Is development "the new peace"? Global citizenship as national obligation in postwar Guatemala

Short form title: ***Global citizenship as national obligation in postwar Guatemala***

Abstract: Amidst growing policy interest in global citizenship education, this ethnographic study examines one school's mission to foster global citizens amongst elite youth in Guatemala. Despite educators' efforts to raise awareness about local inequities and instill national identity and attachment to Guatemala, students constructed a neoliberal vision of citizenship that allowed them to disregard national politics of diversity and instead focus on efforts to become globally competitive, often at the expense of reproducing inequality and division.

Keywords: global citizenship, postwar, neoliberalism, interculturalism, development

Author Manuscript

This is the author manuscript accepted for publication and has undergone full peer review but has not been through the copyediting, typesetting, pagination and proofreading process, which may lead to differences between this version and the Version of Record. Please cite this article as doi: 10.1111/aeq.12266

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved

Received Date:
Revised Date:
Accepted Date:
Article Type: 06/30/2018

Title: Is development "the new peace"? Global citizenship as national obligation in postwar Guatemala

Title: ¿El desarrollo es "la nueva paz"? La ciudadanía global como obligación nacional en Guatemala

Michelle Bellino (University of Michigan)

Abstract: Amidst growing policy interest in global citizenship education, this ethnographic study examines one school's mission to foster global citizens amongst elite youth in Guatemala. Despite educators' efforts to raise awareness about local inequities and instill national identity and attachment to Guatemala, students constructed a neoliberal vision of citizenship that allowed them to disregard national politics of diversity. Instead, they focused their efforts on becoming globally competitive, often at the expense of reproducing inequality and division.

Abstract: Dado el interés político creciente en la educación para la ciudadanía global, este estudio etnográfico examina la misión de una escuela que intenta promover ciudadanos globales entre los jóvenes elites de Guatemala. A pesar de los esfuerzos de los educadores de crear conciencia sobre las desigualdades locales e inculcar identidad nacional y la afinidad hacia Guatemala, los estudiantes construyeron una visión neoliberal de la ciudadanía que les permitió desechar la política nacional sobre la diversidad. En cambio, centraron sus esfuerzos en hacerse competitivos al nivel mundial, a menudo a costo de reproducir la desigualdad y la división existente en Guatemala. Este estudio aboga por la importancia de enfoques críticos y reflexivos en la educación para la ciudadanía global, particularmente mientras que las ideologías neoliberales se aumentan globalmente y trascienden al sector educativo.

Running Head: Global citizenship as national obligation in postwar Guatemala

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved

Author Manuscript

Keywords: global citizenship, globalism, postwar, neoliberalism, interculturalism, development, elite

Author Manuscript

Introduction: Preparing Citizens for an "Unknown Future"

On graduation day, I arrived early with Alejandro's family and we made our way through the parking lot, cluttered with school security and students' private bodyguards. The basketball court was converted into an outdoor auditorium where hundreds of parents, grandparents, siblings, and current students filled the chairs lining the court. A small brass section of the school band played classical music as the graduating class of 2012 marched toward the stage in shimmery blue robes. Alejandro's stepfather and grandmother snapped a continuous stream of photos until Alejandro was seated on the stage with his classmates. After welcoming families, the principal began with a message about technology, globalization, and the changing times. His speech centered on the school's preparation of students for the "unknown future," which would encompass global interconnectedness, rapid technological advancements, and career paths the world was only beginning to grasp. The student valedictorian spoke about her positive experiences at the school and the close friendships that they would all remember as they parted ways across the globe. As the principal had anticipated, more than 90% of the graduating class would be studying outside Guatemala, a point of pride for the school's promises to foster global citizenship and world-minded leaders.

The ceremony concluded with an invited speaker, a prominent Guatemalan entrepreneur whom many knew as a member of one of the "thirteen families" whose extreme wealth transcended, and often directly deployed, political power. For most students at the International Academy, this figure was viewed as a hero with sage advice for budding business professionals, and a great feat that he was willing to address the graduating class. In his speech, Guatemala's future and the future of the graduating class were tied together, though less uncertain, than the landscape painted by the principal. He praised the Academy for its attention to academic rigor and students' ethical and civic development, noting that this institution cared about "developing

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved

citizens with principles, values." In what struck me as a contradiction, he then added, "we want you to be good people, but most importantly good professionals." In what followed, it became clear that good professionals according to him were good people, while good people took action to improve their country through business endeavors. The speech linked Guatemala's need for security to economic development, positioning students' capacity to professionalize as key to reaching both of these goals:

> I believe that Guatemala can develop, advance, can be a place with a job for everyone. But more than that, a safe place—where we can go out, where we can walk… without fear of violence… This will not be easy, but we need to professionalize. It is the responsibility of this country to be independent, advanced, prosperous, united. We are not yet there, but I believe that you can make some of this become a reality. It is a big responsibility… (June 30, 2012)

He alluded to an unsettled history of "bad decisions" and "suffering and pain," again pointing to development as the vehicle that would pave a better, more secure future for all Guatemalans. "We have had good Guatemalans struggling for our country, and the only thing they want is to improve their country… and this is why we have to be the best professionals in the world, to improve Guatemala." The audience stood to applaud as the man exited the stage, yelling over the crowd, "Long live Guatemala, and long live the class of 2012!"

The guest's graduation speech resembled many of the conversations I observed between teachers, school leaders, and students at the International Academy. Messages to students routinely centered on the duty of Guatemalan youth to change the country and particularly to "improve" conditions of poverty and violence through economic development. Unlike other Guatemalan high schools, where messages of civic obligation provoked discussions of unequal power, privilege, and risk (Bellino 2015, 2016, 2017), these calls to action were accompanied by efforts to deepen students' civic attachments to Guatemala, in the face of their unique capacity to traverse national borders. Alongside messages that the school promoted transnational identities and global citizenship, reflected in the presence of US teachers, bilingual instruction, and encouragement to pursue college abroad, teachers struggled to remind students that they had particular civic roles to play in Guatemala's postwar future. Questioning the global framing of the school's goals, Guatemalan teachers worried that reinforcing transnational identities and networks would threaten students' identification with the nation, echoing persistent debates

Author Manuscript

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved

within citizenship education that transnational identities compete with national affiliations (Abu El-Haj 2009, 2015; Ramirez & Meyer 2012; Torres 1998). Meanwhile, students resisted their teachers' attention to citizenship as a national construct, as national framings threatened students' transnational identities, desires to be geographically mobile, and forced them to confront histories of ethnic exclusion and hierarchy through the unresolved work of interculturalism.

After the graduation ceremony, students gathered under a decorative tent and posed for family pictures, displaying their diplomas for the cameras. Alejandro turned to me and feigned vomiting. He explained that the guest speaker's talk was hypocrisy, given the man's history of labor exploitation. "He wants us to improve Guatemala by exploiting it… Develop means exploit." As an outlier in his school community, Alejandro found profound flaws in the message that elite children of elite families not only had implicit moral permission to continue the country's history of exploitation, but that exploitation's disguise as development was construed as civic obligation. Being a "good" Guatemalan implied putting the country in a position to compete on the global market, which meant evading questions of social division and entrenched inequities.

Set within a school whose mission centers on the development of leadership and global citizenship among elite youth, this ethnographic study illustrates the tensions that ensued between the school's aim to foster global citizenship and everyday interactions between teachers—who challenged this goal, and students—who reinforced it. Young people in this setting largely conceived of their transnational interactions as a dimension of their civic duty to the nation, narrowly defined through the lens of economic development. In the process, they constructed a neoliberal vision of citizenship (Baltodano 2012; DeJaeghere 2017; Sleeter 2014) that reaffirmed students' elite status within Guatemala and their duty to challenge Guatemala's subordinate place in the global power hierarchy.

Two decades since Guatemala's peace process ended a brutal civil war, young people today experience unresolved legacies of violence, further complicated by high rates of social and political crime. At the International Academy, a private school attended by the country's elite, teachers aimed to convey students' responsibility to resolve domestic issues as future leaders, while students looked outward for ways to assert Guatemala's global competitiveness—subscribing to the idea that development was "the new peace." In the sections that follow, I

Author Manuscript

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved

outline the growing policy commitments to, and critiques of, global citizenship education as embraced by schools, nations, and international educational stakeholders. I then illustrate tensions that emerged in everyday school interactions, where national citizenship constructions conflicted with students' self-identities. Through ethnographic data, I highlight ways in which global citizenship, interpreted through the lens of global market competitiveness, became a legitimizing discourse for students to disregard the politics of diversity within Guatemala. I close with implications for reimagining global citizenship as encompassing local struggles, necessitating the intersections of global, national, and local power inequities, economic and otherwise.

Framing Education for Global Citizenship: Knowing, Belonging, and Competing in a Globalized World

Definitions and Approaches to Global Citizenship Education

Educational discourse and policy initiatives aimed at fostering global citizens have proliferated since the end of WWII, when education and "international mindedness" were posed as solutions to global conflict and key to violence-prevention (Suarez & Ramirez 2007). Today, educating for global citizenship, global consciousness, and global competencies is regarded as a goal for all citizens in all countries, regardless of their experience with globalism, democracy, or pluralism. In 2012, the United Nations' Global Education First Initiative (2012) identified global citizenship education as a priority. Global citizenship education was subsequently adopted as a Sustainable Development Goal (SDG), aiming to foster citizens who will "make informed decisions and assume active roles locally and globally in facing and resolving global challenges" (Target 4.7, no. 62). The SDGs further stated the connections between global citizenship education (GCED), education for sustainable development, peace and human rights education, intercultural education, and education for international understanding, recognizing GCED as a concept that bridges and embraces other educational initiatives with similar aims and scopes within and outside national borders. These approaches have gained more traction in recent decades amidst near unprecedented global migration and the shifting nature of armed conflict. In the face of increased mobility, radicalization, and insecurity, fostering a sense of global connectedness and interdependence has emerged as a pressing goal of contemporary times (Davies 2008; Pashby 2011).

Author Manuscript

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved

Growing interest in and commitments to educating for global citizenship have been accompanied by robust scholarship aimed at defining global citizenship, theorizing its relationship to the nation-state, globalization, and transnationalism, and questioning its meaning and feasibility in educational practice. Anthropologists and multicultural educators argue that diversity within nation-states has shifted substantially in an era of global migration, so that schools must respond by reorienting citizenship education from the nation to students' growing transnational identities and affiliations (e.g., Abu El-Haj 2009; Banks 2008; DeJaghere & McCleary 2010; Dyrness 2012; Hall 2002; Osler & Starkey 2003). Citizenship education that is oriented transnationally poses an alternative to assimilative and narrow conceptions of belonging within one nation-state, particularly for those whose identities have been historically excluded from the benefits of national citizenship. In these cases, transnational identity constructions broaden the scale for social and political belonging. Transnationalism and strategies of "flexible citizenship" also serve to "accumulate capital and social prestige" through one's "repositioning in relation to markets, governments, and cultural regimes" (Ong 1999, 6). Privileged, mobile classes have embraced the discourse of global citizenship and cosmopolitanism, while forging a global elite, buoyed by the privatization of education and elite education markets (Kenway & Fahey 2014).

Alongside strong endorsements for education that embraces cosmopolitan identities and a commitment to global justice, global citizenship and GCED have also been subject to wide critique for their framing of "exclusive and elusive" ideals that do not exist (Koyama 2015; also see Matthews & Sidhu 2005), their abstract nature (Davies 2006), and their implicitly normative and Western orientations (Pashby 2011). In part, these critiques derive from a number of competing philosophies, strategies, and goals undertaken in the name of GCED. Just as conceptions of democratic citizenship and citizenship education span "minimal" to "maximal," and beyond to more "critical" enactments (DeJaeghere 2006, 2009), GCED has been conceived along an analogous continuum. Oxley and Morris (2013) distinguish between more conventional, potentially "neo-imperial" "cosmopolitan types" of global citizenship (with political, moral, economic, and cultural dimensions), and more radical "advocacy types," encompassing post-colonial and transformative stances (305-306). Theorists conceive of these types as upholding discrete attributes or ideologies of globalization and global citizenship (304), or, in some cases, as constitutive of a developmental trajectory (Banks 2016). Across these models, transitions from

Author Manuscript

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved

"personally responsible" to "justice-oriented" (Westheimer & Kahne 2004), minimal to critical approaches (DeJaeghere 2006), soft to critical global citizenship (Andreotti 2005), or traditional to transformative outlooks (Abu El-Haj 2009, 2015; Banks 2008), imply a shared vision that equitable and just societies depend on citizens who are increasingly conscious and critical of injustice, reflective and reflexive about their positioning within global power structures, and disposed to take action on behalf of others near and far. At the "soft" (Andreotti 2005) end of the spectrum, global citizenship is often reduced to marketized expressions of international connectedness, and positive features of multiculturalism (Oxley & Morris 2013, 318), failing to examine how transnational structures generate, and derive from, power inequities operating at multiple scales.

Critical and Marketized Enactments of Global Citizenship Education

The critical ideals of GCED, when implemented through "minimal" approaches, narrowly interpret global citizenship through the lens of global capitalism and thus undermine its resonance as a shared commitment to global justice. DeJaeghere (2017) argues that neoliberal values such as individual self-reliance have contributed to educating for "entrepreneurial citizenship," where citizens are expected to "contribute to their own development, to the political stability and security of the nation, and to global economic development" (3). Within a "neoliberal social contract" (Flanagan 2008, 130), active and engaged citizens are not those who oppose injustice and work toward a global common good, but those who engage economically in the global market as producers and consumers. Camicia and Franklin (2011) similarly argue that neoliberal pressures have produced "entrepreneurial citizens," competing with calls for critical democracy in UK and Philippines curriculum. Global capitalism and global justice intimate oppositional goals for GCED, precisely because "markets do not nurture a concern for social justice" (Matthews & Sidhu 2005, 63). Yet Pashby and Andreotti (2015) view these dual agendas as "a false dichotomy," in that both draw on normative, liberal views of individual autonomy, rather than call for collective or systemic reform, or grapple with the complexity of neoliberal market forces and power relations that interact simultaneously at multiple scales, privileging some identity groups while oppressing others.

In states emerging from identity-based conflict, enhancing citizenship education is a frequently cited goal, as states seek to revise the national imaginary, and foster inclusion and unity, while promoting citizens' knowledge of rights and responsibilities in a changed society

Author Manuscript

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved

(Bellino 2014; Davies 2004; Quaynor 2012). Global citizenship frames pose an alternative to the challenges many post-conflict states face in unifying citizens across differences that were mobilized in conflict; rather than ground citizenship in national identity and a national past marred by violence, educational focus aims to broaden identifications outside national borders and shift attitudes toward citizens' shared values such as human rights, respect for diversity, and social justice (Davies 2006; Smith 2003). For example, in Northern Ireland, there have been substantial efforts to revise curriculum through the lens of "Local and Global Citizenship," in order to "move beyond disputed national identities" (Arlow 2012, 87; also see Smith 2003). Looking outside national borders can facilitate critical reflections on division and exclusion within the nation-state, by offering "safe" opportunities to compare diverse states facing similar challenges (Murphy & Gallagher 2009), and to examine interactions among states positioned in a global hierarchy (Dyrness 2014).

However, reorienting citizenship education through a global framework rarely offsets the lived experience of exclusion, which is often imposed and reinforced in schools (Abu El-Haj 2015; Dyrness 2012, 2014; Osler & Starkey 2003; Ríos-Rojas 2014; Rubin 2012). As Torres (1998) reminds us, "racism and ethnic tensions, sexism and patriarchy, and class exploitation… [are] constitutive of the daily experience of people, both at the level of the elites and the socially subordinated sectors" (85). The experience of local, national, regional, and global belonging is thus felt simultaneously and at times in contradictory ways. On the one hand, global citizens are encouraged to root themselves in the local and "expand" or "extend" their identifications outward from local communities, to the nation, and finally to global networks (Pashby 2011, 430). This outward expansion presumes that "students must have clarified and positive cultural and ethnic identifications… before they can attain clarified and reflective national, regional, and global identifications" (Banks 2016, 37). On the other hand, global citizens are imagined to place their global identity "with, if not above, … national, regional, or local memberships" (Koyama 2015, 4). Accounting for young people's multiple identifications and memberships poses a particular challenge in postcolonial and post-conflict settings, where educational emphasis on global connections, culture, and participation without attention to local intercultural relations, can subvert critical attempts to be "inward-looking" (Kymlicka 2003, 159). As DeJaeghere (2006) argues is the case in Australia, "the complex nature of democracy in multicultural

Author Manuscript

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved

societies… in which identity, values, rights, and participation are contested, warrants a critical approach to citizenship education" (297, emphasis added).

Widespread adoption of GCED at the policy level reveals inherent tensions in how this approach is implemented in classrooms, how discourses of global belonging interact with existing national relations and divisions, and questions over who has access to transnational networks, mobility, and power (e.g., Engel 2014; Goren & Yemini 2015). Importantly, educators' and students' locations within local, national, and global power structures mediate their adoption and interpretations of global citizenship discourses. A cross-national study of elite schools in the UK and former British colonies found that school actors selectively adopt certain aspects of globalization in an effort to reproduce and secure their status as members of a global elite or global capitalist class (Kenway & Fahey 2014). It follows, then, that these tensions would play out differently amongst students who conceive of themselves as locally privileged but globally marginalized. This study explores the linkages between global capitalism and GCED in an elite private school context, during a time of intense conflict in Guatemala between mega-development projects financed by international corporations and supported by elites as efforts to improve the postwar state through economic development, and popular struggles to resist these projects, asserting cultural and political rights of rural and indigenous peoples as the unresolved work of the postwar transition. As such, this case becomes a window into the global expansion of GCED and neoliberal ideology, along with the inequities and social hierarchies intertwined with these processes (Flanagan 2008; Mullings 2005).

Research Context and Methods

Elite schooling in Post-war Guatemala

This paper draws from a multisited ethnography (Marcus 1999) and "vertical," comparative case study (Bartlett & Vavrus 2014, 2017), based on fourteen months of fieldwork spanning 2010-2012 in four school-community contexts, two in rural settings and two in the urban capital of Guatemala City. Here, I focus on a single ethnographic case in order to link global policy initiatives to local interpretations in one school setting, however my analytic insights are, in part, derived from comparative theorizing, further elaborated elsewhere (Bellino 2017). Like Rubin (2016a), I analyze interactions between globally circulating policies and everyday teaching and learning that takes place in classrooms in the aftermath of Guatemala's

Author Manuscript

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved

armed conflict, underscoring the agency of teachers, students, and communities in the implementation of educational policy reform.

A consequence of colonialization and post-colonial policies aimed at nation-building, indigenous Guatemalans have long endured structures designed to isolate, intimidate, and exclude them from the benefits of state membership. Moreover, Guatemala's efforts to participate in global capitalism have routinely come at the expense of structural exclusion and dispossession of Maya and other indigenous peoples, so that "capitalist modernization has meant keeping part of the population excluded from liberal rights" (Levenson 2013, 12). These exclusionary structures became further entrenched through a period of military dictatorships, authoritarian governance, and a brutal counterinsurgency campaign backed by foreign entities including the US Central Intelligence Agency and Department of Defense, whose motives were tied to both political and economic interests (Cullather 1999). The truth commission investigating Guatemala's civil war determined that state actors committed genocide, targeting Maya peoples, communities, and culture. Though the peace process proposed socioeconomic and political reforms designed to redress historical injustices, Guatemala remains marked by extreme inequities and divisions along class and ethnic lines. Indigenous Guatemalans remain among the poorest, and most poorly educated, in Latin America (Poppema 2009), inequities deepened through the privatization of education and other social services.

The International Academy, an elite private school in Guatemala's capital city, is organized around a school mission to shape global citizens, defined broadly as "responsible members of a global society." In preparing students for a rapidly changing, globalized world, the school offers a rigorous curriculum with a suite of courses devoted to business and leadership skills. The school's promotional materials promise bilingual mastery, strong moral values, and the "professional" development of students. Most classes are taught in English by American teachers, and students are encouraged to socialize with one another in English during free time. Social studies and Spanish literature are the only courses taught in Spanish, historically by Guatemalan teachers. Many students at the International Academy believed that the school was created for global citizens, more than it aimed to shape global citizens. When I asked about their meaning of global citizenship, students identified themselves as "global" citizens because they held multiple passports, and in some cases owned properties in several states. Their initial conceptions reinforced impressions that global citizenship is limited to mobile elites with

Author Manuscript

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved

transnational ties, coupled with neoliberal conceptions that educational services should cater to consumer demands. Nearly all students' families had transnational social networks and business investments that transcended borders, though there was great variation in the number of family generations that established their ties to Guatemala. Some students were adjusting to their first months in the country, while others claimed to be descendants of the earliest European colonialists. Economic linkages to Guatemala distinguish this elite student population from schools catering to families of foreign dignitaries, whose time in Guatemala is often envisioned as temporary. Nearly the entire student population self-identified as ladino (non-indigenous), a label one teacher eventually banned despite its everyday usage within and outside of school. Likewise, there were no indigenous teachers; the only peoples I encountered at the school who identified as indigenous were custodial staff.

Methods and Participants

My entry into this elite school came largely through Alejandro, whose Kaqchikel Maya stepfather made him the closest to an indigenous student in the recent history of the school, though he did not self-identify as indigenous or ladino. Like his classmates, Alejandro also had transnational ties. His mother was Greek, but their family struggled financially, operating a local shop and paying his school fees with family remittances. His mother and extended Guatemalan family have been intimately involved in indigenous justice movements since the civil war. These aspects of Alejandro's financial and political upbringing distinguished him from the majority of his classmates, who were wealthy and politically conservative. I have been connected to Alejandro and his family since 2004 through human rights movements, and thus our relationship is embedded in our shared commitments to justice struggles. I began accompanying Alejandro to school as a participant observer in his eleventh-grade year, and I became immersed in the school context in 2012 during his senior year, when I attended classes and school activities for eight weeks. During this time, I lived with Alejandro's family, traveled to and from school with him, and spent much of our free time together, while also expanding my student and teacher networks within the school. I returned to the school at the end of the academic year for additional visits and to attend important educational milestones including graduation and the senior prom. In addition to ethnographic observations of formal and informal school activities, unstructured and semi-structured interviews with Alejandro and his classmates, teachers, and school leaders expanded my perspective on the elite schooling experience.

Author Manuscript

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved

Analysis

My initial, cross-case analysis comprised a multistep process of "open" and "closed" coding of all fieldnotes (Emerson, Fretz, & Shaw 2011), seeking to compare educational opportunities across formal and informal spaces where young people were confronted with historical injustice and positioned as citizens of a postwar, post-authoritarian democracy with particular roles to play in constructing a peaceful and democratic future. I have since reanalyzed school-based ethnographic and interview data collected in this setting, drawing more explicitly on theoretical conceptions of global citizenship and global citizenship education discussed in the previous section such as distinctions between moral, economic, and cultural orientations. Throughout the analytic process, I paid particular attention to conceptions of citizens' rights, risks, and responsibilities; youth attitudes toward historical and contemporary justice struggles; social and political self-identifications within and outside the nation; and youth actions oriented toward sustaining or transforming current social and political arrangements. In this way, my analysis accounts for a variety of frameworks relevant to youth civic development and GCED along the spectrum of "soft" (Andreotti 2005) or "minimal" (DeJaeghere 2006) to critical and transformative approaches (Abu El-Haj 2009, 2015), while also anticipating some deviation from theories, which have been developed largely in the context of stable democratic settings. Particular to this setting, I examined how civic identities and attitudes intersected with historical interpretations of colonialism and identity-based conflict, as well as societal calls for peace, security, and economic development. These sites of analysis led me to focus on tensions within and between teacher and student interpretations of global citizenship, as well as their linkages to expanding neoliberal agendas.

Researcher Positionality

Recognizing my theoretical, educational, and civic commitments to critical and postcolonial approaches to global citizenship education has been key to my analysis, as has scrutinizing my own entanglement in global fields of power through which this story unfolds. Researching elite-serving contexts, or what Nader (1972) coined "studying up," allows for an understanding of how privileged identities are constructed and maintained locally and globally (also see Gaztambide-Fernández 2009; Kenway & Fahey 2014). Becoming an ethnographic observer and participant at the International Academy encompassed unique opportunities to document the replication of elite privilege within Guatemala. Meanwhile, my global privilege

Author Manuscript

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved

was further reinforced by the corporatization of elite credentials boasting an “international” quality education taught by educators trained in the US. (See Gaztambide-Fernández 2015 for a consideration of ethical and methodological positioning within “elite entanglements”.) Less frequently raised were the ways in which my privilege as a US citizen rested on the imposition of neoliberal and structural adjustment policies that had impoverished and destabilized Guatemala politically and economically.

Although my data collection extended beyond Alejandro’s immediate social networks, it is important to emphasize that my primary student guide within this social world identified as an outsider in several ways, despite having attended the Academy since primary school. By association, I too came to signify a questioning stance toward the elite project of the school, and yet my privileged identity as a white US citizen might have also made students more at ease in revealing their assumptions and questions about race and division within and outside of Guatemala. As in all ethnographic research, the multiple ways in which I was positioned—and was able to position myself—as an “insider” and “outsider” influenced the relationships, data, and analysis represented in this study.

Findings

In this section, I highlight four dimensions of citizenship education as enacted where tensions emerged between teachers’ and students’ national and global identifications and their relationship to local, national, and global power dynamics: (1) ethnic and national citizenship labels, (2) mobility and migration, (3) indigenous cultural rights, and (4) justice struggles.

Ethnic and National Citizenship Labels

It was one month before graduation, and students had what their teacher called “one foot outside Guatemala,” referring to the majority of students who planned to pursue higher education in another country. As students’ departure grew imminent, Profe Castillo, a middle-aged career social studies teacher, became more transparent about his instructional goals with his students. At the start of a unit on citizenship, Profe outlined an essay he assigned students on “civic identity,” which would explore students’ personal, social, and national identity. He wrote these terms on the board and in a separate column, listed Guatemala’s four ethnicities as they were identified in their class text: mestizo, Maya, Xinca, and Garifuna. Any student in the room could have easily produced this official list of Guatemala’s “four pueblos,” but Profe wanted the opportunity to clarify his expectations at the outset: these were the terms he wanted to see in

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved

Author Manuscript

their essays. In a third column on the board, he wrote indio and ladino (non-indigenous), then drew an X through them, instructing students to call Mayas indigenous and to self-identify as mestizo. This was not the first time—nor would it be the last—that tensions arose in the school around how to name one's ethnic and national identity.

Students reacted almost immediately to Profe's admonition that they not use the label ladino to describe themselves. The conversation that ensued centered on students' justification that they maintain the label despite its colonial roots. When one student asked why ladino was not considered an ethnic group, Profe responded that ladino is, "a scoundrel, someone who is not worth the trouble." (May 15, 2012) The term ladino is steeped in colonial justifications of a constructed racial hierarchy, with an emphasis on European ancestry while distinguishing from the "mixed race" of mestizos. Over time the term came to signify different markers of social hierarchy within Guatemala, ranging from one's ethnic origins to linguistic ability (see Grandin 2000 for further discussion), yet in the time I spent at the school I never heard a teacher explain what made ladino a problematic term, a historical exploration that might have persuaded students to abandon the term altogether. The "four pueblos," a cornerstone of Guatemala's postwar civic narrative and a gesture toward "cosmetic" multiculturalism (Bastos 2012) did not maintain the distinction of ladino. As Profe explained to me, the curriculum shifted from ladino to mestizo because "we recognize that there is some indigenous in all of us." (May 24, 2012) Students copied the essay guidelines into their notebooks, and Profe continued. "I don't want to hear anyone calling [himself or herself] ladino in this classroom. In this classroom, ladino does not exist." Profe was not the only teacher at the school who expressed frustration over students' use of the term ladino. The other social studies teacher similarly exhorted her students to adopt the term mestizo, insisting that the term would remind them of "the relationship they have to indigenous peoples and culture." Meanwhile, the US teachers at the school did not take issue with this term, as many of them had been oriented to Guatemala as a country made up of indigenous and ladinos.

Students audibly groaned, but Profe continued calmly until the room quieted. His opening assertions about citizenship drew on classic definitions of legal status based on one's country of birth. He explained, "We are talking today about what it means to be a citizen. Who was not born in Guatemala?" Three boys raised their hands. Profe pointed to each and asked where they were born. Two were from South Korea. A boy with dark wavy hair announced that he was born in

Author Manuscript

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved

Spain, to which Profe replied with a flip of his hand, "You're more Guatemalan than a tortilla." Students laughed, and the boy grinned, seemingly unoffended. Profe continued, now emphasizing that citizenship was, in fact, "not just about where you were born, but where you grow up. It's where you have affection and respect for what is happening in your country."

Several students nodded, but Nicolás disagreed, returning to ethnic distinctions and reasserting the boundaries between non-indigenous and mixed race. He said, "But Profe, my parents are from Italy, so I am not mestizo. Therefore, I am Italian, or ladino. I don't have Indian in me, so it is not accurate for me to call myself mestizo." Other students chimed in with their own affiliations to other countries, agreeing that the label mestizo carried the implication that one had indigenous roots. Not even Alejandro felt this label captured the complexity of his hybrid identity, which he referred to as "Greek-Guatemalan," "Greek-Kaqchikel," or "Guatemalan-Greek" depending on his mood. Yet in his essay, he explained that his mother's Greek heritage, his father's mestizo identity, and his stepfather's Maya identity "mixed" to shape his own identity as mestizo. This mixing captured part of the story. Privately, he believed that his biological father was ladino and in fact this posed a problem for the family, as it had become apparent that his father held racist assumptions about Maya and other indigenous peoples. Alejandro had personal reasons for distancing himself from the label of ladino, but most of his classmates saw it as the most accurate representation of their identity. As a student named Carlos explained, "I am not Maya, so I have nothing to do with the indigenous. Therefore, I cannot be mestizo… I'm ladino, and they're indigenous. I am European." In his view, it was inaccurate to presume indigenous membership through the label mestizo; moreover, the category of ladino captured his transnational heritage. As he spoke, he moved his fists inward until his knuckles locked, demonstrating that indigenous and ladino were, and had always been, "separate."

Students' protests continued. One student noted that some of the Korean students at the school spoke Spanish no better than tourists, an allegation which made the Korean students in the room erupt into laughter and, again, did not seem to offend anyone. The student completed his thought by asking whether Korean students were really mestizo just because they lived in Guatemala? Profe did not answer the student's question directly, but this challenge led to a revised assertion that citizenship was less contingent on where you were born or where you grew up. Profe concluded, citizenship was more "about saying, I feel part of my country. I may not have the opportunity now, but in the future, I will do something for my country."

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved

Author Manuscript

Mobility and Migration

Amongst themselves, students talked often of leaving Guatemala and shedding the perpetual insecurity and unpredictability that comes with inhabiting a violent place. This was an easy conversation for high school seniors who were making post-graduation plans. But younger high school students similarly experienced ambivalence about Guatemala, despite their elite status. A tenth grader Elisa explained that she would stay with her grandmother in Guatemala if her parents returned to Portugal. An eleventh grader Miranda, who had a Swiss and Guatemalan passport, shared:

> My parents want to move. They are always saying if it doesn't get better, we're going to move. But I told them I want to finish high school here… I want to graduate, and then if things aren't better, then I'll go abroad to a university to study… Then, we'll see. (May 8, 2012)

Nicolás explained, "I'm staying here. I have my family's companies, and I'll work for them. But my parents think I should first study in England. I'm Italian, I have an Italian passport and everything, so I can study in Europe." (May 11, 2012) Later Nicolás explained that his parents were "working on" getting him a student visa for study in England and possibly a Canadian passport, so that he had additional choices for work and education before returning to Guatemala. During these conversations I tried to remain sensitive to what must have felt like challenging family decisions about what life in a high-risk society demanded, and yet I also knew that some students, like Alejandro, lacked the legal status and financial means to come and go the way his peers did.

Other students were frustrated at the idea of elites leaving the country, when Guatemala so clearly needed them. Carlos explained, "People keep saying we're a shit country, and they want to leave. I want to leave too, but not abandon my country… I think they [the government] focus only on the bad. They need to teach people to take action." (May 8, 2012) When I asked what he meant by taking action, he explained that what Guatemala needed was economic investment and development, opportunities that elites could provide. The bulletin board at the back of Profe's classroom was populated with post-it notes scattered under a question posed in large text, "What do you promise to do to make Guatemala a better country?" Students posted promises to abide by laws, to stop littering, to vote "for the president who will make Guatemala succeed," and a recurrent pledge to create jobs. Here, Carlos's ideas about investing in the

Author Manuscript

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved

country found likeminded company. Noticing my daily glances at the board, Profe pointed to the number of students who expressed an interest in contributing to Guatemala's economy as an indication of their connection to the country, one that they would come back for. Profe's statement suggested that studying abroad and exploring the world would not detract from students' ties to Guatemala, as long as people continued to remind them of their civic obligations to the country's development. In an effort to contribute to his students' civic identity development, Profe fused economic and moral obligations through neoliberal ideology while ensuring students that their elite status was secure, similar to practices of GCED in other elite classrooms (e.g., Kenway and Fahey 2014). (See Dyrness 2012, 2014 for similar efforts amongst educators to curtail migration of elite youths in El Salvador.)

Profe worried that the school's internationalist orientation tacitly exempted students from their civic duties and connections to the state, illustrating enduring tensions within citizenship education in a globalized world (Abu El-Haj 2009; Banks 2008). Privately, he explained, "We are a school for Guatemalans, but these students are also citizens of other countries... the students need to sing our anthem, they need to know their flag. How else will they learn to feel proud of being Guatemalan?" (May 24, 2012) Cultivating civic pride, loyalty, and investment in the future are explicit dimensions of Guatemala's civic education curriculum and comprise traditional aims across national citizenship education that pair capitalism and democracy as "perfect complements" (Schugurensky & Myers 2003, 2). Yet several of the Guatemalan teachers believed that the global-minded mission of the school undercut these symbolic gestures and civic rituals. As graduation neared, Profe tailored his messages to graduating seniors, explaining that he was happy to see them stay or go, but if they left that they should come back, because Guatemala needed them. "We need your experience, we need your expertise. We need you to take care of your country… You are Guatemalans for life." (May 21, 2012) Meanwhile, Alejandro worried that these statements reinforced the hegemonic logic that development depended on exploitation. He believed that the only society his friends wanted was "one where they are on top, forever." Working to increase Guatemala's global competitiveness would do little to disturb national hierarchies. In fact, it seemed to depend on them.

Indigenous Cultural Rights

On several occasions, Profe encouraged students to reflect on their privileged place in the nation's landscape. His instructional goal for these conversations was to encourage students to

Author Manuscript

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved

dialogue about ethnic, cultural, and linguistic diversity in Guatemala. At times, he launched these dialogues with provocative (and slightly misleading) statements about how indigenous labor was the primary source of the country's economy. Although his conversation starters were not always within the bounds of intercultural education, at times appropriating racist discourse to incite debate, students often resisted and redirected these efforts. Rather than questioning the historical relationship between indigenous labor and students' material wealth, discussions about diversity instead pointed to the challenges diversity posed to national unity and economic development. This economic framing secured students' interest in these discussions, though it also solidified their impressions that Guatemala's underdevelopment and lack of global competitiveness were linked to internal diversity politics and peoples' inability to "move beyond the war."

Profe's provocation that students recognize indigenous labor in the accumulation of their family wealth served to encourage students to reassert stories of essential difference and the risks one endured to economically develop the country. Several students eagerly shared stories about family members who encountered violent resistance by indigenous populations to their family's business, whether recently or in the distant past. With little inclination to link these resistance movements to historical and structural oppression, students told these stories in order to highlight how their family was unfairly punished and put at risk for being industrious and hardworking. Luis objected, "The workers protest. They organize the farmers to revolt against the fincas (estates). They don't just work the land for ladinos." (May 18, 2012) Pausing, he corrected himself to conform to the classroom rules, "Mestizos." On another occasion, a student pointed to a generic illustration in the textbook of a finca and explained that her grandparents had been murdered by indigenous resistance to ladino landowners. Other students argued that indigenous labor and agrarian expertise should not be celebrated as a source of the country's wealth and resilience, but rather as the principal reason for Guatemala's underdevelopment and lack of global competitiveness. Students retold these narratives at key moments to make several points: racism was bidirectional, indigenous people used physical violence to resist development, and the Guatemalans who risked their lives to develop the country were the ones working to improve country's global reputation against great odds from within.

In another class session, students lamented aloud that their country was known globally for violence but not for its many assets such as rich natural resources and hardworking, industrious people. The connections they proposed between violence, security, and development

Author Manuscript

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved

were complex, multidirectional, and often charged with frustration and resentment. Several students hypothesized that if Guatemala could alleviate security concerns, they would be in a position to leverage their assets and, in doing so, could become “one of the most developed countries” (May 11, 2012). In their view, what prevented Guatemala from achieving this level of competitiveness in the global market was indigenous resistance to development efforts, which they linked to violence and insecurity. Looking at indigenous struggles for historical justice and cultural rights—which some regard as the result of unresolved war legacies (Bellino 2016, 2017), students at the International Academy came to see the reasons why Guatemala was ill-equipped to compete in the global economy. Isabella explained, “it is unfortunate that they [indigenous] do not want development and modernization in our country…They want their culture to be separate.” (May 17, 2012) Another student, Carlos, believed that development would end violence by offering opportunities for economic mobility. He explained:

> To end violence, we need to focus on what’s good about the country. I think the forest industry could be treated as a matter of importance. The rural area is never developed. They never invest in the rural community, they just give them money; they don’t develop those communities… [Guatemala] is a country of forests, and we can take advantage of that… If I were President, I would say we are all united, and we need to recognize the things that belong to all of Guatemala. (May 10, 2012)

It is no mistake that Carlos’s statement referenced “the things that belong to all of Guatemala,” rejecting indigenous struggles to claim ancestral land and exercise autonomy over natural resources in their communities as yet another example of indigenous peoples’ separatism and efforts to thwart development.

Whether students conceived of development as an impetus for violence-prevention, an outcome of improved security and the creation of a more conducive environment for investors, or a national priority hindered by violence, what was shared across students was their impression that resisting development was irrational. Alejandro’s critique that development in Guatemala was historically linked to indigenous exploitation was a private reflection, one he knew not to share in the full class setting, where he would be dismissed as a Communist. In these ways, Alejandro concealed important aspects of his identity in order to achieve social inclusion in school.

Author Manuscript

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved

When Profe touched on linguistic diversity in the country, students again critiqued discourses and legislation upholding bilingual education and multi- and interculturalism as challenging Guatemala's capacity to assert itself as a developed country in the world market. After reading a textbook passage about Guatemala's diversity, one student asked whether Kaqchikel was a "real language." Profe affirmed that it was, and that Maya languages had sophisticated vocabulary and syntax. The student responded, "But they sound like animal languages." Several students burst into laughter. Nicolás clarified that it did not matter what indigenous languages sounded like or how sophisticated they were; what mattered was that "it has no value in the global market." He contrasted this to the utility of Spanish, which was spoken in multiple countries and might prove necessary "to conduct business." Profe's patience wore thin, and he put up his palms to his students as if to say, enough. Their exchange continued, with the teacher and students becoming increasingly normative in their oppositional orientations toward "language-as-problem" and "language-as-right" (Ruíz 1984, 17; also see Hall 2002).

> Profe: We don't need to look at the language for its applicability in the global market… It's about respecting the identity of the people. This is the important point here. It is a cultural right to learn in one's maternal language.
>
> Nicolás: But it doesn't serve a purpose.
>
> Profe: But for them it does serve a purpose. And we can't teach something to someone if it's not in the maternal language. How can we expect them to learn?
>
> Carlos: Look at the Korean students! Spanish is not their maternal language. But they are here learning, because Spanish is our official language. (May 17, 2012)

Like many debates in this classroom, this one was left unsettled. When I asked a student what he made of the conversation, he explained in vague terms, "They are making it so that every language is official because they say those are their rights." After class, Nicolás illustrated the strong affinity students felt toward ladino identity and how indigenous language rights threatened what they perceived to be a principal force of unity in the country. He said, "Here in Guatemala we have a big problem with unity… Now people say the indigenous should speak their own languages—in school, in trials—but Spanish is the official language here. This is bad for Guatemala." Ethnic and linguistic pluralism thus posed a "problem" for national unity and, by extension, for global development and modernization (Bastos 2012; Ruíz, 1984).

Justice Struggles

Author Manuscript

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved

Students did not uniformly accept the economic agency assigned to them as "entrepreneurial citizens" (DeJaeghere 2017) with civic obligations that conformed to neoliberal agendas (Flanagan 2008; Sleeter 2014). Alejandro and Guillermo were distressed at the close-mindedness of their classmates and created friendships through a shared critique of elitism. Guillermo explained:

> I'm so frustrated that they [my classmates] don't know what is happening around them…They only know their house and their family—that is all they know about the world. For example, if they read something about injustice, they say oh, and then it's like they forget about it right after. (May 13, 2012)

For Alejandro, the willful ignorance of his classmates served the more sinister purpose of maintaining social distance and denial that their privilege was built on a history of oppression.

In an effort to disrupt his classmates' apathy, Alejandro began a letter-writing campaign to raise awareness of indigenous struggles against mega-development projects taking place in their communities, hoping to showcase the legitimacy of concerns indigenous peoples have when they resist. His US teachers agreed to post the information outside their classrooms, but Alejandro noted that he was granted permission to post the letter but not to explain it. His Guatemalan teachers, meanwhile, did not allow him to post or explain the campaign, not even those who openly claimed the importance of building Guatemalan identity as intercultural and inclusive like Profe Castillo. This was not, in their view, the way to build Guatemalan pride and risked provoking conflict in the school. Soon after, Alejandro removed the letters, admitting that his friends were uninterested. Indeed, it was more than disinterest. The campaign questioned the legitimacy of mega-development projects coordinated by transnational corporations—the very economic development most students believed would advance their country's place in the global market, challenging the economic fields of power in which their own privilege was embedded.

The school principal reminded me that families in the school were often implicated in issues like these, and the school had to be careful not to offend. In many instances, addressing "global" issues was less fraught than grappling with local struggles and ways in which global forces infringed on local wellbeing. In all cases, educators had to exercise caution in exploring social issues with students. The principal explained, "We can talk about the environment, but we can't talk about the hydroelectric companies or the mines. We can talk about nutrition, but we

Author Manuscript

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved

can't criticize McDonalds or Coke, because we have families that own these companies here." He continued:

> Sometimes students come to me and say, why aren't we doing certain activities, why aren't we protesting this or that, and I tell them it is complicated… They want changes, but when they start investigating who is responsible, they see it goes back to their own house. (May 22, 2012)

With his finger he drew a circle on the desk, indicating that students' investigations into injustice forced them to reflect inward and confront their own privilege, an uncomfortable reckoning.

Like Profe, the principal was aware that national pride was lacking among youth. He explained, "People here aren't really proud of being Guatemalan. They believe what they hear from the international press… So we try to do some things here to make them more aware of what's going on." The school's mission to develop students as global citizens thus was not imagined to interfere with improving perceptions of Guatemalan identity or fostering national connectedness. Yet efforts to inform students about "what's going on" came up against pressures from families who, on occasion, requested that the school not take a stance on justice and equity issues within Guatemala. One student, Samantha, detected this as an invitation to look inward, but not too closely. She explained, "We spend so much time learning about other countries like the US, and I sometimes wonder about that. It's like they are saying, *shhh, don't ask about* Guatemala." The constraints on critiquing injustice in Guatemala made looking outward to share in moral outrage at injustice practiced elsewhere less complicated, illustrating the risks of ethnocentrism and exceptionalism when a global scope displaces or disengages from local contexts and everyday experiences (Engel 2014; Pashby 2011; Pashby & Andreotti 2015). Alejandro explained that the same teachers who dismissed his solidarity campaign were eager to support students in their creation and dissemination of materials that centered on the egregious human rights violations of Joseph Kony. Similarly, I observed in various classes students easily protesting abstract ideas such as violence, poverty, and illiteracy. In the abstract, these critiques did not threaten elite privilege, because they did not stand in for group rights, but rather further legitimized discourses of citizens' individual responsibilities to become educated, find work, and contribute to the country's economic advancement. This economic obligation to improve the country's place in global power structures was expected of all citizens, irrelevant of their social locations or their position in national power structures.

Author Manuscript

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved

Discussion: Development as "The New Peace" and the Market Value of Diversity

Educators at the International Academy worried that students with transnational networks would leave Guatemala to access a better life in a more developed country, with opportunities for economic success and security that could not be guaranteed at home. In an effort to counteract migration, they emphasized students' civic identities, attachments, and long-term obligations to Guatemala. To an extent, students accepted their envisioned roles as Guatemala's future leaders, uniquely positioned to "improve" the country. Simultaneously, they asserted their ethnic identities as ladino and European, signifying their transnational ties and desires to be geographically mobile, while distancing themselves from historical legacies of racial hierarchy and the politics of national diversity. These efforts to mark ethnic identity through affiliation with European colonialists also illustrate the persistence of colonial legacies in shaping contemporary inequities and claims to elite status. Students' struggles with ethnic and national categories make evident the need for citizenship education to go beyond the "anachronistic" positioning of a single state as the source of one's civic identity (Abu El-Haj 2015, 193), particularly in divided societies where national identity is deeply contested (Smith 2003). But a closer look at the tensions that unfolded in the International Academy illustrate how the near universal policy imperative to foster global citizenship can be adapted to further neoliberal agendas in ways that risk reinforcing social divisions, creating market-based rationales for historical inequities, and forging new racialized struggles.

Although students debated whether they should exercise their privilege to leave Guatemala, there was consensus that the country needed economic development, investments accessible to elites. Students' self-conceptions and understandings of national and global civic obligation merged through imagined engagements with the global market economy, so that students recognized their civic ties to Guatemala and the opportunity to exercise citizenship through the creation of jobs and leveraging of transnational business partnerships. Developing the country's economy and increasing Guatemala's global competitiveness, in their view, forged a path toward peace, security, and poverty alleviation. Students came to see themselves as uniquely positioned to resolve internal divisions through the market, rather than through debates or struggles over cultural rights. In other words, teacher and student interactions co-produced a neoliberal vision of citizenship that functioned to maintain students' elite status within Guatemala, buttressed by anticipating their subjugation outside of Guatemala. These findings

Author Manuscript

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved

support Kenway and Fahey's (2014) insights that elites selectively appropriate the language of global citizenship to sustain their privilege, while reinforcing "neo-imperial" (Oxley & Morris 2013) and "exclusive" (Koyama 2015) enactments of GCED. This study also extends these findings by demonstrating how youth draw on transnational social identities to confer elite status domestically while reinforcing Guatemala's low position in the global world order, a dual positioning I examine in more depth below.

For many elite students at the International Academy, the opportunity to develop is the solution to Guatemala's long history of violence and division, proposing that challenges to civic equality and security can be resolved through the expansion of global capitalism. This view is quite literally broadcasted by international corporations whose billboards hover over village entrances proclaiming, "development is the new peace." The link between peace and economic development has, ironically, been violently affirmed by state actions that marshal the national military to "protect the rights of corporations over citizens," a refrain that Alejandro and his family's solidarity network often use to signify the state's persistent concern over economic development at the expense of human development. The perspective that economic development solves all social ills was further legitimized in school, where the framework of global citizenship encouraged students to leave Guatemala but return with the knowledge and transnational power necessary to develop the country's economy as their civic duty. Civic obligations thus merged with economic neoliberalism, as citizens were expected to exploit opportunities to migrate, even as this obligation sits in tension with transnational social and economic networks that might lure them into pursuing opportunities elsewhere and disinvesting in Guatemala's economy. As Alejandro explained, these encouragements to develop the country implicitly invite continued exploitation of poor and working-class Guatemalans in order to sustain elite privilege. They also correspond with neoliberal assumptions that, "Equality is… an individual, economic issue that can be resolved in the market" (Bastos 2012, 164-165). Through these constructions, "'the market itself becomes democracy'" (Macedo, Dendrinos, & Gounari 2003 cited in Sleeter 2014,; also see Baltodano 2012; Flanagan 2008).

Students did not mask their insecurity that indigenous rights movements threatened their power and privilege. On the surface, their statements illustrate Hale's (2002) critique of "neoliberal multiculturalism," showcasing elite anxiety over the reversals of power that might ensue if indigenous movements were successful at reallocating resources. But students were also

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved

expressing concern that Guatemala's internal divisions were an impediment to economic development, while economic development—in their view—stood to resolve inter-class and ethnic strife. According to the logic that presupposed development as peace, indigenous resistance to mega-development projects was irrational and harmful to Guatemala's needs as an underdeveloped, post-conflict nation. The resolve of this economic perspective likewise illustrates the ways that "[g]roups with power and influence often equate their own interests with the public interest" (Banks 2008, 132). This was poignantly illustrated as students ridiculed and dismissed indigenous language rights by assessing their economic value (and lack thereof) on the global market.

Importantly, students' views hinged on a fundamental miscomprehension of the objectives of indigenous struggles, as well as a lack of knowledge of the history of exclusionary power structures in their country, ideas that could be discussed in schools but which are often silenced (Bellino 2014; Rubin 2016a, 2016b). Students routinely expressed concerns that resistance movements, mother tongue instruction, and indigenous autonomy to make decisions about the fate of their villages were efforts to "be separate," rather than indigenous aims for recognition and inclusion in the civic space. Justice struggles were contrasted with opportunities to participate in the global economy, opportunities denied to all Guatemalans as a result of indigenous peoples' presumed anti-development efforts. Though there are debates within indigenous communities about the long-term benefits and drawbacks of developing rural areas, the principal argument made through resistance movements is that indigenous communities have the right to decide for themselves whether and how to develop their land and resources. In many cases, resistance encompasses claims that Guatemala needs to develop its own economy without the interference of transnational corporations. While elites desire access to a "'global space' that is essentialised as inevitable, necessary and separate" (Matus & Talburt 2015, 242), indigenous struggles are intensely local and territorialized. Students' views thus upheld liberal assimilationist assumptions that if development structurally integrated indigenous peoples into the formal economy, they would no longer require their native languages or differentiated treatment as members of historically oppressed groups. Capitalism would finally unite a divided Guatemala. This view ties to perceptions of linguistic pluralism as an impediment to social cohesion and assumptions that speakers of subordinate languages are "expected to lose their first language" (Ruíz 1984, 27, emphasis in original; also see Heath 1992; Nieto 2009) in order to

Author Manuscript

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved

assimilate and become “modern” (Bastos 2012; Hall 2002; Levenson 2013). Mullings (2005) argues that the expansion of global capitalism and neoliberalism have created new expressions of race and racialization, reproduced through new means of accumulation and dispossession. Narrow, market-based conceptions of cultural identity become a vehicle through which neoliberal ideology rationalizes gross inequities, depicting them as a consequence of meritocracy and free market competition. For example, students’ reproduction of their elite status, at times, depended on assigning blame to indigenous groups for their marginalization (see Baltodano 2015; Flanagan 2008 for illustrations of similar efforts to naturalize inequities through appeals to meritocracy).

Interpreting global citizenship through the lens of the market allowed students to denounce indigenous struggles under the auspice that indigenous rights—especially those that aim to protect land and local practices from mega-development projects—hold the country back and create collective disadvantage. Dyrness’s (2014) ethnographic study of Salvadoran students illustrated opportunities for critical reflection as elite students with transnational networks confronted the limits of their privilege outside the boundaries of their home country, recognizing “the subjugation of Salvadoran culture, society, and identity within a transnational field” (76). I observed similar tensions as students reflected on their elite status within Guatemala and the negative stereotypes the outside world held about Guatemala. However, at the International Academy, these openings to examine Guatemala’s subordinate place within global power hierarchies served to strengthen students’ resolve that national divisions, a history of violence, and ongoing rights struggles were preventing the country from earning its rightful place in the global market. If indigenous communities would cede their attachments to ancestral land and their mother tongue, and assimilate into capitalist norms, students reasoned, the country could prove its worth in natural resources, entrepreneurship, and commitment to hard work. Registering the economics of globalization, elite students shaped a particular narrative of national diversity politics as a hindrance to participation in the global economy. Looking at Guatemala from a “global” perspective, local power hierarchies and a history of ethnic and class division became irrelevant. Everyone, they presumed, would be equally disadvantaged in the global arena, thus ensuring fair competition.

This focus on Guatemala’s global marginalization shifted the gaze away from internal conflict and intercultural relations. Educators at the school were more supportive of students’

Author Manuscript

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved

interest in distant, “global” justice struggles and abstract rights than Alejandro’s contentious attempt to forge solidarity with indigenous communities. The positioning of global as separate and isolated from local and national issues is not uncommon in citizenship educational practice (Engel 2014; Matus & Talburt 2015). Education for global citizenship can, paradoxically, erase the global dimensions of, and de-territorialize, local struggles in order to recognize global issues at play (Ramirez & Meyer 2012, 21). In part, these manufactured separations between global and local serve political purposes. As Kymlicka (2003) explains, “Local interculturalism almost always creates more anxiety than global interculturalism, particularly in contexts where there is a long history of mistreatment and mistrust between the groups” (160). School interactions at the International Academy illustrate how global and universal framings of “world issues” can address injustice and inequity in less politically charged ways, but they also showcase the risks of abstracting these issues from particular social and historical contexts. These erasures implicitly frame local struggles as isolated and unwarranted distractions in the face of unified goals for economic advancement. Constrained by “minimalist” (DeJaeghere 2006), neoliberal interpretations, global citizenship education as enacted in this school does not call on citizens to turn inward to further democratize their fragile postwar democracy, instead demanding that they turn outward, toward global markets and toward addressing injustices that do not intersect with their privilege. Perhaps the greatest irony is that privatization, international investment, and free markets are posed as the solutions for Guatemala’s postwar instability, even as these same neoliberal policies, mobilized through neocolonial efforts to monopolize markets and influence political structures, have contributed to contemporary domestic conflicts, as well as Guatemala’s global marginalization. In this case, recognizing the damage inflicted by neoliberal policies is key to exposing the false promises of market competition as a global equalizer.

Conclusion

This ethnographic case demonstrates the ways that school communities selectively appropriate global citizenship discourses as outlined in global agendas, at times embracing multiple and conflicting interpretations of global citizenship and their relationship to local and national civic issues. It also illustrates how global policy efforts intersect with neoliberal constructions of individual responsibility and market forces as a mediator of social good, discourses that have framed Guatemala’s postwar reconstruction as an economic endeavor and fueled conceptions that development is peace. As students embrace a version of global

Author Manuscript

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved

citizenship oriented toward the market and to which their elite status is uniquely suited, they find support to dismiss indigenous and collective struggles on the basis that local cultural expressions lack global market value. This case reflects the concern that some approaches to GCED "unintentionally, but very easily, reproduce assumptions that reinforce rather than challenge mechanisms of inequality by placing student-agents at the center of the world" (Pashby & Andreotti 2015, 10). The school's largely economic and individualized emphasis on accruing global connections and consuming global culture, without attention to local intercultural relations or the history of exclusionary power structures, undermine the critical goals of global citizenship, intercultural education, and multicultural democracy. One interpretation of this account is that the school is not enacting education for global citizenship. But this interpretation would overlook the reality that policy initiatives are shaped and reshaped, critiqued, and resisted at every level of implementation (Bartlett & Vavrus 2014), and particularly so in settings where teachers themselves are implicated in conflict and post-conflict dynamics. Equally important in this context are the active roles that young people play through their own responses to educational policy as enacted.

Likewise, young people's conceptions of their roles as global citizens serve as a reminder of the ways in which efforts to shape global citizens interact with national constructions of civic identity and obligation, as well as students' sense of their social location, belonging, and civic purpose. Elite students contend with multiple messages to embrace their freedom as mobile elites, while confronting national obligations that anchor them to Guatemala. School actors encourage students to access global citizenship by leaving the country but remind them that their civic duty to the nation will eventually call them home. At times these messages conveyed an uncomfortable recognition that Guatemala needs them more than they need Guatemala (Bellino 2017). Meanwhile, permission to look outside national borders to critique injustice and intercultural relations was validated by conceiving of global as an essentialized and separate perspective that does not belong to a particular community or physical space. These omissions highlight the importance of critical (DeJaeghere 2006, 2009) and "reflexive" approaches to global citizenship that allow for "understanding and critical questioning of one's own place within the world, not as isolated from broader global processes, but as implicit within those processes" (Engel 2014, 242). Critical and reflexive dimensions of GCED are particularly important as local identities, conflicts, and legacies of injustice interact with competition for

Author Manuscript

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved

resources on a global scale. If education entrusts young people with more than economic agency, they might be further inspired to examine their position at the intersections of global, national, and local fields of power, and to consider the power they have to reposition themselves in the world they want to shape.

Notes

Acknowledgements: I would like to thank students and teachers at the International Academy for their participation and insights throughout this research. I would also like to thank Hugh Starkey, Avril Keating, and Laura Engel for initial feedback on this work, as well as the AEQ reviewers and editors for their generative feedback, which greatly strengthened this paper.

References

Abu El-Haj, T. (2009). Becoming a citizen in an era of globalization and transnational migration: Re-imagining citizenship as critical practice. Theory into practice, 48(4), 274-282.

Abu El-Haj, T. (2015). Unsettled belonging: Educating Palestinian American youth after 9/11. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Andreotti, V. (2005). Soft versus critical global citizenship education. Policy and Practice: A Development Education Review, 40-51.

Arlow, M. (2012). Education for local and global citizenship: The Northern Ireland experience. In E. A. All (Ed.), Education for global citizenship (pp. 82-91). Qatar: Qatar Foundation.

Banks, J. A. (2008). Diversity, group identity, and citizenship education in a global age. Educational Researcher, 39(3), 129-139.

Banks, J. A. (2016). Cultural diversity and education: Foundations, curriculum, and teaching (6th ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.

Bartlett, L., & Vavrus, F. (2014). Transversing the Vertical Case Study: A Methodological Approach to Studies of Educational Policy as Practice. Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 45(2), 131-147. doi:10.1111/aeq.12055

Bartlett, L., and Vavrus, F. 2017. Rethinking case study research: A comparative approach. New York, NY: Routledge.

Author Manuscript

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved

Bastos, S. (2012). Multicultural projects in Guatemala: Identity tensions and everyday ideologies. Latin American and Caribbean Ethnic Studies, 7(2), 155-172.

Bellino, M.J. (2017). Youth in postwar Guatemala: Education and civic identity in transition. Rutgers, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Bellino, M.J. (2016). So that we do not fall again: History education and citizenship in “postwar” Guatemala. Comparative Education Review, 60(1), 58-79.

Bellino, M.J. (2015). The risks we are willing to take: Youth civic development in “postwar” Guatemala. Harvard Educational Review, 85(4), 537-561.

Bellino, M.J. (2014). Whose past, whose present?: Historical memory among the “postwar” generation in Guatemala. In Williams, J.H. (Re)constructing memory: School textbooks and the imagination of the nation (pp. 131-152). Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Camicia, S. P., & Franklin, B. M. (2011). What type of global community and citizenship? Tangled discourses of neoliberalism and critical democracy in curriculum and its reform. Globalisation, Societies and Education, 9(3-4), 311-322.

Davies, L. (2004). Building a civic culture post-conflict. London Review of Education, 2(3), 229-244.

Davies, L. (2006). Global citizenship: Abstraction or framework for action? Educational Review, 58(1), 5-25.

Davies, L. (2008). Educating against extremism. Trent, UK: Trentham Books.

DeJaeghere, J. (2006). Intercultural meanings of citizenship in the Australian secondary curriculum: Between critical contestations and minimal constructions. In E.D. Stevick & B.A.U. Levinson (Eds.), Reimagining civic education: How diverse societies form democratic citizens (pp. 293-316). Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.

DeJaeghere, J. (2009). Critical citizenship education for multicultural societies. Interamerican Journal of Education for Democracy, 2(2), 223-236.

DeJaghere, J. G., & McCleary, K. S. (2010). The making of Mexican migrant youth civic identities: Transnational spaces and imaginaries. Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 41(3), 228-244.

Dyrness, A. (2012). Contra viento y marea (Against wind and tide): Building civic identity among children of emigration in El Salvador. Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 43(1), 41-60.

Author Manuscript

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved

Dyrness, A. (2014). National divisions, transnational ties: Constructing social and civic identities in postwar El Salvador. The Journal of Latin American and Caribbean Anthropology, 19(1), 63-83.

Emerson, R., Fretz, R., & Shaw, L. (2011). Writing Ethnographic Fieldnotes.Chicago: University of Chicago.

Engel, L. C. (2014). Global citizenship and national (re)formations: Analysis of citizenship education reform in Spain. Education, Citizenship, and Social Justice, 9(3), 239-254.

Gaztambide-Fernández, R.A. (2015). Elite entanglements and the demand for a radically un/ethical position: The case of Wienie Night, International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 28:9, 1129-1147.

Gaztambide-Fernández, R. A. (2009). The best of the best: Becoming elite at an American boarding school. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Goren, H., & Yemini, M. (2015). Global citizenship education in context: Teacher perceptions at an international school and a local Israeli school. Compare, 1-22.

Grandin, G. (2000). The blood of Guatemala: A history of race and nation. Durham, NC: Duke University.

Hale, C. R. (2002). Does multiculturalism menace? Governance, cultural rights and the politics of identity in Guatemala. Journal of Latin American Studies, 34(3), 485-524.

Hall, K. D. (2002). Lives in translation: Sikh youth as British citizens. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Heath, S. B. (1992). Telling tongues: Language policy in Mexico, colony to nation. New York: Teachers College Press.

Kenway, J., & Fahey, J. (2014). Staying ahead of the game: The globalizing practices of elite schools. Globalisation, Societies and Education, 12(2), 177-195.

Koyama, J. P. (2015). The elusive and exclusive global citizen. Retrieved from New Delhi, India:

Kymlicka, W. (2003). Multicultural states and intercultural citizens. Theory and Research in Education, 1(2), 147-169.

Marcus, G. E. (1999). What is at stake—and is not—in the idea and practice of multi-sited ethnography. Canberra Anthropology, 22(2), 6-14.

Author Manuscript

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved

Matthews, J., & Sidhu, R. (2005). Desperately seeking the global subject: International education, citizenship and cosmopolitanism. Globalisation, Societies and Education, 3(1), 49-66.

Matus, C., & Talburt, S. (2015). Producing global citizens for the future: Space, discourse, and curricular reform. Compare, 45(2), 226-247. doi:10.1080/03057925.2013.842682

Murphy, K., & Gallagher, T. (2009). Reconstruction after violence: How teachers and schools can deal with the legacy of the past. Perspectives in Education: The Pedagogical Transition in Post-Conflict Societies, 27(2), 158-168.

Nader, L. (1972). Up the anthropologist—perspectives gained from studying up. In D. Hymes (Ed.), Reinventing anthropology (pp. 284-311). New York: Pantheon.

Nieto, S. (2009). Language, culture, and teaching: Critical perspectives. New York: Routledge.

Ong, A. (1999). Flexible citizenship: The cultural logics of transnationality. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Osler, A., & Starkey, H. (2003). Learning for Cosmopolitan Citizenship: theoretical debates and young people's experiences. Educational Review, 55(3), 243.

Oxley, L., & Morris, P. (2013). Global citizenship: A typology for distinguishing its multiple conceptions. British Journal of Educational Studies, 61(3), 301-325.

Pashby, K. (2011). Cultivating global citizens: Planting new seeds or pruning the perennials? Looking for the citizen-subject in global citizenship education theory. Globalisation, Societies and Education, 9(3-4), 427-442. doi:10.1080/14767724.2011.605326

Pashby, K., & Andreotti, V.d.O. (2015). Critical global citizenship in theory and practice: Rationales and approaches for an emerging agenda. In J. Harshman, T. Augustine, & M. Merryfield (Eds.), Research in global citizenship education (pp. 9-33). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.

Quaynor, L. J. (2012). Citizenship education in post-conflict contexts: A review of the literature. Education, Citizenship and Social Justice, 7(1), 33-57. doi:10.1177/1746197911432493

Ramirez, F. O., & Meyer, J. W. (2012). Toward Post-National Societies and Global Citizenship. Multicultural Education Review, 4(1), 1-28.

Ríos-Rojas, A. (2014). Managing and disciplining diversity: The politics of conditional belonging in a Catalonian Institut. Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 45(1), 2-21.

Author Manuscript

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved

Rubin, B. C. (2012). Making citizens: Transforming civic learning for diverse social studies classrooms. New York: Routledge.

Rubin, B. C. (2016a). “They don’t tell it”: Indigenous social studies teachers transforming curricula in post-conflict Guatemala. Journal of International Social Studies, 6(1), 114-127.

Rubin, B. C. (2016b). We come to form ourselves bit by bit: Educating for citizenship in post-conflict Guatemala. American Educational Research Journal, 53(3), 639-672.

Schugurensky, D., & Myers, J. P. (2003). Citizenship education: Theory, research and practice. Encounters on Education, 4, 1-10.

Sleeter, C. E. (2014). Multiculturalism and education for citizenship in a context of neoliberalism. Intercultural Education, 25(2), 85-94.

Suarez, D.F., & Ramirez, F.O. (2007). Human Rights and Citizenship: The Emergence of Human Rights Education. In C.A. Torres & A.Teodoro (Eds.),Critique and Utopia: New Developments in the Sociology of Education in the Twenty-first Century (pp. 43-64). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Torres, C. A. (1998). Democracy, education, and multiculturalism: Dilemmas of citizenship in a global world. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

United Nations’ Global Education First Initiative. (2012). Retrieved from http://www.globaleducationfirst.org/220.htm

Westheimer, J., & Kahne, J. (2004). What kind of citizen?: The politics of educating for democracy. American Educational Research Journal, 41(2), 237-269.

Author Bio:

Michelle Bellino is an Assistant Professor at the University of Michigan School of Education (bellino@umich.edu).

Author Manuscript

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved