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1. Introduction
Thank you for taking the time to meet and discuss your review of DFID’s development awareness work. Think Global are submitting this written response to supplement our conversation and also to guide any future conversations. In this response we follow your topic guide for the stakeholder interviews, for ease of analysis.

We focus this response on the role of development education in contributing to development outcomes. Terminology in this area is not always clear. For clarity, we are using the term development education as a subset of development awareness. Where development awareness can mean any form of activity that increases public awareness of international development issues, development education refers more specifically to projects and programmes that increase levels of public knowledge about the complexities of international development, and engage audiences in taking action to tackle global poverty individually and collectively.

2. Summary and top line recommendations
Educating and engaging the UK public in tackling global poverty is a small but very important part of the work of international development organisations including DFID. There is a clear link between development education and development outcomes: educating the public encourages them to play an active role in meeting development outcomes through donations, volunteering, ethical purchasing, behaving sustainably in their own lives and campaigning; and public support also gives government and NGOs legitimacy. Development education...
unlocks citizen action to complement the role of government and NGOs. This is very much in keeping with the idea of the Big Society, that citizens need to be encouraged to play their role in making the world a better place, to complement the role played by government.

To maximise the impact of development education on development outcomes, development education needs to offer participants opportunities to learn about the complexities of international development and make the connections to their daily lives, rather than presenting a simple ‘aid works’ message. Projects and programmes in this area also need to incorporate opportunities to take action on global issues, to ensure that learning is linked to changes in values and behaviour amongst participants.

Development education in schools and with young people is particularly valuable and impactful, because educational settings allow for more in-depth conversations amongst audiences that DFID may not be able to otherwise reach. We detail a range of practical examples of this link between development education and development outcomes.

We also summarise the range of evidence for this link between development education and development outcomes, including findings that development education:

- inspires the public to take positive social action including volunteering for and donating money to international development charities and causes;
- encourages the public to feel empowered to take personal action to combat climate change, an issue which is critical for international development as it affects many of the world’s poorest communities;
- helps the UK public to understand our collective commitment to spend a small proportion of our taxes on official development assistance;
- has over the past decade encouraged school children (now today’s 16-24 year olds) to be significantly more supportive of tackling poverty than the population as a whole; and
- helped to generate £53m of the £101m public donations to the Disasters Emergency Committee in response to the 2010 Haiti earthquake, indicating a very strong return on investment.

Therefore it is an appropriate use of the development budget to use a small proportion of it to galvanise the UK public to make their own contribution to international development. Indeed it is likely that this is economically efficient as a small amount spent on development education is likely to lead to a rise in donations, volunteering and other pro-development behaviour amongst the public.

To date, there has not been sufficient investment in measuring the impact of development education, meaning that the evidence base around existing programmes is not strong enough to easily compare the effectiveness of different interventions. Options to address this could include conducting a longitudinal study of a cohort of young people and/or developing a basket of
outcomes-focused indicators against which interventions could be measured at the levels of knowledge, attitudes and behaviours.

DFID’s role in this area should be to ensure appropriate investment is made in development education and wider awareness-raising as a public good and in particular to:

- commission programmes to educate and engage the public about global issues, with strong accountability measures in place to measure impact; and
- conduct research, public opinion monitoring and to learn lessons from evaluations of programmes in this area, in order to monitor the state of public engagement and to raise the quality of development education and awareness work.

These two roles will help galvanise other organisations into educating and engaging the public effectively, thereby contributing to development outcomes.

DFID should not rely entirely on its own communications team to raise awareness about development issues amongst the general public. Its messages are likely to be less trusted than those coming through civil society and DFID’s direct reach is likely to be more limited than that if it works with and through civil society partners.

The impact of future programmes will be enhanced if DFID implements a clear and targeted strategy, focusing on particular audiences and using appropriate methodologies for each audience.

In future, DFID should focus on the overall strategic role described above, working through partners to deliver specific projects. There will be no ‘quick fix’ for engaging the public, but there are many existing programmes that, scaled up, could have an enormous impact on public knowledge, attitudes and behaviours towards development outcomes. A strategic schools programme, building on what we have learnt over the past few years, should be at the heart of future development education activities.

2.1 Recommendations

In this section we provide a summary of Think Global’s main recommendations about the best way forward for using the development budget to educate and engage the UK public about global poverty. We recommend that DFID:

- Continues to invest in work in this area, recognising the clear links between development education and development outcomes and recognising that if they do not provide strategic support in this vital area, it is unlikely that any other funding will step in. This will mean there will be significantly less development education work which in turn will lead to a drop in UK public understanding, support and action for development.

- In continuing to invest in this area, DFID must make clear that development education and awareness is not about DFID’s corporate promotion and marketing activity but an investment in public understanding and engagement with the aim of tackling global poverty. This can best be
achieved by commissioning external partners to deliver development education programmes that encourage critical thinking about international development.

- Puts a future programme of support for schools and young people at the core of its development awareness support. The evidence is clearest that this will have a long-term impact on UK support for the principles of international development, and allows DFID to reach groups of the population that it cannot reach any other way.

- Focuses engagement outside of schools on two segments of the population as defined by DFID’s market segmentation work: the interested mainstream and distracted individuals.

- Develops a number of other core programmes by specifying target audiences and outcomes and then allowing organisations to tender to showcase how they will meet the intended outcomes. We would suggest that media, business leaders and community / faith groups might be core priorities.

- Renews its focus on outcomes-based evaluation, exploring the potential for a longitudinal study in schools and developing a basket of outcomes-focused indicators for evaluating programmes.

