

DO THE PHILOSOPHY, CONCEPTS AND GOALS OF THE FOUR CORE GRADE
EIGHT SASKATCHEWAN CURRICULA REQUIRE TEACHERS TO BE GLOBAL
EDUCATORS?

A Thesis Submitted to the College of Graduate Studies and Research in Partial
Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Master of Education in the Department
of Curriculum Studies
University of Saskatchewan
Saskatoon

By

Jacqueline J. Khan

University of Saskatchewan

Copyright Jacqueline Joan Khan, January 2008. All rights reserved.

PERMISSION TO USE

In presenting this thesis in partial fulfillment of the requirements for a Postgraduate degree from the University of Saskatchewan, I agree that the Libraries of this University may make it freely available for inspection. I further agree that permission for copying of this thesis in any manner, in whole or in part, for scholarly purposes may be granted by the professor or professors who supervised my thesis work or, in their absence, by the Head of the Department or the Dean of the College in which my thesis work was done. It is understood that any copying or publication or use of this thesis/dissertation or parts thereof for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission. It is also understood that due recognition shall be given to me and to the University of Saskatchewan in any scholarly use which may be made of any material in my thesis.

ABSTRACT

The twenty-first century is a globally interdependent society, with people connected on a political, cultural, environmental and economic level. To prepare students to graduate into this interconnected community, global education is integral to their schooling. A global education program includes three equally important components: 'Content', that promotes knowledge of and respect for the pluralistic and diverse world; learning to take 'Action', which encourages students to recognize and respond to global needs; and 'Pedagogy', which should incorporate collaboration and allow students too develop as critical thinkers . When the first two categories are taught and learned using an appropriate pedagogical style, students are empowered to find and use their own voices to contribute in their global community.

While research demonstrates that Saskatchewan teachers believe that global education is important, studies indicate that global education is not implemented by Saskatchewan teachers. What inhibits implementation of global education? The written curriculum is a document that guides teachers in planning and delivering subject content mandated by Saskatchewan Learning. For this study I inquired into whether the Grade 8 curriculum of the four core subject areas (Mathematics, English Language Arts, Social Studies and Science) require and assist Saskatchewan teachers in being global educators.

A text analysis was done to determine if the goals, philosophies and objectives of the Grade Eight Core Curriculum reflected the three components of a global education program, thus requiring Saskatchewan teachers to be global educators. Quantitative analysis was used to determine the number of times global education concepts appeared in the curricula and a qualitative analysis was carried out to determine how the concepts

were used. Analysis of the curricula determined that global education concepts are found predominantly the Social Studies document, meaning that teachers of other subject areas do not receive much assistance to be global educators. Analysis also revealed that while global education concepts appeared in the philosophies and goals sections of all curricula, the concepts were lacking or absent in the objectives sections, meaning that the curricula do not provide direct assistance to teachers in implementing global education.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

At this time I would like to acknowledge the advisory skills of Lynn Lemisko. With humour, empathy and discipline she kept me on the right track as the research included in this thesis unfolded. For their invaluable input in fine tuning the thesis I would like to acknowledge my committee members Richard Julien and Dianne Miller.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PERMISSION TO USE.....	i
ABSTRACT.....	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	iv
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	v
LIST OF TABLES.....	vi
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
2. LITERATURE REVIEW.....	2
2.1 Theoretical Frameworks of Global Educators	11
2.2 Themes in the Literature.....	13
2.2.1 What is Global Education?.....	13
2.2.2 The Importance of Global Education.....	16
2.2.3 The Implementation of Global Education.....	22
2.2.4 Obstacles to Teachers Being Global Educators.....	25
2.2.5 What is a Global Education Curriculum?.....	27
2.2.6 Summary of Literature.....	31
3. METHODOLOGY.....	32
4. ANALYSIS.....	44
4.1 Introduction.....	44
4.2 Analysis of Content Category.....	45
4.3 Content Analysis Conclusions.....	58
4.4 Analysis of the Action Category.....	60
4.5 Action Analysis Conclusion.....	67
4.6 Analysis of Pedagogy Category.....	68
4.7 Pedagogy Analysis Conclusion.....	72
4.8 Summary of Findings.....	73
5. CONCLUSIONS.....	74
5.1 Key Findings: Meanings and Implications.....	75
5.1.1 Focus in Social Studies.....	76
5.1.2 Focus in Introductions.....	78
5.1.3 Representations of Key Ideas in Global Education Categories.....	81
5.2 Recommendations for Further Studies.....	85
5.3 Future Implications.....	86

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1 Distribution of Content Keywords.....	46
Table 2 Distribution of Action Keywords.....	62
Table 3 Distribution of Pedagogy Keywords.....	68
Table 4 Percent of Keywords Used in Each Curriculum.....	76
Table 5 Percent of Keywords Used in the Introduction and Objectives Section of Each Curriculum.....	79
Table 6 Comparison of Keywords found in the 2006 ELA Curriculum and the 1999 ELA Curriculum..	88

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

Over the years, my respect for and my love for our world has been strongly forged. As my love for our world continues to grow, so does a metaphor to describe it. I compare our world to a beautiful, multi-coloured, multi-textured, evolving tapestry. The tapestry, while being a dynamic whole is enriched in its beauty and creation by the individual and unique patterns, materials and colours that catch the eye and complement one another.

The perception of the world that I have woven over the years originated from my circumstances of birth. My father is Trinidadian, my mother, Canadian. While my childhood and early teenage years were spent in Trinidad and Tobago, my later teenage years and adult life have been spent in Canada. One country gave me my childhood, the other my choice of career. I am of two nations, two ethnicities and two cultures. My favoritism for one of the nations, ethnicities, or cultures does not exist. Both nations have strengths and weaknesses of which I am a product. While my parents were my first teachers, it is belonging to two very diverse, but equally loved countries that has helped to shape my perception of the world.

Desmond Tutu, a recipient of the Nobel Peace Prize for his role in bringing about the downfall of Apartheid in South Africa, on a state visit to Trinidad and Tobago, my birthplace, referred to it as the "rainbow nation." It is a title of which I am extremely proud. In my father's homeland I grew up celebrating the Muslim holy day Eid, the

Hindu festival of Divali and the holy days of my own Christian faith. My classmates were of African, Chinese, Syrian, East Indian and Caucasian descent. My school curriculum contained literature from other lands, European History and international geography.

When I entered the Saskatchewan school system at the age of fourteen, I was struck at the peculiarity that I was to my classmates. There was great mention of my complexion and my accent. Also, to the degree that my fourteen-year old mind could register, I was also struck by the novelty the world was to my classmates. Many stereotypes existed concerning the Caribbean, Asia and Africa. When my classmates envisioned my island they envisioned sun-kissed beaches, but I do not believe their minds were ever able to travel inland to the hot, humid streets and to the poverty of a developing nation. According to my memory, there was little in the curriculum to help students become acquainted with the world outside of North America and Europe.

My Canadian education, life and friends have served me very well and there is no intent to belittle any of my experiences in my mother's homeland. However, having started my formal education with a curriculum that introduced the world to me had a beneficial effect on my perception of the world, my place in it and the role that I wish to play in it.

After teaching for four years in Prince Albert, Saskatchewan I worked and traveled in Asia and briefly Africa. It was at this time that my love affair with our world took on a new dimension. During this time of travel, the intricacies and complexities of the weaves of the fabric became more evident to me. My awareness of the interdependence of our world grew. In 1998 the South Korean economy crashed and as this economic downturn affected prices, imports and exports to other nations I saw the

domino effect that one country's economy could have on a continent and the world. The term "global village" took on a new reality for me.

The global village that I have become aware of is the result of globalization. There are a variety of ways to describe globalization and a mixture of views regarding this phenomenon. The argument has been made that globalization, "the process of borrowing ideas and skills from others and adapting them to fit local conditions is as old as civilization" (Becker, 1991, p. 97). What has made it of significance in the twentieth and twenty-first century is the rapidity, caused by improvements in transportation and technology, under which this sharing takes place. Basiga (2004) characterizes globalization as the spread of western culture and the economic control of the North over the South. This control has taken place through institutions like the World Bank, the World Trade Organization (WTO) and the International Monetary Fund (IMF). Globalization is also described as the "compression of the world and the intensification of the consciousness of the world as a whole" (Diaz, Massialas, Xanthopoulos, 1999, p. 37). This definition presents a more positive view of globalization and supports the idea that there are world problems that require a world community to attend to them.

When I refer to the term globalization, I am referring to the political, cultural, economic and ecological interconnectedness of the world. I believe that this interconnectedness has had positive outcomes for our global community so it should be promoted, but there have also been the negative ramifications that Basiga (2004) stated. These negative outcomes of globalization must be addressed. It is globalization that has taken all the different parts of my tapestry and pulled them together into one striking work of art. Yet, it is also globalization that allows one piece of the tapestry to dominate over other colours, or to pull at the fabric and cause fraying in certain parts.

While one can argue whether or not globalization has been a positive or negative phenomenon, one cannot argue that it is omnipresent. Improvements in technology, transportation and communication during the twentieth century have made our world smaller. The average Saskatchewan student is part of our present day global village. As consumers in the global village, Saskatchewan student's pens are made in Japan, their i-pods in China and their shoes in Mexico. Their parent's investments are affected by events on the other side of the globe. Their classmates are now from a variety of non-European cultures and school vacations no longer take them to the nearest lake, but to vacation spots overseas. Global transportation brought SARS across the ocean and the media made students immediate witnesses to the destructive forces of terrorism as the World Trade Center collapsed in 2001. Genocide, poverty and natural disasters enter their living rooms every evening. Our students are growing up with a world-view and in a global situation that is not the same as their grandparents or their parents and they need to be prepared and to understand it, to be a part of it.

Early in my Master's program I did a research paper exploring the purpose of schooling. From this research I determined that if you combine educational philosophies, the purpose of schooling is unavoidably for citizenship. As educators, we want to graduate students who are prepared for and going to be active and conscientious members of society.

Postman (1995) states that schools are engineered with the primary purpose to "prepare children for competent entry into the economic life of a community"(p. 27). Robertson (1998) echoes this belief. She points out that schools are reflections of society. Our Canadian society is industrial based and corporate dominated. As a result, the existing idea is to make our schools a human resource pool for corporations. Some

will argue that the belief that schooling's main purpose to create a labour force is a cynical and narrow view of schooling. Arguing for a more individualistic purpose, Lymchak (2001) believes that "Education is predominantly understood as a liberating force and as an empowerment of the learner" (p. 28). The economic view is softened and the individualistic view is expanded upon by Osborne (1996) who explains that if schools graduate students who are transformed by their learning, then they will transform their society (p. 27).

The call for education to be an instrument of personal development for students, which will in turn lead to social development, is evident in many school systems' lists of objectives. An example of this is seen in the Ontario Secondary Schools Teachers Federation Report. In 1999 they stated that the purpose of education is to nurture, encourage and provide the opportunity for students to:

- a) learn how to learn; b) develop critical thinking skills, mental activity and a love of life long learning; c) become proficient in the use and understanding of technology; d) become knowledgeable and productive citizens of the community; e) become self-reliant, fulfilled individuals; e) practice values such as civility, tolerance and peaceful co-existence; f) gain the knowledge, skills and attitudes to help them find employment and pursue post-secondary education; g) achieve competency, literacy, numeracy, communication skills, critical and creative thinking, personal and life skills, and individual global responsibilities.

Many of these goals and ideals are reflected, adapted or combined in other school systems' lists of purposes. The formula appears to be a simple and effective one: Develop the child, and one will develop society.

Education revolves around citizenship. It is proposed that through successful individual development, society will improve as schools graduate active, informed citizens. At one time citizenship was restricted to defining members of a nation, however, "Now, like people in many other countries, informed and conscientious

Canadians see themselves not only as part of a local community, a province and a nation, but also as part of a broader global community" (Evans, Hundey, 2002, p. 126) By the 1970's, Canadian citizenship education had to include "a sense of identity as Canadians but also as citizens of the world" (Osborne, 1999, p. 10). Wishnietsky (2001) emphasizes this concept, arguing that if schools are for the benefit of society, the twenty-first century is a global society, therefore schools have to prepare students for productive citizenship in the emerging global environment. He calls for curriculum that "offers a global perspective in all subjects at all levels; is extensive and international; is open to new ideas as they emerge" (p. 26).

These concepts of citizenship are enforced not only by our federal government, they are also part of the Saskatchewan Grade 8 Social Studies curriculum. Every year Citizenship and Immigration Canada sends out a poster and an order form to assist schools in celebrating Citizenship week. In 2005 the order form included an activity titled, *My Commitment to Our Global Community* and the poster encouraged students to "Cultivate Your Commitment to Canada...spread peace, plant respect, nurture belonging, be a global citizen!" The introduction to the Saskatchewan Grade 8 Social Studies curriculum encourages learning that aims to help students understand citizenship not only at a local level, but at a global level. Students are encouraged to consider the actions and contributions of citizenship at a family, community, provincial, national and global level.

Our present students exist in a global community. Therefore, content that equips them with the skills and knowledge to be successful in that environment are required. The society that students are expected to contribute to and change is a global society, therefore, an awareness of international issues, problems and possible solutions are

needed in education. To successfully accomplish the goals of education, global education must be implemented. Global education is an important and unavoidable extension of what has been taught to students since kindergarten, but what we appear to have forgotten as adults (UNESCO, 1983). When dealing with their classmates, children are taught to, "Play fair. Don't hit people. Put things back where you found them. Clean up your own mess. Don't take things that aren't yours. Say you're sorry when you hurt somebody...Stick together" (Fulghum, 1993, p. 130). These are the simple, but significant ideas that formulate the content and philosophy of global education.

Global education as explained by Tye and Tye (1992) is:

(1) the study of problems and issues, which cut across national boundaries, and the interconnectedness of cultural, environmental, economic, political and technological systems and (2) the cultivation of cross cultural understanding, which includes development of the skill of "perspective-taking"--that is, being able to see life from someone else's point of view (p. 85).

Global education is not restricted to knowing about the globe and the cultures that live on it, it extends to a call to do something about the many issues that face the global society (Hendrix, 1998).

To successfully teach the content of global education, students must become critical thinkers and problem solvers. As a critical thinker, students need to look at issues from many sides and points of view. As problems solvers, they need to be able to look at the world without prejudice or stereotype and be able to explore the roots of world problems and seek long-term solutions. Therefore, global education is not only about content and a serving attitude to the world, it is about pedagogy. Global education incorporates a teaching style and a learning environment that allows students to think for

themselves, look critically at issues and discover their unique voice (Diaz, Massialas, Xanthopoulos, 1999, p. 79).

My literature review will contain further discussion and exploration of these major factors of global education, but for now, I will emphasize that to realize the ideals of education, global education cannot be a separate, distinct part of education. Global education is intertwined with the purpose of education for it "is concerned with the survival of the human species, with the prospect of the development of every individual and with the improvement of the quality of life for all humankind" (Hendrix, 1998, p. 305).

On my return to the Saskatchewan classroom in 1999 I became my school's Social Studies and History teacher. Along with this title, I also became the global education teacher. If any issue arose, pertaining to development or culture, it was assumed that it was my responsibility. When it came to assigning professional committees by my principal, I was assigned to the Social Justice committee. Our school's Social Justice Club is run by me. Since these are my areas of interest and my staff supports me, I happily accept these responsibilities. However, when we consider the present global village we exist in, and how global education is so intrinsically connected to the purpose of schooling - that is, citizenship - it does lead to the question: Is global education the responsibility of all educators, and not just the Social Studies teacher's responsibility?

In a 1992 study of Saskatchewan teachers by Ryan and Duek, it was discovered that while 67 percent of teachers think that global education is important and 83 percent think that it is becoming increasingly important, 80 percent of Saskatchewan teachers do not apply global education to any extent (p. 42). According to these statistics, there is a

huge discrepancy between Saskatchewan teachers' beliefs about global education and our actions taken toward being global educators.

Why the discrepancy? As a Social Studies teacher I have no choice but to be a global educator for I have a professional obligation to fulfill. My curriculum states, "**The ultimate aim** [of the kindergarten to grade 12 Social studies program] **is to graduate students who have a sense of themselves as active participants in and citizens of an interdependent world**"[Bolted *sic*] (p. 3). The curriculum then aids me in meeting these objectives by having units and activities that fall under the definition of global education. Do other subject areas teachers have curriculums that state and facilitate these objectives? I ask this because:

A curriculum converts the general goals of education into more specific plans of action. It describes what teachers are expected to teach and therefore what students are required to learn. It organizes the sequence of courses from grade to grade and provides the basis for evaluation, whether of schools, students or teachers. It tells parents and public at large what to expect of the schools. It is the very centre of schooling (Osborne, 1990, p. 31).

In their study, Ryan and Duek (1992) discovered that one of the major barriers to teachers being global educators is that we were not trained to be global educators therefore, we do not know how to be global educators. Other barriers, which I will explore in my literature review, were also suggested by other researchers. However, for the purpose of my study, I would like to explore whether or not the curriculum supports or hinders an educator in the implementation of global education concepts across the subject areas. Specifically, I would like to address the question: Do the philosophy, concepts and goals of the four core Grade 8 Saskatchewan curricula (i.e., Social Studies, Mathematics, Science and English Language Arts) require teachers to be global educators?

In the upcoming chapter I will review the trends in the literature regarding global education. Chapter Three will be an explanation of the methodology used in the research, as well as an explanation as to why I am focusing my research on the concepts and goals of the Grade Eight curricula. An analysis of the data will be presented in Chapter Four and the significance of the analysis will be highlighted in Chapter Five.

Chapter 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

Theoretical Frameworks of Global Educators

In my exploration of global education, I had to open my view of global education to the work of other researchers in the field. As I became more acquainted with the research, commonalities began to emerge concerning the theoretical framework of global educators and I think it important to outline these prior to the discussion of the literature itself. Amongst promoters of global education there are common philosophies and ideals that influence and propel the work in global education. Generally, global educators are postcolonialists, postmodernists and constructivists.

Postcolonial theory, as explained by Leela Gandhi (1998) is a guiding framework for global educators. According to this theory, it is impossible, or counter productive to move forward in the twenty-first century without exploring our colonial past. This past included a power relationship between the imperial and colonized world, which at present is often labeled the “developed” and “developing” world. If our global society is going to continue to work on our tapestry together, we have to look at what has influenced the design, colour and weave of the tapestry to date. We cannot ignore that there are pulls and snags that affect the tapestry. Flaws, created by past relationships and current forms of imperialism, cannot be removed, so we have to learn how best to work with them.

In relation to curriculum, a post-modernist framework prevails. Patrick Slattery (2000) explains that while many may be uncomfortable with postmodernism, it may “offer a fresh way to look at our sociopolitical, economic, ethical, religious, psychological, ecological and educational dilemmas” (p. 133). A postmodern curriculum challenges the status quo, singular voices and one perspective or interpretation of a story. With the belief that there is no absolute truth, a postmodern curriculum challenges a teacher to be a learner as the curriculum wages war on “totality of representation that reduces learning to information transmission, disciplinary structures, grand narratives, and concepts of “reason” that continue to foster the bifurcations that perpetuate racism, patriarchy, environmental degradation, homophobia, colonialism, and classism” (p. 138)

Regarding pedagogical style, global educators follow a constructivist theory. If the tapestry is to continue to evolve in its dynamism, all hands must be at work. Therefore, students cannot rely on teachers to provide knowledge and information. Students must be encouraged not merely to receive knowledge, but to construct their own knowledge. They must search for information to develop their answers. When students design their own knowledge, they truly know, understand and possess it. Allowing students to develop and use their own voices and knowledge benefits our global tapestry because students will feel confident that they have something to contribute to the tapestry. When students take part in the making of the tapestry, they will want to protect it and continue to influence its design.

Much of the research and literature in the field of global education is influenced by postcolonialist, postmodernist and constructivist theories. As I identified these theoretical frameworks I recognized them in myself. My desire to see global education

become an integral part of the education system is because I believe our future cannot be pursued without recognizing and respecting the events and relationships of the past, curriculum needs to present a multitude of perspectives and stories, and students need to explore and build their own capabilities to acquire knowledge.

Themes in the Literature

The theoretical frameworks of the researchers exploring the domain of global education are obvious in the literature. In addition, based on examination of research in the field, I was able to categorize popular areas of focus. The research in global education focuses on four main ideas: defining global education; stressing the importance of global education; theorizing about how global education should be taught and the content that should be included; and exploring barriers to global education instruction. My own interest led me to further look at what global educators had to say about a global curriculum.

What is Global Education?

According to the research global education has been around for approximately thirty years and it emerged to support and attempt to remedy the problems of a world that was becoming more and more interconnected through advances in transportation and communication systems (Hendrix, 1998). Advocates of defining the term global education argue that it must be done to lead policy makers in the right direction when making decisions on content within the area. Others argue that the field is still too new and broad to define (Tye and Tye, 1991, p. 87). Gardner (2000) claims that the definition is not important, it is the content that we need to focus on.

There is a concern that teachers believe they are global educators when they are not, for they do not understand the full range of global education (Ukpokdu, 1999). In

the research it is explained that global education is often interchanged with peace education and development education (Basiga, 2004; Gardner, 2000.) However, attention is given to explaining the interrelated but distinct fields of multicultural education and international education. Multicultural education involves looking at curricula themes, historical or contemporary, from the multiple perspectives within a society. It allows for the different views and voices of a society to be heard (Ukpokdu, 1999, p. 299). Banks (2001), another African American educator expands on this definition and purpose of multicultural education by stating that multicultural education “is to help all students, develop the knowledge, skills and attitudes they need to survive and function effectively in a culturally diverse society” (Banks, 2001, p. 12).

Banks (2001) continues to explain that multicultural education is key to the enhancing the ideals of a democracy. Democracy upholds the values of equality and justice. According to Banks (2001) multicultural education helps to bridge the gaps between the ideals of democracy and the social realities of democracy where prejudice, misunderstandings and stereotypes do prevail. The concern is expressed by Mathison (1994) that in order to “form a less judgmental, more sensitive environment for our students, we may avoid discussion of values for fear that such discussions might convey a disrespect or disapproval of one particular cultural belief system or another” (Mathison, 1994, p. 5). There is also the fear that multiculturalism threatens nation building as cultures may give greater loyalty or respect to their origins as opposed to their present nation. Other critics of promoting multicultural education claim that it may not be progressive and lead to characterizations or stereotyping of cultures (Gunew, 2007). Some promoters of multicultural education argue that the content of multicultural education must avoid neutrality and instead, delve into issues of inequality,

oppression, injustices and judgments. For it is not by ignoring, but by discussing and revealing these issues that they will be overcome (Banks, 2001; Brown and Kysilka, 2002; Mathison, 1994).

While multicultural education is an important feature of global education, it is only part of the complete field. International education is the study of "nations, geographic areas, cultures, international organization and diplomacy" (Hendrix, 1998, p. 1). While global education includes this content, due to the postmodernists influence, it also extends its focus to social change and the promotion of problem solving on a global sphere. Anderson, Nicklaus and Crawford (1995) show how multicultural education and international education are necessary parts of global education when they state that global education is:

an education for all students that will enable them to see themselves as HUMAN BEINGS whose home is PLANET EARTH who are citizens of a MULTICULTURAL SOCIETY living in an increasingly INTERRELATED WORLD and who LEARN, CARE, THINK, CHOOSE AND ACT to celebrate life on this planet and to meet the global challenges confronting human kind [Upper case font, *sic*] (p. 5).

The shared goals of multicultural education and global education are further enforced by Banks (2001) and Brown and Kysilka (2002) when they explain that multicultural education allows us to respect diversity within our borders while global education encourages students to respect their pluralistic world. Both groups of researchers enforce that "multicultural education and global education can be seen as two parts of the same theme of how individuals, groups and institutions can work together to build a better world locally, nationally and internationally" (Brown and Kysilka, 2002, p. 8).

Pike (2000) echoes these beliefs about global education and adds a couple more components. For Pike, global education also requires a certain focus on perspective and pedagogical style. Global education must make room for a diversity of perspectives not only in the content being taught but also amongst students, for individual perspectives are partial, varied and important. To encourage multiple perspectives, Pike (2000) also points out that global education cannot only stress what we learn; there is also a focus on how we learn. “Global educators advocate learning that is student-centered, participatory and interactive” (Pike, 2000, p. 223) To be effective global educators and to be able to implement the content of global education, including content that promotes equity, justice, respect for rights, co-operation and interdependence, global educators must use a teaching style that accompanies and accommodates the message being delivered. Hassan (2000) explains this further when he says that teachers cannot see knowledge as a finished product. Promoting a constructivist view he states, “teachers must recognize and value the learners’ experiences, perspectives and ways of knowing and have confidence in them as persons who can, with encouragement and help, inquire and reconstruct knowledge” (p. 100). In a global education classroom, the teacher’s role is not diminished, only adapted as she/he too becomes a learner and as she/he allows students to share their knowledge and perspectives on a topic or particular content area.

Based on the literature, I have concluded that global education entails three dominant factors. The first element introduces students to, and allows students to build a respect for, our pluralistic and diverse world. The second aspect allows students to identify the problems of our global village. The third factor, carried out with the appropriate teaching style and learning environment, allows students to find their voice and empowers them to carry out positive change in their global village.

The Importance of Global Education

While the majority of the literature I encountered supported global education, there are critics. Brown and Kysilka (2002) as well as Osborne (2001) report that there is concern that nationalism will be decreased as native countries face criticism or as other cultures are promoted. However, Brown and Kysilka (2002) counter argue with the point that global education “does not lead to a diminishing national pride but a heightening awareness of citizen duties, responsibilities, and positive global attitudes (p. 3). This section will describe how the need for global education ranges from our responsibilities as educators to prepare our students for the world, our collective responsibility to improve the world and our responsibility to improve ourselves as educators.

As mentioned in the introduction, Saskatchewan students are graduating into an interdependent, interconnected world. Yet, the unfortunate reality is that most high school students are globally unaware (Ashun, 2004). It is our responsibility as educators to improve this situation. In support of the argument that students are graduating not as local citizens, but as global citizens, I shall further explore the concept of citizenship. The literature on citizenship, and the Saskatchewan Social Studies curriculum, explains citizenship to have three main characteristics. Citizenship allows one to claim membership in a community, whether it is local or extended. Then, as a recognized member of that community you are guaranteed rights and freedoms. In turn, the citizen now has responsibilities to that community (Evans and Hundey, p. 121).

“From their very beginnings, public schools in Canada, as in other countries, were expected to prepare the young for citizenship (Osborne, 2001, p. 12). However,

depending on the trend or needs of Canadian society, citizenship education has varied. At the turn of the twentieth century, literacy was the primary focus of citizenship education. This was so that voters could make independent, knowledgeable choices at the ballots. For aboriginal peoples, immigrants and minorities, citizen education meant attempted assimilation into the dominant Anglo-Saxon culture. Bridging the two World Wars, citizenship education took the form of character education (pp. 17 – 19).

Both Banks (2002) and Kingwell (2000) argue that these are archaic ways of looking at citizenship and do not satisfy the pluralistic nature of nations, or the interdependent, diverse nature of the global community. Kingwell (2000) emphasizes that first and foremost, citizenship caters to our deepest need, the need to belong. However, there are levels of belonging. We belong to a municipality, a region, a nation and an international community (Kingwell, 2000, p. 6). Banks then reinforces, citizenship education needs to evolve to cater to the multiple levels of belonging that are prevalent in present citizenship (Banks, 2002, p. 81).

Evans and Hundey (2000) remind us of our global community when they mention the global communication possibilities of the Internet and the global economy that is characterized by trading blocs such as the European Union and the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA). Global communities are not only being portrayed through cultural diversity and pluralism but protected through international organizations like Amnesty International and UNICEF which make us aware of not only national rights, but international rights (Dieter, 1996, p.17). Therefore, our students cannot graduate as only national citizens; they must graduate as global citizens. They will have membership in a global community. Global rights and privileges will be open

to them and in turn, very importantly, they will have responsibilities to their global community.

A simple but effective example of how students enjoy global privileges and, therefore, should be concerned with their global responsibility exists in their diets. Our Canadian climate does not allow for the growth of bananas, yet many of our students enjoy the snack of a banana that was produced in either Ecuador or Costa Rica. The production of this banana has more than likely been controlled by a large corporation like Dole, Chiquita or Delmonte. The global community that our students are a part of allows them to enjoy a fruit that was grown in another part of the world. However, being part of that global community does not mean that they simply have the chance to enjoy the benefits of a global society. They must question and feel a sense of responsibility to the workers involved in the production of the bananas, especially when reports emerge that the average age of a worker in a Dole banana plantation is 11.5 years old and that fear of poisoning exists as fungicides are sprayed where workers toil and eat (Stephens, 2006).

Due to the expanded definition of citizenship Becker (1991), Gardner (2000), Hendrix (1998), and Pike and Selby (2001) reinforce the idea that we need to provide our students with the tools to partake in a global society. Kingwell (2000) enforces this idea when he says:

What we need now is a new model of citizenship based on the act of participation itself, not some quality or thought or right enjoyed by its possessor. This participatory citizenship doesn't simply demand action from existing citizens; it makes action at once the condition and the task of citizenship (p. 12).

Through global education students can be introduced to, prepared for and empowered with the knowledge to face a world that has been connected on a political, economic,

social, technological and environmental level. "Every child should be educated about [global] issues so that they can understand the key global considerations which will shape their lives" (Gardner, 2000, p. 228). As educators, if we graduate them without an attempt to provide them with this knowledge we are doing them a disservice (Hendrix, 1998, p. 305). As the goal of education is citizenship, schooling needs to incorporate global education to prepare our students to be a part of and contribute to their global community.

A key component of global education is development education. Cronkite (2000) reminds us that global education started as development education (p. 83). While students are a part of a dynamic, pluralistic, diverse global community, this picture cannot be presented without the flaws. There are present day international wars that have a direct affect on local economies. The reality of our world is that population distribution does not match resource and wealth distribution. An expanding population in the south is diminishing an already stretched food supply. Pollution and global warming are concerns that previous generations did not face to the degree that they face today. Gender, race and social inequalities are rampant (Diaz, Massialas, Xanthopoulos, 1999, p. 87). There are issues of global poverty, global health concerns, conflict, human rights violations and environmental concerns that need to be addressed. Basiga (2004) attributes many of these present day concerns to the negative effects of globalization. Basiga (2004) "equates globalization to westernization and modernization, where existing local social structures and cultures are destroyed and replaced by the social structures of capitalism, rationalism, industrialism and the imperialism of such social institutions as McDonalds, Hollywood, CNN and the like" (p. 2).

With a postcolonialist theory Gardner (2000) echoes these concerns. He illustrates how the social, economic and political control of colonization has been replaced by the economic control of globalization. After World War Two, when European Empires let go of their colonies, a void was left. Countries that had not governed themselves or had control of their resources for centuries were now left to do this. Therefore, hand in hand with independence, came continued poverty. In search of revenue and trade partners the once colonized Southern hemisphere turned to the imperialistic North. Once again, the developing world became the North's labour force (Frank, 1997, p. 266). Referring to a United Kingdom study carried out in 1999 by Livingstone, Gardner explains that analysis of the data shows that 80 per cent of the world trade in bananas is controlled by three global corporations; three corporations control 83 per cent of the coffee trade; five control 77 per cent of cereals and ten control 94 per cent of agrochemicals (p. 231).

To preserve the multiplicity of cultures and independence of voice that our world needs to keep the dynamism of our tapestry, students need to be taught that while our similarities unite us, it is our differences of practice, ideas and cultures that strengthen us in this world. Global education is a viable tool for students to learn about, respect and preserve these much-needed differences.

In order for students not to feel helpless, frustrated or overwhelmed by the fact that one billion people live in poverty and that villages in Africa are being wiped out by Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome (Sachs, 2005) global education can empower "young people with the vision that poverty, disease and injustice can be eradicated and that they have an active role to play in creating a better world" (Agnew and Fincham, 2004, p. 50).

As educators we have a professional obligation to grow in our field, explore new ideas and find new ways to enhance our lessons. Alcoze (1993), Stull (2004), Coulandberg (1994), Fountain (1995) and Pike and Selby (2000 and 2001) show how teachers can take curriculum subject lessons and add a global dimension to them. Math lessons become a study of Egyptian drawings. Science lessons are explorations of environmental solutions. Language Arts classes are journeys to foreign lands and music classes are rhythmic introductions to cultural beats. Curriculum requirements are covered, student's abilities to become global citizens are improved and lessons take on a new interest level and multiple dimensions when an educator applies the content and purposes of global education in a pedagogical style that allows for critical and creative thought. Not only are students' enthusiasm for learning rejuvenated, but teachers' joy and interest in teaching is also re-inspired as old concepts are taught in new ways. By challenging teachers to expand their knowledge base, value the perspective of the child and vary their pedagogical style, "Global education can induce positive changes in teachers' belief and conceptions, enrich their professional skills and strategies, and enhance their self-efficacy" (Hasan, 2000, p. 103).

The Implementation of Global Education

As I began to explore the field of global education I had many questions about how global education should be administered within school systems. At what grade level should it be taught? Is it not covered already in the Social Studies program? Should it be a separate subject or an extra-curricular club? After reading the literature and the research findings, I have come to believe that global education is so integral to the purpose of schooling in the twenty-first century that it cannot be a separate field or

one teacher's responsibility. Global education is a "necessity at every grade level, in every curricular subject area and for all children and adults" (Tye and Tye, 1991, p. 85).

Menchion (1997) suggests that global education be in the curriculum at the elementary level and then become a separate credited subject at the secondary level. Most of the literature does not call for a global education program, but for global schools (Becker, 1991; Hasan, 2000; Hendrix, 1998; Little, 1991; Tye and Tye, 1991; Ukpokdu, 1999; Wessel, 1989). It is further clarified and enforced that "Schools should not only be a reflection of, but a change agent for a more pluralistic, global, tolerant, positive society" (Brown and Kysilka, 2002, p. 165).

A global school is not far from reach, nor does it require massive changes. It requires a promotion of attitudes that in turn begin to effect actions. Global schools make respect for one another and the school environment an unbreakable priority. When students see the importance and value placed on their treatment of others and their immediate environment, these attitudes will extend into the future and the larger environment. Respectful and open communication between staff members, students and parents demonstrate on an ongoing basis the importance of peaceful conflict resolution and conflict avoidance (Greig, Pike and Selby, 1987).

A global school takes accepting and co-operative attitudes and encourages these to become behaviours. Cross-cultural staff and students, posters that reflect global philosophies, cultural days and guest speakers who can share their cultural experiences all aid a school in spreading global concepts (Ashun, 2004; Merryfield, 1994; Taylor, 1996).

Schools should be places in which students observe teachers, parents, and other adults discussing music from other parts of the world, reading authors from other countries... What matters is that we look at each of

the learning standards and do our best to see how we can model them through day-to-day action in schools (Skelton, Wigford, Harper, Greeves, 2002, p. 55).

The suggestion is given by Taylor (1996) that to further enhance global education, schools need to provide the opportunity for students to act in their global society. Students need to make connections between what they are taught and community responsibilities. Recycling programs, recognition of Earth Day and schools accepting energy conservation challenges promote awareness of environmental issues. An involvement in community projects opens student's eyes to socio-economic divisions and discrepancies. Travel clubs that expose students to other cultures and successful lifestyles and field trips that expose students not only to their past, but also to the reality of their present society are all opportunities to expand education out of the classroom. Schools must make an inclusive and conscious effort to have students responsible and responsive to their society.

Global education must be part of public education policy; however, these efforts would be futile if teachers do not undertake the responsibility to be global educators. "Educators and policy makers who are concerned about formulating and promoting goals and objectives would do well to remember that it is the teacher who most influences the learning that takes place in the classroom" (Becker, 2001, p. 228).

Pike and Selby (1991) describe a global educator as one whom:

(a) is global centric rather than ethnocentric; (b) is concerned about culture and perspective; (c) is future-oriented; (d) is a facilitator; (e) has a profound belief in human potential; (f) is concerned with the development of the whole person; (g) employs a range of teaching/learning styles in the classroom; (h) sees learning as a process that is lifelong; (i) tries to be congruent (aligns teachings with practices); (j) is rights-respectful and seeks to shift the focus and locus of power and decision-making;

(k) seeks “functional interdependence” across the curriculum; (l) is a community teacher (p. 274).

According to this definition, we all have the potential and ability to be global educators. According to the research, we also have the responsibility to be global educators. Yet, it remains that one of the major obstacles to the successful implementation of global education, is that teachers are not global educators (Burnouf, 2004; Hendrix, 1998; Menchions, 1997). The next section discusses some of the reasons why Saskatchewan teachers are not global educators.

Obstacles to Teachers Being Global Educators

The majority of the research indicates that there is a primary obstacle that affects teachers in North America from implementing global education. North American teachers have not been trained to be global educators (Dhand, 1989; Menchion, 1997) and as a result, we may not even understand what the field entails (Ukpokdu, 1999). Teachers have been trained as subject-content teachers, but not to see "the connections between physiological, biological, ecological and other world wide systems" (Hendrix, 1998, p. 308). Not only does our pre-service education not provide the necessary tools to equip us as global educators, the majority of in-service education programs do little to provide teachers with the knowledge or motivation to teach from a global perspective (Hendrix, 1998; Menchion, 1997).

The second most commonly indicated reason is the lack of user-friendly resources available to teachers. However, Aschun (2004) has made the suggestion that the problem may not be the availability of resources, but instead, teachers do not have the time to seek the relevant resources (p. 33).

Merryfield (1994) carried out a study in Ohio which might, in an inverse manner, relate to Saskatchewan teachers. From September 1990 to May 1991, Merryfield observed 12 teachers from a variety of grade levels once a week. The teachers were selected through recommendations and their willingness to partake in the study. Recommendations were based on their achievements in global education. The classes that were studied included students who were Caucasian, African-American and a few immigrants from Asia and the Middle East. From this study, Merryfield concluded that cultural diversity in a classroom affect teacher's strategies and in these cases, promoted global education. The results of this study raise the question: Do Saskatchewan teachers not implement global education because students in our classrooms, with the exception of First Nations students, are predominantly of European/White ancestry? In her study, Merryfield states that "Planning [of lessons] began with consideration of student characteristics" (p. 235). Therefore as Saskatchewan students are characteristically not from the continents of Africa, South America and Asia, this may affect the global content in Saskatchewan teacher's lessons.

Pertaining to Saskatchewan teachers, Wessel (1991) did a study titled, *The world in the classroom: A review of global education in Saskatchewan*. The purpose of the study was to "examine all aspects of global education in Saskatchewan schools" (p. 3). The study ran for five months and interviews were held with personnel at varying levels in the education field. Also, 476 teachers chosen randomly from Saskatchewan schools completed a questionnaire. From this study, insight was given into some of the reasons why Saskatchewan teachers are not global educators.

According to this study, the major barrier that Saskatchewan teachers face is the one that other North American teachers in general face. Pre-service education has not

prepared us to be global educators; however it was observed that recent graduates believed that there had been improvements in this area. This study is now about 17 years old, so one can only hope that this has continued to improve.

Wessel detected other variables. Teachers who had overseas experience, separate school teachers and French immersion teachers were more likely to implement global concepts. The variables may be influenced by the fact that overseas experience has influenced teacher attitudes, separate schools have greater community support for global education and French immersion teachers by very nature of their language and heritage, are cross-cultural (p. 10).

Wessel (1991) also identified responsibility as a barrier. While teachers of lower grades, Mathematics and Physical Education believe global education is important, they perceive it as the responsibility of other teachers (p. 9). This in turn raises the issue of curriculum focus because "Some people view social studies as the major vehicle for global education" (p. 7). Hence, it might not be surprising if global education objectives are firmly stated in the Social Studies program, but the questions remains: Are they stated in other subject curricula? If global education should be the responsibility of all teachers, should global education objectives not be part of all curricula?

What is a Global Curriculum?

There is much discussion amongst promoters of global education about how curriculum should reflect global education. While there are some who state that global education could be a credited course at the secondary level, the majority of the literature adamantly opposes this and argues for infusion. The arguments against a separate curriculum include the idea that there is no room to fit a new subject into an already crowded day. Also as a separate elective course, students may question the importance

of global education if it is not made mandatory. A separate course also does not promote good pedagogy as students may not make connections between the content in the global education course and the content of the rest of the curriculum subjects like Math and Science (Diaz , Massialas and Xanthopoulos 1999, Hendrix 1998).

The reasons for infusion are that all students will be reached and students will be able to make the global connection in all subject areas for it is being stressed in all disciplines. Through integration, additional class time will not be required, yet all curriculum objectives will be met for “nearly every subject has significant and legitimate international dimensions (Diaz, Massialas, Xanthopoulos, 1991, p. 68).

After one decides to create global education curriculum, the overwhelming question arises: What should a global education curriculum include? The answers to this are many and tend to overlap. Diaz, Massialas and Xanthopoulos (1999) report a few researchers’ ideas. “Political issues, cultural-social issues, development issues, economic issues and environmental issues” are necessities according to Merryfield and White (1996, p. 179) who also stress the need for multiple perspectives and a presentation of the interconnectedness of the world.

Five concepts for a global curriculum are promoted by William Kniep (1989). He maintains that a global curriculum must include the study of: interdependence; change; conflict; scarcity and culture (p. 66). Robert Hanvey (1976) presents a more detailed explanation of a global curriculum model. His model also contains five dimensions that reflect the postcolonialist, constructivist and postmodernist frameworks:

- (1) *Perspective Consciousness*: the recognition or awareness on the part of the individual that he or she has a view of the world that is not universally shared, that this view of the world continues to be shaped by influences that often escapes conscious detection,

and that others have views of the world that are profoundly different from one's own.

- (2) *State-of-the-Planet Awareness*: awareness of prevailing world conditions and development, including emergent conditions and trends.
- (3) *Cross-Cultural Awareness*: awareness of the diversity of ideas and practices to be found in human societies around the world, of how such ideas and practices compare, and including some limited recognition of how the ideas and ways of one's own society might be viewed from other vantage points.
- (4) *Knowledge of Global Dynamics*: Some modest comprehension of key trails and mechanisms of the world system, with emphasis on theories and concepts that may increase intelligent consciousness of global change.
- (5) *Awareness of Human Choices*: some awareness of the problems of choice confronting individuals, nations and the human species as consciousness and knowledge of the global system expands. (Hanvey, 1976, p. 5 – 34).

Based on a theory of quantum physics, Selby (1998) explains the world as an interconnected tapestry of “dynamic complexity” (p. 3) rather than as individual threads and patterns. With this explanation, David Selby has created a four-dimensional model of global education. With Pike, he also stated the aims for global education. The five aims for global education are:

1. System consciousness—Students should: (i) acquire the ability to think in a systems mode; (ii) acquire an understanding of the systemic nature of the world; (iii) acquire an holistic conception of their capacities and potential.
2. Perspective consciousness—students should: (i) recognize that they have a worldview that is not universally shared; (ii) develop receptivity to other perspectives
3. Health of planet awareness— students should: (i) acquire an awareness and understanding of the global condition and of global developments and trends; (ii) develop an informed understanding of the concepts of justice, human rights and responsibilities and be able to apply that understanding to the global condition; (iii) develop a future orientation in their reflection upon the health of the planet.
4. Involvement consciousness and preparedness—Students should (i) become aware that the choices they make and the actions they take individually and collectively have repercussions for the global

present and the global future; (iii) develop the social and political action skills necessary for becoming effective participants in democratic decision-making at a variety of levels, grassroots to global. 5. Process mindedness—Students should: (i) learn that learning and personal development are continuous journeys with no fixed or final destination; (ii) learn that new ways of seeing the world are revitalizing but risky (Hicks, 2003, pg. 268).

These aims are achieved through the global education curriculum that includes the following four dimensions:

1. Issues dimension—This embraces five major problem areas (and solutions to them): inequality/equality; injustice/justice; conflict/peace; environmental damage/care; alienation/ participation
2. Spatial dimension—This emphasizes exploration of the local-global connections that exist in relation to these issues, including the nature of both interdependency and dependency
3. Temporal dimension—This emphasizes exploration of the interconnections that exist between past, present and future in relation to such issues and in particular scenarios of preferred futures
4. Process dimension—This emphasizes a participatory and experiential pedagogy which explores differing value perspectives and leads to politically aware local-global citizenship. (Hicks, 2003, p. 271).

In a practical light, there is no space to add a new curriculum subject into an already crowded day; therefore global education must be infused throughout the curricula. Hendrix (1998) is adamant about this point, arguing that if it were a separate subject, the subject would be "ghettoized" or fall under the responsibility of the teacher who has an interest in the field. He stresses that it needs to be the responsibility of all educators. Wessel (1992) confirms that "examination of the curricular documents and discussion with both curricular developers and teachers leads to the conclusion that the integrative approach of core curriculum is an appropriate vehicle for global education" (p. 6)

Summary of Literature

The literature has focused on defining the field of global education, emphasizing its importance and how global education should be approached by school systems. It has reinforced that global education is the responsibility of all educators. Yet, educators are major obstacles to the implementation of global concepts.

Lack of understanding, lack of appropriate teacher training, lack of resources and lack of time have been identified as reasons why teachers are not global educators. However, according to one study, (Wessel, 1991) teachers with overseas experience, who teach in the separate system and the French immersion program, include more global education concepts in their lessons.

What the research does not answer is if curriculum promotes or hinders the implementation of global education. The literature explains that there are global education curriculum models and criteria by which a curriculum can be judged to determine if it promotes global education. For the purpose of my study, I will analyze Saskatchewan curricula to determine if it holds these criteria and thereby determine if it is, or is not, a reason why Saskatchewan teachers are not global educators.

Chapter 3

METHODOLOGY

The question that I am seeking to answer is: Do the philosophy, concepts and goals of the four core Grade Eight Saskatchewan curricula require teachers to be global educators? The reason why I am delimiting my study to the Grade Eight curricula are explained in a later paragraph. The question and my theoretical frameworks have provided a source and direction to my research methodology. To accommodate my theoretical frameworks and to pursue my question, I shall be using quantitative and qualitative methods examine sections of particular curricula. In this chapter I explain why the curricula I have chosen are a valid source for analysis, as well as how this source and my theoretical framework are best approached through text analysis. Also, I will explain what areas of curriculum will be researched, then how the information will be gathered and analyzed.

A general definition of curriculum is “anything and everything that teaches a lesson, planned or otherwise” (Wilson, 2002). To accommodate this definition there are various forms of curriculum. A few examples are the hidden curriculum, societal curriculum and the explicit or written curriculum. The hidden curriculum speaks to the rituals of learning. Classroom arrangements, timetables, students raising their hands and school calendars are aspects of this curriculum. Informal education can be classified under societal curriculum. It is the education that we receive from our peers, families, jobs and neighbourhoods. It is ongoing education. My analysis of curriculum pertains

to the written curriculum. “Written curriculum is simply that which is written as part of formal instruction of the schooling experience...[it] is usually confined to those written understandings and directions formally designated and reviewed by administrators, curriculum directors and teachers often collectively” (Wilson, 2002). In Saskatchewan, as in all Canadian provinces, the written curriculum for each subject and grade is contained in a curriculum guide. Due to my focus on the written curriculum, whenever I refer to curriculum or curricula, it is the written curriculum in the form of the curriculum guide that I am referring to.

The written curriculum has been chosen for my research source due to its potential usefulness to teachers and what it represents. Teachers have numerous tools. We have our teaching skills, our content knowledge, textbooks, resources, blackboards, overheads and the list goes on. To guide us in the use of these tools, are curricula. The curriculum gives the teacher aims, objectives and goals for a course. It suggests resources, lesson plans and teaching strategies. Assessment rubrics and strategies can also be accessed through the curriculum. The curriculum should be a main building block from which a teacher constructs his or her program for the year and it is the expectation of principals and Directors of Education that it is.

While some critics may misconstrue that curricula are latent, invalid documents that are stashed in a cupboard and not used, this is not the case. While deciding on my research method and considering the limits of my research, I approached my schools Grade Eight Mathematics, Science and English teachers to borrow their individual curricula. All three teachers had their curriculum within an arms reach of their desks. When I asked if I could take the curriculum to look at it, it was only allowed with the assurance that it will be returned to them quickly. Despite the fact that all of us have

access to our curricula through the internet, we all want and have our own copies in our classrooms, for they are valuable to us and they are referred to on a regular basis.

While I do not argue that these three teachers are representative of the majority, I do argue that if teachers chose to access the curriculum, a curriculum aids a teacher in developing a yearly program, a unit of study and a daily lesson. Therefore, I wish to determine if the curriculum is an aid or a barrier to teachers being global educators.

As stated earlier by Osborne, a curriculum “describes what teachers are expected to teach and therefore what students are required to learn” (Osborne, 1990, p. 31). What goes into a curriculum is what a culture or society believes is important and valued for there is a “hegemonic relationship exerted by a culture through the curriculum” (Ross, 2000, p. 8). The curriculum is the knowledge, values and skills that a society deems important and wishes to be passed to upcoming generations. Therefore, our Saskatchewan curriculum is a discourse as to what curriculum developers and the provincial government believe is important. If global education is important to Saskatchewan educators, it should be evident in curricula, therefore by analyzing the curriculum I will be able to determine if global education is a component that has been included to assist teachers in developing global knowledge, values and skills with students.

My post-modernist view leads to my belief that curriculum should encourage and promote voices and perspectives that have not been heard in the past. In order for our world to move forward, we need to recognize the realities of our past, but weave in new stories, voices and perspectives. As a post-colonialist who spent the first part of my life in a developing nation, I have a substantial interest in power-relations. My post-colonialist theoretical frame-work stems from the belief that our world politics and

economics are heavily influenced by the power-relationships that evolved and continue to evolve from a colonial past. As a post-colonialist I am interested in “points of resistance to domination” (Mongham, 2003) and I see global education as a means to do this. Through textual analysis, or a “close reading” of curricula I will try to determine if these concepts are present and to what extent.

[Text] analysis is a technique for examining information, or content, in written or symbolic material...In [text] analysis, a researcher first identifies a body of material to analyze and then creates a system for recording specific aspects of it. The system might include counting how often certain words or themes occur. Finally, the researcher records what was found in the material. He or she often measures information in the content as numbers...[text] analysis is used for exploratory and explanatory research but is often used in descriptive research (Newman, 1997, p.31).

Text-based analysis is valid to research because of both the ontological and epistemological positions that it reveals. The text, which in this case is the curriculum, is a live, valid document that has much to say about a society, group or organization. People are products of a culture, and by interviewing or observing them you can learn much about what a society does or believes is important. This same process can be applied to text. The curriculum has been made by and approved by Saskatchewan educators and government officials. It is a product of our Saskatchewan society. We can “read aspects of the social world” (Mason, 1996, p. 72) through text and in this case, curriculum. This is its ontological importance.

The curriculum speaks through the words, text and graphics that it contains. The words, text and graphics are the evidence of the ontological position. If the curriculum designers wished for the curriculum document to bear witness that global education concepts are important and that teachers are required to be global educators, there should

be evidence of that in the document. It is by this evidence that we have the epistemological value of text. It is the proof of what the document has to say.

Leavy (2000) explains these two factors that are present in a document when she states, “the themes exist within the artifacts independent and prior to the research process and through a careful process of selection and analysis [you can] extract those already present themes” (Leavy, 2000, p. 3). The connection of these thoughts to curriculum is that the curriculum holds the values of our society. Through text analysis I will be able to read the evidence to determine if one of the values we require our educators to promote to our students is global education.

The evidence I shall be gathering will be in the form of keywords. A keyword is “a word or thing that is of great importance or significance; specifically on information-retrieved systems, any informative word in the title or text of a document, etc., chosen as indicating the main content of the document” (Durant, 2007, p.3). By this definition, if I locate, count and analyze keywords that represent global education concepts I will have a greater understanding of whether or not the curriculum document does require Saskatchewan teachers to be global educators.

Further on in this chapter I will explain how the keywords that I will be searching for were chosen. Presently, it is important to mention that while a keyword approach to analyzing documents is a successful form of analyzing text (Allan, 2006; Durant, 2007), there are limits that I shall have to overcome. The greatest challenge is to take into account the context of the word. While a word that represents a global education concept may be apparent in the document, within its context, the meaning may not represent a global education idea. There is also the possibility that a global

education concept may exist in the document, however not hold one of the keywords that I have decided to use in my study.

The text I shall be analyzing is sections of the Grade Eight English Language Arts, Social Studies, Science, and Mathematics curricula. The specific sections I shall analyze are from the introductory sections titled: Introduction; Program Aim; Goals; Principles; Development Characteristics of Middle Level Students and Instructional Implications; and the Core Curriculum Components and Initiatives. I will also analyze the Foundational Objectives in each of these four core curricula.

The reason for choosing curriculum at the Grade Eight level comes from personal observation. As a Grade Seven through Eleven Social Studies and History teacher, I have noticed that the most globally-oriented curriculum at these levels is the Grade Eight Social Studies curriculum titled, “The Individual in Society”. The units for this curriculum are titled Culture, Identity, Citizenship and Interdependence. Three of the titles, Culture, Citizenship and Interdependence fall directly under Merryfield and White’s, Kniep’s, Hanvey’s and Selby’s requirements for a global curriculum. Due to the strong global content in the Grade Eight Social Studies curriculum I am curious to see if curriculum designers kept that emphasis throughout the Grade Eight level, or whether they restricted the emphasis of global education to the Social Studies teacher, and did not make it a requirement for the other subject teachers.

I am focusing on the above mentioned sections because activities, units and resources stem from Aims, Goals and Objectives. If global concepts are not enforced in these sections, then they are not going to be a focus in individual units and the teacher is once again left without a curriculum to assist him or her as a global educator. Because global education incorporates a pedagogical style that is student-centered and

participatory, I felt it was necessary to analyze the section that deals with instructional implications to determine if this global factor is included.

Mathematics, Science, English Language Arts and Social Studies are core subjects. They must be taken at the Grade Eight level; therefore, if curriculum designers want a concept enforced, the most effective way of doing it is through these four subjects. That is why I am not analyzing all Grade Eight curricula, but delimiting the study to the four core subject areas.

The data will be collected and further analyzed through cross-referencing and recorded on a chart. There will be a separate chart for each curriculum. Each chart will have the headings of the section of the curriculum being analyzed on the left hand side. At the top of the chart will be three categories: Content; Action and Pedagogy. The chart will be filled in with quotations drawn from the curricula that contain various keywords that correspond with the categories. The categories and the keywords have been derived from further study of global definitions and global curriculum requirements that were previously discussed in the literature review.

In the literature review I stated that there are three predominant factors in global education. From an understanding of these factors I have developed the three category labels I will use to refer to the aspects of global education that should be found in a curriculum. The categories and the corresponding factors are: Content - content that allows students to develop a respect for and awareness of the pluralistic and diverse world of which they are a part; Action - a call to action and change, or citizenship on a global level; Pedagogy - a student-centered pedagogical style that allows for multiple perspectives.

After a perusal of Hanvey's (1976) and Selby's(1998) requirements for a global curriculum I determined where their requirements overlapped and where they did not, and have combined their ideas into the list of requirements below. Each of the requirements suggests 'keywords' that I can use in my text analysis. The global requirements and the prompt words, in brackets, are:

- *Perspective Consciousness*: (a) the recognition or awareness on the part of the individual that he or she has a view of the world that is not universally shared, that this view of the world continues to be shaped by influences that often escapes conscious detection, and that others have views of the world that are profoundly different from one's own.(b) Multiple perspectives. (perspectives, diverse, pluralistic)
- *State of the Planet Awareness/Issues Dimension*: (a) awareness of prevailing world conditions and development, including emergent conditions and trends.(b) Political issues. (c) Inequality/equality; injustice/justice; conflict/peace; environmental damage/care; alienation/participation. (universal, global, political, equality, justice, conflict, environment, equity, rights and peace)
- *Cross-Cultural Awareness*: (a) awareness of the diversity of ideas and practices to be found in human societies around the world, of how such ideas and practices compare, and including some limited recognition of how the ideas and ways of one's own society might be viewed from other vantage points. (culture, race)
- *Knowledge of Global Dynamics/ Spatial Dimension/ Temporal Dimension*: (a) Some modest comprehension of key trails and

mechanisms of the world system, with emphasis on theories and concepts that may increase intelligent consciousness of global change.

(b) Emphasizes exploration of the interconnectedness that exists between past/present and future in relation to such issues and in particular scenarios of preferred futures. (c) Emphasizes exploration of the local-global connection that exist between past/present/future in relation to these issues, including the nature of both interdependency and dependency. (international, interconnected, interdependency)

- *Awareness of Human Choices/Process Dimension:* (a) some awareness of the problems of choice confronting individuals, nations and the human species as consciousness and knowledge of the global system expands. (b) Leads to local-global citizenship. (awareness, participation, co-operation, citizenship, contribution, responsibility, membership, social/community development)
- *Process Dimension:* (a) This emphasizes a participatory and experiential pedagogy which explores differing value perspectives and leads to politically aware local-global citizenship. (student-centered, varied pedagogy, participatory, critical thinkers, active learning, student-involvement, collaborative, explore, create, question and interactive)

These global requirements can be grouped under the three category labels of global education that I derived. I have grouped categories, requirements and keywords as follows:

The Content category includes the Perspective Consciousness, State of the Planet Awareness, Cross Cultural Awareness and Knowledge of Global Dynamics requirements. The keywords for this category are: perspective; global; culture, equality;

justice; conflict; peace; environment; interconnected; interdependency; diverse; international; universal; race; pluralistic; rights and equity.

The Action category aligns with the Awareness of Human Choice requirements and the keywords are: citizenship; co-operation; awareness; participation; contribution; responsibility; membership and social/community development.

The Pedagogy category includes the Process dimension requirement and the keywords are: student-centered; participatory; varied pedagogy; critical thinkers; active learning; student involvement; collaborative; explore; create; question and interactive.

After the curricula have been reviewed and the four charts completed, my analysis of the data will include examination of how often a keyword appears, examination of the meaning of keywords in context and examination of where the keyword is being used. It will be important to look at all three of these aspects, because as mentioned earlier, while one of the keywords may appear often, it might not be used in connection to global education. Merely counting how often the keywords are used can be misleading when determining the emphasis the curriculum is placing on global education. To clarify emphasis, I will also be analyzing where the word appears, for if it appears in a heading, or as a unit title for example, it gives the concept greater importance and emphasis than if it appears in common text.

During my analysis, I will also do a comparison to see how the data gathered in each category of global education is portrayed across the four curricula. The data can also be used to answer or explore questions like: Does the data support the idea that the Social Studies teacher is the only one expected to be the global education teacher? If not, is there a curriculum that dominates in the representation of global education concepts? Which curriculum has the least global education elements? Is there a

category that is represented more than the other? Is there a category that is lacking representation?

These questions stem from certain assumptions that I have before I even begin the research. The first assumption that I have is that the Social Studies curriculum is going to have the greatest amount of global concepts of the four core curricula. This assumption comes from personal experience and the research discussed in the literature review. From my experience with my staff, there is the understanding that a social justice issue or a global issue is the Social Studies teacher's responsibility. Speaking with other Social Studies teachers, they share similar experiences. Environmental issues and concerns do appear to be a global education responsibility that is shared by a larger number of staff members, however as Wessel's study states, "Some people view Social Studies as the major vehicle for global education" (p. 7).

While I do predict that environmental issues will be tackled in the Science curriculum, I also predict that the curriculum with the second highest amount of global concepts will be the English Language Arts curriculum. This assumption simply stems from the belief that a variety of global issues can be dealt with in the literature choices of an English Language Arts curriculum. Therefore, if the philosophy, concepts and goals of an English Language Arts program required a teacher to be a global educator, it would not be a difficult task for the teacher to carry out.

The other assumption that I carry pertains to citizenship. The aim of the Social Studies program is that students not only see themselves as citizens of their nation, but "**citizens of an interdependent world**" [**Bolded sic**] (p. 3). While I do not expect the concept of global citizenship to be a requirement of all four curricula, I do predict that education for citizenship to be a requirement of the other three curricula. The lack of

expectation for global citizenship is connected with the perception that global education is the responsibility of the Social Studies teacher. It is possible, and I am curious to see if my data agrees, that this perception exists and stems from the fact that the curriculum does give global education responsibilities to the Social Studies teacher and not to the other subject teachers. However, I do assume that all curricula encourage and require learning for students to carry out their role as citizens.

My final assumption aligns with which global education category: Content; Action and Pedagogy would be the most represented. A great deal of the research has fed my own personal philosophy of education, which is that we do not want students to acquire knowledge and skills, we want them to do something with what they have learned, not only for themselves, but for society. That is why I believe the Action category, which gives a societal purpose to education will be a prevalent strand of the three global education categories.

Using a mixed method, text analysis research methodology, I hope to clarify these assumptions and determine if the philosophy, concepts and goals of the four core Grade Eight Saskatchewan curricula require teachers to be global educators.

Chapter 4

ANALYSIS

Introduction

The results of my text analysis are revealed in this chapter. For clarity, my analysis will be discussed according to the categories that were used to gather the data: Content, Action and Pedagogy. For each of the categories a quantitative and qualitative analysis was done; that is, it was important to look at not only how often keywords appeared, but also where they appeared and how the keywords were used to get an accurate representation of how global concepts were used in the four core Grade Eight curricula.

When I refer to the curriculum, I am referring to the areas of the curriculum that were analyzed. These areas varied slightly for each of the core curricula, depending on what was available to be analyzed. In the Social Studies curriculum the areas looked at were: Introduction; Program Aim; Goals; Principles; Development Characteristics of Middle Level Students and Curriculum Implications; Core Curriculum Components and Initiative and Foundational Objectives. The sections reviewed in the ELA curriculum were: Introduction; Aim and Goals; Implications for the Language Arts Program and for Teachers; Core Curriculum Components and Initiatives and the Learning Objectives. The Mathematics curriculum's analysis included: Philosophy, Aim and Goals; Core Curriculum Components and Initiatives and the Foundational Objectives. Finally, the sections looked at in the Science curriculum was: Philosophy, Aim and Goals;

Development Characteristics of Middle Level Students and Curriculum Implications and the Foundational and Learning Objectives.

These areas were analyzed because the Introduction sections of a curriculum (Program Aims, Goals, and Core Curriculum Components) explain the philosophy and ideals of a program and they give the teacher a general overview of what curriculum planners believe the course should involve. The Learning/Foundational Objectives of the curriculum emphasizes and in some cases, literally highlights what a specific unit must include. “Objectives are statements of desired outcomes. They describe what a student should achieve from their involvement in a particular subject area over a specified time frame” (Saskatchewan Learning, 2006, p. 31). The sections included in the Introduction aids the teacher in understanding the ideals of a curriculum and the Objectives aid the teacher in making the ideals a reality in the lessons and units he/she plans.

Analysis of Content Category

In a global education-based curriculum, the Content category refers to knowledge and awareness of global issues and concerns. As mentioned in the Methodology chapter, when you blend Hanvey’s and Selby’s models of a global curriculum, the content that should be covered in a global curriculum is:

- *Perspective Consciousness:* (a) the recognition or awareness on the part of the individual that he or she has a view of the world that is not universally shared, that this view of the world continues to be shaped by influences that often escapes conscious detection, and that others have views of the world that are profoundly different from one’s own.(b) Multiple perspectives.

- *State of the Planet Awareness/Issues Dimension:* (a) awareness of prevailing world conditions and development, including emergent conditions and trends. (b) Political issues. (c) Inequality/equality; injustice/justice; conflict/peace; environmental damage/care; alienation/participation.
- *Cross-Cultural Awareness:* (a) awareness of the diversity of ideas and practices to be found in human societies around the world, of how such ideas and practices compare, and including some limited recognition of how the ideas and ways of one's own society might be viewed from other vantage points.
- *Knowledge of Global Dynamics/ Spatial Dimension/ Temporal Dimension:* (a) Some modest comprehension of key trails and mechanisms of the world system, with emphasis on theories and concepts that may increase intelligent consciousness of global change. (b) Emphasizes exploration of the interconnectedness that exists between past/present and future in relation to such issues and in particular scenarios of preferred futures. (c) Emphasizes exploration of the local-global connection that exist between past/present/future in relation to these issues, including the nature of both interdependency and dependency.

Based on these notions as to what the content of a global education curriculum should be, the seventeen prompt words I chose to represent this category are: perspective; global; culture, equality; justice; conflict; peace; environment; interconnectedness; interdependency; diverse; international; universal; race; pluralistic; rights and equity.

The tally of the keywords representing ‘Content’ found in each curriculum is recorded in the following table. For each curriculum the number of times that a keyword appears in the Introduction section and the Objective section are shown:

Table 1

Distribution of Content Keywords

	Soc. St. Intr.	Social Studies Obj.	ELA Intro.	ELA Obj.	Science Intro.	Science Obj.	Math Intro.	Math Obj.	Overall
Perspective	14	0	11	0	4	0	4	0	33
Global	4	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	6
Culture	43	12	29	4	12	1	7	0	108
Equality	1	0	2	0	0	0	2	0	13
Justice	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Conflict	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Peace	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Environment	15	0	7	0	15	6	8	1	52
Interconnected	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Interdependency	2	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	6
Diverse	19	0	8	0	4	0	4	0	35
International	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Universal	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Race	2	0	5	1	0	0	0	0	8
Pluralistic	1	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	4
Rights	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Equity	8	0	14	0	6	0	5	0	33
Overall	110	16	79	5	51	8	31	1	301

As the chart shows, in the Social Studies curriculum 11 of the 17 keywords appear at least once. Nine of the 17 keywords appear at least once in the English Language Arts curriculum, while both the Science and Mathematics curricula have less

than half the keywords appearing at least once. The Science curriculum includes 8 of the 17 keywords, while the Mathematics curriculum only has 7 of the keywords.

To get a clearer comparison of how global education concepts are distributed amongst the four curricula, percent values can be used. Content keywords are used a total of 301 times across all four curricula. Content keywords appear in the Social Studies curriculum (110 + 16) 126 times. Therefore, out of total usage, Content keywords are used most in Social Studies curriculum, with 42% of total usage. The percent values for the English Language Arts, Science and Mathematics curricula are 28%, 20% and 10%. Due to the greater percent of Content keywords included in the Social Studies document, it stands to reason that the curriculum is a greater aid to the Social Studies teacher in implementing a global education program than it is to the Mathematics teacher.

Another point of interest when looking at the numbers is the distribution of keywords in each of the curricula. Out of the 126 times Content category keywords are used in the Social Studies curriculum, 110 instances are found in the Introduction section and 16 in the Objectives section. Therefore, out of all the times the Content keywords are used in the Social Studies document, they are only used 13% of the time in the Objectives section of this document. A similar pattern is seen in the other three curricula. In the ELA curriculum only 6% of the keywords are mentioned in the Objectives. In the Science curriculum about 14% are in the Objectives and the Mathematics curriculum has only 3% of the Content keywords in the Objectives. These percentage values show that while the curriculum may require or aid a teacher in understanding that global education concepts are expected to be addressed in their

program, the curriculum is of less assistance when it comes to helping the teacher implement these concepts in their lessons, or carry out the requirements.

The prompt word, culture, is the most highly used word in the four documents. It is used 108 times which equals about 36% of the total usage. The most significant use of the term culture is in the Social Studies curriculum. In this curriculum the prompt word is used 55 times, which represents about 18% of total usage, while in the ELA curriculum culture is used 33 times representing about 11% of total usage. The Science curriculum uses the term 13 times, representing about 4% and the Mathematics curriculum has 2% of the word usage as it appears only 7 times in that curriculum.

It is not only percent values that show that the Social Studies program contains a greater emphasis than the other curricula do on the term culture. This is also seen when you take into consideration that when culture is used in the Social Studies program, it is used at least once in reference to a unit heading, while it does not hold such a position of prominence in any of the other three programs. The fact that the word culture is a unit heading is of significance because the Grade Eight Social Studies program is divided into four units: Culture; Identity; Citizenship and Interdependence. The Social Studies document suggests, therefore, that one quarter of the year that students spend in Social Studies in Grade Eight should be focused on the topic, culture—the habits, customs and lifestyle of a group of people. This focus is not mirrored in the other programs.

The same holds true for the keyword, interdependency. When this keyword appears in the ELA curriculum it is used to explain the connection between the five learning outcomes students are expected to achieve as described in the section titled, *The Common Curriculum Framework*. The sentence here reads, “The five outcomes are interrelated and **interdependent** (bold added) and each can be achieved...” (p. 3). In

the Social Studies curriculum four out of the five times the keyword interdependent is used it is in connection with one of the four units in the curriculum. The unit 'Interdependence' states the objective that students must "know and explain ways in which all citizens and cultural groups are interdependent" (p. 17) and appreciate "that because all aspects of society are interconnected and interdependent there cannot be change without consequences" (p. 17). The ELA usage is in reference to the connection between language objectives and does not have a global education connotation. In comparison, the Social Studies usage, once again, has a strong global education component as it connects to the Knowledge of Global Dynamics/Spatial Dimension/Temporal strand which aims for students to be aware of "the interconnectedness that exists between past/present and future in relation to such issues and in particular scenarios of preferred futures" (Hanvey, 1976, p. 5- 34).

From these observations it was clarified that I should not only look at the numbers to determine the global content of the curricula. In order for the analysis to be complete I also had to look at how the words were used. My qualitative analysis of the Content category keywords began with the keyword, culture, as it is the word that appears the most in all the curricula. As stated earlier, it appears 55 times in the Social Studies curriculum and 33 times in the ELA curriculum. Hanvey states that a global curriculum must bring about an "awareness of the diversity of ideas and practices to be found in human societies around the world, of how such ideas and practices compare, and including some limited recognition of how the ideas and ways of one's own society might be viewed from other vantage points" (Hanvey, 1976, p. 5-34).

The fact that the word culture is used 55 times in the Social Studies curriculum supports the idea that this program includes global education components. The Social

Studies curriculum includes the keyword ‘culture’ in the section titled *Core Curriculum Component and Initiatives*, indicating that it is the obligation of educators to “Create a classroom environment in which students’ backgrounds, cultures, interests, language, thinking abilities and learning styles are accepted and respected” (p. 9) and that they should “incorporate multicultural content and perspectives in units of study to extend students’ understanding and appreciation of cultural diversity and richness” (p. 10). Both of these quotes align with the Perspective Consciousness strand of the Content category that calls for “Multiple perspectives” and the Cross-Cultural Awareness strand that says a global curriculum should promote “A general understanding of the defining characteristic of world cultures with an emphasis on understanding differences and similarities” (Diaz, Maasialas and Xanthopoulos, 1999, p. 271).

Both the Perspective Consciousness and the Cross-Cultural Awareness strands are further emphasized in the specific learning objectives of the Culture unit of the Social Studies program. The Knowledge/Content focus of that unit is to:

- Know that culture is learned and is ever changing
- Explain and give examples of the seven patterns of culture: economic, political, kinship, artistic, religious, educational and recreational.
- Identify relationships among the patterns of culture (p. 17).

The Values/Attitudes of that unit are:

- Demonstrate sensitivity toward, and appreciation for, all cultural groups.
- Appreciate the need for accuracy in the portrayal of peoples of every culture (p.17).

Due to the number of times and the manner in which the word culture is used in both the Introduction and the Objectives of the Social Studies curriculum, there is a noticeable representation of the Perspective Consciousness and the Cross-Cultural Awareness strands of Hanvey and Selby’s global education curriculum.

While the ELA curriculum does not have a unit assigned to culture, the word does appear 33 times and the ways in which the keyword is used in the 33 locations reflect Hanvey's idea of a global curriculum. In the *Core Curriculum Components and Initiatives* section, the ELA curriculum recognizes that "Students grow up in homes that are culturally and linguistically diverse" (p. 12), that we need to "Affirm cultural backgrounds of students" (p. 12) and "Respect cultural perspectives that may differ from one's own" (p. 11). These quotes show that the use of the term, culture in the ELA curriculum does reflect the Perspective Consciousness strand.

The Perspective Consciousness strand is further enforced under the **Multicultural Content and Perspectives** (original bolded) heading that is found under Core Curriculum Components. The curriculum states that:

A multicultural perspective should permeate the English language arts program and reflect all peoples' experiences. Some guidelines follow. The program should:

- Address the various cultural groups in a country and model respect for cultural and linguistic diversity.
- Reflect an awareness of stereotyping and generalization. It should acknowledge the difference among individuals within the same culture.
- Reflect an awareness that class, gender, region, and religion all influence individuals.
- Help students see historical events from a variety of perspectives. Students need to understand the social, economic, and cultural history of people, not just military heroism or campaigns.
- Use culturally relevant literature as it is particularly important for all students to see their lives and experiences reflected in literature.
- Include texts that are representative of various cultural backgrounds promoting sensitivity and an awareness of potential cultural and gender bias (p.14).

Although there is the inclusion of cultural content in these two curricula what is missing is "reality." Selby states that a global curriculum must include the "Issues

dimension – This embraces five major problem areas (and solutions to them): inequality/equality; injustice/justice; conflict/peace” (Hicks, 2003, p. 271).

The prompt word, equality, appears only twice in the ELA curriculum and once in the Social Studies curriculum. Conflict does not appear in the ELA curriculum and it only appears once in the Social Studies curriculum. The words peace and justice appear in neither of the documents.

Curriculum constructors appear to recognize that we have a world, a tapestry, that is dynamic due to its cultural diversity, but by excluding keywords that refer to ‘problem areas’, and therefore these issues, they do not recognize the flaws in the tapestry. Mathison (1994) did express the concern that “we may avoid discussion of values for fear that such discussions might convey a disrespect or disapproval of one particular cultural belief system or another” (p. 5). To counter that concern, researchers (Banks, 2001; Brown and Kysilka, 2002; Mathison, 1994) argued that deep awareness and sensitivity will not be developed, and in turn solutions will be difficult to develop, if issues of inequality, peace and justice are not addressed. Grade Eight students are young and should be encouraged to recognize and respect differences. They should be encouraged to celebrate the diversity of cultures in their world. Yet, they should be aware that conflict, inequality and injustice does exist between cultures and not on a superficial level that causes hurt feelings by name calling, but on a deep level that causes poverty, malnutrition and loss of life.

While one can be pleased with the amount of times that the prompt word culture is used, one has to look at where it is used in the curriculum. Out of the 55 times that the word culture is used in the Social Studies curriculum, 43 times it appears in the Introduction section and 12 times it appears in the Objectives section. Therefore, only

22% of the time that the keyword is used in that curriculum is it found in the Objectives section - the section that directly relates to the lesson planning for teachers. A similar pattern is seen in the other three curricula. Out of the 33 times that the word culture appears in the ELA program, 88 percent of the time it is found in the Introduction section and only 12 percent of the time it is found in the Objectives. The Science curriculum only mentions the prompt word about 8% in the Objectives section and the Mathematics curriculum does not mention it at all in its Objectives.

From these numbers one can argue that curriculum planners do believe that the Perspective Consciousness and Cross-Cultural strands of Hanvey's and Selby's models of a global curriculum should be included in a course. However, the curriculum needs to provide greater assistance to the teacher in implementing these strands by including these strands at a greater concentration in the Objectives section.

The word environment appears quite consistently in all four curricula. Due to this consistency, I have also chosen to take a closer look at how the keyword, environment, is used in the four curricula. In the Social Studies curriculum it appears 15 times, 7 times in the ELA curriculum, 9 times in the Mathematics curriculum and 21 times in the Science curriculum. Hanvey's global curriculum calls for "Knowledge of Global Dynamics," which is, "Some modest comprehension of key trails and mechanisms of the world system, with emphasis on theories and concepts that may increase intelligent consciousness of global change" (Hanvey, 1976, p. 5 - 34). The condition of our earth has been described as one that is in crisis for it has been said that due to global warming, "No one can say exactly what it looks like when a planet takes ill, but it probably looks a lot like Earth" (Kluger, 2006, p. 31). Pike and Selby say that a global curriculum should address "environmental damage/care" (Hicks, 2003, p.268).

Clearly, these global education proponents advocate for inclusion of content that explores global environmental issues.

The keyword, environment, is used fifteen times in the Social Studies curriculum. Out of the fifteen times, it is used twice in the context referenced by Hanvey and Selby. In the *Introduction* the curriculum explains that:

Social Studies education can be defined as the study of people and their relationships with their social, physical and technological environments...It provides them with opportunities to make connections between their own and others communities, cultures and environments, and to take action in relevant and meaningful ways that give them a sense of accomplishment and a belief that they can make a difference (p. 3).

From this statement one can argue that curriculum planners do echo Hanvey and Selby's belief that humans are in a relationship with their environment and they do have a responsibility to see what affects that relationship. There is also the hope that students will take action to improve that relationship.

While 9 out of 15 times the word environment is used it does not refer to the content that Pike and Selby and Hanvey suggest, I argue that use of the keyword in these nine locations does have a global education connection because reference is made to a learning environment that encourages many voices to be heard and for students to feel comfortable with their differences. This is a pedagogical style that is promoted in a global education curriculum. In the *Developmental Characteristics of Middle Level students and Instructional Implications* section teachers are encouraged to "provide a safe learning environment that affirms diversity and encourages risk-taking" (p. 5). Later on, in the *Core Curriculum Components and Initiatives* section under the *Adaptive Dimension* section, further encouragement is given to "Create a classroom environment in which students' backgrounds, cultures, interests, language, thinking abilities and

learning styles are accepted and respected” (p. 9). Hence, while the keyword ‘environment’ is not often used in reference to the content of global education within the Social Studies curricula, it is used to support global education pedagogy—that is, the Process Dimension strand that “emphasizes a participatory and experiential pedagogy which explores differing values perspectives...”(Hicks, 2003, p.271).

A similar pattern is seen in the ELA curriculum. Of the 11 times that the keyword environment is used, it refers only once to the impact that humans are having on the environment. In the *Core Curriculum Components* under the **Personal and Social Development** [original bolded] subtitle, the ELA document declares that students are to “Deepen understanding of the meanings of “respect” and demonstrate abilities to show genuine respect for self, other people, living things, possessions, and environments” (p. 11). However, similar to the Social Studies document, the ELA curriculum uses the keyword, environment, 6 times when referring to a learning environment that allows students to “Grow as independent learners within a classroom environment that promotes self-esteem, curiosity, competence, and trust” (p. 11). That is, the ELA document uses the word when referring to a learning environment that supports students developing feelings of empowerment - which is, once again, a form of global education pedagogy. The English Language Arts further promotes this form of pedagogy by encouraging teachers to use “The Adaptive Dimension [that] requires that English language arts teachers make adjustments to their instruction, environment, and resources in order to accommodate student diversity” (p. 12) and reminding teachers that “All students have a right to a learning environment that is gender equitable” (p. 14).

In the Mathematics curriculum, while there are nine uses of the word environment, none of them are in connection to the Content category of Hanvey’s and

Selby's global education models. Although the Mathematics document uses the term twice in reference to particular locations in the environment – for example, under the *Indian and Metis Curriculum Perspectives* heading, which reads “Saskatchewan Indian and Metis Students come from varied cultural backgrounds and geographic areas encompassing northern, rural, and urban environments.”—references of this nature are only tangentially connected to the content requirements of a global education curriculum. However, once again, seven of the locations where the term environment is used in the Mathematics documents refer to a global pedagogical style that promotes the voices of all students. In the *Core Curriculum Components* section, under the bold heading of gender equity it is ascribed that “These actions will assist teachers to create an environment free of bias and enable all students to share in experiences and opportunities that develop their abilities and talents to the fullest” (p. 7).

In comparison, in the Science curriculum, 14 of the 21 times that the keyword environment is used it is in reference to the Content category of Hanvey's and Selby's global education models. Hanvey's and Selby's belief that students should be aware of how we are affecting and what is affecting the environment is mirrored in the *Core Curriculum Components* section when it is explained that:

Many scientific and technical skills in use today exist because of materials and instruments which have been developed through advances in technology. The impact that these new things have on our lives and on the environment is very important (p. 15).

Under the *Foundational and Learning Objectives* students and teachers are called to:

Examine how living things alter their environment.

1. Find examples of succession in the ecosystem of your area.
2. Observe and describe the rate of environmental change.
3. Assess how living organisms contribute to environmental change (p. 804).

Further on, the Science curriculum indicates that students should develop the ability to “Assess the impact that the search for, extraction of, and refining of fossil fuels has on Saskatchewan and Canadian environments” (p. 816).

Seven of the times that the word environment is used in the Science curriculum do not pertain to developing understanding of how the environment is being jeopardized or affected, but these locations include Hanvey’s strand of Knowledge of Global Dynamics as they make reference to students having a better relationship with the environment as well as improving their knowledge of what the environment affects. In the *Philosophy, Aim and Goals* of the program it states:

- understand and accurately apply appropriated science concepts, principles, laws and theories in interacting with society and the environment;
- understand and appreciate the joint enterprises of science and technology and the relationships of these to each other in the context of society and the environment;
- interact with the various aspects of society and the environment in ways that are consistent with the values that underlie science; and
- develop a unique view of technology, society, and the environment as a result of science education, and continue to extend this interest and attitude throughout life (p.1).

In the remaining locations where the word environment is used in the Science curriculum, they are, once again, in reference to the learning environment.

According to the data gathered from the four curricula the only teacher who appears to have the responsibility for educating Grade 8 students about environmental care and protection issues would appear to be the Science teacher. Presently we face a world that is in jeopardy from global warming. Global warming is causing a combination of droughts and floods, both of which are putting the world’s food supply in jeopardy. Global warming is a direct result of human activity (Kluger, 2006, p.31). Should it only be the Science teacher’s responsibility to educate children about this?

Would it not be a more effective strategy for tackling global warming if this issue was explored across the curriculum?

Content Analysis Conclusions

The analysis of the content category supported some of the assumptions that I held before I began the research, but also revealed some new insights. Overall, in the four core curricula there is a greater distribution of global education terms representing the Content strands of global education in the Introduction sections than there are in the Objectives section. The limited focus of global education Content keywords in the Objectives section hinders teachers from being global educators because this is the section that is the greatest aid to teachers when designing a unit or a lesson.

