that has at home viewers phone in to vote for their favourite acts. Each time someone phones in to vote there is a bit of income generated (normally for the show itself). For the campaign each text generates £5. The organization’s brand and profile are forefronted in the show. In addition UKAid (DfID’s new international development brand) is matching any funds raised through Born to Shine. As of October 2011, between donations from the British public and UKAid the show has raised £1.778 million for No Child Born to Die campaign (DfID website). This has raised questions about whether Save the Children UK has been given an unfair advantage over other charities in contradiction to the broadcasting code, which states: “Where possible, the broadcast of charity appeals, either individually or taken together over time, should benefit a wide range of charities (Rule 9.34 of the code, cited in The Guardian’s Voluntary Sector Network Blog, August 9, 2011). These queries have not yet been an impediment to Save the Children UK and Born to Shine’s ongoing partnership.

Save the Children UK’s increased commitment to campaigning is demonstrated in their regularly refreshed campaign strategies. Over the 2008-2009 period Save the Children UK led or partnered in the following campaigns: ‘Knit One, Save One’ campaign to knit hats for infants to prevent them from getting pneumonia (800,000 hats knitted and sent to developing countries); 5th Birthday campaign cards sent to Prime Minister Gordon Brown asking why all children do not live to reach their fifth birthdays (14,000 children and youth sent cards); Sarah Brown’s (Prime Minister’s wife) campaign
to address children’s mortality; *Mission Nutrition* campaign launched through a BBC children’s show called *Blue Peter* to encourage children to fundraise (one million meals for children); and Campaign to End Child Poverty encouraged UK government to add £1 billion to 2008 budget to help UK families experiencing poverty; (Save the Children UK Annual Report, 2008-2009, p. 13). Drawing on the spirit of their founder, Eglantyne Jebb, who had a talent for marketing campaigns and fundraising, Save the Children UK has increased and multiplied its efforts to lead successful campaigns.

**Save the Children UK’s advocacy**

While Save the Children UK’s campaigns worked to gain public support, in the form of funds and support for change, its advocacy programming is directly related to its high-level policy work. Much of Save the Children UK’s advocacy work has focused on children’s poverty issues within the UK. 2008 – 2009 marked one of the worst economic periods since the Great Depression. Poor families were struggling to get by, “In Wales, children are struggling for basics – food and education – though we’re living in a Western democratic society” (Suleman, a member of the Global Children’s Panel, cited in Save the Children UK Annual Report, 2008-09). The organization’s policy and advocacy team advocated for children in the UK and released several reports over the 2008-2009 period that detailed the following advocacy activities and outcomes:

1) The Impact of Fuel Poverty on Children showed that the health of children in Northern Ireland was negatively impacted by cold, damp homes, which led to the government giving one-off £150 fuel payments to 150,000 families;

2) Through efforts of the Save the Children UK-led Children’s Fuel Poverty Coalition the Scottish government promised to assist low-income families with children through an energy-assistance package;

3) Lobbying in Wales and Northern Ireland led to both governments making commitments to end child poverty by 2020;

4) Years of campaigning resulted in refugee and asylum-seeking children finally being afforded the same rights to go to school and benefits as any other poor children (Save the Children UK Annual Report, 2008-2009, p.20); and,
5) Save the Children UK is working with Family Action and British Gas to ensure that the poorest families (900) receive one-off cash assistance. (Save the Children UK Annual Report, 2008-2009, p.13)

As part of restructuring, Save the Children UK also had to cut back on some of its UK poverty programs, and the termination of their work with refugees and Traveller children (p.20).

The policy and advocacy teams working on issues impacting children’s rights globally lobbied the national government and the European Community, which lead to DfID and the EC working on an action plan for addressing nutrition. After three years of lobbying, the efforts of a coalition of aid agencies, led by Save the Children, convinced the World Food Programme to adapt a more flexible approach to hunger issues. They advocated for the G20 leaders “to protect children in developing countries from the effects of the economic crisis”, resulting in the leaders committing an additional £50 billion. In 2008, Save the Children UK launched the Child Development Index, a tool that they had been working on since 1990, which scores how well countries are doing in three areas that are specific to children’s wellbeing (p.13).

It is evident through the successes that Save the Children UK has had in recent years with its campaigns, advocacy, and fundraising programming that the organization has skillful people designing and implementing their programming. Their campaign programming is thoughtful and captures the public’s attention. Their advocacy work attempts to tackle some of the most difficult poverty issues both domestically and globally. Their efforts, for the present seem to be focused almost exclusively on these types of programming mechanisms. This is not to say that their campaigns and advocacy work do not have socially transformative, dialogical qualities to them, because they do. These programming mechanisms, while they could be considered “good” global citizenship opportunities, did not offer the same longer-term, dialogical, situated learning journeys that some of their earlier global education programming did.

**Save the Children Canada’s global education programming**

Save the Children Canada has a history and reputation for their work in child and youth engagement, but their experience with global education programming is limited. Starting
in the mid-1990s Save the Children Canada began training youth within Boys and Girls clubs and other organizations working with youth as youth-to-youth facilitators who would use children’s rights-based methods for health promotion and community development. They took a six-step approach based on child-to-child methodology, co-developed in the late 1970s with Save the Children Canada’s Chief Executive Officer, David Morley (2006 - 2011) (http://www.child-to-child.org/consultancy.htm). They provided youth-to-youth programs across Canada (rural, urban, refugee children, Aboriginal, low income, middle income, and street children) using an approach through which children/youth identify a problem and take steps towards taking action. The child-to-child method is also used by the Save the Children sister organizations with youth/children in developing countries. Canada is credited with being influential in the development of this program. The Child-to-Child training program was funded by Save the Children, Levi Strauss and Co Ltd., and Health Canada (Child-to-child Trust website).

In 2005, two major disasters, the tsunami in South Asia and later the earthquake in Pakistan, rallied Save the Children Canada to produce resources for teachers. Earlier in 2005 they produced the Tsunami Disaster in South Asia: Education Kit, which became the template for resources that would be produced for other emergency situations and for the Rewrite the Future campaign. The tsunami resource has activities and information for children under twelve and another section for older children (twelve to eighteen). The activities move from learning about the geography (people, climate, physical area, and the qualities of natural disasters) to learning about the work of humanitarian aid workers (one activity asks students to imagine their role as humanitarian aid workers – medical teams, teachers, psychologists, logistics workers, and engineers) to fundraising activities. Throughout the resource there is a strong emphasis on Save the Children contributions and brand. However, there are also critical thinking activities that might offset the branded and fundraising activities, e.g., students asked to question or compare Canada’s contributions to relief efforts to other areas of the world and to question or compare Canada’s media coverage of the disaster to other areas of the world. Later in 2005, Save the Children Canada produced the Earthquake in South Asia: Teaching Tools resource, which follows a similar template to the tsunami resources, moving students’ learning
from geography to humanitarian aid (Save the Children’s work specifically) to fundraising. This resource provides an abridged version of the Declaration of the Rights of the Child to work with and eight pages of curriculum links for each province and territory in Canada.

Also in 2005, Save the Children Canada put together a proposal for CIDA’s Global Classroom Initiative fund for the production of a kindergarten to grade twelve education program that would promote issues of sustainable development and conflict resolution within the context of children’s rights. The proposal was not approved, but it was demonstrative of the organization’s interest in expanding their global education programming.

The only education resource produced by Save the Children Canada since 2005 is the Rewrite the Future Children Affected by Armed Conflict: Colombia, South America A Teacher’s Resource. The resource was placed on the Save the Children Canada website for free download and teachers informed of its availability through Save the Children Canada’s school networks. It was described as providing “educators with curriculum-relevant, factual, easy-to-facilitate activities to engage children and young people on this issue” and offering Canadian children “concrete opportunities to contribute to improved access to education for children affected by armed conflict” (Save the Children Canada, 2006, p.3). The emphasis in this resource is on philanthropy, humanitarian efforts, and Save the Children’s work. Many of the activities are similar or the same as those in the South Asian Earthquake and Tsunami resources (mapping exercise, To be safe I need…, Hot Air Balloon, imagining that the student is a humanitarian aid worker, and fundraising activities) but more is offered in the way of instructions and connections to provincial curriculum. Some new activities link directly to the Rewrite the Future campaign’s mandate to provide education to children in conflict zones, including The Pencil Game, which attempts to demonstrate the way that conflict disrupts children’s potential to get an education. The Build a Board Game activity highlights the philanthropic challenge of a “wealthy businessman with a big heart” who offers to give $10 million to the first INGO to reach Colombia from Canada. This Save the Children Canada-produced Rewrite the Future template that marries a campaign, with education, advocacy, and fundraising was also used by Save the Children UK as its Rewrite the Future teacher’s resource on Sudan.
In December 2008, Save the Children Canada announced a School Program that would virtually link Canadian school children with children in Haiti and Colombia. The idea was to engage Canadian students with the subject of children who lacked access to education due to conflict, as part of the Rewrite the Future campaign. Save the Children Canada carried out a school-link program with Toronto area schools and Colombia and Haiti. The students, in grades 6, 8, and 9, prepared and exchanged "locality packs" containing letters, photos, CDs of things that represented their daily lives. A pilot was carried out three different times with approximately ten classes in four schools and the project was completed in 2010 (Correspondence with Natalie Folz of Save the Children Canada). After this point Save the Children Canada has not produced any further education materials and work with schools is on an ad hoc basis. Canadian teachers looking for Save the Children teaching resources are now directed to the Save the Children Alliance website where there are five resources available: the two Rewrite the Future teaching resources (Canada’s version on Colombia and the UK’s version on Sudan), a resource guide for Spanish speaking teachers on children and meeting the Millennium Development Goals, a resource guide for Italian teachers on what it is like to grow up in Ethiopia, and a two page document on fundraising in schools.

Although Save the Children Canada is much smaller than Save the Children UK and had no comparable history of developing well-regarded education materials, the Canadians took the lead on creating the prototype for the kind of education-campaigns/fundraising hybrid that both organizations are now using.

**Funding for Save the Children Canada’s global education programming**

The finances for the most recent Save the Children Canada global education programming came out of their budget for a CIDA Canadian Partnership Branch (CPB) funded five-year project (2006 – 2011). In Save the Children Canada’s proposal they included a line item for $6000 to be put towards a Canadian schools initiative that would highlight the Rewrite the Future campaign teaching resources. They hired a formally trained teacher to do this work part-time, since the funds were not yet in place to carry out the entire program. The idea was that once the part-time person was in place she or he would raise more funds, most likely through CIDA’s Global Classroom Initiative, to
create a larger program. They sent in a proposal to the GCI fund for an expanded global education program, just as CIDA was preparing to terminate the GCI. Their school linkage program does seem to be in line with CIDA’s new and only global education funding, which is focused on school partnerships.

**Save the Children Canada’s campaigns and advocacy**

Save the Children’s history of campaigning is reflective of the wider Canadian INGO sector’s involvement with campaigns; it has not been a priority activity for the organization. Since 2003, Save the Children and UNICEF have joined forces in a Soft Toy campaign through the IKEA furniture store. For every soft toy sold at IKEA between November 1st and December 31st, IKEA donates $1.00 to the two organizations. This global fundraising campaign taken up by UNICEF and Save the Children organizations in various countries offers little in the way of information, learning, and/or advocacy. Save the Children Canada also supported the Make Poverty History campaign, highlighting child poverty issues in both Canada and globally in 2005. During the 2008 - 2009 period, Save the Children Canada coordinated a Holiday Campaign, which raised $75,000 (Save the Children Canada Annual Report 2008-2009, p. 4). Once again this was more of a fundraising campaign than an awareness campaign. Save the Children Canada is also a part of the Canadian Global Campaign for Education and participated between 2004 and 2010 in Global Action Week activities and campaigning for Education for All.

The October 2009 launch of the Save the Children Alliance’s Every One campaign in Canada was the first time that Save the Children Canada had ever participated in an awareness and advocacy campaign of this size (Save the Children Canada Annual Report, 2009, p.6). Prior to the launch they, along with other INGOs, lobbied the Canadian government about issues relating to newborn and children’s health in the first five years. They managed to secure endorsements from five former prime ministers along with other influential Canadians (p.6). As of 2010, interested supporters need to join the Save the Children Canada’s Every One Facebook page to get involved. Almost 25,000 Canadians have joined the campaign through the social network Facebook, as advocates and donors. (Save the Children Canada, 2010, p. 11).
On the Save the Children Canada website they invite the public to “get involved” which leads to a page which asks to readers if they want to “Advocate” or “Join”. If they choose to advocate then they are encouraged to write to their MPs and the Prime Minister about issues that relate to the “No child is born to die” campaign including funds going to provide health care and vaccines, and other health care necessities to the world’s most vulnerable children. If the readers choose the “Join” option then they are taken to the Save the Children Canada’s Every One campaign Facebook page. Supporters are also encouraged to follow along with campaign updates on Twitter (Save the Children Canada, 2009, p. 6).

An earlier advocacy campaign (2007) encouraged Canadians to ‘Be Choosy About Your Chocolate’ and to challenge the exploitative labour practices in West African cocoa production. Other campaigns targeted youth at risk of sexual exploitation in Canada’s Aboriginal communities, encouraging them to call a hotline and advocated for a “Canadian strategy to combat human trafficking in Canada” (Save the Children Canada, 2006-2007, p. 8). The advocacy campaigns mentioned here have more substance than the popular trend of “liking” campaigns on Facebook or following INGO campaigns on Twitter.

Campaigns, fundraising, and education: Comparing Save the Children Canada and Save the Children UK

Save the Children’s work appears to have come full circle over the past decade. The organization that was co-founded by a brilliant campaigner and fundraiser appears to be returning to its roots. The founders, Eglantyne Jebb and Dorothy Buxton were exemplary models of social justice activism. Eglantyne was especially skilled at rallying the public to support her extremely controversial request to care for the “enemy’s” children after World War I. Her concern and compassion was for humanity in general, but Jebb realized that the only way to the British public was through their inability to let children die. This extraordinary woman, who was not particularly fond of children, went on to write the Declaration of the Rights of the Child, the principles that are foundations of the work of Save the Children, UNICEF’s, and many other agencies whose focus is child welfare.
The Jebb sisters dedicated their lives to longer-term socially transformational work, their ideas based on “New Liberal ideas surrounding citizenship and social responsibility” (Mulley, 2009, p.303). During the First World War when the British papers were full of dehumanizing and propagandistic accounts of the war, Dorothy and Eglantyne went to great efforts to acquire papers from as many enemy and neutral countries as possible so they could provide a range of diverse perspectives about the war. At the time it was near impossible to arrange a “dialogue” between people with differences, but the journal was a way of ensuring that there was a means for people to critically reflect on how ‘others’ were impacted by the war. After the war, due to the dire conditions caused by the economic blockades, the sisters moved from unsuccessfu

The two Save the Children sister organizations share this history, along with a similar mission and mandates, but the similarities, for the most part, end there. Save the Children UK was the founding organization and Save the Children Canada grew into a full-fledged organization in the late 1980s after having been a committee since 1921. Save the Children Canada is much smaller than Save the Children UK, with a budget that is only 5% of the UK’s. The UK has a prestige (Princess Anne is their longstanding president) and reach that was established through Eglantyne and her family’s connections, including economist, Maynard Keynes and playwright, George Bernard Shaw.

During the 1990s into the mid 2000s, Save the Children UK regularly produced teaching packs. This curriculum was respectful to children and their communities and was not branded. The learning material treated UK children as equals with children around the world and encouraged them to form partnerships, and to learn through global peer-to-peer inquiry. If campaigning or related activities were suggested, they were not branded. As well, in discussions of poverty and child labour, UK children who were living in poverty and having to work were included in the comparisons. These learning materials were focused on longer-term learning goals of children forming relationships of inquiry with one another. There was not an overt goal of social transformation, but rather
that these children from radically different contexts participating in open, situated dialogue with one another would come to know one another’s humanity.

In 2006 the first Rewrite the Future materials appeared: a hybrid of education lessons with Save the Children branded campaigns and fundraising. Around 2007 when restructuring started, the education department was reduced and moved from its long time home in UK Programs over to Campaigns and Advocacy. The curriculum after 2007 became branded with repeated examples of Save the Children’s work and programming. The UK learner was now seen as a potential donor and/or humanitarian aid worker, and the children in developing countries were no longer co-learners, but children in need of humanitarian assistance. The goal of social transformation was now amelioration. By 2009, education programming was cut altogether and schools and youth work became the purview of the Campaigns and Advocacy Department.

Save the Children Canada does not have a well-known history of global education programming. They were respected for their Child-to-Child facilitation training, but through the lean 1990s when not much public engagement or global education funding was available, few attempts, if any, were made to produce education materials until the mid-2000s. Around 2004, Save the Children Canada applied for CIDA Global Classroom Initiative funding to expand its programming to classrooms. The work was based on the Rewrite the Future campaign. The first Rewrite the Future education materials were written by the Save the Children Canada group. It was used as a framework for the hybrid education/campaign/fundraising materials later used to produce Save the Children UK’s Rewrite the Future materials for Sudan. Save the Children Canada used a small amount ($6000) of public engagement funds from their Partnership Branch fund to seed their global education programming, which they hoped would get further support from CIDA’s GCI. Their GCI proposal did not get funded and CIDA subsequently ended the GCI fund. They launched a pilot school linkage program, based on the Rewrite the Future campaign, between schools in Toronto, Colombia, and Haiti. Since this project, their work with schools has been ad hoc. The Canadians hired a staff person with teaching experience to make inroads into schools, but they were never able to gain enough support for anything beyond the Rewrite the Future materials. There was a lack of an organizational “champion” to make sure that longer-term social transformational work
was prioritized, and little support from government (CIDA or Ontario’s Ministry of Education).

