GLOBALIZATION IN THE NORTH AMERICAN REGION: TOWARD RENEGOTIATION OF CULTURAL SPACE

RATNA GHOSH *McGill University*

ABSTRACT. There are sharp differences in the economic, educational and political conditions among the NAFTA countries. This paper focuses on the difference in cultural and value orientations in Mexico, Canada and the United States. Education is increasingly market driven, which poses a challenge in balancing the integration of education with international standards while still maintaining distinctive cultures. A conceptual model is proposed as a constructive approach for socio-cultural integration, and its educational implications are discussed.

MONDIALISATION EN AMÉRIQUE DU NORD : VERS LA RENÉGOCIATION DE L'ESPACE CULTUREL

RÉSUMÉ. Les conditions économiques, pédagogiques et politiques diffèrent grandement au sein des pays de l'ALENA. Ce document met l'accent sur la différence d'orientation sur les plans de la culture et des valeurs au Mexique, au Canada et aux États-Unis. L'enseignement est de plus en plus axé sur le marché, ce qui pose le défi d'intégrer l'enseignement aux normes internationales tout en maintenant l'identité des cultures distinctes. Un modèle conceptuel est proposé comme approche constructive à l'intégration socioculturelle et ses incidences au niveau de l'enseignement sont abordées.

Although the globalization process has been going on for centuries, today the concept has taken on a new meaning. While it generally implies the maximization of efficiency through free trade, its meaning has broadened to encompass the social, political and cultural aspects of life. The vast literature on the concept indicates a lively debate on the pros and cons of the process (Shorish, 1998). Proponents see it as spreading a culture of efficiency, democracy and a high standard of living through technology and free trade. The countries of the south have argued that it is a means of re-colonization of the world by industrialized countries through the structural adjustment programs demanded by the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and World Bank. Others see it as bringing about a single culture spread by

the IMF and World Bank, the European Economic Community (EEC), North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), World Trade Organization (WTO), and multinational corporations, at the expense of the United Nations and its agencies and nation-states. Some view globalization as being inherently unjust and unfair because it is seen as a threat to human rights (Shorish), but others argue that globalization is an irreversible process.

This paper came about in the context of a NAFTA Higher Education Mobility project that involved collaboration by several universities from Canada, the United States and Mexico. As a female Canadian academic with origins in the Indian sub-continent I am especially sensitive to issues of culture and values in a global context. My work in intercultural and comparative international studies has focused on the impact of globalization. I take the position that the process of globalization is irreversible, whether we like it or not, and it has both positive and negative effects.[1] The question is therefore how to develop safety nets in order to minimize the negative effects. One positive impact of globalization on education is the need for democratization, as economic democracy is needed for political democracy and stability, and the need for well-informed consumers means a need for education. However, the tendency towards homogenization of cultures and loss of individual identity results in a negative effect. How can this best be dealt with?

GLOBALIZATION

The word globalization was used initially in economics to refer to the integration of production on a global scale, as the globalization of production is related to the globalization of products. Sociologists have identified two main processes of globalization.

The first process is the expansion of capitalism into an integrated global economy. Globalization is a way of lowering production costs because multinational corporations are more easily able to integrate factories and production in several countries into a single manufacturing system, attracted by cheap labour, weak trade unions and less state regulation of employment conditions. This is done on a regional scale, as well as through the North American Free Trade Agreement. Until NAFTA, manufacturing operations tended to be based in one country, even when the goods were sold in other markets.

The second process is the spread in the ideology of consumerism across the globe, which has resulted in the globalization of culture. This has been achieved through marketing efforts which attract consumers, resulting in their purchasing a global product rather than one designed for the national market. Technological development in communications and information systems has facilitated the transmission of a homogenous consumer culture.

The consequences of globalization reach farther than the economic and financial areas, also affecting social and cultural institutions.

