Globalization can be roughly described as the phenomenon through which goods, technology, culture, language, food and even people, peculiar to one part of the world flow into another. Technological innovations have expedited globalization.

Arjun Appadurai holds that this phenomenon has rewritten social formations and cultural affinities are characterized by what he terms as “-scapes” (“ethnoscape, mediascape, technoscape, financescape, and ideoscape”), that is, communities with a common thread linking them together rather than nationalities or physical, geographical borders. “Deterриториализацию”, “дiasporic public” and “translocal communities” are some of the terms he uses to associate this process of people living in different territories from their origin: this multicultural system of living, non-uniform patterns of development in various places, and technological advancements in communication and transport, have brought about inequalities in relationship hierarchies. This means that some communities dominate over others, and some financial markets profiting while others are left behind. In Australia too, the process of globalization is visible, in the way Australian universities have opened their doors to take in multicultural students, and facilitating job opportunities to include wide diasporas of the world communities. The differences in lifestyles, in beliefs between the communities do breakout as violent crimes periodically, as exemplified in the crimes against Indians in Australia, recently. The future should be able to find more peaceful ways of living together with the understanding gained from these redefined affinities.

According to Agostino Portera, the fall-out of Globalizations is that, “the development of relations between nation states and people with different cultural backgrounds seems to give a new connotation to the phenomenon of migration, inasmuch as its transient, marginal or even ‘disease-inducing’ overtone gives way to its proper structural and systemic features.” (p. 481). Education has been, inevitably, affected by this phenomenon.

Portera illustrates that ‘intercultural’ form of education holds more advantages than ‘multicultural’ or ‘trans-cultural’; even though ‘multicultural’ education was formulated with the intention to understand the similarities and differences between cultures, it still served to recognize the minorities as the ‘others’ and also formed a hierarchy of sorts. He discards ‘transcultural’ education as being inherently “fragmentary” and having the potential to lead to “cultural imperialism” (p.484).

‘Inter-cultural’ education on the other hand is a monumental change in the basic perspective – the aim is to “both to know and to ‘tolerate’ people with different cultural backgrounds and live in peaceful co-existence” (p. 485). Rather than being views as a “risk” or “danger”, the ‘other’ person is viewed as “enrichment” for “personal and social growth” (p. 485). As the name “Interaction” suggests, the different cultures are made to practically ‘interact’ with each other, and facilitate transfer of ideas, languages, religious views etc with appropriate changes in curricula, and also in the teachers being more open-minded. This enables a more congenial atmosphere for imparting of knowledge and learning on the level ground of education.

Inter-cultural education is a good tool to ease the tensions arising from “ethnocentric or racist” differentiations, because, it enables one to accept early-on that, differences are imperative to successful and peaceful co-existence in a globalized world. For example, increasingly students are taking to work in India, Bangkok, or the Gulf after studies, to get exposed to those cultures.