Preparing Democratic Citizens:

The Arts as Cosmopolitan Discourse

Taralynn R. Carter

The University of Oregon

Capstone presented to the Arts Administration program
at the University of Oregon in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the
Master of Arts in Arts Management.

Dr. Douglas Blandy

The University of Oregon

Arts and Administration Program

Approved by:_____

Date:_____

Acknowledgements

I am grateful to all of the people who have assisted and supported me through the frequently uncomfortable and challenging research and writing process. My thanks to Dr. Douglas Blandy, my research advisor throughout the process. I also owe a debt of gratitude to my parents for always supporting me and believing in me, and in particular to my mother, Susan, for making me believe that art can both be, and have, a purpose. And finally, to Lindsey Cranton, for acting as a sounding board and providing me with invaluable support when the going got rough. I could not have done it alone. My sincerest thanks to you all.

Taralynn Carter											**Taralynn@UOregon.edu**

Curriculum Vitae							1161 Polk Alley
Eugene, OR 97402
(253) 225-6684

-Education-

M.A. in Arts Administration, University of Oregon (in progress)

> Concentration in community arts
> Graduation expected June 2011

B.A., Northern Arizona University 2009

> Major: History
> Minors: English, French, Classics

Current Research

Education: The arts as socio-cultural discourse (working title)

> Examines the theoretical relationship between art, democracy, and education, and explores the potential of arts education as a culturally democratizing experience. Capstone, terminal masters research.

Past Research

Just out of reach (unpublished)

> An outline of the recent history of American arts education and its funding

-Professional Experience-

ArtsBridge Scholar

The Jordan Schnitzer Museum of Art

Currently employed

- Elementary school arts instruction
- Integrated curriculum development/implementation

Tutor

Multiple private employers

Currently employed (high-school and college level)

- Subject areas: history, humanities, art history, medieval studies, English composition, literature, grammar, arts administration

Administrative/education Internship

Arizona State Parks; Phoenix, AZ
June-August 2011
- Evaluation and development of new interpretive education materials

Curatorial Internship
Museum of Northern Arizona; Flagstaff, AZ
September 2008-May 2009
- Exhibits
- Museum education

Abstract

The purpose of this work is to examine the rhetoric and reality of western education in light of cosmopolitan philosophy, and offer a prescription for a cosmopolitan education. Cultural democracy is viewed as the pursuant result of practicing the cosmopolitan ethic, and the value of practicing cosmopolitanism is delineated. Cosmopolitanism is described as a discourse allowing for participation in a globalizing world, and the process of discourse acquisition is analyzed with specific attention paid to the theories of sociologist J. Paul Gee. Prominent educational philosophy of the 20th and 21st century is explored to determine the relationship between cosmopolitan and education rhetorics, and relies on educational researchers Sleeter and Grant to illustrate whether the reality lives up to the rhetoric. In the end, arts-integrated education is offered as a multi-cultural, interdisciplinary practice that fosters the acquisition of cosmopolitan discourse.

Keywords: arts education, cosmopolitanism, globalization, discourse

Preparing Democratic Citizens: The Arts as Cosmopolitan Discourse

We live in a world where globalization is both buzzword and burgeoning reality. Economy, culture, and basic human interactions all take on a new immediacy, and suddenly require a new set of skills to navigate. Cosmopolitanism offers a way of analyzing events, and guiding behavior that could garner the initiated many opportunities in the globalized landscape. It is a set of beliefs, behaviors, and attitudes well worth arming our children with, but Cosmopolitanism is a complex and controversial subject to inculcate.

The arts offer a uniquely apt and accommodating tool for the inculcation of cosmopolitanism, as they provide multi-cultural opportunity and democratic practice in the classroom. Arts education could potentially be used to engender cosmopolitanism in students, providing them with an invaluable tool for engagement with globalization and cultural democracy. My purpose here is to delineate the meaning of cosmopolitanism, make clear its philosophical and rhetorical connections to modern education, and to offer the arts as a cosmopolitan tool for the engendering of cultural democracy.

What is Cosmopolitanism?

Cosmopolitanism focuses on the actions of individuals, not those of nations or states, adopting the exercise of cultural relativism as the basis for an ethical code in the global era (Appiah, 2006).   It is both prescriptive and descriptive; it offers a way of relating to the world, and describes changes that have already been seen in international relations (Houser, 2005; Hennon 2000).   It is a call for social change on an individual level that affects change on a global level.   Cosmopolitanism, recently

revived by Kwame Anthony Appiah, dismisses pragmatist oversimplification in favor of relativist principles, and offers a discourse for participation in cultural democracy (Appiah, 2008).

Cosmopolitanism developed in the fifth century and became popular in the early 20th century, but failed to achieve any significant political or social results. Cosmopolitanism finds its roots in Roman philosophy of the fifth century, and was later revisited and further developed by Kant in his essay *Perpetual Peace* in the 18th century (Brown & Held, 2010). However, until the 20th century, globalization was a relatively new, and ultimately still rather far-off concept in practice, so most people had little use for cosmopolitanism.

In the 20th century, the concept was taken up by Jacques Derrida and Emmanuel Levinas, though it is possible neither recognized their work as the extension of Kant's "ius cosmopoliticum." Instead they addressed issues of hospitality and ethics respectively, laying the groundwork for Kwame Anthony Appiah's modern conception of cosmopolitanism (Harvey, 2009). Appiah has today revived cosmopolitanism, delineating and expanding it in his volume *Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a World of Strangers*. He argues that a new code of ethics must be developed and is developing for peaceable cohabitation of a globalized world.

The Cosmopolitan Ethic

The cosmopolitan ethic is chiefly concerned with humanism, and human motivations. Tossing aside the pragmatist notion of simple value driving desire, Appiah (2006) instead focuses on the underlying *needs* that motivate those values. He

argues that the fundamental beliefs that drive human desires are based on localized

values extrapolated from the world they know and what they *need* to survive in it; the

values of a given location are fundamentally different from those of a different location.

Thus, forcing a new belief system or value on a fundamentally different cultural

paradigm than our own is not only difficult, it is impossible. This is because the

introduction of the new belief does not change the individual's world-view, but rather

exists outside of it (Gee, 1990). From this, the cosmopolitan ethic is formed: culture is

relative and ought to be explored and understood on its own terms, and its members

treated accordingly (Appiah 2006, p. 23).

Appiah (2006) is careful to distinguish cosmopolitanism from constructionist and

deconstructionist paradigms, and even more adamant that cosmopolitanism differs

considerably from positivism. Modern cosmopolitanism, as Appiah (2006) writes, aims

to move past the simple constructionist view which is mired in Positivist concepts of

values and desires, instead relying on a relativist view that absolves values of reified

significance. In doing so, Appiah acknowledges all motivations as stemming from

values, but ultimately removes the moral significance from the term "value." Instead,

Appiah contends that values as such are simply extrapolated desires from universal

needs/goals. That is, values stem from peoples' desire to share the things they consider

universally important and necessary to the human experience, and as such they cannot

be considered universal values, but rather universally common desires. By dismissing

the positivist debate, Appiah creates equality among the values of individuals, and a

new ethical imperative: equal respect for differing cultures, and their myriad attitudes, traditions, and beliefs.

Who is a cosmopolitan?

A cosmopolitan is an individual who actively seeks to engage with the unfamiliar, while acting in a culturally democratic manner (Appiah, 2006). By dismissing the reified values of individual societies and cultures, Appiah is obliquely calling for cultural democracy. French philosopher Jean-Luc Nancy neatly summed up cultural democracy with one question: "Does [democracy] ultimately designate the reconfiguration of the theologico-political through a transcendent-negative or a positive-immanent metamorphosis, or does it designate a genuine break from the theologico-political?" Nancy is getting to the very heart of the nature of democracy, asking whether it is a concept that can and does exist independent of the nation-state, and even independent of the political realm in its entirety, specifically with regard to ideologically influenced government (Nancy, 2010). If it can, this is cultural democracy.

Patrick Jenlink (2007) contends that not only can a democracy independent of the state exist, but that it is currently developing in the post-modern world. He calls the process a "thickening of the global sphere," resultant from "the deep, social and political relationships that once connected civil society to the state...being detached and redirected across national boundaries..." (p. 34). He is referring to the growing network of international non-profits (specifically non-government organizations or NGOs), volunteers, travelers, and philanthropists that have created social and community networks independent of national boundaries, for the benefit of the global citizenry.

This means that there is an ongoing restructuring of power, and thus the global social landscape is rapidly changing from that of the 20th century (Jenlink, 2007). Cultural democracy has become not something political, but a series of working relationships based on ""civil society" or the "social bond," considered from the point of view of an ethos or a democratic feeling under the regulative idea represented by the motto "liberty, equality, fraternity," however this is to be interpreted" (Nancy, 2010). Thus, being a Cosmopolitan means understanding what cultural relativism is, and how to enact it.

Knowing about cultural relativism is not, however, the defining feature of the cosmopolitan. Being a Cosmopolitan requires a specific set of knowledge, skills, attitudes, and experiences. It is more than simply acknowledging differing beliefs, but requires actively seeking to engage with unfamiliar people, places, and circumstances (Appiah, 2006). These interactions themselves require a certain set of behaviors to accomplish, and certain motivations to initiate. In short, in order to be a Cosmopolitan, you must have command of the Cosmopolitan discourse.

<div align="center">What is Cosmopolitan discourse?</div>

Discourse describes any given set of speech, gestures, values, attitudes and beliefs that is unique to a particular group (Gee, 1990). For example, there is a discourse among native Inuit peoples. Museum and arts professionals engage in discourse about antiquities. Within the educational environment there is a discourse unique to Californian high school students in the lunch room, and this differs significantly from the classroom behavior of these same students because classroom behavior is, in itself, a

discourse (Gee, 1990). These discourses vary still further if you examine students in variable places. The discourse of students in Los Angeles differs significantly from students in say Washburn, North Dakota. In sum, there is a discourse unique to each and every community, be it a community of interest, a community of location, or a community of leisure.

Sociologist and theorist J. Paul Gee (1990) calls a discourse "'a sort of 'identity kit' which comes complete with the appropriate costume and instructions on how to act, talk, and often write, so as to take on a particular role that others will recognize" (p. 56). To be fluent in a discourse is to be able to converse and interact freely with community members, without being recognizable as an outsider, as different, or foreign. This is easily recognizable in terms of national identity. The language you speak marks you as from a particular region. But so too does your tone and inflection in speaking the language. As well as the gestures you make, the attitudes you display, and the actions you take. It is all these, taken in sum, that form a discourse unique to a particular place, and it is the ability to exercise all of them together as appropriate that makes one fluent in a discourse. What is true of a national discourse is similarly true of community discourse; the ability to engage fluently with any particular community indicates discourse inclusion.

We engage in discourse in order to attain in-group status, with all of its accordant benefits (Gee, 1990). The first benefit is the same of all discourse: status and solidarity. As Gee writes, "Status and solidarity are the ultimate goods that stand behind all uses of languages..." (p. 24). Thus, simply being part of the in-group is its

own reward, and frequently comes with status both in the in-group and through it.

More than that, membership in a community may offer more express benefits or

"goods." These benefits can include money/material goods, power, spiritual reward,

emotional release and nearly anything else you can think of. For instance, if you hold a

law degree and practice law, your degree of fluency in legal discourse determines how

successful you are in the profession. Fluency in the discourse brings with it an

opportunity for great financial reward, status both within the legal community and

other communities, potentially facilitates the acquisition of power, and allows one to

exercise authority over others. A tango dance community might offer entertainment,

companionship, and social networking. A youth soccer league provides exercise,

facilitates friendship-building, and provides parents a respite. But you must know the

discourse to participate in these communities as well. Not all discourses offer blatant

material rewards, but there are, nevertheless, rewards to membership-- every

community offers "goods" that come with membership.

   To navigate the initial cultural space that is the classroom, one must posses all

the tools of a discourse (Hennon, 2000). One must know the language, execute the

appropriate actions, and exhibit the expected attitudes and beliefs of the community

engaged in discourse. Students initially develop two discourses: classroom discourse

and student-peer discourse (Hennon, 2000). The former refers to the accepted formal

rules of practice in the classroom-- speaking appropriately, raising hands to speak,

teacher-led discussion, response structures and much, much more--, and accounts for

the structure of the classroom and the school. The latter is the informal, self-instituted

code of conduct that governs interactions between students. It is less academically

demanding, but no less complex. Thus, from the student perspective, even the most

basic classroom experience requires proficiency in no less than two complicated

discourses.

To these two discourses, the content of student curriculum adds a myriad of

others that expand students cultural environments. As Dewey (1916) will attest,

students are instructed in economy, government, and inquiry. School becomes a place

to both receive instruction, and carry out exercises, in democracy, capitalism, and the

scientific method.   In so doing, students address issues of individual and group

identity, providing them with personal cultural context and experiences (Drury &

Reicher, 2011). Learning the language, history, and motivations of the state/people also

affords the student the ability to engage in a cultural discourse of nationalism, thereby

strengthening their connection to the dominant culture and allowing for the

transmission of national cultural values (Freire, 1974).

Even more significantly, schools instill practices of economy and government in

students. The reified significance of these specific economic and government practices

within an educational paradigm significantly shape a student's worldview (Dewey,

1916). Words like capitalism, democracy, socialism and globalization carry such

significant cultural value, are so entrenched in their own reified social significance, that

they are valued or abhorred concepts independent of practice (Drury &Reicher, 2011).

Students learn about capitalism and how to engage with it in order to become

functioning participants in a capitalist nation. They learn about and practice political

democracy so that they may participate in governance as adults-- we acquire

democratic discourse so that we may participate. As a result of reified social values,

students can also learn to dislike and oppose dissenting perspectives, as 1950's

American school children were taught to hate and fear communism, or as Muslim

fundamentalist students are taught to hate and denigrate "the west" (Tyack &Cuban,

1995; Appiah, 2006, ch. 6). In this way, our discourses become our identities (Gee,

1990).

To these already myriad discourses, I would add another: Cosmopolitanism.

Why add this complex and potentially controversial discourse to the already jam-

packed and economically-battered curriculum? Because, as you have read,

cosmopolitanism ethically demands it. Because fluency in Cosmopolitan discourse

brings with it many benefits. And because schools, specifically classrooms and classes,

are unique social/community environments that are particularly receptive to the

addition of new discourses.

"The goods" of Cosmopolitanism: Globalization and Opportunity

Cosmopolitanism is changing the scaffolding of social and political participation

to reflect the needs and desires of a global population unlimited by national boundaries,

and offers cultural democracy as a way to cope with the restructuring of world power

inherent in globalization. To be fluent in cosmopolitan discourse is to know how to

utilize the political, social, and educational resources available in the new global

landscape-- this is the ultimate "good" associated with mastery of cosmopolitan

discourse. It brings with it, however, a commitment to culturally democratic behavior--

both a greater reward, and a greater dedication.

According to sociologist Henri Lefebvre, globalization is "a process of worldwide

spatial restructuring that unfolds in part through reconfiguration of state sociospatial

organization: the renegotiation of spatial geography" (Brenner, 1997). Brenner (1997)

further clarifies Lefebvre's definition by emphasizing its agent, writing that "one of

[globalization's] major organizational-institutional dimensions is constituted through

the territorial state itself." "Spatial restructuring" is found in the relatively recent

intentional interdependencies of world markets and the consequential commodification

of foreign cultures (Brenner, 1997). Giddens (2001) states that globalization is "signaled

by the role of global markets, new developments in electronic communications, and

geopolitical transition." Because of this, while it is not inclusive in the definition,

globalization carries connotations of cultural imperialism, and is widely decried as

oppressive and detrimental to indigenous cultures (Porter &Vidovich, 2000). Yet

despite the connotations globalization carries, ultimately it is a descriptive term and

thus it neither can nor does espouse any specific goals or aims.

Cosmopolitanism is an intellectual tool for comparative analysis, providing a

critical framework for understanding and engaging with globalization. In contrast to

globalization, cosmopolitanism is both descriptive and prescriptive; where

Globalization can only be used to describe a pattern of events and attempt to predict

future phenomena, cosmopolitanism provides a critical and ethical framework for

actions. Cosmopolitanism offers cultural relativism as a guiding principle, requires

active and on-going engagement with the unfamiliar to facilitate acclimation, and results in culturally democratic behavior (Appiah, 2006). Thus, while globalization is limited to describing past events, cosmopolitanism gives one an ethical and behavioral code for engagement with a globalized world.

An understanding and practice of the Cosmopolitan ethic and engagement with cultural democracy brings with it access to what Jenlink (2007) referred to as the "thickening global sphere" comprised of international cultural networks, social resources, and aid institutions. The changes wrought by globalization include a dramatic contraction of intellectual distance between groups with widely different cultural identities (Houser, 2005). Cultural groups that evolved their traditions in wildly divergent environments now communicate continually, and frequently share space in urban environments. Practice of the Cosmopolitan ethic is meant to broaden one's experience with and understanding of the unfamiliar, and consequently prepares one to engage democratically with these various groups and their representative institutions (Appiah, 2006). Understanding and engaging in this behavior, over time, gives one the skills to engage with institutions that espouse similarly culturally democratic values. The ability to engage-- facility with the discourse of cosmopolitanism and its accompanying opportunity to utilize cosmopolitan resources-- is the ultimate "good" of cosmopolitanism.

Is today's education cosmopolitan?

We clearly live in a world where globalization is both buzzword and burgeoning reality, but does the education our children receive reflect the needs of a global citizen?

The No Child Left Behind Act, intentionally or otherwise, threw education into the

global sphere; nations compare educational methods, standards, and results,

consequently indicating internationally comparable educational values and ideals. The

standards of the global community are affecting the content of local education (e.g.

Bloch & Blessing, 2000; see also: Navoa 2000; Torres, 2000; Whitty, Gewirtz, & Edwards,

2000). Education, then, is global.   We are faced with the challenge of developing

curriculum content and standards to serve a globalized citizenry. We must also

reconsider our values, methods and cultural goals in the face of a rapidly evolving

global future. To include cosmopolitanism in the classroom, there are three things that

must be addressed: Is western educational philosophy compatible with

cosmopolitanism? Does modern educational rhetoric reflect a commitment to

educating global citizens? And is this commitment reflected in educational practice?

    The 20th century bore witness to the advent of progressivism in education,

which dismissed the empty receptacle philosophy of education in favor of educating the

"whole" student, and preparing them to become participatory citizens (Tyack & Cuban,

1995). This ran contrary to traditional notions of education, and faced challenges in the

curriculum and forms of western schools. It was difficult to shake the enculturatory

nature of national curriculum and the reified cultural boundaries implicit in educational

rhetoric (Tyack & Cuban, 1995)

    Education, at its core, is a process of enculturation-- a not-entirely-cosmopolitan

concept. Education is a process meant to pass along to future citizens the basic

symbols, languages, traditions, and beliefs of a unique place and culture. In its initial

stages, both formal and informal education focus on social skills and the basic building blocks of symbology-- colors, shapes and letters--, necessary for navigating cultural space (Mitchell & Ziegler, 2007). In its earliest incarnation, that cultural space is simply the child's primary environment. In formal education, this is classroom itself. These basic cultural tools are will be the basis for a lifetime of cultural interaction. By extension, that "cultural space" will become society, community and civilization at large (Gee, 1990). In this way, the content of a student's education is a system of enculturation-- a way of learning to recognize aspects of and navigate cultural space, and responding in an appropriate way. This is enculturation in action.

In writing *The Child and the Curriculum* (1902), John Dewey first began to delineate the problems of the education system as he saw it, and how it stemmed from what and how children were being taught. He actively denounced the "empty receptacle"[1] philosophy of education, and began advocating for a more honest, proactive form of education in pursuit of social ideals (Tyack & Cuban, 1995). *Democracy and Education* (1934) illustrates Dewey's shift in focus from simple curriculum reform to the social and cultural ramifications of education. Dewey would eventually come to focus on the idea of liberal, student-directed, inquiry-based education as liberating, while categorizing other forms of education as enculturation-- cultural indoctrination (Tyack & Cuban, 1995).

Dewey built on the earlier progressivist philosophies of Francis Parker, who advocated for a form of education that valued student inquiry and experience, and stressed a particular type of enculturation. Parker attempted to create a school that

could become a "cooperative community while developing in individuals their own capacities" (Cremin, 1962). Stanwood Cobb attempted to espouse these new philosophies via his founding and leadership of the Progressive Education Association from 1919-1955, and various academics supported his beliefs, including Rudolph Flesch and Charles Eliot (Tyack & Cuban, 1995).

Despite the prejudicial nature of the word enculturation, and the widespread disavowal of it as an educational technique, enculturation need not be negative. More importantly, enculturation is unavoidable in education; indeed, education itself is part of culture, and culture is the basis and framework of education. Enculturation then, is a given. It is a way to pass on the social, linguistic and ideological beliefs of a culture. The danger then becomes the reification of a single culture, and the acceptance of its motivations as values (Dewey, 1938).[2] Dewey's concern is the use of education to propagate a form of enculturation that creates social stratification, promotes cultural isolationism, and perpetuates the outdated and misinformed beliefs of an earlier era, alienating modern students, and thus in turn the people as a social and political entity (Tyack & Cuban, 1995).

Dewey argues that there is nothing implicitly wrong with enculturation; he draws a line between enculturation to a liberated citizenry and other forms of education, only so that one can consider what a free education might look like. Dewey's idea of a free education is based almost solely on the needs of the child (Dewey, 1902; see also Dewey, 1938; Tyack and Cuban, 1995). This may seem intuitive, but there are many ways in which we track children into specific jobs or job sectors.

Educational content, quality, and trajectory is frequently heavily influenced by school

location and regional economics (Britel, Chilcott, Hindmarch, Katz, Skoll, Tavey,

Weyermann, D., & Guggenheim, 2011). And there is significant reinforcement of reified

cultural boundaries that assign values to student choices regarding avenues of inquiry

and research (Houser, 2005).

Progressivism, the dominant educational philosophy of the 20th century,

demands examination of curriculum and process so as to end mindless enculturation

and begin educating students in such a way that both the experience and the content of

a student's education will prepare them to be fulfilled, participatory citizens. In order

to do this, Dewey called for the dismissal of reified cultural boundaries-- the exercise of

cultural democracy in education (Tyack and Cuban, 1995). It would seem, then, that the

philosophies that have shaped modern western education are already cosmopolitan.

Academics might argue that Deleuzian philosophy drives much of modern

education-- a philosophy that is shaped by the three-fold concepts of

deterritorialization, a deminishing focus on recognition and representation, and

decreased (ideally nonexistent) reification of cultural categorization (Roy, 2003).

Kaustav Roy (2003) effectively summarizes Deluzian theory in *Teachers in Nomadic*

Spaces: Deleuze and Curriculum, paying particular attention to the ways in which

Deleuzian rhetoric differs from past education paradigms, and how it relates to and

differs from many of the prominent philosophical movements of the 19th and 20th

centuries. Given its anti-constructionist perspective, and its rejection of reified

paradigmatic values, the ideals of Deleuzian theory align well with a re-emergence of cosmopolitanism, and both seem to compliment the globalization of society and culture.

The vision of modern education, then, has always been cosmopolitan, and continues to be to this day. The founders of modern education as we know it dismissed simple enculturation and called for the dismissal of reified cultural boundaries-- truly cosmopolitan sentiments. Contemporary theorists have a similar vision for modern education, specifically with regards to cultural democracy. And the recent push for comparative international educational assessment only drives the point home: education should be Cosmopolitan, yet the reality is that the content of our children's education is frequently culturally diverse, reflecting the pluralism of globalization, but western education is habitually lacking in culturally democratic experiences and the practice necessary for students to engage with and benefit from them (Sleeter & Grant, 1987).

According to Sleeter and Grant (1987), the prevailing practice in western classrooms is to show multicultural material and focus on the differences between foreign culture and the student's own. This strategy not only further entrenches the us vs. them mentality, it relies on a cumulative record of student enculturation to a single set of ideal practices. In other words, this system prevails because it reinforces a cultural ideal that values enculturation education (Freire, 1985). So students continue to consume materials that only widen the gap between "us" and "them"-- the familiar and the unfamiliar--, despite the uniquely accommodating culture of the classroom. These practices run counter to the Progressive, Cosmopolitan vision of education.

What does a cosmopolitan education look like?

The "renegotiation of spatial geography" inherent in globalization and the "rescaffolding" of cultural space inherent in cosmopolitanism necessitate a change in education in order to prepare children to navigate their geographic, social, and cultural worlds in the future (Houser, 2005). Cosmopolitanism has been offered as both a tool for intellectual analysis of, and as ethic to guide interactions with, this changing social and cultural landscape. Having discarded the empty receptacle paradigm, and its accompanying enculturation, we turn to discourse acquisition as a more liberated, preparatory form of education that gives students the tools to interact with and benefit from a variety of communities. As a discourse however, it is not enough to simply instruct students in the Cosmopolitan ethic (Gee, 1990). Cosmopolitanism is a complex discourse acquired through both practice and experience, not simply overt instruction.

A Cosmopolitan education is multi-cultural, culturally democratic, and gives primacy to practice, utilizing the unique community of the classroom to facilitate experience. Appiah (2006) argues for a cosmopolitan education that is multicultural, and culturally democratic. He writes, "...we should learn about people in other places, take an interest in their civilizations, their arguments, their errors, their achievements, not because that will bring us to agreement, but because it will help us get used to one another" (Appiah, 2006, p. 78).

Appiah (2006) stresses the need for, "Conversations across boundaries of identity whether national, religious, or something else..." (p. 85) using the term conversation both literally and, "as a metaphor for engagement with the experience and the ideas of

others" (Appiah, 2006, p. 85). In this way, cosmopolitanism gives us two ethical

directives for education: to educate in a way that considers the values and beliefs of

many cultures, and the motivations and beliefs of many peoples and groups, and to

facilitate cross-cultural conversation so as to engender cultural democracy.

Practice is cosmopolitanism's primary method of dissemination (Appiah, 2006, p.

69-86). Appiah gives great weight to the role of practice, emphasizing that the

cosmopolitan ethic is practiced by actively seeking to engage with the unfamiliar, to

view the subject of the interaction in a culturally relative way, and for each engagement

to become part of a cumulative record of cultural socialization.[3] There are several

implications here. The first is that the actor has intention, the second it that the actor

has learned and understood relativism, and third, that there is a cumulative result from

the process. Thus, cosmopolitanism (or at least cosmopolitan behavior) is learned,

functions or fails on the intentions of the actor/agent, and the results are unique to each

individual.

Practice, most commonly defined, means to train by repeated exercise. You

practice the piano, penmanship, and football. You repeatedly engage in an activity in

order to master the skills necessary for proficiency. As with cosmopolitanism, herein

lies an implication that cannot be ignored: you were not proficient in those skills before,

or you would not require practice. Which means that one practices a *learned behavior*.

Further, one can garner a license to practice medicine or law, yet ostensibly said doctor-

or lawyer-to-be is at least relatively proficient in the practice already. So practice

implies an on-going exercise of learned behaviors, beyond the point of proficiency.

Appiah, then, is stressing the nature of cosmopolitanism as a learned behavior, that

must be repeated frequently to gain proficiency, and which must be exercised

habitually in order to remain proficient and develop further proficiencies.

Cosmopolitanism must be practiced, as one practices the violin, rugby, or ballet.

Cosmopolitanism is a team activity, and requires team practice. As a budding

Cosmopolitan, you can role-play individually, you can profess certain ethical mores,

and you can make a commitment to culturally democratic behavior, but this is similar

to practicing soccer or baseball by yourself-- you will hone skills necessary to

proficiency, but you will never really become proficient at the necessary gestures and

behaviors until you play with a team against an opponent (Appiah, 2006, p. 69-100).

Nor does your intention ever manifest itself as action without the opportunity to engage

with the unfamiliar. While teams and opponents run counter to the spirit of

cosmopolitanism, the practice is the same; cosmopolitanism stems from the many and

varied interactions of widely diverse cultural groups, and to practice cosmopolitanism

requires engagement with these groups and their products.

The inherent group identity of a classroom of students is a uniquely

accommodating environment for the acquisition of group behaviors (Drury & Reicher,

2011). In the classroom, concepts of "us" and "them" take on increased meaning as the

classroom is frequently the first place where the "us" is collective-- where "I" becomes

"us"-- and where collective power can be experienced and exercised (Mitchell &

Ziegler, 2007).[4] As very young children, we have little concept of "us" beyond the

singular. As adults, we have many conceptions of "us": the singular, the plural

personal, and the "us" that refers to the self as part of the many communities to which

one might belong. This has ongoing social impact because, as Hennon (2000) writes,

"The community becomes a project of political reflection that aligns the capacities and

aspirations of the citizen with the aims of government" (p. 254). Which is to say, our

communities become our public and political identities.

Rarely is one so actively engaged in a community, or in a social, cultural, and

political practice, however, as one is in the classroom. A student is, at all times, a

participant that is actively engaged in group behavior, where there is always an "us".

Even the most actively apathetic student in the classroom is still *in the classroom.* S/he

has come to the table, so to speak. An apathetic, uninterested student is still present,

grouped with others of similar demographics, responsive (be it positively or negatively)

to an outside authority figure, shares some interests with others in the student group

and has some interests that diverge, and comes to the group with an already entrenched

set of values, beliefs and attitudes. In short, they are a community.

Like the real, globalized world, a class is comprised of students with unique

cultural backgrounds, patterns of behavior, and beliefs, naturally providing the subject

matter, the locus, and the motivation for engagement with cultural relativism. Students

come to a classroom with varied backgrounds. Their families may hold divergent

customs and beliefs, and they may engage in widely varied behaviors. Because of this,

Gee (1990) defines the "complex reality of our schools" as "an amalgam of many

differing social beliefs, actions, reactions, and resistances." It is this "amalgam" that

provides such opportunity for the acquisition of cosmopolitanism, as it provides an

environment ripe for the controlled and focused practice of cultural democracy (Dewey, 1934). A cosmopolitan education is one that recognizes the value of a multicultural classroom, and allows students to practice democratic behavior in the classroom, utilizing the classroom community.

There is yet one more step in the Cosmopolitan learning process: experience. Dewey (1934) defines experience in this way: "In an experience, things and events belonging to the world, physical and social, are transformed through the human context they enter, while the live creature is changed and developed through its intercourse with things previously external to it." Appiah (2006) terms the outcome of successful practice as an engagement, but the parameters are the same; the actor is in some way intellectually or socially changed by an interaction/event.

While Appiah contends that these experiences are "valuable in themselves" as they advance the cosmopolitan mindset, Dewey (1938) contends that what Appiah (2006) calls an "engagement" is valuable because the experience resulted in increased understanding in the individual. In large part, it is this resultant engagement or experience that is the outcome and intent of practicing the Cosmopolitan ethic. To alter the individual perspective, to make the strange seem more familiar-- this is the practice of cosmopolitanism.

Jean Piaget's work, and the work of later developmental psychologists confirm this viewpoint, contending that the source of knowledge and form of education ultimately shape a child's authentication of knowledge, and reaffirming that a child's educational *experience* can have as much impact on a child as curricular content (Piaget

& Inhelder, 1969).[5] This provides Dewey's (1938) cultural and intellectual assertions on

experience with pseudo-scientific observational data to back it and re-entrenches the

Dewian concept of experience as vital to education, affirming that the Cosmopolitan

goal of experience is directly in line with modern educational philosophy. More

importantly, it affirms the role of practice and experience in identity development, be it

a Cosmopolitan identity or any other.

<p align="center">Democratic Experience: The Arts as a Cosmopolitan Tool</p>

The acquisition of Cosmopolitan discourse requires opportunities for practice

that facilitate experience. It is not enough to tell students to be Cosmopolitan, or

democratic, or capitalist, or anything else. Even if they agree with the sentiment, they

may not understand the motivations, or how to go about practicing the ethics involved.

Because a discourse is like a language-- with accompanying accent, gestures, and

attitudes, the acquisition process requires opportunities for engagement with the

discourse and those fluent in it, and for reflection on these engagements (Gee, 1990).

An arts-integrated classroom offers the multi-cultural experiences, democratic practice,

and interdisciplinary application necessary for the acquisition of cosmopolitan

discourse.

Here, it is tempting to point out that we teach our children reason, scientific

method, democracy-- all of the things that we value--, ought this not translate into

informal student behavior and thus social identity?   In a word, no-- or at least not on

any observable scale. To change the way students interact with one another, or to

influence the variety and frequency of their interactions, it to change the parameters of

the student-peer discourse. It is not only the ideas that must be conveyed, but the

practice that accompanies it-- the speech, behaviors, and beliefs unique to the new

discourse. Gee (1990) succinctly summarizes why this is so difficult, contending,

"Discourses are mastered through *acquisition,* not *learning* " (p. 170). The conclusion

here is that, like political democracy, like economy, like the scientific method, a

discourse must be observed, practiced, internalized, interpreted, and reexamined for it

to take on meaning for the participant (Gee, 1990, p. 146-147). In short, there must be

more than just overt instruction, there must be collateral learning for successful

acquisition of a new discourse.[6]

Gee contends that "For anything close to acquisition to occur, classrooms must

be active apprenticeships in 'academic' social practices, and, in most cases, must

connect with these social practices as they are carried on outside the 'composition' or

'language' class…" would call this cross-application of material, wherein overt

instruction is carried over into practical application (Gee, 1990, p. 126). Exercises that

allow students to try out behaviors they have received instruction in, projects that

require the transposition of a familiar set of skills to an unfamiliar application, and

activities that require interpretation all facilitate discourse acquisition. These are the

practices of an arts-integrated classroom.

Kathy A. Mills (2011) echoes Gee (1990), contending that for discourse or literacy

acquisition to occur, students must receive overt instruction in both academic skills and

cultural behavior that is then cross-applied to visual, expressive, transformative

mediums. Mills' research indicates that interdisciplinary practice is necessary to

literacy development. Specifically, Mills contends interdisciplinary practice of the arts

facilitates experiences and critical framing to assist in meaning-making and thus

transformed practice (Mills, 2011, p. 45).

Mill's (2011) identifies four processes necessary for acquisition: experiencing,

conceptualizing, analyzing, and applying (p. 15). The author contends that these four

processes are realized through the arts, citing specific examples of observable literacy

development and discourse acquisition through the cross-application of "academic"

skills to artistic disciplines. Further, Mills writes of the ability of interdisciplinary arts

applications to inculcate classroom discourse, writing, "A newcomer to the dominant

culture became socialized by her peers, into full participation in the activities, artefacts,

and knowledge- the socio-cultural practices- of the multiliteracies classroom" (p. 55).

While Mills' (2011) terminology may differ from our own, she recognizes the

power associated with the ability to effectively engage with any given group or

discipline, writing "Clearly, access to literacies- new or old- is tied up in the politics and

power relations of everyday life in literate cultures" (p. 9). The author is addressing

how discourse acquisition is frequently determined by social and economic factors, but

in so doing she also spells out the importance of literacy, or the ability to engage

completely with a discourse, in determining one's social and economic well-being.

Mills' (2011) multiliteracies classroom, a classroom that effectively inculcates

discourse, relies on multi-cultural material, inter-disciplinary application of skills, and

individual meaning-making to transform practice. Appiah (2006) would likely call

transformed practice the result of practicing the cosmopolitan ethic, and Mills, too,

stresses that "a requirement of transformed practice is that learners transfer meaning-making practice by putting meaning-making to work in other contexts or cultural sites" (p. 45). The emphasis here is on the necessity of intercultural and inter-disciplinary experience to the transformed practice of cosmopolitanism.

Mills (2011) describes the importance and scope of a multi-cultural education, writing, "This is achieved by moving from a standard, national, or universal culture, to foster productive diversity that acknowledges the multilayered lifeworlds of students…a pluralistic worldview, not a tokenistic one, is the only way the educational system can "possibly be genuinely fair in its distribution of opportunity, as between one group and another'" (p. 9-10).[7] Leslie Hennon (2000) supports this assertion, describing the range of one's ability to engage with the world around them as the construction of discursive space-- a space whose limits are defined by the breadth of individual experience. Thus, a person's literacy is determined by their discursive space-- a space which can be significantly expanded through exposure to the arts.

Dewey (1934) returns repeatedly to the arts as a way to facilitate experience, presenting art as an "intensified" experience, writing, "The work of art … operates imaginatively rather than in the realm of physical experiences. What it does is to concentrate and enlarge an immediate experience" (p. 285). Dewey sees art not only as a way to engage with the unfamiliar, but as a uniquely apt tool for experiential learning about culture. Dewey contends that the process of viewing art can be a highly stimulating engagement because of arts' unique ability to represent perspective, be it personal or cultural. All components of a work of art are democratically determined,

and the viewing of a work of art can be similarly democratic. Further, a work of art is uniquely representative of a time, place, culture, and point of view that are fundamentally different from the viewer's own (Appiah, 2006; Dewey, 1934; Freire, 1973). Thus, each encounter with a work of art is, at least at some level, an engagement with cultural democracy-- a cosmopolitan experience.

Dewey (2006) would call learning about cosmopolitanism through art "collateral learning," and Gee (1990) would call it discourse acquisition. In both cases, students are practicing what they have been overtly instructed in, either through cross application of the cosmopolitan ethic to another discipline (art creation), or the exercise of cosmopolitan behavior (in the viewing of culturally diverse art). While there are certainly a number of ways to inculcate cosmopolitanism in the classroom, the arts are an opportunity for "intensified experience" in the "microcosm" of the classroom-- a highly effective tool for engendering cultural democracy (Dewey, 1934).

Appiah (2006) agrees that the arts are a unique and primary opportunity for engagement with the unfamiliar, and for practice of the cosmopolitan ethic. As we have seen, Appiah calls for "conversations" or engagements that result in gained experience. As for how one accomplishes this, Appiah (2006) writes, "Conversations across boundaries of identity- whether national, religious, or something else- begin with the sort of imaginative engagement you get when you read a novel or watch a movie or attend to a work of art that speaks from some place other than your own" (p. 85). Art, then, gives a unique social and cultural viewpoint that differs from that of the viewer,

and consequently the viewer must assimilate the piece into their worldview. In so doing, the viewer either revises or reaffirms certain beliefs about reality.

Dewey (1938) calls for positive experience in education, Gee (1990) contends that acquiring discourse is a process of collateral learning, and Appiah necessitates experience for development of the Cosmopolitan ethic. Similarly, Gee believes the cross-application of skills like that found in arts-integrated education is necessary to discourse development, Dewey believes the arts provide an "intensified" cosmopolitan experience, and Appiah (2006) validates the place of the arts in a cosmopolitan education. Though each may call it by a different name, each is concerned with the experience of the student, and the shaping of the student into discursively-fluent citizen, and each agree that the arts are a unique way to facilitate this goal.

Mills (2011) "multiliteracies classroom," Freire's (1973) concientization, Dewey's (1938) experiential education, and Appiah's (2006) creative education could all effectively be called arts-integrated education. They all call for a form of education that uses the rich multicultural resources of a globalized world to foster personal meaning-making for the benefit of the student. Each is a form of education that focuses on developing linguistic, visual, and cultural literacies by providing opportunities for interdisciplinary practice and experience. This is form of education whose goal is to help students make their own meaning, transforming practice into a conscious act that extends students' discursive space into the global sphere.

Conclusion

The arts could be a highly effective tool for the acquisition of cosmopolitan discourse; they could be used in classrooms the world over to engender culturally democratic behavior in students. Yet, despite the global and even overtly cosmopolitan tone of education rhetoric and philosophy, our children's education has been stripped of the arts and cultural experiences that facilitate both discourse acquisition and cosmopolitanism. Arts-integrated classroom practices foster culturally democratic behavior, encourage personal meaning-making, and provide the experience and critical framing necessary to transform individual practice. In short, an arts integrated classroom develops in students the discursive literacies necessary to survive and thrive in a global world.   Arts education is a cosmopolitan tool for engendering cultural democracy-- a necessary skill-set for the 21st century student.

References

A Pedagogy of Multiliteracies: Designing Social Futures. (June 06, 1996). *Harvard Educational Review, 66(1)*, 60-92.

Arts and societal learning: Transforming communities socially, politically, and culturally. (2007). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Written symposium. (2000) *: Arts education in Africa.* Heldref; 2000.

Appiah, K.A. (2006). *Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a world of strangers.* New York: W.W. Norton & Co.

Appiah, K.A. (April 01, 2008). Chapter 6: Education for global citizenship. *Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, 107(1)*, 83-99.

Apple, M. W., Kenway, J., & Singh, M. (2005). *Globalizing education: Policies, pedagogies, & politics.* New York: Peter Lang.

Beyer, L. E. (2000). *The arts, popular culture, and social change.* New York: P. Lang.

Bloch, M.N., & Blessing, B. (2000). The restructuring the state in Eastern Europe: women, child care, and early education. In T.S. Popkewitz (Ed.), *Educational knowledge: Changing relationships between the state, civil society, and the educational community* (p. 59-82). Albany: State University of New York Press.

Boudreaux, D. J. (2008). *Globalization.* Westport, Conn: Greenwood Press.

Brenner, N. (January 01, 1997). Global, fragmented, hierarchical: Henri Lefebvre's geographies of globalization. *Public Culture: Bulletin of the Project for Transnational Cultural Studies, 10(1),* 135.

Britel, M., Chilcott, L., Hindmarch, E., Katz, M., Skoll, J., Tavey, S., & Weyermann, D. (Producer), & Guggenhein, D. (Director). (2011). *Waiting for superman.* Hollywood, CA: Paramount Home.

Brown, G.W., & Held, D.H. (Eds.). (2010). *The cosmopolitanism reader.* Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Cmiel, K. (2007). The swirl of image and sound: on the latest version of anti-realism. In In Blake, C.N. (Ed.), *The arts of democracy: Art, public culture, and the state* (p. 223-243). Washington, D.C: Woodrow Wilson Center Press.

Cocke, D. (January 01, 2004). Art in a democracy. *Tdr, 48(3),* 165-173.

Cremin, L.(1962). *The transformation of the school: Progressivism in American education, 1876-1957.* New York: Knopf.

Dewey, J. (1902). *The child and the curriculum.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Dewey, J. (1934). *Art as experience.* New York: Minton, Balch & Company.

Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and education: An introduction to the philosophy of education.* New York: Macmillan.

Dewey, J. (1938). *Experience and education.* New York: Macmillan.

Drury, J., & Reicher, S. (2011). Collective identity, political participation, and the making of the social self. In Azzi, A. E. (Ed). *Identity and participation in culturally diverse societies: A multidisciplinary perspective* (p. 158-177). Chichester, West Sussex, U.K: Wiley-Blackwell.

Feser, E., & Appiah, K. A. (January 01, 2006). Books, arts & manners - we are the world - cosmopolitanism: ethics in a world of strangers. *National Review, 58*(4), 42.

Freire, P. (1973). *Education for critical consciousness.* New York: Seabury Press.

Freire, P. (1985). *The politics of education: Culture, power, and liberation.* South Hadley, Mass: Bergin & Garvey.

Gee, J. P., & Green, J. L. (January 01, 1998). Chapter 4: Discourse analysis, learning, and social practice: A Methodological Study. *Review of Research in Education, 23,* 1, 119-169.

Gee, J. P. (1990). *Social linguistics and literacies: Ideology in discourses.* London [England: Falmer Press.

Getty Center for Education in the Arts. (1993). *Perspectives on education reform: Arts education as catalyst.* Santa Monica, Calif: Getty Center for Education in the Arts.

Giroux, H. A. (1988). Schooling and the politics of ethics. In *Schooling and the struggle for public life: Critical pedagogy in the modern age* (p. 37-70). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Greene, M. (September 06, 1992). The passions of pluralism: Multiculturalism and the expanding community. *Journal of Negro Education, 61*(3), 250-61.

Hansen, D. T. (January 01, 2010). Chasing butterflies without a net: Interpreting cosmopolitanism. *Studies in Philosophy and Education, 29,* 2, 151-166.

Harrison, L. E. (1992). *Who prospers?: How cultural values shape economic and political success.* New York, NY: Basic Books.

Harvey, D. (2009). *Cosmopolitanism and the geographies of freedom*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Hennon, L. (2000). The construction of discursive space as patterns of inclusion/exclusion: Governmentality and urbanism in the United States. In T.S. Popkewitz (Ed.), *Educational knowledge: Changing relationships between the state, civil society, and the educational community* (p 243-261). Albany: State University of New York Press.

Houser, N. O. (January 01, 2005). Arts, aesthetics, and citizenship education: Democracy as experience in a postmodern world. *Theory and Research in Social Education, 33(1)*, 45.

Jenlink, P. M. (January 01, 2007). Globalization and the evolution of democratic civil society: Democracy as spatial discourse. *World Futures, 63*, 5-6.

Kalantzis, M. & Cope, M. (2000). Changing the role of schools. In B. Cope and M. Kalantzis (Eds.), *Multiliteracies: Literacy learning and the design of social futures* (p. 121-149). London: Routledge.

Kammen, M (2007). Culture and the state. In Blake, C.N. (Ed.), *The arts of democracy: Art, public culture, and the state* (p. 69-97). Washington, D.C: Woodrow Wilson Center Press.

Mans, M. E. (January 01, 2000). Symposium on arts education in Africa - The African context. *Arts Education Policy Review, 101(5)*, 9.

McLaughlin, J., Kentucky Alliance for Arts Education., & Kentucky Arts Council. (1990). *Building a case for arts education: An annotated bibliography of major research*. Lexington, KY: Kentucky Alliance for Arts Education.

Mills, C. W. (1959). *The sociological imagination*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Mills, K. (2011). *The multiliteracies classroom*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Mitchell, P., & Ziegler, F. (2007). *Fundamentals of development: The psychology of childhood*. Hove, England: Psychology Press.

Nancy, J.-L. (2010). The senses of democracy. *The truth of democracy*. New York: Fordham University Press.

Navoa, A. (2000). The restructuring of the European educational space: changing relationships among states, citizens, and educational communities. In T.S. Popkewitz (Ed.), *Educational knowledge: Changing relationships between the state, civil society, and the educational community* (p 31-58). Albany: State University of New York Press.

Papastephanou, M. (August 01, 2005). Globalisation, globalism and cosmopolitanism as an educational ideal. *Educational Philosophy and Theory, 37*(4), 533-551.

Peet, R. (March 08, 2002). Teaching global society. *Radical Teacher,* 62(62), 8-10.

Piaget, J., & Inhelder, B. (1969). *The psychology of the child*. New York: Basic Books.

Popkewitz, T. S., & Lindblad, S. (January 01, 2004). Historicizing the future: Educational reform, systems of reason, and the making of children who are the future citizens. *Journal of Educational Change, 5,* 3, 229-247.

Porter, P., & Vidovich, L. (2000). Globalization and higher education policy. *Educational Theory, 50*(4), 449-466.

Prosterman, L. (2007). Subtle, intangible, and non-quantifiable: Aesthetics, law, and speech in public space. In Blake, C.N. (Ed.), *The arts of democracy: Art, public culture, and the state* (p. 275-304). Washington, D.C: Woodrow Wilson Center Press.

Radcliffe, S. A. (2006). *Culture and development in a globalizing world: Geographies, actors, and paradigms*. London: Routledge.

Roy, K. (2003). *Teachers in nomadic spaces: Deleuze and curriculum*. New York: P. Lang.

Schriewer, J. (2000). World systems and the interrelationship networks: the internationalization of education and the role of comparative inquiry. In T.S. Popkewitz (Ed.), *Educational knowledge: Changing relationships between the state, civil society, and the educational community* (p 305-343). Albany: State University of New York Press.

Sleeter, C. E., & Grant, C. A. (1987). An analysis of multicultural education in the United States. *Harvard Educational Review, 57*(4).

Smith, R. A., Simpson, A., & Getty Center for Education in the Arts. (1991). *Aesthetics and arts education*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Torres, A.A. (2000). Public education, teachers' organizations, and the state in Latin America. In T.S. Popkewitz (Ed.), *Educational knowledge: Changing relationships between the state, civil society, and the educational community* (p 31-58). Albany: State University of New York Press.

Tyack, D. B., & Cuban, L. (1995). *Tinkering toward utopia: A century of public school reform*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.

Vygotskiĭ, L. S., & Cole, M. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Weismann, D. L. (1970). *The visual arts as human experience*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J:
        Prentice-Hall.

Whitty, G., Gewirtz, S., & Edwards, T. (2000). New schools for new times? Notes
        towards a sociology of recent education reform. In T.S. Popkewitz (Ed.),
        *Educational knowledge: Changing relationships between the state, civil society, and the
        educational community* (p 31-58). Albany: State University of New York Press.

---

[1] See also Freire (1973) for the origin and explanation of "empty receptacle."

[2] See also Drury & Reicher, 2011 with regards to the significant impact of cultural reification; and Appiah (2006) for an explanation of the dangers of cultural reification to cosmopolitanism.

[3] See also Gee (1990, p. 165). For a discussion of "filtering," Gee's concept that echoes Appiah's "cumulative record of socialization," and describes it as a social process.

[4] See also Hennon (2000) for an explanation of how the concept of "us"and "them" affects the construction and extent of discursive space.

[5] See also Mitchell & Ziegler (2007) for a more recent analysis of psychological development; and Vygotskii & Cole (1978) for a discussion of how formative experiences affect long-term psychological development.

[6] Dewey delineates the concept of "collateral learning" in both *Democracy and Education* and *Art as Experience*, referring to it as the process by which students indirectly acquire knowledge.

[7] See also Kalantzis and Cope 2000 (p. 125) as Mill's source, and for a more complete explanation of pluralistic education.