After a decade of discussion, the Save the Children Alliance began to go through organizational changes that impacted the sister organizations. The longer-term vision of the Alliance was to increase the efficiency of their child’s rights work, by narrowing down the focus. During the year of primary data collection for this study, both Save the Children UK and Save the Children Canada went through organizational restructuring to align better with the entire Alliance, an attempt to streamline and prevent overlapping work between sister organizations. In 2010, the Save the Children Alliance became Save the Children International and they hired the former Save the Children UK chief executive, Justine Whitbread, to direct the international strategy. Whitbread was chosen because her marketing and public relations background had served Save the Children UK so well. During her tenure, Whitbread doubled the revenues at the UK office, and refocused Save the Children UK’s work on campaigns and advocacy. Save the Children UK, and later the Alliance, did have a champion of sorts, but not for the longer-term dialogical learning journey. Whitbread’s skills lay in short-term didactic programming that would brand the organization and increase its share of the donor market.
Chapter Eight: INGO Global Education: Comparing Personal Ideals, Organizational Approaches, and Institutional Policies

Introduction

Over the past fifty years, thousands of global educators from both the INGO and formal education sector have navigated the peaks and valleys of global education programming in the United Kingdom and Canada. This study draws on the varied experiences of twenty-eight participants who have either worked as global educators or in support of global education programming. Many of them have spent a year or more doing volunteer work overseas with programs such as Canada’s Canadian University Service Overseas, (CUSO) or the UK’s Volunteer Service Overseas, (VSO) or one of the many other volunteer sending organizations. Some of the participants became teachers and then worked in a “developing” country. Other participants became teachers after they returned from volunteering overseas. Many were politically activated during their university years and joined solidarity networks. Some have been directly involved in curriculum production for schools while others have produced and facilitated workshop-style programming for adults. A number of them are certified teachers who work for INGOs and others have gone on to work in various INGO fields including international development policy or with government agencies or foundations. These participants are part of the history of INGO global education programming. Their understandings of the field help to illuminate the portion of this study that resides on the level of the individual and how the personal resonates with organizational and government priorities, practices, and policies.

Table 5: UK Informants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UK INFORMANTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>E01, E02, E03, E04</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E05</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E06</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Extensive experience with education, 14 years’ experience as High School principal, now works for the Department for Education (DfE) formerly, the Department for Children, Schools, and Families
- Background in the labour movement and with labour education, voluntary overseas INGO
This section explores the second study question, “how do conceptions of the purpose of INGO global education align among individual global educators and global
Participants were asked about their ideals for global education. This question was left somewhat open, so they could speak about particular methods that they preferred to use or about outcomes that they hoped for. They were then asked about how their organizations approached global education programming. Did the organization have a particular framework for global education? Was global education a priority? The intent of the question was to understand how well personal global education ideals aligned with participants’ perceptions of the approach taken by the organizations. They were then asked about institutional policies, those of the international development government agency and/or the department or ministry of education, and how their understandings of these policies aligned with their personal global education ideals and their organization’s approach for global education. Finally, they were asked about the most challenging goals to implement and, if they were able to do their global education programming without constraints, would it look any different?

The first three questions assisted in fleshing out the contextual reality of people doing INGO global education work; what their own higher expectations and goals for global education might be; and how these goals are either supported or suppressed within their organizations and through institutional policies. These last two questions regarding challenges and constraints were intended to get a better impression of where exactly the participants might be experiencing resistance to their global education ideals and what these barriers looked like. The final question about constraints was meant to edge participants beyond their regular parameters for discussing global education programming in order to understand if their conceptualizations of what their programming could be were at all compromised by donor criteria and/or organizational priorities. It also helped to determine if and how organizational priorities were affected by changes on the institutional level. The responses to these questions give deeper insights into the alignment and contrasts among the personal global ideals of individuals, and their perceptions of organizational approaches, and government policies.

**Personal global education ideals**

The participants’ personal global education ideals fell into a range of themes, most of which could be found in the global and related educations literature. Roughly twelve
themes were emphasized: Taking action, interconnections, dialogue/equitable relationships, responsibilities, local to global analysis, range of perspectives, long-term transformation of society, critical reflection, analysis of power relations, knowledge of global issues, values, rights and, branding the organization. Some of these themes were spoken about in connection with other themes, for example participants who spoke about ‘taking action’ might have done so in conjunction with being informed (knowledge and understanding of global issues) and with transforming society. There is an underlying assumption that participants might have intended to include many of these themes within their descriptions of personal ideals, but in some cases they emphasized their importance within responses to other questions.

While this section attempts to relay the data in a direct manner, it also considers how each theme connects to other themes and the possibility that, for example, if a participant felt that “taking responsibility” was an ideal then there is an underlying assumption that this ideal might be directly connected to a number of the other ideals, such as, “knowledge of global issues” and “taking informed action”. The sections that follow on participants’ views of organizational approaches, institutional policies, and challenges and constraints serve to illuminate the areas that some of the participants did not articulate when speaking about their personal ideals.

**Taking action**

Unlike many of the abstract or solely intellectual ideals connected with global education, taking action is about moving into practice, praxis. It is the tangible outcome of the “awareness-to-understanding-to-action” continuum that has been frequently cited in this study. The taking ‘responsible action’ or ‘informed action’ is a characteristic of global education that is grounded in the literature and derived predominantly from practices of active citizenship education and INGO development education. As most of the participants in the study are from INGOs mandated to achieve results in poverty alleviation it is not surprising that the most articulated ideal was ‘taking action’. ‘Taking action’ answers the question, “what’s next?” after acquiring the understanding and skills related to global education for one of the UK participants, a few Save the Children UK participants and one Canadian participant (E07, E02, E03, and C14). For a few of the
other Canadian participants, ‘taking action’ is the act of transforming society through challenging and changing power relations (C15, C16, and C17). Canadian participants, one from Save the Children Canada and just under half the Canadian participants (C01, C10, C09, C11, C12, and C13), spoke about where taking action can occur. One did not have to volunteer overseas to make a positive impact globally; action could be taken locally, in the community, or in the policy realm. Participant C07, who had worked with a volunteer-sending organization, felt that individual action meant, “making life choices that aligned with your values”. Taking action was also seen as the ‘missing link’. Participant E09, an EES coordinator, thought what was truly important about educating for a global perspective was “what the person does with it”. One UK participant was concerned that in INGO global education programming the ideal of “taking action” had taken precedence over the longer-term multi-perspective “learning journey”. For UK participant E08, there was concern with the notion that fundraising campaigns were considered “taking action” and had become the rationale for INGOs to release themselves from their obligations to produce the education programming that had little immediate benefit to the organizations.

**Interconnections**

The concept of being interconnected to everyone and everything on the planet is a foundational characteristic of global education. It is rooted in an age-old notion, often thought of as primarily spiritual in nature, that we are one with the rest of the world, that the boundaries (physical, geographical, and mental) are constructed and disguise how truly reliant on and interdependent we are with everything else. Early environmentalists adopted the concept of the interconnectedness of people, animals, plants, and the natural world. They learned from various worldviews of indigenous peoples who had traditionally embodied practices that honoured our interdependency. The popular working frameworks for global education of leading practitioners and theorists such as Richardson (1976) and later Pike and Selby (1988) as described in Chapter two placed the concept of “worldmindedness”, which is based on the concept of interconnections, firmly into global education’s foundation. Over half the participants from the Canada-wide group, one from Save the Children Canada, one from Save the Children UK, and
one from the UK wide group spoke about interconnectedness as an ideal central to their practice and understanding of global education. Through economic globalization and technology people have become closer (physically and psychologically) (E01, E05) and the impact of global events can now be witnessed, examined, and experienced by all. One of global education’s primary functions, according to both the literature and the participants, is to bring that awareness and understanding of global interconnections to learners. This is the self-reflexive aspect of global education that counters negative concepts of people as “others” (E01, C01) and is, for many participants, bound up with the ideal of taking “responsibility” (C01, E02, C03, C07, C08, C09, C10, C12, C13, C14, C15).

**Responsibilities**

Under half the participants spoke about the ideal of people taking responsibility in conjunction with an awareness and/or understanding of inequities in the world, and taking action. Being responsible is connected to both the notion that people are individually and collectively culpable for global injustices, which links to the understanding that the everyone and everything is interconnected, and that taking responsibility is embodied through “taking action” in an informed and responsible way. Not all participants spoke about responsibilities as an ideal and only one, C08, spoke about responsibilities (used the term “obligations”) alongside the concomitant notion of rights. Two of the participants from Save the Children UK, (E02 and E03) mentioned young people learning about our/their responsibilities in relation to the rest of the world and how that responsibility is related to action (E03). Participant C04, from Save the Children Canada, felt that “people should take some sense of responsibility for ensuring that people around the world have the basic necessities of life”. The ideals of Canada-wide participants C07 and C08 expressed similar understandings of responsibilities as C04, that ensuring the well-being of everyone else in the world is integral to one’s own well-being. These sentiments echo those of the African philosophy of ubuntu, “We believe a person is a person through another person, that my humanity is caught up, bound up and inextricable in yours” (Archbishop Desmond Tutu, cited in Mulferno, 2000, 57-58, cited in Wilkinson, 2003, p.356). The participants from the DEEEP project
(E11, E12, E13) relayed the ideal of “individual, collective, and historical European responsibility for colonization”, which relates to the need for changes to unfair trading policies. The ideal of taking responsibility is described by participant C10 as people taking positive actions locally to impact the global community, linking the concept of responsibility to local-to-global analysis.

**Dialogue/equitable relationships**

A few participants from the UK-wide study (E06, E11, E12, E13), one from the Save the Children UK group (E04) and one from the Canadian group (C15) spoke about the importance of dialogue between people holding different perspectives and from different contexts, geographical, socio-economical, cultural, and so on. A few from the Save the Children UK and Save the Children Canada (E01, E04, C01, C03) and one from the Canada-wide group (C16) emphasized the importance of building equitable relationships between learners (children and/or adults) in the global South and North - an ideal that would have to include dialogue and exchange. The desired outcome of these ideals seemed to be a wider, more inclusive engagement on global issues and with this in mind these two ideals have been placed together. Participant E06, who works for a volunteer-sending organization, considered “a dialogue of understanding between groups around the world” to be the most important global education-related practice. Canadian participant C15 also valued dialogue, as both an ideal practice and ideal outcome of global education, saying pushing for answers (e.g., from corporations or other faceless entities that impact people’s lives) can lead to a dialogue.

Participants from both Save the Children UK and Save the Children Canada talked about creating a space for dialogue across boundaries and for the opportunity for children to develop equitable relationships and to learn from one another in a manner that is not dichotomized into “us and them, rich and poor, black and white” (E01, E04, C01, C03). Within the DEEEP project (E11, E12, and E13) creating a space for intercultural dialogue was one of the goals for their intra-state global education programming. The ideal of dialogue across boundaries (geographic, physical, and psychological) and building equitable partnerships is, of course, also connected to the ideal of listening to and interacting with a range of perspectives “in a participatory form” (E08, E09).
Local-to-global analysis

The ideal of global education being “local-to-global” or “glocal” overlaps with the notion of “interconnections”, which was one of the most widely held ideals among the participants. The ideal of learning locally was not articulated directly among the UK participants, only the DEEEP group (European) and a few Canadians. The DEEEP group (E11, E12, and E13) spoke about connecting local and domestic issues to global issues. Their methodology for deepening engagement with global issues, especially with new member states, is to build on local experiences and understandings and to work outwards: a common popular education technique. Canadians from INGO network organizations (C09, C12, C13) that operated similarly to the DEEEP group, said “equity” should be extended “out from your own social group to the broader global community”. Also representing the networks, C10 and C11, spoke about being actively engaged and responsible at the local level “to affect change globally”. For participant C15 from a learner centre, it was imperative that there needed to be “locally-based analysis of global issues”, and gave the example that when learning about South Africa and Apartheid one also needed to be learning about the racism against the First Nations peoples in Canada. This would create “an affinity of action in terms of being able to make those two connections”.

Engaging with a range of perspectives

The range of perspectives ideal encompassed both a variety of theoretical lenses through which global issues might be understood as well as different perspectives based on cultural understandings and personal experiences. Participants E08, who had worked with the development education network, and E09, an EES coordinator, directly stated that engaging with a range of perspectives was a key characteristic of global education. Other participants expressed this ideal in slightly different ways. Save the Children UK participant E01 felt that along with a human rights framework (the predominant lens of Save the Children) one needed to explore issues through multiple frames such as economic and environmental perspectives, among others. Another Save the Children UK participant, E04, spoke about “getting young people, as citizens of the world, communicating and learning from each other”, which accents the dialogical quality
connected to engaging with a range of perspectives that was also expressed by participant E06 who spoke about dialogue between “North and South, rich and poor”. Participant E05, who had worked with the Department for Education, felt that “intercultural understanding” and engaging across barriers of different languages, cultural practices, and customs was a way of creating more harmonious relationships and extending community locally and globally. Among the Canadian participants, C07, with a history of working with public engagement, felt that ideally “people would be pushed to understand differences” and C15 saw the global educators’ role as introducing these new perspectives to learners and creating the space to explore them.

**Long-term societal transformation**

For most INGOs some aspect of social transformation is core to their work. For example, poverty alleviation is an underlying goal of many organizations working on international development issues. Societal transformation is not typically articulated as a directly stated goal of global education programming, more often, global education’s stated purpose is related to understanding the causes and conditions surrounding global poverty and acquiring the skills to take an active role in addressing these causes and conditions. If one’s definition of global education includes taking action, then that is the connection between the intellectual activity of understanding and learning and the application of knowledge to create societal change. Thus this goal of social transformation is implicit in the most commonly-held ideal of ‘taking action’.

The ways in which this ideal of societal transformation was expressed by participants fell into three areas. The first area was directly ‘poverty alleviation’ as the bottom line goal of global education programming. This was expressed by the DEEEP network (E11, E12, and E13) whose purpose was to coordinate, support, and provide leadership for global education activities among INGOs in the European Union. A few Canadians did not speak specifically about poverty alleviation, but emphasized the importance of engagement and making changes to society ‘over time’. A participant from a smaller Canadian INGO (C16) spoke about the importance of long-term engagement as it would be the only way to make the changes that would lead to a more “equitable” or “just world”. Similarly, participant C17 from a medium-sized, faith-based organization,
also felt that the ideal was to “work for real systemic, long-term change”. Another perspective on societal transformation was that of participant C15, who had twenty years experience working with a development education centre doing community engagement work around local and global issues. C15 saw global education’s ideal outcome as “transforming society” by offering “opportunities for people to change some of the more negative relationships we have with the world into positive ones”.

**Critical reflection**

This area gathers together the ideals that could be loosely characterized as ‘skills’ needed to interpret and analyze information on global issues. A few participants from Save the Children UK and a few from the UK- and Canada-wide groups spoke about this area in a number of ways. One concentration of comments was on understanding of self and identity, which meant knowing oneself and how one’s own identity is shaped by one’s experiences, social status, race, gender, sexual orientation, and so on. Then to be able to take that understanding of one’s self and use it to reflect critically on what is going on in the world in order to make decisions for social change (E03, E08, E09, C11). Related skill sets would involve having media literacy and the ability to address controversial issues (E02). Furthermore, ideally, global educators will be “catalysts for learning” (C15) by exposing classrooms and communities to new ideas and issues that will stimulate engaged and self-directed inquiry and debate, but not be prescriptive about what conclusions learners should arrive at (C15 and C10).

**Analysis of power relations**

Analysis of global and local power relations could be considered a sub-category to the critical reflection ideal. In this case, one participant from Save the Children UK and a few from both the UK-wide and Canada-wide groups who made specific reference to “power relations” or “social injustices” were identified (E02, E08, E09, C16, C17). The related skills needed for making this analysis, critical thinking, reflection, media literacy, and the ability to address controversial issues are inextricably related to ‘analysis of power relations’. Other areas, such as understanding ‘interdependence’ are also connected to analysis of power relations. For example, within the Department for Education and
DfID’s Educating for the Global Dimension the concept of interdependence is defined as, “understanding how people, places, economies and environments are all inextricably interrelated, and that choices and events have repercussions on a global scale”, which can be interpreted as understanding where and how power is exercised in the global community.

**Knowledge of global issues**

Knowledge of global issues is likely an assumed ideal for many. Awareness of global events and issues is a foundation upon which greater understanding and knowledge can be built. The awareness-to-understanding-to-informed action paradigm, which was a common framework for most of the participants, considers understanding (of global issues) to be the necessary premise for taking informed action. A few of the participants from both the UK- and Canada-wide groups (C11, C14, E11, E12, and E13) mentioned the ideal of being informed or spoke about the aforementioned engagement paradigm – awareness-to-understanding-to-action. Other participants from Save the Children UK and the UK group (E03, E07, and E08) were slightly more descriptive, speaking about understanding the “wider world” (E03, E08) and having “knowledge and understanding of global issues” (E07). Within the literature, knowledge of global issues is a common feature of all the global and related educations.

**Values**

This theme of values included a range of ideas regarding attitudes and behaviours that included moral and spiritual beliefs as well. Of the participants who mentioned this thematic area as a personal ideal, three worked primarily with schools and one with youth (outside of schools) and with the INGO sector. The participant who worked with the Department for Education, spoke about global education encompassing a “whole person ethos”, described as being a dimension similar to “the spiritual, moral, cultural”, as these aspects related to one’s “wellbeing” (E05). Two of the others, one in the UK at a large INGO, (E07), and one in Canada, also at a large INGO, (C14), spoke about values and attitudes. For (E07) values and attitudes that students would acquire are “empathy, respect, tolerance, and the capacity to live and work in the global society of the 21st
century”, and for (C14), there would be a values and attitudinal change leading to the person being “more personally invested in international cooperation”. Participant C07, with a background working with VSOs and INGO public engagement felt that the ideal was in people “making life choices that align with their values”, that it was not enough to say one believed in a value (e.g., by “liking” an issue on Facebook), one must embody those values. This area was only directly mentioned by four participants, but the concepts of ‘taking action’ and or taking ‘responsibility’ are connected to attitudes and behaviours related to changes in values. So this ideal may be understood as being an ideal that is implicit within other ideals.

**Rights-based framework**

The personal global education ideal of educating from a rights-based perspective was talked about by three participants one from Save the Children UK (E01), one from the Enabling Effective Support initiative in the UK (E09), and the other from an INGO network in Canada (C08). Save the Children is, of course, an INGO that does development and educational work using a children’s rights-based framework. The participant from Save the Children UK almost automatically spoke about a rights-based education first when first asked about personal ideals, but upon reflection remarked that this was only one of many ways of approaching global education and that outside of the organizational framework (participant E01) would use a range of perspectives beyond human rights, e.g., environmental and economic. The other participant from the UK, (E09), mentioned human rights as one of the many dimensions (or lenses) of the Educating for the Global Dimension framework used by schools in the UK. The Canadian participant (C08) believed that, “as global citizens we share obligations that are ultimately rooted in international human rights to promote the well-being of everybody on the planet and thereby contribute to our own well-being”. This expression of the obligations of global citizenship, while using the language of human rights as a conceptual frame, is ultimately related to the concept of ‘interconnectedness’ and ‘responsibilities’. Often the concept of rights is discussed in relationship with responsibilities, but in this case, participants were more likely to discuss responsibilities (individual and collective) as an ideal over using a rights-based framework.
Branding the organization

Branding the organization as an ideal outcome for global education programming was mentioned by only one person, participant C05, from Save the Children Canada. This participant’s background and focus within the organization is fundraising and philanthropy, but they also did work related to public engagement. An INGO’s brand is dependent on carving out a specialized niche within the development sector. This proposed ideal outcome is based on using the Rewrite the Future materials to inform university volunteers about children’s access to education in conflict zones, so that the volunteers will be able to relay the organization’s “brand” or primary focus while doing outreach. While other participants made minor comments about public relations in other areas it was not considered a common ideal.

Personal global education ideals: Motivations and methods

Participants’ global education ideals did not all fit neatly into previously constructed paradigms of global education, but their collective responses reflected many of the characteristics of global education from the literature. Many of their ideals, when looked at in relation to the conceptual framework of motivations and methods, could fall under the shorter-term didactic programming or the longer-term dialogic programming. Taking action, interconnections, responsibilities, values, and rights-based frameworks are all ideals that could be part of an approach that seeks longer-term transformation, but they could also be characteristics emphasized in campaigns and one-way communication strategies without a depth of commitment or understanding. Knowledge of global issues, local-to-global analysis, and analysis of power relations require more than a short-term engagement, but do not necessarily mean that a long-term engagement, equitable partnership, or societal transformation are desired outcomes. On their own they are abstract, intellectual exercises. Dialogue/equitable relationships, engaging with a range of perspectives, transforming society, and critical reflection all suggest a longer-term engagement with practices that lead to transformation on the personal, organizational, and societal levels. Only one of the ideals, branding, fell solely under short-term motivations and methods as the goal of the practice is to market the organization. The successful branding of the organization would ideally lead to stronger support (via
donations and membership), which in turn could translate into more effective programming for alleviating poverty, but it does not contribute to the longer-term goal of societal transformation. Overall, the majority of participants’ personal global education ideals indicated that they valued long-term dialogical, participatory methods over short-term didactic methods. However, they did not only identify these qualities as being ideal within global education programming, but also within forms of awareness campaigns and advocacy.

Table 7: Informants’ Global Education Ideals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Global Education Ideal</th>
<th>Canada-wide</th>
<th>UK-wide</th>
<th>Save the Children Canada</th>
<th>Save the Children UK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Taking Action</td>
<td>C07, C09, C12, C13, C10, C11, C14, C15, C16, C17</td>
<td>E07, E09, E11, E12, E13</td>
<td>C01</td>
<td>E02, E03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interconnections</td>
<td>C07, C08, C09, C10, C12, C13, C15</td>
<td>E05</td>
<td>C01, C03</td>
<td>E01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibilities</td>
<td>C09, C12, C13, C10</td>
<td>E11, E12, E13</td>
<td>E02, E03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialogue/Equitable Relationships</td>
<td>C15, C16</td>
<td>E06, E11, E12, E13</td>
<td>C01</td>
<td>E01, E04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local-to-GLOBAL Analysis</td>
<td>C09, C12, C13, C11, C10, C15</td>
<td>E11, E12, E13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaging with a Range of Perspectives</td>
<td>C07, C15</td>
<td>E05, E06, E08, E09</td>
<td>E01, E04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-term Societal Transformation</td>
<td>C15, C14, C16, C17</td>
<td>E11, E12, E13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Reflection</td>
<td>C10, C11, C15</td>
<td>E08, E09</td>
<td>E02, E03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of Power Relations</td>
<td>C16, C17</td>
<td>E08, E09</td>
<td>E02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of Global Issues</td>
<td>C11, C14</td>
<td>E07, E08, E11, E12, E13</td>
<td>E03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values</td>
<td>C07, C14</td>
<td>E05, E07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rights-based Framework</td>
<td>C08</td>
<td>E09</td>
<td>C05</td>
<td>E01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branding the Organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Organizational Global Education Approaches

This next level of exploration of support for INGO global education programming was to find out how and if the global education ideals of the participants aligned with their organizations’ approaches to global education and if global education was a priority within the organization. The range of responses to questions regarding organizational approaches fell roughly into two broad categories: 1) descriptions of organizational approaches to global education, and 2) the perceived tensions that exist within the organization with regard to global education programming. The last part of this look at organizational approaches discusses whether or not participants’ personal global
education ideals aligned with their perceptions of their organizations’ approaches and priorities.

**Organizational approaches**

The organizational approaches most described by participants were: the awareness-to-understanding-to-action continuum; participatory decision-making; critical thinking and structural analysis; education sector focus; and, children’s rights. Some of the participants highlighted the type of organizational framework for global education in terms of a broad lens, e.g., the awareness to action continuum or children’s rights, while others spoke about how decisions were made regarding organizational global education programming.

Most of the participants that represented INGO member networks in the Canada-wide group and just under half of the networks in the UK-wide group (E11, E12, E13, C10, C11, C09, C12, and C13) said that their organizations used the ‘awareness-to-understanding-to-action’ continuum as their framework for approaching global education and public engagement. For these networks this was an overarching framework that was agreed upon among their members; however, the individual membership organizations were diverse in their approaches to global education. Some members “have more focus on communication or some more on fundraising as their modus operandi and some don’t engage in public engagement per se” (C11). One of the members of the DEEEP group suggested that it was a bit like advertising, “Attention, interest, desire, action when you see publicity, then finally you want to buy it” (E12). Other than the networks, the continuum as an organizational approach, was only mentioned by one non-network INGO, (C14), who saw the taking action piece as part of a desired values and attitudinal change.

Two networks (E08 and C11) and one learner centre (C15), talked about the participatory manner in which their members determined priorities. Participant C15’s organization was described as a “non-hierarchical structure” in which the members, the board, and wider constituency, who held similar, but varied worldviews, determined the priorities for the organization. Most of the participants in Canadian INGO networks (C09, C12, C13, and C11) and two Canadian INGOs, one small (C16) and one faith-based
(C17), said that their approach to global education included “critical thinking” and/or a “structural analysis”.

Some of the networks and organizations spoke about their approach specifically to education programming. Participant E08, from a global education-focused network, described a “richness of practice” that was “high quality, educationally-focused and educationally-determined” and participant E07’s large INGO supported a “learner-centred focus” and “teacher training”. A few others, representing the EES network, a Canadian INGO network, and a Canadian learner centre emphasized that their approach, particularly to schools, was “not prescriptive” (E09, C10, C15), and that they tried to bring a variety of perspectives into schools. For example, participant E09, an EES coordinator, spoke about using the educating for the global dimension framework as well as drawing from other sources, such as Oxfam’s global citizenship education model. One of the primary concerns for E07 and E09 was being both flexible in approach and fast-acting to help schools keep up with global events and changes.

Perhaps because a children’s rights framework was so obviously forefronted in their organizations, not all the Save the Children UK or Save the Children Canada participants mentioned this framework as the dominant organizational approach. The participants that did talk about their organization’s rights-based framework were three Canadian Save the Children participants (C03, C04, and C05) and one participant (E01) from Save the Children UK, who said that the rights-based approach was, “all about empowering the people that they work with” and also felt that INGOs (like Save the Children) enable deeper relational work, child-to-child and North-to-South.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational Approaches</th>
<th>Canada-wide</th>
<th>UK-wide</th>
<th>SC Canada</th>
<th>SC UK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Awareness-to-Understanding-to-Action Continuum</td>
<td>C09, C12, C13, C10, C11, C14</td>
<td>E11, E12, E13</td>
<td>C09, C12, C13, C10, C11, C14</td>
<td>C09, C12, C13, C10, C11, C14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participatory Decision-making</td>
<td>C11, C15</td>
<td>E08</td>
<td>C11, C15</td>
<td>C11, C15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Thinking and Structural Analysis</td>
<td>C09, C10, C11, C12, C13, C16, C17</td>
<td>E11, E12, E13</td>
<td>C09, C10, C11, C12, C13, C16, C17</td>
<td>C09, C10, C11, C12, C13, C16, C17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Sector Focus</td>
<td>C10, C15</td>
<td>E07, E08, E09</td>
<td>C10, C15</td>
<td>C10, C15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child’s Rights-based</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C03, C04, C05</td>
<td>E01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overall, Save the Children participants did not discuss any kind of organizational approach other than the child’s rights-based approach. INGO networks in both Canada and the DEEEP group emphasized the awareness-to-understanding-to-action continuum and critical thinking and structural analysis. Two Canadian INGO participants also spoke about their organizations taking an approach that included a structural analysis. Canadians were less likely to speak about an education approach as their responses were more about “not being prescriptive” with the education sector. The UK-wide group spoke more specifically about working with schools. Only a few participants spoke about participatory decision-making, two from INGO networks (one Canadian, one UK) and one Canadian learner centre.

**Tensions**

Just under half the participants spoke of some level of tension within their organization regarding global education programming. These tensions were connected to external pressures for INGOs to compete for a greater share of the donor market. Participants from Save the Children UK and Canada underscored many tensions with regard to how and if their organizations valued global education programming. Four of the participants (E01, E03, C01, and C03) felt that their organization valued global education as a prelude to fundraising or campaigning and staying “on message” (E02). For participant C03 this was not necessarily a tension, because fundraising and campaigning were a way of ‘taking action’; however, for others it demonstrated their organizations’ preoccupation with having tangible outcomes of increased support over “education for the sake of education” (E01, E03). It was also felt that global education was not well understood within the organization (C01). In the UK there had not been commitment to global education in recent years; the focus was elsewhere (E02, E04). Participant E04 made the observation that global education programs were somewhat of a “luxury” for INGOs and that when organizations had to cut back, the utility of these programs came into question. This tended to alienate global educators, since we’ve all been trained teachers who’ve gone into the NGO field, who straddled… sometimes you can feel closer to the professional field than to the NGO charity field. Because you’re really sitting in two camps and trying to bring them together (E04).
Even though getting global education into schools was one of the major struggles for the INGO sector, forging a solid relationship between the development and the education sector had repercussions for the INGO global educators. As these hybrid international development workers/teachers became more aligned with the formal education sector they became less aligned with their organizations.

There was also the sense that Save the Children and UK INGOs in general were “unsure who [INGOs, DfID, or DfCSF] should be responsible for global education” so the INGOs were “backing away” (E03). Another comment made by several Save the Children participants, both in the UK and in Canada, was that there was no organizational champion at the more senior levels to assist with making schools-based global education programming more of a priority (E01, C01, and C03). Up until 2007 Save the Children UK had a strong advocate for global education within the organization, Andrew Hutchinson. His over thirty years of work and commitment to global education was highly regarded and his presence sorely missed by all the Save the Children UK participants.

The non-Save the Children participants noted similar tensions within their organizations. Participant C14, from a large INGO, felt that although their organization did appreciate global education it seemed to be in the context of being a “value-added” to the greater priority area of fundraising. A participant who had worked on public engagement programming, C07, felt that the organization demonstrated a “gap in theory to practice” as it valued global education on paper (through policy), but in practice campaigns and communications took up most of the organization’s resources.

**Alignment of personal ideals with organizational approaches**

Just under half of the participants stated that their ideals were aligned with their organization’s values (E07, E08, E11, E12, E13, C09, C12, C13, C10, C11, C14, C16, and C15). Those participants whose organizations were Canadian INGO membership networks (C09, C10, C11, C12, and C13) admitted that while the staff, boards of directors, and many of their organizational members supported similar approaches to global education programming, commitment to and interest among the entire memberships varied. Additionally, one Canadian participant, C16, from a smaller INGO,
said that the organizational approach to global education programming was more short-
term in nature, still with a social justice and equity focus, but not entirely aligned with 
C16’s ideal of longer-term societal transformation.

Although organizational values regarding global education may have aligned with 
participants’ personal ideals on paper or within education departments, in some cases 
participants indicated that their organizations did not consider education programming to 
be a priority. In E07’s case, as part of organizational-wide restructuring, the education 
program was reduced and staff were laid off “irrespective of the sound and influential 
work they were doing”. Participant C14, as noted above in the section on tensions spoke 
about how the organization saw global education as a “value-added” to fundraising. For 
both participant C14 and for E07, there was a difference between their personal ideals 
aligning with the education departments that they headed and the priorities of the 
organizations as a whole. Participant E07 summarized the issue as follows

INGOs in their public awareness-raising too often aim for short-term goals 
that promote essentially simple campaigning messages and actions. 
Development Education is a long-term investment to achieve impact and 
outcomes that will positively shape the thinking and values of the nation’s 
citizenry towards notions of sustainable development and global 
interdependence. These outcomes (as distinct from outputs) are 
notoriously difficult to evaluate.

At participant C17’s organization there were tensions across departments. Education and 
advocacy departments were complementary, but the goals of the fundraising and 
communications departments that were inextricably tied to the organization’s education 
programming were not aligned with C17’s personal ideals for global education.

Some of the other participants who did not make direct mention of whether or not 
their ideals aligned (E01, E02, E03, E04, C01, C03, and C17), indicated through their 
explanations of their organizations’ approaches and priorities that there was not an 
alignment. Due to the tensions within the Save the Children organizations, the UK was 
going through a review of the development education programming and Canada had only 
a halftime staff person working on global education. Neither the Canadian nor the UK 
Save the Children participants said that their ideals aligned with their organizations. 
These disjunctures within the Save the Children organizations manifested in the
termination of education programming in the UK and a minimal commitment to global education in Canada.

**Government policies and priorities**

The participants’ experiences and understandings about their governments’ global education policies and priorities fell into two broad areas: observations about DfID, DCSF (the UK’s Department for Education, which was called the Department for Children, Schools, and Families in 2008), CIDA and the Provincial Ministries of Education (MOEs) support for global education programming, and pressing concerns about government support for global education. It is important to note that these interviews were conducted in 2008, prior to major and further cuts to INGO and global education programming that took place in the UK in 2011 and Canada in 2012.

**Observations about government global education programming support**

At the time of the study the UK’s international development department (DfID) had invested more in INGO global education programming than any previous government. Within the first few years of DfID’s existence, the department, in collaboration with the Development Education Association (DEA), established a partnership with the Department for Education to promote educating for the global dimension in schools. This commitment and collaboration between two government departments, the INGO sector, and global education stakeholders (the DEA’s members were also from both the international development and education sectors) to provide global education programming was the primary focus for most of the UK participants. The sense among participants was that there was not an ‘ideal practice’ or ‘collective vision’ of global education programming coming from the government departments, instead the government’s approach was pragmatic. Since DfID’s mandate is poverty alleviation, there is an element of needing to address the status quo in the world. For two participants this meant an approach to global education that is open to exploring global power relations and inequities in the world (E07, E09). It also meant that DfID was looking to build a constituency that would support international cooperation (E01, E02, and E06) because DfID had “recognized the value of INGOs in raising public awareness” (E07).
The DCSF (Department for Education) had to have a strong rationale for including global education in an already crowded curriculum for children and young people in the UK. The understanding that schools are coveted spaces for influencing consumer behaviour (Norris 2011) has added an increased burden of having to vet the wide range of interests coming from the private and public sectors. Within and around the DCSF are definite international and intercultural interests. The Joint International Unit and the British Council are two bodies that have supported the inclusion of the global dimension in education through their related interests in school and teacher exchanges and improving international competencies. The sense from the participants was that the DCSF took more of an international education approach, one that emphasized skill sets that improved students’ chances of success in a globalized world rather than identifying and challenging global injustices. This international education approach was partially due to the influence of the British Council’s agenda, articulated in the sustainable schools framework (E09). Two of the participants (E09 and E01) expressed concerns regarding the overlapping of an international education’s “business and trade” focus (E01) that does not seek to challenge global inequities, with a global education’s perspective that “issues of poverty, injustice, and inequality are at the heart of the understanding that the world is structured in a way that power is not equally distributed” (E09). Through the DCSF and British Council partnership the focus on school exchanges has raised concerns about how these partnerships will be framed by schools and teachers. Will they be equitable learning exchanges or will they be uneven relationships between have and have not schools that reinforce stereotypes and the global status quo?

Although the two departments came at the issue of educating for the global dimension from somewhat differing perspectives and interests (E01, E07, and E09) they have been able to work together to bring global education into schools. The acceptance of the global dimension in schools began with the citizenship curricula, which for some was a welcome starting point (E07). This said, others felt that it was just another marginalized area within which to house global education (E06). How the collaboration was actually enacted was also cause for speculation as to whether or not the two departments had much of a dialogue outside of their individual interests and investments in the programming (E06).
The global dimension as it is represented in policy documents is cross-curricular and whole school allowing for much broader interpretations of how and where global education can be taken up in classrooms and schools. DFID recognized that INGOs have taken a leadership role in developing “practical work that could be taken up by teachers, that can affect whole schools environments, whole school change” (E07). The most important feature of governments’ support for global education, according to participant E08, formally with the global education network, is whether civil society organizations and educators “are given the creative space within education to experiment and innovate within broad goals and framework”. It was mentioned that DFID was “mainstreaming development education focal points” and “promoting change through education” (E01). This might be true of individual INGO development education initiatives, but within the DFID’s input into the Enabling Effective Support initiative, “the question about development and aid is never really discussed” (E08), rather, the programming message within the broader learning goal of “promoting in people of all ages to be more caring, more aware and more just for an egalitarian world”. As participant E08 believes, “you can’t divorce talking about development and aid without also combating racism or other things”, which was why DFID was supportive of the EES and development education initiatives collaborating with the Community Cohesion and anti-racist education (E01 and E09).

The Canadian participants had much less to say than their UK counterparts about government support for INGO global education programming because recent (within the past decade) examples of support have become increasingly rare. The main source of support for Canadian INGOs is through CIDA and provincial education ministries. The participants spoke about four types of support offered by CIDA during the period up until the data collection period: The Global Classroom Initiative offered through CIDA’s Communications Branch; the allowable 10% usage of Partnership Branch project funds for public engagement; the public engagement coordinating funds from Partnership Branch granted to the Provincial Councils; and the Stand-Alone Public Engagement Project fund also offered through Partnership Branch. Among the participants who spoke

---

28 The Global Classroom Initiative and the Stand-Alone Public Engagement Project fund have been discontinued.
about CIDA’s Global Classroom Initiative (GCI), the response was somewhat lukewarm. A common complaint was that the application process took up many hours of staff time to create, as did securing a partnership within the formal education sector (C01 and C10). While it was a step in the right direction (C01), the complicated application process and the one-off nature of the funding deterred participants from applying. Two participants (C10, C14) said that they preferred to develop their own relationships and projects with the ministries of education and school boards. It was also noted that the CIDA criteria to promote its development objectives within the GCI could be disconcerting for teachers who were asked to document if they were “more aware of the role that Canadians play in international development”, which was not an area that they had set out to teach (C09). While the GCI was seen as a potential avenue for working with schools, many INGOs seemed to find the application process and criteria to be more effort than resource strapped INGOs could afford to give.

The ways that CIDA supported public engagement, through the allowable 10% of the Partnership Branch INGO project budget, the Provincial Councils public engagement coordinating fund, and the Stand-Alone Public Engagement fund, were not discussed in great detail. As organizations had the choice as to whether or not they wanted to spend 10% of their overseas project budget on public engagement, the participants felt that there was the option to do this work (C03, C14, C16). However, how much an organization chose to spend of their precarious project budget on public engagement was the key determinant. For some organizations digging into the scarce project funding to do public engagement work was not a priority (C03) and for others (C16) public engagement was valued by the organization, so they used upwards of 25% of the total budget for this kind of programming. The participants also spoke about the support that CIDA gave to the Provincial Councils to act as regional coordinating bodies for public engagement. As of 2006, each Provincial Council received $50,000 to carry out work with their INGO membership. The councils could still apply for the various funds available from CIDA, but this dedicated fund now ensured that they would not have to compete with their members for the public engagement funds. Most of the INGOs in Canada and in this study were members of either a provincial council and/or the national council, the Canadian Council for International Cooperation (CCIC), and thereby benefitted from the
councils’ public engagement work. The councils were places that members could convene, collaborate, and work to further their collective efforts to engage Canadians about international development issues. The other option for public engagement was the Stand-Alone Public Engagement fund. Participants C10 and C13 commented that this Stand-Alone Public Engagement fund had less criteria and a more straight-forward application process than the Global Classroom Initiative. The downside to the Stand-Alone Public Engagement fund was that it was just that, “stand-alone”, and therefore did not encourage continuity in programming. It also became increasingly competitive.

Overall impressions about CIDA’s support ranged from somewhat optimistic to deeply disappointing. Participant C14 felt that based on recent meetings with CIDA “they were thinking about education for education’s sake”, but at the same time was wondering what the response from CIDA would be if programming encouraged “asking critical questions of the government”. Participant C03 said that providing global education programming was possible because of the 10% public engagement allowance, but was not certain that it was enough to really develop the programming and it depended whether or not the organization was willing to make global education a priority over other programming areas. Other comments about CIDA programming were neutral to negative. Participants C16, from a small INGO, was not certain what CIDA’s position was on global education, and C17, from a medium-sized, faith-based INGO, said, “when we’re putting together our education campaigns, the word CIDA has never come up”. Others felt that CIDA was not “thinking about education” or seeking input from Canadians (C09); global education activities coming out of Communications Branch, such as the Butterfly 208 competition\(^\text{29}\) had a “very minimalistic vision” (C07); and that the responsibility for public engagement had been “bounced around inside CIDA”(C07).

Aligning the interests that are found in two different levels of government, international development on the federal level and education provincially, has been an ongoing challenge for the INGO sector in Canada. National level Canadian organizations with education programs, such as UNICEF, Oxfam, and World Vision, are supposed to

\(^{29}\) “Butterfly 208” contest that encourages Canadian youth between 14 & 18 years of age to submit an essay or artwork based on one of the following themes: child protection, education, HIV/AIDS awareness, the environment, or health and nutrition”(archived email communication from Joe Knockaert, Director of Pacific Regional Office CIDA, April, 3, 2003).
represent all of Canada, but developing meaningful partnerships with every ministry of education across Canada requires a lot of resources. Much is dependent on how open particular ministries, teachers’ associations, and school boards are to global education. Some provinces provide multiple entry points and have ongoing relationships with INGO global educators (C09, C10). The curriculum (in this specific province) had citizenship and global citizenship themes throughout it and INGOs are listed as resources for teachers (C10). Other provinces are more ad hoc in their relationships with INGOs varying from school board to school board. With the exception of the celebrity-style popularity of the Me to We franchise affiliated with the INGO Free the Children, no particular INGO has made deep inroads into schools. Participant C01 from Save the Children did not gain much traction with the Ontario Ministry of Education, nor with other ministries across the country. Other participants, such as C14, from an INGO with national reach, had connections with specific people in a few ministries who were truly supportive of the organization’s work.

**Concerns: Global education support for small ‘p’ politics and public relations**

In the UK, where INGOs had been trusted partners and allies of DFID since the late 1990s, there was not too much concern about DFID’s intentions with regard to supporting global education. Participant E01, from Save the Children UK did however, raise a red flag concerning possible misuse of global education programming should the government decide to delve into “small ‘p’” politicking to build more support for interventions in countries of interest. While participant E08 was convinced that DFID was not intending to self-promote through its support of global education, giving the Enabling Effective Support initiative as an example of programming without a pro-development message, others (E02) said that the messaging is pro-government to “support development abroad”. As well, supporting “global understanding and building a global community” helps to build a constituency, in the case of both DFID and the European Union, which was not seen as a negative by participant E06, but as a necessary part of coalition-building.

While the small ‘p’ politicking of government through global education was a distant fear in the minds of the UK participants, it was a lived reality for the Canadian
participants. Getting resources for global education programming was challenging, but not if your interests aligned with those of the government and you were willing to focus your program on Canada’s foreign policy interests. The participants noted that it was “depressingly” easy to get government resources for programming on Afghanistan (C09, C12, C11, and C13), a primary Canadian foreign policy interest at the time of data collection. Requests to fund programming that discusses the controversial aspects of climate change, mining, or food security were most likely to get turned down by CIDA (C10 and C11). As more of the responsibility for public engagement and global education funding comes under the purview of CIDA’s Communications branch the ‘messaging’ and the demand that global educators align with the governments’ key thematics intensifies.

From the mid-1990s onward, while funding for INGO global education programming and long-term overseas volunteer placements declined, funding for short-term ‘voluntourism’ placements increased. Participant C07, who had worked for a volunteer-sending organization in the past, felt that this “exotic job experience” for young Canadians was the government’s attempt to hold on to the “good guy, peacemaker image” from the days of Pearson and Trudeau (C07). C07 noted that with the increase in numbers of young people doing short-term placements came a decrease in funding to cover important areas such as debriefing (in some cases reduced to a one hour phone call) when volunteers returned and ensuring that the returned volunteers carried out global education programming in Canadian communities after they returned. The global education aspect and reciprocity of the volunteer-sending ideal was leaning more towards what Canadians can get from the world,

My cynical side says in many cases there’s an awful lot being given by the countries of the South that are receiving these young people, than what the young people are actually contributing (C07).

Over the years there have been notable changes to CIDA’s approach to public engagement (C09 and C10). From 1999 to 2004 the CIDA-developed Public Engagement Continuum was the key framework for INGO global educators, but in the past five years many participants felt that CIDA has avoided talking about the continuum, even though it was received well and taken up by the sector (C09, C10, C11, C12, C13, and C14). Public engagement is still a strong part of CIDA’s image, but there is a sense that the
agency will shift towards more controlled public engagement messaging (C10).
Speculation over whether or not CIDA might get reclaimed by Defense, Foreign Affairs, and International Trade has made the Agency appear to be protective over its image, possibly struggling to validate its existence (C12). Participant C14 was concerned about the Agency’s resistance to any meaningful engagement with the public and gave the example of the progressive global education work that the Australian government was working on, asking hard questions about their country’s “role in the world”, while the Canadian government “is very closed to this kind of input from the public” (C14).

Some informants believed that the movement of the public engagement/global education portfolio from Partnership branch (the branch of CIDA that works with INGOs) to Communications branch allows for greater control over the messaging related to Canadian foreign policy and development. At a time when there is a “chill around advocacy” coming from the federal level (C07, C09, C10, C11, C12, and C13) the centralized, watchful Communications branch can ensure that INGOs are promoting a positive image of Canadians on the world stage that will build a supportive Canadian constituency (C07).

**Challenges and constraints in comparative perspective**

Not all the participants responded to the questions about the challenges they faced reaching their global educational ideals. The Canadians reported facing more challenges than the UK participants. None of the UK participants acknowledged that they felt constrained by any of the criteria for global education funding, but many of the Canadian participants responded that they were constrained by the criteria.

**Challenges**

The challenges global educators faced reaching their goals looked different in the UK and in Canada. The UK-wide participants who responded to this question spoke about four areas of concern that dealt directly with concerns about criteria for global education funding: dealing with a defensive government; issues of identity, values, and culture; alleviating poverty; and global citizenship rhetoric versus critical reflection and learning. With regard to defensive government, since the mid-1990s this had not been the case, but
as participant E06 pointed out, with the upcoming election (in 2009) that the government right now (2008 Labour Party) feels very fragile as it was becoming more evident that the Conservatives would win. Participant E06 had heard a Minister say “Why fund organizations that criticize us?”. On the one hand, the INGOs are DfID’s constituency and the work of INGOs can help raise the profile of the department, but on the other hand, it seems that the government wants to “influence and direct”, whereas “if they were feeling more confident they would be much happier to let a thousand flowers bloom” (E06).

Within the Enabling Effective Support (EES) program, participant E09 recognized that they have to be sensitive about any of their programming that might touch on people’s identity, values, and culture or issues that people might have had lived experience with, for example refugees and asylum-seekers, as the government policy or statistics may not align with individual experiences. In addition, E09 felt that it was important that within the sector, their network is “explicit about what we or the network members have really achieved – have to be careful not to over claim”. Under conditions in which the state gives INGOs reason to believe that their financing is continually on the chopping block unless they are demonstrating success, INGOs are more likely to “over-claim”, as E09 referred to it, their achievements, and under-claim their difficulties (Wallace, 2002, p. 3). This creates an environment in which the pressure to produce short-term outputs is so great that it is difficult to impossible to have honest, critical reflection about INGO global education programming and what its longer-term achievements could be. Finally, the DEEEP participants, (E11, E12, and E13) felt that the most challenging aspect of their work was the overarching goal of poverty alleviation and “how to get people to develop their own vision out the information they have”. They are also concerned with challenges such as those faced by the Netherlands. The Netherlands “spends 20-30 million € on development education, the same budget as the EC” for the past 30 years, and while “40% of the population know about the Millennium Development Goals, which is quite high, only 8% are actively supporting poverty alleviation (E11, E12, and E13). Not only does this mean that having the knowledge does not necessarily translate into an attitude change, the Netherlands is also facing domestic problems with rising racism and xenophobia. This anecdote about the Netherlands
underscores a point made by participant E08 who was concerned that the concept of
global citizenship that policy makers think they are signing on to “might be just rhetoric”,
that there needs to be a deepening of understanding, reflection, and learning.

The Canadians interviewed for this study faced numerous challenges, including:
working within a multi-stakeholder environment; struggling to get the attention of a
media saturated public; local-to-global issues; less resources for sustained engagement;
addressing power relations; encouraging people to be generous; and the rise of
“conservative” values. For participant C11, doing justice work in a multi-stakeholder
environment meant having to flatten out one’s core ideals in order to gain wider
acceptance. Other participants (C09 and C10) had difficulties determining if there is a
causal relationship between their public engagement and global education efforts and
people’s actions when there are so many influences (popular culture, media) competing
for the public’s attention, including rampant consumerism. The government’s resistance
to funding local analysis of global issues has been a disruption to global education
programming for decades (C15). The provision of less and less resources for sustained
engagement had signaled the increase of more-bang-for-your-buck-type global education
experiences with no long-term commitment (C11). It was challenging for participants
C16 and C17 to enact their personal ideals of including a structural analysis of poverty in
their global education programming, possibly due to some of the more “conservative”
values that are being forefronted in Canada (C17). Participant C17, from a religious-
based organization, also spoke about the conditions of economic recession and increased
consumption making it difficult to convince people of the “ideal of sacrificial giving”,
which is to give “more than you feel comfortable giving”.

Participants from Save the Children spoke about the challenges of how to make
the global education message meaningful. There was concern about how to steer people
away from the over-simplified dichotomies of us/them, black/white, rich/poor and so on
(E01 and C01), and how to relay the complexity of issues like fair trade and child labour
to a public that is already bombarded with messages (C03). Participant C01 found
challenges in both steering learners away from simply wanting to fundraise (towards
other areas of action) and with attempting to understand how global education
programming fits into the priorities of Save the Children Canada.
Imagining no constraints

When participants were asked if they would do anything differently if there were no constraints imposed by their funders, it was clear that some of the constraints might be more internal (organizational) than imposed by donors. This could be seen from the disjunctures noted earlier between personal ideals and organizational approaches. In other cases, participants had difficulty thinking through the possibilities of not having constraints, as they had not projected beyond the parameters of the funding criteria (both explicit and implicit criteria). Participants in the UK did not respond to how their programming would look different without constraints, nor did the participants from the two Save the Children organizations. Other participants from the Canada-wide study did have some ideas of how their programming would change without constraints. The constraints that Canadian participants experienced were both explicit, (e.g., small amounts of funding and having to highlight Canada’s foreign policy positively), and implicit, (e.g., even though, by Revenue Canada’s charity laws, INGOs were allowed to use up to 10% of their budget on advocacy, it was understood in the sector that an organization potentially put its funding at risk by engaging in advocacy that did not align with government positions).

Participant C07 thought that without constraints there would be “more emphasis on action versus theoretical discussions about it”, along with “more community outreach” and “more freedom of speech”, because, “we’ve gotten very nervous”. Participant C09, from an INGO network, thought that without constraints they would not feel obligated to emphasize the “promotion of establishment things like the MDGs”, but could focus on areas such as, being “more overtly critical of Canada’s involvement in extractive industries and [Canada’s] not signing the Aboriginal declaration of the rights of Indigenous Peoples”.

Other Canadian participants, C10, C11, and C12 felt that without constraints they would work on a greater variety of issues that are not approved by the current government, such as more “local-to-global environmental issues” (C10), “climate change, mining”(C11), use a broader interpretation of international development (C12), and “be more creative… take things in different directions” (C13). Participants C09 and C15 both
spoke about wanting to do more anti-racist work. C15’s organization, a learner centre, went ahead and did this work, but did not report it to funders:

the feds [in CIDA] wouldn’t touch anti-racist education with a 10-foot pole. One of the curious things was you could talk about refugees and why people became refugees, but you couldn’t talk about the difficulties people had once they came to Canada. (C15)

Participant C16, from a smaller INGO, thought that Revenue Canada was the true constraint, rather than CIDA, because of its strict charity laws around advocacy. Within C17’s organization there had been warnings about not raising certain issues, because this could be “endangering our funding”, but C17 felt more constrained by the conservative nature of their organization’s decision-making religious base than by CIDA. Another distinction between the UK participants and the Canadians was that three of the Canadian participants (C11, C10, and C17) all remarked that it was “difficult to think outside of the box” when asked what they would do if they had no constraints on their programming. For most of the Canadian global educators, funding has been so scarce that for organizations that continue to use CIDA funding for global education programming, they have stopped imagining the possibilities for programming beyond the funding limitations, as they have had to work within parameters of restrictive criteria for the past decade.

The interplay among individual global education ideals, organizational approaches, and government policies

At all three levels of inquiry, personal, organizational, and government there was evidence of both longer-term dialogical and shorter-term didactic approaches. The participants’ personal global education ideals reflected a range of global education-related characteristics in the form of knowledge, skills, attitudes, and desired outcomes. Four of the ideals: dialogue/equitable relationships; engaging with a range of perspectives; transforming society; and critical reflection suggest a longer-term engagement with practices that lead to transformation on the personal, organizational, and societal levels. Five of the ideals could be related to programming that was short-term, didactic, or longer-term: taking action, interconnections, responsibilities, values, and rights-based frameworks. These are all ideas, practices, and frameworks that could be applied to or relayed through a one-way campaign, but they tend to be part of a collection
of approaches, e.g., taking action would be valued as a practice that would be connected with having knowledge of a global issue, then wanting to take responsibility for it. Taking action was also a red flag for one participant who pointed out that INGOs focus mostly on the “action” rather than the learning that needs to be done prior to making decisions about “actions”.

There were three ideals based on understanding and analysis: knowledge of global issues, local-to-global analysis, and analysis of power relations that might require a short to medium term engagement, but are also part of a long-term engagement that could lead to equitable partnership, or societal transformation. One participant spoke of branding one’s organization as an ideal outcome for global education, which is an atypical response, but this participant was from a philanthropy department and the response was indicative of a goal that an organization would have for global education programming.

Organizational mandates had longer-term transformational goals, but for many this was not reflected in their global education programming approach. This was the case for both the UK and Canada. INGOs were perceived as having begun to favour a short-term, didactic approach using fundraising campaigns as global education. Just under half the participants felt that their personal global education ideals aligned with their organizations approaches, however it was often the case that it was the global education approaches within their organization’s global education departments that aligned with participants’ ideals. Organizational priorities were not necessarily aligned with individual ideals.

In the view of the participants, government policies and priorities varied between Canada and the UK. DfID and CIDA had similar long-term transformational mandates for their agencies, but DfID demonstrated actual commitment to long-term transformation in global education programming, whereas CIDA’s interests tended to be short-term and didactic. DfID and the DCSF had a partnership that moved global education forward in schools, and demonstrated longer-term commitment. However, some of the participants felt that the British Council heavily invests in DCSF global education and takes a distinctly international education/business and trades perspective that emphasizes acquiring an international skill set for a globalized world rather than addressing global social and economic injustice. Canadian participants thought that
CIDA did not have an on-going relationship with provincial ministries of education (MOEs). Participants acknowledged that across Canada MOEs have committed to educating for the global perspective through additions to the curriculum, but it is not yet an overarching curricular policy as in the UK due to the challenging educational structure in Canada. The provincial MOEs had only ad hoc relationships with INGOs in this study, but were noted to have relationships across Canada with the INGO-related GE programming of the Me to We franchise, which is marketed across Canada.

The UK participants noted facing challenges with a defensive pre-election government that was likely to lose and now needed to justify all of its support for global education while the economy is crumbling. Other challenges mentioned were delicate issues around culture and identity, meeting transformational goals (alleviating poverty), and global education as rhetoric versus a genuine learning journey. The Canadians spoke about struggling to provide education in a wider culture of rampant consumerism, finding it difficult to include power relations, being constrained by criteria, and facing a chill on advocacy.
Chapter Nine: The Changing Nature of INGO Global Education Programming: Analysis and Conclusion

Introduction

The first goal of this study was to compare and contrast the shifting nature of global education programming in INGOs in Canada and the United Kingdom. This required learning about the mechanisms of support for INGO global education programming and the institutional and organizational frameworks within which INGO and global education funding protocols are created and enacted. The second goal was to determine how both these areas interact with the ideals of global education held by individual global educators and their advocates.

The first related questions of this study are “how has the nature of global education programming shifted in INGOs in the two international contexts of Canada and the United Kingdom? and “What accounts for these shifts?” Answering this question involved conducting a document analysis (reports, journal articles, web articles, and curriculum), and semi-structured interviews with both global educators and those working in collaboration with global educators in Canada and the United Kingdom. The INGO global education programming, practices, support, and historical changes were examined to determine the socio-political influences within each country in order to get a better understanding of the shifts in INGO global education programming, and to draw out some prevailing themes that became evident from a historical comparative perspective.

To answer the second question, “how do conceptions of the purpose of INGO global education align among individual global educators and global education advocates, organizations, and institutions?” participants were interviewed about what their own global education ideals were and how these interacted with the approaches of their organizations, and the related policies of institutions. The participants’ responses were considered in relation to the other participants’ responses and the conceptual framework of educational models and ethical positionings.

This chapter looks across the data at the debates and issues that arose from the country-wide studies, the case studies of Save the Children UK and Canada, and the
interviews with individual global education staff. This chapter consists of four sections. The first three sections provide an analysis from across the two country contexts and the Save the Children cases studies. The first section presents data relating to the shifting nature of INGO-produced global education programming in Canada and the UK, the second section highlights the similarities and differences between INGO global education in Canada and the UK, and the third section explores how the global education ideals of individual global educators and advocates align and contrast with organizational approaches and government policies. The fourth section discusses the implications of this study’s findings for future INGO global education programming. This chapter ends with the study’s contribution to the field, possibilities for future research, and concluding remarks.

**The shifting nature of global education programming in INGOs in the UK and Canada**

Within the three historical periods of INGO global education in the UK and Canada programming looked different in each country. This section is a comparative reflection on the shifts in INGO global education within the following periods: post-World War II to 1960s, the 1960s to the mid-1990s, and the mid-1990s to the 2000s.

**Post World War II to 1960s**

The UK as historical empire-builder, previously one of the most powerful nations in the world, provides the foundational ground from which the INGO landscape for both countries began. Canada, as a former colony of Britain, has a much more recent history with its own INGOs, (dating back fifty years rather than 100) and many of its INGOs are sister organizations of the founding organizations in the UK. During the post-World Wars, pre-1960s period, different sectors (education and INGO) within the UK were engaged with both longer-term societal transformation type global education through the citizenship education associations looking to promote peace and international understanding and with shorter-term didactic INGO campaigns to raise awareness of global poverty, conflict, and emergencies while raising funds to help ameliorate suffering. Canada during this period had mostly informal engagement with global
education learning. One could argue that this engagement was long-term dialogical because people were gathering together to learn about and address global issues, but the activities of these groups were not well documented. They were, however, indicative of the type of localized, regional global education programming that would take root in Canada during the early 1970s.

1960s to 1980s: A rise in INGO global education programming

The 1960s to 1980s signaled a rise in INGO global education programming for both Canada and the UK that was brought about by the returnees from the first volunteer sending overseas (VSO) programs that were trending in North America and Europe (U.S.A.’s Peace Corp, Canada’s CUSO, and the UK’s VSO). In Canada, the returnees who became global educators were trailblazers as there was little in the way of prior forms of global education programming. In the UK, many of the returnees either were teachers or became teachers upon returning. With their interest in development and education the teachers joined INGOs to assist with education programming in schools. INGOs in both Canada and the UK were interested in programming that would encourage public participation in bringing about longer-term global-social transformation. In Canada global educators were faced with the task of developing programming in a vacuum. In the UK there was already a precedent for global education in schools (through citizenship associations and UNESCO) and Oxfam had already begun developing education programming for schools.

The Canadian global educators were supported during this period by a government that encouraged public participation in international development. In this period of strong institutional support Canada facilitated the growth of a network of global education learner centres that supported formal and non-formal global education learning and also repeatedly challenged the status quo. While getting global education into schools was a goal for both the INGO global education sector and for CIDA, the decentralized nature of the Canadian education system worked against their efforts. During this period INGO global education programming in Canada evolved in a highly regionalized manner with learner centres as the resource hubs for schools and communities. The learner centres’ programming drew on local experiences and interests, e.g., programming in the
prairies connected with farmers and global food production, in Quebec centres connected with issues relating to French-speaking countries, and in the Atlantic provinces there was a focus on global enclave communities that survived on fishing or mining.

In the UK, government support for development education all but disappeared with the Conservative government between 1979 and 1997, but since public support for INGOs was so strong the sector continued to receive institutional funding from government in the form of international development block grants. The INGOs ensured that liberatory and social justice models of education were produced through their financial support of the DECs’ longer-term dialogical programming. Transformational work was also supported through the shorter-term advocacy work that was carried out by the collectively established, arms-length World Development Movement. In Canada the ability to do longer-term dialogical, social justice programming was dependent on government support. In the UK the ability to do this type of programming was due to the INGOs’ large and strong constituencies.

1990s to 2000s: INGO global education at a crossroads

In the mid-1990s, both Canada and the UK reached a turning point with INGO global education. The longer-term dialogical programming was increasingly supported in the UK through the New Labour government (elected in 1997). In contrast global education was almost entirely decimated by the loss of funding from the Canadian government in 1995. The Canadian government became less willing to fund the increasingly politicized programming of the learner centres, which often challenged the government’s policies. Eventually the government initiated a series of austerity measures and deep cuts were made across sectors, particularly in those considered to be “public welfare”. The 1995 federal budget cut the Public Participation Program fund leading to the closure of most of the learner centres. Later, the Canadian government made some movements towards supporting a more robust INGO global education program, for example through CIDA’s Public Engagement Continuum (1999 – 2004) with its emphasis on awareness to informed action. However support for potentially longer-term social transformation was eventually dropped by CIDA. Starting in 1999, CIDA began to introduce a few funding mechanisms for global education and public engagement including the Global Classroom
In the UK the New Labour government and the newly formed independent international development agency, DfID, were allies of the INGO sector and strong supporters of global education. Together DfID worked with the Development Education Association (DEA) to convince the Department for Education to include educating for the global dimension as an overarching theme in their curriculum policy. DfID encouraged long-term dialogical global education programming: in the schools (which it supported through the Enabling Effective Support initiative), within INGOs (25% of the large Partnership Program Agreements was to be spent on global education), and countless other areas both formal and non-formal. The Department of Education showed interest in the longer-term learning goals of global education and social transformation, although it was also influenced by the support of the international education-oriented British Council, which emphasized acquiring individual student skills for the global job market (e.g., languages, cultural awareness, and international experience) over the skills associated with social transformation (e.g., the ability to be self-reflexive, take informed action, and apply structural analysis). Despite the swell of support for INGO global education programming, during the mid to late 2000s UK INGOs began to abandon their long-term, participatory global education programs and increase their shorter-term, didactic fundraising and advocacy campaigns. After the UK INGOs had assisted in “winning the argument” to get global education in schools they decided that it was no longer a priority for their organizations.

INGOs and CIDA continued to try to influence the more complicated argument of getting global education into the Canadian provincially-based school system. After the 1995 cuts there was once again a vacuum in the INGO global education sector and while INGOs were struggling to redefine their programming to suit the tighter budget many competing commercial interests were working to infiltrate the school systems. Individual teachers and school boards across Canada have carried on ad hoc relationships with well-established INGOs such as UNICEF, however, most INGOs interested in building more
comprehensive global education programming in schools have had limited success, with the exception of Free the Children’s Me to We franchise. Unlike other Canadian INGO initiatives Me to We has been enormously successful in marketing its programming to the public school system, which may just be the missing link between the seemingly opposite circumstances of the INGO global education sectors in Canada and the UK.

In looking at historical socio-political influences on INGO global education in Canada and the UK a few of the trends that have encouraged both longer-term dialogical INGO global education programming and shorter-term didactic global education programming are evident. The conditions that have supported longer-term, participatory global education are circumstances that have caused citizens to actively seek peace (e.g., the World Wars), a level of economic security, and governments that welcome citizen input. Conversely, the socio-political conditions that have encouraged INGOs to produce predominantly shorter-term didactic global education programming are citizens that are disengaged and distracted from the plight of others, the economic conditions of a recession, and a government that does not seek out or encourage participatory decision-making.

While these circumstances explain why INGOs in Canada and the UK during certain periods had the ability and the encouragement to produce longer-term global education programming, it does not explain UK INGOs recent abandonment of longer-term programming. What the data seems to indicate is that over this fifty-year period the nature of INGOs has shifted away from an earlier model of a solidarity movement due to increased pressure to conform into a professionalized business model. INGOs have become more business-like in their approach to capturing the “aid market”, which includes acquiring donors (private, corporate, and institutional), large-scale development projects, the ability to advocate at high-level gatherings, and even merging and acquiring other INGOs. Where would an unprofitable, unwieldy, participatory, situated learning paradigm fit into a sleek INGO marketing plan? Therein lies the problem. The longer-term social transformation model appears to be a vestige of INGOs’ past.
Table 9: Summary of INGO global education history in the UK and Canada

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>United Kingdom</th>
<th>Canada</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-1960s</td>
<td>Citizenship education - Longer-term, dialogical, transformational (world peace)</td>
<td>Informal gatherings (adult education) longer-term, dialogical practices (in the making)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Campaigns – shorter-term, consequential</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960s-1980s</td>
<td>No government support</td>
<td>Learner centres and INGO regional programming – longer-term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>INGO support for longer-term transformational work</td>
<td>transformational, dialogical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>World Studies Project &amp; other formal education sector global education initiatives</td>
<td>CIDA – supporting civic engagement – long-term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>– longer-term</td>
<td>MOES/teachers’ associations – ad hoc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>World Development Movement – advocacy</td>
<td>Towards end of 1980s government begins to defund when global education conflicts with corporate interests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(short-term, consequential)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990s-2000s</td>
<td>DfID support for long-term in schools</td>
<td>CIDA retracts all funding for global education – no long-term or short-term commitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Enabling Effective Support) and block grants for INGOs requiring 25% be used for global education</td>
<td>CIDA produces Public Engagement Continuum – long-term, participatory, dialogical method – abandoned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DSCF support for long- (global dimension in education) and short-term (British Council international education approach)</td>
<td>CIDA funding for global education short-term, purpose of messaging, MOEs support for global education is found in the curriculum (citizenship education, social studies), relationships with INGOs (except for Free the Children’s Me to We) is ad hoc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>INGOs stop producing education programming, instead focus on campaigns and fundraising in schools (short-term)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The nature of shifts in INGO global education programming in Canada and the UK: Similarities and differences

This section explores the similarities and differences in the histories of INGO global education programming in Canada and the UK.

Similarities

The following areas of similarity between, Canada and the UK more generally, and the INGO sector specifically, account for some of shared successes and struggles that the INGO global education sectors have experienced in each context.

The development education centre movement

For Canada the global education learner centre movement was the beginning of INGO global education history. The centres were born out of the returned volunteers and laid the early foundations of global education in Canada. Although most of the learner centres had to close after the 1995 budget cuts, their work was historically significant.
Development education centres also were an important part of the UK’s INGO global education sector. For both Canada and the UK, the centres have provided a space for the formal education sector and for non-formal, adult and community learning opportunities. Both DEC movements also acted to support the education programming interests of INGOs and in turn have been supported financially by the INGO sector. In Canada the INGOs only supported the centres for a brief period whereas in the UK the INGOs funded the DECs throughout the period the Conservatives were in office, approximately 18 years.

**INGO competition and branding**

The increasingly competitive market for funding, from governments and foundations, and from private donors has encouraged INGOs to seek better ways to brand their organizations. On the one hand, INGOs in the UK coordinate their charity weeks and other national events in order not to compete with one another. On the other hand, they are in competition for the “mindshare” of their “target audiences” and have been discouraged from collaborating with other INGOs by their marketing and communications departments in order not to “confuse the stakeholders” regarding their “brand platform” (Sustainability, 2003, p.16). Since the late 1960s in the UK and 1970s in Canada INGOs have been trying to work more closely with schools. The past decade has seen an increase in competition between INGOs. One participant’s (E06) comment about “the brand sweepstakes in secondary schools” refers to the attempts to outbid both other INGOs and commercial enterprises in the race to “colonize” schools (Norris, 2011). Participants in Canada spoke about having a difficult time getting their INGO’s education work into schools (C17) because the Free the Children’s Me to We brand had saturated the school market.

When INGOs were mostly doing education programming with schools there was growing interest from the organizations as to how to make more of their relationships with these young people. This has caused tensions for INGO global educators in both Canada and the UK who have tried to keep the global education, longer-term “learning journey” (E08) separate from campaigns and fundraising. Children and young people in school settings are a coveted target market for both corporations wanting to develop a new generation of consumers (Norris, 2011) and for INGOs looking to recruit campaign
supporters to establish their brand and to increase fundraising potential. As can be seen from the changes in education programming noted in the Save the Children UK and Save the Children Canada case studies, branding, campaigning, and fundraising activities are key foci for INGO work in schools.

**State interest in volunteer sending overseas programs**

In the late 1950s to early 1960s the first volunteer-sending overseas (VSO) programs were launched in the United States, the United Kingdom, and Canada. In these countries the post-war conditions of peace and relative prosperity were optimal conditions for launching programs that would demonstrate the goodwill of the sending countries and give young adults some international experience. In Canada and the UK the first decade of returned volunteers were the people who established the global education learner centres. Generations of returned volunteers staffed the INGO sector. CIDA’s middle-management bureaucracy for many years (until the early 1990s) was populated with ex-CUSO, SU CO, and WUSC returnees. The attraction of overseas volunteer-sending type programming for state funders was that it provided easy to measure outcomes and a fairly small price per volunteer for providing overseas development services.

Canadian support for short-term volunteer placement programming grew in the early 1990s and was one of the few programming areas that received increased funding after the budget cuts. However the concomitant global education programming that used to be connected to the volunteer-sending programming was subject to further reductions. The numbers of volunteers going overseas increased, but the length of the stay, the educational preparation, and the follow up global education programming decreased for Canadians making it less a longer-term commitment to dialogical-based social transformation and more of an “exotic job experience” (C07). In the UK where global education funding remained a priority for government funders, volunteer-sending organizations continued to provide education and debriefing programming to try to ensure that the relationships formed between the global South and North would have equitable outcomes.
**INGO global educator grey area**

It was noted both in the UK study and the Canadian study that INGO global educators existed in a bit of grey area between formal education and the INGOs. Global educators formally trained as teachers and hired to make inroads into the schools often felt more aligned with the teachers whom they tended to work more closely with than their INGO co-workers (E04). The first batch of global educators in Canada, the returnees from overseas volunteer projects, were not necessarily trained teachers. Some went on to become teachers, but to begin with, as noted by several participants in this study (C15, C08, and C06) the global education movement was more of a global solidarity network within which global education was part of conscientizing people. Towards the end of the 1980s the INGO sector became more professionalized overall and it began to be the norm that people with formal teaching training would be hired in order to make a better connection to schools. This trend of professionalization curbed other INGO staff members from working on global education projects in an unstructured way as was the norm in the 1970s and 1980s. The result of these changes was that global educators became increasingly isolated within their organizations. In the UK the INGO education departments were bigger than their Canadian counterparts, but they still had to seek out global educators from other INGOs or through the DEA network for moral and professional support (E04).

**Local to global issues**

Both countries struggled with the local to global issue of refugees and domestic populations of people whose countries of origin fall into the global South category. After the UK’s former colonies became independent in the 1950s waves of non-European immigration began, provoking nationalist behaviours, race riots, and increased concerns about national cohesiveness. According to one participant (E07), during the peak of the race riots in the 1980s critical multiculturalists felt that the global education programming that focused on poverty and conflict in the countries of origin of many of the UK’s immigrant populations caused feelings of anger and shame among the immigrants, and pity and superiority among white Britons. In the early 2000s collaboration between DfID and Department for Education resulted in the Community Cohesion program being
launched, which was an effort to ease tensions that were rising up in impoverished UK communities. The extreme, racist nationalists and the Muslim extremism were competing areas of concern for the UK. In Canada the local to global issues were compounded by the fact that the criteria for INGO global education funding excluded domestic issues. CIDA did not want to fund programming that discussed issues of racism and refugees in Canada (C15), making it difficult to gain more profound understandings of how local issues are connected to global conditions.

Global education as a marginalized area of interest

Global education programming in the UK and Canada exists among the various other alternative educations: critical multiculturalism, anti-racism, and so on. The isolation of INGO global education that has tended to push it into a small area of understandings focused on international development has made it difficult for global education to join up with like-minded educations that focus locally. As well, the history of global education practitioners and theorists to date have largely been white and from North American and European countries.

The early INGO global educators of the 1960s and 1970s were influenced and informed by the anti-racist, Black Power, women, Indigenous peoples, gay rights, and other equity and justice-seeking movements. During the 1970s and 1980s the global education movement in both the UK and Canada joined forces with the movements that fronted the rights and issues of racialized people. This gave the global education movement added layers of complexity and served to challenge the position and privilege of white people, but the sector was also fraught with tension because of it. Not all global educators implicated themselves or their communities in upholding the status quo that creates global inequities. Challenges and accusations made towards those of privileged race, class, gender, and ability were often enough met with opposition and denial. Critical multicultural and anti-racist educators are in essence seeking similar goals to those of the many global educators that have resisted white, Western global education frameworks.

