



Development Education Research Centre

Research Paper No.14

for the Global Learning Programme



Young people's understandings of global poverty

Kate Brown

Development Education Research Centre
Research Paper No.14

Young people's understandings of global poverty

Kate Brown
2015

Published by the Development Education Research Centre

Development Education Research Centre
UCL Institute of Education
36 Gordon Square
London WC1H 0PD

Tel: 020 3073 8309
Website: www.ioe.ac.uk/derc

First published 2015
© Crown copyright

ISBN: 978-0-9574546-7-5

Disclaimer

This paper has been written by Kate Brown, and the content and opinions are hers alone. The author does not speak on behalf of the GLP-E and its consortium partners.

Cover image: © Kingsford Community School, Newham

Contents

	Acknowledgements	3
	Executive Summary	4
1	Introduction	6
2	Methodology	10
	2.1 Introduction	10
	2.2 Sampling	10
	2.3 Group interviews	13
	2.4 Analysis	14
	2.5 Parameters and limitations of this research	15
3	Findings	16
	3.1 What do young people know about global poverty?	16
	3.1.1 Progress in tackling global poverty	16
	3.1.2 Understanding challenges to progress	17
	3.1.3 Different ideas of poverty	20
	3.2 How do young people think they can respond to global poverty?	21
	3.3 In what contexts do young people think they learn about global poverty?	23
4	Conclusion and recommendations	26
	References	30
	Appendix 1	35
	Appendix 2	36
	Appendix 3	37
	Appendix 4	38

Tables

Table 1: Research questions	8
Table 2: Characteristics of participating schools	11
Table 3: Approach of participating schools to global learning	12
Table 4: Numbers of participating students	13

Table 5 Group interview schedule **14**

Table 6: Has progress been made in tackling global poverty? **16**

Table 7: Challenges to progress in tackling global poverty **18**

Table 8: Contexts in which young people perceive themselves to learn about global poverty **24**

Acknowledgements

This research would not have been possible without the time and willingness of the Global Learning Programme Coordinator in each of the participating schools, and of the students who participated in group interviews. I would also like to thank Dr Frances Hunt and Dr Douglas Bourn at the UCL Institute of Education, and the team at Think Global, for all their support.

Abbreviations

CPD	Continuing Professional Development
GLP	Global Learning Programme
ISA	International School Award
MDGs	Millennium Development Goals
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
PSHE	Personal, Social and Health Education
RE	Religious Education

Executive summary

This report forms part of the research and evaluation of the Global Learning Programme (GLP) in England. It focuses on young people, the end beneficiaries of the programme, about whose global learning there is currently a limited, though growing, body of evidence.

This small-scale, qualitative piece of research is based on group interviews with 62 Year 7 and Year 9 students in six secondary schools in England. It explores what these young people know about global poverty, what they think about actions individuals can take in response to global poverty, and the contexts within which they perceive themselves to be learning about these issues.

This research is significant in adding to a limited body of academic research exploring young people in England learning about global poverty. It is unique in focusing on young people's understanding of global poverty in direct relation to the pupil learning outcomes of the GLP. Key findings include the following:

- Young people participating in the research found it difficult to say whether progress had been made in tackling global poverty. All groups were either collectively uncertain or found it difficult to come to agreement on this issue.
- Young people were mostly able to suggest and discuss challenges to global poverty reduction, though the majority of reasons given were internal to developing countries (e.g. poor governance, population growth, arid environments). All groups of young people were able to give some explanation of the relationship between conflict and poverty, but no group explained the relationship between inequality and poverty, and half of the groups were unable to say whether inequality was a particular issue in developing countries. Poor governance was the most commonly given challenge to development.
- All groups of young people understood that average economic poverty or wealth has limitations as a measure or understanding of poverty, and all groups were able to suggest other ways in which to measure the quality of life of an individual, from their weight, to their education, to their level of power. No group directly talked about access to services or realisation of human rights as ways of understanding poverty.
- In terms of actions individuals can take in response to global poverty, donating to charity and buying Fairtrade products were the actions most often ranked highly by participants. However, in two-thirds of group interviews scepticism about the effectiveness of charities was expressed. Raising the awareness of others and volunteering in a developing country received mixed reactions, with young people reporting both pros and cons to these actions. All groups initially ranked turning

out lights as an unimportant action to take, and, even after prompting, a third of groups were unable to make the link between the use of energy, climate change, and the lives of people in developing countries.

- Young people in this study were almost all unable to see their role in holding their government to account in tackling global poverty. All groups ranked contacting a politician as of low importance, all explaining that politicians do not answer all their correspondence. When pushed to consider actions they could advocate a politician to take, two-thirds of the groups talked about giving money (though it was not always clear if this was to another government or a charity), and no student talked about actions their government could take relating to trade, debt or other financial and political relationships.
- Participants reported learning about global poverty in a broad range of contexts, both inside and outside school. All groups mentioned geography lessons and online or television NGO charity adverts, and, in all but two interviews, young people talked about the importance of talking to their parents or grandparents.

Reflecting on this research in relation to the GLP and its intended pupil learning outcomes, this report recommends that the programme explores how to develop teachers' and pupils' understanding of the following four themes:

- the extent to which, around the world, progress is being made in tackling global poverty
- the extent to which ineffective governance (of governments and charities) is a barrier to development and how individuals and governments are and can work to overcome this challenge
- the current and potential role of the British government in tackling global poverty, and the importance of citizens advocating their views to politicians
- criticality in 'reading' messages from the media, and particularly NGO advertising, which forms an important dimension of young people's learning about global poverty.

1

Introduction

The Global Learning Programme (GLP) is a government-funded education programme. It is creating a national network of like-minded schools, committed to equipping their students to make a positive contribution to a globalised world, by helping teachers deliver effective teaching and learning about development and global issues at Key Stages 2 and 3. More specifically the GLP aims to:

- help young people understand their role in a globally interdependent world and explore strategies by which they can make it more just and sustainable
- familiarise pupils with the concepts of interdependence, development, globalisation and sustainability
- enable teachers to move pupils from a charity mentality to a social justice mentality
- stimulate critical thinking about global issues, both at a whole school and pupil level
- help schools promote greater awareness of poverty and sustainability
- enable schools to explore alternative models of development and sustainability in the classroom.

The GLP forms part of a long history of response by English educators and education policy makers to global poverty. Policy and pedagogical approaches have varied, and terminology used has included global education, global dimension, global perspectives, development education, global citizenship, and global youth work (Hicks, 2007; Bourn, 2008). The term used consistently here, in line with the GLP, is global learning (Bourn, 2014). Practice in England contributes to an international discourse on global learning, which varies in emphasis and trajectory (see, for example, Hartmeyer, 2008; Kirkwood Tucker, 2009; Lenskaya, 2009). Global learning's unique trajectory in England is characterised both by the range of overlapping traditions that it encompasses and the significant role in its development of Non-Governmental Organisations (NGOs), initially in place of state involvement (Sinclair, 1994), and, since the turn of the century, in combination with government support. In an international context, English global learning is well respected and perceived as well established (European Multi-Stakeholder Steering Group on Development Education, 2010). Despite this, there is a limited, though growing, body of research into global learning in English schools (Smith 1999 and 2004; Marshall, 2007; Bourn and Hunt, 2011; Bourn and Cara, 2012 and 2013; Hunt, 2012).

A highly significant element of the GLP is its comprehensive programme of research and evaluation, which aims to build a body of knowledge on global learning in the context of schooling in England. This report forms part of that programme. It describes a small-scale, qualitative piece of research into young people's understandings of global poverty. It explores what young people know about global poverty and the actions individuals can take to bring about change, and the contexts within which young people perceive themselves to be learning about global poverty. The research focuses on young people's learning at Key Stage 3. The term 'young people' therefore refers here to the 11–14 year olds who took part in this research, as well as older teenagers and young adults involved in existing research cited in this report.