- Recognises that we are currently in a very tight funding environment, and so brings together a range of funders to lever further funding into this area.

- Puts the results of the current review out for a full 12-week consultation period.

3. Detailed comments

3.1 Development and awareness-raising in the UK

3.1.1 Defining ‘international development’, what you see as DFID’s role in this arena?

We follow the definition of international development as furthering sustainable development and improving the welfare of the population in one or more countries outside the United Kingdom (International Development Act, 2002). This means that international development is about more than aid and more than responding to disasters; it is about medium- to long-term development of countries outside the UK. Whilst aid is important to support the poorest people in the world, it may not be the catalyst for longer term development. The UK public tend to think of development as just meaning aid or disaster relief. This has potentially been reinforced by DFID’s rebranding as ‘UKAID’. One of the important roles of development education is to enable the public to understand some of the complexities and debates around development. This leads to a public which has a more sophisticated understanding of development and its longer term nature.
DFID has a vital role to play in international development and is seen around the world as one of the best government international development agencies.

3.1.2 How important it is to raise awareness of development issues among the UK general public?

Educating and engaging the UK public in tackling global poverty and furthering international development is a small but very important part of the work of international development organisations including DFID. This is for two reasons:

- By increasing the knowledge of the UK public, and stimulating engagement with tackling global poverty, a multiplier effect is created. Investment in education and engagement repays itself many times over because it encourages the UK public to take an active role in tackling poverty. Development education encourages the public to donate to, volunteer or campaign for charities tackling global poverty. It also encourages the public to make ethical purchases and behave more sustainably in their own lives. Examples of and evidence for this multiplier effect are included in section 3.1.3 below.
- Public support for the actions of their government and NGOs is crucial to allow them to operate in this field; without public support NGOs and DFID will lose their legitimacy and licence to operate. Evidence that educating and engaging the public will help generate this legitimacy is included in section 3.1.3 below.

At present, this role is particularly important. Public support for and understanding about development appears to be falling (see for example DFID, 2010) but the budget for official development assistance (ODA) is ring fenced and will rise steeply in the next few years. There is a real risk of a public backlash against international development, as evidenced by the Institute of Development Studies which highlights that international development "is seen as a prime target for cuts in order to reduce the UK budget deficit." (Henson, Lindstrom, 2010)

There is a great deal of misinformation about international development amongst the general public. For example, the International Development Select Committee reports that "DFID’s 2008 Survey showed that 42% of the public mistakenly believed that the UK Government’s development work was focused on humanitarian relief." (International Development Select Committee, 2009) In a range of surveys the public regularly seriously overestimates the proportion of UK GDP spent on overseas aid. In this context it is vital to offer the public better information to encourage informed debate about this issue. This is emphatically not about promoting DFID’s work, but rather about building societal understanding for the principles of international development.

A recent Foresight report from Sir John Beddington, Chief Scientific Advisor to the Government (part sponsored by DFID and DECC) emphasises this importance in relation to food security (Foresight, 2011):
"Unless the footprint of the food system on the environment is reduced, the capacity of the earth to produce food for humankind will be compromised with grave implications for future food security. Consideration of sustainability must be introduced to all sectors of the food system, from production to consumption, and in education, governance and research. Governments are likely to need to consider the full range of options to change consumptions patterns including raising citizen awareness, approaches based on behavioural psychology, voluntary agreements with the private sector, and regulatory and fiscal measures. Building a societal consensus for action will be key to modifying demand.”

DFID has recently conducted a market segmentation exercise, which characterises all members of the public as one of six groups: active enthusiasts; interested mainstream; distracted individuals; family first sympathisers; insular sceptics; and disapproving rejectors (DFID, 2008). Whilst it is important to educate and engage all of these groups, it is reasonable to assume that DFID can have most impact by educating and engaging the interested mainstream, and distracted individuals. Active enthusiasts are already committed to development outcomes (though they may need support to remain committed). Family first sympathisers regularly state that they do not have the time to engage further, though they broadly agree that the UK needs to take a leading role in tackling poverty. Insular sceptics and disapproving rejectors are unlikely to be moved by attempts to educate and engage them, and so should be less of a focus.

3.1.3 How, in your experience, do you think raising awareness of development issues can contribute to development outcomes? Good practice / examples from your organisation?

Think Global has been working to educate and engage the public with global issues for around twenty years, and over this time we have developed a clear theory of change to link development education through to development outcomes.

**Theory of change:**

Development outcomes rely at least in part on the knowledge, understanding and attitudes of the public. This is for two reasons.

First, NGOs and the government need the public to be supportive of their work. If fewer members of the public choose to support NGOs through volunteering, campaigning or donations, and if collectively we cannot reach a democratic agreement to spend taxes on international development, development outcomes will suffer severely. Public support legitimises the work of the Government and NGOs in this area.

Second, the public have a direct role to play in development outcomes. Donating to, volunteering and campaigning for international development charities, ethical
purchasing, and behaving sustainably in their own lives can all play a part in tackling poverty, and the collective impact of the public can be greater than government action alone. Donations are critical, and clearly linked to NGO legitimacy discussed above. However, other actions are also important because they help members of the public to see tackling global poverty as part of their identity, building a long-term commitment to this issue. We have seen this in major public initiatives such as the Jubilee Debt Campaign.

Therefore by educating and engaging the public with international development and how they can contribute to tackling poverty we can expect to have a significant impact on development outcomes today and in the future.

However, research on behaviour change and values shifts highlight that these outcomes will not be achieved simply by encouraging people to learn more about international development (Hogg, 2011). Instead, we need to combine knowledge with opportunities for action, such as that provided by the Global Youth Action project, discussed in more detail below.