Further, there is an unequal representation of the Hanvey and Selby global education strands. I was not surprised that the curriculum with the most global education terms is the Social Studies curriculum and that this curriculum, as well as the ELA curriculum, encourages recognition and respect for cultural diversity. These two curricula include the Perspective Consciousness and Cross Cultural Awareness strands. However, both of these curricula have low representation of the State of the Planet Awareness/Issues Dimension and Knowledge of Global Dynamics/Spatial Dimension/Temporal Dimension strands. These curricula do not deal with environmental issues, or issues of conflict, equality or peace. Therefore one can conclude that they are ineffectual global education curricula.

On the other hand, the Science curriculum, with some focus on environmental issues, includes the global education strands, State of the Planet Awareness/Issues Dimension and Knowledge of Global Dynamics/Spatial Dimension/Temporal

Dimension. However, the Science curriculum also shows an imbalance because it does not deeply address Perspective Consciousness and Cross Cultural Awareness strands.

The Mathematics curriculum has the least global education content of the four curricula. This is a striking observation because the Mathematics teacher has 200 minutes per week of teaching time for his or her subject area while the Social Studies and Science teacher only has 150 minutes per week. Therefore, it is unfortunate that the Mathematics curriculum provides the least aid to a teacher to implement a global education program.

From the analysis of the Content category of the four core Grade 8 curricula, I have determined that curricula do not require Saskatchewan teachers to be global educators in the Content category. The lack of global education keywords in the Objectives sections and also the lack of representation or low representation of certain global education strands indicate that teachers may not read global education as a requirement.

Analysis of the Action Category

The Action category of a global education curriculum is vital. Anderson, Nicklaus and Crawford (1995) state that global education is:

an education for all students that will enable them to see themselves as HUMAN BEINGS whose home is PLANET EARTH who are citizens...and who LEARN, CARE, THINK, CHOOSE AND ACT to celebrate life on this planet and to meet the global challenges confronting human kind [uppercase, *sic*] (p. 5)

Agnew and Fincham (2004) echo the view that global education is a call to youth for action when they explain that global education can empower “young people with the vision...that they have an active role to play in creating a better world” (p. 50).

Citizenship, as taught in the Grade Eight Social Studies curriculum, is not only about having rights in a society, it is about being responsible in a society and to a society. There is a lesson in the Grade Eight Social Studies Citizenship unit that aims at helping students understand that for every right we enjoy in Canada, there is an associated responsibility. Responsibility calls for a sense of duty accompanied by action. The role of action in citizenship is emphasized by Kingwell (2000) who states that “What we need now is a new model of citizenship based on the act of participation itself...it makes action at once the condition and the task of citizenship” (p.12)

Hanvey supports these views in his global education model when he says that a global education curriculum should have “A review of strategies for action on issues in local, national, and international settings” (Diaz, Maasialas and Xanthopoulos, 1999, p. 67). Pike and Selby further promote this with their suggestion that a global education curriculum “leads to politically aware local-global citizenship” (Hicks, 2003, p. 271).

Based on these ideas, I selected the following words to represent the Action category: citizenship; co-operation; awareness; participation; contribution; responsibility; membership; social/community development. The tally indicating the number of Action keywords found in each curriculum is divided into the Introduction and Objectives sections in the following table.

Table 2

Distribution of Action Keywords

	Social Studies Intro.	Social Studies Obj.	ELA Intro.	ELA Obj.	Science Intro.	Science Obj.	Math. Intro.	Math. Obj.	Overall
--	-----------------------	---------------------	------------	----------	----------------	--------------	--------------	------------	---------

Citizenship	3	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	12
Co-operation	4	0	1	0	3	1	2	1	12
Awareness	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Participation	5	4	5	0	2	2	2	0	20
Contribution	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	1	4
Responsibility	3	1	6	0	3	1	3	1	18
Membership	5	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	9
Social/Community Development	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	4
Overall	20	14	16	0	9	9	8	3	79

At first glance, it is pleasing to note that out of the eight keywords representing the Action category, six of them appear in the Social Studies curriculum. However, only four of them appear in the ELA curriculum and five of the eight words appear in both the Science and the Mathematics curricula.

The fact that the Social Studies program is the most global education oriented out of the four core Grade eight curricula is once again supported by the quantitative analysis of the Action category. The total number of times that the Action keywords appear in the four curricula is 79. Similar to the Content category, the keywords appear the most in the Social Studies curriculum. The Social Studies curriculum uses the Action category keywords 34 times, which amounts to 43% of total usage. The Science curriculum has a slight lead on the ELA curriculum using the keywords 18 times, which represents 23% of total usage, while the ELA curriculum used the keywords 16 times or

20% of total usage. Once again, the Mathematics curriculum has the lowest amount of keywords with a count of 11, which is 14% of total usage.

After looking at the distribution of keywords in the Introduction and Objectives section I detected a similar problem in the Action category in the distribution of keywords as I did in the Content category. None of the keywords representing Action are found in the ELA Objectives section. In the Mathematics curriculum, although the words are used 11 times altogether, they are used only three times—or 27% of the time they are used in this curriculum, in the Objectives section.

The Social Studies and Science curricula do show a more promising distribution. In the Social Studies curriculum 14 out of the 34 keywords are in the Objectives section, which is 41%. In the Science curriculum, keyword usage is evenly split between the Introduction and Objectives sections with nine in each to give a 50% representation to each of the sections. Despite this more fair representation in the Science curriculum, I do argue that the majority of the Action keywords found in the four curricula are located in the philosophical Introduction sections and not in the practical Objectives sections.

As is stated by Osborne (2001) that “From the very beginnings, public schools in Canada, as in other countries, were expected to prepare the young for citizenship” (p. 12). Despite citizenship being a focus of education, the word citizenship only appears once in the Mathematics curriculum and it does not appear at all in the English Language Arts or Science curricula. It does appear eleven times in the Social Studies curriculum, however, which represents about 32% of keyword usage in that curriculum. Actually, at an appearance of 11 times, no other Action keyword is used as often as the word citizenship in one curriculum, even though its usage is restricted predominantly to the Social Studies curriculum.

Due to the belief that education focuses on citizenship and because the keyword does have 32% representation in the Social Studies curriculum I decided to look at how the word was used in the Social Studies curriculum. The Social Studies *Program Aim* states in bold, “**The ultimate aim is to graduate students who have a sense of themselves as active participants in and citizens of an interdependent world**” (p. 3). Under the *Principles* heading it also states that “Students learn to be effective citizens locally and globally, when they see themselves as active participants in an interdependent world” (p. 4). It goes on to explain that “Instruction should provide opportunities to develop, value and practice citizenship skills as students explore, reflect on and assess issues, construct thoughtful points of view, and recommend and engage in appropriate actions based upon adequate knowledge and consideration” (p. 4). These aims and principles all reflect the Awareness of Human Choices/Process Dimension strand suggested by Hanvey and Selby that says that a global education curriculum should have “A review of strategies for action on issues in local, national and international settings” (Diaz, Maasialas and Xanthopoulos, 1999, p. 67) and that it should lead to “politically aware local-global citizenship” (Hicks, 2003, p. 271).

The program aim and principle stipulated in the Introduction sections of the Social Studies document is supported by the second unit of the curriculum that is titled, Citizenship. As with the Culture and Interdependence units, this is a significant part of the Grade Eight Social Studies program as it is one of four units to be studied in Grade Eight and, therefore, should be one quarter of the Grade Eight Social Studies student’s focus for the school year. The Knowledge/Content requirements for this unit are:

- Know the nature of citizenship in democratic societies, especially Canada.
- Know the process by which people become Canadian citizens.
- Know the role citizens serve in Canadian democracy (p. 17).

The Values/Attitudes mandated in this unit by the curriculum are to:

- Appreciate the rights and exhibit the responsibilities of Canadian citizenship.
- Appreciate the process by which people become Canadian citizens.
- Appreciate and respect the positive contributions of all citizens toward a healthy Canadian society (p. 17).

The Grade Eight Social Studies curriculum does put a clear, strong emphasis on citizenship however, it is important to note that while the program *Aim* and *Principles* expresses citizenship on a global level, it is not supported in the *Foundational Objectives*. In the Citizenship unit emphasis is on a local level or national level, not a global level. The Action component of global education that is promoted by Hanvey and Selby does insist on citizenship at a global level.

The Knowledge/Content requirements put a clear focus on Canadian and democratic citizenship. Yet, there are autocratic and oligarchic governments in our global village. Therefore, if we are aiming for students to participate in an interdependent world, it would be beneficial for our students to understand how citizenship varies in these types of governments. If curricula explored these ideas, it would not only develop an appreciation of our Canadian rights that many take for granted, it would also encourage students to ask why others do not have the same rights. By exploring these ideas, comes the hope that this recognition and questioning would lead students to act in the future to promote equal rights for all not only on a national, but also the global level. In order to claim that the Social Studies curriculum includes a 'global education perspective,' such values and knowledge requirements need to be included in the Foundational Objectives of the Interdependence or Culture units.

The Citizenship unit does draw attention to action as a part of citizenship. In the Values/Attitudes requirements the curriculum indicates that students should display responsibilities and notice positive contributions. These are all called for within a

Canadian context though. While it is important that our Grade Eight students recognize and act on their present and future responsibilities to their nation, it is also important that they recognize and respect the contributions made by Canadians and many others beyond Canadian borders. Our global village includes people who live in developing nations where poverty and malnutrition do exist, sometimes as a result of exploitation connected to the interdependence of our world; action must be taken by Canadians to remedy or assist in the remedy of this situation.

Of the keywords representing the Action category, the word, participation, is the most consistently used across the four curricula. In the Social Studies program it appears nine times, six times in the ELA curriculum, four times in the Science document and twice in the Mathematics program. Pike and Selby state that one of the goals of a global education program is for students to “develop the social and political skills necessary for becoming effective participants in democratic decision-making at a variety of levels, grassroots to global” (Hicks, 2003, p. 268). A global education program must promote participation. Decisions have to be made on many levels and it is those who participate in projects, activities and society that get to make the decisions.

In the Social Studies curriculum 4 out of the 9 times that the word participation is used, it connects with Pike and Selby’s aim. Two of the uses were stated earlier in the *Program Aim* and the *Principle* sections. These uses were “**The ultimate aim is to graduate students who have a sense of themselves as active participants in and citizens of an interdependent world**” (p. 3, bolded *sic*) and “Students learn to be effective citizens locally and globally, when they see themselves as active participants in an interdependent world” (p. 4). Another use appears in the *Introduction* when the curriculum says “At the Middle Level, the Social Studies program provides opportunity

for students to develop a sense of themselves as active participants in their world (personal, local, national and global)” (p. 3). The fourth use appears under the *Goals* heading where it indicates that one of the goals of Social Studies education is to “develop students’ knowledge of concepts, generalizations and theories so that they are able to make reflective decisions and participate in society as responsible citizens” (p. 3).

The other 5 times that the word participation is used in the Social Studies curriculum is similar to how it is used in the ELA, Science and Mathematics curricula. None of these curricula use the word participation in the above mentioned context, but 3 of the 6 times it is used in the ELA curriculum, 3 out of 4 times in the Science curriculum and both times that it is used in the Mathematics curriculum it is in connection with global education Pedagogy category. In Pike and Selby’s global education model they include the Process dimension that “emphasizes a participatory and experiential pedagogy which explores differing value perspectives” (Hicks, 2003, p. 271). This pedagogical style is supported by the use of the word participation in the four curricula. All four programs say that students should “Participate appropriately and effectively in groups” (p. 17) The ELA curriculum “Encourage[s] students to participate in planning and evaluation” (p. 12). The Science curriculum hopes to promote life-long learning by encouraging students to “participate in learning activities, individually and as members of a co-operative group” (p. 804). Finally, the Mathematics program encourages greater participation on the students’ part by, “Adaptations of teaching methodologies, curriculum organization, timetabling, or the appropriate use of technology assist students who may find learning difficult, and others who are not sufficiently challenged, to become active participants in their learning” (p. 5). Therefore, while the use of the keyword participation does not support the Action category intent of Hanvey/Pike and Selby, it does often support the Pedagogy category intent of a global education curriculum.

Action Analysis Conclusions

As in the case of the Content category, the Social Studies program does have the most Action keywords. However, while this curriculum does promote the concept of

citizenship it does this more on a local than a global level, which does not meet the requirements of a global education curriculum.

Even though the Science curriculum does have an equal distribution of keywords in both the Introduction and Objective section, the other three curricula show a greater percentage of keywords in the Introduction section. Therefore greater focus is given to telling teachers ideals in the Introduction section than giving them practical, tangible guidance in the Objective section.

It was important to restate the importance of the Action category in a global education curriculum as I did at the beginning of this section of my analysis, because my examination shows that, contrary to my assumption, this component is the most obscure category in the four curricula. The Content, Pedagogy and Action keywords are used a total of 301, 158 and 79 times respectively, meaning the keywords are used 546 times altogether in the four curricula.. The 79 times that Action category keywords are used represents only about 14% of all the times all keywords are used. Therefore, even though I began my research with the belief that the Action category would be the most prevalent strand of the three categories, this statistic shows that of all the categories of a global education program, the Saskatchewan curricula's least represented and least supported strand is the Action category.

Analysis of Pedagogy Category

Global educators are constructivist. A global educator believes that students need to involve themselves in the learning process and feel confident sharing their view and perceptions. A pedagogical style that allows for this and accommodates the diverse learning needs of students is what is promoted in a global education curriculum. The final strand of Hanvey and Selby's combined global curriculum frameworks is the Process Dimension that "emphasizes a participatory and experiential pedagogy which explores differing values perspectives and leads to politically aware local-global citizenship" (Hicks, 2003, p. 271). The prompt words for this final category are: student centered; participatory; varied pedagogy; critical thinkers; active learning; student involved; collaborative; explore; create; question and interactive. The number of Pedagogy keywords found in each curriculum and the distribution of keywords in the Introduction and Objectives sections are included in the following table.

Table 3

Distribution of Pedagogy Keywords

	Social Studies Intro.	Social Studies Obj.	ELA Intro	ELA Obj.	Science Intro	Science Obj.	Math. Intro	Math. Obj	Overall
Student-centered	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Participatory	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Varied pedagogy	1	0	2	0	3	0	3	0	9
Critical thinkers	9	0	10	0	7	0	6	0	32
Active learning	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	5
Student involvement	5	0	0	0	3	1	2	0	11
Collaborative	9	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	13
Explore	4	0	7	0	7	7	3	0	28
Create	6	0	9	3	16	2	6	0	42
Question	1	0	3	0	1	0	1	0	6
Interactive	5	0	0	0	2	0	3	0	10
Overall	43	0	35	3	39	10	28	0	158

The quantitative analysis of the keywords representing Pedagogy resulted in a slight twist to the previous categories. In the Content and Action categories, the Social Studies curriculum had the highest percent of keyword usage at 42% and 43% respectively. In the Pedagogy category it is the Science curriculum that has the highest percent usage of keywords. The total number of Pedagogy category keywords found in the four core curricula is 158 keywords. The Science curriculum uses the Pedagogy keywords 49 times, which is 31% of total keyword usage. The Social Studies curriculum has 43 of the keywords, which is 27% of total usage. The ELA curriculum is close behind with 35 keywords, or 24% of total usage. Once again, it is the Mathematics

curriculum that has the least keyword usage at 28 words out of the 158, which is 18% of total usage.

While the Mathematics curriculum does have the lowest representation of keyword usage, it does include 10 of the 11 Pedagogy keywords, while the Science curriculum uses only 7 out of the 11 words. The Social Studies curriculum uses a respectable 10 out of the 11 keywords while the ELA curriculum includes only 6 out of the 11 keywords. It seems surprising that terms like “student involvement” and “active learning” were missing from the ELA curriculum as it seems reasonable to expect that the five strands of this subject—i.e., reading; listening; speaking; representing and writing--would accommodate these terms easily.

The distribution of keywords in the Pedagogy category between the Introduction sections and the Objectives sections of the curricula can only be termed alarming. The Pedagogy keywords are used 92% of the time in the Introduction sections and only 8% in the Objectives sections. Objectives are outcomes that need to be achieved, so it seems that if the Saskatchewan program is to not act as a barrier to teachers being global educators, the curriculum needs to emphasize objectives that help students become “critical thinkers”, “active learners”, “creative” or any other of the Pedagogy category keywords.