The critical years of clashing and uniting during the late-1960s to early 1980s were disrupted by the professionalization of global education and the INGO sector in Canada. In the UK the heavy burden that Thatcher’s regime placed on poor and racialized communities was a key area of tension for INGO global educators. In both nations
political contexts that were derisive of social relations and social welfare aided in keeping marginalized groups divided through competition for scarce resources. At the point when global education as part of a solidarity movement could have been bringing equity-seeking groups closer together, the budget cuts, the formalization of global education within INGOs, and the focus on overseas program delivery succeeded in marginalizing these groups even further. As of 2010 Canada’s critical education community remains silo’ed.

In the UK, during the past 13 years of Labour government support for critical education progress has been made in bringing together the common interests of these two groups, e.g., the Enabling Effective Support initiative working with the Community Cohesion initiative to take on global issues and domestic racism. However, groups with nationalist interests have risen in the UK (similar to Scruton’s critiques of global education in the 1980s) and are asking the public to choose between using funding for direct aid (e.g., vaccinations for children in countries experiencing poverty) or to fund the interests and propaganda of minority groups (Boin, Harris, and Marchesetti, 2009).

Differences
The following areas of differences between Canada and the UK more generally and the INGO sector specifically account for some of the major differences in how INGO global education has shifted in each context.

Fundamentally different historical roles
Canada and the UK are similar in that they have predominantly white, Christian populations; increasing multi-ethnic and multi-racial populations; and their cultural traditions share British roots. However, historically they are connected through Canada being a former colony of Britain, which underlines the great difference in power and global status between the two countries. The UK’s status as a former empire builder and colonizer colours its relationship with the global South. For UK global educators, and European global educators more generally, there is often an innate sense of responsibility and culpability for the conditions in the global South that comes with a colonial history. Canada’s colonizing history has proven to be more controversial, because the colonizing
took place on Canadian soil and involved the oppression of Canada’s First Peoples. Addressing Canada’s colonial past is a local issue that has attracted global solidarity. For Canadian global educators local to global issues became points of contention with the federal government. In the UK the colonizing did not happen on domestic soil, so a geographical division existed between the subjects of global education and the learners; unless they immigrated to the UK.

**Strength of INGO sector**

The UK’s strong INGO sector is the most crucial piece in their INGO-produced global education story. Their strength begins with their long history with solidarity movements, e.g., the anti-slavery movement, and with the early incarnations of development work and campaigns and advocacy, including Save the Children in 1919. Organizations like Oxfam and Save the Children have founding offices in the UK and are international operations with sister organizations around the world, which give them a powerful global reach. The domestic public support has given the organizations a large and historically committed donor base enabling the sector to be relatively autonomous, as it does not have to rely solely on government funding. Securing support mainly through private donations has allowed organizations to diversify their funding with charity/jumble shops (requiring a large output of money to run, but keeps the INGO brand in the public eye), investments, and other possibilities for raising unrestricted funds.

The public support also makes the INGO sector an important ally to any government’s (Labour or Conservative) international cooperation department and foreign office. Throughout the lean social welfare years, starting with Thatcher’s Conservative government and ending with Major (1979 to 1997), the large INGOs still received block grants from the government. Even the Thatcher government, which almost entirely defunded global education programming, knew the importance of its relationship with the INGOs. Between the public support and the block grants the INGOs were able to fund the development education centres (DECs) during the period of little to no funding for development education from the government. During this time DECs flourished. They had also managed to ensure that they were free to advocate for the most controversial issues through the creation and support of an arms-length organization (it receives no government funding) the World Development Movement. Thus the INGO sector has
remained strong because of its long history of public support, by having a diversified and
independent funding base, which ensured that it can advocate without repercussions from
the Charity Commission, and through its support of the global education community.

Comparatively, Canada’s early INGO global education programming was almost
non-existent, and dealt with a significantly smaller, scattered population. Canada’s INGO
sector also supported the global education learner centres in the 1970s, but stopped when
CIDA funding for the centres increased in the 1980s. After the 1995 funding cuts the
wider INGO sector was also suffering from a severe budget shortage and could not rescue
the decimated global education sector. The Canadian INGO sector’s reliance on
government funding made it vulnerable to threats of defunding. Even though Revenue
Canada’s charity laws allow Canadian INGOs to spend up to 10% on (non-partisan)
advocacy, the threat of being viewed as politicized by government funders and
potentially being defunded has kept INGOs wary of engaging in any advocacy activities.

**Political support for INGOs**

In the UK, the Labour Party has long been an ally of the INGO sector and supportive of
global education programming. Throughout the years of partisan flip-flopping between
Conservative governments and Labour governments, the Labour party has removed the
international cooperation office from the Foreign office in order to give development
cooperation work more independence from UK’s foreign policy interests. When the New
Labour Party was voted in after almost 20 years of Conservative rule it immediately set
up the Department for International Development (DfID) and allocated funds to support
global education programming. During the Labour government’s leadership, 1997 to
2010, it increased funding for global education and diversified the programming options.

DfID’s support of the INGO sector increased through Partnership Program
Agreements (PPAs), which replaced the block grants and became available to even more
INGOs. The PPA was restricted funding, but not closely monitored. The required criteria
for the PPA was that INGOs were to address DfID’s four primary themes, one of which
was global education. In 2009 DfID requested that the PPA holders spend a full 25% of
this grant on global education. The department invested £11 million in the Enabling
Effective Support (EES) multi-stakeholder initiative to bring the global dimension into
UK schools. Within DfID’s Building Support for Sustainable Development portfolio,
which included programs for schools, youth groups, universities, adult education groups, and so on, the investment in EES is one that did not bring the department any immediate benefit, as the messaging and branding potential were limited. The point of the investment was to encourage other stakeholders, namely the education sector, to take up the global dimension. The difficult economic times and the stretched education system left DfID as the primary funder, and in many regions as the sole funder, of this initiative.

The Canadian INGO and global education sector have never had the level of support demonstrated by DfID. The only comparable period would be CIDA’s commitment to global education during the 1970s and 1980s when Canada was a world leader in global education programming. The initial support for global education and INGO work had come through the Liberal Party, the party that created Canada’s image as the humane internationalist. Unlike the UK’s Labour Party the Liberals have not maintained a consistent relationship with international development, so despite Canada’s own partisan flip-flopping between Liberal and Conservative leaders there was no longer a political party that would support global education (perhaps the New Democrat Party, but they have never succeeded in getting into office). The demise of Canada’s thriving global education sector of the 1970s and 1980s was seemingly unavoidable, as Canada’s global education sector most definitely did not have a “champion” at the federal level.

**INGO and global education networks as spaces for citizen engagement**

It was due to the support of the INGOs during the lean times that the development education centres (DECs) were able to take hold in communities around the UK. In the 1980s the DECs began to get organized into an association, the National Association of Development Education Centres (NADEC). The small network of six DECs grew to 46, and later over 100 affiliated organizations joined the network. In the early 1990s the network became the Development Education Association (DEA) with over 250 organizational members from the INGO, community, and education sectors. The DEA was an effective means for the sector to liaise with the government. They had been working with the Labour party forming a plan for global education in the UK that would be put into action after DfID was formed. The strength of the UK’s INGO sector has been in its capacity to provide citizens with a means of voicing their support for social transformation. While INGOs themselves may not be traditionally democratic structures
they are capable of providing a space for citizen engagement. During the Thatcher years when citizens interested in longer-term social transformation and equity had an arguably smaller voice in federal politics the INGOs were able to provide both the support for those voices and the space to have the dialogue.

Additionally, the UK INGOs were united through the British Overseas NGOs for Development (BOND), with 290 members (2006 figures) and CONCORD, the European NGO Confederation for Relief and Development. Both platforms advocate for global education programming. CONCORD has the DEEEP, Development Education Europe Exchange Project, which supports all 27 European Member States in setting up and maintaining global education programs. These strong global education and INGO networks in the UK and Europe have pushed global education programming onto official agendas. These networks of diverse networks strengthen opportunities for long-term, participatory, dialogic programming across sectors.

Canadian INGOs also have established networks for support, but none specific to INGO global education. In the late 1960s, CIDA established the Canadian Council for International Cooperation (CCIC) and later the Provincial and Regional Councils. Unfortunately, the Councils’ reliance on government funding has made it increasingly difficult for them to speak independently on behalf of the sector. Their role as liaisons between the INGO sector and the government is compromised by the fears of defunding. In 2010, CCIC, a long-time advocate for international cooperation and public engagement lost its CIDA funding, which had provided core support for its work. Initially established by CIDA in 1968 to increase civic engagement with international cooperation issues, forty years later, the “critical friend” of Canada’s International Development Agency was no longer a valued partner of the government. Unlike the UK, Canadian INGOs do not have a wider network of support, a strong constituency base that extends throughout the continent, or a network dedicated to global education practice.

Global education in the formal education sector

Another important difference between Canada and the UK is the take up of global education in the public education system. The two country contexts have education systems that shape how and if global education is taken up in schools. Even though there is a certain amount of autonomous decision-making within the UK’s devolved states
(Wales, Scotland, and Northern Ireland), overarching education policy is made at the federal level by the Department for Children, Schools, and Families (DCSF) (now once again called the Department for Education). Therefore DfID’s development education interests and the DCSF are at the same level of government, which has made it possible to work on areas of common interest. In Canada CIDA is a federal department while responsibility for education programming is made at the provincial level, meaning that the one federal department has to attempt to align with thirteen provincial ministries of education. There is a Council of Ministers of Education, Canada (CMEC) that has an interest in internationalizing education, however decisions regarding global education programming are made at the ministry and school board level.

Besides the structure of the education systems it is also the case that the UK began doing global education work in schools long before INGOs started their education programming. Early iterations of global education programming appeared in British schools in the mid to late 1930s. These programs were encouraged by citizenship education organizations. The Council for Education in World Citizenship (CEWC) began in 1939 and was one of the better known global education programs in the schools through the 1940s to the 1970s. In the 1940s the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization’s (UNESCO) became involved in schools promoting education for international understanding. Then in the 1950s the One World Trust was established by the All-Party Parliamentary Group for World Government, this was a group concerned with the proliferation of nuclear weapons. By the 1960s Oxfam introduced the first INGO-produced global education into schools. Obviously, by the time INGOs became interested in school programming there was already a precedent for and interest in this type of learning. Even so, INGO global educators felt that it took 25 years of “banging on about development education being in schools” (E01) before global education had finally been accepted and mainstreamed through the addition of the global dimension in the curriculum in 2003.

Canada did not have much exposure to global education in schools, beyond a few (25) experimental UNESCO schools starting in 1955. During the 1950s Canada was highly nationalistic and it is likely that the UK’s world citizen curriculum would have been considered unpatriotic (Evans, Ingram, MacDonald, & Weber, 2009, p.25). Global
education programming was limited to nonformal educational settings such as churches, labour organizations, and with organizations like the Quakers and the Red Cross. Global education programming only started to appear in schools in an ad hoc fashion in the 1970s. Due to the combination of a lack of foundational work in schools and education being the jurisdiction of the provinces and international development the jurisdiction of the federal government joint action on global education programming has largely been unsuccessful.

**Ability to do advocacy programming**

Finally, one of the areas essential to the UK INGO sector’s strength is its ability to do advocacy. In 1969 when charity regulations in the UK were strict around advocacy the INGO sector banded together to form an arms-length, independently funded advocacy organization, the World Development Movement. This organization carries out the longer-term work of pressuring the government for increased international aid and pushing for controversial issues to be placed on the government’s agenda. Additionally, the UK INGOs’ dedicated constituencies have made INGOs a force to be reckoned with. Larger INGOs can carry out their own campaigns and advocacy programs to pressure the government to take on fair trade and aid policies. The ability of the UK’s INGO sector band together to create the World Development Movement in the first place was indicative of the sector’s strength. While the UK INGOs do have corporate partnerships, which may make them hesitant to address corporate responsibility for global poverty, they can still safely advocate for corporate responsibility through the arms-length World Development Movement.

Canadian INGOs and learner centres took liberties advocating controversial positions against government and corporate policies in the 1970s and 1980s, but dependency on government funding gave the government leverage to stifle their critiques. Canadian INGOs, unless their policies and ideological stance is in alignment with the government, or they are financially independent, have had difficulties gaining a strong position of partnership with the government. As mentioned in connection with the strength of networks above Canadian charity laws allow organizations to spend up to 10% on advocacy, but the current “chill on advocacy” (C10) has succeeded in
discouraging INGOs from doing much in the way of advocacy.\textsuperscript{30} This inability to address controversial issues at the federal level translates into a censorship of controversial issues within global education programming.

**Summary**

Within the histories of Canada and the UK’s INGO-produced global education areas of similarity and differences have emerged. Both countries were similar in that, (a) they had at one time (or continue to have) a vibrant global education centre movement, (b) competition increased between INGOs affecting global education programming, (c) volunteer sending programs continue to interest governments, (d) professionalized INGO global educators experienced isolation within their organizations, (e) local issues involving racism and refugees have been in tension with global issues, and (f) global education is an educational area that receives less attention. The major differences between INGO global education in both countries were that, (a) they have had fundamentally different historical roles and global status, (b) the UK’s INGO sector is much stronger than the Canadian one, (c) the UK’s INGOs and global education have continued political support from the Labour Party throughout the years, (d) UK and European INGOs and global education networks are spaces for citizen engagement, (e) global education is well-rooted in the UK’s school system, and (f) the UK’s INGO sector has the ability to do advocacy work. These similarities and differences reflect the key conditions of INGO global education in each country.

**Ideals, frameworks, and policies: Global education’s purpose as understood and enacted by individuals, organizations, and funding agencies**

This section responds to the question regarding the possible impact of differing global education ideals, approaches, and frameworks at the individual, organizational, and donor levels. The themes that emerged in Chapter Eight, which looked at the individual global educators and global education advocates’ global education ideals in comparison with the

\textsuperscript{30} In the spring of 2012 two more INGOs, known for doing advocacy work on Canadian mining corporations, Mennonite Central Committee and the Canadian Catholic Organization of Development and Peace have both lost their CIDA funding.
priorities of the organizations that provide the programming, and with the funders of INGO-produced global education programming, provide the foundation for this section.

The responses to these questions give deeper insights into the interplay among the personal global ideals of individuals, organizational approaches, and government policies and how these practices, policies, and frameworks translate into ethical positionings and educational ideologies (motivations) and the related global education programming methods. In short, interviews with INGO global educators illuminate the driving forces behind whether INGOs choose to privilege shorter-term didactic methods or longer-term dialogical methods.

**Personal global education ideals: Motivations and methods**

Participants’ global education ideals did not all fit neatly into previously constructed paradigms of global education, but their responses as a collection reflected many of the characteristics of global education from the literature. Many of the ideals, when looked at in relation to the conceptual framework of educational models and ethical positionings, could fall under the shorter-term didactic programming or the longer-term dialogic programming. Taking action, interconnections, responsibilities, values, and rights-based frameworks are all ideals that could be part of an approach that seeks longer-term transformation, but they could also be characteristics emphasized in campaigns and one-way communication strategies without a depth of commitment or understanding. Knowledge of global issues, local-to-global analysis, and analysis of power relations require more than a short-term engagement, but do not necessarily mean that a long-term engagement, equitable partnership, or societal transformation are desired outcomes. On their own knowledge and analysis are abstract, intellectual exercises. Dialogue/equitable relationships, engaging with a range of perspectives, transforming society, and critical reflection all suggest a longer-term engagement with practices that lead to transformation on the personal, organizational, and societal levels. Only one of the ideals, branding, fell solely under short-term motivations and methods as the goal of the practice is to market the organization. The successful branding of the organization would ideally lead to stronger support (via donations and membership), which in turn could translate into more effective programming for alleviating poverty, but it does not contribute to the longer-
term goal of societal transformation. Overall, the participants’ personal global education ideals indicated that they valued long-term dialogical, participatory methods over short-term didactic methods.

**Organizational global education approaches: Motivations and methods**

The organizational approaches to global education programming aligned to a certain degree with the literature. The awareness-to-understanding-to-action continuum; participatory decision-making; critical thinking and structural analysis; children’s rights-based frameworks; constituency-building; and learner-based approaches were all represented as core characteristics within the literature. Most of the organizational frameworks identified (awareness-to-understanding-to-action continuum; participatory decision-making; and critical thinking and structural analysis; constituency-building; and learner-based approaches) aligned with longer-term dialogical methods, others, such as the children’s rights-based framework were discussed in relation to how they facilitated another longer-term global education practice. A children’s rights framework was used to facilitate an equitable dialogue between children in differing global contexts. The tensions identified by the participants tended to involve the organizations prioritizing fundraising or campaigns over education programming. It was here that the longer-term dialogical and transformational goals of participants came into conflict with the shorter-term consequential goals of the organization.

**Government policies and priorities: Motivations and methods**

While the overarching mandates for the government international development agencies, DfID and CIDA, aligned with the long-term transformational goal of alleviating poverty, the way in which each agency enacted their global education policies and priorities relayed different stories. The participants’ understandings of DfID revealed that while there was some sense that DfID had an interest in short-term communications/public relations through global education programming, the wider experience with DfID was that it had committed to investing into schools’ engagement with the longer-term global dimension “learning journey”.
Canadian participants had a much different experience with CIDA. The Canadian Agency leaned towards methods that were, for the most part, short-term and didactic and the implicit (and some cases explicit) motivation was to promote Canadian foreign policy goals. There was some commitment to the long-term dialogical project of transformation through the coalition-building Provincial Council funding. However, the rest of the funding options had more negative implications for organizations, including: forcing organizations to choose between allocating funds to overseas projects or to invest in domestic global education; using up staff time with time-consuming application processes; having strict criteria that could lead to organizational mission and values drift; and/or providing few possibilities for any continuity in global education programming.

Both DfID and CIDA were heavily invested in volunteer sending as a method of increasing international awareness among young people. The difference between their volunteer sending programs is that in the UK the related global education work was well-supported, while in Canada there were more funding opportunities for more young people to go overseas, so the numbers increased, but little to no funding allocated for education and extension programming. The UK’s volunteer sending programs were better resourced and had more encouragement for producing longer-term learning experiences and equitable partnerships.

There were fewer differences in motivation and methods of the education sectors in the UK and Canada, but greater differences in commitment. One of the obvious differences between the two education sectors was that in the UK education was centralized at the federal level, allowing for differences in approach within each devolved state (Wales, Scotland, and Northern Ireland), and in Canada all education matters (except for those regarding First Nations peoples on reserve) were under the provincial jurisdiction. The DCSF could collaborate more easily with DfID than could the Canadian provincial ministries of education with the federally based CIDA. The DCSF’s commitment to educating for the global dimension was made long-term through its inclusion in the curriculum as a cross-curricular and multi-faceted learning goal. How teachers take up the global dimension depends on individual choice and influences.

For the Canadian participants, relationships with ministries of education across Canada were uneven. The Council of Ministers of Education Canada (CMEC) had a
mandate for internationalizing the curriculum, a perspective similar to that of the British Council. However, the dispositions of each provincial ministry of education vary from province to province. Quebec, Saskatchewan, Manitoba, and New Brunswick have demonstrated longer-term commitment to global education and partnerships with the INGO sector. Other provinces are more ad hoc with their commitments to global education. All the provinces and territories have included some references to global and international perspectives in their curriculum documents (typically in the citizenship education and social studies areas), creating spaces for INGOs and teachers to collaborate. Another area of commonality across Canada is the education sector’s partnerships with the Free the Children’s social enterprise – Me to We. While older, established INGOs are having difficulties developing and sustaining partnerships with schools, the Me to We youth leadership model is thriving in school boards across the country. This demonstrates the education sectors’ inclination towards global education as practiced through a short-term didactic method that emphasizes the virtue-based ethical positioning of the hero’s journey, rather than the longer-term more difficult journey of committing to participatory, dialogical practice leading to equitable global partnerships.

Exploring how INGO global education is understood and valued at three levels, the personal, the organizational, and the institutional or government has revealed several key issues with regard to how global education is supported, valued, and enacted within the INGO sector. At the personal level, participants’ ideals were, for the most part, reflective of the literature. Participants valued taking action, interconnections, dialogue/equitable relationships, responsibilities, local to global analysis, range of perspectives, long-term transformation of society, critical reflection, analysis of power relations, knowledge of global issues, values, and human and children’s rights. These ideals and how they were presented as a collection of activities, knowledge, and frameworks demonstrated a longer-term vision for global education that would stimulate ideas and actions about broader social change, rather than short-term interests in gaining support for campaigns, volunteers, or funding.

Organizational frameworks often reflect a longer-term, participatory approach to global education programming in terms of the organizational philosophy, but this does not mean that the education programming is used to further long-term, transformational
goals. It appears that the value of education programming is being re-assessed at the organizational level to determine how to gain more of the school-aged market. This clash of personal ideals and organizational priorities appears to be more of a challenge for participants in the UK. Canadian participants did allude to having some disjuncture between personal ideals and organizational priorities (C14, C17), but were more likely to face difficulties with CIDA’s limited vision of INGO global education and the lack of access points into the formal education system. Interestingly enough the longer-term societal transformation vision that DfID was gladly supporting did not seem to have an impact on whether or not INGOs held the same values. In fact the more that the government provided support for global education programming, particularly once it had convinced the DCSF to take it on, the less the INGOs seemed to feel it was their obligation to provide this type of programming. INGOs, once deeply rooted in the dialogical, participatory, social transformation work of social movements, had moved on. The actions of INGOs, although still connected to poverty alleviation, have a distinctly corporate feel to them as they look to conquer increasingly larger portions of the donor ‘market’.

**Implications**

The experiences of the study participants and the information from the secondary data have led to some understandings about the shift in the nature of INGO global education programming in Canada and the UK. Their experiences have also illuminated how conceptions of global education align and contrast among the ideals of individual global educators and advocates, organizational frameworks, and government policies. What do the understandings derived from these two areas (shifts in the nature and conceptualizations of INGO global education programming), if looked at together, imply about the future of INGO global education programming in Canada and the UK?

More recently in Canada, school boards and even whole ministries of education (MOE of Ontario for example) have been captivated by Free the Children’s Me to We franchise. Their virtuous leadership model, exposure tours, camps, We Days (that attract thousands of students), Me to We clubs, resources, and Oprah-endorsement has created a new INGO global education paradigm. This successful hybrid of a self-funding for profit
business coupled with an international development organization is in a sense, the learner centres of the new millennium. Except instead of being regionally-developed, local expressions of people’s interest in learning for social transformation they are centrally-developed, controlled, branding mechanisms that have mastered the ability to fundraise through their children and youth programming. This Canadian model of INGO global education as social enterprise places Canadian INGOs in the same position as UK INGOs, looking towards education sites for the potential to create brand awareness and loyalty and to carry out fundraising campaigns.

There has been a clear shift in the identities of INGOs in the humanitarian assistance field since the 1960s and 1970s from being aligned with solidarity movements to having more of a corporate identity, adopting concepts like “branding” and “bottom-lines” to make them more effective and competitive organizations within the international development field. The UK INGOs have strong branding and market identities while at the same time they keep up an equally strong advocacy front, something which is difficult for Canadian INGOs with the advocacy-averse Canadian government. According to the participants (both the Canadians and those from the UK) and the documentary analysis the formal education sector has become an arena to market goods and services. The lengthy process and commitment necessary to produce education programming typically does not produce any immediate benefit to an INGO and any long-term benefits of educational programming are difficult to assess. Without a campaign, advocacy or fundraising piece connected to education programming an INGO may get little out of the effort to produce the programming beyond possible brand awareness. Conversely, schools may not be as interested in engaging with INGO materials if they do not have a learning component and an imperative from the curriculum. While producing education materials may not be of immediate value to INGOs, gaining access to schools is of great value.

The main reasons for the shift in the nature of INGO global education are all directly or indirectly related to INGO dependency on fundraising. Dependency on government and other institutional sources of funding has lead to the professionalization of the international development sector. This trend within the sector pushed INGOs to work towards industrial standards and outcomes and further away from conceptualizing
their work as a humanitarian imperative for global social and economic justice. This INGO professionalization trend has resulted in the following contextual changes within the sector:

1. INGOs that have adopted a business model over the past thirty years have revisioned their organizations from temporary actors “working to put themselves out of business” into organizations that are part of a growth industry. Organizations with roots in social movements and a primary goal of equity and social and economic justice now have work portfolios that include mergers and acquisitions.

2. Overall shifts in the international development sector led to the increased use of business frameworks, such as results-based management (RBM), that focused on quantitative outcomes. The work in the field became more short-term outcome driven, which then translated into an outcome driven agenda for domestic education programming. In the case of INGO global education programming, longer-term, equitable, dialogical, learning partnerships with no immediate benefit to the organization did not translate into accountable programming within an RBM framework.

3. Historically INGOs have worked in collaboration with one another to address and challenge global social injustices. Currently, greater global competition for the “poverty market” for INGOs more generally, coupled with dependency issues for Canadian INGOs, has created a push for INGOs to embrace a business paradigm for their work. The business model, which equates growth with success, is premised on the related notions that more is better and that competition improves individual performance. These business values make collaborating and negotiating partnerships difficult for INGOs as the pressure for these organizations to perform within a growth industry pushes them into competing for the market share of the domestic supporter base.

4. One of the most compelling markets for industries in general, not just INGOs, is that of children and youth. Thus schools have become a coveted site for marketing. INGOs, feeling the pressure to perform, have developed programming for children and youth that emphasizes the INGO’s brand and more blatantly recruits children and youth as campaign supporters and fundraisers. The organizations are looking for immediate results from their school-based programming. INGOs have retreated from their long-term commitments to curriculum that privileges equitable learning partnerships with children.
around the globe as this type of programming does not guarantee an immediate (or any) outcome for organization. Emphasis has shifted to the branding of INGOs and the commercialization of global education.

(5) The result of the professionalization of the international development sector is a shift away from one form of global education to another. INGOs have moved away from what has been called “critical” global education towards “softer” forms of global education (Andreotti, 2006a; Reimer, Shute, and McCreary, 1993; Askew and Carnell, 1998). INGO global education programming is trending towards a socially regulatory style of learning, which seeks to ameliorate global poverty through charity, rather than to engage in the more difficult liberatory and social justice education that has the goal of social transformation. This “softer”, charity focused approach highlights the learner as the “virtuous” hero, potentially a future humanitarian aid worker, who can help the poor, unfortunate other in the global South through fundraising.

The message to learners is that the global poor need “our” help. In this socially regulatory type of global education programming children, youth, and adults globally are not represented as equals. INGOs that foreground this type of global education are assisting in maintaining the global status quo. Thus, the global poverty market that is important to the growth of the INGO industry remains unimpeded by social transformation.

Reflections

International development non-governmental organizations (INGOs) in the United Kingdom and Canada have been rethinking their commitments to global education programming. Over the past decade, INGOs in both countries shifted their attention from education programming towards campaigns and fundraising. In the UK where there is government support from both the international development sector and the education sector INGOs are reducing or in some cases eliminating their education programming. The longer-term commitment to learning has been superseded by programming that will more directly bring about positive results for the INGOs in the form of donations and volunteers. The longer-term responsibility of educating for a global perspective is left up to the formal education sector.
Does it matter whether or not international development non-governmental organizations (INGOs) engage in longer-term dialogical global education programming? Historically, it has mattered to INGOs. The commitment to social transformation, eradicating poverty, and contributing to global social justice have been and are the underlying principles for INGOs, but how can these idealistic goals be met without practicing the foundational work of collective, participatory, and equitable dialogue? This study looked at how support for INGO global education programming has changed over time and what could be learned from the foundational principles and practices that INGOs have prioritized historically. Canada’s “democratic summer” and the UK INGOs creation of a democratic space, both in the late 1970s and early 1980s, are periods explored in this study, during which the potential for INGOs to facilitate the citizen engagement needed for longer-term transformation were demonstrated.

To the degree that the historical past is not "problematized" so as to be critically understood, tomorrow becomes simply the perpetuation of today. Something that will be because it will be inevitably. To that degree there is no room for choice. There is only room for well-behaved submission to fate. Today. Tomorrow. Always. (Freire, 1998, p.102)

Is it ethical for INGOs not to contribute as fully as they are capable to these longer-term discussions? INGOs and civil society organizations are some of the primary connections between the global South and North. They are the ones with partnerships in the global South, regularly making connections with people who are on the receiving end of not only the donations, projects, and other sources of aid from the North, but also the misperceptions about their contexts. INGOs have the potential to facilitate the dialogical relationships that can open up possibilities for the collective and participatory communications that could lead to changes in the power structures and dynamics of the dichotomized world of North and South and rich and poor.

For those opposed to the practice, INGOs producing global education programming is insignificant compared to the direct need of people in humanitarian emergencies and furthermore, a waste of development dollars. Time and money are the deciding factors. Although people may agree in principle to the importance of the long-term learning journey as a foundational piece for making change in the world order and for changing people’s minds and attitudes it does not have the short-term tangible outcome of, for example, giving families in malarial areas mosquito nets. The urgency of
dealing with immediate concerns with practical solutions is indisputably justified, but by whom and how will the long-term foundational work be done? Should it be left to the global governance institutions? Or could it be worthwhile to invest in facilitating equitable learning relationships that could lead to positive changes in global and local interactions, rather than focus on short-term, didactic communications that encourage people to donate, volunteer, or to “fix” a situation? 

Government support for INGO global education programming and citizen engagement could be considered a natural part of an open and participatory democratic system. However, recipients of state support have to be mindful of the criteria attached and especially to be wary if the government does not demonstrate an interest in facilitating actual social change. While it matters that governments support citizen engagement what it really comes down to is INGOs acting more like social movements gathering voices and opinions of people to shape and move ideas in the global sphere. The more INGOs expand and become rooted and fixed in their corporate models, the less they appear to be open to longer-term methods that do not have immediate benefits to the organizations bottom line.

International development NGOs that produce global education programming in Canada and the United Kingdom have been at a crossroads for the past decade. The difficulty is that even though international development government agencies are funding global education and thereby encouraging INGO participation in this activity, INGOs continually face questions about the best use of their resources. These questions come from different stakeholders: the funding agencies, the general public who donates on an individual basis, employees within INGOs, and the recipients of overseas assistance. Should an INGO whose mandate is to work overseas to alleviate poverty put scarce resources into domestic education programs? Or should the resources, as much as possible, be allocated to overseas assistance? Former Tanzanian president Julius Nyerere (1961- 1985) challenged donor governments to use aid money for domestic development/global education programming with the idea that citizens in an industrialized nation educated about the inequities taking place globally will encourage their elected officials to make policy decisions that will benefit (or at least do no harm to) people around the globe.
“Take every penny you have set aside in aid for Tanzania and spend it in the UK explaining to people facts and causes of poverty”. (Julius Nyerere, former president of Tanzania)

Those working within INGOs often find it difficult to justify domestic education programs, which, unless based on fundraising and/or campaigning, do not make immediate contributions to the organization’s mandate. Any future informed actions regarding international development that may be related to global education programming are difficult to track. The difficulty of evaluating the impact of global education programming is an ongoing source of frustration for global educators (Höck & Wegimont, 2003; Krause, 2010). The push for accountability within the international development sector often holds INGOs to a narrowly-conceived idea of education programming, one that is based more on ‘messaging’ or public relations that highlight the work of the INGO, the donor, and/or donor country. Furthermore, INGOs in the UK who have been fighting to have global education programming picked up in the formal education sector are now in a period when the global dimension has been added to the UK curriculum, so the “argument’s been won”. The UK organizations (e.g., Christian Aid, Oxfam, Save the Children) who have led the way for INGO global education programming for the past three decades are now withdrawing from education programming to focus on campaigns and advocacy. This begs the question: is there a role for INGO global education programming?

Significance of the study

This study contributes to the narrow body of literature on INGO-produced global education in Canada and the UK. There is little current research on Canadian INGO-produced global education. Furthermore, while European academic literature and INGO sector-based reports on the nature of global education started to appear in 2000 (Krause, 2010; McClosky, 2005, 2011) there has been no similar research in Canada. This study is unique in its use of historical Canadian INGO global education documents and interview data, contributing to an area which has received scant attention since the mid-1990s. Of the few comparative studies in this field none are historical, nor do they explore INGO case studies. Another distinctive feature of this study is its exploration of the contrast
between the practices of INGOs as value-laden entities and the personal global education ideals of INGO global educators.

My research has made a connection between the historical background of INGO global educators and the nature of the difficulties they are currently facing. Within this exploration of the fundamental changes that have occurred in INGO global education programming in Canada and the UK over the past fifty years I have provided documentation and an analysis of how the commercialization of INGOs is reflected in their education programming. The study critically analyzes INGOs’ increased use of fundraising campaigns and branding activities within schools. I see this study’s mapping out of relationships between current and historical critical junctures in INGO-produced global education as serving to highlight important new questions about the educational contributions of INGOs.

**Future research**

As this research journey has unfolded many fascinating possibilities for future research have surfaced. Two research areas that I feel compelled towards are an historical study of Canada’s global education learner centres, and a study investigating the possibilities and limitations of developing a pan-American participatory dialogue network for international cooperation.

Before settling on doing my doctoral research on INGO global education in Canada and the UK one of my earlier intentions was to research the Canadian global education learner centres. While working in the INGO sector from 2002 to 2005 I read through archival materials from the 1970 to 1994 period when there were learner centres across Canada. The amount and variation of programming, the political tensions, the solidarity across interest groups, and the spirit in which this education movement was created was intriguing and inspiring. The learner centres were imperfect. The programming was uneven, many of the global educators had little experience with educating, the centres were often mired in political controversies, and they were unsustainable due to their overreliance on institutional funding. Despite all this, the learning centres’ regionally developed programming that worked to link local interests
and experiences out to global issues is a model of praxis that is worthy of further exploration.

The second area of future research regarding the possibilities for a pan-American participatory dialogue network for international cooperation is an interest that evolved while doing research in the UK and Belgium. The capacity of the multi-stakeholder INGO global education networks in the UK and Europe far exceeds that of INGO networks in Canada. Since INGOs are moving towards a more commercialized approach to international development it would appear that there needs to be better mechanisms for including multiple perspectives and increasing the possibilities for ongoing dialogue and learning. Ideally, the two research ideas would connect. What are the possibilities for developing a pan-American network of regionally-developed learner centres that would facilitate equitable learning relationships?

**Concluding remarks**

Beleaguered formal school systems in Canada and the UK are demonstrating increased interest and commitment to both global education and its alluring cousin, international education. International education focuses on building up students’ individual intercultural awareness, language, and other globally marketable skills rather than on the socially transformative skills associated with global education, such as self-reflexivity and the ability to take informed action, that will assist students in addressing global injustices. Thus, are INGOs prepared to shape programming to interact with these changing interests? If one considers the rise in volunteer sending programs and international school partnerships contrasted with the limited growth of critical global education programming, the answer could be yes. But the other question is whether INGO global education programming, predicated on the understanding of collective responsibilities for improving the human condition, has been displaced by a more pragmatic concept of raising individual profile through acquisition of globally marketable skills and experiences. The question the INGO sector must ask itself is whether or not withdrawing from education to focus on programming with limited critical interaction and reflection will ultimately benefit or detract from their longer-term goal of global poverty alleviation.
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Appendix 1: Global dimensions in the UK school curriculum

The Department of Education and Schools’ Global Dimension in the School Curriculum (Department for Education and Skills (DfES). (2005). Developing the global dimension in the school curriculum.)

There are 8 key concepts underlying the idea of the global dimension to the curriculum.

- **Global citizenship** – Gaining the knowledge, skills and understanding of concepts and institutions necessary to become informed, active, and responsible citizens.
  - developing skills to evaluate information and different points of view on global issues through the media and other sources
  - learning about institutions, declarations and conventions and the role of groups, NGOs and governments in global issues
  - developing understanding of how and where key decisions are made
  - appreciating that young people’s views and concerns matter and are listened; and how to take responsible action that can influence and effect global issues
  - appreciating the global context of local and national issues and decisions at the personal and societal level
  - understanding the roles of language, place, arts, religion in own and others’ identity

- **Diversity** – Understanding and respecting differences and relating these to our common humanity.
  - appreciating similarities and differences around the world and in the context of universal human rights
  - understanding the importance of respecting differences in culture, customs and traditions and how societies are organized and governed
  - developing a sense of awe at the variety of peoples and environments around the world
  - valuing biodiversity
  - understanding the impact of the environment on cultures, economies and societies
  - appreciating diverse perspectives on global issues and how identities affect opinions and perspectives
  - understanding the nature of prejudice and discrimination and how they can be challenged and combated

- **Human rights** – Knowing about human rights including the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child.
  - valuing our common humanity, the meaning of universal human rights
  - understanding rights and responsibilities in a global context and the interrelationship between the global and the local
  - understanding that there are competing rights and responsibilities in different situations and knowing some ways in which human rights are being denied and claimed locally and globally
  - understanding human rights as a framework for challenging inequities and prejudice such as racism
  - knowing about the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child, the European declaration on Human Rights and the Human Rights Act in UK law
  - understanding the universality and indivisibility of human rights

- **Interdependence** – Understanding how people, places, economies and environments are all inextricably interrelated, and that choices and events have repercussions on a global scale.
  - understanding the impact of globalization and that choices made have consequences at different levels, from personal to global
  - appreciating the links between the lives of others and children’s and young people’s own lives
  - understanding the influence that diverse cultures and ideas (political, social, religious, economic, legal, technological and scientific) have on each other and appreciating the complexity of interdependence
  - understanding how the world is a global community and what it means to be a citizen
  - understanding how actions, choices and decisions taken in the UK can impact positively or negatively on the quality of life of people in other countries

- **Conflict resolution** – Understanding the nature of conflicts, their impact on development and why there is a need for their resolution and the promotion of harmony.
  - knowing about the different examples of conflict locally, nationally and internationally and different ways to resolve them
- understanding that there are choices and consequences for others in conflict situations
- understanding the importance of dialogue, tolerance, respect and empathy
- developing skills of communication, advocacy, negotiation, compromise and collaboration
- recognizing conflict can act as a potentially creative process
- understanding some of the forms racism takes and how to respond to them
- understanding conflicts can impact on people, places and environments locally and globally

- Social justice – Understanding the importance of social justice an element in both sustainable development and the improved welfare of all people.
  - valuing social justice and understanding the importance of it for ensuring equality, justice and fairness for all within and between societies
  - recognizing the impact of unequal power and access to resources
  - appreciating that actions have both intended and unintended consequences on people’s lives and appreciating the importance of informed choices
  - developing the motivation and commitment to take action that will contribute to a more just world
  - challenging racism and other forms of discrimination, inequality and injustice
  - understanding and valuing equal opportunities
  - understanding how past injustices affect contemporary local and global politics

- Values and perceptions – Developing a critical evaluation of representations of global issues and an appreciation of the effect these have on people’s attitudes and values.
  - understanding that people have different values, attitudes and perceptions
  - understanding the importance and value of Human rights
  - developing multiple perspectives and new ways of seeing events, issues, problems and opinions
  - questioning and challenging assumptions about perceptions
  - understanding the power of the media in influencing perceptions, choices and lifestyles
  - understanding that the values people hold shape their actions
  - using different issues, events and problems to explore children and young people’s own values and perceptions as well as those of others

- Sustainable development – Understanding the need to maintain and improve the quality of life now without damaging the planet for future generations.
  - recognizing that some of the earth’s resources are finite and therefore must be used responsibly by each of us
  - understanding the interconnections between social, economic and environmental spheres
  - considering probable and preferable futures and how to achieve the latter
  - appreciating that economic development is only one aspect of the quality of life
  - understanding that exclusion and inequality hinder sustainable development for all
  - respecting each other
  - appreciating the importance of sustainable resource use – rethink, reduce, repair, re-use, recycle – and obtaining materials from sustainably managed sources
### Appendix 2: Three development education paradigms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deved Paradigm</th>
<th>Deved for Amelioration</th>
<th>Deved about Interdependence</th>
<th>Deved for Transformation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deved Approach</td>
<td>Charity &amp; Self-Help Approaches</td>
<td>Structural Critique &amp; Maldevelopment Approaches</td>
<td>Empowerment &amp; Conversion Approaches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thesis</td>
<td>Primary goal is to raise awareness: ‘knowing what’</td>
<td>Develop critical skills of analysis &amp; organization to promote change: ‘Knowing why’</td>
<td>Stimulate radical individual, social, and structural change; ‘Knowing How’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme</td>
<td>Development is portrayed as ‘There.’ Information is primarily emotive.</td>
<td>Development is viewed as ‘Between.’ Information is primarily statistical.</td>
<td>Development recognized as occurring ‘Here.’ Information is primarily descriptive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tactics</td>
<td>One-way communication: mass appeals are popular</td>
<td>Two-way communication: emphasis on smaller groups</td>
<td>Open system communication: employs participatory methods &amp; techniques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>Elite &amp; middle class people. Learners regarded as donors or volunteers</td>
<td>Middle class with some attention to the marginalized. Learners regarded as advocates for Third World</td>
<td>Marginalized, middle class, upper class. Learners regarded as agents of transformation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terms</td>
<td>Assistance; Aid; Help; Self-reliance; Basic Needs</td>
<td>Solidarity; ‘the system’; social justice</td>
<td>Liberation, partnership; emphasis on values</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Reimer, Shute, and McCreary, 1993, p.16)

### Appendix 4: Participant descriptions: UK and Canada

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Informant’s background</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E01</td>
<td>UK – Save the Children</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E02</td>
<td>UK – Save the Children</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E03</td>
<td>UK – Save the Children</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E04</td>
<td>UK – Save the Children</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E05</td>
<td>UK – Department of Education</td>
<td>Extensive experience with education, 14 years’ experience as High School principal, now works for the Department for Education (DfE) formerly, the Department for Children, Schools, and Families</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E06</td>
<td>UK – Large, volunteer-sending organization</td>
<td>Background in the labour movement and with labour education, voluntary overseas INGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E07</td>
<td>UK – Large INGO</td>
<td>International coordinator for education within a large INGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E08</td>
<td>UK – Network of INGOs, DECs, global education stakeholders</td>
<td>Background in labour movement, ten years with network, academic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E09</td>
<td>UK – Coordinator of an EES Regional Network</td>
<td>Background in elementary education, and critical multiculturalism in the media, coordinator of one of the regional Enabling Effective Support programs funded by DfID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E11</td>
<td>Europe – Development Education Exchange Europe Project</td>
<td>Background in development education, social movements, public engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Informant’s background</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C01</td>
<td>Save the Children</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C03</td>
<td>Save the Children</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C04</td>
<td>Save the Children</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C05</td>
<td>Save the Children</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C06</td>
<td>Large INGO</td>
<td>Background in global education dating back to the late 1970s and international cooperation management through various international development INGOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C07</td>
<td>Volunteer overseas INGO</td>
<td>Background in global education through a voluntary service overseas INGO dating back to 1980s and public engagement work with INGOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C08</td>
<td>INGO network</td>
<td>Background in global education dating back to the late 1970s, has worked for the past 20 years on international development policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C09</td>
<td>INGO network</td>
<td>Background in global education dating back to the late 1980s, staff member in an INGO network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C10</td>
<td>INGO network</td>
<td>Background in global education dating back to the late 1980s, staff member in an INGO network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C11</td>
<td>INGO network</td>
<td>Background in global education dating back to the 1990s, staff member in an INGO network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C12</td>
<td>INGO network</td>
<td>Background in global education dating back to the late 1990s, staff member in an INGO network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C13</td>
<td>INGO network</td>
<td>Background in global education dating back to the early 2000, staff member in an INGO network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C14</td>
<td>Large INGO</td>
<td>Background in global education dating back to the late 1980s, staff member of a large international development INGO with a nationally well-established education program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C15</td>
<td>Learner centre</td>
<td>Background in global education dating back to the 1980s, long-time staff member of a learner centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C16</td>
<td>Small INGO</td>
<td>Background in global education dating back to the late 1980s, staff member of a small international development INGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C17</td>
<td>Medium INGO, church-based</td>
<td>Background in global education dating back to the late 1980s, staff member of a medium-sized international development INGO with an education program in both schools and certain faith communities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 5: Interview protocol

Definition of global education for this study:

For the purposes of this study, global education is used as an umbrella term to represent a field of education in Canada, and a range of studies within that field that includes the following areas: global citizenship education, peace studies, environmental studies, development education, education for sustainability, human rights education, anti-racist education, multicultural education and that which is, in the Canadian context, referred to by CIDA as public engagement programming.

The global education programming that I’m focusing on in this study is that which is primarily aimed at students and teachers in the formal education system from kindergarten to grade 12. However, any global education programming aimed at Canadians outside of the formal education system (for example, programs aimed at vocational studies institutions or communities) is also of interest to me.

A. Background information:

1. What is or was your role at the international development NGO? (What is/was your title/position? How long have you been in this position? What were your main responsibilities?)

B. Global education and you:

2. What has your experience been with global education programming and public engagement programming? (How many years? What context/organizations? Were you working on grant proposals/fundraising? Programming implementation? Evaluation?)

3. What would you say are the “ideals” of global education/public engagement?

C. Global education in the NGO’s organizational context:

4. How would you describe the version of global education/public engagement “ideals” of the NGO you work/ed with?

   a. Have these “ideals” changed at all over the past 20 years?

5. Are there any ideals that are more difficult than others to implement? (If yes, which ones do you think are more challenging and why?)

6. What is the government’s (CIDA and/or the Ministry of Education) version of global education “ideals”? (Is it similar to your own, that of the NGO you work with, or are there some variances?)

   a. Have the government’s “ideals” of global education changed at all over the past 20 years?

D. NGO’s global education/public engagement programming:

7. Who is the target group for your global education/public engagement programming? (Does your program extend beyond the formal education system?)

8. What is the process for determining the content of your global education/public engagement programming?

9. What are the factors that shape the content of your global education/public engagement programming and have there been any changes over the past 20 years? (What is/are the most influential factor(s)? What has the least impact on GE/PE programming, but is something you still consider important?)
10. How does the production and dissemination of global education/public engagement programming work towards fulfilling the NGO’s organizational goals?

E. Funding the NGO’s global education/public engagement programming:

11. What sources of funding does the NGO draw upon for its programming? What is the main source? Have the key sources of funding changed over the years? If so, what have been the changes?

12. Do funders have criteria for applying for global education/public engagement funding? (If so, what are the criteria?)

13. Are there specific conditions or criteria that donors place on the global education/public engagement funding that the NGO, with choice, would prefer to do differently? If so, can you give me an example(s) of this situation?

14. Is there any type of global education/public engagement programming that the NGO might want to produce, but knows or is led to believe that this programming would not be supported by funders?

14 a. What has been your experience with multi-sectoral partnerships for global education? What are the possibilities and limitations of working within this framework?

F. Fundraising campaigns and global education programming:

15. Is there a connection between the NGO’s fundraising campaigns and its global education/public engagement programming? (If so, describe that connection.)

16. If the NGO did not have to fundraise (receive money through government funders, foundations, or from private donations) for global education/public engagement programming, would this programming look different? (If so, how would it be different?)

G. Donor perspectives on global education programming:

17. In looking at your main sources of funding over the past 20 years how would you describe their interest and commitment to global education/public engagement programming?

H. Global education programming and NGO accountability:

18. ID NGOs in Canada have been encouraged to sign on to Imagine Canada’s Ethical Code, CCIC’s Code of Ethics and internationally to the INGO accountability charter. How do you think that the terms of being accountable to donors and recipients might affect NGO-produced global education programming? (Can you talk a bit about if and how global education/public engagement programming relates to accountability practices?)

I. Final thoughts?

19. Is there anything else that you would like to add about global education programming, the funding of global education programming, global education programming funders, international development funders, or global education and accountability?
Appendix 6: Invitation letter and consent form

Date

Dear Participant,

Your name was put forward by [name and affiliation of person who recommended potential participant], as a potential participant in the doctoral research study I’m conducting on the supports and limitations for NGO-produced global education programming in Canada and the United Kingdom over the past 40 years.

Through this research I will be seeking to understand the contextual factors that have affected the development of different global education themes and practices over time. There are some interesting variances between NGO-produced global education programming in Canada and the United Kingdom that, subjected to a deeper inquiry, may reveal the room international development NGOs have for maneuver within the current global education programming context.

My doctoral research is being supervised by Dr. Karen Mundy at OISE, University of Toronto within the Comparative, International and Development Education specialization. Prior to my life as a doctoral student I was a global educator, both in Toronto’s formal school system and in my role as the coordinator of the Ontario Council for International Cooperation, OCIC, an umbrella organization of international development NGOs.

In the fall of 2008, I would like to interview personnel who have worked on implementing global education programming (either on outreach, program development, or policy) in order to understand how people in the field have experienced support and/or limitations for their work in the United Kingdom and Canada. Consenting participants will be asked to participate in two interviews, an initial interview and a follow up interview (either one of the interviews may be done via email or phone). Each interview will last for approximately one hour and the discussion will be audio taped. Participants will be asked a series of open-ended questions.

Sample questions include the following:

(1) What opportunities are there for non-governmental organizations to participate in the negotiating of the objectives and terms of global education programming in Canada (the United Kingdom)?

(2) If non-governmental organizations and development education centres did not have to rely on fundraising at all (from any source), yet still had the same amount of finances to work with, would global education programming in Canada (the United Kingdom) look different? If yes, how would programming differ from its current form?

All data collected from participants will remain completely confidential. Interviews will be audio taped only with the recorded permission of participants. At the beginning of the interview, participants will be reminded that it is their right to request that the digital recorder be turned off at any time during the course of the interview. Written field notes will also be recorded during and after interviews, but these notes will use pseudonyms and/or numeric codes through which to identify the participants throughout the field research.

Access to raw data, audiotapes, and numeric codes will be restricted to the principal investigator. The master list of numeric codes will be kept in a location that is different from where the raw data will be stored. Research data will be stored in a password-protected electronic media receptacle in two locations (to avoid data loss) while in the dwellings the researcher will be staying in during fieldwork. When back home in Canada, the data will be stored in a locked filing cabinet in the researcher’s home. The digital
audio data will be locked in a secure location at all times. All raw data will be destroyed within five years of the completion of the study.

Participation in this study is voluntary and therefore not compensated. However, all participants will be offered refreshments and transportation expenses will be reimbursed. Participants are free to withdraw from the study at any time.

If you would like to participate in this study please contact me by email at: nweber@oise.utoronto.ca or by phone: 416-XXX-XXXX.

Sincerely,

Nadya Weber
Ph.D. Candidate, OISE/University of Toronto
nweber@oise.utoronto.ca
Phone: 416-XXX-XXXX

By signing below you are indicating that you are willing to be interviewed for this study, you have received a copy of this letter and you are fully aware of the conditions outlined above. Please keep a copy of this letter for your own records.

Name: ___________________  Signature: ___________________

Date: ___________________

Please initial if you wish to have a summary of the findings of the study upon its completion: ____

Please indicate if you wish to remain anonymous within this study: Yes __  No ___
Or anonymous where indicated: ____
Letters to the Editor
WORKING FOR PEACE

To the Editor of the Manchester Guardian

Sirs,—We are committed now in Korea to a war for which, since the "branding" of China, no end can be foreseen. We are committed to a rearmament so vast that our sheer daily absorption in it must rob us more and more of the spiritual freshness and energy indispensable for the achievement of peace. Every day now our minds are being more completely conditioned; the "hell bomb" is the latest attraction in the Sunday press, and Amiel, whom not one Englishman in ten thousand has ever heard of, is brought on from the grave to warn us that, long before "the Hun" invaded Belgium, "the Russians" were barbarians. It is impossible to exaggerate the deterioration even during the last two months. Useless, then, to repeat like a parrot that war is not inevitable; war is now quite inevitable unless we make an almost superhuman effort, of a new and more positive kind, to prevent it.

I suggest a two-point programme. First, the proposed conference with Russia, which has been hanging about as if we had eternity at our disposal and now looks like being held up (if it comes off at all) for heaven knows how many further exchanges, should be pressed on with as if our lives depended on its immediate convening. Hack diplomatic routine, "preparation," manouevring for position, warfare by "Notes," all should be thrown overboard: we just have not time for them. Abandoned, too, must be lengthy arguments and counter-arguments about the agenda, about whether the scope should be narrow or wide, about whether we should negotiate on Russia's set of points or on ours. Childish irresponsibility, when meanwhile every moment we draw nearer the abyss! The great thing is to get together on anybody's ground, and then make a desperate effort to widen things out and achieve agreement. But now comes the crux: however certain our statesmen may be—and I share their certainty—that the Kremlin is primarily responsible for our present disasters, we must yet negotiate, as Mr. Nehru has urged, not in the mood of war but in the mood of peace. Nothing could be harder: but if we can make so vast an effort to rearm materially, cannot we make a comparable effort to disarm spiritually, to subdue our passions? And I suggest that, apart from this particular conference with Russia, we should always and everywhere subordinate human negotiations face to face for long-range paper warfare.

Secondly, we should take the initiative in proposing for immediate discussion some variant of the plan already proposed by Walter Reuther—namely, that a great international fund should be established, as an urgent matter of life or death, for improving the conditions of those fellow human beings who, to the number of hundreds of millions, are starving, destitute, and in despair. I should like to see our own country, by the size of its proposed contribution, challenging the world to a new kind of rivalry, a rivalry in the works of peace. So might international discussion, leading to international administration, find itself with a fruitful topic instead of a sterile one. So might the trend to war, issuing from a concentration on national as opposed to international interests, be reversed. So at last might swords be turned into ploughshares.

May I ask through you, sir, that all who are in agreement with this letter should send a postcard with just the word "Yes" and their name and address to me at 14 Henrietta Street, London W.C. 2. I do not guarantee any action of any kind, but if the response is large enough something might possibly come of it.—Yours &

VICTOR GODLINCZ.

14 Henrietta Street, London W.C. 2, February 7, 1951

from The Guardian, February 12, 1951 Source: http://www.waronwant.org/about-usextra/inform/17174-the-guardian-letter-that-led-to-war-on-want
Appendix 8: 1919 Save the Children Fund flyer

Flyer showing starving Austrian children (Save the Children UK website)

printed in the Daily Herald, May 16, 1919 (Mulley, 2009, Plate 17)
Appendix 9: Save the Children UK and Save the Children Canada Resources

Save the Children UK resources reviewed:


Save the Children UK. (2002). Young Citizens: Children as Active Citizens Around the World London, the United Kingdom: Save the Children UK.


Save the Children UK. (2006). Rewrite the Future - Learning about Children Affected by Conflict in Sudan and Southern Sudan London, the United Kingdom: Save the Children UK.


Save the Children Canada Resources Reviewed:

