INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF URBAN EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP
IJUEL

2008, Volume 2
16 – 29

On what side of "International" are we? Using cognitive frames to explore educational leaders' challenges in internationalizing education

ELIZABETH MURAKAMI-RAMALHO
University of Texas - San Antonio

Issues perceived as promoting or hindering the efforts to internationalize education using cultural cognitive frames –constructions based on culturally influenced perceptions—are explored in this study. A fast-paced global economy demands prompt leadership, especially in urban areas, in order to prepare educators and students for global citizenship. However, tensions in the adoption of international perspectives in education are perceived, including differences between rural and urban exposures to international issues, cognitive frames originated in the grammar of schooling, and contemporary socioeconomic and political influences. Using examples of educational leaders in American international schools, it is suggested that educators benefit from "looking in" to culturally established frames, as well as "looking out," examining exogenous sources in order to expand knowledge that proactively supports the preparation of global citizens.

> So, let us keep the parameters of what we are talking about clear. The parameters are beyond the oceans that surround us, and they are beyond our time here on earth. The parameters we are discussing reverberate into the future.
>
> Oren Lyons, Six Nations Iroquois (1991), in his speech about sovereignty and the natural world economy

The fast-paced global economy has demanded prompt leadership from schools in order to better prepare educators for international issues and, in turn, prepare students as global citizens. However, the issue of internationalizing education is complex when considering the preparation of students to function in a globalized society. For educational leaders in urban areas, it involves more than curricula expansion, or multiple language offerings. It may require an evaluation of contemporary world systems that pushes for globalization and whether these work for the interest of the communities served. This study offers an exploration of the issues of internationalizing education using cultural cognitive frames–subliminal constructions based on context-based culturally influenced perceptions—and how these influences promote or hinder the internationalization of education.

Using the example of U.S. educators teaching in K-12 schools overseas (Murakami-Ramalho, 2008), I examine individual and collective meanings related to international issues. Initially, I explore the meaning of internationalization, and then discuss tensions in the adoption of

international perspectives in education. Subsequently, it is considered that the value of micro and macro examination of internationalization is warranted for educational leaders, with leaders “looking in” to examine whether the idea of internationalization inspire ideas of protection of borders to fit localized interests in educational institutions, as well as “looking out” in the aim to understand the influence of global trends pushing individuals and schools toward globalization.

What Side of *International a*re We?

Focusing on the word *international* is problematic. The word *international* produces cognitive frames that may deploy us from our place of origin into a pyrotechnical universe that can range from adventuristic places for vacations, to exotic foods and customs (Touraine, 2000). Because the word international can convey a variety of meanings, it has numerous and controversial perspectives (Knight, 2004).

International, or internationalism as a movement, for example, is defined by ideas of agreement, support, and cooperation (Liebeck & Pollard, 1994). However, it also seems to generate ideas of differentiation from the local to the foreign. Internationalism, however, seems to convey controversial overtones when used as a contrast to *nationalism*, which carries the idea of patriotism, a concept that favors resistance to external control because individuals may feel threatened when connecting ideas of outsiders and the nation. Internationalism, then, ceases to have a supportive and collaborative tone, and begins to revolve around a political or nation-state tension. This mind frame is especially meaningful when we position ourselves as individuals belonging to a specific place of origin. We are inclined to delineate a line separating *us* from the *others*, placing ourselves on the local side of the line and placing everyone or everything else that is *different* on the international side.

Cognitive scientists such as Lakoff (2004) have explained that when we hear a word—like international, in this case—we build a mental structure, or frame, that guides the “way we reason and consider what counts as common sense” (p. xv). A concept can only make sense when it is instantiated in the synapses of our brain, added Lakoff, referring to how we “connect facts to long-term concepts that structure how we think” (p. 17). That means that if the concept *international* can be connected only to an individual’s mental model of war images or catastrophes, the concept international as collaboration among countries will make no sense. Cognitive frames, Lakoff said, also shape the way we act, and when we act within collective frames, we define our culture and expand into action, exercising our beliefs on societal levels.

Framework: Drawing the Line

Knight (2004) defined internationalization as the “process of integrating an international, intercultural or global dimension into the purpose, functions or delivery of education” (p. 11). Because a number of cultural interpretations and variations can be given to the process of integration in international education, culture is considered here as a significant factor in the conception of a cognitive frame. Culture is perceived here as patterns of behaviors that are acquired and transmitted by cognitive frames over time, which become “generally shared within a group and are communicated to new members of the group in order to serve as a cognitive guide or blueprint for future actions” (Kluckhorn & Kroeberg, as cited in Hallinger & Leithwood, 1996, p. 107). These symbols are translated through action and shared cultural interpretations. Cultural interpretations, however, can vary between countries and also within regions of the same country. Internationalization of education is considered here as being intrinsically connected to movements toward globalization (Basiga, 2004; Burbules & Torres, 2000; Knight 2004; Taylor, 2000).

Whereas some scholars perceived globalization as universalization and commodification of knowledge, including issues of technology, communication, culture, health care, heritage, genetic codes, and natural resources (Barlow, & Clarke, 2002; Basiga, 2004; Reiser & Davies, 1944 as cited in Scholte, 2000; Smith, 2000), others believe that globalization relates to political and economic processes (Burbules & Torres, 2000; Carnoy, 1999; Gabbard, 2003). Each of these believed involves people (who is important), and things (what is important). In the U.S., one of the difficulties is defining *who* and *what* counts in terms of preparing students for socioeconomic pushes for globalization. At the same time we may consider what is foreign as threatening national boundaries, we are daily consumers of international goods, like clothing, fuel, and technology (our frames of what counts may be devoid of *who* counts).

In educational leadership, culturally sensitive studies are deemed as a significant contribution to the field (Greenfield, 1995; Hallinger & Leithwood, 1996; Heck, 1998), especially when considering the societal culture as the source of the values that shape the goals in education (Hallinger & Leithwood, 1996, p. 11). If the societal culture is becoming more diverse, the cognitive frame may also have to shift with regard to the way education is delivered, with increased improvements in diversity practices and examinations of educational policies and practices, especially across countries. Black and Mendenhall (1990) highlighted the importance of developing cross-cultural skills in enhancing job performance. Educational leaders are then at the crossroads between socioeconomic and cultural changes and the effective preparation of teachers and students in their communities. They need to be open to new trends and examine the local and global landscape. They need to translate these new trends into best practices and programs, in order to be better prepared to make decisions that will advance their communities.

Tensions in the Adoption of International Perspectives in Education

In this section some of the tensions perceived in the adoption of international perspectives in education are identified. These tensions are perceived as challenging educational leaders to reexamine cultural assumptions at a personal before the professional level. Tensions include considerations of rural vs. urban exposure to international issues, established cognitive frames originated in the grammar of schooling, and contemporary socioeconomic and political influences.

In rural or less cosmopolitan areas, modernization may still be perceived as questionable benefit to local communities. Globalization may be seen as less meaningful, threatening nationalism and citizen loyalties (Burbules & Torres, 2002). The risk of framing a dividing line in this case is that, as a group, we may collectively determine *who* and *what* does not count. By cognitively sorting what counts, there is a risk of assuming that there is little to learn from exogenous knowledge. When we determine that there is little to be learned from external sources, we begin to create distinctive cognitive frames in which the line of *who* or *what* counts becomes discriminatory and endogenous.

In urban areas, people are more exposed to the promise of globalization as generating a more prosperous and egalitarian world through education. In urban settings, the recurrent presence of international visitors and the apparent success of cross-national negotiations are reminders that efforts to internationalize education are a positive opportunity for modernization through student’ knowledge acquisition. So, education mirrors cosmopolitan movements in which "education mirrors society in the sense that social change generates educational change" (Anderson, 1991, as cited in White, 1999, p. 168).

The Grammar of Schooling

In the U.S., the bureaucratization of schooling that began in the 19th century was perceived as an urban social and economic necessity. The grammar of schooling, a term used to define the structures, rules, and practices that organize the work of instruction, was a consensual template of a “real school”—a template maintained by public educational institutions for at least the last two centuries and that might still be at play. A free but systematized education for all was instilled to accommodate the waves of immigrant workers in the country—with the intention of bringing an “urban-industrial order” and supplying the modernized society with operative workers (Tyack, 1974). In this context, “educational leaders have tried to transform immigrant newcomers and ‘outsiders’ into individuals who matched an idealized image of what an ‘American’ should be” (p. 235). The ‘Americanization’ rhetoric was often messianic, according to Tyack, “a mixture of fear outweighed by hope, of a desire for social control accompanied by a quest for equality of opportunity for the newcomers” (p. 232). The Americanization ideology was less than idyllic, however, as the new pluralistic society concurrently developed a culture of ethnocentrism and bigotry inside and outside the schools.

Teachers and administrators often would create a sense of “shame” at being foreign, calling children “little kikes,” for example; children would replicate the behavior, calling each other “Japs” or “Polacks,” and making fun of the Chinese boys’ pigtails, or the Mexican children’s tortillas. Tyack affirmed that “prejudice, clinging to old cultures, and poverty had much to do with a lack of fit between ethnic groups and the schools” (p. 248). Differences in ways of being, class, religion, and cultural traditions may have added to the other strong influences responsible for the educational misfit that contributed largely to the marginalization of people in urban contexts.

This is but a small example of a much larger and systemic discrimination (Kozol, 1991) process that does not even include the lives and experiences of Native, Mexican, and African Americans. Through the use of cognitive frames to define and depict who is on the “other side,” people of color were “framed.” With a crafted cognitive frame that connected them to savages, Native Americans were among those most victimized by disastrous federal educational policies. Decimated, removed and banned to enclosed sterile spaces, Native Americans were to be stripped of any cultural or religious beliefs, self-importance, or lifestyle. Seeking to transform “the other” into decent American citizens, the federal government created the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) and boarding schools for Indians that were intended to, according to Richard Henry Pratt (1973), “kill the Indian and save the man.”

A cognitive frame of laziness was crafted around Mexican Americans, who often were used as cheap labor and deported when not needed. Often poor and migratory, in California, for example, they were once considered “Indian” and therefore subject to school segregation. Such conditions limited Mexican Americans’ voice in their children’s schooling, creating an underlying impression that these children were different and needed minimal education, often conforming to their lower class situation. Although successful (Donato, 2000, p. 81) and holding prominent positions in the service of society, Mexican Americans still encounter much discrimination.

Similarly, African Americans continually have been framed in exclusionary social processes in their efforts to participate in society. Often connected to inappropriate behavior in schools, African Americans still live in the shadows of misguided promises, with ill-funded and segregated schools. Desegregation movements did little to improve this landscape, with alternative schools used as a place to “warehousing” especially African American students whose behavior was deemed inappropriate for mainstream schools (Dunbar, 1999; Wilson, 1987). Male students in particular found schools continuously sending them the message that the system had given up on them (p. 1).

Socioeconomic and Political Influences

While a local or regional understanding of the benefits of globalization in the U.S. is still to be determined, from a worldwide level, the value of globalization is market-driven through corporate decisions. Controversial frames toward globalization movements, then, may be shaped by political and socioeconomic states and the country's relationships with more or less developed countries. This relationship, sometimes originating from historical colonization movements, may also carry notions of supremacy, especially in more developed countries. This means that, whereas the word *international* may still be interpreted as *exogenous* most frequently in affluent Anglo-Saxon countries, globalization has proven to at least be economically profitable.

The same globalization movement that seemed to carry promises of prosperity and equality in some cases also enhanced economic disparity, with poor countries becoming poorer, and rich countries becoming richer (Basiga, 2004; Burbules & Torres, 2000). Countries in South America or Africa, for example acknowledge that they are "financing the long-term wealth of the rich countries" (Wade, as cited in George, 1992, p. 208), especially when analyzing how the International Monetary Fund (IMF) engine influences education in those countries. Countries that find themselves trapped in an economic hierarchy of sorts seem then to value the internationalization of education not only as a means to seek parity of knowledge and prosperity, but as a necessity in order to empower new generations to improve the economic landscape of their countries. These are but a few examples that illustrate the landscape of systemic discrimination that limits the integration of international issues in education.

Discussion: Educational Leaders at a Crossroads

In the face of these tensions, educators, especially in urban areas, are challenged to evaluate contemporary world systems and determine how to prepare students to merge successfully into these world systems at local, national, and international levels. Unarguably, educators are challenged to learn faster in order to make decisions to deliver programs that prepare students to grapple with international issues. Learning to adapt the acquired knowledge is one of the challenges educators face in the third millennium. Elevating learning is paramount in a fast-paced global economy, and the challenge demands prompt leadership. Educational leadership requires "looking in" to culturally established frames, examining and questioning assumptions and beliefs, as well as "looking out," learning from exogenous sources in order to achieve universal and inclusive levels of knowledge to proactively prepare and support schools in the preparation of global citizens.

Looking In: Internationalizing Education

By using the word *international* as a starting point, internationalization of education can be examined through the values and opportunities provided by educational leaders to improve practice. Bennett (1993) suggested that there is significant growth when people become more culturally aware of experiences they once considered ordinary. He claimed that this awareness is the first step in perceiving similarities across cultures, instead of focusing on differences. Perceiving similarities in this case does not mean homogenization through deculturalization. Instead, commonalities of purpose are sought, with goals of educational attainment for the refinement and enlightenment of societies. Examples from educational leaders in American international schools offer yet another opportunity to examine theories of action (Argyris & Schon, 1974), challenging inconsistencies between espoused theories and theories-in-use relating to the perception of international relations. From our home countries, *international* may mean someone or something that originates anywhere but our home, our place. However, what happens

when we move to another country? Will the new place still be international? Haven't we now become international ourselves?

Reframing the national and international frames within the U.S. has been an issue of contentious debate. Hence the importance of "looking into" the educator's frames, including some espoused societal beliefs. Strong leadership initiatives in U.S. educational policies in the mid-20th century, for example, showed mounting improvements in reframing cultural practices that perpetuated racial and ethnic lines to the detriment of children of color (Spring, 2004). However, the adoption of policies was slow in comparison to the fast-paced, globalized socioeconomic movement that is concurrently pushing the internationalization of education.

In a study of 30 educators in American international schools (Murakami-Ramalho, 2008), it was found that educators and school administrators arriving in a new country and school had to become familiar with the job and the school population, but also learn to survive in the new country where a new language, directions, and customs differed significantly from their own. These educators, who once served in U.S. public schools, were now part of more than 150 American international schools on all continents. Their input was perceived as highly relevant because they seemed challenged to reflect on their overseas experience. Although many researchers have provided detailed portraits of education in different countries, it is often difficult to adapt the lessons to fit urban, suburban, or rural school settings in the U.S. However, it was noted that educators in American international schools evidenced new perceptions about leadership, including new ideas about leadership for diversity in U.S. public schools.

When educators move to American international schools, their primary intentions often are challenged. American international schools offer a familiar school setting for U.S. educators, but they are immersed in a not-so-familiar society. These educators often need to revisit their cognitive frames as both professionals and citizens, in order to function successfully in this new environment. Instantly after arrival, these educators must be ready to welcome new parents and provide a sense of safety to staff, faculty, and the community-at-large. In this environment, students from 40 or more countries are served, in a unique academic environment, including preparation for cultural adaptation and social participation in the host society.

An interesting phenomenon has been taking place in American overseas schools during the last decade. A number of these schools have been considering adding the word *international* to their names. Three circumstances seemed to have motivated this change: (a) recognition that these schools provide an international curriculum, often through an IB program, which has become, even in some schools in the U.S., a curriculum known to prepare students for the global world; (b) recognition of the increasingly diverse population in these schools, and in some cases a decrease in American students; and (c) growing discomfort, in comparison with 4 to 5 years ago, with publicly sustaining an American identity overseas.

Educators' adapting in American international schools naturally includes the conceptual construction of America as the source of their own roots in relation to the new environment. An example of such a construction was evident in this study in a teacher's attending a faculty meeting about respecting the values and rights of international groups represented in the school. After the meeting, the school administrator shared that:

> Educators may walk into an American international school with a set assumption of what *international* means. When you ask a U.S. educator new to living overseas what international means, the perception is of "anything else but us." So, in a short session with the faculty, we got into this whole discussion of American vs. International, and one American teacher asked, "Are you saying that because I am an American I can be an international, too?" –that's the dilemma we get in here. (Personal interview, 2004)

Not quite clear about the definition of *international*, the teacher asked whether as an American, she was considered international. This candid but powerful example of defining representation of self speaks of societal constructions. Because in the U.S. cognitive frames are constructed through color and ethnic divisions, this educator was challenged by these cognitive frames now that she was a member of an international community.

Another educational leader who had served in American international schools for quite some time noticed that, as an international educator, he could perceive the benefits of this experience: "I would say that, in general, educators who lived overseas are sometimes more poised and more experienced than their domestic counterparts, possessing a wider horizon and broader perspective about school and about global events" (personal interview, 2004). After evaluating his role as an educator overseas, he stated that he was proud of being a visible example of the American culture. "But I also recognized," he continued,

> that we are not the only story in the world, and that there are many other stories, and many other cultures that all which blended together can make a stronger whole in the same way that I think that one of our strengths in the U.S. is the diversity of its population, and its diversity of ethnic backgrounds; that stands true for international schools. It's diversity that makes us strong. (Personal interview, 2004)

Experienced educators in international schools noticed that families new to the international environment bring with them a natural kind of fear that diversity is going to weaken the fabric of the American culture. "I don't think it's true, either the opposite it's true, but people who'd never had exposure to other cultures can be understandably hesitant or afraid or nervous, xenophobic to embrace diversity" attested one of the administrators. Administrators in these schools mentioned limitations in teacher preparation in order to understand the students' potential. This may be the case with educators who are afraid that students will not be able to participate in the school system until they become more English proficient, often using assimilation techniques to integrate students. "Assimilation does not mean integration," stressed an administrator. "If you never had English as a second language (ESL) students in your class, or you had no training on how to deal with diversity, then you feel as though you're overwhelmed—and the immigrants and the native children are not being well served," the same administrator explained.

The administrators studied highlighted that those serving in public schools in general tend to be overwhelmed about not having enough schools, enough resources, too many students, not enough teachers, and especially inadequately trained teachers; adding diversity to that mix is inevitably perceived as a source of additional stress. Overwhelming feelings from educators act as an impediment to learning more about diversity issues.

Even though there are well-established training programs in cross-cultural understanding in business and marketing relations (Black & Mendenhall, 1990; Hibler, 2004), those are rarely included in the list of priorities in school wide professional development. Hiebler, for example, noticed that diversity training may even be perceived as anti-American, especially by those who do not consider themselves members of any minority group. She affirmed that "as diversity training becomes more global in nature, it must keep pace by recognizing the ways that different national values influence training participants" (p. 7).

The perceptions of educators in K-12 American international schools shed light on the meaning of their overseas experiences, and how such experiences influence pre-established cognitive frames, especially about leadership for diversity in U.S. public urban schools. Such an exercise was perceived as enriching the field of explorations around cross-cultural paradigms (Murakami-Ramalho, 2002). While considering issues of culture and leadership, Hallinger and Leithwood (1996) acknowledged that "cultural values vary across nations, [and] we would expect cross-

cultural variation in the educational goals of societies as well as the normative practices aimed towards their achievement” (p. 109). Further, the authors suggested that educators shift their focus to leadership values conducive to working together within an organization for successful outcomes in schools as part of a larger society.

Educational leaders in American international schools are seen here as influential role models and decision makers who are able to provide insights into domestic communities, including teachers, students, and their families. Such insights might complement the paramount efforts made by scholars and practitioners advocating for diversity. Initiatives and legislation such as *Brown v. Board of Education*, civil rights and affirmative action, and Title IX (Sadker & Sadker, 1995; U.S. Dept. of Education, 1997) have inspired all-inclusive practices. Title IX, for example, propelled educators to think more deeply about enriching their practice and improving the school environment for students’ success.

Looking Out: The Influence of Global Trends in Education

Social reality as cognitive frames occurs through parallelisms, according to Burbules and Torres (2000): “in things and in minds, in fields and in habitus, outside and inside of agents” (online, ¶ 3). So, by looking in—into the minds of educators—tensions were identified in this study in the way they conceptualized mental frames in internationalizing education. *Looking out*, however, is equally imperative. As possibilities are considered for the improvement of education through educators’ awareness of self in educators, it is important to take a look outside the school boundaries, to understand how globalization movements are pushing the internationalization of education. To look outside of schooling as a support service for local communities, it is necessary to acknowledge schools as public institutions. Burbules and Torres (2000) explained that as schools officially became of public concern, schools were and still are evaluated economically—considered for their costs and benefits, sources of expenditures, as well as investments.

Public accountability, then, projects the school in a network of responsibilities at the state and national levels. However, it is not always clear where or how policies at the state and national levels have been influenced and adopted. Globalization experts have asserted that some of the policies and regulations have been implemented to propel the globalization movement (Burbules & Torres, 2000; Carnoy, 1999; Valverde, Bianchi, Wolfe, Schmidt, & Houang, 2002), with standardized tests being seen as efficient instruments that allow for performance evaluation and cross-comparison with other countries.

Cross-country analyses of educational strategies, styles, and achievement are systematically being developed. The Third International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMMS) (Valverde et al., 2002), among other equally compelling studies, showed how the “quality of national education systems is increasingly being compared” (Carnoy, 1999, p. 16), with special focus on science and mathematics. By increasing accountability and supporting high-stakes testing, national evaluation measures are obtained. The emphasis on measuring school outcomes did not occur spontaneously, Carnoy said. Measuring outcomes has been pushed by organizations such as the International Educational Assessment, the American National Center of Educational Statistics, the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, and the World Bank. All of these organizations advocate for a highly quantitative view of progress through education in times of economic competition and efficiency models for social productivity.

At the same time, scholars have been cautioning about the effects of privatization and decentralization in all sectors (Basiga, 2004; Burbules & Torres, 2000; Carnoy, 1999). The privatization of education as a model for increased local involvement from parents and site-based management in schools has been accompanied by a reduction of the welfare state. Burbules and Torres explained that this restructuring process is leading to a model of exclusion of a large part

of the society, and in particular, "women living in poverty in developed and developing countries" (online, p. 4). So, although globalization is economically attractive on a world scale, it has been creating alarming fragmentation and division for people at local levels. Drastic cutbacks in social spending on education, for example, are dramatically increasing the gap between the rich and the poor, sorting students between market and investment players, and low-skill laborers.

Changes are occurring at the national and international levels, and rationales driving internationalization and globalization are occurring at the political, economic, and institutional levels (Knight, 2004). Ignoring the globalization movement no longer is an option if freedom to determine domestic policies is being reduced. The freedom to determine local policies is subject to the country's involvement in favoring economic exchanges at the global level and the country's influence in economic and political negotiations. Perceiving the privatization of public services as a choice also requires further examination if it is limiting access only to those who can afford it, ignoring civic commitments to public education (Burbules & Torres, 2000).

Conclusion

This study is but a much-needed reexamination of cognitive frames that have been developed to shape our society in relation to international issues. It is a small attempt to contribute to the field of schooling through the examination of cognitive frames that influence the adoption of idea to internationalize education. It is possible that cognitive frames that suggest international issues as threatening or counterproductive negatively influence the adoption of internationalization in education. Cautionary reactions should certainly be considered before internationalizing education, especially if there are implications for influencing the tender minds and hearts of children.

However, this study also considers educational leaders' responsibility for discontinuing the perpetuation and pervasiveness of cognitive frames that are not conducive to preparing children for globalized societies, especially if these cognitive frames result in pressure to exclude these same children from being part of a healthy and productive society. The responsibility of educational leaders to make the *cognitive unconscious* visible, then, is of utmost importance because it can only enlighten future members of the society. It is a long and arduous process that begins with one's examination of adopted historical paradigms. Reframing cultural givens, and language of use created around notions of supremacy are some of the areas worth of examination. "Language and framing is all about metaphors," affirmed Hazen (cited as in Lakoff, 2004), "and while the basic precepts are easy to grasp, reclaiming the language requires some serious thinking and lots of practice" (p. xiv). The movement is paramount because it requires a paradigm shift that will change the established blueprint of generational practices.

Educational leaders in both rural and urban areas find themselves in the middle of complex tensions at both the micro and macro levels. At the micro level, communities push for the protection of local interests in educational institutions. At the macro level, the nation-sector seems to push for globalization (Knight, 2004) through the internationalization of capital, political negotiations, economic gains, and models of privatization reducing public resources. In fact, one of the goals of globalization is to move beyond national borders to allow capital to flow freely between countries (Basiga, 2004, Burbules & Torres 2000; Carnoy, 1999; Hirst & Thompson, 1996; Sanders, 1996; Scholte, 2000; Tujan, 1998). The decision to prepare students for the internationalization of two realities—of practices and minds—then seems to require careful examination before being implemented.

As leaders of teachers, the responsibility lies in the avoidance of leading schools through ad hoc or reactive responses, but rather a pro-active approach in the interpretation of policies and mandated reforms. Generations of teachers and students may be subject to implementations

without proper vision or guidance before schools are reframed to become comprehensive resources to prepare students as part of a fast-paced economy. In terms of internationalizing education, a solid knowledge base of current global movements should be developed, in addition to many other aspects of preparing students for the winds of change ahead.

Both K-12 and postsecondary institutions encounter the same challenges in terms of preparing their stakeholders for international levels of awareness and understanding. Even though some communities are protective of their schools and communities in terms of internationalizing practices and minds, the media permeate the lives of students inside and outside of school. Moll (as cited in Lee & Smagorinsky, 1990) highlighted the importance of building cultural wealth through providing funds of knowledge for students. Schooling is considered here as a venue for social contexts (zones of proximal development), which include technologies and communication as means for "higher-order" intellectual activity. Moll added, however, that technologies and communication should be carefully evaluated as influential cultural tools. Media such as the internet and television productions such as Channel One, for example, even if not always accurate, are reaching students within the U.S. even before teachers have the opportunity to bring issues for discussion into the classroom, thereby creating gaps between external and internal realities in schools.

In addition, learning for educators may include comprehending international issues from a critical perspective. One of the big lessons offered by some of the contemporary scholars cited here is that globalization is not an all-inclusive movement. They warn us that those who participate in economic exchanges are not necessarily including all countries. Disparities in resource allocation are occurring at a national and international level, across and beyond national borders, sorting people by economic resources and degree of access to technological advancements. Through this sorting order, some countries and local populations can serve only as low-paid laborers in the socioeconomic push. Basiga (2004) advocated for greater awareness and participation of individuals in the globalization movement, particularly in First World countries, calling for enhanced civic responsibility with regard to the negative effects of globalization. Simultaneously, more education and awareness about positive or negative effects of globalization should be provided for individuals in developing countries, stated Basiga. "It has taken centuries to realize the encroachment of globalization into world systems; it may take longer to mollify its negative effects." (p. 9)

At the micro level, teacher training may begin with reexamination of diversity as a responsibility to promote "social relationships in which difference and otherness become articulated" (Giroux, 1992, p. 7), examining and considering the possibility of incorporating issues of "otherness" in our practice. "Otherness" relates to one's personal perception that the other is only different and never similar. We need to change our cognitive frame from fear to curiosity—from, "Oh, you are different…" to "Wow, you are different!,"—as one of the participants stated in relation to building wealth and cultural capital through international experiences. Otherness is a protective mechanism that prevents us from embracing what Banks described as "the notion that the other is us and we are the other" (Tucker, 1998, para.25). Expanding on this idea, it seems that only as we incorporate otherness in ourselves are we able to recognize sameness as a civic responsibility.

Most important, the words "otherness" and "sameness" refer to cognitive frames, or dispositions, rather than prescriptive propositions to change pedagogy. In practice, otherness and sameness refer to the notion that every child learns differently in school, but our disposition as educators includes ways to help students minimize communication gaps without taking time away from academic demands. In addition, studies of leadership that combine socio-political problems and issues of diversity in contemporary times (Banks, 1994; Willower, 1994) should be considered, with the aim of ameliorating any facet of schooling that prevents students from learning.

When considering issues of international education as sophisticating the delivery of knowledge, this study is not intended to ignore the challenges of a large part of the world's population struggles with limited access to education. Nevertheless, the delivery of knowledge merits examination when considering the fact that even when delivered, education may not be preparing global citizens. In fact, peace educators (Burns & Aspeslagh, 1996; Hicks, 1988; Reardon, 1988, Selby, 1999) have argued that modernization and globalization issues can be understood only when combined with issues such as militarization, human-rights abuses, cultural conflicts, environmental destruction, and personal or inner peace (Basiga, 2004, p. 10).

Peace education advocates social justice as a means for ensuring the well-being of peoples. This approach, along with the International Baccalaureate (IB) as an all-inclusive curriculum for K-12 students, promotes cognition as a "social activity distributed with mediational tools and artifacts connected to historical and situated culture" (Lee & Smagorinsky, 1990, p. 2) that expands knowledge to international levels. For many, globalization still stands for providing equitable education and improving education for all, including the poor. Education is being developed through standardized testing and accountability movements, as well as the decentralization of schools. However, because tests are influenced by political contexts, testing and standardization do not necessarily enhance the quality of education (Basiga, 2004).

Decentralization through magnet or charter schools has not necessarily contributed to improving the quality of education. Magnet or charter schools have provided students with the choice of environments of higher-order intellectual activity, proving to be a viable formula for students and families with customized educational goals using the same public resources available for comprehensive schools. However, even though some magnet schools, for example, are well preparing students for an economically competitive new world order, it is also perceived that when they are ill-managed, these schools are enhancing segregation and negatively affecting the lives of students, especially socioeconomically oppressed groups, thereby ceasing to provide a successful future to students.

As with many studies in globalization that are entitled "introduction to globalization" in education, attempts to cover the topic in this study was perceived as only touching the tip of a colossal iceberg. Awareness of negative effects of globalization are increasingly being articulated, but the books and articles hardly cover all pertinent issues in one single piece, especially if attention is to be given to each country affected by globalization movements effecting and affecting areas from poverty to gender discrimination, to policies and the interplay of nation-state goals and objectives. Unfortunately, the limitation of works like these is that they transfer the responsibility of being better informed about global issues to the reader, and then only if there is a genuine interest in pursuing answers to international issues that visibly—or invisibly and unconsciously—affect local educational goals.

References

Argyris, C., & Schön, D. (1974). *Theory in practice: Increasing professional effectiveness*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Banks, J. A. (1994). Educating for diversity: Transforming the mainstream curriculum. *Educational Leadership, 51(4),* 4-8.

Basiga, B. (2004). Globalization and Peace Education. *Canadian Social Studies 38(3), online www.quasar.ualberta.ca/css/*

Barlow, M., & Clarke, T. (2002) *Blue gold: The fight to stop the corporate theft of the world's water*. New York: New York Press.

Bennett, M. J. (1993). Towards ethnorelativism: A developmental model of intercultural sensitivity. In M.Paige (Ed.), *Cross Cultural Orientation* (pp. 27-69). Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press.

Black, J.S., & Mendenhall, M. (1990). Cross-cultural training effectiveness: A review and a theoretical framework for future research. *Academy of Management Review, 15(1),113-136.*

Blaisdell, B. (2000). *Great speeches by Native Americans*. Mineola, NY: Dover Publications.

Burbules, N. C. (2002). The global context of educational research. In L. Bresler & A. Ardichvili (Eds.), *Research in international education: Experience, theory, and practice*. New York: Peter Lang.

Burbules, N. C., & Torres, C.A. (2000). *Globalization and education: Critical perspectives.* London: Routledge.

Burns, R., & Aspeslagh, R. (Eds). (1996). *Three decades of peace education around the world*. New York: Garland.

Carnoy, M. (1999). *Globalization and educational reform: What planners need to know*. Paris: UNESCO, International Institute for Educational Planning.

Donato, R. (2000). "No one here to put us down:" Hispano education in a southern Colorado community, 1920-1963. In L. Cuban & D. Shipps (Eds.), *Reconstructing the common good in education: Coping with intractable American dilemmas* (pp. 68-81). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Dunbar, C. (1999). African American males and participation: Promising inclusion, practicing exclusion. *Theory Into Practice, 38,* 3-8.

Edwards, R., & Usher, R. (2000). *Globalisation and pedagogy*. London: Routledge.

Freire, P. (1973). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Seabury.

Gabbard, D. (2003). A nation at risk—Reloaded, part I. *Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies*, *1(2).* Available: http://www.jceps.com

George, S. (1992). *The debt boomerang: How third world debt harms us all*. London: Pluto.

Giroux, H. A. (1992). Educational leadership and the crisis of democratic government. *Educational Researcher, 21(4),* 4-11.

Hallinger, P., & Leithwood, K. (1996). Culture and educational administration. *Journal of Educational Administration*, *34(5),* 98-115.

Harris, P. R., Moran, R. T., & Moran, S. V. (2004). *Managing cultural difference.* Burlington, MA: Elsevier Butterworth-Heinemann.

Heck, R. H. (1998). Conceptual and methodological issues in investigating principal leadership across cultures. *Peabody Journal of Education, 73(2),* 51-80.

Hibler, K. (2004). Is diversity training anti-American? *Intercultural Management Quarterly, 5(1),* 7-12.

Hicks, D. (1993). Preparing for the millennium. *Alberta Global Education* 1(1), 1-4.

Hicks, D. (1988). Understanding the Field: Changing Paradigms. In D. Hicks (Ed.), *Education for Peace*. London: Routledge

Hirst, P., & Thompson, G. (1996). Globalisation: Ten frequently asked questions and some surprising answers. In *Soundings* (4). 47-66.

International Baccalaureate Organization. (2005). [On-line]. Available: www.ibo.org

Knight, J. (1994). *Internationalization: Elements and checkpoints (Research Monograph, No. 7)* Ottawa: Canadian Bureau for International Education.

Knight, J. (2004). Internationalization remodeled: Definitions, approaches, and rationales. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 8(1), 5-31.*

Kozol, J. (1991). Savage inequalities: Children in America's schools. Victoria, BC: Crown Publications.

Lakoff, G. (2004). Don't think of an elephant: Progressive values and the framing wars a progressive guide to action. White River Jct.,VT: Chelsea Green Publishing

Lee, C. D., & Smagorinsky. P. (Eds.). (1990). *Vygotskian perspectives on literacy research.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Liebeck, H., & Pollard, E. (1994). *The Oxford dictionary*. Oxford, GB: Oxford University Press.

Murakami-Ramalho, E. (2002). Globally mobile: Talking with Ruth Useem and Ann Baker Cottrell about cross-national educational experiences. *International Educator, 9,* 24-27.

Murakami-Ramalho, E. (2008). Domestic practices in foreign lands: Lessons on leadership for diversity in American international schools. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 12(1),* 76-95.

Pratt, R. H. (1973). The advantages of mingling Indians with whites. In F. P. Prucha (Ed.). *Americanizing the American Indians: Writings by the "Friends of the Indian" 1880–1900*. Cambridge, MA.: Harvard University Press, 260–271,

Reardon, B. (1988). *Comprehensive peace education*. New York: Teachers College.

Sadker, M. & Sadker, D. (1995). Failing at Fairness: How America's Schools Cheat Girls. New York: Touchstone Press.

Sanders, H. (1996). Multiculturalism, regionalism and globalization: The challenge to the world trading system. London: Routledge

Scholte, J. (2000). *Globalization: A critical introduction*. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Selby, D. (1999). Global education: Towards a quantum model of environmental education. Canadian Journal of Environmental Education, 4, 125-41.

Smith, D. (2000). A few modest prophecies: The WTO, globalization and the future of public education. *Canadian Social Studies*. 35(1) [online] http://www.quasar.ualberta.ca/css/CSS_35_1/modest_prophecies.htm.

Spring, J. (2004). *Deculturalization and the struggle for equality*. (4th Ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Taylor, P. J. (2000). Izations of the world: Americanization, modernization and globalization. In C. Hay et al. (Eds.), *Demystifying globalization*. Houndmills, Basingstoke: Macmillan, 49–70.

Touraine, A. (2000). *Can we live together? Equality and difference*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Tucker, M. (1998). Dr. James A. Banks on multicultural education. *NEA Today* [On-line]. Available: http://www.nea.org/neatoday/9809/banks.html.

Tujan, A. (1998). Crisis and globalization. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Alternatives to Globalization*. Philippines: IBON Foundation.

Tyack, D. B. (1974). *The One Best System: A History of American Urban Education*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

U.S. Department of Education. (1997). Title IX: 25 years of progress [On-line]. Available: http://www.ed.gov/pubs/TitleIX/index.html

Valverde, G. A., Bianchi, L. J., Wolfe, R., Schmidt, W. H., &Houang, R. (2002). A*ccording to the book: Using TIMSS to investigate the translation of policy into practice through the world of textbooks.* The Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

White, C. (1999). *Transforming social studies education: A critical perspective*. Springfield, IL: Charles Thomas.

Willower, D. J. (1994). Dewey's theory of inquiry and reflective administration. *Journal of Educational Administration, 32,* 5-22.

Wilson, W. J. (1987). *The truly disadvantaged: The inner city, the underclass, and public policy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Elizabeth Murakami-Ramalho is an assistant professor in Educational Leadership with an emphasis in urban education in the Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies at University of Texas-San Antonio. Her research interests include local and international leadership in urban schools and issues related to organizational learning and ecology, hybrid identities/communities, social justice, race, ethnicity, and gender.