This being said, in the locations where the Pedagogy keywords are used, all refer to the global education pedagogical context that researchers say should be included in curriculum that is globally oriented. That is, all keyword usage indicates curriculum that respects the diversity of student’s learning needs, allows for diverse perspectives and allows students to be creative, exploratory and interactive in their learning.

There is no Pedagogy keyword that dominates in all of the curricula so I shall give selected examples of how a variety of words are used. In a powerful statement the introductory section of the Social Studies curriculum proclaims the goal, “to develop student’s critical understanding of events of the past and present as they affect the future, and to help them recognize that they have the opportunity to shape their future” (p. 3). Later on in the *Principles* part of the introductory section of this curriculum it calls for “Instructional strategies that facilitate active learning include exploration, inquiry, critical and creative thinking, problem solving, decision making, discussion, debate, and reflection” (p.4). Further on in the *Core Curriculum Components and Initiatives*, also part of the introduction, the Social Studies document ask teachers to “involve students in reflecting upon and assessing their learning experience and identifying their strengths and needs” (p.10).

In the ELA curriculum, also in the *Core Curriculum Components and Initiatives* the curriculum says to “Understand that questioning is essential to learning and demonstrate the ability to generate relevant and personally meaningful questions in a variety of topics” (p. 11) and to “Use a variety of instructional and assessment strategies and procedures to accommodate and broaden individual abilities and learning styles” (p. 11).

Similar pedagogical ideals are promoted in the introduction of the Science curriculum under the heading, *Teaching Science at the Middle Level*. Here the curriculum designers suggest that “In Middle Level science classes, stimulate creative questioning by your students.” This guide advocates a constructivist view of science teaching for “Students must be actively involved in doing science and thinking about science in order to understand science” (p. 1). The same ideals are seen in the

introduction of the Mathematics curriculum in the *Core Components and Initiatives* section where it reads, “If students are encouraged to think critically and creatively throughout a unit, then the assessment for the unit should also require students to think critically and creatively” (p. 4) and “One of the most basic adaptations that can be made to assist students is to give them sufficient time to explore, create, question and experience as they learn” (p. 5).

Also, in support of the Pedagogy category, it is important to remember that the keyword, environment, in the Content category has significant use in the global education pedagogy context. The same holds true for the keyword, participation, in the Action category.

Pedagogy Analysis Conclusions

The use of keywords representing the Pedagogy category, consistently reflect a global education pedagogical style that “emphasizes a participatory and experiential pedagogy” (Hicks, 2003, p. 271) which is suggested by Pike and Selby. While this consistency in the introductory sections of the curricula does assist the Grade Eight teacher to understand the importance of a global education pedagogical style, the absence of the words in the objectives section may lead teachers to assume such teaching is not required.

Summary of Findings

A quantitative and qualitative analysis of the Grade Eight core curricula—Social Studies, ELA, Science and Mathematics—was carried out to determine if the philosophy, concepts and goals of the curricula require Saskatchewan teachers to be global educators. From the analysis it has been determined that the Social Studies curriculum is the greatest aid to the implementation of global education for the Grade

Eight teacher, while the Mathematics curriculum provides the least aid. It has also been found that out of the three global education categories—Content, Action and Pedagogy—the Action category has the least representation in all of the core curricula. Finally, all four curricula have a greater distribution of keywords in the Introduction section of the curricula than in the Objectives section. Therefore, from the analysis it has been determined that global education concepts may not be implemented by teachers because the curriculum does not require the concepts to be implemented. The implications of these conclusions will be discussed further in the final chapter.

Chapter 5

CONCLUSIONS

In the past few years the tapestry of our world has been affected by natural disasters like Hurricane Katrina and the South-East Asian Tsunami. These disasters evoked a response of generosity from the global community that was impressive, but was met with some cynicism because, unfortunately, it takes horrific events such as these to remind us that we are connected within our tapestry by the thread of our humanity. Too often these reminders have only a temporary effect. The unfortunate reality of our tapestry is that there are international emergencies of malnutrition, disease and conflict everyday.

To successfully confront the disasters that fray our global tapestry, we need global citizens. A primary purpose of Canadian schooling is to promote citizenship. We believe that if we develop the child, we will in turn develop society (Osborne, 1996, p. 27). The society that our students are graduating into is a global society. Therefore, our schools need to graduate students who recognize that if their part of the tapestry is to flourish, all parts of the tapestry need to be strong. We need to graduate students who recognize that they are not only responsible to themselves and their local community; they are also responsible to their global community (Evans, Hundey, 2002, p. 126).

In order for schools to accomplish the task of graduating global citizens, they need to implement global education. Global education makes students knowledgeable and aware of their global community. It calls them to action while using a pedagogical style that encourages critical and creative thinking. To effectively graduate a global citizen, global education needs to be an intrinsic part of education (Wishnietsky, 2001, p. 26).

While recognizing the increasing importance of global education, a study that was carried out with the purpose “to examine all aspects of global education in

Saskatchewan schools” (Wessel, 1991, p. 3) stated that many Saskatchewan teachers admitted that they do not implement global education concepts in their teaching.

Various possibilities were given in Wessel’s study as to why Saskatchewan teachers are not global educators; however he did not mention the curriculum as a reason why Saskatchewan teachers are not global educators. Actually, the study concludes that “the integrative approach of Core Curriculum is an appropriate vehicle for global education” (Wessel, 1991, p. 6). To determine the extent to which the curriculum requires teachers to be global educators, I did a text analysis of selected components of the Grade Eight core curriculum. This final chapter will discuss the meanings and implications of my key findings and conclusions, and explain the significance of these findings to future research in the curriculum development field.

Key Findings: Meanings & Implications

As well as answering the larger question about whether curriculum requires Saskatchewan teachers to be global educators, there were other questions that I was hoping that the research would address. Some of these questions were: Does curricula support the notion that the Social Studies teacher has the most responsibility for engaging students with global education concepts? Which curriculum has the least global education elements? Is there one category, Content, Action or Pedagogy that is emphasized more than the other? Is there a category that is lacking representation?

These questions and ones that emerged during my research were answered. Through the text analysis I determined which curriculum had the greatest inclusion of global education concepts and the distribution of keywords in the curricula showed which global education category had the most representation of the three categories. The meaning and significance of these findings will be discussed in this section.

Focus in Social Studies

The following table shows the percentage of total keyword usage in each category for the four core curricula.

Table 4

Percent of Keywords used in Each Curriculum

	Social Studies	ELA	Science	Mathematics
Content	42	28	20	10
Action	43	20	23	14
Pedagogy	27	24	31	18

In both the Content and Action categories, the Social Studies curriculum has the greatest percent of total keyword usage at 42% and 43% respectively. In the Pedagogy section, while the Science curriculum has the greatest percent of keyword usage at 31%, the Social Studies curriculum is not far behind with 27%. Because this is only a 4% difference compared to the 14% and 20% lead that the Social Studies curriculum has in the other categories, the Social Studies curriculum is the document with the greatest percent of keyword usage.

The quantitative analysis demonstrates that the Social Studies curriculum has the greatest amount of global education keyword usage. The qualitative analysis of the four curricula supports the findings of the quantitative analysis. The Social Studies curriculum not only has the greatest percentage of keyword usage, it also has the most emphasis placed on global education concepts. The Social Studies curriculum includes units of study titled Culture, Interdependence and Citizenship. All three of these units have “Knowledge/Content” and “Values/Attitudes” objectives that align with Hanvey and Selby’s global education curriculum strands. While the other three curricula may have representation of these keywords, they do not devote units of study to them.

Based on the number of times that global education keywords appear in the Social Studies curriculum and due to the in-depth representation that they have in the units of study, I state that my study does support the notion that the Social Studies teacher is the teacher most responsible for delivering global education concepts. However, I argue that this is not the most effective manner of assisting Saskatchewan students in becoming global citizens. If education is for the purpose of citizenship, it is the responsibility of all educators to prepare our students to be prepared and productive citizens in our global community. It is the responsibility of all educators to be global educators, but all four curricula do not equally aid teachers to be global educators.

Further, if curriculum constructors and educators are relying on the Social Studies curriculum to be the main contributor to student understanding of global citizenship and their understanding of global education concepts, it must be acknowledged that there are shortcomings in the Saskatchewan Social Studies curriculum as a global education curriculum. An example of this is the exploration of the concept “citizenship”. A global education curriculum teaches the meaning and purpose of citizenship on a local, national and global level (Diaz, Maasialas and Xanthopoulos, 1999, p. 67). However, as previously noted, while the introductory portions of the Social Studies curriculum indicates that “Students learn to be effective citizens locally and globally, when they see themselves as active participants in an interdependent world” (p. 4), the *Foundational Objectives* of the Citizenship unit in the Grade 8 Social Studies curriculum emphasizes citizenship at a local and national level, not at a global level. This is a significant shortcoming because the research into citizenship education demands that students develop understanding of citizenship not only within the Canadian context but in an international context (Evans, Hundey, 2002;

Osborne, 1999; Wishnietsky, 2001). Because the Social Studies curriculum does not require this exploration, we have to recognize that the Grade 8 Social Studies program actually does not support Saskatchewan teachers being global educators because this curriculum lacks important global education components.

A final point to consider if Saskatchewan curriculum constructors are relying on the Social Studies curriculum to be the primary source of global education is the amount of time that a Social Studies class is scheduled in a Grade Eight student's timetable compared to Mathematics or English Language Arts. Even though Social Studies, ELA, Science and Mathematics are all core subjects, they are not given equal time in the Grade Eight time table. Mathematics, the subject with the least global education elements is allotted 200 minutes per week in a student's schedule. English Language Arts time allotment is 300 minutes per week. Social Studies, the subject with the most global education criteria is only allotted 150 minutes of instruction time per week. Due to the distribution of teaching time that the four core subjects are allotted, one has to realize that even though Social Studies is one fourth of the core curricula, it has considerably less subject time allotment than English Language Arts and Mathematics. Therefore, the curriculum constructors have not supported teachers in being global educators because global education concepts appear most often in the Social Studies curriculum and this becomes of greater significance as this curriculum receives only half the time allotment that the English Language Arts curriculum receives.

Focus in Introductions

As I was analyzing the data from the text analysis, I discovered something that I was not initially seeking. I found there is a significant discrepancy between the Introductory sections of the curricula, which includes the Principles, Aims and Goals of

a curriculum, and the Objectives sections, which some teachers rely on when implementing the Principles, Aims and Goals. The following table compares the percentage distribution of keywords in the Introduction and Objective sections in each of the four core curricula.

Table 5

Percent of Keywords Used in the Introduction and Objectives Section of Each Curriculum

	Soc. St. Intro	Soc. St. Obj.	ELA Intro.	ELA Obj.	Science Intro.	Science Obj.	Math. Intro.	Math. Obj.
Content	87	13	94	6	86	14	97	3
Action	59	41	100	0	50	50	73	27
Pedagogy	100	0	92	8	80	20	100	0

This table demonstrates that the majority of global education keywords found in the four core Grade Eight curricula are in the Introductory section and not the Objectives section. Except for the Action category in the Science curriculum, the difference in representation is significant. The difference in representation between the philosophical introduction and the practical objectives varies from 18% in the Social Studies Action category all the way to 100% in the Mathematics and the Social Studies Pedagogy categories.

The importance of this finding is highlighted when considering Wessel's study (1991), which states that the major barrier to Saskatchewan teachers being global educators is that they are not trained to be global educators. Saskatchewan teachers, like most North American teachers, have been educated as subject-content teachers and we often do not see the connection or significance between the subject content and world issues (Hendrix, 1998). Because Saskatchewan teachers are not trained to be global

educators and may not see the connection between the subject that they are teaching and necessary global issues, it is not enough for the curriculum to predominantly state the ideals of global education in the introductory portions of curricula. Global education concepts must be included in the Objectives sections, as clear criteria so that teachers, when planning lessons and units, can make connections between subject content and global issues for themselves and for students.

Also, the reality of our profession is that very often teachers are assigned to teach subjects which are not their specialty. The Science or Mathematics teacher can be assigned to teach Social Studies, the subject with the most global education concepts. The Social Studies curriculum, therefore, needs to offer more assistance for the teacher who is foreign to the subject content to implement needed global education concepts. Presently, because so many of the global education concepts are in Introduction section and not the Objectives section, the curriculum actually does not provide enough aid to teachers to be global educators.

Representations of Key Ideas in Global Education Categories

Using the three global education categories that I derived from the Hanvey/Selby models - that is Content, Pedagogy and Action - I scanned the curricula looking for 17 Content keywords, 11 Pedagogy and 9 Action keywords. The total number of keywords found in each category is: Content (301); Pedagogy (158) and Action (79). By dividing the total number of keywords found in each category by the number of words sought in each category, I calculated the average number of times a category keyword was used in the curricula. Content category keywords were used on average 18 times. The

keywords for the Pedagogy section appeared on average 14 times and the Action keywords on average were used 10 times. The next section will discuss the significance of these numbers in relation to the curriculum as a barrier to global education.

Content is the most represented category in the Grade 8 curricula, with keywords appearing an average of 18 times. The keywords in this category (perspective; global; culture; equality; justice; conflict; peace; environment; interconnectedness; interdependency; diverse; international; universal; race; pluralistic; rights and equity) represent the Hanvey/Selby strands: Perspective Consciousness; State of the Planet Awareness/Issues Dimension; Cross-Cultural Awareness; and Knowledge of Global Dynamics/Spatial Dimension/Temporal Dimension.

While the Content category is numerically the most represented, sometimes the way in which the Content keywords are used do not connect with the above mentioned strands. For example, in the Social Studies curriculum the word ‘environment’ is used only twice out of the fifteen times, it appears in relation to the environmental issues described in Hanvey/Selby’s global education curriculum suggestions. Most often in the Social Studies curriculum, as well as the other three curricula, use of this keyword refers to the learning environment in a classroom situation. Therefore one cannot argue that the number of keywords accurately represents the Content category strands of global education.

The other key finding in relation to the Content category is that not all strands have equal representation in the four curricula. Keywords that represent the Perspective Consciousness and the Cross Cultural Awareness strand - including words like perspective, diverse and culture - appear 33 to 108 times in the curricula. However words that represent the State of the Planet Awareness/Issues Dimension and the

Knowledge of Global Dynamics/Spatial Dimension/Temporal Dimension strands - including words like equality, justice, conflict and peace - appear as little as 13 times in some curricula, and sometimes do not appear at all. Due to this lack of representation, or unequal representation, I argue that curricula do not require Grade Eight teachers to be global educators.

I also argue that how the curricula include the Content category can be ineffective. To stress the cultural diversity and multiple perspectives of our world without the awareness that this can cause and has caused conflict, is not giving students the complete and accurate view of the tapestry. It is also not completely preparing students with the awareness, knowledge and tools to be part of the tapestry. A global educator is, or needs to be, a postcolonialist and a postmodernist. According to Leela Gandhi (1998), we cannot move forward if we do not look back on our past. Our past is one of conflict and inequality that was perpetuated by European colonialism. This past has imprinted and shaped our present. Therefore to look at an issue such as culture and the interdependency of our world without considering issues like conflict, (in)justice and (in)equality gives a misrepresentation of the reality of our world. In order to truly and effectively study issues like culture and interdependency we have to also study the issues of conflict, injustice and inequality that exist between the present day developed and the developing world.

Patrick Slattery (2000) supports a curriculum that has a post-modernist framework, that is a curriculum that has multiple perspectives and diverse views that challenge the status quo and make us look at a situation or issue in a new light. In the Content category the keyword 'perspective' is used 33 times in the four curricula and the Social Studies curriculum does indicate that "teachers should encourage students to

celebrate their Canadian identity, while fostering multicultural and global perspectives that help them to respect and understand other peoples cultures and viewpoints” (p. 4) The keyword ‘diverse’ is used 35 times in the four curricula and reference is made to cultural, learning and perspective diversity throughout the core curricula. While use of these keywords do support and represent the postmodernist framework, it is important to note that neither of these words are mentioned in the Objectives section of the four curricula. Therefore, while the ideals of the postmodernist theory are represented, suggestions on how to implement a postmodernist curriculum are lacking as the words are not mentioned in the Objectives section.

Pedagogy is the second most represented global education category, with keywords appearing an average of 14 times. The keywords in this category student-centered; participatory and varied pedagogy represent the Hanvey/Selby Process Dimension strand. While keywords like ‘student-centered’ and ‘participatory’ do have low representation in the curricula, and few Pedagogy keywords appear in the Objectives section, one can still argue that the curriculum is an aid for teachers in implementing a global education pedagogical style, due to the consistency of keyword usage in relation to the Process Dimension strand.

A constructivist theoretical framework supports a global education teaching style, a style that allows students to discover their own answers and construct their own knowledge. While the two go hand in hand, it is important to note that the constructivist view of education that is apparent in the Grade Eight core curricula is not necessarily a requirement for global education, but a result of curriculum change in Saskatchewan that was detected all the way back to the 1980’s. This change in curriculum was a “move from a content-focused curriculum which put student’s learning experiences at the

centre—or in educational jargon, a move from a transmission curriculum to a transactional curriculum” (Robinson, 2002, p. 6). While this move to making curriculum follow more of a constructivist framework is a benefit to a global education pedagogical style, it is not motivated by or done with a global education philosophy in mind, neither is it done, necessarily, to assist teachers to be better global educators.

Of the three categories, it is the Action category, with an average keyword usage of 10, which is the lowest represented category. This is the category that addresses the Awareness of Human Choice/Process Dimension strand of Hanvey and Pike’s global education model. This is the strand that asks that students not only acquire knowledge, but do something with their knowledge to benefit their local and global society. It is the strand that supports many education philosophers beliefs about what schooling should do—that is, improve the student, improve society (Postman, 1995; Robertson, 1998; Osborne, 1996). Therefore, it should be expected that curricula would be a greater aid in implementing this strand. As the four core Grade Eight curricula are presently constructed, surprisingly, they are not. This means that the curricula do not require Saskatchewan teachers to implement the Action category of a global education curriculum.

Recommendations for Further Studies

Though the text analysis of the four core Grade Eight curricula reveals important findings concerning the role curriculum plays in assisting or hindering Saskatchewan teachers from being global educators, there were limitations on the research. First, the scope of the research needs to be noted. Out of 12 years of formal schooling, only one year of written curricula was analyzed, the Grade Eight year. Also, a curriculum, on

average, can be over 300 pages in length. By limiting my analysis to the Introduction and Objectives sections, I looked at about 50 pages in each curriculum.

While I am confident that if global education concepts are a priority to curriculum constructors they would be mentioned in these sections, there is the possibility that they can be further emphasized in individual unit and lesson plans further on in the curriculum. This does open a door for future research within the field of global education and curriculum research. A specific unit, for example Culture in the Social Studies curriculum can be analyzed to determine if the unit does have a more postcolonialist view of Culture and a more equal representation of the Content strands. Further studies can also be done of the curriculum at a variety of grade levels to determine if keywords and concepts that are lacking in the Grade Eight curricula are apparent and emphasized at another grade level.

A global education curriculum is not the only solution to making Saskatchewan teachers better global educators. “Educators and policy makers who are concerned about formulating and promoting goals and objectives would do well to remember that it is the teacher who most influences the learning that takes place in the classroom” (Becker, 2001, p. 228). In order for teachers to be effective global educators more studies need to be carried out to determine and identify the supports Saskatchewan teachers need to become better global educators. After these supports have been identified, then ways to implement these supports can be explored. According to the research, one of the greatest areas of support teachers need to become global educators is lack of awareness about what a global educator or global education is, resulting, in part, because teachers are not trained to be global educators (Dhand, 1989; Menchion, 1997; Ukpokdu, 1999; Wessel, 1991). Therefore, it stands to reason that teacher training

programs need to be adjusted to accommodate this deficiency. While we may not presently have answers as to how this can or should be accomplished, solutions to the problem need to be explored.

Future Implications

The future implication of my research lies within the field of curriculum development. There is a “hegemonic relationship exerted by a culture through the curriculum” (Ross, 2000, p. 8). If a society has a worldview, a belief, a direction that it wishes to travel and it needs to impart this to its youth, a powerful tool for this is the curriculum. The written curriculum guides educators to the knowledge and skills they should be passing along and developing in a society. The curriculum also gives suggestion on how to share the knowledge and skills.

Our Saskatchewan and Canadian future is unavoidably linked to the future of our global community. To move into the future, we have to look to the past from which we evolved. Our global community is the product of a past that wove power relationships, exploitation, and resistance to domination and shared understandings into our tapestry. To look to the future we also need to know our present. Our present global community speaks in many tongues, has a multitude of perspectives and voices that need to be heard regardless of gender, ethnicity or economic class.

Global education promotes these needed theoretical frameworks. If our curriculum is to guide our children to their future, postcolonial and postmodernist views need to be integrated into the curriculum. The most effective way to do this is not to make global education a separate subject, but to integrate it throughout the curriculum: According to Wessel (1991), “If we accept this perspective, overall curriculum design becomes an important issue for global education. While it may be useful to have

individual teaching units or special events on global topics, it is more important that the curriculum as a whole reflect a global view”(p. 43).

There are suggestions offered by researchers to guide curriculum constructors to the requirements for a global education curriculum. There is a belief among Saskatchewan educators that global education is important. There is the hope expressed in Wessel’s study (1991) that “current curriculum review in Saskatchewan affords an excellent opportunity to place a global attitude at the centre of our plans for K–12 education” (p. 43). Then, there is the reality that the curriculum does not require Saskatchewan educators to be global educators.

If one were to look at the English Language Arts curriculum as a model to determine if this reality is changing, the answer is disappointing. When I began gathering the data for my analysis I used the 1999 English Language Arts curriculum. Before I completed my analysis, the new English Language Arts curriculum came out in June 2006. Wanting my data to be relevant, I also analyzed the most recently issued English Language Arts curriculum, therefore gathering data on the keyword representation from the two curricula. A comparison of the total keywords found in the two curricula is in the following table.

Table 6

Comparison of Keywords found in the 2006 ELA Curriculum and the 1999 ELA Curriculum

	Content	Action	Pedagogy
1999	124	16	35
2006	84	17	42

While the count of keywords in the Action and Pedagogy categories are close, there is a significant difference in the Content category. The new curriculum has 40 fewer

keywords than the old curriculum. This is not an in depth analysis, however if new curricula follow the pattern of the English Language Arts program, it would appear that curriculum will continue to not require Saskatchewan teachers to be global educators.

This study concludes that the philosophy, concepts and goals of the four core grade eight Saskatchewan curricula do not require teachers to be global educators. There are areas where the curriculum does satisfy the needs of a global education curriculum, however there are crucial aids and content that is missing. If educators in Saskatchewan wish to prepare our students to be prepared, productive post-colonialist and postmodern global citizens, the curriculum needs to be of greater aid than it is presently. There remains much progress to be made in construction of curricula that satisfies the characteristics of a global education curriculum which can contribute to our ever-evolving global tapestry.

Bibliography

- Alcoze T. et al. (1993). *Multiculturalism in Mathematics, Science, and Technology: Readings and activities*. USA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.
- Allan, K. (2006). Excellence: a new keyword or education? *Critical Quarterly*, 49(1) 55-78.
- Ashun, M. (2004). Bringing Global Awareness to the Curriculum. *Education Canada* 44(2) 32- 34.
- Agnew, D. and Fincham, K. (2004) Education for development: A worthwhile investment. *Education Canada*, 44(2), 49-51.
- Anderson, C.C., Nicklas, S. k., & Crawford, A. R. (1994). *Global understandings: A framework for teaching and learning*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

- Banks, J. (2001). Multicultural education: Goals, possibilities, and challenges. In Diaz, C. *Multicultural Education in the 21st Century*. New York City, NY: Addison-Wesley Educational Publishers Inc.
- Banks, J. (2002). *An Introduction to Multicultural Education*. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Basiga, B. (2004). Globalization and peace education. *Canadian Social Studies*, 38(3) www.quasar.ualberta.ca/css
- Becker, J. (1991). International education: Teaching for the "Nation of Human Beings." *Educational Leadership*, 48 (5), 97-101
- Becker, J. (2001). Goals for global education. *Theory Into Practice*, 21(3), 228-233.
- Bogdan, R.C. and Bilken, S. K. (1998). *Qualitative research in education: An Introduction to theory and methods*. USA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Brown, S. and Kysilka, M. (2002). *Applying Multicultural and Global Concepts In The Classroom and Beyond*. Boston: Pearson Education Company.
- Burnouf, L. (2004). Global awareness and perspectives in global education. *Canadian Social Studies*. 38(3). www.quasar.ualberta.ca/css
- Cronkhite, L. (2000). Development education: Making connections north and south. In Goldstein, T. and Selby, D. *Weaving Connections: Educating for Peace, Social and Environmental Justice*. Toronto: Sumach Press.
- De Cou-Landberg, M. (1995). *The global classroom: A thematic multicultural model for the K-6 and ESL classroom*. USA: Addison -Wesley Publishing Co.
- Dhand, H. (1987). Recent research on global education. *History and Social Science Teacher*, 71 - 73.
- Diaz, C., Massialas, B., Xanthopoulos, J. (1999). *Global Perspectives for Educators*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Durant, A. (2007). Raymond Williams keywords: investigating meanings ‘offered, felt for, tested, confirmed, asserted, qualified, changed. *Critical Quarterly* 48(1) 1 -26.
- Evans, M. and Hundey, I. (2000). Educating for citizenship in Canada: New meanings in a changing world. In Goldstein, T. and Selby, D. *Weaving Connections: Educating for Peace, Social and Environmental Justice*. Toronto: Sumach Press.

- Fountain, S. (1995). *Education for development: A teacher's resource for global learning*. London, Great Britain: Hodder and Stoughton Educational.
- Fulghum, R. (1993). All I ever really needed to know I learned in kindergarten. In J. Canfield and M. V. Hansen (Eds.), *Chicken Soup for the Soul*. Deerfield Beach, FL: Health Communications, Inc.
- Gandhi, L. (1998). *Postcolonial theory: A critical introduction*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Gardner, R. (2000). Global perspectives in global education. In D. Lawton, J. Cairns and R. Gardner (eds.), *Education for Citizenship*. London, Great Britain: Cromwell Press.
- Grieg, S., Pike, G. & Selby, D. (1987). *Earthrights: Education as if the earth really mattered*. London: The World Wildlife Fund and Kogan Page Limited.
- Hendrix, J.C. (1998). Globalizing the curriculum. *Clearing House*, 71(5), 305-309.
- Gunew, S. (2007). Postcolonialism and multiculturalism: Between race and ethnicity. Retrieved on August 23 2007 from <http://faculty.arts.ubc.ca/sgunew/RACE.HTM>
- Hanvey, R. (1976). An attainable global perspective. *The American Forum for Global Education*. New York, NY.
- Hasan, O. (2000). Improving the quality of learning: Global education as a vehicle for school reform. *Theory into Practice*, 39(2), 97-103.
- Hicks, D. (2003). Thirty years of global education: a reminder of key principles and Precedents. *Educational Review*. 55(3), 265-275.
- Kingwell, M. (2000). *The world we want: Virtue, vice and the good citizen*. Toronto, ON: Penguin Group.
- Kluger, J. (April 3, 2006) By any measure, earth is at the tipping point. *Time*. Toronto, ON: Time Canada Ltd.
- Leavy, P. (2000, May) Feminist content analysis and representative characters. [70 paragraphs]. *The Qualitative Report*. [On-line serial], 5 (1/2). Retrieved November 21, 2005 from <http://www.nova.edu/sss/QR/QR5-1/leavy.html>.
- Mason, J. (1996). *Qualitative Researching*. Great Britain: Redwood Books.
- Mathison, C. (1994). Getting to the heart of things: Intersections of multicultural, global

- and civic education. *Multicultural Education Journal*. 12(1) 3-10.
- Menchions, C. (1997). Global illiteracy in the age of the internet or what we fail to tell our children. *Canadian Education Association*. 37(2) 42-47
- Merryfield, M. (1994). Shaping the curriculum in global education: The influence of student characteristics on teacher decision making. *Journal of curriculum and supervision*, 9(3) 233 - 249.
- Merryfield, M. and Subedi, B. (2003). A global education framework for teaching about the world's women. *Social Education*. 67(1) 10-17.
- Monaghan, P. (2003). *Interdisciplinary Research Design for the Committee on Personnel And Professional Development, School for New Learning*. Retrieved November 20, 2005 from http://www.sn1.depaul.edu/contents/faculty/interdisciplinary_research_design.doc.
- Neuman, W. L. (1997). *Social research methods: Qualitative and quantitative approaches* (3rd Ed.) Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Ontario Secondary Schools Teachers Federation. (1999). *Standing up for public education*. Secondary School Reform Provincial Executive Report to AMPA. Toronto.
- Osborne, K. (1999). *Education: A guide to the Canadian school debate--Or, who wants what and why?* Toronto: Penguin Books.
- Osborne, K. (2001). Public schooling and citizenship education in Canada. In Bruno-Jofre, R. and Aponiuk, N. (eds.) *Educating Citizens for a Pluralistic Society*. Calgary: Canadian Ethnic Studies.
- Pike, G. (2000). A tapestry in the making. In Goldstein, T. and Selby, D. (eds.) *Weaving Connections: Educating for peace, social and environmental justice*. Toronto: Sumach Press.
- Pike, G. and Selby, D. (1991). *Global teacher, global learner*. London: Hodder and Stoughton.
- Pike, G. and Selby, D. (1999 and 2000). *In the Global Classroom 1 and 2*. Toronto, ON: Pippin Publishing Company.
- Postman, N. (1995). *The end of education: Redefining the value of school*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc.
- Robinson, Sam. (2002). *Curriculum change in the 1980's: Directions and the core*

curriculum. Retrieved September 17, 2002 from http://www.usask.ca:8900/educur_801/htmlarticles/Robinson.html.

Robertson, H-J. (1998). *No more teachers, no more books: The Commercialization of Canada's School*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart Inc.

Ross, A. (2000). *Curriculum: Construction and Critique*. London and New York: Falmer Press.

Ryan, A. and Dueck, G. (1992). *The Saskatchewan global education project: Evaluation Report*. Regina, SK: Saskatchewan Instructional Development and Research Unit.

Sachs, J. (2005). The end of poverty. *Time*, 165 (11) 32 - 44.

Saskatchewan Learning. (September 1993). *Science: A curriculum guide for the Middle level (grades 6-9)*.

Saskatchewan Learning. (September 1996). *Mathematics: A curriculum guide for the middle level (grades 6-9)*.

Saskatchewan Learning. (September 1999). *English Language Arts: A curriculum guide for the middle level (grade 6-9)*.

Saskatchewan Learning. (September 1999). *Social Studies: A curriculum guide for the middle level (grade 6-9)*.

Saskatchewan Learning. (June 2006). *English Language Arts: A curriculum guide for the middle level (grade 6-9)*.

Selby, D. (1998). Global Education: Towards a quantum model of environmental education. www.ec.gc.ca/education/documents/colloquium/selby.htm.

Skelton, M. et al. (2002). Beyond food, festivals and flags. *Educational Leadership*, 60 (2), 52-55.

Slattery, P. (2000). Postmodernism as a challenge to dominant representations of curriculum. In Glanz, J. and Behar-Horenstein, L.S. (eds.) *Paradigm debates in curriculum and supervision: Modern and postmodern perspectives*. Westport, Conn: Bergin and Garvey.

Stull, E. (2004). *Global discovery activities for the elementary grades*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Taylor, H. E. (1996). Practical suggestions for teaching global education. *ERIC Clearinghouse on teaching and teacher education*. Retrieved February 26, 2004 from http://www.ericfacility.net/databases/ERIC_Digest/ed395924.html.

- Tye, B.B., Tye, K.A. (1992). *Global education: A study of school change*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Tye, K.A. (ed). (1990). *Global education: School-based strategies*. Orange, CA: Interdependence Press.
- UNESCO. (1983). *Education for international co-operation and peace in the primary-school level*. Switzerland: United Nations.
- Ukpokdu, N. (1999) Multiculturalism vs. globalism. *Social Education*, 63(5), 298-300.
- Warren, M. L. (1991). Educating for global citizenship through children's art. *Educational Leadership*, 48 (7), 54-57.
- Wessel, D. (1991). *The world in the classroom: A review of global education in Saskatchewan schools*. Regina, SK: Saskatchewan Council for International Cooperation. Summary Report.
- Wessel, D. (1991). *The world in the classroom: A review of global education in Saskatchewan schools*. Regina, SK: Saskatchewan Council for International Cooperation. Final Report.
- White, C. (2002). Creating a “World of Discovery” by thinking and acting globally In Social Studies: Ideas from New Zealand. *The Social Studies*, 262-266.
- Wilson, L. (1997). Difference Types of Curriculum. Retrieved on June 2002 from <http://www.uwsp.edu/education/lwilson/CURRIC/curtyp.htm>
- Wishnietsky, D. (2001). *American education in the 21st century*. Indiana: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation.