

Time, Space, and Culture: Diversifying and Globalizing “Minds”

Roberta Levitt
Joseph M. Piro
Long Island University

Abstract

Trend data from multiple sources increasingly point to major demographic shifts in population classifications for the United States. In light of this development, this article presents a rationale for the introduction of *education globalization*, which is globally-focused learning, in American education that addresses the needs of an increasingly diverse student population. This article argues for change in how content and delivery of core curriculum and instruction in American schools must accommodate more flexible learning environments that incorporate not only demographic change but also political, linguistic, technological, and economic shifts driving an increasingly diverse society. As a framework, we suggest introducing Gardner’s (2008) *Five Minds for the Future* as a curriculum organizer. In addition, the conceptual development, complexities, and challenges of globalizing American curriculum tied to diversity and how these connect to contemporary teacher practices are discussed.

Introduction and Overview

Throughout the coming decades, one of the growing challenges sure to dominate American pedagogical practice is how to craft culturally responsive learning environments to address increasing student diversity. As students arrive into classrooms where their culture is dissimilar in trait, belief, and value, schools will need to create an environment in which these students feel emotionally secure, culturally comfortable, and academically inspired (Perry & Southwell, 2011; Rychly & Graves, 2012). This need for a harmonious blending of confidence, culture, and cognition takes on increased immediacy if we examine some projected statistics.

Over the next half century, predicted shifts in demographic classifications for the United States will be astonishing. According to the U.S. Census Bureau, by 2050, the non-Hispanic White population will grow from almost 196 million to about 202 million, an increase of 7%. In 2000, this group comprised nearly 70% of the U.S. population. In 2050, it will comprise approximately 52.5% (U.S. Census Bureau, 2011).

By 2050, over 61 million individuals who identify as Hispanic (and who may be of any race) will be added to the U.S. population, growing from 35.6 million people in 2000 to 102.6 million in 2050, a 188% increase. Numbers for the growth of the Asian population are even more startling, rising from 10.8 million in 2000 to 33.4 million, doubling their proportion of the U.S. population from 3.8% to nearly 8%. The Black

population is projected to rise from 35.8 million to 61.4 million by 2050, an increase of 71%, raising their share of the total population from 12.7% to 14.6% (see Table 1).

Table 1
Current and projected population classifications for the U.S. based on data from the U.S. Census Bureau

Group	Population in 2000 (millions)	Percent of population in 2000	Projected population in 2050 (millions)	Projected percent of population by 2050	Percent of Total Increase by 2050
Non-Hispanic White	195.7	69.4%	201.3	52.5%	7.0%
Black	35.8	12.7%	61.4	14.6%	71.6%
Hispanic	35.6	12.6%	102.6	22.5%	188.0%
Asian	10.8	3.8%	33.4	10.3 %	213.0%

These projections are further compounded by linguistic diversity trends developing across the U.S. population and their effect on American society. A growing number of immigrants from the continents of Europe, Asia, and South America are leaving their mark on U.S. education, economy, history, and culture. This impact is expected to strengthen over time. For example, while Spanish continues to be the most dominant world language taught in U.S. schools, we will see the rise in demand for instruction in languages such as Russian, Farsi, Mandarin, Japanese, and Urdu. The popularity of these languages is no doubt driven by the escalating global significance of countries such as Russia, Iran, China, Japan, and Pakistan, and schools need to be keenly aware of the necessity for the U.S. to respond to this change in the new world order (Tochon, 2009). This fast-moving linguistic and demographic diversity will converge, requiring schools to prepare for education globalization where students will need to manage, what is being called, extreme diversity. Responding to complex and layered citizen identities as students' exposure to various languages, ethnicities, religions, and cultures intensifies, allows, at least in an ideological sense, "multiple citizenships" (KnowledgeWorks, 2012) made even more feasible by the pathway of technology.

This article introduces many of these trends and issues and offers suggestions on how curriculum and instruction can become educational drivers in American schools in order to successfully meet this diversity challenge and build responsive, culturally respectful, and inclusive learning environments. We apply the framework of Gardner's (2008) *Five Minds for the Future* and describe how it may be operationalized to fit the sensibilities of the 21st century teaching and learning process. Finally, we propose recommendations for pedagogy and practice that inform an *education globalization* approach.

Diversity, Education Globalization, and a Culturally Responsive Pedagogy

The concept of diversity has been generally associated with multicultural education and its emphasis on prejudice and discrimination reduction, human rights, an equity agenda, stereotype confrontation, and personal tolerance. Most of these can be considered more sociological or behavioral rather than cognitive in scope and character (Schoorman & Bogotch, 2010). We propose a conceptual expansion of the term diversity to embrace that of globalization, using it to represent how the world is and will be defined and interconnected by distinct cultural, racial, and linguistic narratives (Scholte, 2002).

We use the term, education globalization, as it has been interpreted by Scholte (2002). Rather than tie education globalization solely to cultural, sociological, or linguistic interconnectedness, Scholte asserts that it has more to do with a shift in the nature of spatiality, specifically, social space. “Globalization involves reductions in barriers to transworld contacts. People become more able – physically, legally, culturally, and psychologically – to engage with each other in ‘one world’” (Scholte, 2002, pp. 13-14). The outcome of this *barrier-reduction* is a type of reterritorialization with “a reconfiguration of social geography [that is] intimately interlinked with shifts in patterns of knowledge, production, governance, identity, and social ecology. So a transformation of social space – like globalization – is enveloped in larger dynamics of social change” (p. 14). We see this as a growing worldwide trend in education. Further, education globalization implies that students have begun to sense their growing power to engage in a free-trade of the mind, intellectual exchanges carried out without restrictions. Students have at their fingertips access to digital gateways affording them entry into cultural, historical, scientific, and geographic spaces, which can enlarge and deepen their academic as well as their cyber-citizenship.

World-to-the-Desktop Approach

Building on this idea, Clarke, Dede, and Dieterle (2008) describe contemporary shifts in K-12 education embodying what they call a world-to-the-desktop interface in which students experience barrier-reduction, recruiting both near and distant individuals and resources to act as learning agents. A student with a mobile device living in Chicago, Austin, or Seattle can “access distant experts and archives, communicate with peers, and participate in mentoring relationships and virtual communities of practice” (p. 901). This world-to-desktop approach can help advance a climate of diversity because students situated in a classroom in a monoculturally fixed location can network with individuals in another, and become conversant with multiregional viewpoints and perspectives. This is one example of education globalization. Spring (2009) describes additional features of education globalization which include the following components:

- common national education practices including curriculum and pedagogy;
- global networks and the flow of common ideas and practices;

- global information technology and e-learning;
- global discourses influencing local and national policymakers, administrators, and teachers; and
- effects of world migrations on national and local education policy.

Extending on these components, many of these features speak to the notion of schools around the globe becoming more alike than different, achieving almost an education *harmonization*, a term used by the European Union's 1999 Bologna Process in which higher education institutions agreed to align many of their policies and practices (Hunter, 2010). Furthermore, Scholte (2002) points to unease often cited about globalization, based on the potentially nullifying effects on diversity and difference. Heine and Thakur (2011) discuss the bumpy ride to globalization including episodes of terrorism, pandemics, and security challenges. Because globalization has, rightly or wrongly, become most equated with homogenization, disputes have erupted on the true compatibility of both terms. However, on this question Scholte (2002) advises that "the local and the household aspects of social space can intertwine in innumerable different combinations. By injecting a further dimension into the geographical spectrum – thereby adding to its complexity – globalization could just as well increase cultural pluralism" (p. 29). Expanding on this, he acknowledges the increasing contentiousness resulting from the clashing of worldviews, but also notes that globalization can give rise to non-territorial identities and encourage new solidarities as well (Cottle, 2011; Scholte, 2005). In education globalization, teachers take on these big issues, offering authentic opportunities for students to think critically about their meaning and complexity, encouraging them to become more socially and politically conscious, illustrative of the "flow of ideas" that Spring (2009, p. 5) suggests (Reimers, 2006; Riley, 2004; Villegas & Lucas, 2002).

The Agenda for Today's Student

The sociopolitical agenda students of today will need to attend to includes topics such as environmental sustainability, terrorism containment, cyberspace security, human rights, migration, displacement, asylum seeking, and global health needs. In a culturally responsive pedagogy, to begin to get their arms around these issues, students should be provided opportunities to select a topic of interest, initiate preliminary research, engage in preliminary discourse, and then call upon the knowledge of an expert learning agent through virtual e-contact in another learning space, forming, in effect, a multidisciplinary personal learning network unrestricted by geography and suggestive of the barrier-reduction of which Scholte (2002) speaks. Also, as Desrochers (2001) notes, "it is generally accepted that multidisciplinary teams, by helping individuals overcome the blinders created by their particular expertise, most efficiently link concepts developed in one technology to problems arising in another" (p. 379). The skill sets shaped by such pluralistic educational enterprise encouraging creativity, communication, critical thinking, and collaboration with individuals not necessarily in

close geographic proximity will be indispensable for education initiatives across the approaching decades, a vital part of the education globalization process.

This pluralism is further promoted by the development of a pedagogy that incorporates spatiality, culture, and time, addressing the needs of students from multiple ethnicities, language systems, religions, and abilities by creating an environment where these students can problem-solve utilizing collective, diverse minds (Richards, Brown, & Forde, 2006). This culturally responsive pedagogy takes in students' individual cultures, viewpoints, and experiences, is mindful of students' hybrid identities, and develops a citizenry with increased understanding of and sensitivity to other cultures.

Five Minds for the Future: A Curriculum Framework

What are some models available to help direct the rapidly transforming nature of American education to restructure its delivery paradigm to prepare for diversity? We propose using Gardner's *Five Minds for the Future* (2008) as a curriculum design responding to diversity in minds-on learning. Gardner suggests the interdependence of both the cognitive and the human will dictate the kind of future-focused, out-of-the-box thinking sought and cultivated by 21st century society. Because of this, he proposes five kinds of minds, or "mental dispositions" (p. 19), as best suited for future challenges global societies will face. These include:

- Disciplinary mind: mastery of major schools of thought (including science, mathematics, and history) and of at least one professional craft;
- Synthesizing mind: ability to integrate ideas from different disciplines or spheres into a coherent whole and to communicate that integration to others without being overly judgmental;
- Creating mind: capacity to uncover and clarify new problems, questions, and phenomena, and to ask good and new questions;
- Respectful mind: awareness of and appreciation for differences among human beings and the need to understand others; and
- Ethical mind: fulfillment of one's responsibilities as a worker and a citizen and acting appropriately in both roles.

In expanding on this framework, Gardner advises us "to think about those minds in the manner of a policy maker, rather than a psychologist" (Gardner, 2008, p. 4). Using this policy-centric approach, he goes on to note that curriculum around the world is fast converging, citing buzzwords including "world-class standards," "interdisciplinary curricula," "the knowledge economy" (Gardner, 2008, p. 18) as nation-neutral and universally recognized. Gardner acknowledges that, despite the lip service paid to globalization and diversity that advocates upgrading and internationalizing the learning canon, these pleas ring largely hollow. Education institutions steeped in long-standing traditions, remain reluctant to take any risks in changing the standard order of business, to break out of the academic cloister that educator and American theorist George Counts identified during the 1930s in a work on the social foundations of education

entitled *Dare the School Build a New Social Order* (Counts, 1932). In this work he wrote that, “The educator fails in his line of duty if he refuses to step out of academic cloisters.... Education is one of the highest forms of statesmanship” (Counts, 1934, p. 2). Perhaps stepping out of the academic cloister and viewing education as a form of statesmanship is a good way to conceptualize what we need to do when we begin to address the 21st century issues of globalization and diversity and use minds in fresh and innovative ways.

Some critics contend that this new model by Gardner is merely a remixing of his 1983 well-known and well-studied multiple intelligences work. However, upon closer inspection it can be seen as a useful paradigm that aligns with much of the thinking related to restructuring 21st century curriculum. One major concern voiced over contemporary education enterprise is that 21st century students are studying 20th century curriculum using a 19th century structure (Moe & Chubb, 2010). In fact, Gardner, himself, writes that, “I believe that current formal education still prepares students primarily for the world of the past rather than for possible worlds of the future” (2008, p.17). Using a model like Five Minds is better aligned with new directions emerging in curriculum practice. For example, Stanford University (perhaps in an attempt to break out of the academic cloister) has just revamped its curriculum structure and identified seven skill areas as vital for students: aesthetic and interpretive inquiry; social inquiry; scientific analysis; formal and quantitative reasoning; engaging differences; ethical reasoning; and creative expression. The University committee in charge of this revision described this new approach as emphasizing “ways of thinking, ways of doing” (Berrett, 2012). This more conceptually-driven approach reflects a notable shift away from more subject-centered learning. Likewise, Gardner points out that he chose the word *minds* for the model because, in his view, *mind* reminds us that actions and thoughts are part of our brains and if we want to nurture these capacities “we will be trafficking in the operation of the mind” (2008, p. xv). He goes on to note that while we acknowledge the importance of subjects such as math and science, we really don’t expend much effort in teaching mathematical and scientific thinking. Similarly, we acknowledge factors of globalization easily enough but haven’t quite figured out how to prepare youngsters so that they can survive and thrive in a world different from one ever known or ever imagined before” (2008, p.17).

‘Five Minds’ in Curriculum

So, how might Gardner’s Five Minds paradigm become integrated in the teaching plans of increasingly diverse schools as the 21st century moves forward? How can content areas can be categorized and then operationalized in schools using a Five Minds approach? Table 2 presents some suggestions for application to secondary level learning. Cognitive capacities are paired with broader content areas that can advance the growth, development, and application of these minds.

Table 2
Curriculum Framework for Globalizing American High Schools (Gardner, 2008)

Cognitive Capacity	Content Category
Disciplinary Mind	Language Literacy, World Literature, World Languages, World Geography, Mathematics, Biology, Chemistry, Physics, Environmental Sciences
Synthesizing Mind	Intercultural History & Human Geography, Global and Regional Studies, Cultural Psychology, Media Literacy, Cultural Economics and Finance, Gaming and Simulations, Information and Communication Technologies (ICT)
Creating Mind	Global Arts and World Aesthetics, Curating World Museum Collections, World Heritage in Global Architecture, World Athletics, Entrepreneurial Studies
Respectful Mind	Citizenship Study, Peace and Conflict Resolution Studies, Global Values
Ethical Mind	Philosophy and Ethics, Global Health and Wellness Study, Cyberspace Security, Global Law (e.g., Intellectual Property Rights, International Human Rights)

The organization this model sets down can be an efficient framework around which to design diverse learning experiences. Instead of compartmentalizing subjects into domain-specific disciplines (e.g., history, reading, science), there is opportunity to introduce broader categories more educationally relevant and rigorous to new millennium topics applicable both to state or locally required core curriculum as well as electives. Note the co-existence of some traditional courses of study (e.g., literacy) with those that would be considered more progressive and future-focused (Peace and Conflict Resolution Studies; Global Health and Wellness Study). This mixture would bring curriculum more in line with the view of Hansen (2010) who conceptualizes it as a cosmopolitan inheritance where students are encouraged to move beyond superficial or folkloric acquaintance with other cultures and engage dynamically with their unfamiliar aspects. That instead of an all too simplistic agenda that many schools now follow, the study of world cultures over time would be comprehensive, cogent, and connected to new local and statewide content standards, updated curriculum and assessment policy,

and revised graduation requirements, something occurring on a worldwide scale (Spring, 2009).

We offer, as one example, operationalization of the synthesizing mind. Using the 21st Century Partnership resource map in social studies as a model (Partnership for 21st Century Skills, 2008), secondary school students can be trained to think and engage with a topic such as cross-border migration flows (Talani, 2011), analyze its rationale from nation to nation, track regional movement patterns using resources such as spreadsheets or by diagramming and charting, and then brainstorm solutions using a concept map demonstrating how this migration can impact on the internal and external order of nations. Add to this another layer using multimedia as a communications platform. Students can circulate their position paper using presentational software such as a PowerPoint™, Prezi®, or SlideRocket®; creating a Web site; or recording a podcast of their research. They can sustain conversation after their presentation with supervised blogs where they and their audience continue to communicate and update each other on issues in migration and their impact on globalization. They can then move to the iCivics® Web site where they can engage in game simulations that actively test their knowledge and action levels of civic participation.

Operationization of the creating mind may involve student research of major World Heritage properties located in their native countries (UNESCO, 2012). Studying these sites can develop students' sense of national history, culture, and identity, while motivating them to think about the role of art and architecture as a window into deeper historical and geographical knowledge, generating new perspectives and formulating fresh ideas. Using a variety of digital resources such as search engines, bookmarks, and online databases accessed through mobile devices, background data on the World Heritage mission can be communicated. Following this initial phase, students can develop and design Web pages on their countries' architectural Heritage sites using hyperlinks to these locations that lead users to pertinent essays, videos, and podcasts. They can also experiment with photos (photo blogging) and videos (vlogging) further expanding on all of this by creating a wiki, or digitally exchanging information with students in other cities and countries using Skype®, Twitter®, or VoiceThread®.

We have worked with an intermediate middle school in New York that has collaborated on just such a project with a school in New Delhi, India, related to, probably, India's most famous World Heritage site, the Taj Mahal. The class in New York studied the structure as part of a global history unit on the Indian sub-continent using instructional resources of The Asia Society, and electronically communicated with a school in New Delhi. They also contacted experts at the World Monuments Fund for additional information on the monument, something that takes on special significance in light of recent reports of infrastructure concerns because of the state of its wooden foundation and the condition of the adjacent Yamuna River, the largest tributary to the Ganges River, upon whose edge the structure sits. This has led to the Taj Mahal being placed on the World Monuments Fund's current *Watchlist*. Their teachers urged

students to do some strategic thinking toward a solution to the mechanical problem, encouraging them to apply lines of thought that tap into aspects of engineering and mathematics balanced by those of art and culture. How can this structural challenge be successfully resolved taking into account not only the structural aspects of the dilemma but the ethical and cultural ones it raises as well?



Figure 1. The Taj Mahal on the Yamuna River as seen from The Red Fort in Agra, India.
Photo taken by J. M. Piro, 2004.

It is through activities such as these that students acquire expertise in skill sets that include collaboration, creativity, initiative, self-direction, leadership, and empathy, building capacity to think and act innovatively, approaching problems from the diverse and cosmopolitan vantage point of a working, involved, and informed member of global society (Parker, Ninomiya, & Cogan, 1999; Suárez-Orozco & Qin-Hilliard, 2004). In this way, we ensure that from the early primary grades on, students are trained for a more cosmopolitan *habitus*, one that encourages their reaching out to other countries and cultures to learn about and value differential history, geography, language, religion, and literature and to understand why other cultures matter (Bickmore, 1999; Hansen, 2008; Mitchell & Parker, 2008). Isn't this the kind of student-citizen every nation wants to develop, someone who practices systemic thinking and who has the insight to spot patterns and discover how topics interrelate, combined with the creativity to transfer this to authentic problem-solving with empathy and understanding (Mullen, 2006; Sahlberg, 2006)?

Tensions in Education Policy for 'Education Globalization'

If we are to expect American teachers and students to become more knowledgeable about diverse cultures, we must prepare to confront policy decisions that promote the establishment of the test-based culture presently dominating American education enterprise. The lamentable curriculum narrowing and core content

standardization that is occurring has tiered the teaching of content areas, privileging those of literacy and numeracy at the expense of subjects like civic and global literacy, and world languages (Au, 2011). For instance, it is estimated that while over 50% of European adults speak two languages fluently, only 9% of adults in the U.S. do (Robinson, Rivers, & Brecht, 2006). Further, In the 2010 National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) Geography Assessment results while fourth grade students demonstrated some improvement from 2001 to 2010, there was only slight change on aggregate scores for eighth grade students and significantly lower scores for twelfth grade students in geographical proficiency from 1994 to 2010 (National Assessment Governing Board, 2010a),

Since social studies can serve as a gateway to globalizing minds through the construction of world knowledge, steps need to be taken to preserve the time devoted to social studies and expand its reach (Merryfield, 1998; Myers, 2006). As NAEP Governing Board Chair David P. Driscoll stated, "Geography is not just about maps. It is a rich and varied discipline that, now more than ever, is vital to understanding the connections between our global economy, environment, and diverse cultures" (National Assessment Governing Board, 2010b, p. 1). How many schools in the U.S. consider making virtual visits to emerging, non-Western cultures, including those in Asia, Africa, or Latin America using Google Earth? How many teachers require students to read at least one global newspaper published online in English to track world events, something easily achievable using the iPad© app *Newspapers* (Earnest, 2011)? How many high schools have the vision to revise graduation requirements so as to mandate an international studies course or an online learning course? These are real-life, real-time 21st century skills not only desirable but essential in teaching of and preparing for a growing diverse society and the meaningful education of the maturing cyber-citizen.

Core Content Mapping for Skills Development

Encouragingly, the National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS) together with the Partnership for 21st Century Skills have published a 21st Century *Social Studies Skills Map*. This core content map offers research on skills the NCSS considers vital for future-focused study (Partnership for 21st Century Skills, 2008). The map presents each skill, defines it, and then identifies what student outcomes in various grades would look like for teachers who operationalize the map in their classroom practice.

In this skills map, one activity to promote social and cross-cultural skills has elementary school students working in teams to explore daily life within differential cultural contexts, something easily relatable to the synthesizing mind. These teams browse the Web site of an educationally oriented global network such as the non-profit organization, International Education and Resource Network or the United Nations' UNICEF Voices of Youth project and then engage with children or children's stories in culturally diverse contexts to develop an understanding of similarities between life experiences in these two global spaces. As evidence of learning and engaging the

creating mind, children would represent or synthesize their knowledge in some format, such as audiocasts, Web sites, interactive posters, videocasts, or blogs (See Web Resources list following References.) By active involvement with a culture different from their own, students are trained to work productively with others while bridging cultural differences and applying varying “minds-on” perspectives to innovate, enlarge, and improve the quality and scope of their own work.

Recommendations

This article has outlined some measures American public education can take to expand, upgrade, and diversify curriculum and instruction by globalizing the school culture over time and through space. However, one of the first critical tasks at hand is to imbue an *ethos* where education globalization is valued and not suspect, what some have called developing *worldmindedness* (Merryfield, Lo, Po, & Kasai, 2008). Up through World War II, the American political system, more or less, adhered to the Hamiltonian idea that in order to remain politically independent of the world, it must stay economically and ideologically independent as well. This attitude has slowly transformed into one in which the U.S. has been encouraged to take a more practical, inclusive global viewpoint (Myers, 2006). But how pervasive has this viewpoint actually become and what traction does it have in public education? The American *Zeitgeist* seems to vacillate between an uneasy dialectic of safeguarding national interests by fostering a detachment from global crises to recognizing that American leadership will be indispensable to an increasingly interconnected world (Torres, 1998). The skill sets on how to best balance these competing interests, undoubtedly, will need to be addressed head-on by cogent policy on curriculum and instruction during the next decade.

To combat the potential risk to American world competitiveness this poses, efforts need to be made to encourage and reward those schools and teachers who actively seek to globalize and diversify perspectives, perhaps with these individuals serving as prototypes and their teaching projects cited as best practices (Mullen, 2006; Sahlberg, 2006). Historically, when curriculum is designed, it has been driven by a back-to-basics attitude or conceptualized as a treaty to appease special interest groups, an approach which continues to be ascendant even as we are in the midst of the second decade of the 21st century. Clearly, it is time to energize and update curriculum to match the realities of contemporary society, so that policy decisions at the regional, state, and national levels are thoughtful, knowledgeable, and visionary (Waks, 2003). The following recommendations are made to ensure that an education globalization approach is optimized by multidimensional considerations.

Education Globalization: Not Only an Idea, Also an Agenda

Once the concept of education globalization is agreed upon, there must be proactive efforts to actually make it happen. If stakeholders, including legislators and

social scientists, cooperate with teachers, administrators, curriculum specialists, university faculty, and other experts to develop resources advancing the infusion of education globalization while simultaneously initiating and maintaining a dialogue around what comprises an effective, comprehensive approach to learning, their efforts may result in a foundation for policy. If a leadership base is created that strongly advocates a conceptual buy-in to education globalization, a structure will emerge that motivates participants and extends and sustains initial start-up excitement.

Advocating for a New Professionalism

The linchpin on the route to education globalization is teachers. Without their support, little can be accomplished. To garner, excite, and sustain their interest, a range of incentives and opportunities should be offered. These include training in stand-alone professional development academies where teachers can spend a significant block of time examining and creating best practices for globalizing education and teaching diversity. Faculty for these academies will consist of legislators, historians, and economists, as well as educators. International partnerships should be cultivated where teachers and their students virtually interact with individuals from other cultures using teleconferencing and other efficient approaches. Training global education coaches and tele-mentors in school buildings will help administrators, teachers, students and the community-at-large internationalize the teaching and learning process and will provide access to resources that encourage the accomplishment of this goal. Mentor-teachers will build diversity awareness as they create global toolkits for practitioners to use as templates. These steps will respond to the imperative that the practice of global learning be well-designed, well-communicated, and well-rewarded (Merryfield, 1998).

Recognizing an Ethical Focus

In order for respect for diversity to make continued inroads into education, we must acknowledge that schools exist not just within a market but in a society, a society being transformed by diversity. As emphasized by the statistical projections for 2050 that opened this article, population proportions in American society are undergoing recalibration. By redesigning classrooms to respond to increased diversity, we must strive to encourage social responsibility, personal expression, tolerance, global honesty, and human rights so that we may achieve societal goals that serve a larger public interest and a shared *cosmos*. While a definition of *ethics* may be culturally or nationally determined, efforts must be made to acknowledge that there are Universalist human values and human rights that exist without borders. Making sure that success in globalizing education is measured by an ethical yardstick must be a bedrock principle. This is essential to any program or practice that works to promote global fluency and competency (Woolf, 2002).

In closing, it is clear that creating, promoting, and sustaining meaningful education globalization will be a formidable task. Whether our efforts bear any fruit will

be dependent upon the sincerity of the dialogue and the strength and scope of participant action. For some the task may seem extreme and excessive, taxing the already stretched resources of a school, a society, and a culture. But the poet and visionary William Blake (1757- 1827) wrote that it is important not to become diverted or discouraged by excess, by wanting to know or accomplish too much because, in his view, excess can function as a motivating force. For him, “the road to excess leads to the palace of wisdom...for you never know what is enough until you know what is more than enough” (Blake, 1906, pp. 13, 17). By continuing to open up American education to the world and inviting in multiple cultures and varied voices, the process of producing an accomplished and worldly student-citizen, who is well-positioned to not only compete globally but to lead and prosper, will be accelerated. In placing the power of globalization within the mixture of 21st century culture, diversity, and global ideals and values, we will most assuredly speed the process of building our own enduring and most worthy palace of wisdom.

References

- Au, W. (2011). Teaching under the new Taylorism: High--stakes testing and the standardization of the 21st century curriculum, *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 43(1), 25-45.
- Berrett, D. (January 26, 2012). Stanford remakes curriculum, following trend to focus on critical thinking vs. disciplinary content. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from <http://chronicle.com/article/Curriculum-Proposals-at/130461/>
- Blake, W. (1906). *The marriage of heaven and hell*. (Ed. John Luce and Company.) Library of Congress edition: Call number: 6401561. Retrieved from <http://www.archive.org/details/marriageofheaven00blak>
- Bickmore, K. (1999). Elementary curriculum about conflict resolution: Can children handle global politics? *Theory and Research in Social Education*. 27(1), 45-69.
- Clarke, J., Dede, C., & Dieterle, E. (2008). Emerging technologies for collaborative, mediated, immersive learning. In J. Voogt & G. Knezek (Eds.), *The international handbook of technology in education* (pp. 901-910). New York, NY: Springer-Verlag.
- Cottle, S. (2011). Taking global crises in the news seriously: Notes from the dark side of globalization. *Global Media and Communication*, 7(2), 77-95.
- Counts, G. S. (1932). *Dare the school build a new social order?* New York, NY: John Day Company.

- Counts, G. S. (1934). *The social foundations of education: Report of the commission on the social studies* (Part 9). New York, NY: Scribner.
- Desrochers, P. (2001). Local diversity, human creativity, and technological innovation. *Growth and Change*, 32, 369-394. doi: 10.1111/0017-4815.00164
- Earnest, D. (2011). Newspapers. *Apple*. Retrieved from <http://tinyurl.com/6vhmn9g>
- Gardner, H. (1983). *Frames of mind: The theory of multiple intelligences*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Gardner, H. (2008). *Five minds for the future* (2nd ed.). Boston, MA: Harvard Business Press.
- Hansen, D. T. (2008). Curriculum and the idea of a cosmopolitan inheritance. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 40(3), 289-312.
- Hansen, D. T. (2010). Cosmopolitanism and education: A view from the ground. *Teachers College Record*, 112(1), 1-30.
- Heine, J., & Thakur, R. (Eds.) (2011). *The dark side of globalization*. New York, NY: United Nations University Press.
- Hunter, F. (2010). Bologna beyond 2010: Looking backward, looking forward. *International Educator*, 19(2), 60- 63.
- KnowledgeWorks. (2012). 2020 Forecast. In *KnowledgeWorks*. Retrieved from <http://knowledgeworks.org/action/our-work/creating-conditions-change/2020-forecast>
- Merryfield, M. (1998). Pedagogy for global perspectives in education: Studies of teachers' thinking and practice. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 26(3), 342-379.
- Merryfield, M., Lo, J., Po, S. C., & Kasai, M. (2008). Worldmindedness: Taking off the blinders. *Journal of Curriculum and Instruction*, 2(1), 6-20.
- Mitchell, K., & Parker, W. (2008). I pledge allegiance to . . . flexible citizenship and shifting scales of belonging. *Teachers College Record*, 110(4), 775-804.
- Moe, T., & Chubb, J. (2010). *Liberating learning: Technology, politics, and the future of American education*. Report from The Center for the American Experiment, Minneapolis: MN.

- Mullen, A. (2006). Toward a global perspective on preparing global citizens. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 34(1), 146-152.
- Myers, J. P. (2006). Rethinking the social studies curriculum in the context of globalization: Education for global citizenship in the U.S. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 34(3), 370-94.
- National Assessment Governing Board. (2010a). Geography. *The Nation's Report Card*. Retrieved from http://www.nationsreportcard.gov/geography_2010/
- National Assessment Governing Board. (2010b). In geography, proficiency overall remains low: Lowest performers show greatest improvement; grade 8 remains flat; grade 4 increases, while grade 12 declines since 1994. NAGB. Retrieved from <http://www.nagb.org/geography/>
- Partnership for 21st Century Skills. (2008). Social studies: 21st century skills map. *21st Century Skills*. Retrieved from http://www.p21.org/storage/documents/ss_map_11_12_08.pdf
- Parker, W. C., Ninomaya, A., & Cogna, J. (1999). Educating world citizens: Toward multinational curriculum development. *American Educational Research Journal*, 36(2), 117-145.
- Perry, L., & Southwell, L. (2011). Developing intercultural understanding and skills: Models and approaches. *Intercultural Education*, 22(6), 453- 466.
- Reimers, F. (2006). The public purposes of schools in an age of globalization. *Prospects*, XXXVII(3), 275-294. Retrieved from <http://www.redetis.org.ar/media/document/reimerscitizenship.pdf>
- Richards, H. V., Brown, A., & Forde, T. (2006). *Addressing diversity in schools: Culturally responsive pedagogy*. Tempe, AZ: National Center for Culturally Responsive Educational Systems (NCREST). Retrieved from <http://www.nccrest.org/>
- Riley, K. (2004). Schooling the citizens of tomorrow: The challenges for teaching and learning across the global north/south divide. *Journal of Educational Change*, 5(4), 389-415.
- Robinson, J., Rivers, W., & Brecht, R. (2006). Speaking foreign languages in the United States: Correlates, trends, and possible consequences. *The Modern Language Journal*, 90, 457- 471.

- Rychly, L., & Graves, E. (2012). Teacher characteristics for culturally responsive pedagogy. *Multicultural Perspectives*, 14(1), 44-49.
- Sahlberg, P. (2006). Education reform for raising economic competitiveness. *Journal of Educational Change*, 7(4), 259-287.
- Scholte, J. A. (2002). *What is globalization? The definitional issue – again* (CSGR Working Paper No. 109/92). University of Warwick, Coventry, United Kingdom: Centre for the Study of Globalisation and Regionalisation. Retrieved from http://wrap.warwick.ac.uk/2010/1/WRAP_Scholte_wp10902.pdf
- Scholte, J. A. (2005). *Globalization: A critical introduction*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Schoorman, D., & Bogotch, I. (2010). Moving beyond 'diversity' to 'social justice': The challenge to re-conceptualize multicultural education. *Intercultural Education*, 21(1), 79-85.
- Spring, J. (2009). *Globalization in education: An introduction*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Suárez-Orozco, M., & Qin-Hilliard, D. (2004). *Globalization: Culture and education in the new millennium*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Talani, L. (2011). *Globalisation, migration, and the future of Europe insiders and outsiders*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Tochon, F. V. (2009). The key to global understanding: World languages education—why schools need to adapt. *Review of Educational Research*, 79(2), 650-681.
- Torres, C. A. (1998). *Democracy, education and multiculturalism: Dilemmas of citizenship in a global world*. New York, NY: Roman & Littlefield.
- U.S. Census Bureau. (2011). Population profile of the United States. Retrieved from <http://www.census.gov/population/www/pop-profile/natproj.html>
- UNESCO. (2012). World Heritage List. *United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization*. Retrieved from <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list>
- Villegas, A. M., & Lucas, T. (2002). Preparing culturally responsive teachers: Rethinking the curriculum. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 53(1), 20-32. Retrieved from <http://www.sagepub.com/eis/Villegas.pdf>
- Waks, L. J. (2003). How globalization can cause fundamental curriculum change: An American perspective. *Journal of Educational Change*, 4(4), 383-418.

Woolf, M. (2002). Harmony and dissonance in international education: The limits of globalisation. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 6(1), 5-15.

Web Resources

Asia Society, The. <http://asiasociety.org> (cultural outreach)

Bubble.us. <https://bubbl.us/> (online collaboration)

Edublogs <http://edublogs.org/> (blogs)

Glogster <http://edu.glogster.com/> (posters)

Google Earth. <http://www.google.com/> (global locations)

International Education and Resource Network (iEARN). <http://www.earn.org/>
(international studies)

Mazzoni, D., & Dannenberg, R. (2012). Audacity®. <http://audacity.sourceforge.net/>
(Recording and editing sound)

Nulab. Cacao: online. <https://cacao.com/> (Create diagrams)

Prezi. <http://prezi.com> (presentations and storytelling)

SlideRocket. <http://www.sliderocket.com> (online presentations)

TechSmith Corporation. Camtasia Studio. <http://www.techsmith.com/camtasia.html>

Twitter. <https://twitter.com> (social networking)

Voices of Youth. <http://www.voicesofyouth.org/> (articles on focus topics)

VoiceThread. <http://voicethread.com> (online collaboration)

Weebly. <http://www.weebly.com/> (Web site creation)

World Monuments Fund. <http://www.wmf.org> (preservation of ancient and historic sites around the world)

About the Authors



Roberta Levitt, Ph.D., is an assistant professor in the Department of Special Education and Literacy at Long Island University- Post. Her previous teaching experience includes an Adjunct Professorship and public school experience as a classroom teacher and a literacy specialist. Influenced by her extensive experience in education, her research and publications encompass the areas of professional development, literacy education, childhood learning environments, motivational/instructional strategies, and technology in education. E-Mail: roberta.levitt@liu.edu



Joseph M. Piro, Ph.D., is an associate professor on the faculties of the Department of Curriculum and Instruction and the Doctoral Program in Interdisciplinary Educational Studies at Long Island University- Post. Prior to this, he worked for the New York City Public Schools as a teacher and administrator. His research interests include technology and teacher education and practice, educational policy, and the application of the brain sciences to learning behaviors. E-mail: joseph.piro@liu.edu