A focus on young people and their learning and perceptions of global poverty was chosen because to date there has been limited academic focus on this topic in England (Marshall, 2007; Bourn, 2008). While a range of evaluations and research reports explore what young people have learnt from specific projects or interventions (see, for example, Lowe, 2008; Scott, 2009; Global Student Forum, 2012; Sallah, 2013), few in-depth studies exist. Again, there are exceptions, including research into the learning process of young people in England in relation to global poverty (Brown, 2014); the contexts in which young people learn about the wider world (Cross, Fenyo, Wagstaff and Gammon, 2010); and the engagement of young people in further education with global learning (Bentall and McGough, 2013). This research in the English context joins research internationally, for example studies exploring differences in the way German young people learn about globalisation and development through critical and intellectual discussion at school versus volunteering outside school (Asbrand, 2008), and the responses of young people in New Zealand to NGO imagery (Tallon, 2013).

In exploring young people's understandings of global poverty, this research focuses on three research questions. These questions, and the specific way they have been interpreted in this research, are summarised in Table 1. The specific focus of the questions was chosen to relate to the global learning pupil outcomes of the GLP (GLP, 2014), with global poverty and actions for change seen as both accessible topics and central to the programme.

Table 1: Research questions

Research question	Focus in this research
What do young people know about global poverty?	Young people's understanding of the extent to which progress has been made in: tackling global poverty; the relationship between factors such as inequality, conflict and poverty; and different understandings of poverty, for example in relation to income, services or rights.
How do young people think they can respond to global poverty?	Young people's perspectives on actions they can personally take to respond to global poverty, including: charitable donations; consumer decisions; raising awareness; saving energy; volunteering in a developing country; and political advocacy.
In what contexts do young people think they learn about global poverty?	Young people's perceptions of the places and spaces where they learn about global poverty, both in and out of school.

Current research into what young people know or learn about global poverty indicates that young people feel they know quite a lot about this issue, the lives of people in other countries and global interdependence (Gayford, 2009; DEA, 2010; Cross et al, 2010; Sallah, 2013). There is also significant evidence that young people learn stereotyped views in relation to global poverty, and particularly of Africa (Brown, 2006; Borowski and Plastow, 2009; Elton-Chalcraft, 2009; Leonard, 2012). Only limited research has looked at young people's understanding of specific issues, for example the complexity of poverty, including both financial poverty and poverty of opportunity (Miller, Bowes, Bourn and Castro, 2012). This research follows this specificity, and looks at particular areas of understanding relevant to the pupil outcomes of the GLP (GLP, 2014), including: young people's understandings of the extent to which progress has been made in tackling global poverty; the relationship between factors such as inequality, conflict and poverty; and different understandings of poverty.

Within existing research, evidence of young people's understandings of personal actions they can take in relation to global poverty have largely focused on buying Fairtrade (Gayford, 2009; Global Learning Network South West, 2010) and on giving money to charity (Brown, 2006; Bentall and McGough, 2013). It is worth noting that a further body of research in the English context looks at young people's responses to global poverty and development in terms of their emotions (Holden, 2006; Brown, 2014) and their understanding of themselves, particularly a sense of gratitude, privileged circumstances and luckiness (Simpson, 2004; Beames, 2005; Bentall and McGough, 2013; Brown, 2014). Research in New Zealand (Tallon, 2013) echoes these findings; young people were found to express shock or disbelief at the chaos of life 'over there' and to construct their identities as superior and lucky in relation to the developing world. The research reported here focuses on young people's perceptions of actions or changes in behaviour that individuals can take in response to global poverty, rather than their internal

responses in terms of emotions and perceptions of self. In particular, this research looks at young people's views of behaviours including charitable donations, consumer decisions, raising awareness, saving energy, volunteering in a developing country, and political advocacy. These actions were chosen to represent the main routes for personal action in response to global poverty, though the research also allowed space to elicit additional actions suggested by students.

The majority of existing evaluations and studies exploring learning about global poverty focus on the outcomes of specific educational programmes or projects (see, for example, Asbrand, 2008; Lowe, 2008). This is perhaps an inevitable consequence of the pressures of results-based funding as well as interest amongst educational researchers in the outcomes of educational programmes and interventions. However, research indicates that young people's opportunities to learn about global poverty and development are not confined to educational opportunities designed for the purpose, for example:

'Messages about geographically distant places and people are picked up continuously through general media, formal and informal literature and attitudes and knowledge from family, friends and life experiences' (Tallon, 2012, p. 9).

The multiple contexts in which young people in England learn about the wider world are well documented in survey and focus-group research by Cross et al (2010), and include television, discussion with family, activities or a teacher at school, going on holiday, religious institutions, and friends' experiences. This research seeks to revisit this question of the contexts of young people's learning about the wider world, providing updated insight, and specific focus around learning about global poverty.

This research is therefore significant in adding to a limited body of academic research that explores young people in England's learning about global poverty. It is also significant, though not unique, in looking at young people's understanding of specific issues relating to global poverty, in looking at their perceptions of a wide range of actions they can take in response to global poverty, and in looking at the breadth of contexts in which young people learn about global poverty. It is unique in focusing on young people's understanding of global poverty in direct relation to the pupil learning outcomes of the GLP.

The following section explores the methodological approach taken to exploring the three research questions, before the findings of the research are set out and discussed in section 3.

2 Methodology

2.1 Introduction

This research is a small-scale, qualitative study into the perceptions of young people in relation to global poverty. The research tool used was group interviews, taking place in six schools in England in spring 2014. Two group interviews were held in each school: one group of between four and six Year 7 (11–12 year-old) students; and a second group of between four and six Year 9 (13–14 year-old) students. A total of 62 students took part in the research.

2.2 Sampling

Six schools were purposefully selected to take part in this research. This number was felt to allow the right balance of breadth of participants and richness of data within the time constraints of a small-scale study.

A Whole School Audit¹ completed by all schools participating in the GLP, includes an option to indicate willingness to participate in research as part of the programme. All secondary schools that were part of the GLP in February 2014 and had indicated this willingness were invited via email to participate in this research. Six schools were selected from those who responded and chosen to represent variation along the following lines:

- proportion of students eligible for free school meals (FSM) (as a proxy for levels of social deprivation)
- proportion of students whose first language was not English
- geographical location, both location in England and whether rural or urban. However, it was also necessary for the researcher, based in London, to reach the schools in a day, so the furthest schools from London were in the South West and the East Midlands
- characteristics of the school, including whether single sex or co-educational and its most recent Ofsted judgement
- how developed the school's approach to global learning was. This was assessed on answers to the Whole School Audit including: how long the school had been working on global learning; their involvement in awards such as the International

¹ The Whole School Audit is an online tool participants in schools complete after registering onto the GLP. It asks schools a number of questions mainly in relation to global learning practices across the whole school. For further information see: Hunt and King, 2015.

Schools Award and Rights Respecting Schools Award; and the extent to which staff had been involved in global learning training opportunities. Using this information each school was given an overall level to describe its approach to global learning: early, developing or embedded². Two schools from each of these 'categories' were included.

Characteristics of the six schools are given in Table 2, and their approach to global learning in Table 3. Schools 1 and 2 are categorised as 'early' in global learning, schools 3 and 4 'developing' and schools 5 and 6 'embedded'.

Table 2: Characteristics of participating schools

	School 1	School 2	School 3	School 4	School 5	School 6
Region	Greater London	East Midlands	East Midlands	East	South East	South East
FSM eligibility	38%	3%	16%	8%	9%	4%
Pupils with English not a first language	72%	1%	0%	16%	7%	1%
Most recent Ofsted judgement	Good	Outstanding	Requires improvement	Good	Satisfactory	Good
School type	Academy	Church of England Voluntary Aided	Academy	Girls school, Academy	Academy	Academy

² Early, developing and embedded levels are used within the GLP to categorise how schools define themselves against Whole School Framework criteria in the Whole School Audit (see: Hunt and King, 2015). I used this data to give each school an identifier as early, developing or embedded.

