

GLOBALIZATION AND SELF-DETERMINATION: EDUCATIONAL PERSPECTIVES

Jean E. Benton

Southeast Missouri State University

An examination of the interplay between globalization and self-determination's effects on education creates opportunities to assess how these two forces impact, impede, and stimulate one another, and what consequences will result for educational policy and practice. The discussion of these issues will be grounded in several definitions. Globalization will be considered as "a social process in which the constraints of geography on social and cultural arrangements recede and in which people become increasingly aware that they are receding." (Waters,1995) Nations see less distinctive characteristics of their culture and more homogenization, mixing, and blending of political, social, cultural, and economic processes.

Definitions of self-determination, provide three frames of reference for examining globalization processes: *Statist self-determination* as the right of individuals to participate in the governing of their lives; i.e., self-government (Margalit & Raz, 1990), and *Cultural self-determination* as the right of a nation to preserve its national and cultural uniqueness, and provide protections against effects of statist self-determination. It is protective of the fundamental needs that people have for a cultural identity, which, in turn, gives full expressions to their distinct cultural identity. The right to culture does not necessarily entail

the right to an independent state (Tamir, 1993). *Political-participatory self-determination* is described as a fundamental right, safeguarding the ability of individuals, as group members, to participate in answering and acting upon the key questions of "who we are" – the understanding of the constructed nature of groups, and "what we want" – the notion of agency (Mello, 2004). Statist self-government typically involves control over legal authority, political autonomy, and territorial sovereignty. Statist claims to self-determination are resolved through federalism (final authority is divided between sub-units and a center), regional autonomy, divided sovereignty, and secession. Cultural versions of self-determination address fixed cultural identities, which lead to the treatment of the different as the other, the outsider, and may be used to justify undesirable policies. Political-participatory self-determination means the empowerment of group members to recognize the relational basis of group formation that is linked to social processes, which leads to understanding how our social relations create various group identifications and how we can collectively debate the ordering of social and political institutions and the policies that should be promoted (Mello, 2004). Self-determination applies to

groups that emerge as a result of political constructions.

Self-determination, as conceived by Mello (2004), represents a basic human right because it protects the need for individuals as members of multiple groups to participate in the political construction of the world. Democratic forms of politics are ones that would allow for answers to the questions of “who we are” and “what we want” to emerge out of dialogue, debate, and contestation. The most democratic answers to questions of “who we are,” are contingent and context-specific and they do not seek to reach a definitive and permanently conclusive answer, but rather are attuned to the structural, relational bases of identity formation. The most democratic answers to “what we want” are coalitional, short-term and without bias, whereas definitive answers lead to tyranny (Mello, 2004). Therefore, there is a continuous construction, reproduction, and contestation of national identities in political-participatory self-determination where individuals and groups appropriate, negotiate, and contest discourses of identity. By using these three lenses of self-determination to view various types of globalization, we can develop a deeper understanding of the interplay between these two forces and how they impact educational policy.

Globalization contexts

In considering the interplay between globalization and self-determination, and its subsequent impact on education, it is necessary to examine globalization from several contexts: socio-cultural, political, and economic. *Socio-cultural globalization* is the standardization of culture and social processes. Nowhere else is this felt so strongly as in the United States where shopping malls market the same stores and clothing brands country-wide, where restaurant chains serve up the same dishes, and where the same video games can be played simultaneously across the globe. The cross-cultural nature of

globalization and technological innovation is imposing its will on and changing social processes and patterns that have been in place for generations.

“It is the world of Disney, where the artificial and the commodified replace the real; where the best bits of a culture are extracted, reformulated, and packaged for quick, cheap and easy consumption.” (Bottery, 2006)

In the case of the European Union, nation states are feeling the pressure of socio-cultural globalization through the twin threat of the United States’ exportation of culture world-wide and the cultural relativity and fragmentation that could occur if they are not watchful of the EU’s supranational powers. Just as the United States has succumbed to cultural globalization, the EU, too, could be caught up in this process. One key aspect is language. Currently, all EU member languages are represented in documents and debates. Yet, participants in EU conferences and government must speak in languages that all can understand. While simultaneous translation is available in formal settings, it often comes down to use of English as the lingua franca in most transactions, especially at the informal networking levels. Can small countries, such as Denmark or Estonia, keep their languages, and by extension, their cultures alive in the supranational atmosphere of the EU?

One presence mitigates against this happening. Those nation states that have had strong, fully-developed self-governments, a long history of participation in deciding their own futures, and the ability to give full expression to their distinct cultural identities, through language and cultural traditions, should fare better than those nation states that previously have been subsumed under other supranational governments, e.g, former

Soviet states. Except for a brief post-Soviet period where nationhood and national culture had a chance to flower, these states that have now joined the EU could be even more vulnerable in terms of retaining their national culture.

Another outcome of nation states feeling cultural globalization pressure, either from outside the EU or from within, would be to retreat into more rigid and fundamental cultural positions. How a country responds to these globalization forces depends on its model of cultural belonging. There are several models of cultural belonging currently visible in the various EU countries: assimilationist, relative differentialism, civic nationalism, multiculturalism, and post-structuralism. The expectations of assimilationist policies are to adhere to an expected national cultural identity and language, thus giving up any minority culture and language one might have. Relative differentialism, an especially French phenomenon of the 70s and 80s, ensures the preservation of a separate but secure identity. Not xenophobic, “but formally ‘heterophile’, antiracist, and egalitarian, the new differentialists of the right emphasized, indeed absolutized, cultural difference, seeking to ‘preserve at any price collective identities, and thus differences between communities, haunted by the danger of their destruction through mixing, physical and cultural.’”(Brubaker, 2001) Civic nationalism promotes state rather than cultural identity. Nationalists are people that claim that the nation is the only legitimate basis of the state and that each nation is entitled to its own state. Multiculturalism promotes pluralist discourse. It is the fundamental belief at all citizens are equal and ensures that all citizens can keep their identities, take pride in their ancestry, and have a sense of belonging. Multiculturalism encourages racial and ethnic harmony, cross-cultural understanding, and discourages ghetto-ization, hatred, discrimination and violence. It encourages all citizens to take an active part in

the social, cultural, economic and political activities of the nation. Post-structuralist identities are never stable or unitary; “individuals are reconceptualized as continuously engaged in a process of sense making (switching between contradictory interpretive paradigms) and identities as fragmented (open to contextual re-negotiation and only contingently fixed or defined by existing power structures, institutions and dominant ideologies).” (Karner, 2005).

In addition to viewing these beliefs from a national lens, EU members must now look at these models of belonging from a supranational level. As such, this variety of beliefs about belonging creates a divergent vision of what it means to belong and to be able to answer and act upon the questions of “who we are” and “what we want.” Responses at both national and supranational levels will differ based on EU mandates and expectations of supranational belonging, and based on beliefs about who constitutes “outsiders” and “insiders,” on both levels. One country could have assimilationist policies where all must adhere to that national culture, but at the EU level be asked to use a multicultural or post-modernist frame of reference. The different models that might flow from the two levels of interaction could cause retreat by some countries from supranational policies or the embracing of them by others. How will these beliefs about national and supranational belonging interact with educational policies at both levels? Will all nations agree to policies that reflect a lesser national perspective in favor of a European one?

Political globalization also acts and reacts to socio-cultural processes, and as the relocation of political power moves away from the nation state into supranational bodies (Bottery, 2006), how will economic gain and political clout influence individual

nation-states' educational policies? The interconnectedness of the globe and porous borders through use of information technology, bring the windows of the world into our houses and living rooms which create immense learning opportunities. As more people have access to technology, more information becomes available to be disseminated throughout the world. The virtual world brings the spread of ideas, e.g., democratic governance, anti-colonialism, and environmental and feminist issues, which not only raise awareness that these are options to one's way of life, but have the potential to increase the number of people who want greater participation in the society as a whole. It provides opportunities for people to learn and has the potential to translate into greater job and educational opportunities. Therefore, large political entities that are cooperating in the educational sphere have the capacity to develop human capital at greater rates and capitalize on this ready source of human potential. The creation of a coherent EU educational policy has the potential to dramatically raise the skill levels of EU citizens and create the overall competitiveness of the EU.

Yet, political globalization is impeded by self-determination in several ways.

Hegemony, the discourse of national identity, is premised upon several views of national self-understanding: cultural distinctiveness, delineation of various others, including immigrants (Karner, 2005). The degree to which a country ascribes to these views will also limit their ability to participate in supranational discourse and decision-making. It can also encourage assimilationist thinking and stifle educational opportunity through an unwillingness to effect change at the national level. A collective political history, with a collective present and future (De Cillia et. al., 1999) can way against excessive allegiances to supranational alliances. National legal traditions (Brubaker, 2001) can create barriers to the

development and sharing of common educational policy.

Ironically, political globalization seems to stimulate self-determination. Ethnic and national identities have come to constitute political, social, and psychological points of anchorage against the tide of globalization. (Karner, 2005), and create a reaction to political, economic, and culturally standardized globalizations. When power is progressively relocated away from the nation state, there have been equal or greater calls for local democracy and regional assemblies. Devolution in the UK can serve as an example of this supranationalism through creation of regional assemblies in Wales, Scotland, and Northern Ireland.

American globalization also interacts with processes in the socio-cultural realm through its superpower status at work on a global stage. It is a global force and presence through the military, multinationals, and information technology (Bottery, 2006). One hundred fifty-three countries have a US military presence. The United States has 27% of global market and 50% world's internet users (Johnson, 2004). This superpower status can instill the idea in other countries that the U.S. is too powerful to be challenged. Yet Al Qaeda proved otherwise and attempts at self-determination in the wake of a growing American presence in today's world have created a violent backlash. The Middle East is rife with examples of how America's globalization efforts are stimulating political and cultural self-determination. The ineptness of the United States to share as well as lead, has created a particularly dangerous situation in the world, since it "lacks both the international and domestic prerequisites to resolve conflicts that are internal to other societies, and to monitor and control transnational transactions that threaten Americans at home." (Nye 2002).

Palestine and Iraq are the most current examples of attempts at political self-determination, i.e., self-government. In both cases, cultural self-determination is also very much in play, with various groups exerting their fundamental needs to have their cultural canons recognized, and to have that cultural identity represented in social, political, and economic institutions of the country. But also visible from all sides are the cultural versions of self-determination that see the other as “outsider,” and not worthy of participation in the debates and contestations about which groups will, in the end, have the political autonomy and territorial sovereignty over the other. So, within the borders of these countries, contestation over matters of self-determination has been stimulated by the American imposition of its own cultural and political versions of self-determination which do not match those of the people who live there. Therefore, in one direction, there is political and cultural self-determination in full force with dissent and jockeying for power a constant denominator within these countries, but consolidation and empowerment of a cultural vision from without. I am speaking, of course, about efforts of certain fundamentalist groups to create Islamic globalization. The willful imposition of U.S. culture and the success of Al Qaeda has stimulated a cross-border response in the Arab world and has further encouraged certain Muslims to assert their self-determination through their protests, terrorist acts, and violence.

Economic globalization is a combination of “rapid, largely unrestricted movements of finance around the world, ...the locking of nation states into free market agreements by supra-national organizations, and ...transnational companies who influence national government policies through their ability to relocate their capital, factories and workforces around the world.” (Bottery, 2006). The dynamics of this type of economic

globalization mean that growth is a necessity to show success. Therefore, multinationals are expanding into the public sector where accountability and efficiency are now commonplace and values like care, trust, and equity are increasingly perceived as second-order values, relegated to productivity objectives (Bottery, 2006). Triggered by anxieties caused by the dominance of multinational, nomadic capital, capable and willing to relocate to wherever production costs are the lowest, a “denationalization shock” is created, where certain countries are reduced to law and order policies and rhetoric (Bauman, 1998). Another way that economic globalization impedes self-determination efforts is by relocating political power away from individual cities and countries to supranational bodies, e.g., IMF and World Bank. These entities “exert their influence through stipulating that financial assistance to nation states is conditional upon the dismantling of trade barriers and of their entry into a global system of free markets, which again limits the ability of nation states to firewall their economies.” (Bottery, 2006)

The commodification of cultural goods, which produce standardized cultural products, undermine local and nation-state economies. Disney World, McDonald’s, WalMart, and Starbucks all represent a threat to High Streets and town centers, not only in America but in the rest of the world as well. This is replicated in other supranational units as well. When the EU was formed, there was a down-sizing of industries in every sector of the economy, thus threatening local and country economies. While the cross-cultural exchange of goods can create more choice, it can also undermine the uniqueness of the culture, which may be lost forever, since the exposure is cumulative

With economic globalization, maximum effort and commitment are to reduce costs

along with reduced benefits, which means that people are working more for less money and benefits. With widespread job insecurity, rising unemployment, and greater social inequality created as a result of the globalization of the economy, the populations will move toward political and cultural self-determination and affirm their local and national self-determination against supranationality (Castells, 1998).

The educational frame of reference

The translation of the interactive effects of globalization and self-determination to the development of education policy becomes a complex task. Currently in the EU, individual countries have control over their educational policies and curriculum for the most part. Since educational policy is an important national political steering instrument and one of the remaining parts of identity politics where national governments still possess the power of control (Walkenhorst, 2005), EU members have worked to set restrictions to future EU social and educational policy. The Maastricht Treaty attempts to limit supranational power, particularly in the realm of education.

ARTICLE 126:1 - The Community shall contribute to the development of quality education by encouraging co-operation between Member States and, if necessary, by supporting and supplementing their action, while fully respecting the responsibility of the Member States for the content of teaching and the organization of education systems and their cultural and linguistic diversity.

Yet, the Europeanization of education has begun, through initiatives such as “Education with European Contents” (1978) and “The European Dimension to Education” (1988). Since the 1970s consecutive member state education ministers have signed cooperation agreements at Community level, in order to facilitate the mutual recognition of diplomas,

certificates and other evidence of formal qualifications to facilitate free movement of workers. The Tindemans-Report (1976) then criticized the lack of citizen orientation of the European integration process and subsequently called for a People’s Europe. As a result, the EC education policy developed a political dimension, following Commission proposals for intensified cooperation in political education by targeting specifically school curricula in order to increase awareness of the European integration process at school level. (Walkenhorst, 2005).

In 1999, the EU developed the Bologna Declaration, which seeks to create a common system of tertiary education. The Bologna Declaration, involving 40 European states, created a European Higher Education Area (EHEA) where participating countries can achieve a higher degree of harmonization and convergence in tertiary education through the adaptation of two-tier university degrees with a common system of quality assurance and mobility of students. This agreement sets the stage for the homogenization of the higher education system, which in turn affects the academic culture of the nation state. Homogenization of educational systems could imply a loss of national identity. (Walkenhorst, 2005). This trend is one of neat packages, yet troubling, since European educational policy in the past has been an important part of the social fabric that these countries have protected from supranationalism (Walkenhorst, 2005). Yet, nation states in Europe have traditionally had centralized educational policies and curriculum, which makes the standardization of tertiary education policy at the supranational level a natural inclination in many ways. At what point, though, will the standardization stop becoming a useful tool in shaping both EU and nation states’ educational policy and become a

homogenization of educational policy, where no country's socio-cultural priorities are represented, addressed, or fulfilled? Is this Bologna Declaration the start of further standardization of education and will it stretch into primary and secondary education as well?

When EU countries, with different beliefs about national belonging, approach educational policy making at the supranational level, the variety of cultural forms can create cultural variety, with new opportunities and diverse options from which to choose. The Bologna Declaration provides students the opportunity to experience education from another national perspective, thereby enriching them, broadening their outlooks on life, and developing a new wave of European citizens. Yet, it also can create a defensive posturing in nation-states, where changes and potential losses of cultural identity, local and traditional languages could mean less political power in the overall process of making educational policy. Assimilationist countries, civic nationalists, and relative differentialists could fear the erosion of their cultural identity in the broader EU educational policy, and the loss of their majority language policies and cultural identity. In their desire to see their visions of educational policy, curriculum and pedagogy represented at the EU level, they could be less willing to compromise any portion of their national educational provisions at this higher level. Other responses from utilitarians and post-structuralists, with their educational policies and curriculum that reflect a nuanced recognition of cultural difference and nation-state belonging, would be the ability to easily flow between and among the varieties of country-level educational provisions, see the benefits that such supranational policies can bring and work at this higher level to create broad and inclusive educational policy.

In the U.S., socio-cultural standardization has already taken place, even though education is a provision of states to administer. The recent

federally-mandated No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 is a good example of the standardization of educational policy and assessment. The law establishes accountability for results and requires the states to set standards for student performance and teacher quality in order to improve the inclusiveness and fairness of American education. The law ensures that all children--from every ethnic and cultural background--receive a quality education and the chance to achieve their academic potential. This law supercedes the states' rights to formulate and carry out educational policy, thus eroding the power of states to focus educational initiatives and change where they are most needed. Rather, all states and their constituent school districts have to fulfill this federal mandate and shelve their own agendas. This is a loss of state self-determination to manage and maintain its educational policy and demonstrates very clearly how globalization of educational policy is alive and well in the U.S. Language policy, is another area where large constituencies lobby for the maintenance of English as a national language, even as the Hispanic population surges toward 25% of the U.S. population. This assimilationist approach to national language policies spells the loss of self-determination for this growing ethnic population if not reversed. While education is currently a function of each state's government in the U.S., albeit an eroding process, in the EU, this, too, could be possible, although current trends are indicating otherwise.

Thus far, the discussion has centered mostly on the negative aspects of socio-cultural globalization and its inclinations to suppress self-determination. Globalization also can stimulate self-determination, by providing different windows through which new perspectives can be gained on the familiar, and show how different ways can be

used to pursue the same truths (Bottery, 2006). Access to a variety of cultural beliefs and approaches to life can be realized now, especially through technology. Before the Internet and broadband capabilities for sending and receiving information, not only were cultural beliefs safe from change, but also unknown to most of the rest of the world. With this concept of the world in your palm, the planet has become a place for providing unrivaled opportunities to become aware of and study other cultures. While the Internet is dominated by English language web sites, it does not prevent speakers of other languages from developing web sites in their own language, since it is now possible to translate these web sites into any language. This development not only helps to preserve nation states' language and culture, but it also helps to project its presence throughout the world and preserve its place on the planet. For others wanting access to these languages, it makes languages more accessible on a global scale and preserves cultural self-determination. Thus, self-determination and the desire to keep culture and language alive, stimulates cultural globalization, i.e., the ability to access and take part in cultural variety. "New technologies of reproduction have freed us from the tyranny of both space and time. Music can be consumed everywhere, drawn from anywhere, and at and from any time (Bianchi, 2005)." The virtual world has allowed us access to a multitude of cultural forms. Bianchi (2005), though, also states not all of our access to cultural variety can be done in a virtual world. In order to partake of certain cultural customs, attend religious ceremonies, eat a variety of cuisines, go to a museum, or attend musical and theatrical events, we mostly must be in the real world. Therefore, we should use the threat of globalization to stimulate even more responses of self-determination that move beyond the easily consumed, digested, and learned activities available globally to a virtual and real world where activities compare and discriminate, require intensive and extensive critical thinking and digesting (Bianchi, 2005). The

McDonalldization of education will not create a sustainable planet

Resulting effect on educational policy

Educational policy, at the nation-state level, is a cross-generational transmitter of political culture, and a vital tool for creating social legitimacy, promoting political socialization, developing democratization and preserving national identity (Walkenhorst, 2005). Educational policy, at the supranational level, is a globalization force that homogenizes the cultural canon. With initiatives such as "Education with European Contents" (1978) and "The European Dimension to Education" (1988) a new body of principles, rules, standards, norms and policy will be created which might not reflect any nation-state's cultural and educational priorities.

Cultural globalization of educational policy, e.g., the Bologna Declaration, could create a system of fitting the student to the structure, thus limiting exposure to cultural variety in acquiring a university degree, suppressing the student's national identity, and cultural legitimacy. Likewise, by providing a complete transfer credit system and student mobility, the Bologna Process provides students with more opportunities to broaden cultural perspectives, to learn new ways of thinking, promote political socialization and democratization, and thus strengthen their competitiveness in the global market. The Bologna Declaration also promises the necessity of maintaining independent and autonomous nation-state universities, yet provide a common space for higher education within the framework of the diversity of cultures, languages, and educational systems.

But will the stress on values of efficiency, order, effectiveness, performance, and

compliance at the supranational level take away the care, trust, and equity that now exists at local policy levels and control of education? If educators, working in a supranational structure, will tend to experience less control over their work and the knowledge they disseminate at the local level, how will the European dimension of education impact cultural continuity and change at the national level?

As a result of supranational interference, educational policy could become skewed, both politically and economically. With educational aims no longer directed toward the nation state's specific wants or desires, but rather directed by globalization forces, supranational curriculum aims and goals could subsume national curriculum. In the EU, this translates to a homogeneous university structure across countries, a unified code for transfer credit, standardization in credit definition and use to simplify credit conversion and facilitate transfer credit decisions, joint degrees offered by two or more institutions in two or more countries, a quality assurance system for all with a uniform and objective presentation of information to simplify and streamline aspects of the credential evaluation process, new quality assurance authorities to add another dimension in determining institutional recognition and degree-granting authority, a uniform degree structure to simplify credit evaluation, and a search for a common European answer to common European problems.

Competitive forces also come into play in education. In the U.S., the NCLB law has created competition the public arena of education. Parents now have the opportunity of choosing where they will send their children if their current school does not measure up to the standards set by this national law. Likewise, EU universities are now competing for students across nation-state boundaries. In so many ways, education is now becoming a business model, where accountability and efficiency are the order

of the day. Productivity counts have teachers and administrators focused on charts and data. The economics of education has reduced educators to a numbers game, where the number of students reaching target levels is more important than the processes of getting there.

These economic policies demonstrate that globalization of education is occurring and the EU is no longer thinking as separate nation states, rather thinking as a supranational state – Europe. Since European higher education systems are facing common internal and external challenges related to the growth and diversification of higher education, the employability of graduates, the shortage of skills in key areas, and the expansion of private and transnational education, the Bologna Declaration recognizes the value of coordinated reforms, compatible systems, and common action. By moving in the direction of a coherent European system, European institutions will need to compete more resolutely for students, influence, prestige, and money in the worldwide competition of universities.

The current Bologna Declaration also demonstrates that the EU desires educational institutions to be run as business models with educators there to serve the consumer, while stressing values of efficiency, order, and effectiveness over care, trust, and equity. The Declaration shows that it is interested in increasing the international competitiveness of the European system of higher education by acquiring a worldwide degree of attractiveness equal to its extraordinary cultural and scientific traditions (CRE, Association of European Universities, 1999). By adapting the collaboration set forth in the Bologna Declaration, the EU has formed a larger economic conglomerate, which can compete with the American market, thus assuring its educational institutions a larger

share of the global market in education. Will some nation-states benefit more, economically, from the Bologna Declaration than others? Will this homogenization of tertiary education, in years to come, stifle the local and national flavor of study in another culture, and more or less reduce the EU to another United States of America?

Control of access of ideas and knowledge has become increasingly economically related. By pursuing higher education, a person increases access to the control and management of ideas and knowledge, and thus the ability to commodify knowledge, innovation, and creativity (Stewart, 1998). This fluidity of knowledge generation needed to be an effective worker is countered by the current state of educational systems, which are becoming more standardized, through supranational mandates such as the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) law and other accountability measures. With testing becoming the one measure of success in school systems, and thus the ability of the school to still function, (but if not meeting standards, can be restructured and lose its mandate to provide education), teachers are having to increase the standardization of knowledge that is taught and have less time to focus on each child's needs, talents, and strengths. The Bologna Declaration is also driving the standardization of knowledge by having institutions provide programs, both in structure and in content, that would be enough alike to allow transfer of credit among institutions.

With the crush of political globalization comes increasing information and the spread of ideas about democracy and self-determination. This increases the demand for equity from previously assimilated groups and those treated "differentially." In these states, there is a need to move away from cultural versions of self-determination that exclude immigrants and minorities as "others," without a voice in their own destiny. The nation-state needs to build a

respect for differences and a commitment to diversity. Migrants and minorities need to be provided a strong sense of belonging while allowing them to maintain their identity with the country or origin. Teachers will need to translate these versions of self-determination into curriculum aims and pedagogical practices. Curriculum will necessarily address issues of justice, representation, and self-determination. The classroom will need to reflect this participatory rhetoric through democratic pedagogical practices, such as cooperative learning and student voice. At the same time, the nation-state needs to keep the supranationalization of the educational system in balance, using only those aspects of educational policy at that level that would stimulate, develop, and create a stronger national system of education.

Challenges for Educators

In framing this answer, it is important to develop notions of political-participatory self-determination in the sphere of education. The most democratic answers to questions of "who we are," are contingent and context-specific and they do not seek to reach a definitive and permanently conclusive answer, but rather are attuned to the structural, relational bases of identity formation. Therefore, challenges for educators are to develop visions of belonging that value cultural inclusiveness, either multinational or post-structuralist in form, and to find ways to empower group members so that they can develop group identifications linked to social and political institutions of the state that support collaborative efforts by all sectors of society. The responsibilities of educators must move beyond subject expertise and autonomy in professional work to greater awareness and commitment to the development of linkages with the community in order to build cohesive social policy that promotes educational equity for all youth and

their families. Educators must be transparent, open, and accessible (Bottery, 2006). Educational policy should recognize and support the rights of all youth. Curriculum should reflect these rights and show teachers how to structure their classrooms to achieve this equity.

The most democratic answers to “what we want” are coalitional, short-term and without cultural bias. Therefore, there is a need for educators to develop a deep understanding of the type of national identity in which they operate and, if necessary, work toward shifting destructive nation-state and group notions of cultural self-determination to those of political-participatory self-determination processes, which can bring about collaborative policy-making. They need to find ways to empower students so that they are not marginalized and unable to self-represent their cultural forms.

Another challenge for educators is to be active in the political processes of globalization so that the educational mandates of the nation-state and local municipalities are maintained and not eroded. This means developing a greater awareness of contextual factors that constrain, steer, and facilitate their practice. It also indicates that the teacher education curriculum must be changed in order to provide such content and perspectives. There must be coordination and communication with professional associations to press for standards that would address the socio-cultural, political, and economic globalization forces at work in education. Educators must become activists in their professions.

The positive effects of globalization need to be exploited by educators by bringing into their curriculum, pedagogy, and classrooms the vast array of cultural variety that exists in the world. They must be the role models who partake of cultural customs, ceremonies, music, theatre, and cuisines with their students. They must show them how to celebrate the achievements of the

world’s cultures and to develop a profound appreciation for this cultural variety and richness.

Educators should encourage much more mobility in their students and teachers in order to experience cultural variety through a virtual world, and through real contact. The creation of exchanges at all levels should be put in place, from school to school and culture to culture at the national level; and between nations and cultures. Educators should cross borders much more often than they do, virtually and in the real sense, to share their intellectual work and collaborate on research in areas of common interest. They should involve their students in their research by forming consortia of teacher education institutions in various countries that are willing to provide classroom experiences with a research component to students, so that the work of educators can be advanced on a global scale and so that problems common to a variety of cultures can be investigated on a global scale. Awareness, vigilance, and a proactive mindset can help to develop an educational landscape where the best of self-determination initiatives can be melded to globalization efforts.

References

- Bauman. Z. (1992). *Intimations of postmodernity*. London: Routledge.
- Bianchi, M. (2005). Book review: Creative destruction: How globalization is changing the world’s cultures. *Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization*, 58(4), 556-560.
- Bottery, M. (2006). Education and globalization: Redefining the role of the educational professional. *Educational Review*, 58(1), 95-113.

- Brubaker, R. (2001). The return of assimilation? Changing perspective on immigration and its sequels in France, Germany and the United States. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 24(4), 531-548.
- Castells, M. (1998). *The information age Vol. III: End of millennium*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- CRE, Association of European Universities (1999). The Bologna Declaration on the European space for higher education: An explanation. <http://www.crue.org/eurec/bolognaexplana.htm>
- De Cillia, R., Reisigl, M., & Wodak, R. (1999). The discursive construction of national identities. *Discourse and Society*, 10(2), 149-173.
- Haverland, M. (2003). Social policy: Transforming pensions, challenging health care? In K. Dyson and K. Goetz (eds.) *Germany, Europe, and the politics of constraint*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Johnson, C. (2004). *The sorrows of empire*. New York: Metropolitan Books.
- Karner, C. (2005). The Hapsburg Dilemma today: Competing discourses of national identity in contemporary Austria. *National Identities*, 7(4), 409-432.
- Margalit, A. & Raz, J. (1990). National self-determination. *The Journal of Philosophy*, 87, 439-361.
- Mello, B. (2004). Recasting the right to self-determination: Group rights and political participation. *Social Theory and Practice*, 30(2), 193-213.
- No Child Left Behind Act (2001). <http://www.ed.gov/nclb/landing.jhtml?src=pb>
- Nye, J. (2002). *The paradox of American power*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Stewart, T. (1998). *Intellectual capital*. London: Nicholas Brealey.
- Tamir, Y. (1993). *Liberal nationalism*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Walkenhorst, H. (2005). Europeanisation of the German education system. *German Politics*, 14(4), 470-386.
- Walkenhorst, H. (2005). The changing role of EU education policy: A critical assesment. Paper for the EUSA Ninth Biennial International Conference, Austin, Texas
- Waters, M. (1995). *Globalization*. London: Routledge.

International Journal of Educational Policies.
Vol.1. (1), 2007, 21-32. ISSN:1307-3842

© ICPRES
<http://ijep.icpres.org>