

DR. TAJUDDIN SHARAR*
DR. MUHAMMAD MEMON**

A CRITICAL REVIEW OF GLOBAL EDUCATION THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND ITS RELEVANCE TO PAKISTAN

Abstract

The global scholars criticise nation-centric educational approaches for poorly preparing students for the challenges of globalization and propose global education as an appropriate modus operandi for globalized world. Postcolonial global scholars criticise the existing theoretical approaches of global education to be west-centric and uncritical to issues of globalisation. Drawing upon this on-going debate, this paper offers a critical review of global education theoretical framework and its relevance to Pakistan. A case study method was used to study curriculum practices of global education in two schools in Chitral employing document analyses, semi-structured and open-ended interviews and classroom observations of teachers as data collection tools. The study found that the subject matter and pedagogies did not consider issues from different vantage points, attached less emphasis on knowledge of alternative choices and teachers reproduced colonial cultural knowledge. The subject matter and pedagogies took economic dependencies for granted and ignored how international human rights discourses disproved certain forms of human rights violences. The study proposed a seven-dimensional postcolonial global education theoretical framework as a response to western-centric curriculum practices of global education.

Keywords: Global Education, global perspectives, theoretical framework, west-centrism, colonialism,

Introduction

The globalists oftentimes highlight growing interdependence and refer to various global trends and changes carrying multifaceted implications in every sphere of life including education.

* Assistant Professor, Lahore Leads University, Lahore

** The Hamid al-Din al-Kirmani Professor, AKU – IED, Karachi

According to Memon and Hussain (2009) school curriculum is influenced by technological advancement, research, knowledge expansion, global changes, market demands and economic order and curriculum should prepare students for changing and pressing needs of the time. The global pedagogues also call for transformation of educational approaches to respond to current global trends and challenges. Global pedagogues call for new curriculum knowledge and skills and dispositions among students as citizens of interdependent world.

There have been educational and curriculum reforms in Pakistan to address curriculum inadequacies in light of changing needs. Currently, national curriculum has undergone substantial changes in 2006. National and international experts and educationists have participated in change process with their input. The experts involved in the process claim that the revised curriculum-2006, particularly curriculum of Pakistan Studies at secondary and higher secondary level is more responsive to the global trends and changes. The call for transformation of education in the light of globalization and the theoretical debate in global education prompted this study.

Rationale of the Study

Government of Pakistan (2006 and 2009) intended to make school curricula responsive to the challenges of cultural, economic and political globalisation, and to integrate various global themes. According to Ali (2014) various international agencies such as World Bank and UNESCO and international consultants were involved in educational review in Pakistan, hence modernisation of education in Pakistan is a mix of local and global imperatives. According to him, curriculum change process has also been steered by global forces. Moreover, curriculum authorities also claim that the existing curriculum is different in its objectives than the previous curricula. This also validates the claim that the curriculum of Pakistan-2006 is more globally-oriented and incorporates global themes and contents than ever before.

Social Studies is considered is a carrier of global education and appropriate for practicing global education as compared to other subjects. Firstly, current revision of national curriculum 2006, the involvement of global forces into curriculum revision process and incorporation of global themes into curriculum informed the study of exploring curriculum practices of global education. Secondly, study of Pakistan Studies was selected because Pakistan Studies is taught at secondary and higher secondary level. Since teaching Pakistan Studies has been least concern of curriculum planners and others for developing students' global perspectives this study is an attempt towards bridging theoretical and empirical gap from global education perspectives.

Objectives of the Study

The objective of this study was to offer a critical insight into global education theoretical framework, its relevance to Pakistan and the extent to which current global education theoretical framework assisted in developing students' global perspectives.

Research Questions

The study seeks to answer key research questions i.e. what constitutes global education in a subject-specific national curriculum and how do teachers enact curriculum for developing students' global perspectives?

Theoretical Framework of the Study

The globalists underscore global interdependence (Anderson, 1990) and use it as a rationale for the notion of one world. They project various global trends as manifestations of globalisation creating global interdependence. For example, the significant changing global trends of globalisation argued to be leading to the emergence of a global economy (Stewart, 2007), global polity and global governance (Green, 1997), growing diversity and the increase in the scope and frequency of issues with inter-continental impacts (Pike & Selby, 1988).

The trends of globalization have implications in every spheres of life including educational processes and institutions. The global trends call for substantial educational reforms and a reconceptualisation of curriculum within a global education theoretical framework (Ramler, 1991 and Tye, 1990) for developing world citizens capable of living effectively in a globalised world (Fujikane, 2003).

As an educational response to globalization, global pedagogues have re-conceptualised curriculum with global-centric framework for developing students' as world-citizens. Doing so, global pedagogues offer various models of global education and despite the diversity of global education frameworks global scholars tend to agree to some essential elements of global education. These include; multiple perspectives or perspective consciousness; comprehension and appreciation of cultures or cross-cultural awareness; knowledge of global issues or state-of-the planet awareness, and the world as interrelated systems or knowledge of global dynamics (Kirkwood, 2001).

The goal of these attainable elements of global education is to foster students' global perspectives and world mindedness (Pike & Selby, 2001).

The four-dimensional model of global education of Pike and Selby (2001) also embraces four essential elements of global education in its four dimensions of globality which include spatial globality, temporal globality, issues dimension, and inner dimension.

On the other hand, the critical and postcolonial scholars offer an alternative theoretical perspective of global education. They criticise current approaches to global education for being heavily western-centric and lacking multi-perspectival framework (Kapoor, 2014).

Likewise, global education conceptualised in 1970s is criticised for reproducing legacy of imperialism and shaping colonialism (Chana, 2011 & Merryfield, 2009).

Therefore, some of the critical pedagogues have re-conceptualised global education within postcolonial theoretical framework. Merryfield, (2009) re-conceptualizes global within postcolonial theory of orientalism to explore the educational legacy of imperialism in mainstream academic knowledge. She also recommends to decolonize the contents of global education incorporating worldviews of omitted, marginalised, and misrepresented people in mainstream academic knowledge.

Similarly, Kapoor (2014) also offers multi-perspectival theoretical framework as an encounter to heavy western-centric tilts in current approaches to global education.

Postcolonial scholars also provide detailed account of the mechanism employed to reproduce colonial worldviews in mainstream academic knowledge. For instance, Connell (2007) explains that most theoretical texts in the social sciences are written in the global North and this Northernness of globalisation theories and knowledge (development of knowledge and theories about the world and its people in North) does matter. Employing this theory the perspectives from the rest of the world are excluded or erased whereas western perspectives are distributed through mainstream knowledge resulting in the development of western-centric worldviews among students. In order to address this issue incorporation of multi-perspectival theoretical framework into contents of global education is suggested for developing world-mindedness and global perspectives of students (Merryfield, 2009 & Kapoor, 2014).

Global education approaches are also criticised for failure of addressing issues of racism, economic inequalities and hegemonic processes of neoliberal development (Kapoor, 2009).

Development/Global education is also questioned for its uncontested promulgation of Euro-American versions of capitalist-driven development as a solution rather than a cause of impoverishment, marginalization, exclusion and under development (Kapoor, 2014).

This leads to development of shallow and narrow perspectives instead of fostering global perspectives. Students are not exposed to critical literature of globalisation such as hegemonic processes and conditions of globalisation, issues created and deepened by world systems, economic and political dependencies and certain forms of economic, political and cultural violences again caused by hegemonic world systems cannot develop required and global gaze.

The bottom line is that there are two competing theoretical perspectives of global education. The globalists perceive current approaches to global education as an inevitable educational response to the challenges of globalization and development of global perspectives whereas critical scholars equate current approaches to global education with reproduction of colonialism and orientalism and unable to engage issues of globalisation critically. They provide multi-perspectival theoretical framework and critical pedagogy for making global education free from the shackles of western-centric approaches of education and for developing global perspectives and world mindedness among students.

Research Methodology

A naturalistic case study was conducted to explore manifestations of global education in subject matter and teachers' enactment of Pakistan Studies curriculum. Within a naturalistic inquiry I employed a 'case study approach' for its suitability and appropriateness to explore the case bounded in terms of time and place (Schreiber & Asner-Self, 2011).

According to Stake (2006) a case is the exploration of the functioning of an educational programme and event which provides a justification to employ case study approach to explore curriculum function of forming and shaping perspectives and worldviews of students. The appropriateness of case study method for exploring "how" questions" (Yin, 2009; p. 27) also allowed us explore how do teachers enact curriculum for developing students' global perspectives.

While employing maximum variation ‘purposive’ sampling strategy (Creswell, 2009), two higher secondary schools (one private and one public) were selected as research sites for this study. Three volunteer teachers teaching Pakistan Studies at secondary and higher secondary level joined the study as research participants. The study used document analyses, classroom observations and interviews as major data collection tools.

Findings and Discussions

The study found that current curriculum approaches to global education in case schools is orientalist in nature, reproduces colonial cultural perspectives, lacks multi-perspectival theoretical framework and fails to provide a critical theoretical lens to analyse global economic dependencies, inequality, and certain forms of economic and human rights violences. Therefore, global education theoretical framework found to be inadequate for forging global perspectives of students which in turn inform current curriculum approaches to global education.

Subject Matter and Pedagogies Fail to Consider Issues from Multi-Perspectival Theoretical Framework

The current curriculum practice of global education lacks multi-perspectival theoretical framework. The subject matter only provides multiple perspectives on nation-specific topics such as multiple perspectives were provided to explain the reasons led to the creation of East Pakistan. For example, the syllabus for grade X (2012) provides details of the factors that led to the creation of Bangladesh e.g. unfairness in administration, lack of political representation, armed forces, unequal economic distribution, elections of 1970, disinterest of government during cyclone in East Pakistan, rejection of six points and war with India in 1971. Textbook and objective-driven teachings provide multiple perspectives on nation-specific topics. A teacher distributed multiple perspectives about role of military rule in national integration and disintegration.

The failure of politicians and corruption in the country led to military rule. During military regime there has been unity, peace, development and economic prosperity with more job opportunities in the country... Army has many success stories and current sacrifices of army Jawans in Giari Sector of Siachin is the best example. There is another picture as well. The fall of former East Pakistan was because of military rule...there was centralisation of power and people felt abandoned... Army has also failed to play its constitutional role...destabilised democracy in the country and all the problems we experience in Pakistan are the indirect consequences of weak democratic culture in Pakistan. (Classroom Observation)

There is no evidence of subject matter knowledge and teachers' pedagogies developing ethnocentric perspectives among students offering one perspective as the only truth or universally shared. The intention of promoting students' awareness of perspectival difference is obvious rather than developing absolute ethnocentrism among students. A teacher for example, teaches multiple perspectives bringing forth positive and negative aspects of military rule in national integration and disintegration. Teachers, however, do not provide perspectives from a variety of cultural, political and ideological vantage points on issues to develop the ability of students to analyse issues from multiple perspectives and lenses. This is somewhat consistent with Pike and Selby's (2001) view that teachers do not consider issues from a variety of vantage points which is necessary for forming far-sighted / fair-minded judgments among students. Thus, the current curriculum practice of global education lacks multi-perspectival theoretical framework which is inevitable for making global education truly global in terms of representation of knowledge, perspectives and worldviews on various matters.

Subject Matter and Pedagogies put Less Emphasis on Knowledge of Alternative Choices

The provision of knowledge on alternative choices to students to prepare them for actions and participation in the global society is one of the prime goals of global education and this dimension

appears to be less emphasised in the subject matter. The syllabus for grade X (2012) expects students to be able to “suggest the role industrial sector should play in order to counter pollution (proper waste management, air filter plants, and environmental friendly policies, recycling and reusing products)” (p. 26). The syllabus for grade XII (2012) provides knowledge on alternative choice as it expects students to be able to “suggest the remedies to overcome global warming; discuss as a student your responsibilities to control environmental pollution” (p. 20).

Pakistan Studies Class X (n.d) elaborating possible future world energy crisis only makes generic suggestion of leading moderate life. It states that:

For attaining the ideal of moderation in life for the country we need...to not roll in luxury. A luxurious life results in the wastage of resources. Such as the ratio of cars per person [in Pakistan] is much higher than in India and even higher than China for which our import bill on oil is very high (p. 45).

The teachers also put less emphasis to action dimension which is necessary for preparing students to encounter issues as active participants of global society. For example, a teacher teaching about energy resource scarcity discussed current demand and supply of energy resources and referred to future energy crisis based on current rate of energy consumptions. However, teacher was found to be ignorant about knowledge of alternative choices in order to prepare students for encountering issues. He said that “we need to save precious resources and avoid unnecessary use of resources of oil, gas and coal” (Classroom Observation).

The subject matter and pedagogies provide inadequate information on alternative choices and even the objectives on knowledge of alternative choices in subject matter appear to be generic, such as expecting students to suggest the role industrial sector should play in order to counter pollution instead of preparing students to encounter issues. However, the subject matter provide knowledge of alternative choices in case of environmental issues, expecting

students to be able to suggest remedies to overcome global warming and discuss their responsibilities to control environmental pollution otherwise subject matter and pedagogies attach less emphasis to action dimension. This finding is consistent with Pike and Selby (2001) who criticise schools and teachers for not providing knowledge of alternative choices to students to prepare them as active participants of global society. Hence, the goal of preparing students to act at local level while being involved in local-global activities is missing.

Teachers' Pedagogies Reproduce Colonial Cultural Knowledge and Perspectives

One of teachers brought western cultural knowledge and perspectives into their classroom teachings. For example, in his pedagogical effort to make his students understand economic polarization among people in current era the teacher reproduced colonial cultural knowledge and perspectives as follows:

This is a palace of an Arab ruler...luxurious expenses on interior decorations...luxurious cars of different models. This picture of one of Middle Eastern country... how much food is wasted...This child (black) appears to be a skeleton of starvation...searching for food...This mother (black) is staring helplessly at her child dying for starvation. This child (black) has no one to protect her...has nothing to eat...no option for footwear and the picture depicts a famine stricken child in Sudan. This child (white) has supper protection...prefers soft foods over vegetables...has preference of Nike over Adidas footwear. (Classroom Observation)

The colonial cultural perspectives are promoted through the use of different colonial mechanisms of colonial cultural knowledge production. The teacher reproduces colonial cultural worldviews and knowledge in his photographic presentation with economic division and codification. For example, non-western (black) children are shown as poorer as compared to white children. The colonial cultural vocabulary is also promoted showing black children as dirtier, weaker, suffering from poor nutrition and barefooted due to an unavailability of footwear.

The images on the other hand, show white children cleaner, tidier, smarter, well dressed, well fed, and blessed with better life choices when it comes to purchasing food and other goods. Similarly, Middle Easterners are represented as extravagant and irrational in consumption of wealth and food. It shows that the teacher promotes western cultural perspectives through his teaching.

According to Connell (2007) dissemination of knowledge and worldviews constructed from an imperial centre is a colonial strategy to reproduce colonial worldviews which partly seems operative in teachers' cross-cultural pedagogies.

However, teacher's reproduction of colonial cultural knowledge was unintentional as he wanted to make his students understand economic polarization among people due to neoliberal globalisation instead of promoting colonial cultural worldviews. This intention is evident from his concluding remarks as at the end of his presentation he concluded saying that:

My message is that in this world we need justice, equality and humane attitude. In this world there are dogs carried in Mercedes and people walking bare footed. There are people who are always worried about their food and people for whom hunger is unknown. There are people who run in search of food and there are people who run to digest the food. In this world there are people who have no choice for food, dress and no shelter to take refuge but there are people for them what to prefer is really difficult. (Classroom Observation)

Subject Matter and Pedagogies Take Economic Dependencies for Granted

The subject matter gives coverage to global interdependence but ignores growing global dependencies of world countries. For instance, Pakistan Studies Class X (n.d) addresses economic interdependence of world nations characterized by imports and exports, commerce, and external trade explaining economic interdependence in the following way:

No country in the world is self-sufficient in all commodities while many have surplus products which they wish to export to other countries and get from them those things in which they are deficient. Some countries specialize in the product of certain things such as Pakistan in raw cotton, textile, leather goods, and carpet, Japan in electronics, motor vehicles...U.S in advanced sophisticated machinery, aero-planes and defense equipment. These countries export these things to other countries for which there is worldwide demand...Export of Pakistan are textiles of all sorts, cotton, rice, sugar, wheat, carpets, surgical instruments, sports goods, fruits, vegetables. Main import are defense equipment, machinery, chemicals, medicines, iron, edible oil, petroleum, our trading partners are U.S, European union, China, Middle Eastern countries, Japan, U.K. Bangladesh and Sri Lanka (pp. 66-67).

The teachers also incorporated the concept of global economic interdependence into their classroom teachings to foster students' awareness of global interdependence, emphasising the mutual reliance of countries on one another for resources and products. For example, a teacher provided the following details of imports and exports:

Japan, China and America have large number of industries and consume more oil and gas than they produce. They import oil from other countries. America is storing oil to be used in upcoming 50 years. For maximum consumption of oil in the world both the supply and the price of oil is soaring. Middle Eastern countries meet their security and other needs exporting the oil to other countries. These countries buy weapons...[and] ammunition from America. Japan has no agricultural land but exports technological appliances and products to other countries and imports food stuff from other countries. Pakistan exports rice, sports goods, wheat and other products and imports oil, gas and other products. Each country needs every other country in order to meet her needs. (Classroom Observation)

The subject matter and teachers' pedagogies tend to provide simplistic and naïve explanations of global economic interdependence, ignoring the economic interdependency of nations. The simplistic explanation of import and export, trade activities conceal the imbalance and inequities of power embedded within transnational economic exchanges. These activities do not global dependencies of developing countries such as Pakistan which are reflective from barriers in accessing global market.

The explanation of import, export and trade conceal the facts that economic activities and rules of international trade / global market tend to favour developed countries, thus making developing countries more dependent on developed countries. These rules limit developing countries' access to the global market place, resulting in a unidirectional flow of goods and services. The teachers' simplistic analysis of imports, exports and interdependencies do not reveal hegemonic structures and practices of global trades.

The subject matter and pedagogies do not provide knowledge of how strong states pressurise weak states to keep their frontiers open to those flows of factors of production that are useful and profitable to firms located in the strong states, while resisting any demands for reciprocity in this regard. There is also curriculum silence about the establishment of trade barriers through quotas and enforcement of patents to limit access of peripheral states to the global market (Wallerstein, 2004).

There is also silence about the exclusion of poor countries from the global economy, which currently gives a disproportionate share to the poorest countries in global trade (Short, 2001).

The finding is that subject matter and pedagogies highlight global economic interdependence but fail to highlight dependencies of developing countries created by world systems. It implies that current curriculum practices of global education have been informed by global education theoretical framework which is blind to growing economic and political dependencies deepened by hegemonic economic and political systems.

Subject Matter and Pedagogies Fail to Highlight that International Human Rights Discourses Disprove Certain Forms of Human Rights Violences

The subject matter and pedagogies addressed global interdependence in human rights context. The textbook of Pakistan Studies of class X and XII offered a discussion on the fundamental universal human rights guaranteed in United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The teacher reinforcing the subject matter knowledge highlighted universality claim of international human rights discourses enshrined in UNDHR:

The fundamental human rights promoted in Islam are also guaranteed by United Nations and included in the constitutions of Pakistan. All the charters safeguard the right to live for all human beings and the abolition of slavery and forced labour...right to privacy...right of association, freedom of expression and peaceful protest. Right of protest was suspended in Pakistan many times. (Classroom Observation)

The subject matter and classroom pedagogies put overemphasis on universality claim of fundamental human rights values enshrined in UNDHR. It is projected that as if all the all human rights enshrined in international human rights discourses are implemented across the world which is misleading. The teacher made inadequate references to violations of the freedom of speech in Pakistan during military regime and but concealed similar transgressions across the world.

The subject matter and pedagogies overemphasized universality claim of international human rights discourses, but remained silent about the various human right violations such as infringements on the freedom of speech and the right to free religious practice, torture, violence, war, right to have private business and rights of free religious practices, disappearance cases, war, poverty, starvation, killings (Pavlovic, 2010).

The subject matter and pedagogies failed to capture the fact as how International Labour Organization (ILO) Convention No. 169 has been unsuccessful to ensure the rights of self-determination, serious economic violence of human rights e.g. failure of governments to recognise indigenous people rights of ownership and possession over their lands as witnessed in India; failure of United Nations to stop violations of rights to self-determination by neoliberal development strategies (Kapoor, 2012).

The curriculum is also silent as how international human rights conventions approve certain types of human rights violences and disprove of other forms e.g. economic violence-that is violence caused by the market (Kapoor, 2012).

The curriculum is also silent on international human rights conventions and discourses that are not based on a theory of non-violence rather blind to the theory of non-violence for being oblivious to certain forms of human rights violence characterized by hegemonic practices and processes of world systems. It implies that the theoretical framework of global education is blind to recognize various forms of human rights violences and inadequate to develop students' global perspectives.

Proposed Seven-Dimensional Postcolonial Global Education Theoretical Framework

The limitations in the theoretical framework of Pike and Selby (2001) necessitated a re-conceptualisation of the global education curriculum framework addressing the aforementioned limitations. The limitations identified in global education framework necessitate a postcolonial global education curriculum framework that challenges western-centric approaches to global education, provides multi-perspectival theoretical framework to make global education truly globally-oriented instead of western-oriented.

A four-dimensional framework of global education by Pike and Selby (2001) extended to seven-dimensional postcolonial theoretical framework of global education with the purpose to fill the limitations and inadequacies in global education framework

and to make the theoretical framework of global education curriculum truly world-centric.

The four-dimensional model of global education developed by Pike and Selby (2001) consists of: i) spatial dimension, ii) temporal dimension, iii) issues dimension, and iv) inner dimension. The three additional dimensions of global education curriculum which include v) colonialism and post-colonial pedagogy, v) critique to structural violence of world's systems, and vi) incorporation of Northern and Southern knowledge and vii) developing new "educational discourses" and new "educational resources".

The seven-dimensional theoretical framework is potential for exploring students' global-selves and developing their global perspectives. The following is the seven-dimensional theoretical framework of global education to guide postcolonial global education theory and practice.



Figure 1. Extended Seven-Dimensional Framework of Global Education Curriculum (After Pike and Selby 2001; Kapoor, 2014, Chana, 2011; Connell, 2007 and Schwab 1973)

In the following section, the seven-dimensions of global education theoretical framework are discussed in detail which provides a critical lens for developing students' global perspectives.

Spatial Dimension

The spatial dimension addresses the central concept of interdependence in ecological, economic, social and political terms. This dimension focuses on interdependencies that influence the present and future lives of individuals at the personal and global level. The interplay of the local-global is emphasised in this dimension (See Pike and Selby, 2001).

Temporal Dimension

The temporal dimension refers to the notion that phases of time such as past, present and future are interlinked and interactive in nature and highlights the notion of alternative futures such as probable futures, possible futures, and preferable futures and offers knowledge on alternative choices to enable students make realistic and informed choices.

Issues Dimension

Three principal ideas contained within the issues dimension. First, any curriculum relevant to students' needs should address all the local-global issues that are pertinent to the lives of students. Second, the issues themselves should be viewed as interconnected. Third, students should be helped to understand that their perspective on any issue is but one among many.

Reflections on Postcolonial Educational Framework

The post-colonial framework offers analytical tool to analyze the construction of western knowledge and reproduction of colonialism with specific reference to exploration of strategies employed in subject matter knowledge and teachers pedagogy for colonial categorisation and classification of westerners and Europeans as superior and 'Others' (non-westerners) as inferior. This framework advocate incorporation of postcolonial knowledge into subject matter and pedagogies as a response to western-centric curriculum practices of global education.

Structural Violence of World Systems

This dimension provides a lens to analyze global economic and political interdependence as well as dependencies, economic violence, absence of level playing field in global trade and access to global market so on. This dimension proposes a critical pedagogy to develop a critical awareness and disposition of students towards cultural imperialism and erasure of local cultures, neoliberal and economic violence, resource war, conflict, ecological destruction (Kapoor, 2014).

Incorporation of Northern and Southern Knowledge

This dimension proposes to incorporate worldviews of those people who are omitted, marginalised, or misrepresented in mainstream academic knowledge and incorporation of the experiences, ideas and knowledge of poor, oppressed and people in opposition to people in power into curriculum. This dimension also proposes to develop multi-perspectival theoretical resources and discourses within learning milieu.

Extended Inner Dimension

The students are exposed to seven dimensions of global education instead of four dimensions of globality and as a result develop global perspectives and world mindedness instead of fostering western-centric perspectives.

Conclusion

The contemporary models or theoretical frameworks of global education treat globalisation as a neutral and natural process and fail to converse critically with literature on globalisation and address only one part of the reality.

The current models of global education have failed to offer critical insights into hegemonic processes and conditions of globalisation and capitalistic agendas of metropolitan centres, thereby marginalizing peripheral countries.

The models and frameworks do not provide a lens to unpack how discourses and literature on globalisation reproduce colonialism, western-centricism, and imperialism.

The result is a more entrenched marginalization and exclusion of non-western perspectives. The emphasis on positive aspects of globalisation(s) conceals the negative ones, and extols countries' interconnections and interdependencies. Such analysis hides structural violence and divisions among developed and poor countries of the world that emanates from globalisation.

The result is a partial, shallow and even distorted understanding of globalization. If global education has to be truly global, it has to offer critical analysis and develop better understanding of the hegemonic processes and structural violence of globalization; otherwise global education will advocate western-centric education.

The global education models and frameworks need to offer insights into both the positive and hegemonic aspects of globalisation; examine the structural violence that thrives under the rhetoric of globalisation which purportedly represents nations/cultures across the world.

Global education models and frameworks should promote awareness of how globalisation promotes neoliberal ideologies and capitalism promoting a false sense of universality building on the experiences of the most privileged people in the world (Connell, 2007) which is necessary to make global education truly global-centric and potential for forging world mindedness among students. Otherwise, the current global education approaches informed by current theoretical framework of global education remain to be either euro-centric or western-centric.

References

- Anderson, L. F. (1990). A rationale for global education. In K. A. Tye (Ed.), *Global Education: from Thought to Action* (pp. 13-34). Alexandria: The Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Chana, T. K. (2011). *Colonial Reproductions and Anti-Colonial Pedagogical Propositions for Educating about "the Global" in Urban Schools in India*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Alberta.
- Connell, R. (2007). *Southern theory: The global dynamics of knowledge in social science*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed method approaches*. Thousand Oaks, Calif: Sage Publications
- Fujikane, H. (2003). Approaches to global education in the United States, the United Kingdom and Japan. *International Review of Education*, 45(1/2). 133-152.
- Government of Pakistan. (2006). National curriculum. Islamabad: Ministry of Education
- Government of Pakistan. (2009). National education policy. Islamabad: Ministry of Education.
- Greenholtz, J. (2000). Assessing cross-cultural competence in transnational education: The intercultural development inventory. *Higher Education in Europe*, XXV(3), 411-416.
- Kapoor, D. (2012). Human rights as paradox and equivocation in contexts of Adivasi (original dweller) Dispossession in India. *Journal of Asian and African Studies*, 47(4), 404-420.

- Kapoor, D. (2014). Political society and subaltern social movements (SSM) in India: Implications for development/global education. In S. McCloskey (Ed.), *The Development Education Reader: Key Issues in Policy and Practice* (pp. 1-43). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Kirkwood, T. (2001). Our global age requires global education: Clarifying definitional ambiguities. *Social Studies*, 92, 10-15.
- Memon, M., & Hussain, M. M. (2009). *Canada Pakistan basic education project. Concept paper on improving curriculum in Pakistan: Developing national curriculum framework*. Unpublished report.
- Merryfield, M. M. (2009). Moving the center of global education: from imperial worldviews that divide the world to double consciousness, contrapuntal pedagogy, hybridity, and cross-cultural competence. In F.K. Toni (Eds.), *Visions in global education: The globalization of curriculum and pedagogy in teacher education and schools Perspectives from Canada, Russia and the United States* (pp. 215-239). New York: PETERLANG.
- Pike, G., & Selby, D. (1988). *Global teacher, global learner*. London: Hodder & Stoughton.
- Pike, G., & Selby, D. (2000). *In the global classroom 2*. Toronto, Canada: Pippin Publishing Corporation.
- Ramler, S. (1991). Global education for the 21st Century. *Educational Leadership*, 48(7), 44-46.
- Schreiber, J., & Asner-Self, K. (2011). *Educational research*. Chennai: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Short, J. R. (2001). *Global dimensions: Space, place, and the contemporary world*. London: Reaktion.

- Stake, R. E. (2006). *Multiple case study analysis*. New York, US: The Guilford Press.
- Stewart, V. (2007). Becoming citizens of the world. *Educational Leadership*, 64(7), pp. 8-14.
Studies curriculum. *The Social Studies*, 101, 254-259.
- Tye, K. A. (1990). Introduction: the world at a crossroads. In K. A. Tye (Ed.), *Global education: from thought to action* (pp. 1-9). Alexandria: The Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Wallerstein, I. (2004). *World-systems analysis: an introduction*. Durham, UK: Duke University Press.
- Yin, R. K. (2009). *Case study research: Design and methods (fourth ed.)*. Los Angeles: Sage Publications