

First Edition

MULTICULTURAL EDUCATION

TEACHING AND LEARNING IN THE GLOBAL VILLAGE

Edited by

Anna B. Wolford



**SNEAK
PREVIEW**

For additional information on adopting this title for your class, please contact us at

800.200.3908 x501 or info@cognella.com

FIRST EDITION

MULTICULTURAL EDUCATION

TEACHING AND LEARNING IN THE GLOBAL VILLAGE

Edited by Anna B. Wolford
University of Central Florida



Bassim Hamadeh, CEO and Publisher
Michael Simpson, Vice President of Acquisitions
Jamie Giganti, Senior Managing Editor
Miguel Macias, Graphic Designer
Gem Rabanera, Project Editor
Elizabeth Rowe, Licensing Coordinator
Rachel Singer, Interior Designer

Copyright © 2016 by Cognella, Inc. All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reprinted, reproduced, transmitted, or utilized in any form or by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying, microfilming, and recording, or in any information retrieval system without the written permission of Cognella, Inc.

First published in the United States of America in 2016 by Cognella, Inc.

Trademark Notice: Product or corporate names may be trademarks or registered trademarks, and are used only for identification and explanation without intent to infringe.

Cover image copyright © Depositphotos/marigold_88.

Interior image adapted from Copyright © Depositphotos/marigold_88.

Printed in the United States of America

ISBN: 978-1-5165-0010-9 (pbk) / 978-1-5165-0011-6 (br)

 **cognella**[®]
academic publishing
www.cognella.com 800-200-3908

Contents

Introduction	vi
BY ANNA B. WOLFORD	
CHAPTER ONE	
Toward a Philosophy of Global Education	30
BY HILARY LANDORF	
CHAPTER TWO	
Part I: Conceptual Preparation and Part II: Ethnic Sources of America's Multicultural Heritage	48
BY J. AKUMA-KALU NJOKU	
CHAPTER THREE	
Islam: Beliefs, History, and Rituals	96
BY GABRIELLE MARRANCI	
CHAPTER FOUR	
Culture and Disabilities	112
BY GÉRMAN R. NÚÑEZ	

CHAPTER FIVE

**Globalization of the Local/Localization of
the Global Mapping Transnational Women's
Movements 128**

BY AMRITA BASU

CHAPTER SIX

Rethinking Development 142

BY LAWRENCE HERZOG

CHAPTER SEVEN

Grouping and Cooperative Learning 152

BY ROBERTA KAUFMAN

CHAPTER EIGHT

**Globalization's Pressure on the Economic
Divide in America's Education Systems:
Affluent Schools and Inner-City Schools 178**

BY JESSICA CHILDRESS, UNIVERSITY OF CENTRAL FLORIDA

CHAPTER NINE

America's Linguistic Empire 188

BY JENNIFER SCHOCK, UNIVERSITY OF CENTRAL FLORIDA

CHAPTER TEN

**Comparative Education: Comparing
the Top-Performing Countries to the
United States 200**

BY KIMBERLY LOIARS, UNIVERSITY OF CENTRAL FLORIDA

References 218

Introduction


by Anna B. Wolford

A BRIEF HISTORY OF GLOBALIZATION

This introduction examines education in the context of globalization. Globalization is a popular but elusive concept. Thousands of books have been devoted to the subject. We start with the definition of globalization, perhaps the most important theory of postmodernity.

My undergraduate students at the University of Central Florida usually define globalization intuitively, in simple but powerful terms. For them, globalization means shrinking of the world. More advanced graduate students discuss globalization in the context of economy, culture, technology, and education. Frequently, the students in education come up with their own definitions of globalization that suit their professional and personal interests. As an educational researcher, I do the same. I customize existing social science definitions. My own definition is truly inter-disciplinary. I have been exposed to many intertwined social disciplines. My definition of globalization entangles global politics, economics, culture, environment, and education.

Let us consider several definitions popular in the United States. For former President Bill Clinton, globalization means the ‘world without walls’. For economist and writer Joseph Stiglitz (2007), globalization presents many opportunities to remove trade barriers. For philosopher Noam Chomsky (Fox, 2001; Chomsky, 2013), globalization produces and reinforces the world system of winners and losers. Bill Clinton’s political arguments in support of globalization are based on an assumption that globalization brings the world together around freedom, democracy, and peace. An economic



rationale of Stiglitz and other global promoters extends the political claims by saying that unregulated free trade will lead to a general rise in living standards. There is a problem with this argument. Both American domestic experiences and international experiences have shown that the opening of trade and financial markets didn't bring prosperity to the poorest people in America and in the world's poorest nations. On the contrary, many people see that globalization is a new word for inequity, conquest, imperialism, colonization, and Americanization. Some economists fear that global interconnections creates a false reality. For example, the American government keeps borrowing from the Chinese government, and in turn the Chinese keep lending because of the global dependencies we have created in the last twenty years. Without new market mechanisms, national economies can create a huge global economic bubble ready to burst (Goodman, 2009).

Globalization is nothing new. The phenomenon of globalization, witnessed today, has a long history. In fact, globalization predates modern times. In the twentieth century, London's *The Times* used it in the context of international trade discussions. In 1961, *globalization* appeared in *Merriam Webster's Dictionary*. The French came with their own term, *mondialization*. In the 1960s, the French term lost popularity as French global influences faded away. In 1968, the phrase "global village" was coined by Marshall McLuhan. McLuhan introduced more than the catchy phrase; he noticed a paradigm shift in human communication and interactions that took place in a second half of the twentieth century. McLuhan's breakthrough thesis predicted that new electronic media would shrink the world. He correctly envisioned an unprecedented acceleration of cross-cultural communication across the

globe. As seen, globalization is an old and consistent trend. But the speed of globalizing is new. In 2015, a novelty lies in intensity of economic exchanges and human interactions. We have always had globalization but at the much slower pace. McLuhan was right on the money about communication. In the 1990s, a brand new Internet technology truly revolutionized our world.

When did globalization begin? Again, an answer will depend on your personal interests and professional convictions. The answer to the question of whether globalization constitutes a new phenomenon depends upon how far we are willing to look into the historical global chain of causation. Archeologists have stretched an era of archaic globalization back into ancient history. My graduate students who study history would easily find the roots of globalization in antiquity. Some scholars extend the historical scope of globalization to the ancient times, while some limit the scope to the post-1989 era. Others suggest that these processes have been unfolding for millennia and erupted after the year 2000.

We begin a brief historical sketch of globalization about 12,000 years ago, when small bands of hunters and gatherers reached the southern tip of South America. In this earliest phase of globalization, contact among thousands of hunters and gatherers was geographically limited and mostly coincidental (Steger, 2009). The mode of interactions changed dramatically about 10,000 years ago when humans started producing their own food. Roving bands of nomads lost out to settled tribes, chiefdoms, and, ultimately, powerful states based on agricultural food production. For the most part, globalization in the prehistoric period was very limited. Two monumental developments—the invention of writing in Mesopotamia, Egypt, and China between 3500 and 2000 BCE and the invention of the wheel around 3000 BCE in Asia—boosted globalization to a new level in the pre-modern era. In the political realm, the pre-modern period was the age of empires (the Egyptian Kingdom, the Persian Empire, the Macedonian Empire, the American Empires of the Aztecs and the Incas, the Roman Empire, the Byzantine Empire). All of these empires fostered the multiplication of long-distance communication and exchange of culture, technology, commodities, and diseases. The most technologically advanced was the Chinese Empire with such inventions as ploughshares, irrigation, hydraulic engineering, gunpowder, printing, paper, silk fabrics, codification of law, and standardization of measures and weights. The Silk Road linked the Chinese and Roman Empires, reaching the Italian peninsula. First globetrotters, including Marco Polo, relied on this route to reach China. By the fifteenth century CE, enormous Chinese fleets of ocean going ships were crossing the Indian Ocean and establishing trade posts in Africa. The networks of economic and cultural exchanges triggered mass migration and the growth of cities.

Having contributed little to technology before 1000 CE, Europeans benefited from the diffusion of technological innovations originating in Islamic and Chinese cultural spheres. Europeans emerged as global innovators and explorers later on. The early modern period of 1500–1750 was the time of Europe on the global map. The term “modernity” has become associated with European Enlightenment. During these two centuries, Europe served as the primary catalyst for globalization. The rise of European metropolitan centers strengthened globalization trends. Embracing the new values of individualism and material accumulation, Europeans laid the foundation of our capitalist system today. The rulers of Spain, Portugal, the

2 Multicultural Education: Teaching and Learning in the Global Village

Netherlands, France, and England promoted and supported the exploration of new frontiers. Planet-shrinking endeavors were galvanized by European obsessive competition to get round the world first and fastest. The Atlantic slave trade, though involuntary, created an immigration of Blacks to America.

In his book *A Brief History of Globalization* Alex MacGillivray (2006) presents the history of globalization captured chronologically in the four major global tipping points called fault-lines. The first global fault-line was traced on the globe by the 1494 Treaty of Tordesillas between Spain and Portugal. Portugal won its Brazilian foothold. The result was the first truly global empire, spanning Europe, North Africa, the Americas, and Asia. The outcome of the treaty was a shift from exploration to domination in Brazil. The Spanish also turned their exploration of the Americas into domination in the Caribbean, Mexico, and Peru. Magellan's voyage gave Europeans a new sense of urgency in discovering new trade routes. The global sailing became a potent emblem of competition as European rulers discovered new trading places. The trend was epitomized by the 1648 Treaty of Westphalia that gave a birth of the new national system in Europe. This was followed by a long 200-year contest between France and Britain about the shape and the size of earth and the location of the prime meridian. The second global fault-line in the XIX century was created by the British Empire, the leading global powerhouse.

In modernity, WWI and WWII and the Cold War with the Space Race marked our times as the third global fault-line. In the post—Cold War era, we witnessed the further intensification of trade connections worldwide and the decentralization of global powers. In my lifetime, I have already witnessed the fall of the American empire (the third global fault-line of globalization) and the emergence of new financial and power centers in Asia and South America that initiated the fourth fault-line of globalization.

De-Americanization is not a final frontier in the history of globalization. The outcomes of the fourth global fault-line are still unknown and hard to predict. The new global constellation could be a global spread of influences among continents. In the area of fierce global competition, Asia, Euro-America, and Pan-America may emerge as joint global leaders. In February 2013, President Obama initiated the construction of the Euro-American trade agreement. Potentially, such an agreement can change directions and outcomes of globalization in the future. Thomas Friedman estimates that the key stage of globalization started in the year 2000. New communication technologies (Internet) were crucial at this historical juncture. Coincidentally, the fall of communism at the end of the 1980s ushered in the new era in world politics (Huntington, 1997). The world has become more open and unified after the fall of the Berlin Wall (Friedman, 2005). With these indisputable signals of the fourth fault-line, we are the first generation of the global villagers experiencing the fourth contraction. Today, planetary citizens are riding global waves.

Alex MacGillivray (2006) coined predictive names for a contemporary version of globalization. In his terminology, *thermo-globalization* and *social globalization* is a new stage of globalization that focuses on social activism and environment awareness. Historically, our global citizenry has been undergoing steady contraction and shrinkage. In his brief history of globalization, MacGillivray proposes five stages of global shrinking/contraction.

Contraction 1: The Iberian Period, 1490–1500

In this significant decade, the shape and size of the globe became known thanks to technical innovations and the scientific contribution of Nicolaus Copernicus. This was the time of global competition based on resources traded on the global scale. At the same time, printing helped to spread knowledge and information around the world.

Contraction 2: The Britannic Meridian, 1880–1890

In the nineteenth century, the British Empire cemented its global reach. In addition to expanding to Africa and enforcing a global gold standard, London dictated the position of the international meridian. Trips around the world became possible for both wealthy Europeans seeking new adventures and poor immigrants looking for new job opportunities overseas.

Contraction 3: Sputnik World, 1955–65

The erection of the Berlin Wall in 1961 created a polarized and competing world. In the Cold War, rapid decolonization gave the United States and the Soviet Union a domino set to fight over. Overall, it was a golden age for economic growth and trade in many parts of the world. Importantly but ironically, the Cold War brought domestic prosperity for Americans.

Contraction 4: The Global Supply Chain, 1995–2005

The fault-lines of the previous contractions ran North-South. In the 1990s, fault-lines were reoriented East-West by the supply-chains of giant multinationals. The phenomenon of political power dispersion accompanied this contraction by shifted political and economic powers from America and Europe to Asia, Latin Africa, and Africa.

Contraction 5: Thermo and Social Globalization, 2009–2020 (?)

Alex MacGillivray is not sure about exact timing of this phase. I would say that we entered this stage in 2009. The dominant fault line is characterized by social activism, dramatic climate changes, and the dispersion of power. These changing are happening in many areas of the world. At the same time, power is shifting from nations, corporations, and politicians to ordinary people thanks to Internet and social networks.

In 2015, we are experiencing a new stage of acceleration accompanied by existential uncertainties. So far, we have witnessed many natural disasters, from earthquakes and tornadoes to floods and droughts. Global warming has become a true planetary emergency (Gore, 2006; Chomsky, 2013).

In 2011–2015, the U.S. has faced many expenses associated with humanitarian relief. At the same time, the world has experienced many attempts at democratization, expanding political and legal rights to ordinary citizens, and pan-national cooperation. In 2011, the Arab Spring, a mass grass roots movement of unprecedented proportions, occurred. In 2012, in the United States, the grassroots Occupy Wall Street movement created a wave of civil unrest. In 2014, the Ebola virus epidemic served as a litmus test of the planet cooperation

4 Multicultural Education: Teaching and Learning in the Global Village

capacities. In 2015, we are witnessing an escalation of political conflicts in Middle East and a health crisis in Africa.

ECONOMIC GLOBALIZATION TODAY

Why are we so preoccupied with the globalizing phenomenon in 2015? What is so distinctively different about the contemporary stage of globalization? As I already mentioned, globalization is not the latest buzzword or passing trend. Globalization has already accompanied the early Greek, Roman, Chinese, Indian, and Mesoamerican civilizations. The expansion of European colonies from the sixteenth century began the modern phase of globalization (Johnson & Johnson, 2004). In modernity, the end of WW2 marked a new stage of economic cooperation. The new millennium epitomizes a technological and social phase of globalization with communication, transportation, and social networks as new accelerators. In 2015, globalization is multi-dimensional, intense, and chaotic. In the colonial era, European nations colonized the rest of the world by using direct military power. After WW2, the United States has extended its international presence by exerting political and military pressures.

Recently, tools of globalization have changed from military-based to economic—and knowledge-based. In the future, global leadership will be based on economic rather than military competence. In the 1990s, we entered a qualitatively new phase of globalization known as the new Information Age. The technological revolution, the crisis of capitalism, and the birth of social activism have triggered transformations of social structures (Castells, 1998). Thanks to mass communication, planetary citizens learn more about the globalized world. Social globalization allow people to communicate electronically and assume an active role in the struggle against powerful corporations and political regimes.

In today's interconnected world, the increasing compression of time and space is unprecedented. Interconnectivity has many implications for global business. Economic globalization is expressed in fast interactions of individuals and organizations internationally. The most intense, rapid, and intricate connections take place in the realm of corporate business. The global economy is the international network of individuals, businesses, governments, multilateral organizations, and civil society groups that collectively make decisions about the production, consumption, and distribution of goods and services (O'Connor, 2006). The global economy emerged as a result of the international order created after the WW2.

The pan-nationalization of the global economy was facilitated through a series of political treaties. The Bretton Woods agreement gave birth to the global order. After WW2, the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank were established to provide loans for Europe's post-war reconstruction. Today, the purpose of the World Bank is to fund projects in developing countries. Finally, the general Agreement on Tariffs and Trade was initiated as a globe trade organization. In addition, regional agreements such as the North American Free Trade Agreement and the EU accommodated and strengthened local links. Thanks to these political arrangements, global trade links have been expanding rapidly and visibly. The total value of world trade exploded

from \$57 billion in 1947 to \$12.6 trillion in 2005 (Stiglitz, 2007). However, the profits from free trade have not been distributed fairly. The gap between rich and poor countries is growing. Simultaneously, the distance between rich and poor citizens in western countries is deepening. This trend has led to polarization and civil unrest in many countries.

Social awareness and, in some cases, social uprisings, are attributed to free flow of information globally (Arab Spring, for example). During the 1990s, new satellite systems and fiber-optic cables provided a basis for Internet-based technologies. As Bill Gates notes, millions of individual investors conduct *business@the speed of thought* and receive information about economic, political, and environmental developments (Gates, 1999). In 2011, this unlimited access to global information enabled a social revolution in the Arab World. In 2014, the world was watching the civil disobedience actions against the Chinese government in Hong Kong. In 2015, governments and ordinary people condemned the military invasion of Crimea and Ukraine. In the new millennium, governments have become multi-dimensionally interdependent. The latest Russian case is insightful. Heavy sanctions imposed on Russia have triggered a monetary crisis in Russia. The economic embargo worked because of the Russian economy's dependence on oil export. As seen from above examples, national leaders have no choice but to work together on the global scale. The 1997 South-East Asia crisis was a first sign of global interdependencies. In 2009, the economic slowdown in the United States has the power to halt the global economy. In 2013, the crisis in Europe impacted economic performance in the United States. Stagnation in Europe and North America has impacted tourism industry in Central America, the Caribbean, and Africa. In this interconnected system, national governments have limited power to improve their economic performance on their own. The leaders and economists have to work cooperate and coordinate their efforts.

The problem is that the scope of cooperation on the government level is still limited. Today, national governments have limited resources and willingness to act together for the benefit of their constituency. Often, national officials work hand in hand with corporations to secure personal victories rather than protecting their citizens. The power in global economy has been taken away from nations-states and grabbed by pan-national corporations. The power of transnational corporations (TNCs) is tied to their economic performance. Companies such as General Motors, Wal-Mart, Exxon-Mobil, Mitsubishi, and Siemens belong to the 200 largest TNCs, which account for over half of the world's industrial input. These powerful corporations control much of the world's investment capital and technology. Giant international companies have become the new driving force behind economic globalization (Ellwood, 2007).

Let us look historically at emerging labor markets. The rise of global factories in the 1970s was facilitated by rapid improvement in transportation and communication technologies. Garment and footwear production, toy manufacturing, and electronics assembly lines were relocated to Asia. The new international division of labor (NIDL) emerged as Western countries expanded their factories to new places with cheaper labor. Global markets for manufactured goods, as opposed to primary commodities such as timber and oil, expanded in the twentieth century. Low transportation costs and free-trade zones enabled pan-national corporations to operate globally. Shipping manufactured goods across the globe without tariffs heightened cross-national

6 Multicultural Education: Teaching and Learning in the Global Village

competition. The ability to access global markets through a firm's cross-border activities on a subcontract basis represents an extension of the global trading system. As the international rules that regulate the movement of goods and investment have been relaxed, private corporations have expanded their global reach influencing consumers in every corner of the world.

Some proponents of globalization argue that multinationals are the ambassadors of democracy that will inevitably spread across the planet. They argue that corporations have been at the center of delivering many benefits to developing countries and helping to raise the standards of living throughout much of the world. Corporations have enabled the goods and materials from developing countries to reach the market of western countries. Corporations have been the agents for the transfer of technology from advanced industrial countries to developing countries helping them to breach the economic gap quickly.

Contrary to this claim, many people believe that multinational corporations represent the drawbacks of globalization. Many global corporations are richer than most nations in the developing world. For example, in 2004, the revenues of U.S. car company General Motors were \$191.4 billion, greater than the GDP of more than 148 countries. In 2005, Wal-Mart's revenues were \$285.2 billion, larger than the combined GDP of sub-Saharan Africa (Stiglitz, 2007). The world's top 200 corporations account for twenty-five percent of global activity but employed less than one percent of its workforce. Similar trends are evident with respect to disparities in salaries. Corporate executives earn top dollars while a majority of workers live modestly or in poverty.

Despite the inequalities that economic globalization brought, American economists feel good about the future. They know that Americans learned a lesson from the 2009 economic crisis and aligned the economy with global demands (Real Money, Ali Velshi, 2014–2015). Joseph Stiglitz, the author of *Globalization and its Discontents* and *Making Globalization Work*, believes that globalization has the potential to bring enormous benefits to people in both developed and developing countries (Stiglitz, 2007). Currently, about eighty percent of the world's population lives in developing countries, characterized by low incomes and high poverty, high unemployment and low education. So making globalization work would mean progress for many people in developing countries. Joseph Stiglitz provided us with many suggestive stories of prosperity achieved through the new global system. For example, In India, high-tech jobs in Bangalore brought new affluence. High-tech-sector workers spend money on cars, housing, clothes, and entertainment.

Any visitor to Bangalore can see the rising prosperity of this booming city. Nevertheless, the stories about prosperity can be counterbalanced with new stories about social divisions, pollution, and deforestation. India and China share many drawbacks of rapid uncontrolled development. In March 2013, the *National Geographic* published the article *Return to River Town* by a former Peace Corps volunteer who returned to the city of Fuling in China to witness both transformation and devastation. For the health of the planet and its citizens, development should be sustainable, but in many emerging economies, development brings environmental destruction. The economic pressure to produce cheap goods clashes with the environmental movement to preserve planetary resources. The compilation of economic data

and environmental statistics on climate changes reveals the catastrophic overheating of the planet that can cause the global planetary crisis (The National Geographic, November, 2015). The above stories lead us to a great dilemma of postmodernity: How to find a developmental middle ground between production and preservation? How to reconcile the conflicting forces of development and environmental destruction?

In my lifetime, I witnessed a process of transforming my native country into a successful neo-liberal democracy. After the fall of communism, Poland has welcomed and adopted economic globalization (Kochan, 2010). The end of communism was among the most important events that defined contemporary trajectories of globalization. In the late 1980s, the communist world collapsed and the Cold War international system became history (Huntington, 1996). The Cold War system, characterized by military polarization, was gone almost overnight. After the Berlin Wall dismantled, the world embraced a new political system of international cooperation and competition without reservations.

The driving force behind globalization is market capitalism based in technological innovations leading to the development of high-tech industries. Commonly, globalization means the spread of free market capitalism. In the classic free-market dogma, the more you open your economy to free trade and competition, the more efficient and flourishing your economy will be (Friedman, 1999). In the 1990s, the desire to open the national economy was very strong in Central Europe. Poland is an old democracy that historically has been always oriented toward free market. Consequently, after the fall of communism, Poland fully embraced multi-faceted globalization. Today, Poland can be perceived as a blueprint for a successful transition from communism to liberal democracy and from economic autarchy to globalization. Moreover, Poland has succeeded by developing one of the best education systems in the world. I predicted this outcome many years ago. My older book, *The Decade of Uncertainty*, depicts the successful globalization of a communist country (Kochan, 2010). A sudden exposure of formerly isolated Poland facilitated economic, political, and social changes on an unprecedented scale. Poland's opening to the world in 1990 was a core charge that, as in domino theory, initiated a societal metamorphosis. In a new millennium, Poland is famous for its global, cosmopolitan outlook (Kochan, 2010; Gorniok-Naglik, 2014). In 2015, Poland is still developing at the healthy rate of four percent (Velshi, 2014). People in the capital city of Warsaw enjoy high standards of living due to plentiful job opportunities. Warsaw's colorful supermarkets sell quality products from many corners of the world. The hallmark strategy in Poland was global openness. In the 1990s, Poles welcomed foreign investment and later joined the European Union. Poland has shown remarkable consistency in reforming nation education by using globally proven blueprints. Poland's success story is a lesson in harvesting the forces of globalization in the optimum way. I visited Poland in 2015. I was impressed by the scope of economic transformation and relatively high living standards. I asked my sister, an EU expert, about the sources of accelerated growth. My sister jokingly answered that Poles gladly accepted all developmental grants and loans from the European Union in order to stimulate the economic growth (interview with Sylvia Dargiewicz, 2015). In conclusion of the Polish story, globalization can be like a miracle drug, very beneficial when applied in a timely and skillful manner.