Table 3: Approach of participating schools to global learning

	School 1	School 2	School 3	School 4	School 5	School 6
Approach to global learning	Early	Early	Developing	Developing	Embedded	Embedded
Status within GLP³	Partner School	Partner School	Partner School	Partner School	Expert Centre	Expert Centre
Length of time incorporating global learning	Does not explicitly work with global learning	Does not explicitly work with global learning	Over ten years	Three to five years	Five to ten years	Three to five years
Global learning teacher CPD	No staff have been involved in global learning CPD	No staff have been involved in global learning CPD	Staff have been involved in at least one global learning CPD activity	Staff have been involved in at least one global learning CPD activity	Staff have been involved in at least one global learning CPD activity	Staff have been involved in at least one global learning CPD activity
Award schemes related to global learning⁴	Achieved intermediate ISA; working towards bronze eco-school award	Eco-school green flag; Fairtrade schools award	Initial stages of International School Award (ISA)	SA re-accreditation	Achieved full ISA	Achieved full ISA; Global schools award; Eco-school green flag; Fairtrade schools award
Fundraising for international issues	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No
International school link or overseas Partner School	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No

Diversity in the range of schools and students selected was not aimed at enabling comparison, but rather building a rich picture of young people's understandings of global poverty. In addition, by including schools from across the range of those involved in the GLP, it was hoped that the findings of this research would be viewed as relevant by GLP teachers and educators working in a range of different contexts.

In each school, the contact teacher was the Global Learning Coordinator, nominated to lead the GLP in their school. Having confirmed their involvement in the research, a date for a single visit of the researcher to the school was arranged.

³ GLP Expert Centres are schools with expertise and experience in global learning and have the capacity to run CPD. Expert Centres recruit local schools into their network, run training and share best practice. GLP Partner Schools are schools that want to get involved in the GLP as part of a network. No previous knowledge or experience in global learning is required. Partner Schools are usually recruited onto the GLP via Expert Centres.

⁴ In the participating schools, this included: Eco-Schools, an award programme that guides schools on their sustainable journey, managed in Britain by Keep Britain Tidy, the anti-litter campaign; Fairtrade School Award, run by the Fairtrade Foundation; and Global Schools Award, designed to recognise good practice in delivering the global dimension and developed by the Consortium of Development Education Centres.

The Global Learning Coordinator was asked to select students for the group interviews. He or she was asked to select a diverse group of students, across a range of abilities, gender, ethnic group, and involvement in global learning activities. This diversity was limited by the ethnic diversity within the schools, and also by the fact that school 4 was a girls' school. The numbers of students involved are described in Table 4.

Table 4: Numbers of participating students

	School 1	School 2	School 3	School 4	School 5	School 6
Year 7 pupils	5	4	5	6	4	6
Year 9 pupils	5	5	5	6	5	6

2.3 Group interviews

Informal semi-structured interviews were chosen for data collection, due to their potential to provide rich data without significant violation of privacy (McCracken, 1988). Group interviews were chosen both to save time over individual interviews, and because it was hoped that such a context would create a safe peer environment (Mauthner, 1997), and encourage young people to give their perspective through hearing others do so, enabling interaction and rich data (Hill, Laybourn, and Borland, 1996). A group of between four and six was felt to optimise this effect, while ensuring that all participants would have the opportunity to contribute. Each interview lasted between 45 minutes and an hour, depending on the length of the lesson or lunch-break in which the interview took place.

Using task-based methods in interviews can help overcome young people's lack of experience of communicating directly with unfamiliar adults (Punch, 2002), as well as making use of short interview times to allow access into abstract concepts. Three different activities were used in each interview, with additional prompt questions used to encourage young people to expand on or explain their answers. In each case, the focus was on the discussion prompted by the activities, rather than the answers given. The format of the interview and the three tasks are summarised in Table 5.

Table 5 Group interview schedule

Approx time (mins)	Activity	Research question
0–5	Introduction to researcher, the GLP and why participants' views are important. Students reminded of the anonymity and confidentiality of data collected, and of their right to withdraw (see Appendix 4).	
5–20	Spider-diagram activity Students were shown a spider-diagram of learning contexts, based on the categorisation of learning contexts in Appendix 1. Students are asked to identify where they think they learn about global poverty, and to give more details about the two or three most important places.	3
20–40	Agree/disagree activity Students were presented with four statements about global poverty (see Appendix 2), and asked to work as a group to place each statement on a line running from Agree to Disagree. These statements were selected to allow discussion of participants' understandings of the 'global poverty' element of the GLP global learning pupil outcomes (GLP, 2014).	1
40–55	Card-sort activity Students were given six cards with actions individuals could take to make a difference to global poverty (see Appendix 3). They were asked to work together to rank these from most to least important. These actions were selected to allow discussion of participants' understandings of the 'actions of citizens' element of the GLP global learning pupil outcomes (GLP, 2014). Additional blank cards were included for students to add actions of their own.	2
55–60	Thanks and close.	

The ethical approach of this study drew on the guidelines of the British Educational Research Association (BERA, 2011), the Convention on the Rights of the Child, and guidelines specific to working with children. Particular attention was paid to informed consent, anonymity and confidentiality, though also acknowledging the compromised way in which these can function with young people (Tisdall, Davis and Gallagher, 2009). For more details, see Appendix 4.

2.4 Analysis

The interviews were recorded and transcribed in full and transcripts read iteratively by the researcher, and then colour-coded according to the mention of pre-selected themes within each research question, see Table 1. These themes were drawn from the GLP global learning pupil outcomes, which relate to 'global poverty' and 'actions of citizens' (GLP, 2014), and existing research into the contexts in which young people learn about global poverty (Brown, 2014). Analysis grids by school, age-group and theme were created, extracting relevant quotes from the transcriptions. In the writing of the report, numeric values (the number of groups

able to...) and illustrative quotes were drawn from these grids. In section 3, the findings of this research are presented in relation to the three research questions.

2.5 Parameters and limitations of this research

A number of deliberately selected parameters of this research conversely placed limitations on its scope and findings. The small sample size and the qualitative nature of the research, was chosen to provide rich data within logistical limitations, and enable common themes to be identified in young people's understandings across schools. However, this meant the research was not designed to compare pupils' understandings by school or group characteristics. Despite this, it is interesting to note that an initial comparison of data by schools indicates that characteristics such as eligibility of FSM and Ofsted rating appear to mask variation by school approach to global learning. For example, students in school 2 (3% FSM eligibility, outstanding Ofsted, early approach to global learning) described more than twice the number of challenges or barriers to development than students in schools 5 (9% FSM eligibility, satisfactory Ofsted, global learning embedded) and 1 (38% FSM eligibility, good Ofsted, early approach to global learning). It was also not the focus of the research to look at development in understanding between students in Years 7 and 9, although this was expected, and some evidence of greater understanding by the Year 9 groups was apparent in the data.

The understandings about global poverty that were explored (in relation to progress, challenges to progress and understandings of poverty) were chosen to reflect the GLP global learning pupil outcomes and provide meaningful data in relation to specific areas of knowledge. However, their specific nature also limits the breadth of the study in exploring understandings of global poverty.

Group interviews were selected to provide an environment in which young people could share their views. However, some young people may have been inhibited from sharing their perspective, and others been more dominant. Certainly each young person did not provide their perspective on each question or activity. In addition, it was not consistently possible to identify the contribution of each individual student throughout the interview. Quotations are given by school number and year group.

3 Findings

3.1 What do young people know about global poverty?

3.1.1 Progress in tackling global poverty

All groups found it difficult to decide the extent to which they agreed with the statement 'A lot of progress has been made in fighting global poverty – around the world people's lives are getting better.' Some groups put forward opposing viewpoints, and others agreed about their uncertainty: *'I think we don't know'* (School 5, Year 9); *'It's hard to tell'* (School 2, Year 9).

When pushed to place their card on the agree/disagree continuum, three groups placed their card towards disagree, four towards agree, and five in the middle of the line (see Table 6). This latter position is intended to indicate a viewpoint that there are equal indications of progress and lack of progress in tackling global poverty, but can also be seen as the 'don't know' position in this activity.

Table 6: Has progress been made in tackling global poverty?

