

# A Global Dimension in the Curriculum Project

## Research Report for Yorkshire and Humber Region

### Section A: Background to the research

#### 1. Introduction

The research has encompassed two separate initiatives with different objectives:

- An audit of resources and services provided within the Yorkshire and Humber Region (the Providers Audit).
- A survey into the activities and needs of schools in the Region (the Schools Survey).

Both pieces of research have concerned themselves entirely with services for, and work within, schools of pupils and students aged from 5 – 18 years. The overall purpose has been to inform the Yorkshire and Humber Development Education Group (YHDEG), and any working groups set up, so they are better able to develop an appropriate strategy for making progress. Such a strategy will involve improving partnerships within the voluntary sector and with the formal sector, and making the delivery and take-up of services more effective and efficient.

The specific objectives of the research were:

- Develop a working understanding of what is meant by a young person's entitlement to an education that will prepare them to take part in an increasingly global society.
- Determine existing services that enable this entitlement and, thus, the gaps that exist.
- Map the extent and quality of current delivery of a global dimension in schools.

#### 2. Definition

- 2.1 **The implied understanding:** As a first step, it was necessary to develop a working understanding, or definition, of what is meant by 'an education that will prepare (young people) to take part in an increasingly global society'.

The YHDEG adopted the following:

*"A global dimension in formal sector education (5-18) aims to increase young people's understanding of their mutual dependence, development issues and the need for international development so that they can understand the key global considerations which will shape their lives.*

*This aim is to be achieved through introducing young people to knowledge, skills and values related to the eight key concepts identified in 'Developing a Global Dimension in the School Curriculum' (DfES, DFID, et al, 2000).*

*These are:*

- \* *citizenship,*
- \* *conflict resolution,*
- \* *diversity,*
- \* *human rights and responsibilities,*
- \* *interdependence,*
- \* *social justice,*
- \* *sustainable development,*
- \* *values and perceptions.*

*These concepts should be explored from all levels, from the personal and local through to the international and global.”*

In both research initiatives, these eight key concepts were used to describe to the respondents the thematic and pedagogical range of the enquiry.

- 2.2 **The received understanding:** One of the difficulties encountered in undertaking this research was the extent to which we could be sure that responses from schools (about what they are doing or need) related to our working definition. Although every effort was made to keep emphasising the international and global dimension, the eight key concepts are open to interpretations with no such dimension. Schools can consider citizenship, for example, with no reference to what is sometimes called ‘global citizenship’, and so on. This is picked up again in section 5.2.4 (a).

### 3. Methodology

- 3.1 **The team:** The research work was carried out by the members of the YHDEG (ie. staff at Centre for Global Education (York), Craven Development Education Centre, Diocese of Ripon and Leeds Global Education Project (Leeds), Development Education Centre (Hull), Leeds Development Education Centre, and Development Education Centre - South Yorkshire (Sheffield)). It was co-ordinated and interpreted by myself as external researcher.

- 3.2 **Providers audit:** The audit of resources and services provided within the Yorkshire and Humber Region was undertaken by sending a questionnaire to appropriate voluntary and formal sector organisations and individuals, known to the YHDEG members. This questionnaire is Appendix 1. The data so retrieved would support information and views being collected from local forums. The YHDEG members ran these as a separate initiative to this research.

The intention here was to collect information from *all* of the ‘key players’ in the provision of resources and services that promote the global dimension in the school curriculum to schools in the region. After the initial mailing of questionnaires to a wide range of providers, each team member followed-up the key players in an attempt to ensure their response.

- 3.3 **Schools survey:** The survey into the activities and needs of schools in the Region was undertaken through a combination of 16 face-to-face interviews and a questionnaire mailing. In total, 2,190 questionnaires were mailed to a selection of schools throughout the region, with 295 returned at the time of producing the report (a healthy 13.5% response). The data in the report is based on 249 returns. The remainder arrived too late to be included, but will still be useful to the YHDEG members.

The intention was to build-up a general picture of what is happening in schools and where further assistance would be welcome. The analysis has been broken down over different school types.

## Section B: The Providers Audit

### 4. Findings

Findings from the audit fall into two broad categories:

- \* information about specific organisations or individuals, which might assist with forming partnerships or other relationships; and
- \* information about providers in general that will help to build up a picture of the services and resources available within the region.

#### 4.1 Specific organisations:

Appendix 2 is a print-out of all the 50 organisations within the database (plus one late arrival), showing information about each organisation and its services.

#### 4.2 General observations:

**4.2.1 Kinds of organisations:** Some respondents placed themselves in two categories (eg. a church-based organisation might put 'NGO' and 'faith group').

NGO/voluntary sector	26
LEA – funded	11
Local government	5
Faith groups	4
Individuals	4
Community group	3
Private/commercial	0
Other	2
Total	55

Note: The category 'private/commercial' was included to allow for shops that specialised in global or multicultural resources or crafts that might consider themselves to be providing resources for schools.

**4.2.2 Thematic focus:** Respondents were asked to what extent their services are aimed at promoting the eight key concepts. Would we find that some of them are better served than others?

The scale for responses was: 1 = very much; 2 = a lot; 3 = to some extent; 4 = not much; 5 = not at all

	Average score
Diversity	1.74
Citizenship	1.83
Interdependence	2.06
Social justice	2.07
Values and perceptions	2.21
Human rights	2.32
Sustainable development	2.35
Conflict resolution	2.38

The lower the score, the more the organisations concentrate on that concept, on average. This shows that 'diversity' (understanding and respecting differences and relating these to our common humanity) is promoted the most, while 'conflict resolution' (understanding how conflicts are a barrier to development and why there is a need for their resolution and the promotion of harmony) is promoted the least. However, even 'conflict resolution' had 22 of the respondents scoring it either 1 or 2. So, none of the concepts is worryingly under emphasised in the work of these organisations and individuals.

Very few respondents emphasised only one or two of the concepts. Most perceive their work to promote all or most of the concepts to a greater or lesser extent. This may be because they see the interdependence of the concepts, thus making the exclusion of some difficult or illogical.

**4.2.3 Resource services:** The questionnaire attempted not only to identify the different kinds of resources offered by the organisations, but also to gather quantitative data about those services (eg. the number of pupils/teachers/schools reached). Unfortunately, the great majority of respondents were unable to provide quantitative data, so this information from those few that did, while remaining on the questionnaire forms, has not been analysed.

The services offered are listed below in order of their frequency. This shows that most of the respondents offer advice to teachers in some form, while only 10 of them work with schools on longer term programmes.

Advice/information to teachers	46
Advice/information to pupils/students	31
In-service training for teachers (CPD)	25
Undertaking curriculum development work	25
Loan service of teaching materials	22
Providing workshops or other classroom work	22
Running assemblies	21
Working with schools on whole-school initiatives	16
Sale of teaching materials	15
Working with pupils/students out of school hours	13
Organising full day events for schools	11
Running longer-term programmes with schools	10

Two things are worthy of note: Firstly, the comparatively large number of organisations that offer in-service training might warrant some follow-up enquiries about the nature of this training, its success and the methods used for promoting it. Secondly, comparatively few organisations sell teaching materials, which may offer opportunities for co-operation.

**4.2.4 Promotion:** Respondents were asked how they promoted their services to schools.

Networking	36
At conferences and events	33
Personal visits to schools	31
Newsletter to all schools	29
Website	28
Through LEA structures	21
Newsletter only to mailing list	19
Advertising in the press, etc	14

Apart from direct contact (meetings, events, visits), newsletters and the websites are most used to promote services to schools.

Quite a number of those organisations that produce a newsletter tend to mail it to *all* schools (rather than, or in addition to, a select list of subscribers) – often three or four times a year. This is an interesting finding. Feedback from the schools survey, and from other school surveys undertaken in the past<sup>1</sup>, suggests that many schools feel overburdened with paper that is sent to them. One argument states that documents

<sup>1</sup> For example, 'A Formal Sector Magazine for Development/Global Education: Market Survey Report', Kirby/Global Ink (1995); 'Promoting Development Education Resources to Scottish Teachers: Evaluation Report', Kirby/SDEC (1995).

sent 'cold' to schools are most likely to end up in the bin and the only sure way to reach a teacher is to mail to her/him personally. Does the existence of 29 newsletters flowing into schools at regular intervals throughout the year increase or decrease the chance that any of them will be read?

Of all the forms of promotion used by organisations, newsletters would seem to provide an obvious opportunity for a more strategic approach.

**4.2.5 Target group:** There is surprisingly little targeting towards age groups. Most of the respondents (39) work with all age ranges.

Most (26) also work across the whole curriculum, although some organisations focus on certain subjects. Most commonly: Citizenship (11); Geography (8); RE (8); PSE/PSHE etc (6). Other subjects mentioned as focuses for some were Art, Science, English, Environmental Studies/Education.

Nine organisations focus their work towards particular faith groups: Christian/Roman Catholic (6) and Muslim/other Asian-based faiths (3).

**4.2.6 Geographical focus:** The geographical range of organisations' services varies considerably. Some very small organisations focus on an area nearby – perhaps their town. National organisations may work with schools throughout the country. Both these types of organisation are offering services to schools within the region. Are some geographical areas of the region less well served than others?

Getting an answer to this question is difficult. For example, respondents often provide vague descriptions of their geographical area of coverage; some work to Diocese boundaries and not to LEAs.

The following table makes an attempt to build a picture of geographical coverage by considering all the LEAs in the region. National organisations have been omitted – unless they are based within the region. One should also note there may be organisations geographically based in other nearby regions who work with schools within this region. This is most likely to be the case, for example, in the eastern parts of North Yorkshire, and in the Pennines areas.

The size of population and number of secondary schools is provided to give an indication of demand for services. Also to be taken into consideration is the distance of travel required from school to school or from school to organisation. The 'large' Councils in terms of area are East Riding and, especially, North Yorkshire.

C = Council, D = District, M = Metropolitan

Council/LEA	Population served	No of Secondary Schools	Orgs that provide resource loans or sales and other services	Orgs providing other kinds of services only
Barnsley MBC	227,000	14	8	1
Calderdale MBC	191,585	15	6	1
City of Bradford MDC	488,250	28	7	1
City of York C	176,000	12	7	3
Doncaster MBC	293,453	17	9	1
East Riding of Yorkshire C	312,800	18	8	0
Kingston-U-Hull City C	269,144	17	7	1
Kirklees MC	390,900	32	6	1
Leeds City C	727,500	44	7	5
North East Lincolnshire C	156,253	12	5	0
North Lincolnshire C	?	14	4	0
North Yorkshire County C	?	47	6	6
Rotherham MBC	255,100	17	9	1
Sheffield M City C	528,500	27	9	1
Wakefield MDC	317,533	18	7	2

Conclusions that can be drawn from this table are limited, as this audit was not sophisticated enough to differentiate between the quantity and quality of the services provided by the different organisations to the different LEAs. To do this properly would require more time than was available for this research project.

However, more subjective analysis suggests that the large LEAs of East Riding and North Yorkshire are probably least well served, given the great distances to travel to and from the larger resource- and service-providing organisations. Also, LEAs that have resulted from the fragmentation of larger ones often find themselves very short of resources (budgetary and staff). This is known to apply in the ex-Humberside area (ie. Hull, N. Lincs. and NE. Lincs.)

**4.2.7 Problems faced:** Respondents were asked what constraints affect the quality and efficacy of their services for schools.

Inadequate time/people to do the work	31
Lack of opportunity or time for teachers to take up what they offer	27
Difficulty in promoting themselves	14
Lack of internal organisational management skills	12
Inadequate base, equipment, resources, etc.	11
Lack of interest within schools for their services	10
Lack of awareness about changes and developments within the formal sector	10
Lack of up-to-date information on global issues	4

The top two problems are not surprising. It is interesting, however, that so few think that lack of information on global issues is a problem.

**4.2.8 Regional co-operation:** Respondents, finally, were asked to indicate their level of interest in co-operating and co-ordinating their work within the region. They were offered five general areas that seem to offer opportunity for co-operation or co-ordination, with three responses:

1 = very interested; 2 = possibly interested; 3 = not interested.

The lower the average score, the more interest is being shown in the idea.

	1 = Very int.	2 = Possibly int.	3 = Not int.	Average score
A. Promotion of work (eg. joint leaflet; everyone promotes everyone else; etc)	20	15	2	1.51
E. Joint projects (eg. we could work together on projects of common interest).	20	15	2	1.51
D. Regional coverage (eg. if all parts of the region are not equally well resourced, can we collectively resolve this?)	8	21	5	1.91
B. Marketing (eg. development of a common logo or image so that schools see we are all working towards similar objectives; common newsletter; etc.)	8	17	9	2.03
C. Specialisation (eg. instead of our services overlapping, we could specialise more).	7	13	8	2.04

Some other ideas floated:

- \* Link with existing initiatives in Education for Sustainability
- \* Explore inter-regional co-operation. For example, might there be possibilities in linking our work with that in the North West Region?

## Section C: The Schools Survey

### 5. Findings

As with the providers audit, findings from the survey fall into two broad categories:

- \* information about specific schools, which might assist YHDEG members with their relationships with those schools; and
- \* information about schools in general that will help to build up a picture of the activities and needs within the region.

#### 5.1 Specific schools:

The information provided by schools on the questionnaires is sometimes detailed and will be very useful for those organisations trying to work with those schools. Therefore, the questionnaires have been returned to the YHDEG members that mailed them out in the hope that they will be able file them and use them to their advantage. A copy of the questionnaire, which also acted as the basis for the school interviews, can be found in Appendix 3. Appendix 4 provides a list of the schools that have been included in the analysis.

It is clear, from feedback from the interviews, that in some cases the interview provided both the interviewer and the teacher with information that they can use subsequently. The interview forms have also been returned to the interviewers.

#### 5.2 General information about schools:

##### 5.2.1 Typology of responding schools: The typology covers four dimensions:

- (a) Primary/Secondary: 'Primary' - includes Infant, Junior and Middle Schools, and 'Secondary' includes 6<sup>th</sup> Form Colleges. There were only 2 Middle Schools and 0 6<sup>th</sup> Form Colleges in the survey. 'Special' schools (15), which cover a variety of different age ranges, was treated as a separate category.
- (b) Rural/other: Rural = 64. The 'other' category includes schools in urban areas that draw either entirely from urban environments (109) or which draw some pupils from rural areas ('rural and urban' on the questionnaire - 76).
- (c) Predominantly white/other: 'Other' includes multicultural schools (32) and schools that are mono-cultural but not white (6 – all South Asian cultures). Although not specifically identified in the questionnaire, a number of schools mentioned the presence of Traveller children and are recognised by those schools as being of a different 'culture' to 'white'.
- (d) Contact with YHDEG members: The level of contact was categorised as 'strong' (eg. at least one member has worked with the school), 'weak' (maybe, school is on at least one member's mailing list) or 'no contact'. The categorisation for each school was decided by the members from their records.

The breakdown of questionnaire respondents into the various categories is as follows:

Primary Schools	YHDEG member categorisation			Totals
	Strong	Weak	None	
Rural	4	10	40	54
Other	13	31	87	131
Totals	17	41	127	185
Predominantly white	13	35	111	159
Other	4	6	16	26
Totals	17	41	127	185

Secondary Schools	YHDEG member categorisation			Totals
	Strong	Weak	None	
Rural	1	0	8	9
Other	11	10	19	40
Totals	12	10	27	49
Predominantly white	8	7	24	39
Other	4	3	3	10
Totals	12	10	27	49

There were too few special schools to make a similar categorisation useful. Nearly all were in urban areas and most were predominantly white.

In addition to the questionnaire, interviews were conducted with 16 schools (6 Primary, 6 Secondary and 4 Special Schools). Notable findings from the interviews and written comments on the questionnaires are presented below as observations.

- 5.2.2 The Global Dimension within the school curriculum:** Question 2 of the questionnaire listed the eight key concepts and asked respondents to indicate
- \* how important they think it is that each concept should be part of pupils' and students' educational entitlement; and
  - \* how well each concept is covered in their school.

Due to the importance of these results, a number of different comparisons have been made.

In each case, the range of response was from 0 = 'Not important' or 'Not at all', to 5 = 'Extremely important' or 'Extremely well'. In the following analysis, an average score has been calculated. Thus, the higher the average score, the more important the concept is seen to be, or the better the school covers it.

The difference between the scores given for importance and those given for how well the concepts are covered is a useful indicator of the gap perceived by schools between importance and delivery. The following tables also provide this difference for each concept and the overall mean of those differences.

(a) Primary Schools and Secondary Schools:

Comparison of Primary and Secondary Schools	Primary Schools			Secondary Schools		
	How important?	How well covered?	Diff.	How important?	How well covered?	Diff.
Number of respondents in this category	184	181		49	48	
<b>A. Citizenship</b> (Gaining knowledge, skills and understanding necessary to become informed, active, responsible global citizens).	3.71	2.53	1.18	3.76	2.42	1.34
<b>B. Sustainable development</b> (Understanding the need to maintain and improve the quality of life now without damaging the planet for future generations).	3.70	2.45	1.25	3.53	2.42	1.11
<b>C. Interdependence</b> (Understanding how people, places and environments are all inextricably interrelated and that local events can have repercussions on a global scale).	3.40	2.23	1.17	3.43	2.40	1.03
<b>D. Conflict resolution</b> (Understanding how conflicts are a barrier to development and why there is a need for their resolution and the promotion of harmony).	3.55	2.61	0.94	3.57	2.54	1.03
<b>E. Human rights</b> (Knowing about human rights and understanding their breadth and universality).	3.43	2.22	1.21	3.61	2.54	1.07
<b>F. Diversity</b> (Understanding and respecting differences and relating these to our common humanity).	3.83	2.98	0.85	3.67	2.63	1.04
<b>G. Social justice</b> (Understanding the importance of social justice as an element in both sustainable development and the improved welfare of all people).	3.35	2.25	1.10	3.37	2.40	0.97
<b>H. Values and perceptions</b> (Developing a critical evaluation of images of the developing world and an appreciation of the effect these have on people's attitudes and values)	3.29	2.08	1.21	3.33	2.27	1.06
Overall averages	3.53	2.42	1.11	3.53	2.45	1.08

Observations about the importance attached:

- \* Primary and Secondary Schools consider most of the concepts to be equally important. The exceptions are that Primary Schools see 'sustainable development' and 'diversity' as being more important than Secondary Schools, while it is vice versa for 'human rights'.
- \* It is interesting to note that 'Citizenship' is considered most important in Secondary Schools. This is clearly as a response to its direct curriculum applicability. Primary Schools consider 'Diversity' to be most important, by some distance.
- \* In general, Primary Schools' opinion of importance is heavily affected by the relationship between the complexity of the issue (as they perceive it) and the age of their pupils. In Secondary Schools, the key factor would appear to be how these concepts are prioritised against other curriculum time demands.

Observations about how well the concepts are covered:

- \* Across the board, both Primary and Secondary Schools recognise that they deliver these concepts in their teaching considerably less well than their importance suggests they ought to do. The difference between the two scores ranges from 0.85 ('diversity' in Primary Schools) to about 1.34 ('citizenship' in Secondary Schools). The average difference is about 1.1, for both Primary and Secondary Schools.
- \* Many respondents complained about the overcrowding of the curriculum and the need to find ways of bringing these concepts into existing curriculum areas and subjects.
- \* At all age ranges, 'values and perceptions' is least well covered, while 'diversity' is most well covered.
- \* Many Secondary Schools commented that they are currently undertaking an audit of how Citizenship will be delivered across the curriculum and that they expect this to be better covered in a year's time.
- \* Comments raised at interview pose a question about the success of some schools in really tackling issues around diversity. Some teachers, especially in predominantly white schools, feel there remains a great deal of racism and negativity towards difference.

<i>Special Schools</i>			
Key concepts	How important?	How well covered?	Difference
Number of respondents in this category	15	14	
<b>A. Citizenship</b>	3.80	2.43	1.37
<b>B. Sustainable development</b>	3.33	2.50	0.83
<b>C. Interdependence</b>	3.13	1.64	1.49
<b>D. Conflict resolution</b>	3.73	2.79	0.94
<b>E. Human rights</b>	3.60	2.43	1.17
<b>F. Diversity</b>	3.53	3.07	0.46
<b>G. Social justice</b>	3.67	2.64	1.03
<b>H. Values and perceptions</b>	3.20	1.93	1.27

Observations:

- \* Special Schools find the concepts very difficult for children of all ages that have learning difficulties – sometimes severe. However, they see them as important – in most cases just as important as mainstream schools see them.
- \* ‘Conflict resolution’ gets a particularly high score for importance.

- (b) Rural Schools: Do rural schools provide different answers to schools situated in urban areas? This is explored by comparing rural Primary Schools with urban Primary Schools. (There are not enough rural Secondary Schools in the data to involve them.)

<i>Comparison of Rural and Other Primary Schools</i>	Rural Schools			Other Schools		
	How import?	How well covered?	Diff.	How import?	How well covered?	Diff.
Number of respondents in this category	53	53		131	128	
<b>A. Citizenship</b>	3.51	2.51	1.00	3.79	2.54	1.25
<b>B. Sustainable development</b>	3.53	2.42	1.11	3.76	2.46	1.30
<b>C. Interdependence</b>	3.28	2.21	1.07	3.45	2.22	1.23
<b>D. Conflict resolution</b>	3.30	2.43	0.87	3.66	2.68	0.98
<b>E. Human rights</b>	3.21	2.02	1.19	3.53	2.30	1.23
<b>F. Diversity</b>	3.66	2.75	0.91	3.89	3.07	0.82
<b>G. Social justice</b>	3.11	2.06	1.05	3.45	2.34	1.11
<b>H. Values and perceptions</b>	3.09	1.94	1.15	3.37	2.14	1.23
Overall averages	3.37	2.29	1.08	3.61	2.47	1.14

Observations:

- \* On average, schools in rural areas rate the importance of these concepts significantly<sup>2</sup> lower than schools in urban areas.
- \* Many of these rural Primary Schools are very small, situated in farming village communities. A number of respondents commented that children in their school knew little about the region outside their village, let alone have a global perspective.
- \* Urban schools claim to cover five of the concepts better than rural schools. Figures for the other three are remarkably similar.

(c) Predominantly white schools: Are there differences between predominantly white schools and schools classed as multicultural or schools that are non-white mono-cultural? Again, due to the smaller numbers of non-white Secondary Schools, this comparison is made with Primary Schools only.

Comparison of Predominantly White with Other Primary Schools	Predominantly White Schools			Other Schools		
	How import?	How well covered?	Diff.	How import?	How well covered?	Diff.
Number of respondents in this category	158	155		26	26	
<b>A. Citizenship</b>	3.68	2.53	1.15	3.92	2.54	1.38
<b>B. Sustainable development</b>	3.69	2.46	1.23	3.77	2.38	1.39
<b>C. Interdependence</b>	3.37	2.19	1.18	3.58	2.38	1.2
<b>D. Conflict resolution</b>	3.52	2.57	0.95	3.77	2.85	0.92
<b>E. Human rights</b>	3.41	2.17	1.24	3.62	2.50	1.12
<b>F. Diversity</b>	3.80	2.91	0.89	4.00	3.38	0.62
<b>G. Social justice</b>	3.35	2.27	1.08	3.38	2.15	1.23
<b>H. Values and perceptions</b>	3.27	2.06	1.21	3.42	2.23	1.19
Overall averages	3.51	2.40	1.12	3.68	2.55	1.13

Observations:

- \* On average, predominantly white schools seem to rate the importance of these concepts lower than other schools<sup>3</sup>.
- \* Not surprisingly, the multicultural and mono-cultural non-white schools score a full 4.00 for the importance of diversity.

<sup>2</sup> Applying the *t* test to compare the two sets of scores produces a value of  $t_{obt} = 2.701$ . At the 5% level of significance,  $t_{crit} = 2.145$ . Therefore,  $p < .05$ . This means, there are fewer than 5 chances in a hundred that these scores would differ as they do by chance alone.

<sup>3</sup> Although, the difference between the two sets of figures is not significant to the 5% level of certainty, it would be significant to 10%. ie.  $p < .1$



- (d) Contact with YHDEG members: Is there any difference in the responses from schools that have a strong contact with YHDEG members?

<i>Comparison of Primary Schools with different levels of contact with YHDEG members</i>				Strong contact			Weak contact			No contact		
Key concepts	Import	Cover	Diff.	Import	Cover	Diff.	Import.	Cover	Diff.	Import.	Cover	Diff.
Number of respondents	17	17		41	41		126	123				
<b>A. Citizenship</b>	3.76	2.35	1.41	3.66	2.59	1.07	3.72	2.54	1.18			
<b>B. Sustainable development</b>	3.65	2.41	1.24	3.73	2.54	1.19	3.69	2.42	1.27			
<b>C. Interdependence</b>	3.53	2.18	1.35	3.37	2.15	1.22	3.40	2.24	1.16			
<b>D. Conflict resolution</b>	3.59	2.76	0.83	3.54	2.66	0.88	3.56	2.57	0.99			
<b>E. Human rights</b>	3.35	2.18	1.17	3.46	2.34	1.12	3.44	2.18	1.26			
<b>F. Diversity</b>	3.94	3.12	0.82	3.78	3.05	0.73	3.83	2.93	0.90			
<b>G. Social justice</b>	3.18	2.12	1.06	3.46	2.22	1.24	3.34	2.28	1.06			
<b>H. Values and perceptions</b>	3.35	2.12	1.23	3.27	2.07	1.20	3.29	2.08	1.21			
Overall averages	3.54	2.41	1.14	3.53	2.45	1.08	3.53	2.41	1.13			

Observations:

- \* There is no difference between these three samples. This survey is probably too crude to identify what impact on schools might be caused by contact with YHDEG members. Such impact will need to be measured at a more sophisticated level, school by school.

Due to the small sample numbers, and the difficulty YHDEG members had in identifying what is meant by a 'strong' contact with a large Secondary School, the following analysis compares between 'no contact' and 'some contact' (which is an amalgamation of strong and weak).

<i>Comparison of Secondary Schools with different levels of contact with YHDEG members</i>				Some contact			No contact		
Key concepts	How import?	How well covered?	Diff.	How import?	How well covered?	Diff.	How import?	How well covered?	Diff.
Number of respondents in this category	22	22		27	26				
<b>A. Citizenship</b>	3.73	2.23	1.50	3.78	2.58	1.20			
<b>B. Sustainable development</b>	3.46	2.23	1.23	3.59	2.58	1.01			
<b>C. Interdependence</b>	3.50	2.14	1.36	3.37	2.62	0.75			
<b>D. Conflict resolution</b>	3.73	2.68	1.05	3.44	2.42	1.02			
<b>E. Human rights</b>	3.59	2.37	1.22	3.63	2.69	0.94			
<b>F. Diversity</b>	3.82	2.59	1.23	3.56	2.65	0.91			
<b>G. Social justice</b>	3.59	2.32	1.27	3.19	2.46	0.73			
<b>H. Values and perceptions</b>	3.45	2.27	1.18	3.22	2.27	0.95			
Overall averages	3.61	2.35	1.26	3.47	2.53	0.94			

Observations

- \* Comparing the two overall average 'difference' figures (1.26 and 0.94) suggests that schools that have had some contact with a member feel a greater disparity between importance and coverage. One can only speculate about this: perhaps, the respondents from such schools are more *critical* of what they achieve?

### 5.2.3 The extent that schools are able to tackle the eight concepts at different key stages:

Respondents were given the option of answering '0 = not at all', '1 = not much', '2 = to some extent', '3 = a lot', and '4 = very much' for each Key Stage of relevance to them. The average scores given are as follows:

Foundation: 1.91; Key Stage 1: 2.17; Key Stage 2: 2.45; Key Stage 3: 2.46; Key Stage 4: 2.36; Beyond Key Stage 4: 2.25.

Observations:

- \* This confirms that there is a perception that these concepts are less easily tackled with younger children, on the one hand, and cannot easily be tackled (due to curriculum constraints – see 5.2.6) with older children. The best opportunities are thought to be at Key Stages 2 and 3.

### 5.2.4 Whole-school activities:

- (a) Primary Schools: 76 out of 185 Primary Schools (41%) claimed to be promoting the global dimension through whole-school activity. The table below categorises these activities:

Fundraising activities (often through aid agencies)	30
Southern school links	16
European and Northern country links (school/community)	16
Visitors invited into school, either as part of curriculum delivery (eg. foreign language assistants) or to emphasise a multicultural or international dimension	15
Projects/Weeks/Festivals (eg One World Week, Harvest Festivals, Cultural events)	10
Links with other schools in the UK (eg rural/urban; white/multicultural)	8
Environmental projects (eg. recycling, developing the school grounds)	6
Assemblies	5
Cross-curricular themes/ topic work	5

Observations:

- \* Many respondents offered whole-school activities that clearly had no global dimension to them (eg. school/community activity). This suggests that there is a need to be careful when using the eight key concepts to ensure that schools understand the *global* dimension within them all.
- \* Fundraising is seen by many schools as an appropriate (and, sometimes, the *only*) way to relate to the South. While in some schools this is being done as a backdrop to school work and other educational initiatives, in others it is not clear that the educational aspects are covered.
- \* A number of respondents commented that they are looking to develop links with schools in the South. Some asked for help with this.

- (b) Secondary Schools: 32 of 64 (50%) schools claimed to be undertaking some kind of whole-school initiatives:

European and Northern country links (school/community)	15
Fundraising activities (often through aid agencies)	11
Projects/Weeks/Festivals/Events (eg Equal Opportunities day, cross-curricular events)	9
Southern school links	8
Other	3

**5.2.5 Numbers of teachers involved in teaching the global dimension:** Due to problems with the structure of this question on the questionnaire, the results are confusing and inconclusive and no analysis or observations are offered.

**5.2.6 Blocks, as perceived by schools, which hinder them from fully providing the eight concepts:** Respondents were asked to identify whether any of the blocks identified were major or minor blocks. What, in other words, most hinders schools from teaching the global dimension?

0 = not a block; 1 = a minor block; 2 = a major block. An average score has been calculated for each 'block'.

(a) Primary and Secondary Schools:

<i>Blocks as perceived by Primary Schools</i>	Ave. score
Lack of opportunity/time in the curriculum	1.53
Lack of appropriate teaching resources	1.37
The complexity of the issues	1.26
Lack of external support (eg. training/advice)	1.25
Lack of expertise amongst staff	1.22
The controversial nature of the issues	1.01

<i>Blocks as perceived by Secondary Schools</i>	Ave. score
Lack of opportunity/time in the curriculum	1.59
Lack of appropriate teaching resources	1.33
Lack of expertise amongst staff	1.24
Lack of external support (eg. training/advice)	1.04
The complexity of the issues	0.94
The controversial nature of the issues	0.80

Observations:

- \* Both Primary and Secondary Schools perceive curriculum limitations the greatest block, closely followed by inadequate teaching resources.
- \* The controversial nature of the issues is perceived as the least problematic of the blocks identified.
- \* Feedback from interviews supports these figures, except that lack of staff confidence/competence and a need for training was given as a greater block than is suggested by the Primary School questionnaire responses.
- \* Some interviewees also identified internal school blocks, such as lack of support from the senior management team in releasing funds for resources or training.

(b) Special Schools

<i>Blocks as perceived by Secondary Schools</i>	Ave. score
The complexity of the issues	1.73
Lack of opportunity/time in the curriculum	1.33
Lack of external support (eg. training/advice)	1.27
Lack of appropriate teaching resources	1.07
Lack of expertise amongst staff	0.93
The controversial nature of the issues	0.87

Observations:

- \* Perhaps unsurprisingly, in Special Schools with children with multiple learning difficulties, the complexity of the issues is seen as the biggest block.

- (b) Rural and urban schools: Do rural schools perceive the blocks differently? The comparison has been made within all Primary Schools.

<i>Blocks as perceived by rural Primary Schools</i>	Ave. score
Lack of opportunity/time in the curriculum	1.57
Lack of appropriate teaching resources	1.41
The complexity of the issues	1.39
Lack of external support	1.19
Lack of expertise amongst staff	1.11
The controversial nature of the issues	1.06

<i>Blocks as perceived by urban Primary Schools</i>	Ave. score
Lack of opportunity/time in the curriculum	1.51
Lack of appropriate teaching resources	1.36
Lack of external support	1.28
The complexity of the issues	1.26
Lack of expertise amongst staff	1.21
The controversial nature of the issues	0.98

Observations:

- \* There is very little difference between these two samples.

**5.2.7 The support that schools would find most useful:** As with 5.2.6, this is shown for Primary, Secondary and Special Schools, and also for rural and urban Primary Schools.

0 = Support not needed; 1 = support would be quite useful; 2 = support would be very useful

<i>Kinds of support most wanted</i>	Primary Schools	Secondary Schools	Special Schools	Rural Primary Schools	Urban Primary Schools
Advice about best teaching resources	1.72	1.63	1.53	1.67	1.75
Access to human resources (eg. speakers, 'Southern' visitors, etc.)	1.67	1.71	1.33	1.69	1.66
Chance to view and buy or hire best teaching resources	1.41	1.45	1.20	1.33	1.44
Teacher training (eg. in-school courses)	1.41	1.10	1.33	1.39	1.41
Classroom support	1.33	1.02	0.93	1.30	1.34
Help with overseas school linking	1.25	1.12	0.80	1.37	1.20
Networks to enable you to contact other teachers doing similar work	1.21	1.24	1.27	1.19	1.21

Observations:

- \* In general, there is a great demand for support in this field. All the proposed ideas received an average score suggesting they would be 'quite useful' to 'very useful' (except for two scores within the Special School sample).
- \* Again, interviewees emphasised a greater desire for training support than did the questionnaire responses.
- \* Interviewees and questionnaire comments suggest that some schools would find any support difficult either because it would cost money or because it would require staff to invest time.
- \* Related to the above point, some requests were made for special days when staff could be released to visit a DEC or could receive in-school training.

- \* Some responses also suggested the need for a teacher in school to be given overall responsibility for promoting the global dimension throughout the curriculum.

### 5.2.8 What schools currently use to help them deliver the global dimension:

Respondents were asked to indicate how frequently they used a list of services (2 = frequently, 1 = occasionally, 0 = never). In many cases, the respondent stated that they did not know – these responses have been omitted.

<i>Frequency that current services are used to help deliver a global dimension to the curriculum</i>	Primary Schools	Secondary Schools
QCA guidance documents	1.34	1.32
An aid agency	0.82	0.87
LEA schemes of work/support	0.79	0.67
The QCA document 'Developing a Global Dimension ....'	0.65	0.76
A DEC (or equivalent)	0.44	0.53
Teachers in Development Education (TIDE)	0.04	0.07

#### Observations:

- \* This shows the importance of the QCA guidance documents, although it is disappointing that the specific document on the global dimension is less well used or known about. Perhaps this latter point is due in part to the fact that 'Developing a global dimension in the school curriculum' was not distributed to all schools when published.
- \* A number of respondents, having been introduced to this document by the survey, stated that they would now use it to help with their planning.
- \* Some initial sampling of returned questionnaires from schools, where it is known that a YHDEG member has worked in depth, suggests that the respondent to the questionnaire was not always aware of that work. Most of the questionnaires were completed by the head teacher or deputy head. These respondents may not be aware of the use made of resources and services by classroom teachers.
- \* Where interviews were undertaken, knowledge and use of the local DEC (or equivalent) was greater. Interviews were usually undertaken with classroom teachers or people with a special interest in, or professional responsibility for, the global dimension.

## 5.3 General comments about work with schools

5.3.1 The feedback from the interviews and the questionnaires gives a strong sense of the need to treat schools individually rather than as one of a type.

- \* The person responding to the survey or interview (and, therefore, the person with whom an external organisation has contact) is crucial to the interpretation of what that school is like and what its needs are.
- \* Schools are seen very clearly by their management and their staff as having particular kinds of ethos. Some will describe this as how they are struggling against difficulties or challenges imposed by their catchment area - eg. high unemployment in the catchment population, the number of pupils getting free school meals, the class differences between sectors of the catchment population, the existence of traveller children, and so on. Others will describe, instead, the ethos that they are seeking to achieve – eg. a caring school, a safe environment, one seeking high academic or sporting achievement, and so on.

5.3.2 Given this disparity in what schools are like - their circumstances and ambitions, one gains a sense of the need to tailor support on a school-by-school basis – working in partnership with them. For example, rural schools do not value a Southern school link as highly as some other schools. Some are trying, instead, to link with schools in the UK that are situated in quite different social areas. All-white, rural schools may benefit enormously from a mature link with a school in an inner-city multiracial area. Another example is the use that many schools make of fundraising. This would suggest a need to consider the role that fundraising can take in increasing awareness, on a case-by-case basis.

5.3.3 Comments from the interviews and questionnaires do suggest, however, certain crude categorisations of schools *in as far as they relate to their interest in and take-up of the global dimension*. (The survey has no statistical analysis of the following categories, so there is no evidence to suggest how large each category is in comparison with one another.)

\* Category A: These are schools that clearly recognise the importance of the global dimension and are already achieving a great deal. Perhaps they have school links that are functioning successfully (at least one being with a school in the South). They bring the global dimension into the curriculum in many different ways (both through the core curriculum and through other opportunities, such as events, festivals, and so on). This means there are a number of staff members, and probably the senior management team, who are supportive of this dimension. They also use a variety of resource supports – the local DEC, national organisations, other local resources – and are usually keen to access help wherever it can be found.

\* Category B: These are schools where there is a recognition of the importance of the global dimension concepts, but also a recognition that not enough is done. There is a willingness to do more if the problems (finance, time, staff skills) can be overcome. Teachers in such a school who are keen to promote the global dimension will get support from management up to a point, but will probably be in great need of additional help.

\* Category C: A number of schools recognise the importance of the concepts, but frankly are not convinced that these are of greater importance than existing priorities – such as achieving test and examination standards, or focussing on numeracy and literacy, or dealing with social problems within the school (discipline, truancy). The global dimension seems a luxury when faced with the pressures on them and is likely to be given little attention. Teachers keen to promote the global dimension in such schools are likely to get little or no support from management, nor from staff colleagues. They will either have to plough a lonely furrow or give up altogether.

\* Category D: Then there are those schools that probably think they are doing all this perfectly adequately already. They appear at first sight to be similar to Category A schools, except the apparent activity serves largely as a smokescreen to disguise the fact that the work is ineffective or inadequate. In these schools, the school link may have deteriorated into a pen pal arrangement involving just a few pupils. Most staff view the events as being peripheral to the core of the school. Perhaps, the 'global' has gone out of the work, leaving the social dimension but with no reference to the wider world. Perhaps, the lack of awareness of the need to keep developing has led to staff becoming out of touch with more recent thinking in relation to, for example, fundraising, development issues and racism.

April 2002