REGIONAL INTEGRATION: NAFTA

The inauguration of several trade agreements, including the European Economic Community in 1992 and the North American Free Trade Agreement in 1994, has created regional integrated economies of significant dimensions. It is interesting to conjecture upon the impact that European and North American economic integration will have on the education of their respective societies. As trade barriers disappear, the movement of people for economic reasons will have significant educational and cultural consequences.

Economic integration is one symptom of a much larger change in modes of communication made possible by technological advances (Farrell, 1996). Economic convergence within the United States, Canada and Mexico will involve a supranational level of economic, political and social organization which cuts across nation-states through social and communication networks made possible by new technology. The combined onslaught of technological change, globalization of the economy, instant communication and information transfer, and mobility of people poses unprecedented challenges. The issues are not merely the technological preparation for global competition and an information-based economy, as living and working in an increasingly interdependent world requires international knowledge and intercultural communication skills, and also has moral and ethical dimensions. Educational institutions have a tremendous responsibility in this regard, as there is a need to assert cultural and national identities in a borderless world (Nelles, 1995) in order to avoid the homogenization of ideologies and cultures.

As with the EEC, education is not an explicit part of NAFTA. However, the spirit of NAFTA indicates that the future of the North American community does not lie in economic expansion alone. NAFTA has had its biggest impact in the areas of politics and society, because integration symbolizes a closeness which was not apparent, at least between the United States, Canada and Mexico. The current political and economic convergence poses immense challenges for the culture of organizations and, therefore, for education.

This paper examines several dimensions of asymmetry among the United States, Canada and Mexico, with their implications for educational integration,[2] and proposes a fusion of horizons within a conceptual model of cultural space. The idea is to reach a dimension of integration which is supranational, by not only transcending national boundaries but also as a result of power differentials. The globalization of markets has led to a

globalization of social space, so as a result the challenges of globalization demand a renegotiation of cultural space and a reconceptualization of the way we think about learning and education systems.

IS CHANGE POSSIBLE?

Conceptually, attempts at integration have been made possible as a result of dramatic changes, mainly in two spheres. Shifts in the global political economy and a global consciousness have challenged traditional cultural boundaries and made the emergence of new perspectives in cultural transformation possible. The globalization of identity politics based on international economic position and interest defies national boundaries and traditional class affiliations. The shifts in identity are organized around issues of global survival, such as global warming and AIDS. This brings the notion of working together for common goals to the forefront, making the issues of learning and cross-cultural communication critical ones.

A conceptual model is made possible by the crisis in contemporary social and literary theory which began in the 1960s, represented by a wide variety of developments such as postmodern, post-structural and postcolonial theories, as well as feminist theories. Although diverse in their range and interpretation, new notions of knowledge, culture, difference, and identity have emerged out of these theories, and issues of voice, representation and fragmented subjectivity have come to the forefront.

REGIONAL ASYMMETRIES

What does integration mean in a context of great asymmetry? Not only are there huge differences among the three countries' legal and governmental institutions, but the relative participation of the three economies in world trade is very different both quantitatively and qualitatively (Uriquidi, 1996). While Canada and the United States are close to each other in per capita income, general development, and scientific and technological advances, there is a great difference in their political ideologies and cultures, as well as in the size of their respective economies and populations. The differences between Mexico compared to the United States and Canada are "almost mind-boggling," (Uriquidi, 1966) with perhaps the greatest disparity being in the area of education. The educational systems in the United States and Canada have higher rates of participation, especially at the tertiary level, compared to Mexico. However, the educational systems of the United States and Mexico are different from those in Canada because the combination of public and private funding in higher education in the United States and Mexico leads to greater heterogeneity of standards, size and purpose. As Canadian universities are publicly funded, they tend towards homogeneity of form and standards. Differences in language use put Mexico

and the province of Quebec (in Canada) at a disadvantage in North America. The practical issues arising from the differences in educational systems and rates of participation are those of equity, accessibility and quality in terms of acceptable minimum standards, accreditation and mobility. In addition to the marked differences in education, skills development and economic development, there is vulnerability in currency and internal stability.

DIFFERENCES IN CULTURAL ORIENTATION

The orientations people have in culture and values (how they see the dimensions of meaning and purpose of life) have implications for behavioural and attitudinal differences. International migration brought about by globalization in postmodern societies means that societies are becoming increasingly heterogeneous. Both the United States and Canada, being immigrant countries, consist of many minority ethno-cultural groups. Mexico is the most homogenous of the three countries, but contains pockets of Canadians and Americans, mainly "snowbirds" escaping from the cold, or retirees looking for affordable luxury. The number of Mexican immigrants is increasing in both the United States, where they form the largest minority group, and in Canada, and the multicultural nature of these two countries is rapidly changing the cultural map, although both have a dominant Anglo-Saxon culture.

Kluckhohn (1961) and Hofstede (1980) identify basic dimensions of how cultures vary. Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck (1961) look at 'culture as a solution to universal problems'; they identify common human problems and make basic assumptions of the nature of human reality. They ask if innate human nature is good or evil, neutral or a mix. What is the relation of humans to nature: subjugation, harmony or mastery? What is the temporal focus of human life: past, present or future? What is the modality of human activity: people as being, people as doing or people as doing to become? What is the modality of the relationship between humans: linearity, collaterality or pure individuality? What is the conception of space: private, public or a mix?

Geert Hofstede (1980), on the other hand, views culture as being more often a source of conflict than of synergy. He conducted perhaps the most comprehensive study of how values in the workplace are influenced by culture. He collected and analyzed data from over 100,000 individuals from forty countries. From those results, and later additions, Hofstede developed a model that identifies primary dimensions to differentiate cultures. He later added a fifth dimension, Long-term Outlook.

The following cultural orientations, based on the categories of Kluckhohn and Hofstede, are generalizations, and it is important to keep in mind that

diversity exists as much within as between societies. Cultural orientations, therefore, represent "most of the people most of the time, not all of the people all of the time" (Adler, 1997, p. 17).

Personal relationships: Individualism versus collectivism

Americans and Canadians tend to be more individualistic because they define themselves as individuals, whereas Mexican culture tends to be characterized by collectivism because it is group oriented. A tight-knit social framework is important because in-group members provide security. Collectivist cultures respond to external pressure and control, whereas individualistic cultures control through internal pressures, such as guilt.

Activity: Doing versus being

"Doers" are active and try to achieve as much as possible in life, stressing what they call objective standards. Americans and English Canadians tend to be doers, and maximize work. In general Mexicans and French-speaking Canadians are "be-ers," in that they experience life, are people-oriented, and tend not to focus mainly on work.

Time: Present versus past, and space: Private versus public

Americans and Canadians place less importance on tradition, and more importance on the present and immediate future. For Mexicans, traditions and public events are important. Public versus private spaces are organized differently. In the United States and Canada, time and space are commodities, although the concept of public space is different in Canada due to its socialist ideology. The modern western concept of time is accepted unthinkingly (Giddens, 1984). Hagerstrand has analysed in time-geography, the buying and selling of time as labor time, which is a distinct feature of modern capitalism (Hagerstrand, 1975). Foucault has looked at how maintaining discipline depends upon the division of time (enclosed) and space (partitioned) (Foucault, 1979). Giddens points out that the universalizing mechanisms embedded in globalization imply organization of time and space along modern versus traditional lines (Giddens, 1991).

Power distance

A high power distance implies formality and the importance of titles, position, and status, and it tends to be more bureaucratic. Mexicans tend to accept the power of their superiors and will work the way their bosses want them to. A low power distance is characterized by having less respect for position and authority, and placing more importance on getting the work done.

Uncertainty avoidance

Mexicans tend to like stability and feel threatened by ambiguity. They prefer formal rules and want career stability. Formal lines of communication run vertically in cultures of high uncertainty avoidance, whereas in low uncertainty avoidance cultures the lines of communication run horizontally as well as vertically. Low uncertainly avoidance cultures, like the United States and Canada, have high career mobility.

Motivation: Career success versus quality of life

Motivation is connected to individualistic cultures although in contemporary times it has been accepted as reflecting universal values. Research shows that Latin Americans and Canadians cite extrinsic factors as being more important to them (Crabbs, 1973), with quality of life as most important. Achievement motivation theories and needs hierarchies have been thought to be universally valid. However, the word "achievement" is itself hard to define in other languages. Theories of motivation are mostly American and reflect the American need to achieve. The dominant values in career success are assertiveness and acquisition of material goods. Quality of life culture emphasizes relationships, and a concern for others.

GLOBALIZATION AND CULTURE

Globalization demands a degree of structural change to the normative system. Therefore, despite significant differences in cultural orientations, globalization has made national frontiers highly permeable to cultural influences. Canada in particular is very sensitive to this issue, due to the extremely high volume of values, ideas, and images transmitted through film, video, television, magazines and books from the United States, as well as the information flow. The chosen medium of communication influences the distribution of knowledge over time and space.

Implications for education

This cultural diffusion is market driven. It is an infusion of a new set of values which appeals to individual rather than collective interests. The new factors of production are education and health. In education, it is the market, and not the state, that is the instrument for shaping educational values, those values being excellence (as defined by test scores), efficiency, competition, rates of return, and up-to-the-minute knowledge of skills in mathematics and technology. Regions which do not have high levels of education and training, to allow them effective use of new technology for production, will not have a competitive advantage. On the other hand, there will be a demand for common and comparable standards of learning achievement and an establishment of minimum standards.

Globalization therefore demands that education facilitate innovation in an economic web, which is a concept that implies interconnectedness and multi-level, multi-directional relationships. New business strategies and changing communications technology make global teams imperative for survival in global competition. Multinational corporations must look beyond borders in order to form regional teams and outsource jobs. The implication for education is that students must develop the ability to understand and operate in different cultures. Education must be organized to facilitate international collaboration by internationalizing curricula. Cross-cultural communication, both verbal and non-verbal, will have to be emphasized along with behavioural and attitudinal skills, the ability to adapt and adjust, the autonomy to take responsibility, the ability to make choices and decisions, and critical thinking. It will also be essential to pay attention to moral and ethical standards and values.

CONCEPTUAL MODEL

As converging markets reduce the importance of geopolitical borders, concerns for equity, accessibility and less disparity in regional conditions will rise. The globalization of the economy means that less importance is placed on the location of natural resources and more on global human resources. Multinational corporations are very dependent on educated but cheap labour, as there is no other choice in a market-driven economy. The need for social stability will become increasingly evident.

The challenge is to develop a framework in which integration can supersede regional differences, language barriers, cultural differences and asymmetries in conditions and power, while at the same time avoiding a homogenization of cultures.

Organizational literature shows the emergence of a new paradigm, the intelligent organization (Landier, 1995), which is characterized by pluralism and freedom, a redistribution of power so that the role of the centre is to act on behalf of the parts, and being at the middle of things rather than at the top. This means a change in cultural space. Its integration requires a framework of collective solidarity which mutually reinforces self-reliance, and creation of knowledge which is relevant to all. It sees diffusion and interdependence as essential parts of integration where there is no centre or periphery, and implies that the whole is more than the sum of its parts. This synergistic process involves a "third space" where new ideas and vocabularies are developed to enable us to work together, partly through transforming our own standards. Cultural synergy is a new way of thinking, and institutional culture is influenced by new forms of management and organization that transcend distinct cultures. It builds on diversity and heterogeneity, and assumes that there are many equally valid ways of doing things, defining

goals and reaching them. It also assumes cultural contingency, which means that no one valid way of doing things is superior to another.

A conceptual model of the third space in terms of cultural values based on balance of power could transcend individual power and interest in the context of regional integration. The rationale is that integration involves interactions based on values, attitudes and beliefs that define work and culture, which must consider new ways of looking at knowledge and power, cultural boundaries and identities. Differences and asymmetries cannot be dealt with adequately in the present framework. This transformative model of integration involves notions of voice and representation, identity and empowerment. Integration is more than a cooperative process because it focuses on the creative capacities of societies to sustain the process.

Postmodern thought resists the idea of culture as an organizing principle which creates borders around ethnicity, class, and gender. Creating borders homogenizes cultures within a culture, although neither dominant nor minority cultures are homogeneous. Charles Taylor points out that we cannot judge other cultures, "for a culture [which is] sufficiently different from our own we have only the foggiest idea of what its valuable contribution might consist . . . [because] the very understanding of what it is to be of worth will be strange and unfamiliar to us" (Taylor, 1995). So what has to happen is a fusion of horizons, which involves a broader horizon in which we negotiate a third space (Bhabha, 1990).

Three points need to be made regarding this third space. Firstly, it is not an extension of established values, but rather a renegotiation of cultural space. The word synergistic implies that the whole is more than the sum of its parts but also syncretic because it can be a union of opposite principles and practices. In this case, it refers to the harmonization of cultures, not their dissolution, disappearance, or disintegration. Secondly, the fusion of horizons does not imply difference-blindness, which is neither desirable nor possible. Human beings are different from each other in various ways, and this does not translate into deficiency or deviance when they differ from a traditional norm. It simply means that they are different, but also that they have the right to be different. Indeed, the validation of their cultural, social, and gender differences, and the development of their individual identities, should be a focus of educational integration. Thirdly, fusion does not mean homogenization. It emphasizes identity because individuals see the world from their own perspectives and have multiple identities, some of which may be contradictory. This makes their experiences dialectical. An example of this is being bilingual or multilingual – we do not forget one language when we speak another, but rather we are enriched by the knowledge of the other.

RENEGOTIATION OF CULTURAL SPACE: EDUCATION

Our own cultural conditioning puts blinders on us so that it becomes difficult to see others from their point of view. Quite often we think that we know the other, but sometimes it is like knowing the words without the tune. A renegotiation of cultural space would involve international and intercultural dimensions in content and methods of pedagogy, as well as in defining the standards of excellence by widening the knowledge base to other cultures. Internationalization is a philosophy of education and should permeate all subject areas. It involves a consciousness of the commonality of people as belonging to one world and one humanity, while at the same time being aware of their differences and their right to be different in terms of culture, religion, and language, among other things.

What conceptual changes does this imply for education? Concepts such as knowledge and difference need to be redefined so that standards of excellence and evaluation, for example, have a broader framework of values, ways of knowing and modes of learning (Ghosh, 1996). Theoretically, a redefinition of values is made possible due to the emergence of new notions of knowledge, culture, difference and identity.

Knowledge

Knowledge is increasingly seen as being historically located and socially constructed. Knowledge characterizes the way we look at the world, and where we are located in society affects how we understand the world. The connection between knowledge and power is emphasized.

Feminists were the first to challenge the traditional theory of knowledge or epistemology in which the white, middle-class male "colonizes definition of the norm" (Giroux, 1991, p. 225) and represents all human experience as universal. Feminist, postcolonial and postmodern scholars assert that the claim of universalism is largely inapplicable not only to the historical experiences of women, but also to those of people of other countries, cultures and ethnicities. They reject the idea of universal or overarching philosophies, or meta-narratives, which are meant to represent universal truths. They maintain, to quote Giroux, that "there is no tradition or story that can speak with authority and certainty for all of humanity" (p. 231). It should be pointed out that this is not an assault on Europeans, but rather on eurocentrism.[3] Nor is the idea to replace traditional knowledge, but rather to validate and learn about other forms of knowledge. The questions are: What is knowledge? How is it acquired? What counts as knowledge?

Identity and difference

The dynamics of culture and identity in modern society are complex. In his powerful essay, *The Politics of Recognition*, Charles Taylor defines identity as

a person's understanding of who they are, of their fundamental defining characteristics as a human being (Taylor, 1995). Identity is partly shaped by how others think of us, while non-recognition or misrecognition is a form of oppression imprisoning one to a reduced mode of being. Contemporary conceptions of identity are influenced by postmodernist writers who see identity as developing through relationships, a continuous social process because human beings are always in the making.

Where we are located in society affects how we understand the world. The politics of location confines people because they are located in terms of geography, culture and ethnicity, among other variables (Rich, 1986). The effect of difference on identity is one's location in relation to others, but more importantly, how that location produces a concept of self in relation to the way others identify and define us. In this construction, education plays a significant role.

How we view others will influence how we work with them. It is not the differences in themselves but the social construction and conceptualization of these differences that divide people and create hierarchies (Lorde, 1984). Difference is a comparative term. It is relational and constructed based on deviance from the norm. In education, for example, the norms of excellence and achievement are evaluated based on dominant group characteristics. There is a tendency to equate poor language skills and mispronunciation with a lack of understanding and intelligence. Measuring levels of achievement is more a political issue than a technical one. The questions now are: Different from what? Different in what way? Different from whom? Those who are different become the other, and their histories, cultures and experiences are denigrated or eradicated (Ghosh, 2001).

Quality

When the social and economic environment changes very rapidly, the mission of education becomes helping individuals to find themselves and adapt to an increasingly complex world, and making sense of conflicting and contradictory messages. But who will define quality? The definitions will be different because they reflect differing systems of values. Integration will require a common core of international values based on local, national and global identities as well as universal moral and ethical considerations for dignity, human rights, solidarity, democracy, protection of the environment and a culture of peace. Standards must be established which take the differences of cultures, knowledge, and multi-disciplinary ways of learning into consideration. Different languages and histories will be significant. The humanistic and moral ideals of quality of education are to elevate the mind and personality (Hallack, 1996). For NAFTA, the accreditation of qualifications in the three member countries is a major problem.

Use of technology

For centuries, interdependence among people has been expressed in various forms, but in contemporary North America it is fostered through travel, technology and information networks. Communication is a dominant economic force (Lamoureux, 1983), and the communications revolution has tremendous implications for education because education involves the medium and message of the communicative process. New educational technologies use sophisticated microelectronic and communications media, and their application to the process of education makes possible a wide range of capabilities, transforming past conceptions of collaboration (Ghosh, 1987). The science-based nature of modern educational technologies, in conjunction with the revolutionary advances in that area also results in an exponential disparity in capabilities among the three NAFTA countries. The United States monopolizes research and development (Altbach & Kelly, 1978), while Mexican and Canadian academics are greatly dependent on American centres of intellectual life for the creation and dissemination of knowledge through universities, research centres, publishing houses, and student exchanges. This has implications for the psychological and intellectual orientation of Mexican and Canadian intellectuals, and influences their educational pursuits because they tend to emulate the values and norms of American society.

There is great variation between the United States, Canada and Mexico regarding the area of human resource bases in technology, as well as in the telecommunications infrastructure necessary to support the effective use of technology for educational purposes. The administrative capacity of these countries differs widely. Traditional methods of functioning in Mexico are not always conducive to technological change, and rigid organizational structures may pose further problems.

The potential for integration lies in the influence of technological methods on technological content. Technology affects not only how we teach, but also what should be taught. Technologies of instruction and production are linked (Reimers, McGinn, & McGinn, 1997), with the technology of production having the potential to be a dominant means to integration.

An analysis of studies of organizations indicates that at the macro level of structure and technology, organizations are becoming more similar worldwide (Child, 1981). However, at the micro level it becomes evident that the behaviour of people within organizations is as different as their cultures. People may have the same technology, but they interact with it differently.

If education systems are to integrate then there must be organizational learning (Reimers, McGinn, & McGinn, 1997) because the process must involve multiple participants from all three countries. A dialogue as equals

is an essential condition for evolving into a new model, where experts are only a link in the overall process.

The question of identity

What do cultural identity and sovereignty mean for Canada and Mexico? Does economic integration mean that not only Mexico, but also Canada, must become more like the United States in order to interact credibly and meaningfully? There is the need for asserting cultural and national identities to avoid homogenization, or what Kenechi Ohmae has called the "California-zation of taste" (Ohmae, 1990).

Because people have multiple identities they can be global, regional and local. Globalization may force a number of issues, but as William Watson points out in his book, *Globalization and the Meaning of Canadian Life* (Watson, 1998), despite closer trading ties between the United States and Canada, the two countries have never differed more from each other in terms of their ideology and government. Canada maintains significantly higher tax rates for its social programs and spends more on government.

CONCLUSION

The negative impact of globalization regarding its tendency to undermine social and normative infrastructures is well documented (Breton, 1995). However, cultural theories offer constructive approaches for socio-cultural integration, despite problems involved in asymmetrical situations (Ghosh & Abdi, 2004). At the core of the diversity in culture is a wide array of values, with the greatest challenge to integration being the transformation of values to the point of dynamic equilibrium, a renegotiation of new cultural space.

As the recent SARS episode illustrates, globalization means that viruses know no border and that countries are interlinked; a problem does not remain contained within one nation. What happens in Hong Kong affects what happens in Toronto. It is in the interest of the superpowers to see there is equilibrium and socio-political stability in the global work and knowledge centres as well as in markets. Interactions between different cultures are increasing, and integration will signal the importance of working together across diverse conditions and the need to profit from diversity. In North America, Canada and Mexico have significant roles to play in shaping a region where cultures are distinct but people learn from each other and work together as one, and where dependency is increasingly replaced by interdependency among all three NAFTA partners. Integration will be a dialectic of the local and the global within a renegotiated cultural space.

NOTES

1. The ideas contained in this paper came out of active participation in a trilateral higher education mobility program (NAFTA) between several universities in Canada, the United States and Mexico that took place between 1995 and 1998.

2. Integration refers to the process by which different people come to have closer social, economic and political relationships without discrimination. Interdependence on the division of labour brings about integration, which assumes a civil society.

3. Eurocentrism is defined as envisioning the world from a single privileged point, attributing to the west an almost providential sense of historical destiny which bifurcates the world into "the west and the rest," to use a term by Stuart Hall.

REFERENCES

Adler, N. (1997). *Organizational behavior*. Cincinnati, OH: Southwestern College Publishing.

Altbach, P. G., & Kelly, G. P. (1978). (Eds.) *Education and Colonialism*. New York, London: Longman.

Bhabha, H. (1990). Interview with Homi Bhabha: The third space. In J. Rutherford (Ed.), *Identity, community, culture, difference*. London: Lawrence & Wishart.

Breton, R. (1995). Globalization and the infrastructure of the social order. In *Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada* (pp. 111-126). Ottawa.

Child, J. (1981). Culture, contingency and capitalism in the cross-national study of organizations. In L. Cummings & B. M. Staw (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior*, Vol. 3. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Farrell, J. (1996, October). Changing conceptions of educational quality and educational planning under conditions of globalization. Paper presented at the Conference on Education Reform in Canada, Mexico and the United States: An agenda for cooperation and research. Brown University.

Foucault, M. (1979). *Discipline and punishment*. Harmondsworth, UK: Penguin.

Ghosh, R. (1987). New educational technologies: Their impact on relationships of dependence and interdependence for Third World countries. *International Review of Education 23*, 33-50.

Ghosh, R. (1996). *Redefining multicultural education*. Toronto: Harcourt Brace.

Ghosh, R. (2001). *Redefining multicultural education*, (2nd ed.). Toronto, ON: Nelson Thomas Learning.

Ghosh, R., & Abdi, A. (2004). *Education and the politics of difference: Canadian perspectives*. Toronto: Canadian Scholars Press.

Giddens, A. (1984). *The constitution of society*. Berkeley & Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Giddens, A. (1991). *Modernity and self-identity*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Giroux, H. A. (1991). Postmodernism as border pedagogy: Redefining the boundaries of race and ethnicity. In H. A. Giroux (Ed.), *Postmodernism, feminism, and cultural politics*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Hagerstrand, T. (1975). Space, time and human conditions. In A. Karlquist (Ed.), *Dynamic allocation of urban space*. Farborough, UK: Saxon House.

Hallack, J. (1996). Educational challenges of the 21st century: The vision of quality. *LLEP Contributions* (No. 23). Paris: UNESCO.

Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's consequences: Internal differences in work-related values*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Klukhohn F., & Strodbeck, F. L. (1961). *Variations in value orientations*. Evanston, IL: Row, Peterson.

Lamoureux, J. (1983). Communication and computer science: New battles for freedom. In *Take care! Human rights in the 80s*. Ottawa, ON: Human Rights Coalition.

Landier, H. (1995). *Vers l'entreprise intelligente*. Paris: Calmann-Levy.

Lorde, A. (1984). *Sister outsider*. Freedom, CA: The Crossing Press.

Nelles, H. V. (1995). Borders in a borderless world. In *Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada* (pp. 139-149).

Ohmae, K. (1990). *Borderless world: Power and strategy in the interlinked economy*. New York: Harper Collins.

Reimers, F., McGinn, N., & McGill N. F. (1997). *Informed Dialogue: Using research to shape education policy around the world*. Westport, CT: Greenwood.

Rich, A. (1986). Notes toward a politics of location. In A. Rich (Ed.), *Blood, bread and poetry: Selected prose 1979-1985* (pp. 210-231). New York: W.W. Norton.

Shorish, M. (1998). Globalization and culture. Paper presented at the annual conference of the Comparative and International Education Society (US), Buffalo, NY.

Taylor, C. (1995). The politics of recognition. In A. Gutman (Ed.), *Multiculturalism and the "politics of recognition"* (p. 67). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Uriquidi, V. (1996, October). Requirements for trilateral educational cooperation: Some suggestions. Paper presented at the Conference on Education Reform in Canada, Mexico and the United States: An agenda for cooperation and research. Brown University.

Watson, W. (1998). *Globalization and the meaning of Canadian life*. Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.

RATNA GHOSH is James McGill Professor and William C. Macdonald Professor of Education at McGill University in Montréal, Canada. She was Dean of the Faculty of Education from 1998-2003. She was appointed Member of the Order of Canada in 2000 and was elected a Fellow of the Royal Society of Canada in 1999. She is also a Full Member of the European Academy of Arts, Sciences and Humanities. Her publications in books, journals and encyclopedias, her grants and teaching reflect her varied research interests in international and intercultural comparative studies. She has done research in Canada, Asia, Africa and Latin America. Her latest book with Ali Abdi is *Education and the Politics of Difference: Canadian perspectives* (2004).

RATNA GHOSH est professeure à la chaire James McGill et professeure en enseignement à la chaire William C. Macdonald de l'Université McGill à Montréal, Canada. De 1998 à 2003, elle a été doyenne de la Faculté des sciences de l'éducation. Elle a été nommée membre de l'Ordre du Canada en 2000 et a été élue membre de la Société royale du Canada en 1999. Elle est également membre à part entière de l'Académie européenne des sciences, des arts et des lettres. Ses publications dans les livres, des revues et des encyclopédies ainsi que ses bourses et son enseignement traduisent la diversité de ses intérêts dans le domaine des études comparées internationales et interculturelles. Elle a effectué des recherches au Canada, en Asie, en Afrique et en Amérique latine. Son livre le plus récent, avec Ali Abdi, est *Education and the Politics of Difference: Canadian perspective* (2004).