	School 1		School 2		School 3		School 4		School 5		School 6	
	Yr 7	Yr 9	Yr 7	Yr 9	Yr 7	Yr 9	Yr 7	Yr 9	Yr 7	Yr 9	Yr 7	Yr 9
Between agree and disagree		X	X		X					X	X	
Towards agree	X			X			X					X
Towards disagree						X		X	X			

Three groups mentioned progress in technology as a reason that progress had been made in tackling global poverty. However, the majority of reasoning around the extent of progress focused on the work of NGOs and their communication of this work. Some students argued that progress was being made because of the work of charities and the amount of money that has already been given in donations. However, the appearance of charity adverts and campaigns was viewed as an argument against progress, the situation cannot be improving *'because every year it's the same problem [on Comic Relief or Sports Relief] and it's always happening'* (School 5, Year 9). These opposing arguments were juxtaposed clearly by a Year 7 student:

'Could be getting better because we keep seeing advertisements on TV, and they are like donate two pound a month to help someone get clean water, and

stuff like that. But there's more and more adverts like that, so it makes you think that it's not getting better' (School 3, Year 7).

Students in four of the Year 9 groups highlighted that they felt NGOs communicated little in the way of progress or success, and one student suggested this was a deliberate tactic on the part of NGOs:

'They don't tell us, like, because they know that people aren't going to give money because poverty's being solved then they are just gonna not solve the rest of the problem, but if they tell people that they've not done then they are just gonna, people are still gonna keep giving money, aren't they?' (School 2, Year 9).

This reflects research into the way in which some NGOs select images, communicating a message of a vulnerable, incapable, low-skilled and grateful 'Other' (Dogra, 2012). Most notorious during the Ethiopian famine in 1984–5 (Lissner, 1981), use of simplistic and occasionally negative imagery in NGO advertising, used to elicit donations, continues in the present (Dogra, 2012).

Another Year 9 student indicated the need to hear more about progress in tackling global poverty:

'I think we don't know, we don't see it. We need to see progress, there's not enough progress being shown, broadcast in the media' (School 5, Year 9).

3.1.2 Understanding challenges to progress

Students were asked to consider two statements relating to barriers to tackling global poverty: 'War in poor countries is the biggest reason people there stay poor' and 'The most important way to stop global poverty is to make sure all children in poor countries have a chance to go to school.' All groups were able to discuss challenges to global poverty reduction, and all but one group were able to come up with challenges of their own, as illustrated in Table 7. In Table 7 'conflict' was prompted by the activity; all other challenges were unprompted.

Table 7: Challenges to progress in tackling global poverty

	School 1		School 2		School 3		School 4		School 5		School 6	
	Yr 7	Yr 9	Yr 7	Yr 9	Yr 7	Yr 9	Yr 7	Yr 9	Yr 7	Yr 9	Yr 7	Yr 9
Climate change				X				X				
Conflict	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	
Debt										X		
Environment (arid/ natural disasters/ lack of natural resources)			X	X	X			X				X
Inequality						X		X				
Poor governance	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X
Population size/ growth			X	X	X		X			X	X	X
Struggling economies			X	X								

The following discussion focuses on conflict and inequality, because of their appearance in the GLP global learning pupil outcomes, and poor governance, because it was the most common challenge to development cited without prompt by the activity. Firstly, however, it is worth noting that only one student mentioned debt as a challenge to development, and no group mentioned any other reason relating to relationships between countries, such as trade rules or colonialism. Two groups referred to global warming, but as explored in section 3.2, students found it difficult to make the link between their own use of fossil fuels, climate change and the impact of this on people in developing countries. This emphasis on endogenous causes of poverty echoes a range of research amongst the public and in education. For example, research into public attitudes towards development (Darton and Kirk, 2011, p6) found that the *“causes of poverty are seen as internal to poor countries: famine, war, natural disasters, bad governance, overpopulation and so on”*, and adults have little understanding of the relationship between debt, trade and poverty and are confused about the causes of poverty (Bond, 2014). Modernisation theory, which offers few causes for underdevelopment, has been found to be the most popular and pervasive perspective on development in Irish post-primary schools (Bryan and Bracken, 2011), and students in further education in England find understanding global interconnectedness challenging (Bentall and McGough, 2013).

The relationship between conflict and poverty was prompted by the activity, and was discussed by all the groups. All but two groups felt it was a factor in ongoing poverty, and three groups thought it was an important factor. All groups were able to give some explanation of the relationship between poverty and conflict. Most commonly, this focused on loss of life, and damage to homes and property.

However, four groups talked about the cost of rebuilding or repairing damage, and six groups about the cost of weapons and military personnel, which may divert funds from healthcare and other services. Three groups identified that conflict could not be the most important reason for ongoing global poverty, because there is no war in some poor countries. Two groups went as far as saying they did not think conflict was a barrier to development. Most groups used the terms 'conflict' and 'war' synonymously, but one Year 9 student described how there is always some form of conflict in developing countries:

'There's always some kind of conflict, not necessarily like war but there's always some sort of conflict, whether it's between two parties in the government, either it's between two sort of members, there's always some sort of feud going on' (School 4, Year 9).

The majority of discussion indicated that conflict was thought to contribute to poverty, but one Year 9 student identified that the relationship can run the other way: 'A lot of the time it's not the war that's causing poverty, it's poverty that's causing war' (School 6, Year 9). However, he was only able to explain this by saying that corrupt governments can cause war.

Two Year 9 groups cited stark inequalities between rich and poor in developing countries as a barrier to development, for example:

'And then you've got like the mega-rich. And the mega poor. Because Miss showed us a picture the other day and it's just split by a wall, there's no mixture, it's just one wall straight through the middle' (School 3, Year 9).

When prompted, three further groups were able to indicate that inequality, though an issue everywhere, can be particularly stark in developing countries. All three did so by talking about slums or favelas in developing countries such as Brazil, Ivory Coast and India. Six further groups were not able to say whether inequality was a particular issue in developing countries. Notably, this was true of five out of six of the Year 7 groups, an example within the data of a clear difference in answers between the age groups. No group explained the relationship between poverty and inequality, with the closest to an explanation being offered by a Year 9 group:

'A big divide between the rich people and the poor people, so the poor people are just staying poor because they don't get any help from government, and the rich people get all the money...' (School 4, Year 9).

The most common reason given to explain why some countries are still poor (other than conflict, which was prompted by the activity), was the role of governments in developing countries. The term 'corruption' was used in three groups, but others talked about dictatorships, greedy leaders, and about government's spending money on stadiums or their own clothes instead of on schools or healthcare:

'There's things with governments, corrupt governments and things like that, and they'll just take, they are interested in their own welfare, but they are not particularly as interested in the people who aren't gonna be paying tax, or helping them out much' (School 6, Year 9).

This echoes research into public attitudes towards development in the UK, where a narrative of corruption is dominant (Darnton and Kirk, 2011; Bond, 2014).

3.1.3 Different ideas of poverty

All groups disagreed with the statement 'The best way to measure how poor people in a country are is to measure how much money they have on average. You take the total wealth of the country and divide it by the number of people who live there'. All groups were able to explain that this is because of economic inequality, that a large range in wealth between people means that an average would not tell you much about the very rich or very poor. However, only half the groups (and only one Year 7 group) were able to explain that this problem might be particularly acute in developing countries:

'You could have a country where they've got, say in Africa, Ivory Coast, where they've got millions of people in slums, but they've got a couple of people who are really, really rich, got rich off natural resources and things like that' (School 6, Year 9).

All students could suggest other ways of measuring development, including: how much food people have; health; possessions; how thin people are; how densely people live; cleanliness; what people wear; whether they have food and water; and their level of education or of their children's education. These measures were always phrased in terms of the status or characteristics of the individual, rather than the provision of services and the individuals' access to these services. However, this could relate to the prompt statement that asked students to think about how to measure 'how poor people are', not the level of development of a country or region. Two Year 7 groups talked about how you would need to go and experience someone's life or actually see how they lived to assess the quality of their life. Four groups suggested you could measure how people feel or their levels of happiness:

'Maybe ask them, maybe interview them and ask them what their life is like, ask them questions about how they feel about the way they are living' (School 4, Year 7).

One Year 9 group explained that this is important because there is not always a relationship between being rich and being happy, because *'people don't appreciate what they've got'*

(School 3, Year 9). However, a young person in the same group stated that happiness would not be a good measure, because there is no shared understanding of what it means to be happy. Another suggestion in the same group was to measure people's level of authority or power (although again a counter-argument was that authority might not relate to happiness):

'Yeah, because you've got the people who are in charge, who are obviously going to be a lot richer than the workers, and I think it's a good way of measuring that because there'd be a lot less of the people in charge because there'll be thousands, and thousands of workers' (School 3, Year 9).

No student referred directly to realisation of human rights as a way to understand poverty.

3.2 How do young people think they can respond to global poverty?

All groups considered different actions individuals (including themselves, their peers, teachers and families) can take to respond to global poverty. Six actions were suggested to students in activity 3 (see Appendix 3): give money to charity; think about what you buy, e.g. Fairtrade; tell other people about global poverty; turn out the lights when you don't need them; volunteer in a developing country; and write letters or email politicians to get them to make different decisions. Participants' views on each of these actions are outlined below. In addition, two additional actions across the groups were suggested by students: spend money at local businesses when you visit a developing country; and give other donations to charity (e.g. clothes, fill shoeboxes with gifts).

Participants had complex views about the giving of money to charity. Two groups ranked it most highly, and all but two groups ranked it amongst the top three most important actions. In addition, when pushed to consider the actions that politicians could take on global poverty, three groups said that they could organise a fundraising event, and a further five groups talked about the individual politician or UK government raising or giving money. However, students in eight out of the twelve groups expressed some scepticism about the effectiveness of charities, explaining that you do not know how or where your money will be spent, and giving examples of how funds can be misspent, including on large salaries for directors and on:

'...transporting food over there and stuff... and charities investing in cigarette companies' (School 3, Year 9).

However, students in two groups defended the work of charities, saying that they know exactly how to spend money so that it makes a difference, and their spending on advertising is effective in raising additional funds:

'A lot of people, when you see the adverts on TV, people always talk about how much money it costs to actually make the advert, but I think it's kind of wrong because in the long-run you've got obviously three times that amount, because so many people want to give' (School 5, Year 9).

In two groups students also talked specifically about barriers to their own donations, explaining that they do not always know which charity to donate to, and that they find themselves thinking that they will leave it to other people to donate.

As a result of these challenges, two Year 9 groups said that they thought individual donations were not an important action to take:

'We need a different approach: It's [donating to charity] always being done so I don't feel like we need to focus on it more' (School 5, Year 9).

Three quarters of the groups felt that buying Fairtrade was an important action, and they were all able to provide some explanation relating to a fairer price or more money for the producer. However, three groups caveated this, saying that: you cannot always know if it is fair; it only makes a difference to some farmers; and it is difficult to buy on a budget. The Year 7 group in school 1 had not heard of Fairtrade.

Telling people was strongly linked to action: you need to tell other people so that they can do something. However, half the groups felt that the importance of this action was reduced by the fact that people do not always listen to what you tell them, or that they may not take the action you intend:

'Tell others about poverty, word of mouth is really good but nowadays people don't listen, that's the thing, they hear it and they say yeah, I'll check it out, then they forget or they just won't do it, either way, or they won't be properly listening' (School 4, Year 7).

While two groups talked unprompted about the impact of climate change on developing countries, all groups initially ranked turning out lights as an unimportant action. They reasoned that although you could give the money you saved on your electricity bill to charity, or save fuel for developing countries, there would be no direct effect on poverty. With prompting, eight groups were able to describe a relationship between use of fossil fuels in developed countries, climate change, and natural disasters or crop damage in developing countries. However, four groups were unable to make this link even after prompting. Two groups argued that turning out the light saves little electricity, and so would make little difference to climate change:

'I'm pretty sure the CO2 emissions are not going to kill a child in Africa' (School 5, Year 9).

Volunteering in a developing country received a mixed response, and was often ranked of middling importance. Positive features included the immediate difference you could bring about (three groups), and the benefit for the volunteer in achieving something or seeing the situation for him or herself (three groups). However, it costs money to do (five groups), can have limited impact (two groups), and you may not have the right skills (two groups). One group suggested that volunteering would show solidarity to local people, but another, with some prompting, suggested that *'they could feel offended by you trying to come in like helping them when they think they are doing alright, they could get quite upset'* (School 2, Year 9).

All groups ranked contacting a politician as having low importance, all explaining that politicians receive lots of letters and emails, and do not read or reply to them all. Only one student in School 5, Year 7 argued that this action can be effective if you contact the right person. When pushed to consider the actions politicians could be encouraged to take, eight of the groups talked about money, either the politician's or the government's, which they could give or *'send off'* (School 4, Year 9). Other actions politicians could take included: influencing others (the PM, Obama, the Queen) (three groups); organising a fundraising event (three groups); telling the public how their money is spent (one group); and going to visit a developing country for themselves (one group).

Students in two groups specified that politicians could give money to the governments of developing countries. In other cases, it was not clear from students' responses whether money would be given by the politician to another government or to a charity. This down-playing of the role of the British government was emphasised by comments in other areas of the interview, including that charities *'do most of the work to help'* people living in poverty (School 6, Year 7), that it should be charities that provide education, water, food and healthcare (School 2, Year 7), and that *'we could give away more money to charities, not just us but the government, because I know our health and stuff is important, but you don't just let the rest of the world suffer'* (School 4, Year 7). This reflects findings from public attitude research, where the role of government is largely understood to be in encouraging charities to do more (Darnton and Kirk, 2011).

3.3 In what contexts do young people think they learn about global poverty?

Table 8 outlines the contexts in which the participants in this research most frequently perceived themselves to be learning about global poverty, and additional contexts are described in the text below. These locations reflect the

breadth of learning contexts identified by previous studies on young people's learning about global poverty and the wider world (Cross et al, 2010; Brown, 2014, see Appendix 1). A number of trends are apparent, including the identification in every interview of learning from school geography lessons and from online or television NGO charity adverts. In all but two interviews, young people talked about the importance of talking to their parents or grandparents. None of these trends is surprising: commentary (Lambert and Morgan, 2011) and research (Cross et al, 2010) has identified the key role of geography in furthering the teaching of development issues in English schools; analysis of NGO communication points to the highly visible nature of charity fundraising and campaigning in this country (Dogra, 2012); and Trewby (2014) argues for the key role of family identities in the way in which adults engage with global social justice issues.

Table 8: Contexts in which young people perceive themselves to learn about global poverty

	School 1		School 2		School 3		School 4		School 5		School 6	
	Yr 7	Yr 9	Yr 7	Yr 9	Yr 7	Yr 9	Yr 7	Yr 9	Yr 7	Yr 9	Yr 7	Yr 9
Television news	X	X	X	X		X		X	X	X		
Charity ads/ campaigns on TV or internet	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
TV programmes/ documentaries		X		X		X		X	X			
Geography	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Assemblies	X	X	X		X	X	X			X		
Talking to family members	X	X	X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X
Visiting a developing country							X	X	X	X		
Out of school club						X				X		

Table 8 highlights the dominance of two broad contexts for young people's learning about global poverty: school and the media. It also highlights the greater range of contexts in which Year 9 students perceive themselves to learn about global poverty: in all but one school, Year 9s identified a greater number of contexts.

Two groups talked directly about the equal importance of school and the media in their learning. Given this study's context within the GLP it is heartening that school continues to be '*a key point of connection*' for young people to the wider world (Cross et al, 2010, p.15). In addition to geography lessons, the following places or

spaces in school were identified across more than one school (in decreasing order of frequency): assemblies; history; fundraising; mentor or form time; Personal, Social and Health Education (PSHE); Religious Education (RE); and activities at primary school. International Week, Amnesty Club, Ethics, English and Fairtrade group featured in one school each.

The dominance of the media in Table 8 is a useful reminder of the significance of this other key context for young people's learning about global poverty. In addition to television news and programmes, and charity adverts and campaigns, additional media contexts mentioned by participants included: social media; Google; Wikipedia; Tumblr; charity adverts on trains; children's newspapers; Instagram; and YouTube and MSN. Charity adverts and/or television coverage of campaigns such as Comic Relief and Sports Relief were mentioned in every interview. The most commonly mentioned charities were WaterAid and Save the Children.

As described in section 3.1.1, a number of participants spoke strongly about the impressions they gain from NGO advertising. It is notable that one student reflected that such adverts include *'facts and tables and stuff about poverty'* (School 2, Year 9). Another student highlights the way in which television news always gives a violent, negative portrayal of Africa:

'On BBC1 News they show clips of people living in poverty and in other countries, like Africa, they show, for example, kidnaps and all the stuff that's happening, killing, and bombs, and death, in other countries...' (School 1, Year 9).

This reflects critiques of media portrayals of developing countries, which link representations in television news and programming to young people's stereotypes of *'dusty roads and small huts'* (Elton-Chalcraft, 2009, p. 67; Borowski and Plastow, 2009).

However, there were also signs in some groups of critical approaches to media portrayals of poverty, as the examples below demonstrate:

'BBC News, they try to hide their point of view but it's still their point of view, you can see it through the words they say' (School 1, Year 9).

'Yeah. I didn't realise, now I do, but I'm not saying they like con us, but they narrow it down a bit much, so they just really think of the negatives rather than trying to get people to think of the positives, because it probably gets more money in' (School 2, Year 9).

4

Conclusion and recommendations

This research forms part of a comprehensive programme of research and evaluation planned as part of the GLP. The small-scale, qualitative piece of research reported is significant in contributing to a limited, but growing, body of research into young people's understanding of global poverty. It explores what young people know about global poverty, what they think about actions individuals can take in response to global poverty, and the contexts within which they perceive themselves to be learning about these issues. It found that young people participating in the research:

- Found it difficult to say whether progress has been made in tackling global poverty, and feel that they do not have the information available to know. They said that NGO advertising both evidences progress, through donations that have been made, and a lack of progress, as no change seems to have occurred.
- Were mostly able to suggest and discuss challenges to global poverty reduction. Almost all of these reasons were internal to developing countries (poor governance, natural disasters, population growth etc.). The relationship between poverty and conflict was prompted by the activity, and all groups were able to give some explanation of this relationship, relating to damage and loss of life, the cost of rebuilding and repair, and/or to government expenditure on conflict. There was much less understanding of the relationship between poverty and inequality: no group could explain this relationship, and half of the groups were unable to say whether inequality was a particular issue in developing countries. Poor governance was the most commonly given challenge to development unprompted by the activity.
- All understood that average economic poverty or wealth has limitations as a measure or understanding of poverty. All groups were able to explain that an average does not provide information on range, though only half the groups were able to explain that this is exacerbated by high levels of inequality in developing countries. All groups were able to suggest other ways in which to measure the quality of life of an individual, from their weight, to their education, to their level of power. Four groups talked about happiness as a measure of development. No group directly talked about lack of access to services or realisation of human rights as ways to understand poverty.
- Were all able to discuss actions individuals can take in response to global poverty. Young people's perspectives on charitable donations were complex. Most groups saw donation as an important action they, and/or politicians, could take. However, in two-thirds of interviews, scepticism about the effectiveness of charities was expressed. Three quarters of groups saw Fairtrade as an important action; though

students in one group did not know what the term meant. Both raising the awareness of others and volunteering received mixed reactions. 'Telling people' was strongly linked to action, but over half of the groups felt that people do not always listen to what you tell them or take the action you intend. Volunteering in a developing country was thought to have positives (making an immediate difference, benefits for the volunteer) and challenges (including its expense, limited impact, and that young people do not have the right skillset to be useful). All groups initially ranked turning out lights as an unimportant action to take, and even after prompting a third of groups were unable to make the link between the use of energy, climate change, and the lives of people in developing countries.

- Were almost all unable to see their role in holding their government to account in tackling global poverty. All groups ranked contacting a politician as of low importance, all explaining that politicians do not answer all their correspondence. When pushed to consider actions they could advocate a politician to take, two-thirds of the groups talked about money the politician or government could give, though it was often unclear if this was to a charity, to the government, or a developing country.
- Learn about global poverty in a broad range of contexts, both inside and outside school. All groups mentioned geography lessons and online or television NGO charity adverts, and in all but two interviews young people talked about the importance of talking to their parents or grandparents.

Reflecting on this research in relation to the GLP, a number of the findings seem particularly relevant to the intended pupil outcomes of the programme. Below, four themes are highlighted, and it is recommended here that these themes be given greater prominence within the GLP in England, to strengthen teaching and learning in these areas in schools. It is not the place of this report to specify exactly how these themes might be incorporated into, or strengthened, within the programme, or within schools. Within the GLP, these themes might be addressed through a focus in teacher continuing professional development sessions, or new or reviewed teaching materials. Within schools, there is potential to explore these issues with students in a range of ways, including through particular subject areas, including geography, English and citizenship, and also through assemblies, cross-curricular initiatives and collapsed timetable days. The themes are not ordered by significance, but in relation to the order of findings in this report.

1) Supporting young people to understand progress in tackling global poverty

Understanding what progress has been made against global poverty targets in recent decades is a pupil outcome of the GLP. The first pupil learning outcome of the GLP is that young people '*understand what progress has been made against global poverty targets in recent decades*' (GLP, 2014). This research has

not explored young people's understanding of development targets such as the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), or of progress in relation to specific targets. However, it has demonstrated that these young people are unclear as to whether, broadly, progress has been made in recent years in tackling global poverty and whether, around the world, people's lives are getting better. Consideration, with teachers and young people, of the future beyond the MDGs, and of the emerging Sustainable Development Goals, is an opportunity to increase their understanding of progress made to date, as well as areas still requiring international focus.

2) Supporting open discussion amongst young people about the challenge of ineffective governance

Ineffectiveness or corruption of governments of developing countries was cited in 10 out of 12 group interviews, without any prompt. In addition, in two-thirds of groups the effectiveness of charities in spending donated money was also questioned. This echoes the attitudes of the general public, amongst whom corruption is a dominant narrative in relation to development (Darton and Kirk, 2011; Bond, 2014). The influential 'Finding Frames' report (Darnton and Kirk, 2011) produced in collaboration by a number of development NGOs and exploring ways in which the sector could respond to public attitudes towards global poverty, argues that corruption should not be tackled head on, 'on the *"don't think of an elephant"* principle' (Darnton and Kirk, 2011, p. 92). However, that report contains advice for NGOs seeking to gain public support through, often, short-term and one-sided communications. In the classroom, more extended, open dialogue is possible, indeed is a core dimension of global learning pedagogy (Bourn, 2014), and the role of governments in delivering essential services and upholding human rights is a pupil learning outcome of the GLP (GLP, 2014). It is therefore recommended that questions such as the following are tackled directly within the GLP: What is ineffective governance? Is it a challenge only in developing countries? What proportion of countries and charities is ineffective governance significantly impeding progress? Opening a debate about corruption and governance may enable young people to critique the received narrative about corruption, which otherwise goes unquestioned.

3) Raising young people's awareness of their government's role in the causes of and solutions to global poverty

It is an indictment of our democratic system that the majority of future voters participating in this research (61/62) felt that politicians are not responsive to the views and requests of their constituents. In relation to global learning, it is also a significant issue that young people are largely unaware of the range of actions the British government does and could take in relation to global poverty. When pushed, participants spoke of how they could advocate for politicians (personally,

or the government) to donate money. Even here it was only twice specified that this donation would be made to another government rather than to a charity, downplaying the role of the British government in development. At the same time, when discussing challenges to development, few participants in this study spoke of issues relating to the international community, such as debt, trade-laws and climate change targets. This report recommends that these relationships are given greater emphasis within the programme going forward, as well as the role of the British government in making important decisions in relation to these issues, informed by the views of British citizens. Improved teaching and learning of these issues would support a number of the pupil outcomes of the GLP, including: recognising how people are interdependent; understanding how globalisation has linked people through trade, financial flows, socially and culturally; understanding how governments can act at local, national and global scales; and understanding the role of active citizens in making sure governments deliver rights and essential services.

4) Increasing young people's media awareness

The dominant role of the media in young people's learning about global poverty, and particularly the exposure of all the participants in this study to NGO advertising, is a useful reminder that school is far from the only context in which young people learn about global poverty. Their learning at school therefore has an important role in equipping them to interpret and critique all sources of information, and particularly in developing their media awareness. This is not to underestimate the level of criticality of the media demonstrated by young participants in this study and in others (see, for example, Cross et al, 2010; Brown, 2014). However, the GLP provides a unique opportunity to increase young people's ability to 'read' media (and other) sources, and engage critically with information. It is also an opportunity to acknowledge and directly discuss the exposure of young people to NGO adverts on television and the internet. Doing so would support skills intended to be developed through the GLP, including critical thinking (exploring a range of evidence relating to global development); multiple perspectives (recognising that knowledge is based on viewpoints and power); and challenging perceptions (understanding that perceptions and stereotypes related to people, places and issues exist).

This research is unique in exploring young people's learning about global poverty directly in relation to the pupil outcomes of the GLP. It is therefore hoped that its findings are useful in informing the future development of the programme.

References

Asbrand, B. (2008) How adolescents learn about globalisation and development. In: Bourn, D. (ed.) *Development Education: Debates and dialogues*. London: Institute of Education, University of London.

Barker, J. and Weller, S. (2003) Never work with children? the geography of methodological issues in research with children. *Qualitative Research*, 3 (2), 207–227.

Beames, S. (2005) Expeditions and the social construction of the self. *Australian Journal of Outdoor Education*, 9 (1), 14–22.

Bentall, C. and McGough, H. (2013) Young people's personal engagement with global learning in further education. *International Journal of Development Education and Global Learning*, 5 (3), 46–67.

Bond (2014) *Change the Record: exploring new ways to engage the UK public in global poverty*. London: Bond.

Borowski, R. and Plastow, J. (2009) *Africans Don't Use Mobile Phones: A critical discussion of issues arising from the Leeds University Centre for African Studies (LUCAS) 'African Voices' project*. Paper presented at the Critical Thinking for Development Education: Moving from Evaluation to Research conference. National University of Ireland, Galway, 3–4 October.

Bourn, D. (2008) Introduction. In Bourn, D (ed.) *Development Education: Debates and dialogue*. London: Institute of Education, University of London.

Bourn, D. (2014) *The Theory and Practice of Global Learning*. DERC Research Paper No.11. London: Institute of Education.
[Online]. Available at: www.ioe.ac.uk/DERC_ResearchPaper11-TheTheoryAndPracticeOfGlobalLearning.pdf [Last accessed 15/03/14].

Bourn, D. and Cara, O. (2012) *Evaluating Partners in Development: Contribution of international school partnerships to education and development*. DERC Research Paper No.5. London: Institute of Education.
[Online]. Available at: www.ioe.ac.uk/DERC_5_final_2.pdf [Last accessed 15/03/14].

Bourn, D. and Cara, O. (2013) *School linking – where next? Partnership models between schools in Europe and Africa*. DERC Research Paper No. 10. London: Institute of Education.
[Online]. Available at: www.ioe.ac.uk/SchoolLinking.pdf [Last accessed 15/03/14].

Bourn, D. and Hunt, F. (2011) *Global Dimension in Secondary Schools*. DERC Research Paper No. 1. London: Institute of Education.
[Online]. Available at: www.ioe.ac.uk/GlobalDimensionInSecondarySchools.pdf [Last accessed 15/03/14].

British Educational Research Association (2011) *Ethical Guidelines for Educational Research*. London: BERA.
[Online]. Available at: <http://www.bera.ac.uk/researchers-resources/publications/ethical-guidelines-for-educational-research-2011> [Last accessed 15/03/2014].

Brown, K. (2006) *School Linking and Teaching and Learning Global Citizenship*. Canterbury: citizED.
[Online]. Available at: www.citized.info/pdf/commarticles/Kate_Brown.pdf [Last accessed 15/03/2014].

Brown, K (2014) *Responding to Global Poverty: Young people in England learning about development*. Unpublished PhD thesis. Institute of Education, University of London.

Bryan, A. and Bracken, M. (2011) *Learning to Read the World? Teaching and learning about global citizenship and international development in post-primary schools*. Dublin: Irish Aid/Identikit.

Cross, S., Fenyoe, A., Wagstaff, M., and Gammon, A. (2010) *Global Generation: How young people in the UK connect with the wider world*. London: International Broadcasting Trust.
[Online]. Available at: http://worldview.cba.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2012/06/GG_comp111010.pdf [Last accessed 26/6/15].

Darton, A. and Kirk, M. (2011) *Finding Frames: New ways to engage the UK public in global poverty*. London: BOND.
[Online]. Available at: <http://findingframes.org/Finding%20Frames%20New%20ways%20to%20engage%20the%20UK%20public%20in%20global%20poverty%20Bond%202011.pdf> [Last accessed 15/03/14].

Development Education Association (DEA) (2010) *Putting the Global into Youth Work: Reflections and Learning from Global Youth Action*. London, DEA.
[Online]. Available at: <http://think-global.org.uk/resources/item/2113>. [Last accessed 15/03/14].

Dogra, N. (2012) *Representations of Global Poverty: Aid, development and international NGOs*. London: I.B.Tauris.

Elton-Chalcraft, S. (2009) *It's Not Just about Black and White, Miss: Children's awareness of race*. Stoke-on-Trent: Trentham Books.

- European Multi-Stakeholder Steering Group on Development Education (2010) *European Development Education Monitoring Report*. Brussels: DEEEP. [Online]. Available at: <http://library.deeep.org/record/1043> [Last accessed 26/06/15].
- Gayford, C. (2009) *Learning for sustainability: from the pupils' perspective: a report of a three-year longitudinal study of 15 schools from June 2005 to June 2008*. Woking: WWF-UK. [Online]. Available at: http://assets.wwf.org.uk/downloads/wwf_report_final_web.pdf [Last accessed 16/03/14].
- Global Learning Network South West (GLEAN) (2010). *Our World, Our Say: young people and global issues*. SW England: GLEAN.
- Global Learning Programme (GLP) (2014). *Global Learning Pupil Outcomes for the GLP* [Online]. Available at: http://clients.squareeye.net/uploads/glp/GLP_pdfs/Global_learning_pupil_outcomes.pdf [Last accessed 17/09/14].
- Global Student Forum (GSF) (2012). *Evaluation of the Immediate Impacts of the GSF2012 National Sixth Form Conference*. London: GSF. [Online]. Available at: http://www.globalstudentforum.org/data/damarisg/downloads/gsf/gsf2012/Full_report_GSF2012_national_immediate_impacts_evaluation_v5.pdf [Last accessed 11/03/14].
- Hartmeyer, H. (2008) *Experience the World. Global Learning in Austria: Developing, reaching out, crossing borders*. Münster: Waxmann.
- Hicks, D. (2007) Responding to the World. In: D. Hicks and C. Holden (eds.) *Teaching the Global Dimension: Key Principles and Effective Practice*. London: Routledge.
- Hill, M. (2005) Ethical considerations in researching children's experiences. In: Greene, S. and D. Hogan (eds.), *Researching Children's Experiences, Approaches and Methods*. London: Sage Publications.
- Hill, M., Laybourn, A., and Borland, M. (1996) Engaging with primary-aged children about their emotions and well-being: Methodological considerations. *Children and Society*, 10, 129–144.
- Holden, C. (2006) Concerned citizens: children and the future. *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice*, 1 (3), 231–247.
- Hunt, F. (2012) *Global Learning in Primary Schools: Practices and impacts*. DERC Research Paper no. 9. London: Institute of Education.

Hunt, F. and King, R. P. (2015) *Supporting Whole School Approaches to Global Learning: Focusing learning and mapping impact*. DERC Research Paper no. 13. London: UCL Institute of Education.

Kirkwood-Tucker, T. (2009) *Visions in Global Education: The Globalization of Curriculum and Pedagogy in Teacher Education and Schools*. New York: Peter Lang Publishing.

Lambert, D. and Morgan, J. (2011) *Geography and Development: Development education in schools and the part played by geography teachers*. Development Education Research Centre: Research Paper No.3. London: Institute of Education. [Online]. Available at: www.ioe.ac.uk/GeographyAndDevelopment.pdf [Last accessed 16/03/14].

Leonard, A. (2012) *The Aston–Makunduchi partnership: south north link – in-depth case study*. DERC Research Paper No.8. London: Institute of Education. [Online]. Available at: www.ioe.ac.uk/Aston-Makunduchi.pdf [Last accessed 16/03/14].

Lenskaya, L. (2009) Historical and sociopolitical context in the development and implementation of global education in Russian Education Reform. In T. Kirkwood Tucker (ed.), *Visions in Global Education: The Globalization of Curriculum and Pedagogy in Teacher Education and Schools*. New York: Peter Lang Publishing.

Lissner, J. (1981) Merchants of misery. *New Internationalist*, 100, 23–25.

Lowe, B. (2008) Embedding global citizenship in primary and secondary schools: developing a methodology for measuring attitudinal change. *International Journal of Development Education and Global Learning*, 1 (1), 59–64.

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

Mauthner, M. (1997) Methodological Aspects of Collecting Data from Children: Lessons from three research projects. *Children and Society*, 11, 16–28.

McCracken, G. (1988) *The Long Interview*. Newbury Park, California: Sage Publications.

Miller, G., Bowes, E., Bourn, D. and Castro, J. (2012) *Learning about development at A-Level: a study of the impact of the World Development A-Level on young people's understanding of international development*. DERC Research Paper No.7. London: Institute of Education.

Punch, S. (2002) Research with Children: the same or different from research with adults? *Childhood*, 9, 321–341.

Sallah, M. (2013) *Evaluation of the Global Youth Work in Action Project, 2010–13*. London: Y Care International.

[Online]. Available at: http://www.ycareinternational.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/04/GYWiA-Evaluation-Design_FINAL.pdf [last accessed 26/6/2015].

Scott, M. (2009) *Makutano Junction Mid-term Review: evaluation of questionnaire results*. Hailey: The Mediae Company.

[Online]. Available at: www.makutanojunction.org.uk/images/stories/reports/MJ-evaluation.pdf. [Last accessed 16/03/14].

Simpson, K. (2004) 'Doing development': the gap year volunteer-tourists and a popular practice for development. *Journal of International Development*, 16 (5), 681–692.

Sinclair, S. (1994) Introducing Development Education to Schools: The role of non-governmental organizations in the United Kingdom. In: A. Osler (ed.), *Development Education: Global Perspectives in the Curriculum*. London: Cassell.

Smith, M. (1999) Teaching the 'Third World': Unsettling discourses of difference in the school curriculum. *Oxford Review of Education*, 25 (4), 485–499.

Smith, M. (2004) Contradiction and change? NGOs, schools and the public face of development. *Journal of International Development*, 16 (5), 741–749.

Tallon, R. (2012) The impression left behind by NGO messages concerning the developing world. *Policy and Practice: A Development Education Review*, 15, 8–27.

Tallon, R. (2013) *What do young people think of development?* Unpublished PhD thesis. Victoria University of Wellington, New Zealand.

Tisdall, E., Davis, J. and Gallagher, M. (2009) *Researching with Children and Young People: Research design, methods and analysis*. London: Sage Publications.

Trewby, J. (2014) *Journeys to engagement with the UK Global Justice Movement: Life stories of activist-educators*. Unpublished PhD thesis. Institute of Education, University of London.

Woodhead, M. and Faulkner, D. (2000) Subjects, objects or participants? Dilemmas of psychological research with children. In: P. Christensen and A. James (eds.), *Research with Children*. London: Falmer Press.

Appendix 1: Contexts for learning about global poverty

Drawn from Brown (2014)

Formal	Geography Religious studies Other subjects e.g. history, citizenship Assemblies Fundraising activities
Non-formal	Clubs or committees
Informal	Television – news, documentaries, reality TV, charity ads, film Internet – websites, social media/social networks Books Newspapers/magazine Family Friends Visiting developing countries

Appendix 2: Agree/disagree statements

A lot of progress has been made in fighting global poverty – around the world people’s lives are getting better.	The most important way to stop global poverty is to make sure all children in poor countries have a chance to go to school.
The best way to measure how poor people in a country are is to measure how much money they have on average. You take the total wealth of the country and divide it by the number of people who live there.	War in poor countries is the biggest reason people there stay poor.

Appendix 3: Action card-sort

Give money to charity	Think about what you buy, e.g. buy fair-trade
Write letters or email politicians to get them to make different decisions	Volunteer in a developing country
Tell other people about global poverty	Turn out the lights when you don't need them

Appendix: 4 Ethics of this study

Written voluntary informed consent was sought from all the young people who took part in this research, the Global Learning Coordinator, and from parents if this was requested by the Global Learning Coordinator. Two Coordinators asked for parental consent forms to be provided in advance of the interviews. Each group interview began with an explanation of the aims of the research, the time and commitment required, information about how the data would be used, and details of opportunities for feedback to the researcher and of the confidentiality promised (Hill, 2005). This information was also contained within the consent form itself, which young people were asked to sign, with time provided to read the form and for questions. This information had been conveyed to teachers in advance, in an information sheet, consent form, and sometimes verbally when telephone contact was made. A unique facet of Coordinator's consent, highlighted to them as such, was consent for the researcher to access information they had already provided to the GLP as part of their Whole School Audit. On the day of the visit, Coordinators were provided with a consent form for their signature.

It is important to acknowledge that, as is often the case in research with young people, informed consent may have functioned in an awkward, compromised way (Tisdall et al, 2009). The relationship between adults and young people in schools can disrupt the giving of voluntary consent by children (Woodhead and Faulkner, 2000; Barker and Weller, 2003; Tisdall et al, 2009). In this case, this power dynamic was compounded by two issues. Firstly, the researcher was not party to the extent to which participation in the research was portrayed as voluntary by the Coordinator when selecting students for involvement. Secondly, in three cases, the Coordinator was present for some of the interview, either because this was the policy of the school in relation to visits, or to allow the teacher to continue their work or lesson preparation in the interview space. It is important to acknowledge that this context is likely to have compromised the process of informed consent, as well as affecting young people's responses in the interviews. However, it was important also to be mindful of the needs of the Coordinator and policy of the school. Given that the topic of the interviews was not generally considered to be ethically controversial or relating to personal lifestyle, it was felt that this was an acceptable compromise to make. The researcher sought to make it clear at the start of the interviews that young people's participation was entirely voluntary. The researcher was mindful of interviewees' emotional responses, and treated all participants with the utmost respect and consideration (BERA, 2011, guideline 9).

Neither incentives nor expenses were given for participation in the research. The researcher had a current DBS check.

All findings were kept anonymous and pseudonyms are used for all interviewees, Coordinators and schools (BERA, 2011, guideline 25). All interview information

and data was backed up and stored securely on a password protected computer. Where personal information was collected about participants (for example, their ethnic origin) it was anonymised as quickly as possible and destroyed as soon as it was no longer needed.

About the Development Education Research Centre

The Development Education Research Centre (DERC) is the UK's leading research centre for development education and global learning. DERC conducts research on development education and global learning, runs a Masters' Degree course, supervises doctoral students and produces a range of reports, academic articles and books. DERC is located within the UCL Institute of Education. For further information go to: www.ioe.ac.uk/derc

About the Global Learning Programme

The Global Learning Programme (GLP) in England is a government-funded programme of support that is helping teachers in Primary, Secondary and Special schools to deliver effective teaching and learning about development and global issues at Key Stages 2 and 3. It is being delivered by a team of organisations with complementary experience in supporting development education, the wider development sector and peer-led CPD for schools. For further information on the Global Learning Programme in England go to: www.glp-e.org.uk. Information about the GLP in Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland can be found at: <https://globaldimension.org.uk/chooseglp>.

Think Global

Think Global is an education charity based on London. For over 30 years, they have been working on their mission, to promote education for a just and sustainable world. Think Global specialises in training and resources, research, and advocacy; and works to support global learning throughout the UK and beyond. For further information go to: <http://think-global.org.uk/>

About the Author

Kate Brown studied for her doctorate at the Development Education Research Centre, UCL Institute of Education, exploring the way in which young people in England learn about international poverty. Her background is in secondary Citizenship teaching. At the time of writing this report Kate was Head of Programmes at Think Global. She is currently Director of Learn English at Home, a charity supporting isolated ethnic minority adults to learn English.

The UCL Institute of Education is a world-leading school for education and social science. Founded in 1902, the institute currently has over 7,000 students and 1,000 staff making up an intellectually-rich learning community. In the 2014 QS World University Rankings, the UCL Institute of Education was ranked number one for education worldwide.

Development Education Research Centre
UCL Institute of Education
36 Gordon Square
London WC1H 0PD