Another qualification to this theory of change is that it is not enough simply to promote positive messages, such as ‘aid works’, important though these messages are. This is because the international development sector is not the only source of learning for the public; the media and other civil society organisations also provide opportunities to learn about development, in some cases providing very critical accounts of aid effectiveness. We risk a backlash amongst the public if we over-simplify the nature and challenges of international development (Hogg, Shah, 2010a). Instead, Think Global has found that the most effective way to encourage people to engage positively with international development is to give them opportunities to think critically and creatively about the issues and come to their own conclusions, as well as to help people to connect global poverty to their own lives. We call this approach Connect, Challenge, Change and have developed it over 5 years engaging 3,000 young people to play their part in linking to global agendas:

We help **connect** young people to the global issues that matter to them. We support them to make the connections between the personal, local and global, and to connect with peers who share their passions and concerns.

We encourage young people to **challenge** themselves, to gain a more critical understanding of the world around them, and to challenge inequality and injustice.

We support young people to **plan and take action** to bring about positive change towards a more just and sustainable world.

Educating and engaging the public is valuable and important for all ages. Work with schools and young people is particularly valuable and impactful. In schools it is possible to reach the vast majority of children (and in time, therefore, the whole population) and to offer in-depth opportunities for critical
engagement with international development, rather than trying to catch people’s attention with sound bites and headlines. Global youth work complements this schools work because it can help to reach seldom heard groups of young people. As such, development education in schools and through youth work is a particularly valuable complement to DFID’s wider communications, which can expect to reach a different audience often with greater time pressures and less space to critically engage.

This is, no doubt, why the majority of work around development education in the last decade has indeed been done in schools. We suggest that DFID should maintain that work. However, as argued by the International Development Select Committee (International Development Select Committee, 2009) and DFID’s own external reviews (Thornton at al., 2009) there is a need for a more coherent strategy to deal with those outside of school and in particular the adult population.

**Examples of this theory of change in practice:**

Think Global has published a range of case studies of good practice. Some examples which illustrate this theory of change are:

- A project to reduce water consumption at St Richard’s RC Primary School in Longsight, Manchester, developed into a literacy-based exploration of water inequality and a decision by pupils to raise funds for the provision of clean water in Sub-Saharan Africa.
- Sixteen year old Paul Lichtenstern from North London International School explains what has helped him to develop an understanding of global issues.

The Global Dimension website provides a range of resources for schools to educate and engage their pupils, reaching 1.5 million school children every year, including groups who may not be reached by any other intervention from DFID or NGOs.

The Global Youth Action project, from which Think Global developed the Connect, Challenge, Change model, encouraged more than 3,000 young people to learn more about global issues and take action to tackle poverty and injustice around the world. As an example, the project inspired two girls in Cambridgeshire to live on a pound a day for five days to raise awareness of what life is like for the world’s poorest people (see the video here).

**Evidence for this theory of change:**

*The impact of global learning on public attitudes towards international development and sustainability (Ipsos MORI, 2010a)* provides compelling evidence of the link between educating and engaging the UK public on development issues, and positive outcomes for development. This evidence is based on research commissioned by Think Global from Ipsos MORI, and is summarised below:
• **Learning about global issues greatly increases the proportion of the public who support the principle of overseas aid.** Half of those who have learnt about poverty (51%) or world politics and trade (48%) since leaving school agree that despite the pressure on public finances, the UK should meet its commitment to spend 0.7% of national income on overseas development aid by 2013. By contrast, only one in five (20%) of those who have not learnt about global issues since leaving school agree with this statement.

• **Educating the UK public creates agency around climate change, reducing by half the proportion of people who feel that it is pointless to take personal action on this issue.** Learning about climate change either in school or after school reduces this sense of powerlessness from around a third of the population to around one in six (from 33% to 16% in school and from 37% to 18% since leaving school compared to those who have not learnt about any global issues.)

• **Ensuring that all schools educate and engage their pupils in global issues is vital if we are to nurture a socially responsible, outward-looking populace.** Without an opportunity to learn about global issues in school, over a third of the population (34%) are neither involved in, nor interested in getting involved in, any form of positive social action. Amongst those who have learnt about climate change, poverty or world politics and trade at school, this figure drops to around one in ten (9%, 12% and 12% respectively).

From this evidence, it is clear that investing in opportunities to learn more about global issues, particularly through school-based curriculum activities, contributes to development outcomes. It encourages the UK public to support our collective commitment to spend a small proportion of our taxes on official development assistance; it encourages the public to feel empowered to take personal action to combat climate change, which is closely interlinked with international development; it inspires the public to take positive social action including volunteering for and donating money to international development charities and causes; and it encourages the public to celebrate and welcome cultural diversity in the UK, which potentially plays an important role in international development through the expansion of remittances globally.

Ofsted has found that learning about the wider world also has a range of other beneficial outcomes including improving young people’s attainment, behaviour in school and interest in learning more broadly (*Ofsted, 2009*). Research from Ipsos MORI has also found that learning about the wider world makes a significant contribution to social cohesion by counteracting a widespread sense of discomfort about racial and religious difference in the UK (*Ipsos MORI, 2010a*).

It is of course very challenging to disaggregate the impact on private donations to international development causes of educating and engaging the UK public through school-based and other development awareness activities. However, we
can calculate an estimate for the multiplier effect of schools-based investment by extrapolating from the data contained within Ipsos MORI’s research (Ipsos MORI, 2010b). We estimate this based on the public response to the Haiti earthquake, as one example of the multiplier effect at work and find that **school-based education about poverty helped to generate £53m of the £101m the public donated to the Disasters Emergency Committee for the Haiti appeal (i.e. just over half)**. Whilst the assumptions underneath this can be varied (see Appendix 1) the result is primarily an indicative one to show that there can be a major effect on private international development donations from the changes in behaviour that come from development education.

As a comparison, total money donated by DFID to Haiti was £20m, suggesting that their investment in educating and engaging the UK public through development awareness represents **very high value for money**. Clearly this figure can only be a very rough estimate given the uncertainties and assumptions involved, but it is worth noting that it is far from a full estimate of the impact of development awareness activities in schools, as it is based on a calculation of only one appeal, not a whole year of donations, and only considers donations to the Disasters Emergency Committee, not all public donations to Haiti. Full calculations for this estimate are included at Appendix 1.

DFID’s own research provides further evidence for a link between learning about development issues and the strategic aim discussed above of building long-term support for development. In a survey of public attitudes towards international development conducted in February 2010 (DFID, 2010) DFID found that **16-24 year olds are significantly more supportive of increased government action to tackle poverty than the population as a whole**. Over half (58%) of 16-24 year olds agree that the government should do more, as compared to around a third (35%) of the population as a whole. There are many reasons why young people are more supportive of government action – one of these reasons may well be the recent exposure of young people to development education in schools given DFID’s investment in this area over the past decade.

There is a lack of high quality impact research in this area (discussed in section 3.1.4 below). However, in the absence of large scale research studies such as longitudinal comparative studies this evidence, when taken together, show numerous striking relationships that are powerful indicators of the theory of change set out above.

3.1.4 Effectively measuring impact / ROI

One of the challenges for development awareness is that **there has not been sufficient investment in measuring impact to date**. It is quite challenging to disaggregate the impact of one intervention to educate and engage the public, particularly because the impacts will be felt over the person’s lifetime. Nevertheless, there are several options which would allow the impact of these interventions to be more effectively measured.
For school-based interventions, a longitudinal study of a cohort of young people, some of whom are educated and engaged with global issues and some of whom are not, would provide a very robust dataset. This approach would be expensive for DFID to administer, although it could be incorporated into any future funded schools programme. Alternatively, a body such as the National Audit Office might be convinced to incorporate a longitudinal review of development education, alongside other interventions in the school system, to measure their relative impact.

An alternative is to measure impact through a basket of outcomes-focused indicators, comprising knowledge, attitudes and actions. This might include:

- the proportion of programme participants who know and understand more about international development, sustainability and global interdependence;
- the attitudes of programme participants to the developing world, to the UK’s role in tackling global poverty and to their own capabilities to effect change;
- the actions that programme participants take individually or collectively to combat global poverty in their daily lives; and
- shifts amongst programme participants between segments on DFID’s market segmentation model.

In measuring impact a balance needs to be struck between the quality and quantity of information collected, the costs of measurement and the robustness of the resulting conclusions. At present we suggest that this balance has not been met, and more rigorous impact measures should be built into all future development awareness initiatives. These must be built in from the start of an initiative if they are to be effective and as far as possible they need to be measurable across initiatives.

It seems likely that DFID is intending to move away from funding multiple smaller projects, as they have been over the past decade. If, however, DFID does continue to use this small project model, we recommend that it focuses more on programmatic evaluations (whether and how a whole programme such as the DAF creates change) rather than project evaluation (whether and how a small project funded by e.g. the DAF met its objectives). This higher-level evaluation reduces transaction costs for individual projects, making them more efficient. More importantly, it will allow the overall programme evaluation to be high quality and independent, generating reliable evidence and allowing DFID and partners to learn valuable lessons. The experience of the past few years suggests that it is very hard for individual projects to reach adequate levels of quality and independence in their evaluations without incurring prohibitive costs. This is one of the reasons that the evidence base today is weaker than it should be after a decade of DFID programmes in this area.
3.1.5 What you think DFID’s role should be in this area, compared to campaigning organisations / charities / NGOs?

DFID and other NGOs and campaigning organisations whilst working in partnership to deliver development outcomes have slightly different roles in this area. Whilst NGOs are well placed to deliver individual programmes of awareness-raising this is often tied to fundraising activities, particularly in the present financial climate. In some cases NGO fundraising and marketing has bred public cynicism, particularly where distressing images are used to elicit funds and have given a distorted impression of our progress in tackling poverty around the world (Hogg, Shah, 2010a; Darnton, 2011).

In contrast, as a government department that is not in the business of fundraising from the public, DFID can more easily focus on the long-term benefits of an educational approach, looking critically and creatively at complex development challenges, as discussed in the theory of change above. DFID is in a unique position to drive this agenda in a more neutral way precisely because it is not an NGO that is reliant on public donations. To maximise the benefits of this role DFID must be clear that development education and awareness is not about narrow support for aid spending or promotion of DFID, but about engaging the public in the cause of poverty reduction (Darnton, 2009).

At the same time NGO funding for educational and awareness-raising work has declined over the past decade, making DFID’s role that much more important. Think Global’s survey research suggests that NGOs value development education (Hogg, Moss, Shah, 2011), but are unwilling to fund it individually. This is partly because development education is a public good; if one NGO invests in educating and engaging the public all NGOs will benefit, and so each individual NGO would prefer to allow others to invest. There is a clear role for DFID to overcome this ‘tragedy of the commons’ type problem.

Our survey research also highlights that the public wants development education. 86% believe it is crucial in schools if global challenges are to be tackled in the future and 76% believe it is crucial to learn more after leaving school (Ipsos MORI, 2010a). Forthcoming research shows parents want their children to learn about global issues in school. [Full details of results embargoed until publication – please contact Think Global for a copy of the published report.]

There is a clear case for DFID taking a strategic role in schools-based development education and awareness, rather than the Department for Education (DfE). The current policy focus at DfE is to reduce the interventions, guidance and prescription they put into the education system meaning that development education, though important, is not something that DfE would be willing to promote. There are multiple precedents for other government departments and agencies intervening in the school system where there is a clear case for them to do so. This includes a programme of financial education.
part-funded by the Financial Services Authority, as well as a Healthy Schools programme part-funded by the Department of Health. As a comparison, development education is a legitimate and necessary intervention from DFID in the formal education system, though of course this should not preclude joint working with DfE.

**DFID’s role in this area should therefore be to invest in development education and awareness as something that will be beneficial for the whole development community** and in particular to:

- commission programmes to educate and engage the public with global issues, with strong accountability measures in place to measure impact; and
- conduct research about the sorts of interventions that work well, public opinion monitoring and to learn lessons from evaluations of programmes in this area, in order to monitor the state of public engagement and to raise the quality of development education and awareness work. DFID is uniquely placed to do this kind of work on behalf of the whole development community in a high quality way, rather than leave NGOs to take a fragmented approach which will not lead to high quality information for the sector.

These two roles will help support other organisations into educating and engaging the public effectively, thereby contributing to development outcomes.

### 3.2 Specific programmes to raise awareness

3.2.1 Think Global’s view of the effectiveness of awareness-raising funding programmes initiated by DFID over the last few years (e.g. the DAF, Platform 2)

There are a whole range of programmes initiated by DFID over the past few years, including: the DAF; Enabling Effective Support; DFID Global School Partnerships; Community Linking; Platform 2 and many others. The major problem, alluded to above, is that **these programmes have been initiated without sufficient provision for measuring impact in an intelligent, outcomes-focused manner at the programme level (rather than at individual sub-project level)**.

As such it is very hard to compare the relative effectiveness of these programmes, beyond stating that there are lots of examples of excellent, impactful initiatives within the schools sector and several beyond the school sector. In particular it is very hard to compare the value for money of any programme. It should however be borne in mind that the programmes are of very different sizes, and therefore there needs to be proportionality: those of higher value should be required to provide greater evidence to show their value and outcomes.

It is not clear the extent to which these programmes, taken together, have added up to a coherent strategy for awareness-raising and education. Future programmes would benefit from greater clarity from DFID over the intended
audience (by age, market segment etc.) and the intended outcomes (which we suggest should be critical, creative thinking about international development).

PriceWaterhouseCoopers independently evaluated development awareness work in 2009. The evaluators noted that Think Global's work, of all of the UK development education programmes funded by DFID, offered *the best value for money, with low resource input and high to medium impact.*

3.2.2 What could have been done better? Why/How?

Both specific programmes and the overall Building Support for Development strategy could have been managed more effectively. The original strategy was in many ways a sophisticated vision but was not as well implemented as it could have been and outside of the areas of schools and media it was not followed through in practice. This is detailed in the DFID external review of the Building Support for Development strategy by Verulam Consultants and PriceWaterhouseCoopers (*Thornton et al.*, 2009).

Implementation of the strategy would have been achieved more effectively by making use of DFID’s market segmentation model (had it existed) when working with the adult population, deciding which segments to focus awareness-raising on and tailoring specific programmes to meet the needs of these segments. The market segmentation has been a relatively recent innovation, but should be used more effectively in any future programmes.

Programmes would also have benefited from a greater focus on top level evaluation. Without this top level evaluation the overall evidence base for development education and awareness has been limited, and the evidence that does exist has been produced by civil society organisations rather than by DFID.

There could also have been a greater focus on sharing what works, and learning from other programme participants. This would have allowed models of effective practice to emerge more quickly. There is still a lack of a strong research base in this area of work when compared to other comparable fields such as sustainable development or public health policy.

There was no strategy for projects funded under the DAF, and so a thousand flowers were allowed to bloom. There was a focus on innovation, when this should have been combined with more rigorous evaluation to find the best approaches and take them to national scale in order to create real change.

3.2.3 The value and impact of these kinds of funds?

We would argue that there is general value for a small portion of the development budget to be spent on development education as this is economically efficient in unlocking private contributions to the development agenda. The Government needs to be much clearer about the change it is
seeking to create. Open funds (allowing organisations to bid in) do enable the best ideas to come forth but need clarity of purpose.

It is worth noting that there are very few other sources of funding for this sort of work. It used to be that the INGOs used to fund projects in this area, but nearly all of them have withdrawn from this. Therefore if DFID did not fund work in this area, it is likely that very little would take place.

3.2.4 Where do you see the synergies/opportunities for these types of activities in the future?

Contingent on how the Big Society agenda develops, there could be a strong synergy between this and development education/awareness. Focusing on engaging the public and encouraging them to see beyond their own immediate experience and contribute effectively to global society will help DFID make sense of its contribution to a Big Global Society.

There are undoubtedly strong synergies for work in schools. This includes education for sustainable development and promoting community cohesion in schools; both will encourage a focus on the wider world and empathy for people living in poor countries. These synergies also relate to mainstream school outcomes: as evidence from Ofsted notes, education about the wider world contributes to mainstream school outcomes such as improved attainment and behaviour (Ofsted, 2009); and as research from Think Global notes, education about the wider world contributes to community cohesion (Ipsos MORI, 2010a).

The recent Cabinet Office Green Paper *Giving* highlights synergies in schools with the government’s aim to encourage social norms around giving (Cabinet Office, 2010):

> We also want to ensure that younger children have the opportunity to learn about giving from a young age. We are looking to fund a programme for younger school children to find out about giving and establish a social norm at an early stage of life.

Learning about the wider world in schools has been shown to increase people’s propensity to give, and may provide a useful context in which the aims of the *Giving* Green Paper can be realised.

Amongst the adult population there is a synergy with work around values and frames currently being conducted by Oxfam, WWF and others (Crompton, 2010, Darnton, 2011). This work explores how we can encourage a more outward-looking, globally responsible society, with clear impacts on attitudes towards international development and ultimately development outcomes.

There are strong synergies with DFID’s work to harness the power of the private sector in development. To maximise the benefits of this work, DFID and its partners will need to offer high quality development education to business leaders.
3.2.5 How should DFID be working with charities, NGOs and other Government departments?

DFID benefits from lots of organisations working in the area of development education and awareness, such as Development Education Centres (DECs) and several international development NGOs. In relation to DECs and NGOs, DFID can add most value by setting direction, providing strategic oversight and reducing transaction costs for individual projects and programmes.

So for example, in schools-based development education this would mean setting a coherent overall strategy in partnership with NGOs. It would mean evaluating projects and programmes funded by DFID to ensure they contribute to this strategy. In the current policy environment it might also mean commissioning one large schools programme rather than many small ones. This is because the Government is aiming to reduce burdens on schools, reduce prescription in the curriculum and reduce administrative duplication. As a result many of the levers that would cause schools to seek out a development education provider are disappearing, and the transaction costs of marketing an individual project to schools may be very high. A central schools programme can reduce these transaction costs by marketing the development education sector to schools as a whole and so allow the sector to operate more efficiently.

The UK has real expertise around development education. Outside of DFID, however, there is little funding in this area. If all funding from this area were withdrawn, it would lead to a significant loss of expertise and networks. It is in DFID’s interests that these remain, even if in the longer run they have more diverse sources of funding. **DFID could help to play a strategic role in that transition by encouraging other funders (e.g. trusts and foundations, international NGOs, corporations) to come to bring further funding into this area of work.**

In relation to other Government departments, DFID may wish to consider a joint strategy around the Big Global Society concept. This strategy could explore how DFID and other Government departments can encourage people to contribute more to global society, as well as to local communities. Defra, DECC and DfE would all benefit from developing a joint strategy along these lines.

3.2.6 What is the importance of involving seldom heard groups/communities in these programmes?

Inevitably there is a balance to be struck for DFID between having a large reach amongst groups that are easy to engage, and reaching out to smaller numbers of people in seldom heard groups and communities.

In our experience it is particularly valuable to engage young people not in formal education. **Global youth work** is a proven methodology to engage young people who are often seen as ‘hard to reach’, but who often have very positive views
and opinions on international development once engaged in this agenda. Whilst it requires greater investment to reach young people outside of formal education, the rewards both to DFID and to the young people themselves can be very significant. In many cases the young people who are engaged through youth work will be beyond the reach of other DFID communications.

Development education in schools also offers a valuable and cost-effective way to reach children from poorer communities in the UK. This may be the only opportunity that these groups have to take action around international development issues. Children in deprived and disadvantaged communities are less likely to go to university, travel abroad, consume media that have in-depth coverage of poorer parts of the world or have family members who have done so.

Not enough development education work has been done with communities who are far less interested in these issues. More needs to be done in this area to understand how to reach people who are not the usual suspects. As we highlight in section 3.1.2 above, there is a case for focusing education and engagement on two of the six population segments that DFID (2008) identifies: the interested mainstream and distracted individuals.

3.3 Looking to the future

3.3.1 What do you think are likely to be the major development themes for next few years?

There will be sustained questioning of our commitment to spend 0.7% of our GDP on official development assistance by 2013. This commitment would always be controversial amongst some segments of the population. Coming at a time when all other areas of public spending except health are suffering cutbacks this controversy will be exacerbated. At the same time there will continue to be questions over the efficacy of aid.

The impact of climate change on international development is likely to become an increasingly important theme. As a result, the UK government and civil society will have to make some difficult choices over how to mitigate and adapt to a climate constrained world at the same time as tackling poverty.

There is also likely to be an increased focus on enterprise and the role of the private sector in development. It is increasingly clear that traditional solutions to development are incomplete and the private sector has a role to play. As part of this there is work to be done to educate UK businesses about what more development centred business looks like.

The recent Foresight report points to food, water and fuel shortages as populations expand, which may have impacts in this country as well as globally (Foresight, 2011). If access to these resources becomes scarcer, it may reduce the public’s willingness to prioritise development in favour of a sense that ‘charity begins at home’. Development education will help the public to understand the connection between improved development outcomes and their
own wellbeing, for example the negative correlation between girls’ education and empowerment, and population growth and resource depletion. In turn this will encourage those who are currently less supportive of the UK’s role in international development to see why it is important.

A trend amongst public engagement experts in fields such as sustainability is to seek out, engage and support individuals, often called ‘catalytic individuals’ or ‘mavens’ that have a disproportionate influence on the views and actions of those around them (see for example Brook Lyndhurst, 2009). The international development sector has not yet responded to this trend, although research conducted by Think Global suggests that there is considerable potential for the sector to benefit by doing so (Hogg, 2011). This will be particularly valuable where DFID and partners are seeking to educate and engage the public in more informal settings such as community groups and faith groups.

3.3.2 What is the role of DFID / NGOs / Business/ etc. in communicating with and engaging the UK public?

Whilst DFID’s role is vital in this area, direct messages from the government are not always trusted. This mistrust of government messages has been evidenced across several areas of government, for example in health policy (Phillis, 2004). As such, DFID’s role can most effectively be delivered through key partners in each area of focus.

This leads us to directly address the question in the terms of reference for this review of the value of development awareness activities in comparison to the work of DFID’s own communications team. There are clear benefits for DFID in investing in development education and awareness programmes run by civil society, rather than seeking purely to educate and engage the public through their own communications. Not only are government messages less trusted but also central government can only have a limited role and reach for two reasons. First, DFID’s communications team has a conflict of interest in encouraging the public to engage critically with international development issues because this may lead to legitimate criticism of DFID’s activities. Indeed if DFID leads on this work it creates a risk of being criticised for what could be perceived as spending public funds on departmental ‘propaganda’.

Second, the communications team will find it very hard to engage those segments of the population who do not already know at least a fair amount about DFID because these segments are unlikely to choose to consume DFID’s outputs. A survey of public attitudes in April 2010 (DFID, 2010) revealed that only 3% (or around 200,000) of the public say they know a fair amount about DFID’s work. By comparison, Think Global’s Global Dimension website reaches 1.5 million children each year, including those who would not otherwise choose to engage with DFID communications.
Communicating and engaging with the UK public through schools will remain very important. There is a need for a major programme of support for schools and teachers. This will need a partnership of mainstream educational bodies, NGOs, Development Education Centres, subject associations and others to play a role.

Working with the media also remains vital as it is where the vast majority of people learn more about international development once they leave school (Ipsos MORI, 2010a). The International Broadcasting Trust, One World Media and other partners will be important here. The proportion of work with the media should probably increase as it is such an important way of reaching the public.

Work with business is potentially a fruitful area of focus. Good examples of work in this area are the trade union Prospect’s work to educate their members, and the Business Fights Poverty online community. However, there are two levels at which this work takes place: engaging employees and customers personally and inspiring them to make individual changes in their lives; and embedding a desire to tackle poverty in the core purpose of the business. The latter will be much more impactful, and requires DFID to work with partners to educate business leaders and decision-makers.

Other key partners for DFID are faith groups and informal community groups. As mentioned in section 3.3.1 above, these groups may best be engaged through an approach that identifies and supports ‘catalytic individuals’ in a particular setting to engage others in international development. To achieve this, DFID will need to work with organisations who have expertise and are trusted by the relevant groups. This will include faith-based groups and community groups potentially including community organisers such as Citizens UK.

As noted in section 3.1.2 above, we recommend that given limited resources, for the best return on investment outside of schools DFID targets its resources and activities on the interested mainstream and distracted individuals population segments (for an explanation of these segments see DFID, 2008).

3.3.3 Likely trends in the type of awareness-raising activities undertaken?

There are likely to be two trends in the type of awareness-raising activities undertaken.

On one hand financial pressures on international development NGOs are likely to mean that many will seek to more explicitly link awareness-raising activities to their own fundraising efforts.

On the other hand emerging programmes of work focusing on frames and values within both the international development and sustainable development communities (Crompton, 2010, Darnton, 2011) will encourage a shift away from short-term fundraising and more towards long-term education and engagement programmes (Hogg, Shah, 2010b).

Think Global is leading a group of partners including Oxfam, the Red Cross, UNICEF and Islamic Relief on some pioneering work in schools to try to bring
these two trends together. As a group we have developed a set of guidelines to ensure that fundraising in schools contributes to educational outcomes, as well as being profitable to NGOs, to counter a sense amongst teachers and students that NGOs can sometimes exploit the school environment for their own purposes.

There may also be a trend towards greater segmentation of audiences for awareness-raising activities, with engagement tailored to the specific needs and interests of each audience. For this trend to be sustained, more research is needed into the characteristics of audience segments, as well as into what works in engaging these audiences.

It is likely that online engagement through communities such as Avaaz will become more prominent, although our experience suggests that online approaches need to be supplemented by face-to-face engagement if engagement is to be sustained (Hogg, Shah, 2010a).

3.3.4 Any new ideas / opportunities you know of for engaging the UK public in a way that has a direct impact on development outcomes?

It is important not to focus on, or aim for, a single ‘quick fix’ for engaging the UK public. Successfully educating and engaging the public in global issues will require a multi-faceted approach, with different engagement techniques for different audiences. This should include, but may not be limited to: development education in schools and with young people; work with the media to raise the profile and quality of journalism about development issues; and making use of innovative ways to engage the adult population including through business and through community and faith groups.

Many opportunities to engage the UK public in a way that has a direct impact on development outcomes exist already, and do not need to be reinvented. However, many do need to be targeted more strategically at segments of the population who will be most receptive to them.

**At the core of any new programme of public engagement should be a coherent, strategic project focused on schools.** It is through formal education that the links between development education and development outcomes are clearest.

Think Global has conducted detailed research into what works in educating and engaging school pupils about the wider world (Hogg, 2010). We find that one of the principal barriers to development education in schools is that teachers lack confidence to teach about the wider world. Partly as a result, it is clear that effective practice in schools tends to be stimulated by people equipped with the right support and resources, rather than just by the production of teaching materials. Many good resources and opportunities for teaching about the wider world exist (for example through the Global Dimension website and through high-quality linking programmes such as the Global Schools Partnership) but
many teachers want to be supported through advice and training to use these resources effectively.

The research finds that whilst teachers see a clear moral case for teaching about the wider world, any schools programme also needs to emphasise that such teaching can improve behaviour, attainment and learner engagement, and that it fits within the school curriculum. Teachers also need the support of the wider school environment, and particularly the support of senior leadership teams in schools. This means that any school programme should also raise the profile of development education to school leaders and headteachers.

Experience from the last ten years, summarised in the research, highlights that school programmes are most effective when teachers actively participate in their development, rather than being passive recipients of a programme developed and delivered by an outside body. Often the most effective advocate for development education in schools is another teacher. This helps to ensure that a schools programme is relevant to teachers and helps them to address day-to-day challenges in their work.

Such a schools programme should focus on supporting teachers and heads to embed development and global perspectives across the curriculum and school ethos. There is a great deal of good practice which can be drawn together and scaled up. This could include:

- a tool to audit what is already being done in the school to embed development education and a global dimension to the curriculum;
- continuing professional development for heads and teachers about teaching about development through sharing good practice between schools and provision of specialist outside support by NGOs such as Development Education Centres;
- raising the profile of development education through articles and case studies aimed at schools;
- ensuring teachers have access to the resources they need through the provision of a ‘clearing house’ website of resources such as the Global Dimension Website;
- specialist support for teachers through their subject associations around how to embed development education in any given subject;
- development of new curriculum resources to fill any gaps in existing provision and to take the latest thinking from academia and development practice into schools;
- linking schools in the UK with those in other countries and providing meaningful learning opportunities including shared curriculum working;
- enabling schools to study a development project in some detail and understand the complexities and pitfalls associated with such work.
Examples of current and potential work outside the schools sector are various and there is a lot of good practice that can be build upon. Just a selection of these might include:

- Approaches for working with young people not in formal education such as that developed through the Global Youth Action project.
- In-depth learning and opportunities to take action for ‘active enthusiasts’ (in the terminology of the DFID segmentation) through RESULTS UK.
- More accessible introductions to international development, such as the 1.4 billion reasons presentation from the Global Poverty Project.
- High profile theme weeks such as Fairtrade Fortnight and One World Week.
- Continuing to work with networks of local NGOs, including development education centres, local groups for large development NGOs and university networks such as People and Planet.
- Educating business leaders to encourage them to put international development outcomes at the heart of their business objectives.
- Simple, effective ‘nudge’-based activities such as Cadbury’s shift to using Fairtrade chocolate throughout its range.

There is a lot of good work already going on and DFID is in a position to build on the best of this depending on what its priorities are. It should avoid reinventing the wheel by doing something new for the sake of doing something new.

In any programme of work that is developed, there is a tension between stimulating the best, most innovative projects through open funding mechanisms and taking a strategic approach, exerting more control over what is delivered but losing some of the innovation that exists through competitive programmes. As the list above highlights, there are lots of opportunities for DFID in relation to development awareness and development education; the challenge is to design a policy mechanism that draws out and supports these opportunities effectively. We recommend that the most effective way to achieve this is for DFID to focus on three or four areas (perhaps schools and youth work, media, business leaders and faith/community groups) and specify the outcomes that they would like to see amongst each group. The department might then invite bids to run one programme in each area allowing bidders to specify the programme design that will meet the outcomes DFID is seeking. There may also be a role for an organisation such as Think Global to help support and bring together learning between such development education programmes.

The effectiveness of these opportunities can be maximised by making use of, and adding to, the research that exists about how people are engaged and what motivates action on development outcomes. This will include research into the role of catalytic individuals in encouraging community-level engagement with international development (Hogg, 2011; and see section 3.3.1 above for more explanation), as well as ongoing monitors of public opinion such as the Institute.
of Development Studies Public Opinion Monitor. DFID should also ensure that they fully implement the changes to their own public attitudes surveys as recommended by the International Development Select Committee Report, Aid under Pressure (International Development Select Committee, 2009).

**Next steps**
Given the amount of information contained in this response, we would be happy to talk through any of the points made above either over the phone or in person.

Please do get in touch if this would be helpful, and we look forward to seeing the outcomes of your review. We believe that consultation strengthens the policy development process and we hope that the results of the finalised review will be put out for a full 12-week consultation period.

Yours sincerely

Hetan Shah
Chief Executive
Appendix 1: Estimate of the financial multiplier effect of educating and engaging the UK public with development awareness activities in schools

NB The calculations in this appendix are indicative. They are based on a set of assumptions which can legitimately be varied (for example how much people donate). However, the exact figure of £53m is less important than the overall order of magnitude.

Amongst the general public, 25% donate money to charities responding to global issues, or are actively interested in doing so. Amongst those who have learnt about poverty at school, 32% donate or are actively interested in doing so. Amongst those who have not had a chance to learn about poverty at school, 12% donate or are actively interested in doing so (all percentages from Ipsos MORI, 2010b).

Total public donations to the Disasters Emergency Committee for Haiti were £101m. If we assume that this £101m came from the 25% of people who stated that they donate, and everyone donated the same, then we can estimate that:

- If no-one had the opportunity to learn about poverty at school and only 12% donated, private donations to Haiti would have been £48m.
- By contrast if all members of the UK public had learnt about poverty at school and 32% donated, private donations to Haiti would have been £129m.

As a result, we can estimate that school-based education about poverty helped to generate £53m of the £101m the public donated to the Disasters Emergency Committee for the Haiti appeal (i.e. just over half). As a comparison, total money donated by DFID to Haiti was £20m.

Clearly this figure can only be a very rough estimate given the uncertainties and assumptions involved, but it is worth noting that it may be a conservative estimate of the impact of development awareness activities in schools, as it is based on a calculation of only one appeal, not a whole year of donations, and only considers donations to the Disasters Emergency Committee, not all public donations to Haiti.
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