

Education and Social Inequality in the Global Culture

Globalisation, Comparative Education and Policy Research

12-volume Book Series (Springer)

Series editor: Joseph Zajda (Australian Catholic University, Melbourne Campus)
<http://www.springeronline.com/sgw/cda/frontpage>

Book series overview

The *Globalisation, Comparative Education and Policy Research* book series aims to meet the research needs of all those interested in in-depth developments in comparative education research. The series provides a global overview of developments and changes in policy and comparative education research during the last decade. Presenting up-to-date scholarly research on global trends, it is an easily accessible, practical yet scholarly source of information for researchers, policy makers and practitioners. It seeks to address the nexus between comparative education, policy and forces of globalisation, and provides perspectives from all the major disciplines and all the world regions. The series offers possible strategies for the effective and pragmatic policy planning and implementation at local, regional and national levels.

The book series complements the *International Handbook of Globalisation and Education Policy Research*. The volumes focus on comparative education themes and case studies in much greater scope and depth than is possible in the Handbook.

The series includes volumes on both empirical and qualitative studies of policy initiatives and developments in comparative education research in elementary, secondary and post-compulsory sectors. Case studies may include changes and education reforms around the world, curriculum reforms, trends in evaluation and assessment, decentralisation and privatisation in education, technical and vocational education, early childhood education, excellence and quality in education. Above all, the series offers the latest findings on critical issues in comparative education and policy directions, such as:

- Developing new internal strategies (more comprehensive, flexible and innovative modes of learning) that take into account the changing and expanding learner needs
- Overcoming 'unacceptable' socio-economic educational disparities and inequalities
- Improving educational quality
- Harmonizing education and culture
- International cooperation in education and policy directions in each country

Joseph Zajda • Karen Biraimah • William Gaudelli
Editors

Education and Social Inequality in the Global Culture

 Springer

Editors

Prof. Joseph Zajda
Australian Catholic University
Melbourne Campus, VIC
Australia
j.zajda@jnponline.com

Prof. Karen Biraimah
University of Central Florida
Orlando, FL
USA

Dr. William Gaudelli
Columbia University
New York, NY
USA

ISBN: 978-1-4020-6926-0

e-ISBN: 978-1-4020-6927-7

Library of Congress Control Number: 2007942177

© 2008 Springer Science + Business Media B.V.

No part of this work may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, microfilming, recording or otherwise, without written permission from the Publisher, with the exception of any material supplied specifically for the purpose of being entered and executed on a computer system, for exclusive use by the purchaser of the work.

Printed on acid-free paper

9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

springer.com

Foreword

A major aim of *Education and Social Inequality in the Global Culture*, which is the first volume in the 12-volume book series *Globalisation, Comparative Education and Policy Research*, edited by Joseph Zajda and his team, is to present a global overview of the relationship of education, socio-economic status, and globalization. By examining some of the major education policy issues, particularly in the light of recent shifts in education and policy research, the editors aim to provide a comprehensive picture of the intersecting and diverse discourses of globalization, education, and policy-driven reforms. The spirit of dialogical encounter has very soundly directed editors' efforts in organizing this volume. The editors' task is to deepen, and in some cases open widely, diverse and significant discourses related to globalization, social stratification, and education.

The impact of globalization on education policy and reforms is a strategically important issue for us all. More than ever before, there is a need to understand and analyze both the intended and the unintended effects of globalization on economic competitiveness, educational systems, the state, and relevant policy changes—all as they affect individuals, educational bodies (such as universities), policy-makers, and powerful corporate organizations across the globe. The evolving and constantly changing notions of national identity, language, border politics and citizenship which are relevant to education policy need to be critiqued by appeal to context-specific factors such as local–regional–national areas, which sit uncomfortably at times with the international imperatives of globalization. Current education policy research reflects a rapidly changing world where citizens and consumers are experiencing a growing sense of uncertainty, and loss of flexibility. Yet globalization exposes us also to opportunities generated by a fast-changing world economy.

In this stimulating and important book, the authors focus on discourses surrounding three major dimensions affecting the equality/inequality debate in education and society: *hegemony*, *equity*, and *cultural capital*. These are most critical and significant concepts for examining and critically evaluating the dimensions of social inequality in the global culture.

Hegemony, as perceived by Antonio Gramsci, and other critical theorists, is the dominance of ideology and beliefs of powerful social groups built through implicit consensus. Here, poor and working class people, who have an unequal access to

socially valued commodities, such as wealth, power, and education, participate in hegemonic relations, having consented to them.

Equity has come to mean that which, while upholding justice, is in the best interest of the individual and the community. As the editors argue, Aristotle's conception of equity is that of a corrective of justice, which sits within the law but allows for the interpretation of phenomena to uphold a greater good. According to Aristotle, an equitable person is someone who exercises a choice and does equitable acts, is not unreasonably insistent upon rights, but can accept less than his or her share. Such a notion of civil morality suggests that it is incumbent on all citizens, but especially those with means, to take less than they are entitled to so that others may have a sufficient amount.

Cultural capital, as coined by P. Bourdieu, defines dominant conceptions of what constitutes knowledge, knowing, and social value. Educational systems—schools, colleges, and universities, by upholding a single 'gold standard' of what it means to be knowledgeable, reinforce the differentiated achievement status of class groups, but also reward those who are conversant with implicit rules of dominant ideology. As such, cultural capital refers to success in schooling, largely dictated by the extent to which individuals have absorbed the dominant culture. As the editors explain, schools, in a sense, are markets wherein children enter with various stores of cultural capital that can be exchanged for enhancement of one's capital, and, thereby, their life-chances. Cultural capital, as a significant dimension of educational inequality, continues to shape and influence children's lives and destinies globally—as discussed in scholarly fashion in this book.

The book as a whole focuses on the issues and dilemmas that help us to understand in a more meaningful and practical way the various links between education, social stratification, and globalization. They include:

- The significance of the politics of globalization and development in education policy—their effects on cross-cultural perceptions of dimensions affecting the equality/inequality debate in education and society: *hegemony, equity, and cultural capital*
- The significance of discourses, which define and shape the nexus between education, social stratification, and globalization
- The encroaching homogeneity of global culture, which has the potential to reduce adaptability and flexibility, and reinforce the status quo
- The multidimensional nature of globalization dimensions of educational inequality

The perception of education policy research and globalization as dynamic and multifaceted processes clearly necessitates a multiple-perspective approach in the study of education and this book provides that perspective commendably. In the book, the authors, who come from diverse backgrounds and regions, attempt insightfully to provide a worldview of significant developments in education, hegemony, cultural capital, and equity. They report on schooling and policy changes in such countries as Brazil, Egypt, Guatemala, Nicaragua, Peru, and elsewhere. Understanding the interaction between education and globalization forces us to learn more about the

similarities and differences in education policy research and associated reforms in the local–regional–national context, as well as the global one. This inevitably results in a far deeper and richer understanding and analysis of the globalization and education *Zeitgeist*.

Clearly, the emerging phenomena associated with globalization have in different ways affected current developments in education and policy. Globalization of policy, trade, and finance, for instance, has profound implications for education and reform implementation. On the one hand, the periodic economic crises coupled with the prioritized policies of the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank (e.g., SAPs) have seriously affected some developing nations and transitional economies in delivering basic education for all. When the poor are unable to feed their children, what expectations can we have that the children will attend school? Children from impoverished families are forced to stay at home to help and work for their parents; they simply cannot afford to attend school. The policies of the Organisation for Economic and Cooperative Development (OECD), the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), the World Trade Organization (WTO), and the General Agreement on Trade and Services (GATS) appear to operate as powerful forces, which, as supranational organizations, shape and influence education and policy, yet they also deny the access of the less privileged to the assumed advantages of an expanding global society. One might well ask what the corporate organizations are doing to enhance intercultural sensitivity, flexibility, and mutual understanding. And are those excluded by the demise of democratic processes really able to work together for the common good?

The editors and authors provide a coherent strategic education policy statement on recent shifts surrounding the major dimensions that affect the equality/inequality debate in education and society: *hegemony*, *equity*, and *cultural capital*. They offer new and exciting approaches to further explore, develop, and improve education and policy-making on the global stage. In the different chapters, they attempt to address some of the major issues and problems confronting educators and policy-makers globally. The book contributes in a very scholarly way to a more holistic understanding of the education and inequality nexus, and it further offers us practical strategies for combating educational inequality.

The book is rigorous, thorough, and scholarly. I believe it is likely to have profound and wide-ranging implications for the future of education policy and reforms globally, in the conception, planning, and educational outcomes of “communities of learning”. The community-of-learning metaphor reflects the knowledge society, and offers us a very worthy insight into the way individuals and formal organizations acquire the necessary wisdom, values and skills in order to adapt and respond to change in these turbulent and conflict-ridden times. The authors thoughtfully explore the complex nexus between globalization, democracy, and education—where, on the one hand, democratization and progressive education are equated with equality, inclusion, equity, tolerance, and human rights, while, on the other hand, globalization is perceived (by some critics at least) to be a totalizing force that is widening the gap between the rich and the poor, and bringing

domination and control by corporate bodies and powerful organizations. The authors further compel us to explore critically the new challenges confronting the world in the provision of authentic democracy, social justice, and cross-cultural values that genuinely promote more positive ways of thinking.

In this volume, the editors and authors jointly recognize the need for profound changes in education and society. They argue for education policy goals and challenges confronting the global village, which I think are critically important. Drawing extensively and in depth on educational systems, reforms, and policy analysis, both the authors and editors of this book focus on the crucial issues and policy decisions that must be addressed if genuine learning, characterized by wisdom, compassion, and intercultural understanding, is to become a reality, rather than rhetoric.

I commend the book wholeheartedly to any reader who shares these same ideals.

Vice-Chancellor
Australian Catholic University

Peter W. Sheehan AO

Preface

Education and Social Inequality in the Global Culture presents up-to-date scholarly research on global and comparative trends in education, social inequality and policy research. It provides an easily accessible, practical yet scholarly source of information about the international concern in the field of globalisation, access and social inequality. Above all, the book offers the latest findings to the critical issues in education, democracy and educational inequalities. It is a sourcebook of ideas for researchers, practitioners and policy-makers in education, globalisation and social inequality. It offers a timely overview of current changes in education and social stratification in the global culture. It provides directions in education, and policy research, relevant to transformational educational reforms in the 21st century.

The book critically examines the overall interplay between globalisation, social inequality and education. It draws upon recent studies in the areas of globalisation, educational inequalities and the role of the State (see also Zajda et al., 2006). It explores conceptual frameworks and methodological approaches applicable in the research covering the State, globalisation, social stratification and education. It demonstrates the neo-liberal ideological imperatives of education and policy reforms, and illustrates the way the relationship between the State and education policy affects current models and trends in education reforms and schooling globally. Various book chapters critique the dominant discourses and debates pertaining to the newly constructed and reinvented models of neo-liberal ideology in education, set against the current climate of growing social stratification and unequal access to quality education for all.

The book, constructed against this pervasive anti-dialogical backdrop, aims to widen, deepen and, in some cases, open discourse related to globalisation, and new dimensions of social inequality in the global culture. It is presented around three particular dimensions—hegemony, equity and cultural capital—as these continue to be most significant dimensions defining social inequality in the global culture.

The book explores the ambivalent and problematic relationship between the State, globalisation and social change. Using a number of diverse paradigms, ranging from critical theory to globalisation, the authors, by focusing on globalisation, ideology and social inequality, attempt to examine critically both the reasons and outcomes of education reforms, policy change and transformation, and provide a more informed critique on the Western-driven models of accountability, quality and

school effectiveness. The book draws upon recent studies in the areas of equity, cultural capital and dominant ideologies in education (Zajda, 2005).

Equality of educational opportunity is difficult to achieve in highly stratified societies and economic systems. In 1975, Coleman (1975) and others have argued that education alone was not sufficient to overcome significant socio-economic status (SES) differences in the society divided along dimensions of class, power, income, wealth and privilege. The difficulty of attaining social justice in the global economy is explained by Rikowski (2000), who argues that sustainable social justice is impossible on the basis of capitalist social forms. Globalisation, in most developing countries (the majority of humanity), is articulated in the form of finance-driven policy reforms concerning efficiency and effectiveness. Their effect on education systems is likely to 'increase' educational inequalities and access (Carnoy, 1999).

Furthermore, a lack of emphasis on the relationship between policy, poverty and schooling, and the 'withdrawal of the state as a major provider in the field of education in many parts of the world' raise serious human rights and ethical questions (Soudien & Kallaway, 1999; Zajda, 2005). The growth of global education policy hegemony defining accountability, standards, quality assurance and assessment fails to respond to the changing relationships between the state, education and social justice in the global economy.

Equality of educational opportunities, labelled by Coombs (1982) as the "stubborn issue of inequality" (Coombs, 1982, p. 153), and first examined in comparative education research by Kandel in 1957 (Kandel, 1957, p. 2), is "still with us", according to Jennings (2000, p. 113). Furthermore, the prospect of widening inequalities in education, due to market-oriented schooling, and substantial tolerance of inequalities and exclusion, are more than real. Access and equity continue to be "enduring concerns" in education (OECD, 2001, p. 26). The policy shift away from the progressive and egalitarian vision of education that characterised the 1960s and the 1970s has serious implications for human rights, social justice and democracy.

The general intention is to make *Education and Social Inequality in the Global Culture* available to a broad spectrum of users among policy-makers, academics, graduate students, education policy researchers, administrators and practitioners in the education and related professions. The book is unique in that it

- Examines central discourses surrounding the debate of cultural capital and social inequality in education
- Explores conceptual frameworks and methodological approaches applicable in the research of the State, globalisation and social inequality
- Illustrates how the relationship between the State and education policy affects current models and trends in schooling globally
- Demonstrates ideological imperatives of globalisation, neo-liberal ideology and the State
- Evaluates the ambivalent and problematic relationship between the State, education reforms and outcomes in education globally

- Provides strategic education policy analysis on recent shifts in education, and policy research
- Gives suggestions for directions in education and policy changes, relevant to democratic and empowering pedagogy in the 21st century

We hope that you will find *Education and Social Inequality in the Global Culture* useful in your teaching, future research and discourses concerning schooling, social justice and policy reforms in the global culture.

Australian Catholic University
(Melbourne Campus)

Joseph Zajda

References

- Carnoy, M. (1999). *Globalization and educational reform: What planners need to know*. Paris: UNESCO, International Institute for Education Planning.
- Coleman, J. (1975). What is meant by 'an equal educational opportunity'? *Oxford Review of Education*, 1, 27.
- Coombs, P. (1982). Critical world educational issues of the next two decades. *International Review of Education*, 28(1), 143–158.
- Jennings, Z. (2000). Functional literacy of young Guyanese adults. *International Review of Education*, 46(1/2), 93–116.
- Kandel, H. (1957). Equalizing educational opportunities and its problems. *International Review of Education*, 3(1), 1–12.
- OECD. (2001). *Education policy analysis: Education and skills*. Paris: OECD.
- Rikowski, G. (2000). Education and social justice within the social universe of capital. Paper presented at the BERA day seminar on "Approaching social justice in education: Theoretical frameworks for practical purposes", Faculty of Education, Nottingham Trent University, April 10.
- Soudien, C. & Kallaway, P. (1999). *Education, equity and transformation*. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer Academic.
- Zajda, J. (Ed.). (2005) *International handbook of globalisation and education policy research*. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.
- Zajda, J., Majhanovich, S., & Rust, V. (Eds.). (2006). *Education and social justice*. Dordrecht. The Netherlands: Springer.

Acknowledgements

We wish to thank the following individuals who have provided invaluable help, advice and support with this major research project:

Harmen van Paradijs, Publishing Editor, Springer

Marianna Pascale, Springer

Dorothy Murphy, Assistant Editor, *Educational Practice and Theory*, James Nicholas Publishers

Rea Zajda, James Nicholas Publishers

We also want to thank numerous reviewers who were prepared to review various drafts of the chapters. These include:

Helena Allahwerdi, University of Finland

Ari Antikainen, University of Helsinki

Alberto Arenas, University of Arizona

Jill Blackmore, Deakin University

Malcolm Campbell, Bowling Green State University

Paul Carlin, Australian Catholic University (Melbourne Campus)

David Gamage, University of Newcastle

Mark Hanson, University of California (Riversdale)

Yaacov Iram, Bar Ilan University

Erwin Epstein, Loyola University Chicago

Kyu Hwan Lee, Ewha Womans University (South Korea)

Kas Mazurek, University of Lethbridge

Marie-Laure Mimoun-Sorel, Australian Catholic University (Melbourne Campus)

Wolfgang Mitter, German Institute for International Educational Research

Gabrielle McMullen, Australian Catholic University (Melbourne Campus)

Jerzy Smolicz, University of Adelaide

Sandra L Stacki, Hofstra University

Margaret Secombe, University of Adelaide

David Wilson, OISE, University of Toronto

Rea Zajda, James Nicholas Publishers

We are particularly grateful to Harmen van Paradijs, Publishing Editor, Springer, who supported this project, and who took the responsibility for the book production process, and whose energy and enthusiasm ensured that the book was published on time.

Education and Social Inequality in the Global Culture

Edited by

Joseph Zajda

Australian Catholic University

Karen Biraimah

University of Central Florida

and

William Gaudelli

Teachers College Columbia University

Contents

Foreword	v
Preface	ix
Joseph Zajda	
Acknowledgements	xiii
Introduction	xvii
Karen Biraimah, (with William Gaudelli) and Joseph Zajda	
Education and Social Inequality in the Global Culture	17
Karen Biraimah (with William Gaudelli) and Joseph Zajda	
Chapter 1 Global Convergence and Divergence in Childhood Ideologies and the Marginalization of Children	1
Diane M. Hoffman and Guoping Zhao	
Chapter 2 Measuring Inequities in Secondary School Attendance: The Probability of Attending Secondary School for Primary School Graduates in Nicaragua	17
Caroline E. Parker	
Chapter 3 Religion, International Aid, and Used Clothing: Globalization and Mayan Literacy Revival in Guatemala	41
Mary Holbrock	
Chapter 4 A New Understanding of Globalization: The Case of the Romà	57
Victòria Miquel-Martí and Tere Sordé-Martí	
Chapter 5 Equity Considerations in the Access to Higher Education in Central and Eastern Europe	71
Randal J. Zimmermann	

Chapter 6 The Process of Inclusion/Exclusion in Brazilian Schools: Data from Reality 85
Marta Luz Sisson De Castro and Janaina Specht
Da Silva Menezes

Chapter 7 Private Resources in Educational Finance and Equality Implications: Evidence from Peru 103
Mariana Alfonso

Chapter 8 Defying the Odds: A Study of Grade 11 Female Students in Eritrea. 123
Kara Janigan

Chapter 9 Voices of Teachers in Academic and Vocational Secondary Schools in Egypt: Perceived Consequences of Educational Reform for Quality and Equality 141
Nagwa M. Megahed

Chapter 10 Cultural Capital: What Does It Offer Students? A Cross-National Analysis 155
Gillian Hampden-Thompson, Lina Guzman,
and Laura Lippman

Chapter 11 The Institutionalization of Mass Schooling as Marginalization or Opportunity in Islamic Nation-States 181
Alexander W. Wiseman

Index 203

Introduction: Education and Social Inequality in the Global Culture

Karen Biraimah¹, William Gaudelli², and Joseph Zajda³

1 Dimensions of Globalization

1.1 *Globalization as a Construct*

Globalization is not an easy term to define. There are numerous competing and contested definitions of globalization. The problem lies not so much in defining globalization, but in understanding and critiquing its intended and unintended consequences on nation-states and individuals around the world. Nearly 3,000 definitions of globalization were offered in 1998 alone, as noted in the *Globalisation Guide* (2002):

One can be sure that virtually every one of the 2822 academic papers on globalisation written in 1998 included its own definition, as would each of the 589 new books on the subject published in that year. (<http://www.globalisationguide.org/sb02.html>).

Definitions of globalization have varied from one author to another. Some have described it as a process, while others a condition, a system, a force, or an age. In the past few years, there has been a virtual explosion of interest in globalization by comparative education scholars and policy analysts (Appadurai, 1990; Giddens, 1990, 1996; Robertson, 1992; Arnove & Torres, 1999; Sklair, 1999; Carnoy, 1999; Stromquist & Monkman, 2000; Welch, 2001; Crossley & Jarvis, 2001; Carnoy & Rhoten, 2002; Sen, 2002; Dale & Robertson, 2003; Biraimah, 2005; Rhoads, 2005; Ritzer, 2005; Zajda, 2005, 2006; Clayton, 2006; Zajda et al., 2006).

There still is no consensus, from the literature, as to what constitutes its essential characteristics or core processes. Amongst the most influential scholarly definitions of that term, we can include Anthony Giddens's statement that it is "the intensification of worldwide social relations which link distant localities in such a way that local happenings are shaped by events occurring many miles away and vice versa" (Giddens, 1990). To Leslie Sklair (1999) globalization refers to the "emergence of

¹University of Central Florida

²Teachers College Columbia University

³Australian Catholic University

a globalized economy based on new systems of production, finance and consumption” (Sklair, 1999, p. 146). Some scholars, including Amartya Sen (2002), argue that globalization affects the expansion of markets, and imposes neoliberal policies, but it also impacts positively on human rights and democracy:

Globalisation has contributed to the progress of the world, through travel, trade, migration, spread of cultural influences, and dissemination of knowledge, and understanding (including of science and technology). To have stopped globalisation would have done irreparable harm to the progress of humanity. (p. 11)

In most cases, scholars bring their own critical approach to the intersection of globalization and their particular discipline and methodology. One could argue that under the influence of the World Trade Organization and other multilateral institutions, policy makers in Europe, and elsewhere, have adopted remarkably similar strategic policy goals and reform initiatives, in order to reform universities as entrepreneurial institutions, which appear to be symbiotically connected to the global economy.

In recent years, the construct of ‘globalization’ has become a ubiquitous signifier in education and social sciences and there is a need to analyze the paradoxical complexity and ambiguities surrounding connotations and denotations attached to the term by different individuals who employ a rich diversity of perceptions, disciplines, and methodologies. By finding some common features and differences we may be able to provide a more meaningful paradigm in policy and pedagogical discourses surrounding globalization, the global economy, and the global culture.

Globalization has been referred to as ‘the most over-used term in the current political lexicon’. It refers both to the compressions of the world in such a way that local happenings are shaped by events occurring many miles away and vice versa *and* the “intensification of the consciousness of the world as a whole” (Simon Bromley, Feature Article, *New Political Economy* March 1996, p. 120).

What is ‘globalization’? Is it a market-driven process, propelled by forces of consumerism that imposes a neoliberal economic regime of trade relations, and which represents the ubiquity of global capitalism? If so, is it spearheaded by multinational conglomerates? Is it connected to the discourse about modernity (Giddens, 1991; Robertson, 1992; Zajda, 2006)? Is it also driven by intensified modes of competition that compresses ‘the time, and space aspects of social relations’ (Giddens, 1990; Robertson, 1992)? These are some of the questions arising from a critical perception of multidimensional globalization. In general sense, the phenomenon of ‘globalization’ refers to individuals and institutions around the globe being more connected to each other than ever before, to a quantum-like pace of the international flow of communication, capital, knowledge, and other socially valued commodities, to consumer goods and services produced in one part of the world, and being increasingly available in all parts of the world, and to shifts in political and economic systems influenced by forces of globalization.

The term ‘globalization’, like postmodernism, is used so widely today in social theory, policy, and education research that it has become a cliché (Held et al., 1999; Zajda, 2005). As a construct, ‘globalization’ has acquired considerable emotive force among pro- and anti-globalization researchers. Some scholars view it as a

process that is beneficial—a key to future world economic development—and also inevitable and irreversible. Others regard it with hostility, even fear, believing that it increases inequality within and between nations, threatens employment and living standards and thwarts social progress. Economic ‘globalization’ is a historical process, the result of human innovation and technological progress. It refers to the increasing integration of economies around the world, particularly through trade and financial flows. The term sometimes also refers to the movement of people (labor) and knowledge (technology) across international borders.

As demonstrated above, globalization appears to be a conundrum. As it offers new venues for participation beyond national boundaries, it has exacerbated the socioeconomic divide of means and access to this participatory space. While it creates dialogical terrain to engage others about diverse ways of living, it stigmatizes certain identities as impediments to global progress. Though globalization hints of cooperation among international powers towards peaceful ends, it has given rise to deep schisms in the global body politic and has wrought atrocious violence. As it promises a richer, more diverse dialogue about our global futures, it forecloses public discourses about the myriad problems it has created. Environmental effects, social dislocation, and labor degradation are all directly related to the commingling of profit and progress that is part and parcel of the global age. The voices that attempt to draw attention to emergent social problems produced by globalization have themselves become faint whispers in a deafening chorus of tacit obedience to a new social contract of neoliberalism *qua* democracy that holds certain principles beyond debate: that market forces are always in the best interest of most people, that accumulating wealth is the good life, and that education must support these ends.

Do advocates of globalization desire participation, opening dialogical space, promoting cooperative power, or social equality? Evidence on this question resides with the former. Globalization has come to be associated with exacerbating social inequality, exemplified in the proverbial race to the bottom. In this race untethered capitalists seek to perfect a socially toxic formula that maximizes production and profit while minimizing worker and environmental protection. Popular and scholarly dialogue generally focuses on these events, whether it is the outsourcing of labor from developed countries, the in-sourcing of capitalism that exploits local people and ecosystems, or the subsequent trade issues that emerge from these global outflows and inflows. Increasingly what is needed, however, is study of the systemic complexities associated with these relationships in light of the myriad examples in the social world, rather than myopic attention to a case or detached theorizing about an abstract trend. Progress in understanding globalization will certainly be made when the macro and micro can be viewed in light of each other, each analysis working towards emergent and tenuous theories about globalization. To know something of globalization is to look carefully, closely, and locally at its manifestations, uncovering some element of its meaning, unearthing some dimension of its effects. While such an archaeological method of knowledge development is tediously slow, hampered by the shifting qualities of globalization itself, it provides some basis on which to extend an analysis of what globalization is and what it portends.

George Ritzer (2005, p. 3) offers a useful analytical lens through which to view the macro and micro areas of globalization. He argues that globalization is a category of *nothing*, or “a social form that is generally centrally conceived, controlled, and comparatively devoid of distinctive content”. *Nothing* he contrasts with *something*, or that which is “indigenously conceived, controlled, and comparatively rich in distinctive substantive content” (Ritzer, 2005, p. 7). Ritzer avoids casting social phenomena blithely into this dichotomy, recognizing the potential faultiness of his argument in its apparently oversimplistic logic. Yet he maintains that establishments such as weekend markets, craft fairs, and the corner pub are fundamentally different than the behemoths of corporate globalization, such as Wal-Mart, McDonalds, and Microsoft. The former embrace their individuality and distinctive character while the latter seek uniformity, consistency, and, thus, portability.

Ritzer (2005) examines how manifestations of *something* and *nothing* move and thereby alter one another, processes he refers to alternatively and oppositionally as *glocalization* and *grobalization*. Glocalization is the intermingling of the global and the local such that a hybrid is formed. Eating in a Vietnamese restaurant in Brazil while talking on a Japanese cell phone through a US satellite network to someone in Indonesia about the purchase of land in Russia is an illustration of what has become commonplace and has led to the hybridization of cultural artifacts. Hybridization has brought kosher pizzas, matrioshka dolls (originally a Russian folklore artifact) manufactured in Mexico, and Starbucks coffee, masquerading as a local café in Romania. While such glocalization stirs excitement in the possibilities of a small planet for some, others are dismayed at what they see as the bastardization, commodification, and exploitation of the local. Put another way, is the ubiquity of commodification familiarity an illustration of rationalization, Americanization, and restriction or freedom, diversity, and cultural synthesis (Ritzer, 2004, p. 80)?

Advocates of glocalization see these new syntheses as progress, an effect being people identifying as one. Opponents like Ritzer, however, characterize these same changes as illustrations of grobalization. Grobalization minimizes and trivializes the differences among people and places, affords them less ability to adapt and innovate, directs social processes that are deterministic and dominant, and represents people in commodified ways (p. 77). Heuristically, grobalization *others* people in the world such that they are no longer agents of and for themselves, but are acted on by the ominously large and rationalized order of a global world.

We introduce this vocabulary here since it informs much of the scholarship developed in this volume. Though the authors generally do not use these terms to illustrate their work, the contestation of glocalization and grobalization theory underlies much of what they offer. Alexander Wiseman’s piece about education in Islamic states (see chapter 11) illustrates the ways in which socially diffused commitments to maintaining religiously based Islamic schools are often opposed to market-oriented Western education, thus creating tensions about the nature of schools. His is a nuanced study, however, in that he suggests that intra-national differences among Islamic states and their allocation of resources to education largely illustrates why these countries have been marginalized. Diane Hoffman and

Guoping Zhou's work about how hegemony of Western early childhood discourse undermines traditional Chinese parenting (see chapter 1) suggests that globalization is at work through popular parenting magazines, presenting dissonant maxims for child-rearing as revealed truth.

2 Dialogical Encounters and Globalization

The scholarship of globalization that has emerged in the last two decades is remarkably lacking in its dialogical quality, social critique, and reflections, so typical of classics that have withstood the test of time. Globalization has facilitated the incredible proliferation of pulp literature and coffee table books that has reached a broad audience. Perhaps there is no better example of this than the bestseller *The Lexus and the Olive Tree* by Thomas Friedman (2000). Written in a journalistic style, at times in a sensationalistic manner, Friedman attempts to paint the world in broad strokes, relying heavily on his own extensive travel experiences. While this style may be highly readable and engaging, it is severely deficient with respect to theoretical depth and foundation. The author is not aware of himself in the book, presuming that his worldview is simply *what is* and seeks to explain *what ought to be* in these terms. His description of the "electronic herd" or what he refers to as rapid shift of capital away from a country/region when corporations feel there is political or social trouble afoot is a prime illustration (see Friedman, 2000, chapter 12). An elite view pervades this example, and the book as a whole, as he writes as if the means of social development, such as capital, are ends in and of themselves rather than means to further aims.

What is most troubling in considering discourse about globalization in the social mainstream is the general failure to explore its incongruities and, worse, the opposition to engage dialogue about presumptions embedded in globalization. Like Friedman's electronic herd, globalization and its neoliberal attachments have been reified as *how things are* without a careful examination and subsequent debate of *both* (1) the ontological claims, diverse perspectives on what is happening, and (2) its broad, social effects, along with views about possible alternatives to the current state of affairs. China's recent economic boom offers a cogent case in point. As China is in the midst of a period of economic growth that has threatened to overheat and collapse due to its pace, it has done so without regard to the consequences of growth. Employing an unsustainable program of development based largely on a Western model of rapid capital accumulation, diminutive environmental standards, and strident effort for comparative advantage internationally, China's growth is threatening on many levels. Environmental degradation, disregard for urban and rural poor, and labor exploitation are just a few of the many problems such development causes. What is significantly lacking has been a vigorous debate in China about the processes and direction of their economic growth. Rather, they have largely emulated Western-style development, illustrated by their most recent move to begin mass production and exportation of automobiles, not unlike their neighbors

in Japan and South Korea (Bradsher, 2005, June 28). China's development, illustrated briefly here, is in a real sense an offspring of globalization, with a local twist. The market for goods, the availability of resources, the fixation on consumer goods and technology, and foundational nature of trade are all directly related to the economic interconnectedness that globalization has created.

What globalization has failed to create, in the case of China and many other societies who are major players in this economic system, however, is a robust dialogue about the nature, effects, and alternatives associated with its growth. Relying on what is narrowly *true*, in particular the principles of unsustainable market economics, globalization has jeopardized social stability, such as a safe environment, equitable access to resources, and protection of human labor, in the quest for greater profits. What is perhaps most disconcerting about this trend is not the effects that such obedience to often implicit principles has caused, as if these were not disturbing enough, but the concomitant subverting of free, open, and diverse discourse about the processes at work and their aims. As meetings such as the G-8 Summit and World Trade Organization occur in locations isolated from the din of protest and discourse, those committed to the free and fair interplay of another marketplace, that of ideas, cannot help but be alarmed.

The task of this volume, set against this pervasive anti-dialogical backdrop, is to widen, deepen, and in some cases open discourse related to globalization, social stratification, and education. While we are aware of significant work that comes before ours (see Robertson, 1992; Appadurai, 1996; Carnoy, 1999; Gabbard, 2000; Stromquist & Monkman, 2000; Mittelman, 2000; Stiglitz, 2002; Sklair, 2002; and Daun, 2004), we hope that what is offered here will extend and deepen this scholarship. We have organized this discourse around three particular issues—*hegemony*, *equity*, and *cultural capital*—as we believe these are the most critical concepts in examining the social inequality of globalization.

3 Hegemony

Hegemony, as articulated by Antonio Gramsci (see Forgacs, 2002; and Clayton, 2006), is the fairly static dominance of social groups built through implicit consensus. For Gramsci, whose conceptualizations of hegemony developed through his struggles and imprisonment as an Italian communist leader during the 1920s and 1930s, dominance was not a purely Machiavellian method where the powerful were consciously and purposefully orchestrating the oppression of the oppressed. Rather, poor and working class people participate in hegemonic relations when they have consented to them, have gained something from them, or otherwise assist in their perpetuation (Forgacs, 2000). In terms of this book, hegemony refers to the exploited worker in an economically disadvantaged situation who seeks a *good life*, usually defined in economic terms, at the expense of his/her coworkers and community. This desire to improve their situation leads them to internalize the image of the oppressor and seek their power. As Paulo Freire (2001) suggested writing in the

context of Brazil, land-deprived peasants see the “new man” that they wish to become not as someone born with freedom, autonomy, and responsibility to enact land reform, but “to acquire land and thus become landowners—or, more precisely, bosses over other workers” (p. 46). Gramsci and Freire’s tact differed from Marx in that he did not believe social change and class consciousness would emerge spontaneously among the oppressed out of cataclysmic events, but only through a dialectical process that leads to their political agency and action.

Hegemony is a significant idea within this volume. Diane Hoffman and Guoping Zhou’s piece on the domination of Western childhood models in Chinese popular culture (chapter 1) places hegemony front and centre, as they contend that Western notions of individualization and youth agency, as opposed to parental authority, are implicated in much of what parents read about in *how to* parenting journals. Caroline E. Parker (chapter 2) analyzes school attendance patterns in Nicaragua comparing urban and rural populations. While the heuristics of low-income families, being a girl, and living in rural areas predict that less access to education has merit, she finds the phenomenon is more complex. In particular, her study examines how living in certain rural areas and in the capital city of Managua confounds such generalizations. Mary Holbrook (chapter 3) also develops and problematizes hegemony as she explores the way in which Mayan culture interactively shapes and is shaped by global discourses within and outside Guatemala. Her work presents a strong emphasis on making the global contributions of Mayans, representing the global South, visible. Such analysis allows readers to move beyond the simplistic dualisms of oppressor/oppressed in analyzing changes in Mayan culture to reach a deeper understanding of how hegemony works to involve the oppressed in their own exploitation. In a similar vein, Victoria Miquel-Marti and Tere Sorde-Marti (chapter 4) explore another group frequently ignored in global discourses, the Roma of Europe. They recount the history of the Roma people, associating their frequent movement and cultural dispersion with current forces of globalization. Rather than presenting the oppressed nature of Roma people as those acted upon, Miquel-Marti and Sorde-Marti explore how Romani, particularly women, are using the tools of globalization such as the Internet as a means to participate on their own terms and to advance community goals within this framework.

4 Equity

Aristotle’s conception of equity is that of a corrective of justice which sits within the law but allows for the interpretation of phenomena to uphold a greater good.

As he wrote in *Rhetoric*: “It is equitable to pardon human failings and look to the lawgiver and not the law, to the spirit and not to the letter ... to the whole and not to the part” (I: 13). From these early iterations, equity has come to mean that which is in the best interest of the individual and community while upholding justice, though not in a tight and narrow sense (see also Zajda et al., 2006). The equitable man “is one who chooses and does equitable acts, and is not unduly insistent

upon his rights, but accepts less than his share” (Aristotle, cf. Beever, 2005). Such a notion of civil morality suggests that it is incumbent on all citizens, but especially those with means, to take less than they are entitled to so that others may have a sufficient amount.

Rather than a principled, rights-based argument that fixes justice solely on what one is due by right, equity tempers justice by considering what all is due through a larger, moral criterion than what is fixed in law. Equity is what fills the gap between where the law or civil society is ambiguous, silent, or even nonexistent, as a means of weighing what actions will promote justice and serving the best interests of the community and the individuals within it. Equity discourse is vital since those who advocate social equality in an era of globalization rely on appeals to equity, justice, and fairness rather than codified law. Education scholarship, particularly within multicultural education, often invokes equity as both a pedagogical principle and a rationale for public education. Christine Bennett (2003) differentiates equity from equality, as the latter requires identical treatment and the former “different treatment according to relevant differences” (p. 16). Gloria Ladson-Billings (1996) refers to equity pedagogy as insuring equal access to knowledge for all students, which requires an intimate knowledge of the child (p. 196).

Randall Zimmerman’s work (chapter 5) about higher education in Eastern Europe describes the way in which fair access to postsecondary education has taken shape in the years following the breakup of the Soviet Union. Focusing on the prevalence of class in determining access to higher education, he finds that countries with both a commitment to equity and the resources to service this goal have a broader representation of all social classes in higher education. Marta Luz Sisson de Castro and Janaina Specht da Silva Menezes (chapter 6) examine how policy efforts intended to rectify educational inequities in Brazil often exacerbate the situation they were intended to correct. The municipal government of Rio Grande do Sul implemented a transportation and nutrition program that, while intended to provide access to poor students and thereby promote justice, drained direly needed funds away from efforts to improve teacher quality, develop curriculum, and purchase educational materials. Access to educational resources is also a primary concern of Mariana Alfonso (chapter 7) in her work on education reforms in Peru. She describes a quasi-privatization policy that is designed to augment funding through parental resources. Through a detailed analysis of demographic and expenditure data, she argues that such policies seek to undermine equitable access to education, disenfranchising poor children, particularly those from the Quechua ethnic minority.

The macro-level analyses of equity are well-complemented by the micro/qualitative pieces included herein. Kara Janigan (chapter 8) takes a micro-level analysis of equity, studying Eritrean adolescents who managed to succeed in secondary education despite longstanding limitations about educating girl children in sub-Saharan Africa. She finds that the justice that these young women sought by becoming educated was due in part to their personalities and personal attributes, family resources, and parents’ educational achievement. Nagwa Megahed (chapter 9) also takes a focused look at issues of equity with respect to recent educational reform in Egypt, choosing to interview secondary and postsecondary teachers about their interpretations

of these efforts. Teachers were somewhat varied in their reactions to these policies, as those whose background included working in the private sector were less optimistic about the possibility of achieving equity of opportunity than those who had always been teachers and saw education as a great equalizing force.

5 Cultural Capital

Cultural capital refers to dominant conceptions of what constitutes knowledge, knowing, and social value. By upholding a single standard of what it means to be knowledgeable, educational systems both reinforce the differentiated achievement status of class groups while rewarding those who are conversant with implicit rules of dominant ideology (see Saha, 2005). Sociologist Pierre Bourdieu is widely recognized for his groundbreaking work on cultural capital. In *Distinction* (1979) Bourdieu argues that children develop from their parents a *habitus*, or unconscious orientations towards ways of being that fit their class position and thus reproduce social classes. He argues that these outlooks are cast at birth and even attempts to *add on* cultural capital later in life will convey the sense that the child is an outsider. Schools, in a sense, are markets wherein children enter with various stores of capital that can be exchanged for enhancement of one's capital, and thereby their life-chances. Children who lack the *habitus* of educated parents, or the working or poor classes, are simultaneously viewed as devoid of valued knowledge and filled with useless or detracting family baggage, or what Bourdieu described as an organic culture.

Jane Roland Martin (2003) has shifted this emphasis, seeking to explore the educative forces of society that transcend schools. Rather than employ Bourdieu's category of cultural capital, which generally focuses on that which is explicitly passed on by schools, she refers to this broader emphasis as cultural stock. She suggests that in order for a democratic society to thrive, there needs to be a commitment to examine what in our cultural stock is an asset and what a liability. This vision of cultural socialization, or education as a reproductive institution, is challenged by conservative educators such as E. D. Hirsch (1988) who, in the tradition of Emile Durkheim, insist that culture, and thereby acculturation, is *the* rationale for public education and needs to be done rigorously and with focused attention on continuation of what has come before.

Educational discourse, particularly which involves globalization, often invokes cultural capital in spirit, if not letter. Most of the chapters in this book, and arguably the volume as a whole, develop from an unstated commitment to providing access to high-quality education for all, though there will surely be disagreement about how this ought to proceed. Cultural capital troubles this path, however, as it defies facile explanation, focusing instead on the important matter of socialization into ways of being that are necessarily local, yet emerging within a larger global culture. This is perhaps most evident in Gillian Hampden-Thompson, Lina Guzman, and Laura Lippman's work (chapter 10) addressing cultural capital internationally. Using two massive international datasets, they use statistical analyses to examine