University of San Diego

Digital USD

Dissertations

Theses and Dissertations

2016

When Worlds Collide: Bringing the Native/Indigenous Transnational Nonprofit Leader to the Conversation

Christina E. Mitchell
University of San Diego

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digital.sandiego.edu/dissertations>

Part of the [Nonprofit Administration and Management Commons](#)

Digital USD Citation

Mitchell, Christina E., "When Worlds Collide: Bringing the Native/Indigenous Transnational Nonprofit Leader to the Conversation" (2016). *Dissertations*. 54.
<https://digital.sandiego.edu/dissertations/54>

This Dissertation: Open Access is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses and Dissertations at Digital USD. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Digital USD. For more information, please contact digital@sandiego.edu.

**WHEN WORLDS COLLIDE: BRINGING THE NATIVE/INDIGENOUS
TRANSNATIONAL NONPROFIT LEADER TO THE CONVERSATION**

DISSERTATION

CHRISTINA E. MITCHELL

School of Leadership and Education Sciences

University of San Diego

April 22, 2016

Dissertation Committee

Hans Peter Schmitz, PhD

Steven A. Gelb, PhD

Mary B. McDonald, PhD

UNIVERSITY OF SAN DIEGO
SCHOOL OF LEADERSHIP AND EDUCATION SCIENCES

CANDIDATE'S NAME: Christina E. Mitchell

TITLE OF
DISSERTATION: When Worlds Collide: Bringing the Native/Indigenous

APPROVAL:

Hans Peter Schmitz, PhD . Chair

Steven A. Gehl, PhD Member

Mary B. McDonald, PhD Member

DATE: April 22, 2016

Abstract

Transnationals have long been a subject of academic discussion. Described differently according to discipline and study, the primary characteristic of transnationals is that they cross borders in support of a broad range of purposes, including advocacy and service provision, and profession and research. While not explicitly engaged within the nonprofit conversation up to this point, transnationals do have an implicit association with the nonprofit sector. This dissertation locates the transnationals in the nonprofit sector bringing a particular type of transnational into the nonprofit conversation: the native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leader. Based on findings of an exploratory case study, this leader is a skilled leader original to a country outside of North America or Europe who frequently crosses borders to obtain resources and foster relationships, both locally and internationally, to achieve their nonprofit mission benefitting their country of origin. This dissertation expands the case study findings to investigate in greater detail how the leader negotiates his insider/outsider position as part of his nonprofit work.

The purpose of this case study is to explore more fully the insider/outsider nonprofit negotiation of two native Guatemalan transnational nonprofit leaders who travel regularly between Guatemala and North America in order to engage his understandings of the key nonprofit topics. The question for this dissertation asks: *how does the native/indigenous nonprofit leader's positionality, as insider/outsider, inform his theory of action for his organization?* An exploratory study concluded the leader negotiates his local to international interactions positioning him as both insider and outsider simultaneously despite the location he occupies. Findings of this dissertation suggest these leaders use the privileges of their insider/outsider situation as bridges to

advance their nonprofit work while simultaneously engaging in gatekeeping activities to control the message about their organizations. As a result, the leaders negotiate nonprofit understandings that often collide with the current nonprofit discourse on accountability, advocacy, development, effectiveness, and sector professionalization. The study concludes the dominant nonprofit conversation may not be particularly translatable to a Guatemalan context suggesting a more comprehensive, proactively participatory, and collaborative nonprofit conversation is needed.

To Audrina and David,
For the dreams I have of the extraordinary individuals you will become.
Love, Grandma

Acknowledgements

There is a whole passel of people who helped me move away from the trailer park toward the doctoral program at the University of San Diego. These people are colleagues, family, friends, mentors, and professors who were certain I could succeed. They helped me celebrate my successes and mourn my losses. They also told me to pick myself back up when I failed, encouraging me to try again, only a little harder. They never let me off the hook when I was wrong but always saw my potential when I could not. I sincerely hope every one of these individuals now hears their contributions within these pages.

There a few people I want to thank personally. I owe them so much more than I will ever have to opportunity repay.

When people ask me to tell them about myself, I often pull out a picture of my family. I gave birth to my daughter, Tammara, long before I was ready to be a parent, but she has always been the best part of me. In many ways, she created the person I am now. As she grew up, so did I. We never had what is considered a “traditional” family life, but neither Tammara or nor I would have changed any of it. We had a home full of love, and when the weight of reality got to be a bit too much, we had lots of sarcasm. It was Tammara who encouraged me to go back to school in 2006. Much has changed since then. Through her I now have an accomplished son-in-law, Bobby, and two amazing grand children, Audrina and David, who are my heart and soul. All together they accompanied me through this academic journey continually assuring me they had my back because they knew I did this for them.

I also owe a great deal of thanks to my best friends. Ralph Lopez always reminds me being smart means very little if I am not a decent person. Elizabeth Castillo, Heather

Gibb, Mary McDonald, and Michelle Zive are always ready with advice, honesty, laughter, and wine when needed. Jeff Cox, a witness to my antics since 1995, is always up for a good beer, good food, and a good chat. Stephen and Elaine Elliott generously open their Guatemalan home to me so I can do my research, and Elaine Elliott is always up for any adventure, enthusiastically ready to act as guide, mentor, and translator. I could not have succeeded without any of them.

I also owe a great deal of thanks to Kathleen Coughlan, Emily Rankin, Rondi Stein, and Polly Traylor of USD, who know financial support is part and parcel of academic support for the success of non-traditional students. They assured me of much needed employment keeping a roof over my head, gas in my car, and food in my refrigerator. I also want to thank Dr. Ted Martinez, Jr., of the National Community College Hispanic Council at USD for assuring me my accomplishments and story matter inspiring the forward to this dissertation.

To my committee, Drs. Schmitz, Gelb, and McDonald, you had the hard job of turning me into a scholar. I felt very sorry for you at times because I am so hard headed. Yet, you seemed to take it all in stride. You saw me through and you deserve a standing ovation.

Finally, I feel very strongly that none of this dissertation would be possible without the enthusiasm, generosity, and hospitality of Edwin and Elvia Villela of Help for Schools, Inc., and Ignacio Ochoa of Fundación Nahual. They opened themselves to an emerging scholar, stumbling to unearth the academic mysteries of research and scholarship, demonstrating patience along with an avid interest in my research question

and the knowledge pursued. I hope this dissertation proves as fruitful for them and their organizations as it has proven for me.

Foreword

Edwin Villela, Elvia Villela, and I are traveling in a Jeep Wrangler along a pothole marked, sometimes crumbling, two-lane highway in southern Guatemala. We are on our way to Chiquimula, Edwin's hometown, where we will make our last drop of school supplies, supplies collected over 2,000 miles away in San Diego, California, on behalf of Edwin's small nonprofit organization, Help for Schools, Inc. We slow as we approach a randomized routine traffic stop by the Guatemalan police. We are selected to pull over. Edwin is driving, his wife, Elvia, is in the front passenger seat, and I sit behind them holding onto our towering pile of luggage that is jammed into the back threatening to fly out the raised rear window left open to accommodate its bulk. After the police peek into the jeep, and Edwin's identification, driving papers, and car authorizations check out, we pull away.

Edwin jokes, "I forgot to tell them I was carrying a *gringa*! They may want to check your papers!"

I reply, "I could be here illegally, you never know."

Edwin jokes, "You never know, you could be smuggling something!"

We laugh.

Our exchange is a collision of our positionalities. Our joking is the site of a conscious impact of understanding, a knowing, influencing what we saw and claimed as true based on our identities and lived experiences. The way Edwin and I saw and responded to the routine traffic stop reflected our interpretations. I saw that I am a white, American woman afforded privilege in Guatemala, just like in the U.S., while Edwin, a native Guatemalan and American citizen, is under suspicion even in his home country.

The traffic stop was a shared moment in which I interpreted Edwin as the questionable “Other” while I remained above reproach. However, I know this interpretation is only a partial interpretation because it is produced within a certain circumstance and only from my point of view. Yet, it reflects a reality I question. I consistently ask why some individuals’ achievements, efforts, histories, realities, and voices matter while those of others do not. Through my privileged position as researcher and scholar, I work to bring forward these silenced others interested in what they bring to the conversation.

I value silenced voices because for many years I was a silenced other. I raised my daughter by myself as a consequence of a teenage pregnancy. I began adulthood receiving public assistance experiencing dismissive caseworkers and a discriminatory public who neither held confidence in my capabilities nor believed I had a contributive, relevant voice. I attended community college earning an applied degree removing us from welfare. I then raised my daughter working as a full-time secretary for a small, two-tier, rural college. During that time, I read extensively discovering feminism. Once my daughter graduated high school, I chose to go back to school to follow my interests in women’s empowerment and women’s capabilities. This is the point when my voice shifted from the silenced margins to the salient center.

In 2006, I started the Women’s and Gender Studies undergraduate program at the University of Oregon (UO) following what I believed was the inaccurate and demeaning portrayal of women as victims – helpless beings without ability, agency, or autonomy – related to the armed conflict in the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC). I pursued this interest through my master’s program (also at UO), traveling to Bukavu and Goma, DRC, to meet capable, intelligent, forceful, powerful grassroots women who were working hard

through their nonprofit organizations to end the fighting and develop their home.

Bringing their abilities into the conversation surrounding the DRC conflict was the focus of my master's thesis. Recognizing the women's contributions, portions of my thesis were later published on a nonprofit women's global peace blog (Mitchell, 2012a) and in an open-sourced, peer-reviewed peace journal (Mitchell, 2012b).

Throughout my master's program, I also spent considerable time in Cape Town, South Africa, building my advocacy voice with a nonprofit women's organization tackling the society's everyday prevalence of sexism, the widespread incidents of (often violent) xenophobia, and the horrendous acts of corrective rape against lesbians. After working in South Africa from January – September 2011, I returned to the U.S. to seek entrance to a doctoral program. I was accepted to the University of San Diego School of Leadership and Education Sciences beginning classes in June 2012 continuing my interest in ground-level, grassroots, everyday people's engagement with the nonprofit sector applying a feminist critique to the issues and theories studied. To my disappointment, I found nonprofit discussion to be distant, perhaps better described as cautious or even dismissive, toward feminist theory and its contributive possibilities for sector scholarship and practice.

Because my background is deeply influenced by feminism, and because of the feminist basis of my education and practice, I admit a strong bias for the marriage of feminist theory with nonprofit theory as a way to further the understanding of nonprofit sector operationalization. I believe feminist theory is a way to deconstruct and critique current nonprofit research and scholarship through the incorporation of marginalized and underrepresented voices (typically grassroots or ground-level voices) predicated on

stringent empirical qualitative methodology and analysis. This belief connects who I am as a person with my privileged voice as a researcher and scholar. The connection underlies and guides the inquiry I undertake.

I am a feminist researcher. Hence, feminist theory explains my voice as a researcher and scholar is a culmination of my race, class, and gender as informed and impacted by my lived experiences (Alcoff, 1988; Bourdieu, 1977; McCall, 2005; Takacs, 2003). Feminist theory also explains the research I produce reflects who I am, therefore, affecting my objectivity (Haraway, 1988). More simply, I am my research, and my research is I. Thus, I am mandated to work to control my biases echoing within my research so the research I produce is uncorrupted and valid. Yet, controlling bias is generally difficult for this qualitative researcher because I come to my scholarship espousing my worldview (Creswell, 2007) that the nonprofit sector cannot be fully understood without studying its margins; that is, studying the voices of those who do not make up the bulk of the center but nevertheless have an influence on sector successes and failures. The impetus for this dissertation research is the idea that individuals at the margins of the nonprofit sector have experience, expertise, ingenuity, and resourcefulness adding value to nonprofit theory and practice.

As a feminist researcher, my investigations in the DRC, South Africa, and now, Guatemala, approach inquiry with perspective that stridently “makes room for surprises and ironies at the heart of all knowledge production” (Haraway, 1988, p. 594). Feminist inquiry means I reflexively interrogate my own judgments as shaped by my personal opinions and feelings rather than outside influences (i.e., subjectivity), as well as the ways subjectivity influences and informs my research (Haraway, 1988; Rose, 1997).

Being reflexive means I strive to be aware of “the violence implicit in our visualizing practices” (Haraway, 1988, p.585). In other words, I must be diligently conscious of the ways in which my knowing, including my biases, may be influencing what I see and claim as true in ways possibly counter to the participant’s knowing based on his or her identities and lived experience. I, as a feminist researcher, must claim any interpretations as my own.

However, I prefer feminist objectivity because it embraces possibilities by engaging the research participant in knowledge creation. I utilize a reflexive stance acknowledging my privileged voice to create a shared understanding with the individual revealing his or her experiences, expertise, resourcefulness, and ingenuity with me. I achieve this via Haraway’s situated knowledge recognizing all knowledge is produced in specific circumstances and those circumstances shape knowledge in some way (Haraway, 1988; Rose, 1997). I believe attention to this situated knowledge stance in inquiry produces penetrating outcomes, even across language barriers, because the participant and I create an engaging space of concentrated struggle to find mutual meaning. I adhere to these feminist research principles throughout this inquiry as part and parcel of the methodology.

Given the above, I wish to specifically mention two additional feminist research components because they strongly impact this dissertation. First, I believe the increased interaction and integration between the Global South and the Global North as a consequence of globalization provides an opportunity for nonprofit researchers to transform the ways in which the researcher forecloses the epistemology of nonprofit scholarship. Especially given that better technology supports easier communication,

researcher and the participant have a greater opportunity to produce an interactive understanding – an understanding not barring the native/indigenous informant from knowledge production (Banks, 2007; Spivak, 1988, 1999). Increased interaction and integration opens a critique of nonprofit frameworks to uncover processes inadvertently and unconsciously reproducing ideology (a) ranking produced knowledge, (b) disenfranchising individuals in knowledge claims, and (c) assigning deficiency (Banks, 2007; Spivak, 1988; Takacs, 2003). Conversely, a feminist research frame, challenging where and by whom knowledge is collected, uncovers assumptions and universalisms in epistemology. Feminist research has a transformative effect (Banks, 2007) expanding understanding of the interrelation of identity, experience, and position as it informs nonprofit inquiry. I give concerted emphasis to this transformation within my dissertation.

Second, even while the primary participants of this case study are male, feminist theory does not foreclose male ways of knowing. Native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leadership is not a gender-bound phenomenon, nor should it be. My participants are a consequence of availability. I welcome discussion with female or trans native or indigenous transnational nonprofit leaders to investigate their positionality in relation to the work they accomplish. In what ways are they same, and in what ways do they differ? This research with regards to native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leaders is only a partial knowing opening space for future feminist inquiry.

Ultimately and most importantly, this dissertation voices the experiences of two small-scale nonprofit leaders native to Guatemala undertaking transnational nonprofit activity as a way to help the development of the country they love. North Americans

may not easily understand these leaders' attachment to Guatemala since the North American discourse negatively depicts a country of unfathomable corruption, desolation, and poverty. Like all discourse, the North American depiction of Guatemala is a partial construction, which favors the more powerful North American production, frame, and display (Foucault 1972, 1980). In reality, Guatemala is extraordinarily beautiful, bustling with commerce, and hosting a growing middle-class. Nearly one-third to one-quarter of Guatemala is protected land, Guatemala City boasts high-end malls and BMW dealerships, the lowlands of the south are busy from dawn until dusk growing the produce and sugar North Americans eat, and breathtaking Antigua and the Lake Atitlán regions attract ex-patriots and tourists from around the world. This positive outlook does not diminish that a living Guatemalan monthly salary is an estimated 500 Guatemalan quetzals (roughly \$65) and even that small amount is difficult to earn for the many without access to education, jobs, or trade. Guatemala is developing; however, need and poverty are also developing and, as the leaders voiced to me, the reach of outside aid is limited. These committed leaders are adamant Guatemalans must step up to develop themselves. They are simply using the resources at their disposal to extend a helping hand. I hope you, as the reader, welcome them to the conversation and value their voices.

Table of Contents

Foreword.....	ix
Table of Contents.....	xvi
List of Tables	xvii
List of Figures.....	xviii
Chapter 1: Introduction.....	1
Chapter 2: Methods	10
Chapter 3: Background.....	27
Chapter 4: Literature.....	49
Chapter 5: Findings	69
Chapter 6: Conclusion	146
References	171
Appendix A: Interview Protocol.....	181
Appendix B: Situational and Social Arenas Mappings	184

List of Tables

Table 1	<i>Alphabetized list of study participants.</i>	18
Table 2	<i>List of research topics and themes supported by situational analytic codes and reference citations of current nonprofit discourse, and the negotiated definitions of the native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leaders reflecting the findings of situational analysis.</i>	112
Table 3	<i>Situational mapping of grounded theory codes.</i>	185

List of Figures

<i>Figure 1.</i>	A researcher-generated reproduction of the Situational Matrix from Clarke (2007, p. 355)	11
<i>Figure 2.</i>	<i>Political Map of Guatemala</i> (Nations Online Project, 2016) modified to show researcher in-country travel	21
<i>Figure 3.</i>	<i>Country Map of Guatemala</i> (CIA World Factbook, 2015)	30
<i>Figure 4.</i>	Conceptual framework	64
<i>Figure 5.</i>	Final project map	70
<i>Figure 6.</i>	Situational map	189

Chapter 1: Introduction

Who are native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leaders? Most scholars are familiar with transnationals, a population defined as individuals regularly crossing borders to influence global economic and political interests (Keck & Sikkink, 1999; Portes, Guarnizo, & Landolt, 1999), as a product of globalization that has made communication and transportation easier. Scholars have followed the evolution of transnationals since the late 1990s noting transnationals are activists and service providers, and professionals and researchers. While not explicitly engaged within the nonprofit conversation up to this point, transnationals do have an implicit association with the nonprofit sector. This dissertation focuses on a particular transnational entering the nonprofit field: the native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leader. This dissertation brings the native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leader into the nonprofit conversation.

A 2014 exploratory study defined the native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leader as a skilled leader original to a country outside of North America or Europe who frequently crosses borders to obtain resources and foster relationships, both locally and internationally, to achieve his nonprofit mission benefitting his country of origin (Mitchell, Ochoa, Villela, in press). The exploratory study concluded the leader's actions on behalf of his organization are a relational process between the leader, the leader's transnational, local-to-international interactions, and the leader's understanding of this interaction based on his identities and lived experiences (i.e., his positionality). The exploratory findings indicated the leaders maintain a strong Guatemalan identity and connection propelling the leaders towards helping the development of their country. The

findings also indicated these leaders are simultaneously viewed as both insider and outsider in both the receiving country and their country of origin. The study concluded these native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leaders creatively utilize their insider/outsider situation to negotiate nonprofit action on behalf of Guatemala.

This study builds from the exploratory case study reengaging the two native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leaders, Ignacio Ochoa of Fundación Nahual, a registered Guatemalan association, and Edwin Villela of Help for Schools, Inc., a registered 501(c)(3) organization in California that helps rural schools in Guatemala. Both leaders are native to Guatemala though Edwin is a naturalized U.S. citizen. This study expands the exploratory findings to investigate in greater detail how the leader negotiates the insider/outsider divides as part of his nonprofit work.

Background of Problem

Transnationals cross borders. Various disciplines use different terms to describe transnationals each adding their own unique identifier (Anzaldúa, 1987, 2003; Coe & Bunnell, 2003; Levitt & Merry, 2009; Merriam, Johnson-Bailey, Lee, Kee, Ntseane, & Muhamad, 2001; Merry, 2006; Minkler, 2004; Lewis, 2012; Trinh, 1992). While terms vary, transnationals exist in relation to the crossing of borders (Ahmed, 2000; Ahmed, Castañeda, Fortier, & Sheller, 2003; Anzaldúa, 1987, 2003; Diener & Hagan, 2012; Portes, Guarnizo, & Landolt, 1999). These border crossings involve more than visitations and remittances. They encompass a full range of temporary and permanent “high intensity exchanges” (Portes, Guarnizo, & Landolt, 1999, p. 219) taking the transnationals back and forth between countries on a sustained basis. Within these crossings, transnationals communicate ideas, strategies, information, etc., to their original

communities where they are adapted for use.

This dissertation engages a particular type of transnational – the native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leader. This leader is unique to this dissertation and its exploratory case study. The term announces the appearance of leaders positioned permanently or temporarily in the Global North or the Global South but who work locally and internationally using their privileged transnational position to take advantage of the greater opportunity to utilize resources to serve their communities of origin. The term differs from Friedman’s (1999) ‘transnationalism reversed’ in that these leaders can be permanently positioned outside their country of origin, and there is regular bi-directional, as opposed to primarily uni-directional, interaction from south to north and north to south. The native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leader is a manifestation of the greater international scope of today’s nonprofit sector (Anheier & Themudo, 2005) straddling the local and international nonprofit fields of practice.

The use of ‘native/indigenous’ to describe these leaders is deliberate. Scholarship suggests indigenous describes those original to a region or territory. This general description is problematic and incomplete because these original peoples are known differently in each country. In Canada, they are referred to as First Nations populations; in the United States, they are Native Americans; and in Guatemala, they are Indigenous. More generally, however, the original populations are generally those marginalized or subjugated by the European settlers, and continue to be thought of as “Other” within the borders of their own country though they have adapted to European influences sometimes melding the European into their own cultures. This dissertation uses indigenous to identify the original peoples of Guatemala. Additionally, this dissertation uses native to

signify populations of other original decent (i.e., colonial decent or longer than first generation) whose ancestors came to a country, but are/were born in the destination country. In Guatemala, the native population is known as *Ladinos*, or those of Spanish or Indigenous-Spanish decent; in the U.S., natives are of African, European, and increasingly Latin American, or immigrant decent, and in Canada, natives are European and immigrant decent. Finally, this native/indigenous distinction recognizes the cultural/ethnic conversation in Guatemala that has long strained the country, recognizing the nonprofit contributions and potential contributions of all Guatemalans across local-to-international Guatemalan and North American contexts.

A clear and correct cultural/ethnic designation for these leaders is important as the leaders insisted a clarification between native and indigenous be made clear. Exploratory study findings, produced in collaboration with the leaders, indicated the leaders maintain a strong Guatemalan identity and connection propelling the leaders towards helping the development of their country. A conceptual framework as an intersection of social and feminist theory presented as an explanation of these findings proposed the leaders' strong Guatemalan identity, maintained despite their location outside their country of origin, and premised on personal and political history, directly influenced these native/indigenous transnational leaders actions and decisions in service to and in support of their organizations. The findings also indicated these leaders are simultaneously viewed as both insider and outsider in both the receiving country and their country of origin. The study concluded these native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leaders creatively utilize their insider/outsider situation to negotiate nonprofit action on behalf of Guatemala.

This dissertation expands on the exploratory case study introducing the native/indigenous transitional nonprofit leader to the nonprofit sector. The exploratory study defined the leaders, concluded the leaders negotiate their transnational reality as a relationship between the leaders' local to international interactions and their understandings of this interaction in order to benefit and support their home, and noted the leaders are both insider and outsider simultaneously despite the location they occupy. However, it is unknown how the leaders' insider/outsider situation is negotiated to support the leaders' decisions and actions on behalf of their organizations. This dissertation reengages the exploratory study's native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leaders to answer how the leaders' insider/outsider situation informs their organizational theory of action. Findings of this dissertation suggest these leaders use the privileges of their insider/outsider situation as bridges to engage their nonprofit work. Findings also suggest, however, the leaders' nonprofit understandings, as a result of gatekeeping, collide with understandings offered within current nonprofit discourse.

Statement of Problem

Nonprofit sector research is currently characterized by a one-way conversation obscuring or ignoring the voices of native/indigenous leaders. This problem has been acknowledged in the field as nonprofit scholars comment on the general lack of native/indigenous voices, either local or international (sometimes referred to as grassroots voices), in the research produced (Beck, 2014; Pallas, Gethings, Harris, 2014). One argument posits burying occurs because of sector NGOization, professionalization, managerialism, etc. (Alvarez, 1999; Beck, 2014; Chowdhury, 2011) describing the modern nonprofit management and leadership environment (Salamon, 2012). Defining

native/indigenous broadly as individuals native to a particular country outside North America and Europe, an extensive search of the scholarship mirrored the concern of Beck (2014) and Pallas, Gethings, and Harris (2014). Nonprofit literature, either locally or internationally positioned, is generally lacking in engagement with native/indigenous nonprofit leaders. We know little about whom the native/indigenous nonprofit leaders are, their experiences, and their particular engagement with topics of interest to the nonprofit sector (i.e., the definition of nonprofit in addition to accountability, advocacy, effectiveness, leadership, etc.). As globalization makes communication and travel much easier thereby creating new interactions and identities (McNevin, 2006; Popkin, 1999), specifically transnational interactions and identities, the lack of engagement with native/indigenous nonprofit leaders calls into question the adequacy of present conceptualizations of the sector and how the system presently works. The problem this dissertation addresses is this absence of native/indigenous transnational leaders' voices in the nonprofit conversation. As Keck and Sikkink (1999) note in their seminal article on transnational advocacy networks, transnational actors are not homogenous in purpose or goals, and "to understand how change occurs in the world polity, we have to unpack the different categories of transnational actors, and understand the quite different logic and processes of these different categories" (p. 99).

Contributions of Study

The purpose of this case study is to explore the insider/outsider situation of the native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leaders in Guatemala and North America. The insider/outsider situation of the native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leaders as a social and relational process is best approached by qualitative case study inquiry (Yin,

2009). Social and feminist theory informs the conceptual framework for this case study as one way to describe the native/indigenous transnational leaders' understandings of their social realities based on their identities as Guatemalan, leader, immigrant, migrant, student, etc., and their lived experiences. The framework proposes these understandings manifest themselves in the leaders' actions and decisions on behalf of their organizations depending upon location and through a negotiation of constraints and opportunities (Chowdhury, 2011).

The contribution of this dissertation to nonprofit scholarship is threefold. First, this dissertation answers the call for greater presentation of native/indigenous voices in nonprofit scholarship by entering into a conversation with a specific type of native/indigenous voice, the voice of the native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leader, as a significant addition to sector knowledge. Second, the dissertation brings forward the unique insider/outsider situation of the native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leaders as an understudied situation in nonprofit scholarship. Third, the dissertation adds to the nonprofit theoretical discussion by approaching a conversation with native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leaders as an intersection of social and feminist theory arguing the positionality, intersectionality, lived experience, and borderlands propositions of feminist theory coupled with a grounded theoretical case study methodology develops a richer understanding of the leaders' complex, yet, creative and transformative, reality.

Assumptions and Limitations

This dissertation recognizes three limitations to its findings. First, findings are not generalizable. Study was undertaken assuming a complex situation characterizing only a few individuals. This dissertation argues the native/indigenous transnational

nonprofit leader is a potentially rising phenomenon within the nonprofit sector rather than an established population. Additionally, the limited nonprofit terms investigated as part of the study and study findings are based on the researcher's understanding of popular topics within nonprofit discourse, not any systemic survey of the literature. Finally, it must be cautioned that, even while this dissertation makes many claims related to Guatemalan culture, culture is a difficult subject to approach in any determined manner. The claims of this dissertation are based on researcher observation and cannot be, nor should be, taken as sweeping characterizations about Guatemala. This dissertation and its findings are contextualized in service to a specific question brought forward by an emerging nonprofit scholar encompassing a specific type of nonprofit leader operating within a certain situation.

Organization of Study

This dissertation moves forward with Chapter 2 introducing the research question providing a detailed summary of the study's use of situational analysis research design, methodology, data analysis, and mapping exercises as the method best capturing the complex insider/outsider, local to international, situation of the native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leaders. This methodology fully reflects not only a relational stance, but engages data collection as a complex local to international situational action reflecting the interdependent, inter-operational nature of the adaptive nonprofit ecological system. Such an engagement promotes analysis of not only interviews, but also extant historical, narrative, and visual materials to fully uncover how the leaders negotiate their insider/outsider consciousness within their nonprofit work to help the development of their country.

Chapter 3 then presents a background of Guatemala providing context on researcher interaction, Guatemalan history, Guatemala's nonprofit history, and an overview of the current Guatemalan nonprofit sector with particular attention to North America's connection to Guatemala. Chapter 4 introduces the conceptual framework guiding the research question situating the native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leaders within current interdisciplinary discourse demonstrating transnationals are often characterized as bridges between the local and the international. Chapter 5 brings the native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leaders into the nonprofit conversation by presenting the study's findings of the native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leaders' insider/outsider situation in relation to current nonprofit discourse. Chapter 6 concludes this dissertation offering a summary of study findings and presenting conclusions based on those findings, then opening discussion acknowledging questions, limitations, and future inquiry.

Chapter 2: Methods

Introduction

This chapter introduces and engages the research question informing this dissertation. The chapter provides a detailed summary of the case study's methodology used to gather data in order to answer the research question: *how does the native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leader's positionality, as insider/outsider, inform his theory of action for his organization?* The reader is first introduced to situation analysis as the study's research design chosen for its ability to fully engage the complexity of the native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leaders' insider/outsider, local to international, situation in service to their nonprofit work. The research questions are then presented followed by a full list of participants, data collection details, and the data analysis procedure. The chapter concludes by reiterating the research question and summarizing the situational analysis research design, providing its relevance and appropriateness for the research question, thereby setting the stage to present the study's findings.

Research Design

This case study's research design utilizes the grounded theory approach of situational analysis. Situational analysis (Clarke, 2003, 2007) is a "thick descriptions" (Geertz, 1983) qualitative approach based on an ecological frame for understanding complex social situations. The analysis approaches the research question as a post-modern relationship between the multiple sites of discourse about the situation and "agency, action and structure, image, text and context, history and the present moment" (Clarke, 2003, p. 554) using a series of analytic mapping exercises. Situational analysis

is not grounded theory itself, but a supplement to grounded theory methodology illuminating the key elements and conditions characterizing the social situation studied. Situational analysis is focused on participant voice within the messiness of the actual situation and the differences in social life. The fully analytic focus is on the situation of inquiry but broadly conceived.

Figure 1. A researcher-generated reproduction of the Situational Matrix from Clarke (2007, p. 355) elucidating the 12 dimensions of engagement to uncover the native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leader's insider/outsider consciousness as it operates in service to the nonprofit work.

Situational analysis studies a given situation along 12 dimensions of engagement as presented in *Figure 1*. These engagements refer to the variable conditions of the situation rather than contextual characterization or placement. That is, the messy

conditions of the situation *are* the situation. As such, the situation is studied along 12 dimensions of engagement. These dimensions are not extant, singular specificities studied individually, but rather, all 12 dimensions are an actual part of the action of the situation. Every dimension affects everything in the situation in some way, reflecting the interdependence and interoperation of the nonprofit ecological system. Situational analysis embraces the messiness of complex social interaction to analyze the larger domains of the situation.

The native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leaders' insider/outsider situation is messy spanning local to international contexts. The researcher feels this dissertation would be partial and incomplete to limit the field of inquiry to only a Guatemala or only a North American context. It would also be partial and incomplete to study the leaders outside popular North American discourse about Guatemalans, or outside the technologies allowing the leaders to establish and maintain contacts that support their organizations work. The point of any action is contextual and could be studied separately for that context. However, situational analysis combines the contextual points to provide a more complete, more whole, local to international mapping of how the leaders' insider/outsider situation informs the leaders' local to international nonprofit action.

Research Questions

The question informing this dissertation asked: *how does the native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leader's positionality, as insider/outsider, inform his theory of action for his organization?* An exploratory case study conducted in 2014 (Mitchell, Ochoa, & Villela, in press) indicated the native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leaders' positionality within the adaptive ecological nonprofit sector was related to (1) the

leaders' multiple, simultaneously held identities; (2) lived experiences including Guatemalan events of colonialism and civil war; and (3) the leaders' insider/outsider situation. The exploratory study, authored in conjunction with the leaders, indicated being Guatemalan was not merely an identity but an adequate identifier for their positionality guiding the leaders' nonprofit work (Mitchell, Ochoa, & Villela, in press). Yet, the exploratory case study only revealed the leaders' understanding of their positionality leaving questions regarding how this positionality functions in terms of the work undertaken. This dissertation seeks to answer some of those questions.

The purpose of this dissertation is to bring the native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leaders to the nonprofit conversation by exploring the interaction between the leaders' insider/outsider situation and the leaders' actions on behalf of their organizations. Since the study seeks to explain how the social phenomenon of the insider/outsider situation works in relation to the leaders' nonprofit work, case study is relevant for this project (Yin, 2009). To engage situational analysis design as part of the grounded theory process, questions were asked not only of individuals but also in relation to various encountered contexts making note of images, monuments, texts, video, etc., as relevant to Guatemala and North America, local and international, interaction. Three key research questions were asked:

- R1. How does the insider/outsider consciousness of native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leaders' manifest in actions on behalf of their organizations and the organizations' beneficiaries? To answer this question, interview participants were asked to provide background information about each organization including questions regarding each organization's mission, vision, purpose; employees,

interns, stakeholders, and volunteers; and organizational structure to uncover participant understanding and visibility of the organization as well as operational and formal authority structures. To support this question within other social dimensions, the researcher approached a given context by asking the context purpose, the display of that purpose, how people were used toward that purpose, and how the purpose manifested in operational structure.

- R2. How do the leaders negotiate their insider/outsider position to acquire information and resources in support of their organizations, stakeholders, and beneficiaries? To answer this question interview participants were asked about (a) organizational activities, goals, and strategies, including questions related to advocacy and encountered obstacles; (b) understanding and impact of transnationalism on the organization; (c) understanding and evaluation of organizational accountability and effectiveness; and (d) levels of communication and the types of communication technology used for their organization. To support this question within other social dimensions, the researcher approached a given context by asking (a) the context activities, goals, strategies and how the context is reaching out to its audience or advocating on behalf of the context's purpose; (b) questioning how the context speaks to transnationalism; (c) questioning how the context is displaying accountability and effectiveness; and (d) questioning how the context is communicating with its audience and what are the types of technology used to communicate with its audience.
- R3. How do key stakeholders in Guatemala and North America, as well as donors, volunteers, and other key informants understand the native/indigenous

transnational nonprofit leaders, their organizations, and the mission and work of the organization? To answer this question, interview participants were asked about (a) the level of involvement with other institutions (e.g., business, government, religious, as well as other nonprofits) and how the organization raises funds for its work; (b) the details about any leader or organizational collaborations, networks, or partnerships, and (c) an understanding and evaluation of organizational leadership. To support this question within other social dimensions, the researcher approached a given context by asking (a) the level of involvement with other institutions and, if applicable, the funding source; and (b) questions about how leadership is displayed within the context.

While these questions appear straightforward, they are complex in execution. The researcher could not simply ask either participant or context an explanation of the leaders' insider/outsider situation. Rather, the researcher engaged issues relevant to present nonprofit discourse (e.g., accountability, effectiveness, mission/vision/purpose, etc.) but listened beneath participant answers and information encountered to probe for the nuances of the leaders' insider/outsider situation in operation and the contexts affecting that situation. This process of questioning adequately produced the data on the leaders' insider/outsider situation in service to their nonprofit work from a variety of participants in conjunction with information gathered from a variety of contexts as required by Clarke's (2007) 12 social dimensions of situational engagement.

Participants

Given a situational analysis, it could be argued participants for this study encompass not only individuals but also the contexts encountered. To eliminate

confusion, participant is defined as individual participants to the study. For this section, the primary research participants are Ignacio Ochoa of Fundación Nahual and Edwin Villela of Help for Schools, Inc., and other key stakeholders including organization members, volunteers, donors, and beneficiaries. Information from these participants were supplemented with interviews with three leaders of North-American-headquartered and -led nonprofit organizations operating in Guatemala, one leader who had extensive experience in Guatemala and now heads a U.S.-Mexico trans-border philanthropic organization, and one leader who, after discussion, meets the definition of a native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leader. Participating individuals are referred to as participants rather than subjects because each was provided the opportunity to review and revise transcripts, and approached to provide input into the substance of reported findings.

All participants were secured by convenience through professional contacts building upon the exploratory case study findings. Participants' authorization to participate was secured verbally as part of an institutionally approved interview protocol, which was read to each participant at the beginning of each interview. These interviews were digitally recorded and transcribed, and participants were provided with a copy of the transcription and the opportunity to comment or clarify. Permission was asked to disclose participant names and the names of participants' organizations as part of the interview protocol. Participants could place limitations on identification or remain anonymous assured the researcher would comply with participant wishes. A full list of interview participants is presented in Table 1. A copy of the interview protocol is

provided in Appendix A. The protocol was provided in English and Spanish. When required, a compensated translator was present during the interview.

One participant interview was eliminated during analysis for lack of relevance to the research question. The discarded interview was with an individual familiar with one of the studied organizations but the individual's recall was severely limited. The interview lasted approximately 15 minutes with very few answers provided to the interview questions. However, the interview brought forward potential contacts to further the research and these contacts were pursued.

Data Collection

Research was conducted June 2015 – February 2016, excluding research time for the exploratory case study. The researcher's dissertation committee accepted the research proposal on May 19, 2015, with Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval secured on June 24, 2015. The first interview was completed on July 20, 2015. The researcher collected all data. All ethical considerations pertaining to qualitative methodology was of upmost importance in guiding the research undertaken. The study was conducted with no harmful intent, and participants did not sustain any known harm as a result of this study. Per IRB, research materials (e.g., audio recordings, artifacts, interviews, etc.) were carefully maintained throughout all facets of the research process and were available to the dissertation chair's review upon request.

Data collection took place in Guatemala and North America. The researcher did not limit contexts of collection keeping collection as broad as possible to capture all 12 dimensions of the studied situation. Collection included audio and video recordings of events, field notes, interviews, organizational materials (including websites and web

Table 1

Alphabetized list of study participants giving individual name, name of organization, summary of relevance to study, and location of interview. Identification is given as authorized by the participant.

Name/Title	Organization Name/ Country of Registration	Study Relevance	Interview Location
Andrew Carey, Executive Director	U.S- Mexico Border Philanthropy Partnership/Alianza Fronteriza de Filantropia (Mexico/United States)	Transborder nonprofit organization, Leader has extensive experience in Guatemala	San Diego, CA
Corey	Student	Fundación Nahual, American Supporter	San Diego, CA
Julio Cochoy	Maya Skills (Not Registered)	Native/Indigenous Transnational Nonprofit Leader supporting his organization through a social enterprise venture in Canada	Antigua, Guatemala
Lynne Collins		Help for Schools, American Supporter	San Diego, CA
David & Wendy		In-country American leaders, Faith-based, North American Nonprofit Organization focused on capacity building of Guatemalan nonprofit leaders	Antigua, Guatemala
Elaine		Fundacion Nahual, American Supporter	Skype – Interviewee located in Antigua, Guatemala, though later met participant in Guatemala
Rolando Alecio, Board Member	Fundacion Nahual	Fundacion Nahual, Guatemalan Member	Guatemala City, Guatemala (Translator present)
Bernard Goesfema		Fundacion Nahual, American Supporter/Volunteer	Phone – Interviewee located in Washington, D.C.
Milagro Fajardo, Board Member	Fundacion Nahual (Guatemala)	Fundacion Nahual, Guatemalan Member	Guatemala City, Guatemala (Translator present)
Tamalyn Gutierrez		In-country American/Guatemalan leader, Guatemala/North American registered transnational nonprofit organization focused on elementary education	Antigua, Guatemala
James Kinyon, Owner/CEO	Unipak Global	Help for Schools, American Supporter	San Diego, CA
Alonzo, and Cony Mendez, Board Member/Volunteer	Help for Schools, Inc. (United States)	Help for Schools, American/Guatemalan Member	San Diego, CA
Ignacio Ochoa, Legal Representative	Fundacion Nahual (Guatemala)	Native/Indigenous Transnational Nonprofit Leader focused on community organizing	Skype – Interviewee located in Guatemala though later met participant in Antigua, Guatemala
Susanna Place, Former Board Member/Volunteer	Safe Passage/Camino Seguro (Guatemala/United States)	Part-time, in-country American Supporter/Volunteer of nonprofit organization focused on education	Antigua, Guatemala
Eric and Sandra Rivera	Help for Schools, Inc. (United States)	Help for Schools, American/Guatemalan Member	Los Angeles, CA, though later met participant in Guatemala
Edwin and Elvia Rivera, President	Help for Schools, Inc. (United States)	Native/Indigenous Transnational Nonprofit Leader focused on educational support	San Diego, CA, though later met participant in Guatemala

videos), observation, participation, photographs, research memos, and researcher journal. Sites visited included not only interview spaces but also public buildings, monuments and museum exhibits, and site visits (organization and site of service delivery). North American data collection took place in the San Diego area or by phone or video conferencing application. Concerted attempts were made to secure Canadian and Chicago interviews relevant to the leaders and their organizations but were unsuccessful. Guatemalan data collection spanned the width of the country (see *Figure 2*). Each in-country stop was either the site of interview or service delivery, or used to broaden interview information or gain additional participant or dimensional data. As such, site visits included visitations to Guatemalan-led nonprofit organizations and North American international nonprofit organizations. Comparative to the nonprofits studied, the visited organizations could be classified as operating between small-scale grassroots/ground-level nonprofits and large-scale international NGOs (e.g., Oxfam, Save the Children, etc.). The visits encompassed both urban and rural settings, and areas where there was a large concentration of nonprofits as well as areas where there did not appear to be any nonprofits in operation.

Observation was the core researcher involvement. The goal was to observe as many activities related to the organizations in both North America and Guatemala as possible between June 2015 and February 2016. A bulk of the observation took place in Guatemala as the researcher shadowed Help for Schools, Inc., on its deliveries to the rural schools, and toured the areas where Ignacio Ochoa held trainings and traveled to meet with his board members. Observations also included any site where interactions between the local and the international could be identified. Observation gave way to

participation when extra help was needed in delivering school supplies for Help for Schools, Inc. Participation was also at times convenient for access. For example, the researcher chose to wear a Help-for-Schools t-shirt in order to keep the attention of teachers, parents, and students focused on the supply delivery instead of researcher activity. The researcher discovered if identified as being outside the organization or a researcher it opened questions regarding intentions and occasional requests for help to enter the United States.

While observation was the core means of researcher involvement, interviews comprised the bulk of the data. Both Ignacio Ochoa and Edwin Villela were re-interviewed to expand on findings from the exploratory case study and open deeper conversation on topics of relevance. Interviews were conducted with other key organizational stakeholders including members, volunteers, and donors, as well as North American nonprofit leaders currently operating in Guatemala and one indigenous Mayan transnational nonprofit leader. Interviews were conducted in North America and Guatemala. All interviews were open-ended and semi-structured, and participants were encouraged to continue the interview with the researcher if they felt points were missed or clarification was necessary. Each interview lasted approximately one hour. All interviews were recorded and the researcher transcribed all the interviews with the exception of two sent to a transcription service due to time constraints. The researcher originally proposed a total of 30 interviews believing 15 interviews per leader more than appropriate to obtain the data required. In reality, while the spheres of operation span the local to the international, the core group of both organizations is much smaller averaging

4-5 interviews for each organization. As required by the IRB, all data will be kept in a secure file for five years released only to the IRB and only upon formal request.

Figure 2. Political Map of Guatemala (Nations Online Project, 2016) modified to indicate locations visited by researcher.

Data Analysis

This dissertation does not reflect grounded theory in its purest form. An exploratory case study was conducted in late 2014 to determine the presence of native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leaders and revealing how their positionality informs the leaders' organizational theory of action (Mitchell, Ochoa, & Villela, in press). Thus, this study is not approached without prior knowledge of the leaders' positionality or how their organizational actions may be influenced by their positionality. Rather, the emergent theoretical focus of this grounded theory study seeks to know more specifically how the leaders' insider/outsider situation (a part of the leader's positionality) knowingly or unknowingly advises, infuses, is used in service to, their nonprofit practice.

Data consisted of 18 interviews (2 exploratory interviews with 16 additional interviews undertaken for this study), 11 researcher-recorded site video clips, 10 researcher-recorded site audio clips, approximately 550 researcher-recorded site photographs, 4 museum visits, 4 public building visits, 1 monument visit, plus numerous artifacts consisting of email correspondence between participants and the researcher (particularly participants located in Guatemala), organizational training materials, organizational promotional materials (brochures, business cards, websites, etc.), research memos, and researcher journal pages. Real-time, running memos recording daily field activity were generated via qualitative software's cell phone application for Android. Journaling was then used to thicken descriptions of researcher interactions and add clarity of thought as research and analysis was undertaken. Audio recordings of interviews were coded in addition to interview transcripts providing deeper understanding of participant

responses. As allowed by situational analysis, nonprofit discourse was analyzed to ground common issues and discover the discursive elements related to nonprofit theory and practice, then uncover their interaction with the data.

Data analysis was undertaken according to the precepts of situational analysis. As a supplement to grounded theory, all data was first thematically coded using qualitative software to bring forward key themes (Saldaña & Miles, 2013). The primary coding category was theory of action supported by the propositions of the insider/outsider situation. From literature and the prior exploratory study, a certain number of analytical codes were expected, noted, and included within the grounded coding process. By studying emerging themes in organizational action, patterns of situated, insider/outsider understanding emerged (Clarke 2003, 2007; Kvale & Brinkman, 2009). A case comparison of action patterns was initiated to contextualize the data and control for inferences. Finally, on recommendation of Saldaña and Miles (2013) and with the useful technology of qualitative software, coding began with descriptive codes moving quickly to analytical codes since the software allows coding notations. Because of software capabilities, codes were defined and refined as the coding progressed. Initial coding produced 104 codes which when studied, compared, and edited established 83 project codes. These project codes are presented in Appendix B, Table 3.

Situational analysis works through a series of mapping exercises supporting study of the situated knowledge of the individuals examined, differences of perspective, complex situations of action as informed by insider/outsider consciousness, and the ascendant discourses surrounding the situation (Clarke, 2005, p. xxiii). Situational analysis finds worthy usefulness in the complexity of actual situations and differences

mapping this complexity. Again, this process does not replace basic grounded theory but rather supplements grounded theory with additional data gathering and analytic approaches to bring forward postmodern shifts in theoretical perspectives. A cyclical process of interviewing/journaling/memoing/recording, transcribing (if interview took place), coding, and mapping was found to best serve situational analysis, though this was at times difficult to maintain during field research. The key to situation analysis is to begin working with the data as close to obtaining that data as possible.

Situational analysis encompasses the use of three generative mapping techniques. The first mapping is the situational mapping acting as a researcher tool to ensure all 12 situational dimensions were explored in relation to the insider/outsider situation. This mapping consists of what is known and what is discovered through the coding process compared with codes taken from the literature and exploratory study pushing the researcher to ask questions where gaps and distinctions appear. This situational mapping with associated codes is provided in Appendix B, Table 3.

The second generative mapping is a working relational mapping. This mapping takes the codes and specifies the connections/relationships between the codes. Starting out fairly chaotic, the relational map eventually categorizes itself into associated relational groups and can be adjusted with each round of data collection and coding. The relational mapping is provided in Appendix B, *Figure 6*. From the relational mapping, the 83 project codes were grouped into three topics: (1) Leadership; (2) Bridges, or privileged spaces allowing the native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leader to undertake his work, with a sub-topic of Gates, indicating a controlling of bridge flows; and (3) Collisions as negotiated understandings of major issues concerning the nonprofit

sector to bring the native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leader to the greater nonprofit conversation.

The third generative map is the social arenas map outlining the interactions of the relational groups taking into account the interactions brought forward in the literature and exploratory study, as informed by the situational elements within a real-world setting. The third map quickly moves into final project map completing the analysis explicating, or operationalizing, the particular aspects of Guatemalan transnational nonprofit leader's nonprofit work as informed by his insider/outsider situation interacting with salient points of nonprofit discourse. The project map reflects the findings of the analysis and is presented in Chapter 5 (see *Figure 5*).

Conclusion

This study's question asked: *how does the native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leader's positionality, as insider/outsider, inform his theory of action for his organization?* This case study uses situational analysis to answer the question due to its ecological frame and its post-modern preference for complex social situations. Focused on participant voice, situational analysis is a supplement to grounded theory methodology illuminating key elements and conditions based on 12 dimensions of social engagement of the complexity of the native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leader's insider/outsider consciousness. A cyclical process meant to work with the data as soon as possible following collection supports three mapping exercises culminating in a final project map.

This dissertation proceeds with Chapter 3. The chapter provides necessary background to the study bringing forward a reflection of the researcher's Guatemalan-

North American engagement, an overview of Guatemala's socio-political and nonprofit history, and an introduction of Edwin Villela and Ignacio Ochoa as Guatemalan transnational nonprofit leaders. The chapter pays particular attention to establishing North America's connection to Guatemala.

Chapter 3: Background

Introduction

Given the transnational topic and the origin of the participant leaders, it is important to know a little about Guatemala and its relationship to North America. This chapter begins with a brief reflection of the researcher's encountered cross-border juxtapositions during the research process. The reflection quickly transitions to a general country profile grounding understanding for the site of research. The profile is followed by an overview of Guatemala's socio-political history leading into a summary of Guatemala's nonprofit sector. This chapter then introduces the participants of this case study: Ignacio Ochoa of Guatemala-based Fundación Nahual, and Edwin Villela of North-America-based Help for Schools, Inc., as two examples of native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leaders. The chapter concludes arguing the participant leaders' relevance to this study and introducing current understanding of transnational nonprofit activity.

Researcher Reflection

Entering the Casa de La Memoria museum in Guatemala City there is an exhibit of artist figurines, the small, humanesque, androgynous wooden figures with many moving joints used by artists and art students as models for paintings and sketches as a substitute for real persons. There are two rows of about 10 of these figurines, each with a netted pack full of blocks on their back carried by a strap positioned across their forehead. The figurines are tethered together. The placard explains the years of slavery and subjugation of the indigenous Maya of Guatemala. At that moment, the researcher remembers an earlier visited exhibit 2,000 miles away, part of a larger exhibition at a

southern California natural history museum meant to “reveal the Maya” to North American audiences. The North American exhibit’s placard reads “People Power Moved Maya Goods” explaining how the trumpline, the strap across the forehead, aligns the netted pack heavy with goods along the Maya carrier’s spine making the load easier to transport. Off to the side of the placard, the same type of wooden artist figurine is tethered to blocks encouraging the museum visitor to try to balance the blocks on the figurine to prove how much more efficient the trumpline is. The researcher remembers thinking the exhibit simplifies and romanticizes the poverty of the Mayan reality. Yet, in Guatemala City, the researcher is stopped by a profound juxtaposition. One exhibit in Guatemala uses the figurines, trumplines, and tethers as a metaphor for the very real misery following the Maya through years of their existence. One exhibit in Southern California romanticizes the existence of the Maya inviting people to play with the figurine, trumpline, and tether of the Maya’s misery. The juxtaposition is one of many providing the researcher a very brief but profound glimpse of an insider/outsider reality.

In another insider/outsider juxtaposition, the researcher and the Help for Schools team had completed their supply drops in the far western part of Guatemala. Being tired, hot, and sweaty, the team decides to take a sightseeing excursion to the Guatemala/Mexico border town of Tecún Umán, Guatemala, for some refreshments. The group was mesmerized as they encountered at least two miles of trucks, 18-wheeled cargo vehicles used to transport merchandise, waiting in line along the side of the Pan-American Highway heading north. The researcher and team members, living along the California/Mexico border, are familiar with border-crossing wait times listening to progress as a regular part of traffic updates on the southern Californian radio stations.

The juxtaposition for the researcher was stark. North America tries as hard to contain the northern movement of Mexico as Mexico tries to contain the northern movement of Guatemala. Movement north seems to be such a forbidden act. Such encountered juxtapositions become common throughout the researcher's field work in Guatemala but are always surprising.

The researcher traveled fairly extensively in Guatemala (see *Figure 2*). Along the way the researcher applauded an experimental wind farm in the south and struggled to breathe through the choking wood fires still used in the Mayan-populated mountainous areas to heat homes and cook. In the north of Guatemala, the researcher was puzzled to see a new home resembling the stick-built, split-level model typical of North American suburbia sitting next to a brand new church built in the traditionally thick and rounded Spanish-style of block, plaster, and stucco. The researcher also lodged with a Ixil Maya family in Nebaj getting a feel for a very rough existence the researcher did not suffer happily, while soon after luxuriated at a modern resort hotel, eating pizza and drinking wine at a lovely restaurant, in Panajachel on Lake Atitlán with American tourists. The researcher concluded that while Guatemala has been described as a country of contrasts because each region has its own distinct character, culture, environment, and sometimes even language, it may be more accurate to say Guatemala is a country of transitions as it flows and works, adapts and changes even while very different people and terrains edge against each other. The researcher also concluded Guatemala and North America edge and flow into each other in interesting ways.

Guatemala Country Profile

Guatemala, a Central American country, encompasses approximately 67,660 square miles (an area almost the size of Pennsylvania) joining with Belize and Mexico in the north, El Salvador and Honduras in the south, the North Pacific Ocean in the west, and the Caribbean Ocean in the east (CIA World Factbook, 2015). It is a terrain where a traveler can leave the farming coastal plains at sea level in the morning and arrive by late afternoon at the mountainous areas of the indigenous Maya located 9,000 feet above sea level. It is also not unusual to pass within sight of a volcano or two. Nearly 15 million people, predominantly indigenous Mayan groups plus descendents of the mixed

Figure 3. (CIA World Factbook, 2015) Country map of Guatemala juxtaposed against the Washington, D.C., area of the United States to represent country's size of 67,660 square miles.

Indigenous-Spanish (called *Ladinos*) and Europeans, call Guatemala home (CIA World Factbook, 2015). However, representing the country as only constituting two populations is inaccurate when four ethnically defined groups exist: Maya (Indian origin), Mestizo (Indo-European origin), Garifona (African and Caribbean origin), and Xinca (indigenous Pipil origin) (Palencia Prado & Holiday, 1996). A researcher visit to a cultural museum in Guatemala City also noted Guatemalans of Chinese, English, French, German, Hindu, Italian, Jewish, Norwegian, Lebanese, and Palestinian backgrounds, though these are admittedly small populations. Together, these groups make up the most populous country in Latin America with the fastest growing population rate (CIA World Factbook, 2015). Spanish is the official language though it shares space with 20 officially recognized Mayan languages plus Garifona and Xinca (CIA World Factbook, 2015; Palencia Prado & Holiday, 1996). On a visit to an Mayan-run educational/vocational nonprofit in Chajul, in northwest Guatemala, the researcher found it interesting the primary home language is Indigenous and students had to attend Spanish immersion classes before starting their educational/vocational courses. The country is predominantly Catholic, a leftover from its colonial past, though Protestantism has gained a large hold and indigenous Mayan beliefs remain strong (CIA World Factbook, 2015).

Guatemala is breathtakingly beautiful; yet, there is an apparent chasm between who can afford beauty and those who inhabit the poor, over-crowded *barrios* of the city or the struggling rural farming areas. Guatemala is a largely poor country with an unequal income distribution benefitting the top 20 percent of the population leaving the rest to live below the poverty line (CIA Factbook, 2015). Poverty disparately affects indigenous groups (CIA Factbook, 2015). As usual, poverty also fuels malnutrition.

With almost half of Guatemala's population under age 19, the youngest population in Latin America, the fact that nearly half of Guatemala's children under age 5 are chronically malnourished paints a grim picture (CIA Factbook, 2015). Traveling from the northwestern mountains from Nebaj to Chajul, watching an indigenous family in their *traje*, their traditional clothing, walk off the road and start up into the mountains may paint a sweet, romantic sight for a North American researcher; yet in reality, the family probably lives dramatically below a standard living with little prospect for improvement.

Due to the high poverty rate, it is not surprising the country experiences a high migration rate, legally and illegally, to Canada, Mexico, and the United States (CIA World Factbook, 2015). There are 4.7 million working-age individuals in Guatemala (CIA World Factbook, 2015) most without education, living-wage employment, or trade opportunities amidst a Guatemalan government exacerbating the situation with fiscal corruption. Thus, people leave in order to send money home. Guatemala, with a living monthly salary of only 500 Guatemalan quetzals (roughly \$65), is the top remittance recipient in Central America (CIA World Factbook, 2015). That is not to say Guatemalans want to leave their country or do not confront the disparate and corrupt situation. Multiple corruption scandals were brought forward in 2015 leading to the resignation of the President, Vice President, and other high-level economic officials (CIA World Factbook, 2015), and recently, the researcher was informed Guatemalan university students are leading impactful public demonstrations challenging the exclusionary, hierarchical, colonialistic and repressive legacies reflected in modern socio-cultural and political ideologies.

Guatemalan History

Guatemala's history is one of continuously brutal discrimination against the majority indigenous Mayan population. The Guatemalan government's Spanish colonialists established a hierarchically feudalistic society, which subjugated and exploited the country's Maya in order to support market agriculture (Elliott, 1998; Grandin, 2000; Loucky & Moors, 2000). The system instituted Spanish as the official language, subdivided Mayan communities into 30 different nationally constructed ethnic/linguistic groups resettling them into (currently 22) administrative territories (i.e., known as "departments" somewhat similar to U.S. state structures), and placed Europeans and *Ladinos* in authority over a non-representative state (Elliott, 1998; Palencia Prado & Holiday, 1996). This state system of hegemonic patronage continued beyond independence in the 19th century and into industrialization in the 20th century without major disruption (Elliott, 1998; Loucky & Moors, 2000; Moser, McIlwaine, & World Bank, 2001; Palencia Prado & Holiday, 1996). The Cold War's threat of communism spurred U.S. interest in Guatemala when the democratically elected governments of Arévalo (1945-1950) and Árbenz (1951-1954) initiated reforms including land redistribution. United Fruit Company, a U.S.-based corporation with considerable property holdings in Guatemala, reacted to redistribution by convincing the U.S. government the reforms were communist based (Blum, 2001; Loucky & Moors, 2000; Schelesinger & Kinser, 1982). A U.S.-backed, CIA-sponsored coup overthrew the Árbenz government in 1954 leading the way for a succession of repressive military regimes that unleashed civil war beginning in 1960 between the regime and opposing internal forces (Blum, 2001; Loucky & Moors, 2000). Spurred by Fidel Castro's success

in Cuba, Guatemalan guerrilla opposition forces emerged resulting in the military government's retaliatory genocidal "scorched earth" counter-insurgency policies (Blum, 2001; Grandin, 2000; Palencia Prado & Holiday, 1996) mainly targeting the mountainous departments of Huehuetenango and El Quiché where the Maya had farming villages. According to Palencia Prado and Holiday (1996), the tense climate of 1980s resulted in the highest reported rates of kidnappings, murders, and massacres of the long civil war. The Guatemalan civil war lasted until 1996 resulting in "200,000 deaths, 1 million homeless and internally displaced persons, thousands of refugees, and the annihilation of over 440 indigenous villages in a country with a population of 11 million" (Blum, 2001, p. 329; See also *Comisión para el Esclarecimiento Histórico* (Guatemala), & Higonnet, 2009; *Proyecto Interdiocesano Recuperación de la Memoria Histórica* (Guatemala), Catholic Institute for International Relations, & Latin America Bureau, 1999). It must be noted, however, this war was a fairly contained affair with Guatemalans outside the mountainous areas largely unaware and unaffected by the war. The researcher found it was not unusual to encounter people in Guatemala City who stated their state of living only deteriorated for them after the war's end.

The civil war as well as post-conflict violence and economic hardship are largely responsible for the contemporary Guatemalan migration (Loucky & Moors, 2000; Stoll, 2013). By the mid-1980s, the worst years of the civil war, there were large numbers of Guatemalans in California, Florida, and Texas (Loucky & Moors, 2000). Popkin (1999) reports the 1990 U.S. Census placed 269,000 Guatemalans in the United States. Post-conflict, the persistently deteriorating economic conditions continue to send migrants north (Moser, McIlwaine, & World Bank, 2001; Stoll, 2013). Guatemalan communities

have a particularly large presence in the Los Angeles area (Levenson-Estrada, 2013; Loucky & Moors, 2000). Secondary migrations have now situated Guatemalans across U.S. Sunbelt and in Canada from British Columbia to Prince Edward Island (Loucky & Moors, 2000). As David and Wendy, participants to this study note, they were surprised to see in Princeton, New Jersey, there is a “whole section of town known as ‘Little Guatemala’.”

The Guatemalan Nonprofit Sector

Migration to seek betterment, however, is only part of the Guatemalan development story, which excludes internal nonprofit efforts. While the general history of the Guatemalan nonprofit sector stretches back to the late 1800s (Browning, Guerra, and Girón, 1998), peace expanded the influence and role of the nonprofit sector in Guatemala, particularly in terms of sustainable post-conflict redevelopment (Beck, 2014; Blum, 2001; Palencia Prado & Holiday, 1996). It has been estimated there were between 1,000 and 1,500 nonprofit organizations in operation when the peace accords were signed (Beck, 2014; Browning, 1993; Palencia Prado & Holiday, 1996; Sridhar, 2007) with known hostility by the wartime military government toward Indigenous organizations diminishing their contributions (Browning, Guerra, & Girón, 1998; Palencia Prado & Holiday, 1996). Some estimates state there are now as many as 10,000 organizations operating in the country (Beck, 2011; Browning, 1993; Sridhar, 2007). Of these, Guatemalan government-tracking (2006-2013) places Guatemalan-headed, in-country nonprofit activity at 448 associations, 457 foundations, and 611 NGOs (Ministerio de Gobernación, 2016) not including community development organizations, which are only required to register at the municipal level.

Moser, McIlwaine, and World Bank (2001) state nongovernmental organizations (NGOs), many of which are internationally based, are more trusted than community-based organizations (CBOs), with most post-conflict Western-European-inspired NGO agendas mandating a move from service-delivery assistance to administrative efficiency, monitoring and evaluation, professionalism, and localized self-sufficiency (Palencia Prado & Holiday, 1996). However, tensions arise from the paternalistic nature of the NGO system. Palencia Prado's and Holiday's 1996 report, authored the signing year of the peace accords, noted while the post-conflict Guatemalan constitution recognized freedom to organize, grassroots civil society participation greatly varied because typically vertical, top-down organizational hierarchy consolidated functions within a few unchanging executives who were unsupportive of democratic decision-making, including displaying uncooperativeness with community leadership structures, and capacity-building training programs (Palencia Prado & Holiday, 1996). Researcher exposure concludes this procedural hierarchy largely remains in effect today. However, more relevant to this study, the number of Guatemalan-led nonprofits transnational in nature, meaning known quantity of Guatemalan-led nonprofits operating permanently, temporarily, or some combination thereof between Guatemala and North America, is unknown. The next section introduces two native Guatemalan transnational nonprofit leaders.

Participant Cases

Fundación Nahual. Ignacio Ochoa, legal representative of Guatemalan-based and registered Fundación Nahual, is adamant in his connection to his country. "My base is in Guatemala...I always thought that whatever I do to train, to get training, to study is

to go back and serve. Nothing really gets better than being in Guatemala. Nothing.”

Ignacio’s story is compelling. Born and raised in southeast Guatemala to a *Ladino* family on United Fruit Company property, he trained as a Jesuit in his younger years, attending the Jesuit chain of universities in Guatemala, El Salvador, Honduras, and Panama. Traveling and meeting people, he became aware of, and interested in, the growing people’s movements, citizen and guerrilla, organizing against the repressive Central American governments of the time. Interestingly, he admits to picking coffee for the Sandinistas in Nicaragua and considered joining a guerrilla group for a brief time. He left the Jesuits in 1990 after his Jesuit professors and companions were killed in El Salvador on November 16, 1989, by the Salvadorian government seeking to eliminate internally combative and oppositional elements. Returning to Guatemala, Ignacio worked for the Jesuit Refugee Service, being one of six Guatemalans who co-found the Archbishops Office of Human Rights in Guatemala (ODHAG), and ran a Guatemalan Cultural Center and Mayan and Spanish Language School in the rural mountains of Guatemala. He worked during the Guatemalan refugee return process providing open dialogue and spaces of art, literature, and music to teach Guatemalans about the Peace Negotiations. Since that time, he has remained focused on community organizing. Commenting on his extremely interesting past, of only a few words are written here, he states, “I never asked to be in these circumstances. I never created anything. I was only following the path presented me.”

Education plays a central role to Ignacio’s service to Fundación Nahual and the Guatemalan people. Ignacio not only holds a Jesuit education through the system of Jesuit universities in Guatemala, El Salvador, Honduras, and Panama, he has also

attended universities in Boston and San Diego. In 1997, Ignacio pursued a Fellowship Program on Medical Anthropology and Public Health Studies at Boston University, and in 1999, he achieved his Master's degree in Latin American Studies at San Diego State University. He teaches university classes in Guatemala and has taught a human geography course for a British Columbia university. He also coordinates and facilitates study abroad programs for British Columbia and U.S. universities. In order to learn from what he indicates are the "real people" located where he travels, he claims to work in construction and other menial jobs, or as a mental health counselor or community organizer. He plans to pursue a doctorate in the future. When not attending school in North America Ignacio returns to Guatemala, working to strengthen civil society by teaching methods of community organizing. He states educational exchanges have been beneficial to him and seeks ways for the education to benefit the work of Fundación Nahual and indigenous communities.

Ignacio is the legal representative and a member of the assembly of the small-scale nonprofit, Fundación Nahual, headquartered in Antigua, Guatemala. From Mayan spirituality, a nahual is an animal believed to accompany and protect a person. Founded in 2002, Fundación Nahual is a registered Guatemalan association working as a voluntary, uncompensated, civil society planning group focused on citizen participatory education. Participatory education encompasses many elements for Ignacio and it can be difficult to pinpoint a specific mission. Three individual projects have been concretely identified: Community Development Council development, the establishment of an Indigenous University, and a Think Tank of the Americas.

By word of mouth and invitation, the association conducts schools of leadership and training with indigenous communities to form Community Development Councils (COCODEs), a public investment and planning system established by the Guatemalan government. The COCODE is the legal means by which communities bring forward priorities for municipal improvements and secure money from the Guatemalan government to fund those improvements. Fundación Nahual's work is a collaborative partnership with established community leaders encompassing an empowerment and transformative pedagogy. The association does not undertake this work because indigenous communities are not an organized entity. Ignacio firmly states, "I never, never found disorganized communities. I always found organized communities. The thing is that they're organized not in a colonial¹ understanding." To achieve the training, teaching tools have ranged from a radio program, or radio *novela*, to engage audiences in learning through a popular entertainment medium, to textbooks authored in partnership with community leadership, and now, the recent redesigning and restructuring of the organization's website to have the training tools, laws, and associated materials broadly available to the public. Once the COCODE is established, Fundación Nahual accompanies communities' efforts to access to the government-owned community house for meetings, to educate community members on their rights and duties as citizens of Guatemala, and to enter the COCODEs into Guatemala's multi-level representative political structure.

---

1. Ignacio used the word colonial to indicate the organizational system formed by the Spanish who colonized Guatemala, a system remaining visible today. He also used the term to indicate Western-European community organizational systems as different to, and separate from, indigenous systems of community organizing.

Ignacio is presently in Guatemala following two-year attendance at a First Nations university in Vancouver, British Columbia, working toward a counseling certificate. The training is intended to aid Fundación Nahual's mission by addressing cross cultural approaches and treatment for indigenous alcoholism and drug addiction through pedagogy respectful of the indigenous people and their ways of learning and healing. The association wishes to start its own indigenous university. Ignacio explains the purpose of the university is to meet people where they are, acknowledging not only abuse but also high levels of illiteracy, hoping success through a comfortable pedagogy spurs individuals to pursue university courses. Ignacio explains, "It's so different when you teach sociology, or anthropology, or political science in a format where, yes, you understand the world, the outside world" whereas an indigenous pedagogy assures indigenous communities "there is something within their own culture, it will be something that we order their knowledge, that they will be more prepared, no? Not just for their own people, but for all of us." In other words, he sees using an indigenous pedagogy as utilizing the strength of the community experiences that are part of their culture and history. At this time, funding for the university remains precarious, although Ignacio voiced plans to sustain the university by coordinating student exchange programs, particularly recruiting indigenous students in North America for participation.

The Think Tank by and for the Indigenous Peoples of the Americas is ultimately the grand vision of Ignacio. He came up with the idea while studying in the United States in the 1990s. In attending university in San Diego and living in student housing in La Jolla, California, he became acquainted with Native American tribes and indigenous Mexican communities living close to the U.S.-Mexico border. The idea was furthered by

Ignacio's exposure to indigenous Mexican groups along the Guatemalan-Mexico border encountered as part of the refugee resettlement process, and recent introduction to Canadian First Nation's groups. Ignacio believes there is a necessity for the indigenous peoples of North and Central America to come together under a democratic, participatory organizational cover in order to discuss to solve the problems seemingly indicative of all indigenous peoples despite location (though these were not specifically named). At present, there has been little movement on the Think Tank, though Ignacio believes its time will come. He understands it is difficult to mobilize interests and organize such disparate and oftentimes isolated groups who are among the poorest of the poor with little access to resources. In the meantime, the Think Tank nearly always makes its appearance in discussion.

Ignacio is committed to the service of his country and holds Guatemalans to the same commitment. Throughout his time in Canada and the United States he remained in contact with Guatemala through web-based televideo applications and email in order to see to necessary business. Now back in Guatemala, Ignacio focuses on reestablishing and remobilizing the organization while struggling to find project funding and a permanent professional position. He continually voices suspicion and criticism of the Guatemalan government, which continues to struggle with corruption, the Guatemalan university system, which he sees as structured to keep the elite fractured from the rest of Guatemala, and the international and local nongovernmental organizations, which he feels are exclusionary of the communities they seek to help. More personally, Ignacio reflects,

[My brothers and sister] went to school but also they were working and all this stuff, while I was doing something else, no? I think, therefore, I need to be back unless I feel myself – like I been going and living like four types of lives, I suggest that I have pictures to show how involved I was and how many responsibilities I had, crossing borders and things like that.

Ignacio's personal definition of responsibility is intricately tied to improving Guatemala, though he recognizes age is slowing him down and he needs to seek more secure, stable employment. Yet, in the same personal frame, he states each Guatemalan has a place of service to Guatemala and each needs to find that place. Ignacio feels it is Guatemalan's, rich and poor, educated and uneducated, Mayan or Ladino, who have a collective responsibility to make their country better.

Help for Schools, Inc. (Fundación Para La Educación En Guatemala). Edwin Villela relates, "Well, I come to the states, you know, and then years later when I went back to Guatemala, I made a trip – my first trip was in, if I recall, in 1988. So, you're looking at eight years later by the time I had gone through the country. Close to twelve years later, I am going back.... I see the places and I thought, I mean, we're progressing in Guatemala but I see more people, and I see more poverty, too. We're developing but with development also comes other problems." Edwin's story is no less compelling and no less representative of service than Ignacio's.

Edwin was born and raised in southeast Guatemala in Chiquimula, a predominantly Ladino area, with two brothers and two sisters. They lost their father in the civil war. Edwin explains,

I don't recall exactly how they took place..., but I know that the guerrilla warfare and all that started in the late 1960s. I'm sorry, no, in the mid-60s the movement, the guerrilla movement, started. And so, there were confrontations, especially in the eastern part of the country. Back then we knew that there were influences from communist countries trying to aid this movements...so, there were certain confrontations...and, my father, I don't recall exactly how it happened, but I know that he was part of the groups that were formed in towns to protect themselves. I don't exactly know how the confrontation was. In one of those confrontations, my dad lost his life....

Edwin was 15 years old when his father was killed. In an effort to continue to support her family, his mother, Marta, immigrated to the United States. All of his brothers and sisters eventually followed her becoming American citizens.

In Guatemala, Edwin attended various urban primary schools before entering the military school in Zacapa, Guatemala, to pursue a military career. He eventually left the military school because, he states, "I had disciplinary problems" intimating his worldview did not match that of the military. He then obtained a bachelor's diploma in science and language, going to work in the Guatemala City banking sector. He finally left Guatemala in 1980, when the war escalated, to join his family in Los Angeles, California. Edwin initially supported himself with shift work at a furniture factory. He laughs as he says, "And, of course to me it was like a shock, you know? Getting used to see how we were making furniture down there with nails and hammers and coming here and seeing these big machines that would put together chairs and tables so fast and

everything on an assembly line.” To improve his position, he first attended free ESL classes at a local high school, gained U.S. citizenship, and then pursued courses in real estate through a local community college obtaining his real estate license in 1984. By this time, Edwin had a wife and family. Edwin, tired of the densely populated Los Angeles area, moved his family to Oceanside, (at that time) a sparsely populated northern suburb of San Diego, where he currently resides.

Edwin is president of the small-scale nonprofit, Help for Schools, Inc., a registered 501(c)(3) organization located in Oceanside, California. A group of friends, all Guatemalan immigrants and migrants in either San Diego or Los Angeles, informally started the organization in 2008 to assist their Guatemalan home communities suffering a severe drought. Providing items like medicine and food, their efforts continued for nearly two years. In order to increase the reach of their aid, the group registered as a formal nonprofit in 2010. The organization is voluntary and its officers are uncompensated. Edwin states 100 percent of money raised goes to projects. Their organization relies on newspaper articles, word of mouth, and referrals from members, family, and friends to identify service locations, and works closely with volunteers in Guatemala. Help for Schools is not registered in Guatemala, though Edwin feels it may eventually pursue that registration if doing so would improve the organization’s work. At present, he states the organization is working well.

Education plays a central role to the work of Help for Schools. The group decided the most indelible, sustainable mission for the organization was to support education. Edwin states education helps Guatemalans improve themselves so they can improve their country. Help for Schools targets rural schools where sometimes students

from other villages walk hours through trails between hills and mountains to attend. Edwin tells of having to ride horseback to reach one of the schools the organization sponsored. Edwin states it would be just as easy to help schools in the more populated areas, and he clarifies the government does provide help to even the most rural of schools; however, because of their target schools' location, supplies often do not arrive until well into the school year. Help for Schools believes it gives the rural children a good start to the school year. Edwin explains, "Once [the parents] know that an organization with supplies and they will have means to learn, to learn better, maybe even learn a little more, we have seen that these kids, instead of being turned out to the fields to work, you know, they're sent to school." Help for Schools helps approximately 500 kids annually.

Supplies are delivered once a year, in January, to coincide with the beginning of the Guatemalan school year. The organization generally provides backpacks, notebooks, pencils, color pencils/crayons, as well as teaching aids for the teachers. However, the organization has also provided needed infrastructure where it is lacking. Edwin states, "We always say a school, a school, a school; but, in some of these places, teachers teach under the shade of a tree, with the kids sitting on the ground, you know?" The organization has raised funds to build classrooms to get the children and teachers out of the sun and rain, kitchens to ensure the children are provided a nice meal, and sanitary facilities so children do not have to use outhouses. In certain circumstances, they have also provided electricity and water to school buildings. Edwin reports Help for Schools has seen enrollment increase by almost 50 percent where their organization has provided help.

Help for Schools works closely with the villages they serve. In terms of building projects, Help for Schools commits to providing the building materials while the communities provide the labor. The organization obtains a proposal for the costs for materials then, with the help of in-country volunteers, approaches the leadership committee in the village to obtain authorization for action. Edwin states, “We want [the community] to be part of it....” Since roads only go so far and are often in disrepair, a truck will sometimes drop the supplies then every capable individual – children, parents, and grandparents – carry all the materials to the location. Besides school supplies, materials include cement blocks, rebar, sand, chairs, and desks. Edwin concludes, “They do it with such enthusiasm because they feel happy that [someone] has an interest in their little community.” The organization has visited each of the served locations at least once with one school sponsored for yearly supplies. Every time an organizational member travels to Guatemala, usually for personal reasons, they meet with those involved with the projects and with volunteers.

Edwin is committed to the development of Guatemala. Edwin feels the ability to form and rely on networks of individuals from North America to Guatemala, access to Guatemalan newspapers, speaking the language, sharing the culture, and having a common connection to the country enable the organization’s success. Edwin states, “Outside help only goes so far; that’s just a fact.” Edwin sees other nonprofit organizations working in the villages and notes they have contributed much to the communities’ improvement. However, Edwin believes it is Guatemalans who need to do the work to improve their country. He states,

We, as Guatemalans, need to get better. You know, we want to see our country better, we want society better. We got to get better educated, and we have to respect our resources or develop in a better way. But, if we Guatemalans don't learn to upgrade ourselves, the country's not going to do it. It's just not going to happen. I do believe that we can get better. But, I know it's *our* people, it's Guatemalans, who will do it, you know? Yes, the outside help could help, but I don't put my hopes on that outside aid, you know? I would like to see it within ourselves. Through us.

[emphasis his]

Edwin clearly identifies himself as Guatemalan with a responsibility to his country. He is committed to the mission of Help for Kids and would like to find more U.S. sponsors, emphasizing he will go anywhere and speak to anyone interested in helping to further their mission. Edwin noted, however, that he is getting older and wonders how long he can take on this work. He stated he is ready to pass on the leadership of the organization to another member.

Edwin's brother and his wife and children returned to Guatemala. Edwin's mother is retired and travels between Guatemala and the U.S. as needed for her health care. Edwin, his brother and their sister own the home in which they were born and raised in Chiquimula. His brother's family occupies the main home with Edwin and their sister occupying additional living structures on the property. It is a quaint, comfortable, lively home full of family. Edwin and his wife, Elvia, plan to retire there.

Conclusion

Edwin and Ignacio are part of a small contingency not represented in the profile or history of Guatemala. They are Guatemalans who have used their privileged position

in Guatemala and North America to support the development of their home country. Their privilege encompasses membership within the more powerful and financially secure Guatemalan ethnic group, the ability to travel freely, and acquired education. These are Guatemalans with a relatively secure upbringing, possessing legal entry to North America, and who moved beyond the remittance economy. Furthermore, these Guatemalans used their privileged circumstances to enter into formal nonprofit activity. Edwin and Ignacio have adapted to their realities, accepting the opportunities presented them, to take on the responsibility to help the development of their home country.

However, research and scholarship, specifically nonprofit research and scholarship, has not actively engaged with leaders like Edwin and Ignacio. As a result, we know very little about their emergence. Without a database of this population upon which to draw conclusions, these leaders must be discussed within parameters of what is currently known. The next chapter discusses theory and current literature. The chapter argues transnational is the most accurate descriptor for these leaders who travel between North America and Guatemala as part and parcel of their nonprofit development activity and offers one way to begin a conversation with them.

Chapter 4: Literature

Introduction

The previous chapter contextualized Guatemala as the site of inquiry and introduced Ignacio Ochoa and Edwin Villela as Guatemalan nonprofit leaders dedicated to the development of their home country. In addition, Ignacio and Edwin were presented as the research participants for this dissertation. This chapter introduces the conceptual framework guiding this dissertation's research question then discusses these leaders in connection to current nonprofit discourse. This chapter begins by offering a background for the literature review placing Ignacio Ochoa and Edwin Villela as transnationals. The background is not the literature review in itself but meant to provide the reader with a summary indication of the process guiding the researcher's inquiry. This background is followed with a multidisciplinary literature review to situate transnationals within relevant, current scholarly discussion. As will be seen, transnationals are approached differently according to discipline but are characterized as bridges between the local and the international. A conceptual framework is then presented as one way to introduce the native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leader to the nonprofit conversation by conceptualizing the leader as a local leader who crosses borders frequently to help the development of his home. The chapter concludes with a summary of literature grounding the questions for this dissertation.

Background Guiding Review and Search Descriptors

Before beginning the literature review, the researcher feels it is important contextualize current dynamics within nonprofit research and scholarship guiding this dissertation inquiry. The interdisciplinary nonprofit field has generally engaged in two

distinct dimensions of research – local or international. This means up to the time of this writing researchers and scholars typically pursue questions related to local, in-country nonprofit engagement, or they pursue questions related to international nonprofits (mostly likely) permanently situated in the Global North but who work in regions of need (mostly likely locations in the poorer, less stable Global South). International nonprofits cross international borders to engage in advocacy or activism, emergency relief, and/or development in a one-way, north-to-south projection. Alternatively, there is a culturally popular understanding of transnational, an understanding spurred by Guarnizo and Smith's (2002) 'transnationalism from below', as a term reserved for individuals who travel freely, legally, and regularly from a home country outside North America or Europe to situate themselves for the purposes of education or profession. Definitions always seem to fluctuate and evolve, and transnationals, as indicated by researcher exposure, appear to be at this time thought of differently from poorer, working-class migrants with restricted movement and possible undocumented realities. Furthermore, transnationals were never thought or expected to assimilate or return (Heisler and Heisler, 1986) holding a preference to subvert the authority and control of the state (Smouts, 1998). Typically for purposes of research and scholarship, transnationals and transnationalism are generally the purview of international inquiry despite their local to international interactions.

This dissertation presents its participants, Edwin Villela and Ignacio Ochoa, as transnationals. Both of these educated, professional leaders with formally registered nonprofit organizations travel freely, legally, and regularly between Guatemala and North America, fully engaging in both countries economically, politically, and socially

(Lacroix, 2009). However, these transnational leaders disrupt the local/international divide in nonprofit research and scholarship simply by their geographical location (i.e., one leader is permanently located in North America holding dual citizenship while the other is permanently located in Guatemala with visa access) and they operate small-scale local transnational nonprofits extending service beyond the transfer of money. The leaders undertake their missions, without subverting state authority and control, working directly with and through local Guatemalan and North American communities. In other words, local is where the leader is at any given time (Basch, Glick Schiller, & Szanton Blanc, 1994). Furthermore, these nonprofits do not take on large-scale mobilization of resources typical of international nonprofits. These transnational leaders and their small nonprofits exist because globalization has collapsed the distance between the local and the international, and with their freedom of movement, these leaders are a nonprofit adaptation of this collapse.

At the start of inquiry, an interdisciplinary literature review conducted using university library databases and Google Scholar did not produce substantive literature on native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leaders. Several search terms were applied in different combinations. The search terms included 'boundary crosser', 'cross-border', 'nonprofit,' 'nonprofit leadership', 'philanthropy', 'transnational', and 'transnationalism' surveying development, feminist theory (feminist geography and feminist studies), leadership, migration, nonprofit, and transnational literatures. Four relevant documents were produced. The transnational migration literature produced a journal article concerning Colombian, Dominican, and Mexican immigrant transnational organizations, defined as organizations located in the countries of origin, relying on the solidarity and

sense of obligation of immigrants to the U.S. to raise money for their philanthropic mission (Portes, Escobar, & Radford, 2007). While the article surveys immigrant participation in such organizations, the article does not indicate how many organizational leaders operate by traveling between national borders and how such operation meets their organizational mission.

The second document, a white paper produced for UNHCR, is a case study of Somali refugee youth in Canada who organized to send money to help refugees in Kenya (Plasterer, 2011). Termed ‘diaspora philanthropy’, the youths’ efforts mirror transnational nonprofit activity in that ground-level native/indigenous actors use their position to leverage resources. However, according to definition, native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leaders can be located in either the home or receiving country and cross borders (i.e., are not restrained from travel) frequently in service to their organization. This population of youth is prevented from moving freely as refugees, i.e., being place-bound as refugees in the destination country as well as prevented from returning to their home country or visiting the refugee community in Kenya. Furthermore, the Somali youth were not undertaking formalized nonprofit activity, but contributing financial remittances under the umbrella of the refugee organization to their sister organization.

The third document is from racial and ethnic studies discussing the Guatemalan indigenous Mayan migration to the Los Angeles area (Popkin, 1999). Focused on the same basic population as this dissertation, the study notes the migrant community’s close association with the Catholic Church in their Guatemalan community of origin. The study briefly notes the Guatemalan priest traveled annually from Guatemala to Los

Angeles to meet with the migrant community organization in an attempt to leverage resources and support for the Guatemalan church and its parishioners. It is unknown if the migrant community organization was a registered nonprofit organization. Still, the study focuses on identity and cultural retention among Guatemalan transnational communities similar to that of native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leaders, even while it only hints at nonprofit or philanthropic activity between the migrant community organization and the church.

The fourth and most relevant document is an ethnic and migration journal article acknowledging the existence of Chleuh migrants to France, Belgium, and the Netherlands, who assist the development of their home communities by financially supporting, or establishing NGOs in the country of destination benefitting, native/indigenous-led community development associations in their home countries (Lacroix, 2009). The article challenges known assumptions about transnationals opening spaces for more diverse, less narrowly conclusive, understandings. This article paves the way for this dissertation meant to not only acknowledge the existence of native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leaders, but also invite them to the nonprofit conversation.

All four documents reveal a knowledge gap regarding direct engagement with native/indigenous voices similar to that within the nonprofit literature, though only three openly voice the gap. Portes, Escobar, and Radford (2007) argue “there have been few systematic studies of organizations involved in the transnational field, their origins, and effects” (p. 244). Meanwhile Plasterer (2011) explains diasporic philanthropic groups face criticism within the development community whether or not the groups have

successful development impact, and Lacroix (2009) critically analyzes the foreclosed discussion of transnational potentialities. These arguments indicate the absence of native/indigenous leaders' voices in scholarship may be multidisciplinary in nature. More positively, these preliminary findings presented the researcher with myriad possibilities to open a conversation with native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leaders.

Review of Research

As indicated above, while at this time there appears to be scant literature specific to native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leaders, one can approach the subject from transnational migration and feminist literature situating transnationals as a bridge between the local and the international spheres by communicating ideas, information, and strategies, developing networks, and facilitating financial and investment exchanges. Various disciplines use different terms to describe these individuals and bridges including 'both/and' (Trinh, 1992) and 'insider/outsider' (Anzaldúa, 1987, 2003; Merriam, Johnson-Bailey, Lee, Kee, Ntseane, & Muhamad, 2001; Minkler, 2004) in the feminist literature, 'intermediaries' (Levitt & Merry, 2009; Merry, 2006) or 'knowledgeable individuals' (Coe & Bunnell, 2003) in the transnational migration literature, and "boundary crossers" (Lewis, 2012) and "rooted cosmopolitans" (Tarrow, 2005) in political anthropology literature. These bodies of literature vary in engagement with transnationals whereby feminist literature focuses more on bringing forward transnational voices in comparison to the transnational migration literature focused on situated knowledges to contradict generalized statements. Overall, the discussion of transnationals is premised on the presence of borders alluding to levels of access,

belonging and mobility upheld by laws and social norms in the process of communicating, controlling, and creating geographical spaces (Ahmed, 2000; Diener & Hagan, 2012). Today, increasingly complex networks bridge local, provincial, national, regional, and global systems through globalization, and these networks offer venues for subverting conceptions of borders as fixed and confining (Diener & Hagan, 2012, p. 67). Transnationals subvert borders – they pass through, pass over, pass between man-made delineations of states and nations, and, as will be demonstrated, they also occupy these border spaces – as part of their cultural, economic, personal and political activities (Ahmed, Castañeda, Fortier, & Sheller, 2003; Anzaldúa, 1987, 2003; Diener & Hagan, 2012; Portes, Guarnizo, & Landolt, 1999).

The Origins of Transnationalism. In 1999, Portes, Guarnizo, and Landolt introduced the taxonomy for the emerging field of transnationalism. They described transnationalism as a full range of experiences, both permanent and temporary, outside the simple conveyance of remittances (Coe & Bunnell, 2003). Transnationalism encompasses regular contact over time across national borders between ground-level or grassroots social networks, communities, and institutions (Diener & Hagan, 2012; Portes, Guarnizo, & Landolt, 1999), characterized by “high intensity exchanges, the new modes of transacting, and the multiplication of activities that require travel and contacts on a sustained basis” (Portes, Guarnizo, & Landolt, 1999, p. 219). Portes, Guarnizo and Landolt (1999) find transnationals are typically educated and retain their native/indigenous identity within a destination country, whereby the destination country correlates in proximity to the country of origin (e.g., North America hosts transnationals from Guatemala due to their geographical proximity). Keck and Sikkink (1999) add that

transnationals have the ability to mobilize individuals toward action both in the destination country and the country of origin.

Transnationalism vs. Diaspora. It is important here to distinguish transnationalism from diasporas, a term also referring to the movement of individuals across borders. Transnationalism and diaspora are very similar terms and are often used interchangeably. However, whereas diasporas typically identify national or religious groups living outside their homeland with hopes of eventual return (Diener & Hagan, 2012; Faist, 2010) with a fairly wide span of allegiances (Plasterer, 2011), transnationalism encompasses a varied range of social relationships with a dual allegiance to place of origin and place of destination (Faist, 2010; Lacroix, 2009; Plasterer, 2011) softening the lines between sending and receiving countries (Diener & Hagan, 2012). The terms typically have separate social and political connotations (Faist, 2010) used to contextualize a specific argument. Diaspora seems to indicate the presence of an almost tangible group distinction and/or separateness from the receiving country. This dissertation uses the nuance of transnationalism as opposed to diaspora as one in which the transnational lives a dual life (Portes, Guarnizo, & Landolt, 1999) with or without the presence of a like group though Butler's (2004) study of diasporas positionality particularly relevant to the subject (in Dickenson & Morgan, 2015). More relevant to this inquiry placing transnationals as an understudied contribution to the nonprofit sector, a transnational life is a life of a more permanent, stable place with frequent transition between national borders and a life as insider/outsider simultaneously despite his or her location in the receiving country or country of origin. This dissertation recognizes a fine situated distinction between transnational and diasporas.

Transnationalism and Work. In terms of work or employment, transnationals have not been explicitly linked to nonprofit sector up to this time within nonprofit discourse. Portes, Guarnizo, and Landolt (1999) in substantiation of the new transnational taxonomy placed transnationals as individuals who had regular contact across borders due to business or political purposes. This conceptualization is supported by Saxenian's (1999) research on skilled immigrants, as opposed to elites, entering the technological marketplace of Silicon Valley who acted as capital, information, and knowledge bridges between California and Asia (in Coe & Bunnell, 2003). Coe and Bunnell (2003) utilize Saxenian's work to frame their concept of entrepreneurial transnational knowledge transfer networks supporting innovation. Activism is one of the closest materializations of transnationals operating in the nonprofit sector in the literature. From the outset to the present, there has been discussion of transnational activists and advocates who travel extensively in reaction to policy and law that seeks to subjugate or abuse the less powerful (Levitt, & Merry, 2009; Merry, 2006; Portes, Guarnizo, & Landolt, 1999). Popkin (1999) also suggests Guatemalan migrants are a form of reactive transnationalism because their religious and cultural organizations in the receiving country are embedded in transnational politics, understanding Guatemala in 1999 having just gone through a peace process is much different than Guatemala now. Though activism intimates a possible connection to the nonprofit sector, the link is not made explicit.

The second close materialization of transnationals operating in the nonprofit sector attached transnationals to the sector, though nonprofit attachment was not the authors' intent. Plasterer (2011) presents the fundraising efforts of Somali refugees in

Canada to help Somali refugees in Kenya indicating diasporic communities undertake development work. However, the author describes the youths' remittances as philanthropy under the umbrella of the sponsoring refugee organization rather than formal nonprofit activity. Lacroix (2009) mirrors Plasterer (2011) in relating a lack of recognition of transnationals in development work stating transnational discourse retains a social systems rather than development focus. Yet, Lacroix's anthropological fieldwork revealed transnationals beginning NGOs in the receiving country to support community development organization's efforts back home.

Transnationals and Communication. Whether traversing borders for business, political, or (potentially) nonprofit purposes, transnationals are most influential in terms of communication; that is, transnationals, acting as intermediaries, transfer concepts, ideas, and information from the destination country to the country of origin (Levitt & Merry, 2009; Merry, 2006). Due to their multiple language skills, multi-cultural knowledge, and multi-social familiarity, transnationals adapt knowledge to the understandings of local institutions and meanings (referred to as 'vernacularization') whereby the ideas are 'indigenized', or framed and presented to fit existing cultural norms, values, and practices (Merry, 2006). Vernacularization is an outward manifestation of the 'insider/outsider', 'intermediary', 'knowledgeable individual' role where the global circulates within the local. The transnational learns of global processes and viewpoints of development, rights, security, etc., conveying these to their countries of origin with the intention and hopes to create change.

The transnationals' communicative influence is important here. It is problematic when the voices of native/indigenous transnationals are not engaged in the discussion of

the nonprofit sector given the vital and vibrant communicative role they generally play in the dissemination of information. Not engaging the native/indigenous transnational voice exposes a void in understanding how the nonprofit sector works. Lather (1991) argues adequate transformative theory must be open-minded, non-dogmatic, speaking to and grounded in the circumstances of everyday life, and be premised on a deep respect for the intellectual and political capacities of those normally excluded from the conversation (see also Ahmed, 2000; Spivak, 1989). Within our globalized reality and the opening up and expansion of communication, inviting the native/indigenous transnational voice to the nonprofit conversation offers the opportunity to expand, and perhaps change, what we know of transnationals and the nonprofit sector.

Transnationals and Power. Implicit in Ahmed (2000), Alexander and Mohanty (1997), Lather (1991), Spivak (1989) is the presence of power underlying the exclusion of transnational voices outside transnational actors. Here, these authors speak to a hierarchical demarcation between ground level or grassroots transnational voices and entities involved in international neoliberal globalization in support of market capitalism (e.g., World Bank) (Alexander & Mohanty, 1997; Featherstone, 2003). Merry (2006) acknowledges that on first look, transnationals hold a large amount of power because of their insider/outsider, intermediary, and/or knowledgeable status. Furthermore, transnationals' insider/outsider status also allows them more flexibility to be innovative "because they are unconstrained by social norms" (Levitt & Merry, 2009, p. 444; see also Coe & Bunnell, 2003). However, transnationals are vulnerable to the pulling influences from both the higher authorities and the citizens, they are continually suspect because they are never fully a member of either sphere of operation, and translation of concepts is

typically a top-down process favoring the viewpoints of those with political and economic power (Merry, 2006; Yakushko, Badiee, Mallory, & Wang, 2013). Finally, there is the situational power as transnationalism is always depicted in terms of ‘here’ to ‘there’ as two geographically separate locations (Ahmed et al., 2003) where the more wealthy and fully developed Global North receives the transnational of the less wealthy and under developed Global South. In relation to scholarship or research, the expert from the Global North travels to the Global South to extract information to inform his/her study (Spivak, 1988, 1990). Within the nonprofit sector, transnational nonprofit actors are thought of as situated within international nongovernmental organizations (INGOs) from North America or Europe who travel to the less developed regions to undertake their organizational missions (Risse-Kappen, 1995). Anzaldúa (1987) calls the demarcation of here/there into question in relation to the transnational. She asks if borders are the result of colonialist forcefulness, who occupies whose land and which culture is borrowing from the other (Anzaldúa, 1987)?

Ultimately, transnationalism is a way of knowing that is never quite settled but also opens to possibilities, probabilities, and transformations (Anzaldúa, 2003). This dissertation describes transnationalism as a consciousness. Yakushko, Badiee, Mallory, & Wang, (2013) write:

Many of us from communities or countries, especially those considered to be marginalized, seek to return to our home cultures to collaborate, to provide services, or to conduct research...It is likely that there are even more reasons why those of use from non-Western backgrounds, but who live, study, or work within more privileged Western circles, would seek to

return to our own cultures, and that these reasons are complex and interactive. (p. 69-70)

Transnationals creatively use the abilities gained as a product of exposure to western ideas, culture, education, etc., to help their communities of origin as a matter of knowing what must be done. It is this consciousness that is unique to the transnational and the distinguishing characteristic of the native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leaders inspiring this study. Additionally, the quote brings forward two important points not iterated prior: 1) transnationals education and/or profession may enable their transnational endeavors; and 2) new spheres of transnational engagement are introduced beyond the economic or political– that of service provider and researcher. Given these two factors along with previous statements related to advocacy, activist, and nonprofit/philanthropic work, it is logical to position and engage transnationals in the nonprofit sector, as educated and financially resourceful individuals, to help their communities of origin.

Summary, Findings of Literature, and Grounded Questions

The literature on transnational intermediaries shows four important findings grounding questions for investigation. First, transnationals appear to have evolved to occupy other spheres beyond the economic and political proposed by Portes, Guarnizo, and Landolt (1999). Transnationals are also shown to be activists, advocates, nonprofit members, researchers, philanthropists, service providers, and students (Levitt, & Merry, 2009; Merry, 2006; Portes, Guarnizo, & Landolt, 1999; Yakushko et al., 2013). As such, can we fully position transnationals in the nonprofit sector? Who are they? Where do we find them? How do they use the nonprofit sector to accomplish their missions? Second,

transnationals possibly have certain characteristics, such as a strong native/indigenous identity (Portes, Guarnizo, & Landolt, 1999) and appear to typically hold at least some advanced education (Portes, Guarnizo, & Landolt, 1999; Yakushko et al., 2013). Given these, do native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leaders have characteristics, such as socio-economic factors or education, which enable and influence transnational nonprofit capabilities particularly in terms of nonprofit mission? Third, transnationalism is an insider/outsider situation that is a negotiated way of knowing and interacting with the world that can be confining and conflicted, but also creative and transforming (Ahmed et al., 2003; Anzaldúa, 2003). How does this insider/outsider consciousness manifest itself for the native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leader in nonprofit understanding? How does the native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leader engage in this negotiation to acquire resources in support of their organization, stakeholders, and beneficiaries? Fourth, transnationals innovatively communicate knowledge and concepts to their communities of origin (Coe & Bunnell, 2003; Levitt & Merry, 2009; Merry, 2006). How do native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leaders seek out and use knowledge and information thereby framing their understanding of how best to help their home communities? These four findings and the accompanying questions signal the general interest of this dissertation and open a space to engage the native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leader in conversation. This dissertation study focuses on the native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leaders' insider/outsider situation.

Conceptual Framework

Given the outlined gap in literature, presenting a conceptual framework provides one way to begin a conversation about the native/indigenous transnational nonprofit

leaders as a reality in the nonprofit sector by studying the leaders' insider/outsider situation. The framework, presented as a finding of exploratory case study (Mitchell, Ochoa, & Villela, in press) spurring this dissertation, is conceptually relational engaging (a) the identities each leader holds as leader, transnational, native/indigenous, etc., as well as factors such as education, profession, etc., situating his ability to undertake his nonprofit mission; and (b) each leader's ability to move creatively and fluidly between peers, communities, and local and international spaces allowing the leaders to seek out and use knowledge and information to help their country of origin. The conceptualized nested framework uses adaptive ecology within which to set the leaders' nonprofit theory of action as explained by feminist theory's propositions of positionality, intersectionality, lived experience, and borderlands (i.e., insider/outsider) consciousness. Whereas other theoretical concepts have potentially equal conversational potential, among them political anthropology's brokerage (Hargadon, 2002; Lewis & Mosse, 2006; Tarrow, 2012), the adaptive ecology frame more effectively demonstrates Edwin's and Ignacio's fluid local to international interaction. An overview of the framework is provided in *Figure 4*. Through an adaptive ecological frame, the local to international interoperation (i.e., activity, changes, and developments) is clearer, particularly in light of the international influence on Guatemala's long civil war and subsequent post-conflict development.

Adaptive ecology (Bronfenbrenner, 1979; Bubolz & Sontag, 1993) in connection with social theory's general theory of action (Bourdieu, 1977, 1988; Coleman, 1990) frames the native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leaders' operations. That is, it shows the relation of interactions the leaders undertake, spanning from the local to the international, to support their nonprofit work. This platform posits the sector is a

changing, fluctuating, and adapting interdependent, interoperational social system comprised of a wide number of actors (e.g., economic, political, cultural, nonprofit, etc.) serving in various capacities – from the local to the international, from advocacy to service – who maximize social relationships and/or networks over time (McDonald, Mitchell, Elliott, 2015). Because the native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leaders exist, they represent an adaptation of the nonprofit sector. The framework's unit of

Figure 4. Conceptual framework showing the interaction between the native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leader and the nonprofit ecological system as it informs the leader's actions on behalf of his organization. The interaction understands the leader's actions as influenced by his positionality as informed by simultaneous, multiple identities and lived experience.

analysis is each native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leader while the subject of interest investigates the actions each leader takes and why each takes them. Because the

native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leaders operate in constant transition between countries, it is important to understand each is offered a broad range options and opportunities, locally and internationally, from which each can draw to support and serve his organization and the organization's beneficiaries. The framework assumes the leaders' actions are based on their embedded position in the global nonprofit social system. This embedded position thereby conditions the options of actions each leader considers in order to maximize resources (Alcoff, 1988; Bourdieu, 1977, 1998; Coleman, 1990) as a consequence of what Anthias (2015) has termed "a transnational intersectional imaginary" to describe the transnational's ability to negotiate diversity within local to international interactions based on his/her positionality.

Positionality is the native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leaders' comprehension of their position within the adaptive nonprofit ecological system (Alcoff, 1988; Mitchell, Ochoa, & Villela, in press). That is, because the nonprofit ecological system is an interdependent, inter-operational social system, each leader's nonprofit actions structurally and culturally intersect, incorporating factors of race, ethnicity, class, gender, etc., across contexts such as borders, cultures, and classes (Hands & Hubbard, 2011). Positionality is valuable to understand the native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leaders because it establishes whom the leaders are, how the leaders experience reality, and how the leaders understand differences as informed by each leader's class, ethnicity, race, etc., between the local and international spheres of operation. In other words, the leaders' understanding of reality based on the multiple and simultaneous identities held, known in feminist literature as intersectionality, informs each leader's perspective – both how each leader perceives the outside world, and each leader's

expectations of how others will perceive them (Alcoff, 1988; Banks, 2007; Harris & Bartlow, 2015; McCall, 2005). Positionality via intersectionality allows an investigation of how each indigenous transnational nonprofit leader understands the presented problem(s), forms action, acquires knowledge, and engages stakeholders and beneficiaries both domestically and internationally (Mitchell, Ochoa, & Vilella, in press).

Anzaldúa (1987, 2003) takes intersectionality one-step further in a proposition directly related to the indigenous transnational nonprofit leader. She suggests there is a specific consciousness for those positioned in a constant state of transition between borders, like the native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leader, which she refers to as a borderland position occurring in the space where two or more cultures, classes, individuals, etc., edge each other, whereby the individual is both us and them, or insider and outsider, at the same time. For Butler (2013), this consciousness is a ‘queer’ consciousness in which the individual understands him- or herself in terms of a relationship to difference rather than identity. Butler (2004) then goes on to relate that individuals who have left their country of origin as a survivor of violence develop “a mutual dependency with its concomitant sense of solidarity creating social vulnerability and bodily exposure affecting collective action” (Dickenson & Morgan, 2015, p. 141). This collective action can take a myriad of forms. Reflecting our topic of interest, the collective action under investigation is the nonprofit work in service to the native/indigenous transnational leaders’ country of origin.

Given Butler’s statement, action is taken in part by the native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leaders’ lived experiences (Alcoff, 1988). These lived experiences are not only experiences unique to each leader. Lived experiences also

encompass significant national events that have inseparably shaped, or rather have “bounded” (Levinson-Estrada, 2013) the bodies of, the leader such as Guatemala’s colonial history and war (Bourdieu, 1977; Levenson-Estrada, 2013; Spivak, 1999) and is a key component of understanding the native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leader.

To summarize these interconnected concepts in service to the conceptual framework, the intersection of the native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leaders’ simultaneous identities set within a personal and systemic historical context, thereby framing each native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leaders’ insider/outside positional meaning making informs each leaders’ nonprofit practice. The conceptual framework concludes that the interdependency and interoperation of these concepts influences how native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leaders understand realities related to their country of origin and their access to resources thereby guiding the actions each leader takes (Mitchell, Ochoa, & Villela, in press).

Conclusion

This chapter substantiated Ignacio Ochoa of Fundacion Nahual and Edwin Villela of Help for Schools, Inc., as native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leaders. A background summary of researcher inquiry began the chapter. The background summary argues that while it is logical to see transnationals in nonprofit work, these leaders have only an implicit, rather than explicit, relationship within nonprofit inquiry. Then, a review of current literature suggests several avenues to bring the native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leader into the nonprofit conversation. In order to begin a conversation with such leaders, a conceptual framework was presented. This framework positions the leaders as part of the nonprofit adaptive ecological system demonstrating

local to international inter-operationalization. Edwin and Ignacio are an adaptation of this system creatively using their transnational positionality, that is, their unique way of understanding based on the intersection of their identities brought forward in their lived experiences, to access networks and other resources in support of their nonprofit missions. This dissertation focuses on the leaders' insider/outsider situation.

The next chapter presents the final project map and findings of this study. Findings suggest native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leaders utilize their privileges, termed bridges, and negotiate between North American and Guatemalan nonprofit understandings, termed collisions, in undertaking actions on behalf of their organization.

Chapter 5: Findings

This chapter brings the native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leaders into the nonprofit conversation. It presents the case study's findings of the native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leaders' insider/outsider situation as it is negotiated in support of their nonprofit work. As a complex, local-to-international situation taking place within the nonprofit adaptive ecological system, the case study utilized a methodology embracing the complexity to map the leader's negotiations as they relate to key topics of academic, social, and popular discourse surrounding the nonprofit sector. Findings suggest these leaders use the privileges of their insider/outsider situation as bridges to advance their nonprofit work while simultaneously engaging in gatekeeping activities to control the message about their organizations. This analysis culminated in a final project map the researcher believes adequately represents the leaders' understandings, negotiated over the bridges and between the gate, on the key sector topics of accountability, advocacy, development, effectiveness, leadership, nonprofit (defined), and sector professionalization. These negotiated understandings are presented as collisions between the dominant (though contested) North American position constructing terminology, definitions, and subsequent expectations, and the understandings of Guatemalans who believe Guatemalans can and should help themselves. As findings will present, the leaders do not always undertake their nonprofit work easily or without question, but the leaders display a calling and willingness to take on the work in a manner they feel is suitable to the Guatemalan reality.

This chapter begins by presenting the final situational project mapping of the complex insider/outsider situation of the native/indigenous transnational nonprofit

leaders. This map represents the findings of this case study. The map is followed by a discussion of each map element representing key topics within nonprofit discourse. The discussion will present a brief summary of understandings of each topic as related to current sector conversation followed by the native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leaders' understandings as findings brought forward from the data analysis. The chapter concludes with a summary of these findings leading into the final chapter of this dissertation forming conclusions and offering a discussion of the learning.

Project Map

Figure 5. Final project map showing the relationship between the native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leader, the leader's organization, and major topics within nonprofit discourse. This map builds from the conceptual framework (*Figure 4.*) opening up the line between Guatemala and North America demarcating the leader's insider/outsider reality to depict the action that is happening within and along that line (the borders shown here vertically where Guatemala and North America meet rather than horizontally). This mapping shows the interaction of (a) the close relationship between leader and the organization, typical of Guatemalan culture; (b) the leader's close association with Guatemala; and (c) Guatemalan nonprofit development, a discourse and practice tilted, or preferencing, North American discourse. As indicated, the leader and his organization mostly operate outside the professionalized nonprofit sector meanings and definitions in the space between the gates developing his own understandings (i.e., collisions) in negotiating his nonprofit work.

The following chapter sections discuss each element of the final project map presented in *Figure 5*. Before beginning, it is important to understand nonprofit discourse is a space of contested terrain. Researchers and scholars present definitions and understandings only to have them challenged and reconstructed regularly. This dissertation adds another conversational piece to this already contested terrain, the piece offered by the native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leaders. The conversation with the native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leaders begins by presenting each element of the final project map. For each map element, the researcher presents a brief, cited overview of current nonprofit understandings providing context for the reader as allowed by situational analysis. This overview gives way to the understandings presented by the native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leaders.

Map elements are discussed in an order the researcher feels best represents the flow of the conversation. The conversation first conceptualizes what a leader is and what leadership means in nonprofit discourse and participant understandings to form a working definition of the native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leaders and their leadership. This is followed by a discussion of the privileged spaces, or bridges as they are often referred to in transnational literature, the leaders use to support their nonprofit work and the gatekeeping the leaders use to control organizational information. In the space between the gates, the conversation outlines the collisions between the leaders' understandings of key topics of nonprofit conversation and North American definitions. Understandings for a nonprofit is first brought forward followed by understandings for development, the type of nonprofit work the leaders state they undertake. A conversation

for the sector topics of accountability, advocacy, effectiveness, and professionalization concludes this chapter.

Leader and Leadership

A leader leads. This is the basic definition of a leader, though the means by which a leader leads differs according to the leader (Murphy, 2011). Great leader theory often presents Gandhi, Martin Luther King, Jr., Nelson Mandela, and Mother Teresa as examples of extraordinary leaders. However, each leader leads differently, famous or not, complicating any comprehensive definition for leadership as a definitive operationalization of the leader (Burns, 1978; Klenki, 2008; Murphy, 2011; Nahavandi, 2012). Leadership has been approached as a list of positivist traits (Klenki, 2008) to more recent post-positivist strains tending toward the relational elements leaders display with those they lead (Murphy, 2011; Nahavandi, 2012). Some of these represent values, such as servant or inclusive leadership (Greenleaf, 1998), while others present leadership as a group (Krech & Crutchfield, 1948) or influence (Bass, 1960; Katz & Kahn, 1966) process, with transformative or transactional leadership the more recent manifestations (Bass, 2008; Burns, 2003). Nahavandi, combining these relational elements with the hierarchical position of the leader and (expected) leader action, states, “we can define leader as any person who influences individuals and groups within an organization, helps them establish goals, and guides them toward achievement of those goals” (Nahavandi, 2012, p. 3). This dissertation tends to prefer Nahavandi’s (2012) definition because it indicates the leader occupies a space between action and individual ideology and, therefore, situates leadership as a negotiation.

Native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leaders also occupy a space of negotiation between practice and ideology though the negotiated space is possibly more complex. As an adaptation of the local to international nonprofit ecological system, these leaders meld or combine knowledge they obtain or the experiences they accumulate in Guatemala and North America in service to their organization. As Eric Rivera, a member of Help for Schools notes, “Since the beginning everything has started with [Edwin’s] idea. He’s the one who’s always coming with new ideas. We’re just supporting him.” This adaptive process does not and should not denote ease because learning is taking place as part of action. While the leaders voice a readiness to accept change and adapt to given contexts, and their actions support this, the actual adaptation may be difficult to execute or take on. Edwin explains of the vision for Help for Schools,

Since the beginning we thought we were going to reconstruct schools in Guatemala, but a lot of trials to do that, so we decided, yes, to stay helping with the utilities of the school. We did help with the school with the building. There is too much public inconvenience for us. The government there, they don’t do things, but also they don’t like all that do it.

Adaptation is a negotiation in and of itself between the leaders’ insider/outsider situation and the multiple local to international contexts encountered. Yet, the native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leaders sort of “adopt a new normal,” as Elaine stated concerning Ignacio Ochoa of Nahual and Julio Cochoy of Maya Skills, by which they appear to undertake the action presented to them adapting, learning, making choices or decisions, and perhaps pushing adaptation in others to meet the circumstances presented.

As indicated above, the native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leaders' insider/outsider situation is key to any action they undertake to meet presented circumstances. The insider/outsider manifests in myriad forms indicative of a both/and simultaneous operation the leader must negotiate. The leaders' work is both local and international, and both municipal and regional, in scope. Both/and can denote the leaders' placement as both Guatemalan and stranger when each travels into another village with its own distinct character, culture, and environment. Both/And can denote disassociation as well as inclusivity, such as, "our volunteers are both international and Guatemalan" as Tamalyn Gutierrez indicates, where Guatemalan is something other than international but international itself. It can denote native/indigenous transnational aid as both Guatemalans helping Guatemalans and outsider interference. It can denote both giving temporary help and giving a means for long-term improvement as Edwin explains:

In the long run, these supplies and services will probably turn out to be sustainable. We are helping them get knowledge. How more sustainable can that be? You're not just providing things, you're providing something... not like something they can use like a vehicle, or something for their home, or to cultivate their fields. We are delivering knowledge or the way to acquire knowledge, if you could consider that sustainable. It is [sustainable].

Both/and can denote both traditional and modern where modernity pursues a connection with the past as in Miraflores museum and mall in Guatemala City featuring high-end shops situated around an ancient Mayan pyramid ruin, and Ignacio seeing great value in the Canadian university pedagogy emphasizing traditional native/indigenous learning. It can denote Guatemalan and North American cultural edges where language and time are

both uniformly formal and distinctly regional in operation. It can denote the leaders as both expert, as James Kinyon of Unipak, a Help for Schools supporter, noted, “I think if I tried to do what [Edwin] did and showed up down there it wouldn’t nearly have the effect that he has – not even close,” and novice, as a senior scholar noted “these leaders do not know development.” Finally, it can denote cultural understanding where the leaders are both legal authority and the organization itself.

The leader, in a Guatemalan sense, appears to be the organization. As Tamalyn Gutierrez and Elaine, self-described third-culture individuals as individuals who were raised outside North America, explain, in Guatemala the organization is the leader. In essence, there appears little or no separation between the two possibly reflecting Guatemala’s traditionally hierarchical and relational culture instilling a great deal of power in the leader. Rolando Alecio, a Nahual board member, states, “The organization becomes the project of the leader.” This does not necessarily contradict the North American definition, but adds nuance. In North America, the leader represents the organization, speaks on behalf of the organization and its work, is responsible for directing the work, and in some instances is seen as the driver (i.e., momentum or motivation) for the work. However, Elaine jovially relates:

And, there’s also a very hierarchical understanding that the leader is all and the underlings do not make any decisions without reference to the leader. From a U.S. perspective, I would feel like I’m wasting anyone’s time. I go into a nonprofit, I talk to the secretary, I want to... or, I might call or email. A lot of times I just like to show up and asked to be connected to the volunteer coordinator and we’ll go from there. And, the volunteer coordinator does not have to talk to

the director. Okay, none of that happens here. I have to go make an appointment with the director. A very formal appointment that might involve a half dozen people. I mean, the whole thing is just.... [she trails off laughing].

North American understanding of leadership is also transitive with the expectation that leadership changes. Alternatively, in Guatemala, findings suggest the leader is a manifest representation of the organization – close to the organization in human form – qualifying the leader’s credibility and status in Guatemalan society. For example, in Guatemala uniforms and clothing seem to display membership and rank within the organization or society with Guatemalans taking great care to display such symbols because the wearer is the status. The nonprofit organization appears to work in a similar manner for the leader. Ignacio explains, “The people see me walking around the villages, I talk to them, they know the organization as me.” However, manifest representation can also work sociologically across borders referencing the native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leaders as a representation of what is seen or known about North America and Guatemala since they are situated between the two countries. For example, Edwin and Elvia [Edwin’s wife] sit like North American dignitaries on the platform at a school enjoying the ceremonies conducted in their honor, and Corey, a North American supporter of Nahual, stated Ignacio represents “the grit, determination, and all of the good that was seen in Guatemala.”

This close connection to Guatemala is of utmost importance to the leaders. They are first and foremost Guatemalan (Mitchell, Ochoa, & Villela, in press). They relate to reality through the filter or lens (if you will) of being Guatemalan, holding a sense of deep responsibility and commitment to take needed action, however small, to help

Guatemala succeed. This responsibility correlates to the reason for the leaders undertaking formal nonprofit work as Edwin explains, "...we are going to work to help [Guatemalans] and let's grow, let's develop ourselves. That's the sentiment in us." Possibly the most colorful definition provided to describe the native/indigenous transnational leader came from Corey who stated the leader had "the ability create order out of chaos" understanding in Guatemala aspects of chaos are considered normal and the leader must negotiate this. Yet, even with the leaders' close association with Guatemala, the leaders sometimes break cultural norms by adopting a more North American leadership style in order to accomplish tasks though there is little indication North American leadership styles will always be effective or efficient. As several participants noted, what the leaders are doing in many ways runs counter to Guatemalan culture that is fairly new to nonprofit giving and stewardship, as Susanna Place notes, "People tend to give more gifts, things in kind, in smaller amounts," so the leaders are negotiating and pushing this change simultaneously (i.e., chaos). In operation it appears where the leader is permanently positioned affects the dynamic between Guatemalan culture and leadership style. Edwin, living in North America, appears more collaborative in nature, works at a faster pace, and speaks about future leadership for Help for Schools. Ignacio, on the other hand, living in Guatemala seems to take on a more directly authoritative leadership role, sees time as a necessary component to the establishment of a relationship that will benefit the organization rather than a timetable for the accomplishment of organizational objectives, and accepts his figurehead role giving no indication to the researcher of relinquishing the role in the future.

Overall, the leaders do what they are able to do and try to keep the organization moving forward even in the midst of transition, as indicated by Ignacio's efforts to re-establish Nahual. Both leaders seek out connections demonstrating they maintain strong relationships with people over time as a method of fostering support as supporters reported associations with the leaders of four years or longer. In fact, many Help for Schools in-country supporters are childhood friends of Edwin as is true of Eric Rivera, who reconnected with Edwin 20 years after they left Guatemalan military school. And, Ignacio and Nahual board member, Rolando Alecio, worked together back in 1992 on the Guatemalan/Mexican border in the return of refugees after the war relating how they witnessed the beginning of Mexico's Zapatista movement. There is indication the nonprofit work the leaders undertake is just as much for personal betterment as for the betterment of their country as indicated by the leaders' personal education and the way in which they refer to "we, Guatemalans" in explaining the help provided.

However, the leaders are realists admitting age plays a greater and greater factor in their leadership. Edwin specifically states he is slowing down and may be getting too old to do the work seeing the new generation better prepared to rise up and take the lead. It is also important to note neither leader earns a living from his organization. As such, Ignacio has recently started his "own project" to find a salary for himself so he will be more settled now that he is older. He states, "My intention is to work at Landivar and never ever repeat what I did between 2003 to 2013 on giving my personal money, salary and time to train community leaders for free." The researcher specifically approached the topic of succession, the planned ability for the leadership to step aside, since stakeholders indicate they want to see the organizations continue. Though Edwin is ready to step

down allowing another to have the “opportunity and benefit” of being president, and he recently found a successor, Alonzo Mendez, an organizational member and research participant, Edwin and Alonzo stated they would consider the offer of a larger organization taking over the operations. However, continuance is complicated when the leader is seen as the organization. Supporters, such as James Kinyon, note, “Well, Edwin and his wife, Elvia, they are what drive it. I mean, if they were to do something else, Help for Schools in Guatemala would probably not be able to maintain itself.” Ignacio, on the other hand, seems to still want control over the organization and the work, but welcomes a director or administrator to take over the managerial responsibilities of the organization freeing him to concentrate on community organizing and education activities. These findings indicate both leaders are coming to grips with what future leadership looks like for their organizations.

In conclusion, a native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leadership has a nuanced definition reflecting the leaders’ insider/outsider situation. The leaders may have certain attributes helping them understand and direct other people, instill credibility and trust, provide a compelling message, mobilize action toward a common goal, provide the prominent service, stimulate and inspire positive change, and utilize resources responsibly to reach purposes similar to North American discourse. However, as a human manifestation of the organization, the leaders substantiate the legitimacy of their organizations through a long-term (perhaps permanent), symbolic representation contrary to North American transitive representational definitions. This type of leadership intimates that while North American definitions indicate leaders partner with, collaborate with, and support other leaders and stakeholders across sectors and/or those with an

interest in the project to the extent necessary, native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leaders build, establish, and maintain close relationships with others over a long period of time reflecting the relational aspects of their Guatemalan culture. Finally, for the native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leaders, findings indicate being a leader coincides with a very personal, connected feeling of service or calling to better Guatemala, their home, thereby bettering themselves.

Bridges

Bridges are the privileged spaces transnationals occupy and is a common term in transnational discourse to describe transnational processes. These privileges encompass access and allegiance to different geographical regions, legal citizenship, and having mobility and the ability to cross borders (Ahmed, 2000; Diener & Hagan, 2012). This study's literature review on transnationals provided a good indication of the multitude of privileges transnationals hold. They are skilled (Saxenian, 1999) and entrepreneurial (Coe & Bunnell, 2003) communicators (Levitt & Merry, 2009; Merry, 2006), with formal education (Portes, Guarnizo, & Landolt, 1999) and can mobilize supporters in both the country of origin and the receiving country (Keck and Sikkink, 1999). Transnationals' insider/outsider status also affords them a good amount of power (Merry, 2006) with innovative soci-cultural flexibility (Levitt & Merry, 2009). However, there are limitations to transnational privilege, as transnationals may feel pulled between higher authorities and the citizens, continually suspected, and susceptible to top-down influences (Merry, 2006; Yakushko, Badiee, Mallory, & Wang, 2013). This dissertation also sees the privileges of the native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leader as bridges that support the leader in his nonprofit work.

Additionally, native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leaders occupy privileged spaces. These privileges appear to represent a negotiated positional space located between context and action in which two worlds (i.e., contexts for understandings, realities, processes, knowledge, language, etc.) edge up against each other and reflect the leaders' insider/outsider reality. Findings suggest these privileged spaces can be formal or informal, such as citizenship or education, and known or unknown to the leader, such as their awareness or lack of awareness of their Ladino socio-cultural standing. Bridging is the act of using the insider/outsider privilege to create a connection between different locations and across borders (occurring between individuals, sectors, villages, levels of governmental representation, Guatemala and North America, etc) as when Ignacio explains,

And they basically, I got the point that I wasn't going to try to apply in 2012. I basically made my decision in 2011. But, I left that open space for the university to invite me here. I came. I taught one semester in the department of geography in the University of British Columbia and then went back to Guatemala to continue my work. Then, in 2012, they invited me to come again. Yeah. And then, I basically applied for my work permit. And, finally I was working for that work permit to look for a job. Now, what is all this connected to my work in Guatemala? Because every time I go back to Guatemala it is that perspective of being part of that indigenous network. And I'm working in the north with indigenous and always searching to see alliances between north and south.

The bridge is part of accessing resources (broadly defined), conveying information, and forming cross-border connections (educational, cultural, linguistic, narrational, relational,

structural, etc.), and can involve juxtapositions. For example, a common story of Ignacio is how an illiterate Mayan working in the Nahual office in Antigua was found teaching a Guatemalan university professor about the COCODEs system:

And then, I already told the people the local stories of this, the community leaders. Some of them believe it, no? Then come to them and I said to them inside the office, no?, here it comes a one who is so highly educated in the country, could you please explain it to you, to him, what do we do here and what the COCODEs is. And then, you see that illiterate guy teaching to the highly educated Guatemalan what is this COCODEs about. And then, all of a sudden, the highly educated Guatemalan feels like, “I didn’t know anything about that.” And I said, “No, don’t worry, all of us are learning.”

However, the bridge must be tended, and if the bridge is weak, the connection is likely to collapse. The bridging facilitates adaptation and opening of the space where the leaders’ new normal is adopted. Furthermore, privilege appears contextually associated with North America. The participants living in North America commonly indicated they are seen as economically privileged by Guatemalans whether or not the individual is North American or Guatemalan, as when Edwin had to volley questions by teachers in Pajapita who wanted to get to the U.S. for teacher training, which he is simply unable to provide. And, David and Wendy, North American volunteers to Guatemala, stated “Guatemalans see us and there’s an automatic assumption there’s money.” To explain, travel back and forth to Guatemala is typically a privilege extended to the leader, supporter, or stakeholder positioned in North America. To be certain, Ignacio is also considered privileged in Guatemala, not only due to his education and Guatemalan socio-cultural

standing, but also because of his access to the wealth of North America. Rolando and Milagro, Nahual board members, admit their strong desire for Ignacio to use his North American contacts to secure vital project funding as Rolando admits, “One of the weaknesses of the organization [Nahual] is its ability to seek funding.”

Access. Access is a bridge representing the privileged position of the native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leaders. Access refers to the leaders’ specialized insider/outsider understandings bringing forward abilities and opportunities to approach, gain, obtain, or retrieve resources so the leader can do his nonprofit work. The leaders state they recognize beneficiaries have limited access to resources as when Edwin explains, “I feel like I was lucky because being in real estate you can pretty much go anywhere, per sea, and that’s something you can practice, you know?,” with a willingness to seek out and share resources with others when able, as Ignacio explains when the researcher spoke to him while he was in Canada, “I’m here temporarily but very involved because people want to hear about my Canadian experience.” To clarify and expound on the lack of access for beneficiaries, when questioning Julio Cochoy of Maya Skills if it is possible for his beneficiaries to travel to Canada to continue the social enterprise venture, he states,

That's a beautiful question. I wish that it will be possible, but to be honest, I cannot see that. One reason, I have a passport, I have a visa, and I speak a little bit English. I have some skills to do that. It doesn't mean they cannot do that, but I cannot imagine one of the ladies in our verbalization getting in that. What I'm trying to say, I don't want to demean them, but they see it it's a big challenge. To be realistic, what I see is, they have to create their own business. They have to do

their own business. Then, maybe the last year, I'm going to put them in contact with some buyers from Canada and the States that can come and buy from them, because I cannot see one of the women taking my place. For me, it has been really a big challenge. I'm not married. I can travel. I speak a little English. When I am there, it's difficult for me, really, being in a different country. Thank you to the United Church, I don't have to pay my apartment. They gave me a house. I don't see, to be honest, who in the group can do that, because those ladies, remember, they were living under poverty. No one of them have formal education. I think one of the ladies will be, Eva. Nora, maybe. Dorita, she was in 2nd grade, he most, in 2nd, two years in school. I will say it's impossible.

Although access is a privilege space closed to many, as seen above, there is also indication the leaders may pursue pathways to open access and/or develop a network to enable access as when Help for Schools locates the schools to help stating, “Actually, we find them.” In the findings of this research, such access is relationally and communally tied to Guatemala: that is, access is used to better all of Guatemala.

It must be understood access also impacts the nonprofit services provided since service is associated with and influenced by access to urban as well as rural, developed as well as developing, quetzals as well as dollars. Within this vein, there are limitations as not everyone, particularly the native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leaders, has access to everything. While the native/indigenous leaders hold a privileged position because they have access to numerous resources, they (as yet) do not have the access to the more abundant, sophisticated resources of the North American international organizations. For example, Susanna Place states of her current duties, “I'm mentoring a

team of Guatemalans who work with all the senior staff and the executive director to capture data, entering into software, ask questions of the data, analyze our progress, give staff feedback, constantly trying to see where we are and how we're doing.” Similarly, Andy Carey’s and Tamalyn Gutierrez’s organizations boast of a fairly secure North American funding base, a full North American board of directors and staff, grants, tracking and reporting programs, and North American university-initiated monitoring and evaluation processes that Tamalyn says, “allows us [in Guatemala] to concentrate full-time on the work.” This is access Help for Schools and Nahual simply cannot imagine.

Resources. The above definition of access used the term resources extensively. Resources are broadly defined in nonprofit discourse as any tangible or intangible exchangeable asset (Saidel, 2000). The native/indigenous nonprofit leaders also define resources broadly, in which the resources are a bridge allowing the leaders to do their work. Taken directly from the full range of participant interviews, resources include: access to universities for education and research, building/office space, collaboration, communication, contacts, donated supplies, donated deliverables, donors, education, funding, housing, internet access, interns, leader profession, pedagogy (method and practice adopted for the delivery of service), transportation, storage space (to store materials or supplies), technology, transportation, training, printing services, professionals/professional services, spaces of respite/sanctuary, and volunteers (North America and Guatemala). The native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leaders and their members typically provide needed resources, which could be burdensome. For example, the shipping company used by Help for Schools, owned by Eric Rivera, donates half the costs for shipping and pays the Guatemalan taxes on the containers. And Milagro

Fajardo, the current acting president of Nahual, stated, “I have been the one who undertook the running of Nahual for two years while Ignacio was attending university in Canada. I provided the training when asked, paying my own transportation and lodging.” The leaders extend the definition of resources to include tangible and intangible assets people need to live well. Edwin explains,

Well, it seems like the country, it’s not like it’s a poor country, you know? I mean, we have resources to live and to live well, you know?, in Guatemala. Unfortunately, it’s either—the way I see it—it’s either politicians or people running interests in the country that have those resources, you know? Either apart from the general public or they don’t get developed equally, per se, you know? When I said we have resources—yeah, we have good soil, we have nice weather, and, therefore, I figure that we should be in a better shape.

The leaders note resources for individual betterment require good management so everyone has the opportunity to benefit from them. Tamalyn Gutierrez concurs adding that while recent protests and indictments against public officials indicate people are beginning to be held responsible for their corruption, at present there still seems to be little Guatemalan movement to support responsible management and use of resources.

Citizenship. Access to North American citizenship, or holding a North American visa or passport, is crucial for these leaders’ ability to do their nonprofit work. This is a negotiated position because members of the organization may have citizenship while others may not corresponding to the level of access, movement, and privilege options a member holds. It must be noted, however, citizenship does not necessarily correspond to a designation of ‘home’. The leader, member, or involved stakeholder may hold North

American citizenship but consider Guatemala home. For example, the primary fundraiser for Help for Schools is a large Guatemalan community celebration in San Diego to celebrate the Independence Day of “their home,” although Alonzo Mendez notes, and Lynne Collins concurs, the celebration is “For everybody. For Mexicans, Salvadorians, Hondurans, and, yeah.” Citizenship also appears to have a nuanced meaning in Guatemala where citizenship does not extend broadly to those living within the Guatemalan borders. Left over from Guatemala’s colonial history, the researcher observed there appears to be an underlying understanding of who is considered a citizen of Guatemala and who is consider a citizen “Other” within Guatemala specifically related to the indigenous Maya. In speaking to David and Wendy about their organization’s involvement with Guatemala, which extends back to 1995-1996, they noted in relation to Guatemalan feelings about the war, “because those weren’t Guatemalans hurting up there [the mountainous regions inhabited by the indigenous Maya] there wasn’t a sense we need to get on this.” It indeed appears the segregation is regional since the Maya were grouped and relocated in the northern highlands of the country, a reflection of Guatemala’s classist society as when one individual the researcher encountered stated, “You will not see any of the Indigenous around here since this is a *Ladino* area.” The researcher observed in an event corroborated by Elaine this “othering” may also be a result of self-segregation. The researcher and Elaine stayed with an Ixil Mayan family in Nebaj finding it interesting one of the young girls, dressed in ordinary jeans and a t-shirt inside the family compound, was not allowed to accompany the researcher and Elaine to the market because her sister said she was “not dressed decently,” meaning she was not in

her traditional Ixil outfit of peasant blouse and red skirt specific to the Ixil Mayan women of the area.

Movement. Movement, or freedom or ability of movement, is characteristic of the native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leaders. It is a privilege to make choices about where to be when choice is not allowed or given to others. For example, Edwin's early education involved travel within Guatemala that is not a privilege of poorer students in poorer schools. Ignacio elaborates, "Now, I guess traveling, educating, going abroad, it's a good way. And, I always, finally, what I want is Indigenous from the north to come to exchange experiences with Indigenous in Guatemala." Furthermore, while it is recognized by participants that those who are able to travel have better opportunities, travel can be quite difficult. Many of those interviewed stated it is difficult to for Guatemalans to get visas and Ignacio relates even in the country, travel can be difficult and take a tremendous amount of effort:

And, I was so surprised to go to a 7:30 in the morning class and meeting there one mother and her kid, two kids actually, and then another young student. They were there before me. And, I said, 'How come you are here before me?' 'Oh, we left at 4:00 in the morning.' 'Four in the morning from where?' 'Oh, we are coming from Sololá.' 'From Sololá to Escuintla?! How come?! It's so far away.' Well, that's the school that offers what they were studying. Very interesting. People make a lot of effort in transportation to get to the place. Not all of them, of course, but I value that type of thing.

Movement also seems to relate to the definition of leader or leadership being the one who can move is the one who has the power to represent and is, subsequently,

designated as an expert and this appears true for the North American leaders as well as the Guatemalan leaders. However, this can be problematized. That is, movement is a privileged position that could actually be considered burdensome as in the example of strains on family in terms of migrant employment. For example, a Guatemalan participant's brother, not named here as he was not formally interviewed for this study, stated he takes on the burden of traveling back and forth to the U.S. for economic benefit because his children do not want to live in the U.S. even while two of his three children are U.S. citizens. Movement can be a form of accounting and evaluation as when stakeholders travel to Guatemala to see the project or volunteer as when the members of the Canadian church travel to Guatemala to see Julio Cochoy's Maya Skills organization and meet the artisan women. Movement also relates to the transferring of supplies in the case of Help for Schools. Movement is part of the leaders' ability to quickly adapt and change, thus coordinate and facilitate the transportation of goods quickly and easily. By comparison, it is unlikely the UN could move as quickly or transport materials as easily.

Location also appears related to movement designating the position of the leaders and how they function (or don't function) in those locations. Location demarcates, developed and undeveloped, North America and Guatemala, professional and nonprofit, rich and poor, rural and urban, etc., used often in this dissertation. With the leaders' insider/outsider situation, any location may bring forward a sense of being uncomfortable and, perhaps, the leaders are fine with being uncomfortable because things can be figured out. For example, the researcher noted Edwin's troubled comments when he no longer recognized his way around Guatemala City, though he expressed he had friends who could and would lead him where he needed to go. Location plays a role in where the

organization is registered and if there is a need to register in one country or both, an issue both native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leaders have considered and questioned. In fact, it is unclear as to the legal status of Nahual in the United States having been registered in under an umbrella institution out of La Jolla, California, for a number of years, then registered in Guatemala in 2007 after Ignacio returned home, with board member Rolando Alecio indicating at present Nahual still has a right to receive funds in the U.S. while Ignacio speaks about having to register Nahual as a 501(c)(3). Along these same lines, location represents where there is a greater likelihood to secure donations with all participants indicating donations are more likely from North America than Guatemala.

Above all, location relates to movement and access and how readily one can get (or desires to get) from one place to another since even within globalization types of isolation remain as noted earlier regarding movement. Location relates to where services (government or nonprofit) are in operation based on history and resources available as the researcher noticed where roads are maintained compared to where they are left to crumble. Location relates to where one considers home connoting a deep, emotional connection to place as when Ignacio notes Guatemala is “my center.” Location is related to where information is readily available or received by the leaders. Location relates to the type of opportunities available for development or personal betterment, for example the researcher observed Guatemalan universities are situated in the more affluent, more urban areas though it was noted satellite institutions are starting up even in the more isolated mountainous regions such as Nebaj. Location is also symbolic as in the importance associated with supporting the Guatemalan primary school of North

American Help for Schools member and president-elect, Alonzo Mendez. Location, in other words, appears to be a broadly defined destination of privilege.

Network. Network is a privilege referring to the individuals with which the leaders hold a connection enabling them to work across borders (broadly defined) on behalf of the nonprofit. The network spans from Guatemala to North America, urban to rural, nonprofit to profit, etc., with valuable resources in both locations as indicated by the participant list (see Table 1). The researcher observed the network provides help in establishing contacts, traveling, housing, getting information, obtaining supplies, recruiting volunteers, and solidifying support and logistics. For example, Edwin's Guatemalan friends, Patti and Mario, who were not interviewed for this study but with whom the researcher stayed for a few days while in Guatemala City, will be vetting in-country prices on school supplies to see if large quantities needed can be purchased at competitive cost and stored in Guatemala to cut down on shipping charges from San Diego. However, it must be noted the immigrant context is different from a Guatemalan's who travels to North America in terms of access and path presented, though this study only gives indication of this difference. A visa limits access, which could affect the networks produced in some important ways. For example, Julio Cochoy of Maya Skills travels to Canada on a visa allowing him a certain number of speaking engagements but which prevents him from setting up a registered North American profit-making social entrepreneurship endeavor to support his organization.

Shared Culture. In addition to access, resources, citizenship, and movement, the leaders have the privilege of sharing a culture with Guatemala. As previously noted, being Guatemalan is the impetus for the leaders' work. Any culture is complex and

caution should be used in approaching any claim of expertise of a culture. Yet, there are some points that can be made based on the interactions for this study. Guatemalans have a closer sense of space than North Americans as any ride on a “chicken bus,” a privately-operated Guatemalan bussing system used for transportation by many Guatemalan whose operators pack as many people as possible within a confined space, will prove.

Guatemalans are also observed to frequently demonstrate a need to force forward for fear of being left out or left behind. The researcher first encountered this at LAX international airport waiting to board the plane to Guatemala and a rather chaotic demonstration ensued of Guatemalans crowding, pushing forward, and cutting in line as if they believed, for some reason, they would not get onto the plane even with a ticket and assigned seat, then encountered it with the delivery of school supplies through Help for Schools:

The researcher is watching the delivery of supplies quickly deteriorating into disorganized chaos as parents and teachers clamor to grab backpacks and supplies. The researcher, trying to help gain some order, turns quickly when she hears Edwin’s voice boom over the speaker system. The researcher begins to audio record the scene. “Tercero, Maestra, Tercero!!,” Edwin commands from the microphone in his hand as he is determinedly pointing his finger in front of where he is standing indicating the teacher and the students are to line up in front of him immediately. Segrado, Maestra, Segrado!! Una Mama, y una Papa, Segrado!!,” Edwin again commands, lining up the second graders with the help of the teacher and the parents. Edwin continues to organize each grade in ascending order. Later Edwin explains to the researcher, “We have a certain way we like to do things.

Orderly. No pushing, no grabbing. There is no reason a primary student needs more than one notebook. There's just no need."

Guatemalans are relational in nature prioritizing relationship building over management timetables, as Elaine commented, there this sense "we'll be just really close friends, and, we have tasks, but if our tasks don't get done this month there's always next month."

The culture is also hierarchical, which does not necessarily support individual autonomy in business practice. Guatemala also demonstrates strong gender roles favoring men, and machismo is a real phenomenon. It is also common to ensure available resources benefit one's own family. All these things, relationship, lack of autonomy in business practice, gender roles, and questionable resource allocation, lead to specious management practices (by North American standards) to outright corruption creating a "cloud of corruption" underlying Guatemalan interaction, which Tamalyn Gutierrez explains as, "...there's a risk that either somebody truly is hiding something, or planning to abscond with something."

Sharing a Guatemalan culture, however, instills trust in the organization and its work. Findings confirm some Guatemalans do not trust foreigners. This was a poignant researcher observation when delivering school supplies in the mountains above Chiquimula. Up to this point, the school children had flocked around the researcher to shake hands or get a hug, but the children at the last drop in the mountains above Chiquimula hid from the researcher when the researcher approached them, though the boys were a bit braver than the girls. When the researcher asked the principal of the school about their behavior she explained, "You have to understand, these families know about the Canadian NGO that stole [kidnapped] children to adopt them out, so they are

suspicious of white people.” As such, Edwin specifically defines trust as related to being Guatemalan with Guatemalan connections, stating, “It helps a lot. And, the reason being is because the procedure that we follow, that somebody in that little village, or near the village, knows of the school we are going to help. So, we kind of create this trust, you know?, that so-and-so knows and how, and that way we are able to kind of introduce ourselves in a very easy way.” Along this same vein, shared culture relates to access as Ignacio previously stated villages know him and trust him, as a Guatemalan, doing the work. Trust in a shared cultural context is interesting, however, because Guatemalans in North America accused Edwin’s organization of being thieves at least once, and it emotionally affected the organization’s membership. Cony Mendez explains, “Yeah, they said we are thieves. And, we don’t take anything from that money we collect.” This may indicate Guatemala’s known culture of corruption has the potential to impede native/indigenous transnational nonprofit efforts.

Language is part of shared culture privileging the native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leaders. Contextual in operation, language not only operationalizes as different dialect and meaning, but also as a representation of culture, education, status, sector, etc. Understanding such realities provides the leaders clarity of cultural context; that is, sharing a cultural language provides the leaders understanding of and ability to operate within urban (proper) and rural dialects and the melding of Indigenous and Spanish vocabulary. Ignacio explains, “And, we were going to [...Skype glitch...] the book, the first textbook, and we got some inputs from the community about how to change the language. Even though it was a popular education tools there was some kind of vocabulary that the community leaders heard that they were more into the people who

live on the outskirts of the Guatemala City.” In this respect, language use by native/indigenous nonprofit leaders enables Guatemalan stakeholder trust in a way that may be closed to or difficult for North American leaders as expressed by David and Wendy. However, it was noted by the researcher that knowing English also privileges native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leaders allowing them to build valuable North American connections. Language helps the leaders get their message across despite the audience.

Another aspect of shared culture is time. Time does not have the same meaning in Guatemala and North America. In Guatemala, there is always time for relationship building to move individuals to support, with loyalty to continue to support, the organization. Elaine explains, “Guatemalans feel if things do not get done today, there is always tomorrow.” Goal setting with timelines is a blurry process with Guatemalans seeming to prefer the process of building a relationship with each other in doing the work rather than accomplishing the work itself as Andy Carey notes, “If you were to go to Guatemala you’re not going to find people who will just sit with you, you have to build trust first.” Furthermore, many Guatemalans display a reverence for the old morals and principles over the modern as when Edwin states in looking at a statue in tribute to drama in the city park of Chiquimula, “People just don’t respect education the way they used to and it makes me sad.” This slower definition of time can be frustrating to North Americans with their short definition of time as Elaine laments,

If you make an appointment with someone, they may or may not come. And, it’s kind of considered okay. You don’t even have to excuse yourself. You don’t even have to explain anything. So, for an American coming in, even one who

used to live here, there were a few moments of severe frustration about, ‘What?!

Why can’t I get an appointment?!’

This shortened North American understanding of time also means the organizations may be more readily discarded as a project to support. That is, the organization simply falls off North Americans’ radar as their time fills with other priorities as previously intimated by Corey stating, “And, just after a while, you know, just with him being in another country, and relationships, it just didn’t go anywhere. It didn’t go anywhere.” The researcher observed, however, Edwin’s organization, being located in North America, moves fairly quickly while Ignacio’s organization moves fairly slowly. Not that either pace is preferred over the other. Edwin has a career in the U.S., so his time is not fully concentrated on the nonprofit, admitting he cannot put in the time towards the nonprofit that may be needed. Alternatively, Ignacio operates at a fairly steady pace because as the leader, as the manifest representation of the organization, he can set time convenient to his schedule.

All in all, findings indicate shared culture helps the leaders do their work. For example, Guatemalans enjoy celebrations. Therefore, the primary fundraiser for Help for Schools is a big community celebration held in San Diego on Guatemala’s Independence Day. Alternatively, the arrival of the school supplies at the schools in Guatemala is under the auspices of a celebration, which makes Help for Schools feel they are really doing something good for their fellow Guatemalans. Celebration is a bridge since Edwin can use their culture and its enjoyment of celebration as a way to relate to Guatemalans in both locations. However, it is not fully understood if sharing or understanding the North American culture has the same dramatic impact. Findings indicate being familiar with

the North American culture helps both leaders do their work. Yet, both leaders note instances of culture shock and cultural collisions, which impeded their efforts. North Americans, for instance, are not necessarily relationally motivated preferring more professionalized nonprofit interactions. The most notable collision came in terms of a North American community foundation account established by students who wanted to help Nahual. Elaine explained:

Yes. One of the students who came with one of the classes, her name escapes me but I think it was [name omitted to protect identity] something, she was in the nonprofit program. And, Ignacio was, by this point, feeling a little bit overwhelmed by his finances, I think, and felt like he needed to do something. And, so, we were like, well, we will be happy to try to help fundraise. So, I didn't come up with the idea of the International Community Foundation. It was actually, I think, [name omitted to protect identity] and maybe a couple of others. And so that sounds like a great idea and let's see if Ignacio wants to do it. He agreed to it. So, we started raising money for it...So, it was supposed to have \$5,000 to set it up, but [the foundation oversight authority], who was a friend, said, 'Oh, that's okay. We'll set it up with \$3,000 and just try to get the fundraising machine going.' This is right before we came back to Guatemala in 2010. We arrived in Guatemala in 2010. And, you know, long distance – and, again, I was not on the paperwork, Nacho and his friends here were on the paperwork. I had no access and no part in it. I just tried to raise money for it. But, I explained, 'You cannot get any of this money out without having good reports, good financial reports, a good projection of what you're going to do, and

we need to raise the other \$2,000.’ And, so, I proposed a whole series of ways we might raise that other \$2,000. And, this maybe could be where a difference of opinion could exist between Nacho and me. But, my perception was he was burnt out; he just couldn’t face doing anything. And, you know, I had raised money for [name omitted to protect identity] stuff, and we’d given him money, you know. And, I said [to Ignacio], ‘You know, why don’t we write really nice thank you notes. I wrote and thanked everyone who gave money, but why don’t you write really nice thank you notes to everybody who gave money.’ And, when I could not get him to do that, I kind of was like, this is not something I can make happen. Because, if I can’t get that much buy-in toward raising this money, and giving the proper reports, and giving the proper projections – I mean all of which I was willing to do, and help with, and work with.

Elaine relates she just could not get Ignacio to take interest in raising the money or thanking the donors, issues of professional importance in the North American nonprofit sector. Ignacio’s accounting of the situation relates a more hands-off, less formal understanding of the intended arrangement:

The experience of the San Diego university, they got excited in 2007 and they learned about what I was doing and working. And, they decided to create somehow a group of donors, like \$25 each, and to actually find a way how students in San Diego could raise funds. But, the best thing that they did— in 2007, in 2009, then 2010— the best thing that they did was to speak with the [community foundation] to allow us to be under their umbrella, to be out of that umbrella, to receive funds, if anyone wanted to donate. But then, we got some

messages from them basically saying that they will charge us for every year for the service they do in terms of serving and communicating with the IRS for these things. And, we kind of saw that instead of the money going up, it was going down. Because they said unless we get into \$5,000, they will start giving the money to you. But, we never reached that amount. We reached \$3,000, something, through the help that students donated? We never got the money at the time that it was needed. We were very sad at that. Then they said maybe you could—maybe we could give you \$2,000 and remaining \$1,000 here in the account, to stay open or something like that. In the end, I asked one of the volunteers to terminate that relationship because the next year it would be another \$300 less, next year another one—if we comply with this, we will never get to the \$5,000, the ideal issue, no? And she did, and they basically sent us a check and we needed to file a report, and we got something like \$2,000 because they deduct all of these things that they needed. And, that's fine. It helped for one of the trainings that I was doing then. And that was good.

Whatever truly happened, Ignacio's expectations for his role and how a nonprofit should work did not measure up with the more professional North American nonprofit culture causing difficulties even while a North American attempted to bridge the understandings.

Technology. Technology refers to access to technology and using technology to convey information about the organization. These native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leaders have a noted privilege in their access to technology – a privilege not available to many in Guatemala – though neither leader voices much interest in technology and how it helps their organizations. Both leaders have laptop computers.

Edwin owns the latest cell phone technologies, and both leaders text message extensively. Both organizations have websites, though Nahual's website is currently under reconstruction. Help for Schools has a Facebook account, though use appears sporadic. However, North American supporters of the organizations were particularly interested in both organizations having a greater web presence. Corey, a North American student, nonprofit professional, and Nahual supporter noted, "this was right around the time when social media was kind of starting to take off, so you were being exposed to younger generations attempting to help globally people who were impoverished. And so, I thought, well this might be a great opportunity then to leverage that kind of social media presence that was beginning to take off to expand its global consciousness and in thinking of ways to support these folks." And, James Kinyon, a Help for Schools Supporter, states, "I've often been the one to push Edwin to, you know, create a Facebook account, or get a website where people can contribute, and then market what you've done." It must be further noted technology seems to be something with which neither native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leader is wholly comfortable. Researcher observation suggests both leaders understand the usefulness of technology in relation to North America but that they feel it may not be as useful to them in relation to Guatemala, though the researcher observed Facebook appears to be popular in Guatemala. It must be cautioned a generational interest or learning curve may also impact the level of technological use, though this is only suspected. In terms of technology, it appears the native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leaders negotiate professional level of organizational usefulness with personal level of comfortable competency and interest.

Gates

Bridges allow the native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leaders to do their work. It may be argued the bridges are a primary reason the leaders are able to operate at all. The leaders rely on access to both regions, the ability to move freely and legally, their colleagues, friends, and members who support their work, and the reality of being Guatemalan as part of their nonprofit work. Still, bridges do not present a completely open pathway since gates, a researcher designation to describe impediments to bridge privileges, are sometimes put in place to contain or regulate bridge flow. Systemically, these gates include visa and passport regulations placing strict restrictions on Guatemalan movement, market exchange rates greatly favoring the U.S. or Canadian dollar, denigrating popular discourses fostering discrimination about Guatemala and Guatemalans, language use favoring English and Spanish-speaking white North Americans but causing suspicion for English or Spanish-speaking brown Latin Americans, etc. Each of these systemic gates limits the native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leaders' access to resources. Given this reality, it is not surprising to find native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leaders also use gates in order to regulate information about their organizations. Referred to as gatekeeping (Tarrow, 2005) describing the process of maintaining a preferred understanding, the leaders take measures to control the message about their organizations, take efforts to stay on message, and are conscious about what or whom they place at the center of the message. After all, the leaders want their organizations to be attractive and offer a unified message to stakeholders in North America and Guatemala.

Controlling the Message. It has been previously shown transnationals, by nature of having access to multiple contexts, are known for passing along, transporting, knowledge between contexts. This passing of information may be accidental or deliberate, generative or destructive, and/or overt or covert (Tarrow, 2015). Because of his privileged insider/outsider situation, the native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leader has the power to control the message that is distributed to others. For this study, findings indicate the purpose of controlling the message, what one participant called “selective communication,” is to support each leader’s preferred message about the organization and its work. Controlling the message can mean making the message interesting and compelling, maybe even coloring the message vibrantly relaying interesting or extraordinary facts (for example, using colorful words or framing the message with a nice photo) to capture attention and appeal to the listener in an effort to gain their support. For example, Lynne Collins relates,

[Edwin] likes me [at the Guatemalan Independence Day celebration] as the token *gringa* because there’s a lot of Guatemalans, a lot of Hondureños, because it is a Central American celebration altogether, when they see an American involved in helping in something that’s a cause here in the United States to help their home country, they go, ‘Oh, this must be really good because there’s an American helping out.’

Controlling the message can include suspect practices such as controlling stakeholder interaction, dismissal of other’s information or opinion, exclusion, expecting exceptional forms of business practice by others, expecting exceptional substantiation of nonprofit practice by others, minimizing the importance or impact of a situation, and omitting facts.

Two prime examples controlling the message come forward. The first one relates to Help for Schools. Edwin had met Eric Rivera in Guatemala who led the Help for Schools team to Pajapita for the first delivery of school supplies. On the way, the caravan detoured to visit a small Episcopalian church Eric Rivera is supporting through missionary efforts. Eric enthusiastically showed the researcher around the property and explained the pastor's story. In turn, Edwin made concentrated, repeated efforts to ensure the researcher understood, "This is Eric's project. It has nothing to do with Help for Schools. This is his personal project."

The second example comes in terms of Ignacio's notable charm. Elaine says of Ignacio, "He's a very cheerful man. He's very entertaining. He's very fun. He's very good to be with." And Corey admitted, "He is like a vampire! He's got that charm about him that just mesmerizes you. Here's my blood!" The researcher noted Ignacio is very tentative about his personal relationship status maintaining a persona the researcher describes as suave stating,

Maybe when I am 60 I will start my duty to be a father. Let's see if I can find someone. And then everyone in my family is telling me, how can you find someone younger than you? Well, I have a choice. If I am in any indigenous settings I'll be respectable man. I think I can have a young 25 if I want her, no? Don't be surprised, I can be a father someday.

Given this, the researcher was surprised to discover Ignacio had been married before and is actively dating. It is not to say a leader's personal life is a focus of this study. It is not, nor should it be. Rather, his charming persona, based on his colorful, adventurous past, is part and parcel of his nonprofit work. That is, he relies on his persona to acquire support

for his organization. Subsequently, seeing Ignacio deliberately control the message regarding his personal life lends itself to the nonprofit message he wishes to convey.

Controlling the message can also include leaders' direct language reflecting power or cultural hierarchies. For example, as when Ignacio stated, "we order their knowledge" in relation to the learning within his proposed Indigenous university. Finally, controlling the message also appears to relate to the terms by which the organization's work is measured. For example, leaders define success as finding money for another year of school supplies to help a few more children rather than achieving large-scale impact, receiving monetary compensation for their nonprofit work, or seeing training used rather than counting the number of people served.

Considering the above, controlling the message is complicated by Guatemala's hierarchical culture that cannot separate the leader from the organization. Ignacio notably plays with this cultural reality by telling elaborate, exciting, fun stories about his past adventures presenting an image of his life as related to his work in a manner that tends to deflect knowledge about his personal life. Edwin also appears to consciously separate his personal life from the work of the organization by answering questions carefully and keeping conversational focus on the work done telling the researcher when something was personal information and not related to the research. In both examples, the leader presents a leadership image positively combining the personal with the organization and its work. The leaders appear to understand the importance for Guatemalans to see the leader as the work. Subsequently, they present a message moving people to support their organizations, rather than presenting an exactly accurate message or a message disclosing concrete personal information. This is not particular to the

leaders. The Guatemalan government clearly makes decisions discerning who is exposed to certain contexts or information and how that information is displayed. For example, the researcher found it very interesting Guatemalan government websites went down as the new presidential administration took office in order to give the public impression “real change” was taking place whether or not that was the reality.

Staying on Message. Staying on message is closely related to controlling the message in that the practice is intended to make the leader’s message or agenda appealing and palatable to others. The leaders stay on message to ensure what they say meets up with organizational goals. The leaders also seem to use staying on message as a way to ease out of difficult conversations about services the organization cannot offer and to keep the scale of the organization manageable, for example, when the Guatemalan teachers wished help getting to the U.S. for training, Edwin replied, “I can take your request to the board for consideration, but such help is outside what our organization does.” It was observed Edwin is more forward about the purposes of his organization, more pointedly pragmatic and strategic as in, for example, stating of improvements he would like to see in Help for Schools,

I wish we would have a little more involvement from our community into our programs, into what we try to develop. It seems to be a little difficult to get commitment from other people. And, that I would like to see. Maybe someday I will find ways to encourage others to join in a more active way.

Alternatively, Ignacio appears more scattered or grasping in relating the organization’s purpose though his grand vision points to the indigenous Think Tank and a salaried position. For example, the researcher noted in starting a conversation with Ignacio a

feeling of coming into the middle of a discussion already taking place and having to listen carefully to decipher Ignacio's purpose which usually comes at the end of a long story. It is unclear if these differences are individual or a reflection of the leader's location and culture. There is indication, however, that as a grassroots/ground-level leader, the knowledge reflects each leader's own learning (his own capacity building). The leaders witness different contexts, make understanding of what is witnessed, make a determination about the context, which becomes a shared statement. Another common, well-shared, story from Ignacio gives a good (if opinionated) example:

I learned a lot about Habitat for Humanity. I don't respect Habitat for Humanity anymore. I don't respect all of those people who were telling me that they are building houses for the poor. It's needed. The housing is needed. But, the way they do it is totally backwards and it doesn't resolve the issue. Therefore, you will always have people that are homeless and things like that but don't really create policies but only create this kind of non-solution. And, the local architects and engineers, for profit they build some housing and their main consumers or the poor. And poor families pay their own houses. You don't need an NGO for that. You just need the desire to resolve the housing in the country. But, if you see Habitat for Humanity is coming to Guatemala, and the way they came in 2005, I was in a total disagreement...And of course, my friend architect when he was building his house in 2005, he just used his hand, punched the wall, and said this is the house that these guys are offering to people. Four dry walls, one roof, and one pad of cement. And, that's what they said they were giving to the poor. This is no dignity. This is not a house. I will never get involved with that.

Such learned statements can encompass broad generalizations, such as “all Guatemalans” or “all Americans,” though the researcher noted North American nonprofit organizations demonstrate similar tendencies.

In making North American comparisons, the practice of staying on message may be comparable to “mission mode,” or the leaders’ extreme sense of task orientation as when Andy Carey of the U.S.-Mexico Border Philanthropy Partnership states, “You know, your US-based practices won’t thrive in Mexico... You have to find out what works in Mexico and exploit that.” Mission mode interacts with the native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leaders as the manifest representation of the organization, indicating there is quite a bit of power in operation as the information reflects the leaders’ knowledge. The difference may be these are the “knowledgeable Others,” the native/indigenous experts, which may open the leaders to greater scrutiny since they do not readily voice limitations but frame the situation in terms of possibilities, potentialities, and successes. For example, Edwin states,

So, we thought, hey, we’re going to spread what we can around, because it’s encouraging to go to a place and see the happiness in the little kids when they know they get supplies for their classes. Well, we didn’t want to see that in just one school. We wanted to see it in as many as possible. And so, that’s been the reason. Because concentrated in just one, or maybe just a few, in the long term, will probably be even more beneficial in that sense. But, we want to see our help being spread around.

The native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leaders speak in terms of what was accomplished, or could be accomplished, rather than what failed, what did not occur

contrary to plan, or what happened (or can happen) in place of the plan.

Center. Center is a term picked up from the Cabrillo National Monument in San Diego, California, honoring the efforts of a Spanish conquistador to Guatemala and Southern California. A narrative ribbon at the monument explains, “Cabrillo established a shipyard at the Guatemalan port of Iztapa and, despite the hardships present in the Americas, constructed a fleet [of ships] as good as any built in Europe” through the efforts of indigenous Tlaxcalan and Mayan slaves, sailing one of these ships to San Diego. In a reproduction of an etching, not Cabrillo but a similar conquistador is placed prominently at the center of a scene, the center starkly clear of other people or things, to depict the conquistador’s importance during an Indigenous revolt caused by Spanish efforts to take Central American territory. In a similar manner, center reflects who or what the native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leaders place at the center of the organization’s work in the messages relayed. The center is a construction intended to position desired emphasis or focus for the recipient or audience.

Findings note in leaders’ actions, conversations, and understandings, there is variation in who is or what is placed at the center and how the centered subject is depicted or related to others. Edwin is intentional and focused in his replies, making certain to place precise focus on Help for Schools and it’s work commonly circling back to iterating in some form, “that every penny that goes into the organization gets to the point where it does what it’s supposed to.” He also frequently makes certain the researcher understood Elvia’s, his wife’s, contribution to the work he does, stating, “I’m not sure if I’m being effective, but I have tried, so far. Effective leaders need support, and I have had the greatest support, which is my wife. She’s the one that should take all the

credit.” For Nahual, it is fairly clear Ignacio often places himself at the center as a means to substantiate his stature and credibility as well as the validity of his work, such as in an email reply to the researcher after the researcher passed along a document felt to be relevant to the leader’s work:

[The authors] were [dating] back then, and they were good collaborators in these efforts since both were known by joining the NGOs and the Non-Profit sector for a long time and both were (as we said it Spanish, ‘They lived the good old days by working as NGOs country's Directors or Assistante, etc.’). They were my friends, and I know them well since late 1980s and 1990. The article is a good one and there were so much expectatives from the previous years before Peace Agreement (Civic Participation Agreement) and more than 20 years in a country where professionals never understand about the importance to get educators to train on Citizens about these social laws where I've been working on these 14 years.

In his email reply, Ignacio is suggesting he was aware of the article because he had a personal connection to the authors then circles around to his agenda for community organizing education. These examples indicate center refers to, perhaps, giving clarity or clarifying context to the purpose of organizational action. The center can fluctuate according to audience or intended result, and typically reflects the leader’s agenda. Findings suggest the centered subject is used to recall a popular representation in service to the organization. These representations may represent the compelling or popular discourses about the centered subject in Guatemala and/or North America, though the representations could be interpreted as romantic, simplistic, and/or perhaps an even

stereotypical account of reality, as in having the *gringa*, Lynne Collins, at the Guatemalan celebration to lend an air of credibility to the organization, or Ignacio's adventurous, engaging, funny stories, which center him as a credible, legitimate community organizer. However, for both leaders the stories they use are known and repeated because they are compelling, perhaps unique, and seem to convey each leader's level of integrity (e.g., he is an informed, knowledgeable leader) regarding his nonprofit work.

Collisions

The term 'collisions' is used in this study to describe the native/indigenous transnational nonprofits leaders' understanding of terms often used within nonprofit discourse. The researcher felt collisions an appropriate descriptor for the comparison between the leaders' and sector understandings because, as will be seen, the leaders may be aware of the terms, perhaps even use the terms, but the native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leaders' understanding, as a product of gatekeeping, is interjected into the definitions. The results offer rather nuanced understandings, negotiated understandings, reflecting each leader's insider/outsider situation in service to his organization.

Explanation of each collision begins with a summary of current nonprofit discourse. Again, the reader is cautioned that nonprofit discourse is contested terrain. The purpose of the summary is to insert the native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leaders into the nonprofit conversation and a summary of current thought assists this purpose.

This section first sets the stage by bringing forward the negotiated meaning of a nonprofit organization. The section then engages with the negotiated understanding of development, the particular type of nonprofit work with which the leaders state they

engage. The section completes with the native/indigenous transnational leaders' understandings of accountability, advocacy, effectiveness, and professionalization, common topics within nonprofit discourse. A full summary of these negotiated understandings, i.e., collisions, with discourse references is provided in Table 2.

Nonprofit. There is no definitional consensus on the meaning of nonprofit within nonprofit discourse. Whereas early engagement focused on social-welfare organization, nonprofit is described today as entities sitting between business and government that do not distribute profits to owners or shareholders (Ott, 2001) and are believed to vary in composition, nature, and scope (Anheier & Salamon, 2006). Variation is particularly true for international nonprofits in terms of composition, finance, and size (Anheier & Salamon, 2006; Anheier & Themudo, 2005) though the Johns Hopkins Comparative Nonprofit Sector Project has worked since 1998 to map what the international nonprofit sector looks like in a variety of western contexts (Salamon & Anheier, 1998). Given the known variation, this study relies on the seminal work of Anheier & Salamon to define nonprofit as “organizations that are organized, private, self-governing, non-profit distributing, and voluntary” (Anheier & Salamon, 2006, p.103). However, this study does not distinguish non-governmental organizations (NGOs), international non-governmental organizations (INGOs), or international philanthropy as unique to the definition but notes increasing contributions of transnational nonprofits and increased global nonprofit interaction (Edwards & Hulme, 1996; Keck & Sikkink, 1998; Kriesberg, 1997).

Table 2

List of research topics and themes supported by situational analytic codes and reference citations of current nonprofit discourse, and the negotiated definitions of the native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leaders reflecting the findings of situational analysis.

Topic/Theme/Codes	Supporting Literature	Definition
Bridges		
Bridge Access, Border Defined, Border Designation, Bridging, Ceremony/Celebration, Citizenship, Knowledgeable "Other", Local to global, Location, Movement, Network, Popular Representation/Story, Privilege, Resources, Technology, Time, Trust	Ahmed, 2000; Coe & Bunnell, 2003; Diener & Hagan, 2012; Faist, 2010; Keck and Sikkink, 1999; Portes, Guarnizo, & Landolt, 1999; Lacroix, 2009; Levitt & Merry, 2009; Merry, 2006; Plasterer, 2011; Saidel, 2000; Saxenian, 1999; Tarrow, 2005; Yakushko, Badiee, Mallory, & Wang, 2013	Native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leaders occupy formal or informal, known or unknown privileged spaces representing the leaders' insider/outsider reality. Bridging is the leader's act of creating connection between different locations and across contests. Bridges allow the native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leaders to do their work as a part of accessing resources, conveying information, and forming cross-border connections. However, the bridge must be tended to and if the bridge is weak, the connection will collapse. The native/indigenous transnational leaders sometimes place gates to contain or regulate information about their organizations. Referred to as gatekeeping describing the process of maintaining a preferred understanding, the leaders take measures to control the message about their organizations, take efforts to stay on message, and are conscious about what or whom they place at the center of the message.
Gate Caution, Center, Competition, Conflict, Controlling the message, Conveyance of knowledge, Gatekeeping, Importance of getting it right, Limitations to access, Staying on message		
Collisions		
Accountability Accountability, Cloud of corruption, Funding	Bies & Forte, 2011; Bryson, 1995; Carothers, Brechenmacher, & Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 2014; Ebrahim & Wiesband, 2007	With no Spanish word for accountability, a complex understanding was brought forward. Accountability relates to taking the responsibility to accomplish, though not actually accomplishing, the action proposed at an appropriate scale to benefit Guatemalans. Accountability reporting is more relational and informal rather than formally written or standardized. This general definition is problematized when stakeholders, particularly beneficiaries, take advantage of the relational definition to obtain extra afraid they will not get enough or their fair share while leaders attempt an even distribution. However, because these are small organizations, stakeholders may have more trust in the leaders because accountability visibly (either seeing direct results or direct interaction) meets their expectations. Culturally, accountability means reporting to the highest authority available or present, which could be defined as having the appropriate legal or formal authority rather than legal or formal responsibility. Ideologically, the native/transnational nonprofit leaders feel accountability should include equal access to resources (or the equality of opportunity to secure resources), an elimination of corruption, as well as having proof that the work was completed, or that a supporters' contribution is impacting change. It also means inclusivity or accessibility to options for individual betterment, collaboration with those served/helped, being motivated to take action, and taking personal responsibility to seek action.
<i>Collisions (cont.)</i>		
Advocacy Advocacy, Sense of Obligation, Supporter Exposure, Recruitment	Hawken, 2007; Jenkins, 2006; Keck & Sikkink, 1999; MacIndoe, 2011	Advocacy is not a word used in Guatemala beyond human rights. However, native/indigenous transnational advocacy relates to speaking for the collective betterment of society through a project helping that collective betterment. As such, the leaders display difficulty advocating for their organizations. Storytelling is often used to relate the leaders' organizational point or purpose relying on word-of-mouth to spread the message. Advocacy practice works to raise a sense of obligation in another so the individual takes on the leaders' intended action. This is an individual approach rather than group activity to expose others to the realities, as the leaders understand them, of Guatemala. The person, often referred to as a friend, is generally invited to "accompany" the leaders in their efforts.

Table 2 *cont.*

Topic/Theme/Codes	Supporting Literature	Definition
Development Capacity building, Collective/Holistic, Commerce, Development, Education, Marketization, Service Delivery vs. Empowerment Project	Blum, 2001; Carothers, Breckenmacher, & Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 2014; Drainville, 1998; Glick Schiller & Faist, 2010	Development for the native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leaders means a sustainable process of equal distribution of resources to live adequately, or at least access to resources equally distributed, with citizen ability to hold the government responsible for necessary social service provision and societal supports. The definition favors Guatemalans partnering to help Guatemalans as perhaps a desired, higher quality, more productive, and sustainable form of development to include provision for emergency service injections when necessary. Findings suggest at present in Guatemala, there is little demarcation between commerce, employment, and development work as all three must provide or support a means by which Guatemalans can earn a living.
Effectiveness Culture, Effectiveness- Defined, Mission/Purpose	Salamon, 1987; Shaefer, DeLand, Jones, 2011; Steinberg, 2006; Willems, Boenigk, & Jegers, 2014	For the native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leaders, effectiveness relates to doing the chosen work on an adequate scale (understanding these are small-scale organizations), that proposed and planned projects are accomplished, and that money raised goes to this intended purpose. Supporters often relate effectiveness to a leader's skill set. However, the leaders voiced developmental effectiveness should include increased organized collaboration between entities with a clearer, greater, and interactive connection between North America and Guatemala. However, both leaders stress it is Guatemalans responsibility to develop Guatemala. Furthermore, effectiveness does not include formal substantiation of results since such results would possibly hold little meaning for their supporters, but is best relayed as representing a connection to the organization and its activities.
Leadership Advocacy, Gender dynamics, Adaptation - Melding/Combining/ Changing, Affection for supporters, Age, Agenda setting, Connection, Credibility, Employment, Frustration, Graciousness, High expectations, Honesty in claims, Language, Leader defined, Leadership, Personal betterment, Positionality, Presenting path, Representation, Succession, Service/Calling	Bass & Bass, 2008; Burns, 1978, 2003; Klenki, 2008; Murphy, 2011; Nahavandi, 2012	A native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leadership has a nuanced definition reflecting their insider/outsider reality. The leaders may have certain attributes helping them understand and direct other people, instill credibility and trust, provide a compelling message, mobilize action toward a common goal, provide the prominent service, stimulate and inspire positive change, and utilize resources responsibly to reach purposes reflective of North American discourse. However, as a human manifestation of the organization, leaders substantiate the legitimacy of the organization through a long-term (perhaps permanent), symbolic representation contrary to North American transitive representational definitions. This type of leadership intimates that while North American definitions indicate leaders partner with, collaborate with, and support other leaders and stakeholders across sectors and/or those with an interest in the project to the extent necessary, native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leaders build, establish, and maintain close relationships with others over a long period of time reflecting Guatemalan relational culture. Finally, for the native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leaders, being a leader additionally coincides with a very personal, connected feeling of service or calling to better Guatemala.

Table 2 *cont.*

Topic/Theme/Codes	Supporting Literature	Definition
<i>Collisions (cont.)</i>		
Nonprofit Building/Office/Headquarters, Culture, Direct plea, Indirect plea, Mission/Purpose, Nonprofit defined, Partnership, Pedagogy, Professionalization, Relevance of scale, Social enterprise, Sustainability, Symbol/Symbolism	Anheier & Salamon, 2006; Anheier & Themudo, 2005; Salamon & Anheier, 1998; Edwards & Hulme, 1996; Keck & Sikkink, 1999; Kriesberg, 1997	The native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leaders do not undertake a nonprofit mission but a project filling a niche where government is not taking (required) responsibility. Nonprofit work does not necessarily mean the intent to operate as a nonprofit, but rather, intent to find the legal, legitimate structure by which the project can take place. Neither does choosing to do nonprofit work indicate a prior familiarity with the sector. The native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leaders are attempting to change Guatemalan culture to accept and participate in nonprofit activity based on their own acquired knowledge about the North American nonprofit sector since Guatemalans, beyond the wealthy, are new to nonprofit giving. Acting with, not for, is an important concept for the leaders' nonprofit work. There is the sense that the leaders believe when people are involved in the project, they will take ownership of the project, take care of it and preserve it. The organizations serve, or accompany, partners. Direct pleas for support (broadly defined mirroring resources) appear to be less common among Guatemalan culture as they are akin to bragging or begging. An indirect plea is a relational mechanism to inform people who may be able to

North American expectations of a nonprofit organization do not necessarily translate to a Guatemalan context. Defining nonprofit in a Guatemalan sense involves finding a niche “project.” Edwin states, “other people have always supported the project” and Ignacio states, “Now, what we need in Guatemala is collaboration, coordination, between you NGO to be aware about we need to go through these process of development together. Not like your little thing and your little project...” Terminology here seems important. The leaders are not undertaking a nonprofit mission but a project filling a place where government is not taking (required) responsibility. Nonprofit work does not necessarily mean the intent to operate as a nonprofit, but rather, intent to find the

legal, legitimate structure by which the project can take place. For example, Ignacio adamantly maintains Nahual is registered for the law only, not necessarily as a representation of operations. On the other hand, Edwin's group wanted to legitimize the work they were doing when a member familiar with nonprofits suggested the nonprofit path. Neither does choosing to do nonprofit work indicate a prior familiarity with the sector. In Edwin's case, he was not familiar with nonprofit activity prior to coming to the U.S., while Ignacio has long-time, broad exposure to nonprofits.

The level of cultural engagement with the nonprofit sector is important. The native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leaders are attempting to change Guatemalan culture to accept and participate in nonprofit activity based on their own acquired knowledge about the North American nonprofit sector. Edwin explains,

Yes. I've read, and I hear about it. You know, you always hear about the big players in nonprofits, and what they do, and where they go. It makes me wonder sometimes how other organizations do or accomplish their goals, which I think most of them do in a very good way. But, I really haven't dedicated as much time as I think I need to to learn a little more about other nonprofits and how they work. We just kind of developed ourselves into it.

There is an understanding among participants that Guatemalans, beyond the wealthy, are new to nonprofit giving. To be certain, poverty makes nonprofit activity difficult to undertake. Less common but still relevant is Guatemala's political history in which people mistake nonprofit work for political ideology as, for example, when Eric Rivera recalls being asked, "At our time when we were students, with my wife, to try to help someone in Guatemala, they see it like, 'Are you Communists?'" because help may be

taken as a redistribution of wealth, or as politically motivated, as when David and Wendy, explaining that one of the Guatemalan nonprofit leaders with which they work was approached by the mayor of the community for compensation for allowing him to set up his project, explained the mayor insisted, “well, you’ll have to paint them all [their materials] red because that’s the color of my political party,” as a means to gain votes. As such, acting with, not for, is an important concept for the leaders. There is the sense that the leaders believe when people are involved in the project, they will take ownership of the project, and take care of it and preserve it, a concept David and Wendy state does not particularly translate to Guatemalan society focused on what they need to do to get ahead economically. The native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leaders and their organizations serve, or “accompany,” partners (a term both leaders use and encountered often in Guatemala). The native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leader takes this definition personally because they believe they are undertaking work to make “us” better recruiting other Guatemalans to help.

Culture also impacts the way the native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leaders solicit support. Direct pleas for support (broadly defined mirroring resources) appear to be, as Tamalyn Gutierrez, David, and Wendy explain, less common among Guatemalan culture because such pleas are akin to bragging or begging making a direct plea uncomfortable. While there are certainly exceptions, Tamalyn relates, Guatemalans feel it should be adequate for people to see the leaders’ and organizations’ accomplishments as proof they are worthy of support. This indirectness may hurt the organization in North America with its more direct, professionalized culture as North American supporters of both organizations indicated the organizations could possibly increase their donations if

they simply asked. However, this is not to say an indirect approach is defective. North American nonprofits operating in Guatemala use the same indirect fundraising practice, that is, promotional materials feature a story, usually a success story, and bright photographs of native/indigenous people to raise donations. Still, an indirect plea by the native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leaders is a relational mechanism to inform people, people who may be able to support their organizations, like the Guatemalan Independence Day celebration in San Diego. The plea is relayed in the form of a problem each leader has encountered with an intimation support would be appreciated. For example, Edwin related to the researcher that since returning from Guatemala he had been trying to find someone to help him provide the English voice-over for a organizational new promotional video. The researcher, now familiar with the indirect ask, offered to do the voice over when Edwin was ready. Ignacio uses similar tactics. When his laptop computer charging cord went out he emailed the researcher and Elaine, “My charger from my Apple Mac Book Air got broken, and I think I won't have a way to write emails from it for a long while because the charger of an apple its expensive in Guatemala City, and I cannot afford at this moment. Yes, it's my tool to work.” Ignacio obviously sent the plea out to others as five days later he specifically sent an email to inform the researcher and Elaine another charger was being shipped to him from the U.S.

Symbolically, neither organization has an office, building, or headquarters. Logos, t-shirts, songs (national anthem), preferred terminology, a favorite or profound story seem enough denote membership. Symbols help the leaders negotiate their insider/outsider situation because, in actuality, the services the native/indigenous transnational nonprofit organizations provide could be interpreted as Guatemalan or

North American depending on the identified originating location. The researcher noted Edwin's and Ignacio's organizations go into areas that are not their own bringing in ideas, knowledge, and supplies from outside Guatemala, thus symbols provide a culturally friendly and digestible identifier. As a consequence, it is important for the father and grandfather of Help-for-Schools, North American member and president-elect, Alonzo Mendez, to be in an honored position at the schools when supplies are delivered even while their support of the organization is not extensive. It was important to use Nahual as an organizational name. These symbols establish the leaders and their organizations as Guatemalans helping Guatemalans.

Development. The discursive development understanding has historically concerned a one-way distribution of resources from modern, Western societies to assist social and economic equality for developing or underdeveloped countries. This concern spawned the demarcations used (and intimated) within this dissertation to define local to international units of analysis: Global North/Global South, rural/urban, rich/poor/, developed/developing, etc. (Glick Schiller & Faist, 2010). By the 1970s, the general development agenda embraced neo-liberal restructuring agendas constituting capital-accumulating projects curtailing state investment in public services and state intervention in market issues (Carothers, Brechenmacher, & Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 2014; Glick Schiller & Faist, 2010) while promoting a nationally-constructed consensus of a “new global economic partnership” (Drainville, 1998). By the late 1990s, there were concerted moves to bring development policy into this consensus policy (Drainville, 1998). This resulted in a change Guatemala experienced first hand as international direct aid/relief services diminished while international nonprofits worked

closely with government and world economic entities to engineer the country's 1996 peace accords agreement assuring the agreement focused on bottom-up development (Blum, 2001; Carothers, Brechenmacher, & Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 2014). Guatemalan development focus switched from wartime and natural disaster aid to grassroots empowerment economic development focused on democratization at a grassroots level, civic participation, human rights, or advocacy training (Blum, 2001). Today, development practice largely continues the neoliberal, bottom-up structure focus (though there is criticism) on the rightness of native/indigenous empowerment through programs promoting accountability, inclusion, participation and transparency while emphasizing the importance of expanding country ownership over development processes (Carothers, Brechenmacher, & Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 2014). This dissertation adopts uncertainty about the plausible effectiveness of this neoliberal development agenda.

Capitalistic marketization undergirds the purposes of neoliberal sustainable development agendas. For the native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leaders, development has a different definition reflecting their insider/outsider understanding. Whereas Andy Carey of the Border Philanthropy group defines development as “resolving issues, raising resources, public policy, advocacy at the global level” not limited to raising money but “raising social consciousness through public policy, advocacy, leadership, and philanthropy,” the leaders’ local to international experiences, when analyzed and summarized, determined development means resources to live adequately should be equally distributed, or at least access to resources for development should be equally available, with citizen ability to hold the government responsible for

necessary social service provision and societal supports. As Edwin explains,

But, I still think that we should take a challenge, one of these days, those that feel that they want to help the country, you know?, to find a way to use their resources in a better way. So, they're neither unattended, wasted, or not used properly.

Because, you know, like in other countries you see the wealthy part of the country and the poor part of the country. And, I don't know—Yes! I would like to see someday a more equally distribute resources, you know? Or, better used, I would say, so that we don't have so much of a difference.

Findings also indicate development means leaving something, or providing supports, for the next generation so development carries forward. A prime example is premised on the researcher's encounter with large groves of rubber trees, which take approximately 20 years to mature making them a questionable endeavor for poor farmers. In asking about the feasibility of such an undertaking, the researcher was informed the groves were to leave to the children. Hence, the notion that supporting school children with supplies and teaching community organizing is similarly seen by the leaders to be sustainable development.

Reflecting this definition, the native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leaders state the work they do, or their perceptions of what needs to be done, must improve the whole of Guatemala. This echoes a popular Guatemalan discourse that Guatemalans must help Guatemalans. Given the researcher's conversations with the leaders, help from Guatemalans for Guatemalans is presented as a desired, perhaps a higher quality or valued, more productive, and sustainable form of development. Rolando Alecio, a Nahual board member, explains, "The goal is to strengthen the capacity for community

development that is ground up, not externally motivated ideas come in as to what development is needed.” And, Julio Cochoy states, “My logic was it's very difficult. If we want to work on a healing process, they have to be proud what they're producing and they have to work.” Edwin further clarifies, “

It's like, we know you need something, we are going to work to help you and let's grow, let's develop ourselves. That's the sentiment in us. It's like you say, we do it because we are going to see better and live better. We invested so much and now we want to see, like you said, what kind of sustainability is there. And up to a point, we kind of lived through it. It's kind of in our souls, seeing poverty. And, to go to places that that's still happening and developing. Because, progress develops, but poverty and need also develop. It's like I told you, I left my country in 1980, 25 years later I went back and I saw, oh, yes, nice malls and all kinds of nice things in certain areas. But, in other places the poverty also grew. Like, “Oh God, I can't believe this.” If we can somehow, like you say, bring some sustainable progress... We sure hope someday we can do it.

Both Edwin and Ignacio note they are not doing the nonprofit work for the schools or community but partnering with the community and with the key leaders (i.e., they are accompanying the community and leaders) to get them the resources they need to do their own work. Given this, it was interesting to note that unless participants were asked to think about how their work may be benefitting North America, development was viewed as a one-way, North America to Guatemala, exchange. As Alonzo Mendez stated when asked to think if Help for Schools benefits North America, “No, only Guatemala. Well, probably can be helping here, too. It kind of benefits the United States because they buy

the backpacks, notebooks, pens, pencils, they can give it to Guatemala so the kids will have a better future. So, it sort of does both.”

In truth, there are strong, visible demarcations between rich and poor in Guatemala. To alleviate the disparity the leaders say they undertaking both service delivery and empowerment projects. Edwin explains,

I think that we are part of both activities. Yes, we have a way and a system to deliver supplies... class supplies and student supplies. It's an activity to just bring in products. But, I would think these kids, when they have a hand, these supplies, they can learn better and the teachers can't teach better. In the long run, these supplies and services will probably turn out to be sustainable. We are helping them get knowledge. How more sustainable can that be? You're not just providing things, you're providing something... not like something they can use like a vehicle, or something for their home, or to cultivate their fields. We are delivering knowledge or the way to acquire knowledge, if you could consider that sustainable. It is [sustainable].

Providing education is a sustainable endeavor compared to the temporary nature of food or medicine delivery. The children need a few notebooks and pencils so they have the tools to begin school on time. The delivery of supplies is seen as a necessary, maybe emergency, interjection. Alternatively, Rolando Alecio states Nahual's work is vital since communities will never be able to improve without the civil society training to teach them how to participate in Guatemala's representative government structure.

Rolando explains,

Because COCODEs is part of the local structure, if it has a diverse board, the diversity can work against corruption. It is a strong structure because it has legislative support in the national system. The people have the capability to undo the corruption and remake the system. It is a democratic system that allows people to make change if change is necessary”

For both leaders, supporting a community’s education by providing important services is not a temporary measure, but a means to achieve a sustainable future.

Finally, the leaders found it important to demonstrate to the researcher development does not mean the presence of angry, sad, or negative people. While a clear demarcation exists between those who have and those who do not, and the leaders do not want to diminish this reality, Edwin and Ignacio were clear to point out at every opportunity Guatemalans can be and are happy, industrious, and organized. Edwin and Ignacio substantiate their claim by pointing out not everyone wants to migrate north and the tremendous amount of developed-comparable commerce taking place all over the country. For example, Guatemalan-owned Pollo Camero, St. Martins, and Contigo, if scaled to size, rival the reach of U.S.-owned Taco Bell, Applebee’s, and Verizon (respectively). The country is developing, though development does not magically appear but rather happens in spotty patches producing good and bad results. Findings suggest at the present time in Guatemala, there is little demarcation between commerce, development, and employment. Julio Cochoy says of his social enterprise, Maya Skills, his project participants needed to earn a living in order to heal their trauma and, “That same bracelet we can make the same and even better. If I take to the United States or Canada, I can sell it then \$20... We created the business, because they asked me to do

something to provide. It's not huge business, but at least this production of the jewelry is helping them to complement their incomes in their home.” David and Wendy point out such a nonprofit ideology, the melding of commerce, development, and employment, is contrary to intentional philanthropic good will. They explain, following the move from service delivery to empowerment and capacity building pursued by some international organizations,

[The Guatemalan employees of the organization] were all thinking I’ve had a stable job for the last so many years and now you’re going to leave and I’m going to shoulder all the risk? And over there there’s World Vision or World Concern and they’re still functioning and I have all these technical skills. Forget this. I’m not going to take the risk of being somebody’s supervisor. I’m going to jump and see if they will take me on as an employee.

Rolando Alecio counters this perspective by stating,

With my experience is [another organization], because at first we were all volunteers but then we got a small grant from Holland. Even though it was only a small stipend to each person, it was enough for people to really dedicate themselves to as much work as they put into it. After several years of working, everyone eventually received decent salaries. Whereas with Nahual, if we remain all volunteers, it will be very difficult to grow.

The above indicates Guatemalans may feel all three— working for Pollo Camero, a government agency, or a nonprofit— must ultimately provide a means to earn a living if Guatemala is going to improve.

Accountability, Advocacy, Effectiveness, Professionalization

The nonprofit sector has developed common terminology meant to describe best practice or provide measurement of best practice. Four such terms are accountability, advocacy, effectiveness, and professionalization, though again, these are contested terms. The native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leaders and their organizations were questioned and studied on each of these terms in an effort to develop a working definition best fitting their complex situation as an addition to the nonprofit conversation. These are not generalized definitions, but definitions representing the native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leaders' insider/outsider situation. They are negotiated understandings taking place past the bridges and between the gates. The result is a clear melding of meanings, which continue to develop, that help the leader undertake their work within local to international contexts.

Accountability. Accountability varies in nonprofit definition and execution. Generally, accountability means justifying actions and decisions for personal or organizational activity as required for responsible business practice (Bies & Forte, 2011; Ebrahim & Wiesband, 2007). This general definition is interpreted differently depending on nonprofit subsector or organizational focus taking instrumental (mechanical support for design, monitoring, evaluation, etc.), political (furthering an agenda), or technical (specialized terminology for industry guidance) meanings (Bies & Forte, 2011; Carothers, Brechenmacher, & Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 2014; Ebrahim & Weisband, 2007). Accountability is part of the jargon decision-makers or people of influence use to demand and enforce greater evidence of program achievement, efficiency, and impact (Bies & Forte, 2011; Bryson, 1995). In terms of a nonprofit

organization, leaders must be accountable to a wide variety of stakeholders – beneficiaries, donors, members, and partners – with different levels of concern and influence (Bryson, 1995; Ebrahim & Wiesband, 2007).

There is no Spanish word for accountability. It was determined the closest word reflecting an adequate definition was to comply (*cumplir*), though this word was not quite accurate and required additional researcher clarification. Guatemalan participants were asked how they show or tell people the leader and organization are doing what they say they are doing, then probing their answers for deeper meaning. A complex understanding was brought forward contrasting, and sometimes conflicting heavily, with the North American definition, which encompasses answering stakeholder expectations through formal, transparent mechanisms demonstrating impact. To elaborate, Elaine explains,

Well, again, in a U.S. context [accountability] is time and money, right? I found it very hard to feel like I could even get close to doing that....And, we have laws on the books. Sunshine laws. You can go into any municipality, and I did it in the Ixil area, and you should be able to get information about what's going on there. The nonprofit sector is supposed to be very accountable to the SOT [state tax system] and turn in its reports regularly. And, I know Ignacio had an accountant who did that faithfully. So, that was all done, and paid for, and done correctly. But, the sunshine part of, like, how much of that are you going to share with people from whom you are trying to raise money was not quite as clear to me. I think people just looked for, like, okay, in a lot of little communities your leaders are responsible for putting on a fiesta. The money they collect is for that.

So, if they put on a good fiesta, then, you know, they did a good job. I can see it.

I actually see the product and the results.

Because visibility does not equal transparency, for the native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leaders accountability appears to relate to taking the responsibility to accomplish, not actually accomplishing, the action proposed at an appropriate scale to benefit Guatemalans. For example, Ignacio tells how he explained to a community his organization's responsibility in undertaking the COCODEs training:

My friend economist, Mateo, came one day to train at the School of COCODES and among other things asked people, 'How much does it cost to rent the plastic chair you are sitting on?' Then people responded, 'One Quetzal', -My friend Mateo continues, 'And, how many chairs does Ignacio rent every week?' Then a respected old man said, 'One hundred chairs.' And, how much is one hundred chairs for Q1 each? Well, 'Q100' everyone said in one voice. And who pays this? Then people replied, 'Ignacio!' Ok, $Q100 \times 52 \text{ weeks} = Q5,200$. Now, multiplied this for five years? Is Q 26,000 (USD \$ 3,466). How about the coffee? At Q30 per pound and use four pound per month, per five years? Equals Q31,200 (USD\$ 4,160). How about, Electricity, Phone, Water, Gas, Toilet Paper, Soap, Copies, Text Books for COCODES? and so on, so forth....

While this instruction was not intended as a lesson in accountability, the purposes did demonstrate to the community the responsibility the leader assumed in complying with the mission of Nahual's community organizing work, whether or not accounting sheets could be produced to substantiate Ignacio's claims. Therefore, accountability may not involve any type of formal reporting (including in relation to financial matters) as

previously indicated by Elaine having difficulty with obtaining formalized output from Ignacio, though Edwin determinedly states 100 percent of the funds raised goes towards the project and probably has the accounts to prove this (although the researcher never saw the accounting). In fact, reporting is more relational and informal rather than a written/standardized formal report. Edwin provides written narratives to the organization's supporter using lots of photographs. For some Help for Schools supporters, such as Lynne Collins, this appears preferred since when I asked Lynne to define accountability she stated, "Yes. Look at Elvia's [Edwin's wife's] face when they're giving the kids all their stuff. [Laughter] That says just about everything." For Ignacio, showing accountable community organizing seems more of a challenge since results are difficult to show visually so he appears to rely on individual commentary and stating numbers of individuals seeking his services while Elaine laments, "But accountability is the downfall. If there were any way in the world that [Ignacio] could learn that "donor relations" REQUIRE accountability, communication, and occasional thanks, he could advance" [emphasis hers]. This general definition is problematized when stakeholders, particularly beneficiaries, take advantage of the relational definition to obtain extra afraid they will not get enough or their fair share while leaders attempt an even distribution. However, because these are small organizations, stakeholders appear to have more trust in the leaders because accountability visibly (either seeing direct results or direct interaction) meets their expectations. As James Kinyon explains, "Look, Edwin's on a very small scale, so accountability you can practically see. I trust him 100 percent and that makes a big difference. And, I'm basing this off my gut instinct on that trust."

Culturally, accountability appears to mean one reports to the highest authority available or present. Accountability, therefore, could be defined as having the appropriate legal or formal authority rather than legal or formal responsibility. In fact, Tamalyn Gutierrez stated Guatemala, in general, does not grasp the idea of accountably responsible stewardship of resources and Edwin, in delivering school supplies, admits they, “only bring exactly enough because we cannot trust the principal or teachers to manage the supplies properly. Who knows where the extra supplies will end up.” This overarching authority subsequently gives the leader the ability to control the message and resources to his/her purposes. However, in Guatemala there appears to be an understanding if the person in authority does something wrong, they will be demeaned publically. David and Wendy noted gossip is frequently used to “keep people in their place.” Wendy noted,

And the form that that takes is really awful sometimes. It will be a rumor that, oh, he’s not with his wife, or he’s with this other woman. But, there’s no truth to it at all. But, of course, it’s a rumor that runs around like fire and you kind of have to weather the storm.

Guatemalan and North American participants indicated this punishment more or less works because people fear public consequences and humiliation.

Ideologically, based on the information brought forward thus far, the native/transnational nonprofit leaders stated accountability should include equal access to resources (or the equality of opportunity to secure resources), an elimination of corruption, as well as having proof that the work was completed, or that a supporters’ contribution is impacting change on a scale achievable by organizational size. It also

means inclusivity or accessibility to options for individual betterment, collaboration with those served/helped, being motivated to take action, and taking personal responsibility to seek action. However, their definition of accountability should not necessarily mean the leaders always practice access, equal inclusion, or transparency, or they even collaborate with stakeholders. It was noted by the researcher, for example, Ignacio may have been stalling a bit in placing the researcher in contact with Nahual's board members, and when meeting Milagro Fajardo, the current acting president of Nahual, the researcher was surprised to learn Ignacio intimated the meeting was intended to discuss the exploration of possible funding opportunities or funding partnerships for Nahual rather than a research interview supporting this dissertation. As in all real operation, there can be some disconnect between ideology and practice.

Advocacy. A basic definition of advocacy in the nonprofit sector is sometimes described as collective action, typically associated with political avenues, taken by an individual, group, or network showing public support for, or giving recommendation of, a particular cause or policy as a means to acquire limited resources (Jenkins, 2006; Keck & Sikkink, 1999; MacIndoe, 2011). However, advocacy is undertaken frequently within the broader nonprofit sector encompassing a broad range of activities including but not limited to political interaction (Jenkins, 2006) as a practice of supplying nonfinancial support to nonprofits and civil society as a sector to enable individual organizations to achieve their goals more effectively (Hawken, 2007). Support to nonprofits can include consulting services to individual organizations, promotion of an organization's work, advertising nonprofit work, giving technical assistance or advice, taking action to enhance a nonprofit organization's effectiveness or build its capacity, as well as

advocating for nonprofits and civil society to national governments and international institutions (Hawken, 2007). This study embraces advocacy as an activity towards public support and recommendation that may or may not be politically motivated but is undertaken as a way to acquire resources in support of a nonprofit mission.

Advocacy is used in Guatemala specifically in relation to human rights. Tamalyn Gutierrez notes, “We stayed pretty way out of the arena of normal advocacy, human rights, except for the very fact that education for us is a human right, and that's the one we talk about. We don't talk about ourselves a lot in this society because of that.” Rolando Alecio states this human rights perspective is largely due to international interjection “because of the lack of government commitment the international agencies set in, whereas local development it is seen the government should step in.” Therefore, to acquire a definition, Guatemalan participants were asked to explain the ways they speak for, or on behalf of, the organization adding probing questions. In relation to Guatemala, advocacy does not seem to be related to speaking for or towards one thing, but rather speaking for the collective betterment of society in terms of a project helping that collective betterment as exemplified in the ending statements of Help for Schools promotional video:

...in cooperation with a community, teachers and FUPEGUA together we form the crucible where the wills and efforts of all the people that contribute.

Therefore, in the future we will feel proud that our generation has helped open paths with school buildings and improvements, intellectually helping education of the future generations. Compatriots the world needs it and our country deserves it, God bless Guatemala and all the good hearts that contribute to this noble cause.

Not that the North American organizations do not hold a similar collectivistic definition of advocacy as when Susanna Place specifically states, “I think we advocate specifically for Safe Passage, but I think we also advocate for Guatemala.” However, in respect to the native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leaders, the researcher noted the leaders tend to do well to speak about or on behalf of the populations their organizations serve, but display more difficulty advocating for their organizations contrary to the North American organizations. Elaine explains of Ignacio,

I think that that’s where there is a disconnect, is that he’s advocating for the communities that are living in poverty and it’s hard for him to take the step to really advocate for his organization as an organization. He’s a wonderful advocate for empowering people, empowering people to be able to step up and make something happen in their community. But, as far as saying.... You know, obviously he had enough friendships with these people on the board that they were willing to become a part of it. So, hey, we’re the ones who thought there was a very viable opportunity here.

And Edwin confesses,

I do [talk about the organization]. But, it’s been mainly among our own people, never really going out to give a dissertation in public. It’s been mainly, as I said, namely within groups or our community. Sometimes, when we do have a community event, and, if I have a chance, I will bring up the organization and their activities.

Eric Rivera and Alonzo Mendez of Help for Schools noted similar advocacy efforts; that is, they talk about their organization within their own communities where they are more

comfortable. Storytelling is often used to relate the leaders' organizational point or purpose relying on word-of-mouth to spread the message as when Julio Cochoy explains, "What they do in the church is explain my personal story and then I move to the Maya Skills project and then explain how important it's for us to have this business." Ignacio uses this form of advocacy prevalently and pervasively. For example, in asking Ignacio about his relationship with other nonprofits, he elaborately relates:

When you are asking me what type of relationship do I have with other nonprofit groups? First of all, my relationship was both universities and nonprofits. The nonprofit sector, I always told them, in Sacatépequez, in only Sacatépequez, I identified eighty-five NGOs and at least twenty international NGOs. And then I told them about this structure. And I told them that my friend and I are the representative of those 120 NGOs in that structure, body. And, I explain it to them how we were chosen. And, I explained to them that if they don't get involved the next year we would be representing them and talking on behalf of them, which means we can say whatever we want in the government level, the regional level, about them and they don't, won't, have any clue what type of representation we are doing on behalf of them. Of course, I make them angry trying to get them involved. And, pretty much, people started to get involved, no? And, I told them, we need to go to this process and I will explain it to you how we were chosen and why we need to have some type of democratical participative process here. Plus, you as NGO are supposedly helping the development of this region or department or municipality, but I don't see your action being together with the council system. Your presence is not a presence that does anything for

Guatemalans. It's just presence. You are doing your little work, but you people who belong to the village, or the people who belong to a community, they belong to a community council system. They belong to a COCODEs, but you don't know that because you don't know that the communities are either involved with committees for their own life and their own village, like those who are involved in sports, those who are involved with the church, the Catholic church, those who are involved in the water, because there are things for a committee for that.... Those who are involved in local issues, no? The festivity, the yearly festivity. I mean, the people that your NGO are helping, they belong to committees in their own village when they leave. Now, what we need in Guatemala is collaboration, coordination, between you NGO to be aware about we need to go through these process of development together. Not like your little thing and your little project, but be aware that. And, I explain the same thing to the universities. To the university presidents, no? You, poor you, with so many thousands students. And, they live in their own community. And, I as a teacher of the university, too, I always ask my students, no?, are you involved in the meetings? Who's the members of the COCODEs in your village? Don't tell me you don't know who you are or where you live. I just wanted the people to know what is the social structure from where they are coming from, no?

The leaders' advocacy practice also appears contextual and cultural where more direct advocacy seems to be undertaken in North America than Guatemala scaled according to the leader's access and familiarity with North American audiences, which tend to prefer a more direct approach.

The advocacy practice of the native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leaders works to raise a sense of obligation in another so the individual takes on the leaders' project. This sense appears to be individualistic and relational, meaning obligation is solicited individually and not necessarily coordinated as a group activity, and works to expose others to the realities, as the leaders understand them, of Guatemala. The person, often referred to as a friend, is generally invited to "accompany" the leaders in their efforts. For example, a young Guatemalan, Ricardo, was invited by Edwin to accompany Help for Schools on their drops of supplies to the schools in the Pajapita area.

Throughout the three days of interaction, the researcher noted how Edwin explained to Ricardo what the organization was doing, answering Ricardo's questions, and involving Ricardo by asking him to act as documentarian for the supply drops. As a result, Ricardo left the group saying, "This experience changed my life," and telling Edwin he would help him and his organization in the future. One can compare this process to the volunteer recruitment process of Safe Passage/Camino Seguro, a North American organization, as Susanna Place explains,

We have a formal application process. You can't arrive and knock at the door and say, "I want to volunteer." You have to go through a process. We have a very strict screening process. People have to get referrals. We're aware that there are opportunities to exploit children and set a bad example. We're as careful as we can be in the screening process.

It must be noted, however, accompanying may or may not, depending on purposes, require the individual to have the access and/or the ability to travel to Guatemala or North America since it is unknown if Ricardo has visa access to North America though Edwin

feels he will be a good volunteer. Still, it is apparent several participants of the studied organizations have some established connection to the country, either coming from Guatemala or North Americans having traveled to Guatemala. In terms of Help for Schools, Lynne Collins, for example, lived in Guatemala between 1972-1973, and James Kinyon spent time in Guatemala and his wife is Guatemalan. For Nahual, Corey had traveled to Guatemala as a student as did other students mentioned who wanted to help Nahual, and Elaine lives in Guatemala. Peripherally in terms of the North American organizations interviewed, Andy Carey, Susanna Place, and David and Wendy all intimated a close association with Guatemala of 13 years or longer, while Tamalyn Gutierrez, a long-time resident of Guatemala having grown up primarily in the country, states, "I don't want to be anything but Guatemalan." In fact, it appears these transnational connections may be a primary means by which Guatemalans initially get into North America. That is, there are connections established with North Americans in some manner and these connections help with the Guatemalan with visa requirements. This places obvious limits on Guatemalan nonprofits and nonprofit leaders who do not have such connections affording a notable amount of prestige for those who do.

Effectiveness. Effectiveness is another nonprofit term with transitive, contextual, individualized meanings depending on organizational goals (Willems, Boenigk, & Jegers, 2014). A general definition of effectiveness is producing the desired or intended result. It is closely associated with accountability and efficiency where efficiency measures or tasks lead to greater effectiveness demonstrating accountability (Shaefer, DeLand, Jones, 2011). Nonprofit effectiveness works to balance input and output brought about by activities, processes, projects, and programs intended to reach predefined goals

(Steinberg, 2006; Willems, Boenigk, & Jegers, 2014). While appearing rather straightforward in definition, in operation effectiveness can be difficult to measure in such a varied sector (Willems, Boenigk, & Jegers, 2014). To underscore this variety, this study recognizes efficiency according Salamon's (1987) voluntary failure theory in that effectiveness means a nonprofit organization attempts to sufficiently address, on a relatively small, often localized scale, the underprovision of resources (broadly defined) affecting a particular group or population (Steiberg, 2006).

For the native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leader, effectiveness relates to doing the chosen work on an adequate scale (understanding these are small-scale organizations). As Rolando Alecio of Nahual states, "[Effectiveness] is to do what is necessary with the resources we have." When asked to define effectiveness or Help for Schools, Edwin notes, "[effectiveness] comes to mind the fact that trying to develop aid to Guatemala, specifically, the locals there feel very confident when somebody from abroad comes in and help them. So, it's very effective within the country," and as Julio Cochoy of Maya Skills explains,

Then I say, "Eva made this." Then I will show this picture to Eva, "Eva, look.

This woman like you." She goes, "Oh my gosh. She's a blonde lady, like my

work." This is like a self-esteem also to see what they do. That's my definition of what I got.

These examples indicate big change is needed but a small-scale helping hand is appreciated. Findings also indicate the definition includes a sense that proposed and planned projects are accomplished (as opposed to achieving a mission or vision), but also, that money raised goes to this intended purpose. Rolando Alecio explains of

Nahual, “We’ve never had enough money to have staff, but any money we’ve gotten has been to support helping getting people together for projects. We would have artistic and cultural events and people could make donations as a way to raise money to help pay for food [refreshments] and such.” With such a project-base definition of effectiveness, Help for Schools plans year-by-year hoping to gain enough funds to support a few more schools rather than focusing on providing a regular, steady, stream of school supplies to a few schools. As Alonzo Mendez, president-elect for Help for Schools, states, “[The mission] is expanding because last year they helped one school, this year they’re helping more schools. And then, we’re hoping next year to help more, like, FOUR schools” [emphasis his]. Speaking with research participants, effectiveness was closely related to leadership skill set with participants describing effective leaders as adequately bi-cultural, being a good communicator, bilingual, charismatic, comfortable/familiar working in the area, humble, knowledgeable about the workings of Guatemala, well-educated, and well-connected. However, the leaders indicate effectiveness centers more on elements of collaboration and information-sharing as when Alonzo and Cony Mendez state of the San Diego Guatemalan celebration, “Sometimes, white people come, too. That’s my, what can I say, my dream. Yeah, for all to come....” Cony adds, “I feel white people come because they have workers from Guatemala and then they invite them so they can come and stay with us. It’s nice to see them.” The leaders voiced preference for increased organized collaboration between Guatemala’s development entities, as when Edwin states, “it takes all of us,” to include a clearer, greater, and interactive connection between North America and Guatemala. According to Edwin, Guatemalans feel very confident when someone from abroad helps them. Meanwhile, Ignacio feels it is detrimental for

international nonprofits to release the Guatemalan government from its responsibilities to take care of the welfare of its citizens. However, both leaders continued to voice it is Guatemalans' responsibility to develop Guatemala.

All study participants consider their respective organizations to be effective. The researcher did not receive any contrary answers from either the native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leaders or the North American organizations interviewed. The difference in effectiveness for the native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leaders appears to be the amount of formality in substantiating results. The native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leaders rely on establishing a connection (photographs, emails, etc.) with supporters, his reputation, and word of mouth to substantiate the organization's effectiveness, whereas the North American-based organizations delve into monitoring and evaluation and formal research to prove their effectiveness – resources to which these organizations do not have access and whose outcomes would possibly hold little meaning for their supporters. This establishment of a connection is found to be typical of Help for Schools and Nahual, as well as Maya Skills. Still, it was noted North American organizations understand the value of establishing a personal connection with their supporters by encouraging donors to visit or volunteer, and using pictures in emails, blogs, promotional literature, etc. Susanna Place comments,

Well, I couldn't give you that statistic, but volunteers are our number one referral source for other volunteers as well. Often, their families come down. They come back even if after they've left and gone to graduate school. They stay involved. And, Tamalyn Gutierrez's organization regularly hosts donors in Guatemala so they may see the organization and meet the individuals they help.

Professionalization. Professionalization is a contested technical term referring to the modern nonprofit management and leadership environment focused on greater organizational accountability and sustainability (Chaudhury Bezboruah, 2011; Salamon, 2012). The term is a descendent of the 1980s neoliberal restructuring of the world's economic capital as it informed economic development (Suárez, 2010) and spawned as a result of increased public scrutiny on the functions and operations of nonprofit organizations as a result of high profile fraud and tax evasion cases (Chaudhury Bezboruah, 2011). As a result, the nonprofit sector has become dominated by organizations with a paid professional staff (DiMaggio & Anaheier, 1990) supporting professional management practices valuing expertise and the latest technologies (Chaudhury Bezboruah, 2011; Galaskiewicz & Bielefeld, 1998). Professionalization is a topic highly scrutinized and debated within nonprofit scholarship.

Professionalization is not a theme readily appearing in the data analysis. Instead, data was read for what was missing in relation to the nonprofit conversation. It is clear, the major extent of any openly professional practice the native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leaders undertake is maintaining legal registration in their respective country of primary operation. Even that is negotiated as when Julio Cochoy states when he broached the topic of legal registration of Maya Skills with his program's beneficiaries, "I said, 'Let's go and let's bring a lawyer and let's make a formal institution,' but the answer was, 'No, Julio, we don't want that,' because they associate the formality with dangers." And, as stated prior, Ignacio prefers to run his organization informally but maintains registration simply to conform to Guatemalan law explaining, "we are an association in law only" and in some key ways this has led to problems. For example, it

was discovered Nahual had obtained at one time a Soros Foundation grant and Nahual's lack of professional nonprofit understanding hurt them financially. Elaine explains,

They got the Soros grant. And, it created one of the biggest problems for Ignacio. It was very lively and wonderful while it lasted. But, he and the young man, I believe one of his volunteers or interns, were very naive about putting in enough overhead for administrative costs.

However, Elaine goes on to relate Soros was the professional in the relationship and they have some responsibility in the situation by stating,

And, I think the Soros Foundation experience is another instance of the cultural *choque* [shock or collision] because that's big international. I mean, why didn't they look at the grant and realize, 'Oh, we need to tell them to put in a little money for themselves. It shouldn't all be project money.'

Conversely, Ignacio has been very vocal about his distaste for professional nonprofits and their operations countering,

And, I mentioned it to you that I don't wanted to do anything, nothing at all, what every NGO does. Like children's education, youth, or just doing, because I would rather help them, make them be successful, but I never wanted to do something that other NGOs do here. And, that was my whole question. And, my Board of Directors they seem very strong interest in that. They say well if we change this into a project or whatever we can get some funds and then from there we go. But I will not be part of that but it's not my stuff.

Then adding,

Just to respond to the development, I didn't picture myself to create this NGO and have this legally established because I've never thought about that. I will say that we have the legal status to have it only because here everyone will question it, under what name you are doing it. But having a legal name is just a way of doing it. But, when I thinking about getting funds I said, "Oh, forget about it. I prefer not to get funds." People don't understand what really is important here to support.

In operation, there is a clear demarcation between the small-scale, ground-level native/indigenous transnational nonprofits and the North American-based international organizations interviewed. The professional nonprofits know the nonprofit lingo. They understand the difference, for example, between an organizational mission, vision, and purpose, can define accountability and effectiveness in relation to their organization's work, and know whether or not their organizations advocate, whereas the terms had to be translated and explained for most Guatemalans. For example, when asking Andy Carey to name the stakeholders for his organization without hesitation he stated,

Our member organizations, the board and staff leaders, are our key stakeholders. Then we have our key partners, our funders, our donors. They are all in some way, shape, or form supporting us to achieve our mission. Then we have interested parties. The people that stay engaged with us because we are providing valuable services to them, but we do not have an official relationship with them. You know, we have several people that stay engaged with us through our newsletter because we are informing them in their work. But, we have not completed the transaction where they have become a member.

Alternatively, when asking Edwin to name his stakeholders, the term had to be defined and it was noted it was a term even the researcher had difficulty explaining outside the use of technical language:

RESEARCHER: And, whom do you see as the key stakeholders of your organization's work? Who has a stake in the work that you do?

EDWIN: By stakeholders, you mean the people the people that support the organization?

RESEARCHER: Stakeholders are usually defined as either supporters, contributors, or even those receive the benefits... the beneficiaries of the organization... anyone who's involved in the organization. You know, members.... So, essentially, who do you see as the primary stakeholders within the organization?

EDWIN: I would say the people in need in the areas that we help, somehow they motivate us to work on the organization. Besides them, the actual Board of Directors is also, in essence, the ones that donate their time, their talents, and their efforts to make it happen. But also, nothing like this would happen if it wasn't for the donors, the people that support our program with their donations. So, you can see those are the three roots, the main ones.

Findings show, however, even without the technical terminology, stakeholders demonstrated a fairly shared understanding of what each organization was trying to accomplish indicating the leaders communicate their message well. This appeared true even in terms of Nahual where Ignacio is openly resistant to professionalization and its

formalized practices since it is a manifestation of outside dominance in Guatemala's development.

Conclusion

This chapter presented the findings of the study focusing on bringing the native/transnational nonprofit leader into the nonprofit conversation. The chapter began presenting a mapping of the complex social interaction between the native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leaders and the local to international nonprofit sector. The chapter then proceeded to situate the leaders in the nonprofit conversation first defining leadership then outlining the leaders' privileges, or bridges, allowing them to negotiate the local to international relationship, and simultaneous gatekeeping the leaders impose on these bridges to control what is known about the organization across borders. The final section discussed the leaders' understandings of current topics of discussion in nonprofit discourse: accountability, advocacy, development, effectiveness, nonprofit (defined), and the professionalization of the sector. Findings first provided a cited summary of nonprofit meanings within the nonprofit discourse, acknowledging throughout these are contested meanings within the discourse, in order to provide a conversational starting point. The findings introduced meanings related to the native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leader's insider/outsider situation.

Findings confirm the conclusion of the exploratory case study native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leaders undertake a series of negotiations to make sense of his local to international reality in service to his nonprofit work (Mitchell, Ochoa, Villela, in press). In addition, this study's findings suggest the leaders' understandings, made past the bridges and between the gates, represent collisions, or interjections of the leaders'

own insider/outsider understandings onto terms often used in nonprofit discourse. In fact, the leaders may have no prior definition with which to draw before creating an understanding in order to meet the needs of their organization. For the most part, the native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leaders operate outside the professional nonprofit sector beyond making certain they have the legally and legitimately recognized structure with which they can do their work. There is indication the leaders and supporters prefer the small-scale, more informal, personal connection their nonprofit efforts provide. The next and final chapter concludes this dissertation drawing from these findings to form conclusions and open discussion about the findings.

Chapter 6: Conclusion

Introduction

The last chapter situated the native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leaders in the nonprofit conversation. The chapter mapped the leaders' interactions with common topics within nonprofit discourse. Data indicates the leaders undertake negotiated, contextual understandings adapting them to inform their organizational actions confirming findings of the exploratory case study. However, findings further indicate the native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leaders largely operate outside the formal nonprofit sector. As such, findings suggest native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leaders disrupt nonprofit sector definitions adding nuanced understandings indicative of their insider/outsider situation and gatekeeping. It appears these nuanced and negotiated understandings best serve the leaders' small-scale nonprofit purposes to lend a hand in the development of his country.

This chapter presents a discussion of the study's findings. The chapter first summarizes study findings presenting conclusions based on those findings. The chapter then opens discussion based on conclusions providing space for questions, limitations, and additional inquiry. The chapter then closes this study by presenting the research question and summarizing this study's conclusion in relation to the question.

Summary of Findings and Conclusions

The native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leaders are small-scale nonprofit leaders original to country outside of North America or Europe who crosses borders regularly in service to their nonprofit organization. These leaders are an adaptation of the local to international nonprofit ecological system as leaders using their unique insider/outsider situation to help the development of their home. These leaders combine

knowledge gained as part of their accumulated experiences to make decisions and take action. Adaptation is a negotiation and findings indicate the leaders learn and create understandings as they undertake their leadership practice, which, at times, can be difficult to execute. The leaders seem to have, therefore, adopted a new normal in which they become comfortable with being uncomfortable in order to meet the various insider/outsider (i.e., both/and) contexts and circumstances presented them.

For Guatemalans, the leader is seen as the organization; that is, the leader is the organization made real. This Guatemalan cultural phenomenon impacts the leaders' leadership practice since they are not only the manifest representation of the organization acquiring its sociological status and stature, but they also the representation of what is seen or known about North America and Guatemala. This instills the leaders with an incredible amount of power, though findings suggest their deep connection to their home country tempers this power since they want to see Guatemala to develop and want Guatemalans to take on the responsibility for that development. This desire leads the leaders to work more collaborative and adopt more of a servant leadership stance. It must be cautioned, however, that the leaders are individuals. The leaders adopt and adapt their own leadership styles to meet the contexts presented in order to keep these organizations moving forward.

Findings show the leaders are presented with several privileged contexts that allow the leaders to keep their organizations moving forward. These contexts allow the leaders to bridge the space between the local and the international in order to do their nonprofit work. Termed bridges indicating the space where two worlds (broadly defined) edge each other, these bridges allow creation of connections and access to resources.

These bridges include: (a) access to abilities and opportunities to approach, obtain, gain, or retrieve resources; (b) resources as tangible and intangible assets that allow the leader to do his work; (c) citizenship as a legal means by which the leader can cross borders; (d) network of Guatemalan and North American contacts who help facilitate the nonprofit work; (e) shared culture giving the leader specialized clarity of understanding to Guatemala instilling trust in the leader and helping the leader coordinate logistical nonprofit tasks; and (f) technology as a readily accessible means of communication and connection between Guatemala and North America. Without these bridges, it would be difficult for the native/indigenous transnational nonprofit organization to exist. Therefore, these bridges must be carefully maintained.

It is acknowledged that bridge maintenance includes the installation of gates to control the flow of information about the organization. As the act of gatekeeping, the leaders control the message about their organizations, make efforts to stay on message, and consciously determine who or what they place at the center of the message. The leaders undertake gatekeeping in order to push a preferred message about the organization and its work. The leaders make certain the message presented is appealing and palatable for the recipient audience, and that the story centers on a compelling subject qualifying the leaders' abilities and work. It appears the gatekeeping is intended to present a message moving people to support, or continue to support, the leaders' organizations.

On the other side of the bridges, between the gates, is the space where the native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leaders engage in their local to international work. This work requires numerous negotiations between numerous contexts to achieve

desired results. The space is shared with a number of North American international nonprofit organizations whose professional staffs dominate current understandings about transnational development work. When the native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leaders enter this space, they are disrupting discursive nonprofit meanings and understandings. The leaders are approaching topics of nonprofit discourse injecting their understandings of the nonprofit situation. The results are termed collisions offering nuanced definitions reflecting the native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leaders' insider/outsider situation in service to their organizations. These collisions result in nuanced definitions for accountability, advocacy, development, effectiveness, nonprofit, and professionalization.

Discussion

The discussion of study findings begins with a discussion of the native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leaders and their leadership practice. The discussion then mirrors the outline of Chapter 5 taking in points related first to the leaders' definitions of a nonprofit and the development work the leaders undertake, then proceeding to a discussion of bridges and gates, completing with the negotiated definitions of accountability, advocacy, effectiveness, and professionalization.

Leadership. It is clear the leaders' cross-border movement encompasses a number of contexts from local to international, rural to urban, nonprofit to professional, etc. It is also clear the leaders have adapted in order to function within each of these contexts. They do this by negotiating their circumstances drawing from their past experiences offering a number of different possibilities for action. The exploratory case study identified these leaders as native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leaders.

Transnational, however, is an interesting term since most research participants unfamiliar with the international nonprofit sector ever encountered the term in a deliberative way. Still, Susana Place provided the definition of transnational as relating to “where the money is collected juxtaposed against where the money is spent.” While innovative and accurate, this definition reflected rather hierarchical findings in relation to how the international nonprofit sector operates in Guatemala. That is, it was interesting to note the North American nonprofits doing business in Guatemala were often referenced as ‘international nonprofits’ while it is Guatemalans who are transnational. The movement between Guatemala and North America is an obvious one-sided exchange privileging North America citizens since North Americans can easily travel to Guatemala to study, volunteer, etc., whereas Guatemalans have extensive visa restrictions preventing their entry to North America. The discourse on international nonprofit sector replicates this rather one-way exchange appearing to favor North American contributions. The project mapping supports this finding. The scale of international nonprofit discourse is clearly tilted toward North American perspective.

However, this tilt also favors the native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leaders. That is, the tilt favors leaders who have been introduced to North America, have established contacts and networks in North America, and have the ability to travel between Guatemala and North America easily. However, it is also true the tilt does not only function within the nonprofit sector. It was apparent from researcher observation there were regular informal exchanges of material goods from the more developed North American economy to Guatemala. For example, participants notably brought numerous materials from the U.S. to Guatemala to give away or sell. Furthermore, it was fairly

apparent Guatemalans with North American connections purchase goods in North America to resell in the markets, on the streets, or out of their homes in Guatemala as sort of a self-distribution wholesale system. Thus, transnationals not only exchange ideas or information supporting small-scale nonprofit efforts, but exchange of goods and materials that support small-scale commerce. Such transnational transactional similarities are demonstrations or displays of the type of negotiation, or a negotiation that resulted in an action, decision, resolve, resolution giving greater credence to the local to international adaptive ecological frame for understanding the operation of the insider/outsider situation.

The insider/outsider situation is not always a straightforward or precise in execution, however. Sometimes the negotiation can be clumsy. These leaders hold an understanding of Guatemala as part having a close connection to the country and as part of being positioned in or having frequent access to North America. This understanding places them as insiders and outsiders simultaneously regardless of their location and findings note the leaders embrace a readiness to accept change and adapt to their surroundings within any given context. This is largely true. Both leaders notably adapted to opportunities and situations presented them. Ignacio specifically stated that for him “certain places feel more closely related, more close to Guatemala, than others,” indicating how the leader finds a new normal for himself within different contexts. However, it was also noted Ignacio appears more tentative, perhaps more cautious, about change that does not meet his agenda talking around rather embracing the new action or information presented or suggested. Edwin also demonstrates distress, perhaps a bit of sadness, when, for example, he voiced that the really did not know his way around

Guatemala City any longer relying on the guidance of his friends when in country. There is the danger the supporter or potential supporter could misconstrue their distress or tentativeness. That is, the adaptation and the melding within an insider/outsider context may appear dismissive, grandiose, and/or unfocused (some of the participant descriptors used) as the leaders form their insider/outsider understanding of the new information, opportunity, problem, or situation to fit the context.

There is one other note to bring forward with regards to the leaders and their insider/outsider situation. Both leaders are *Ladino* having a cultural significance potentially raising questions related to the leaders nonprofit work. Findings note there is no separation between the leader and the organization; they are one in the same. Therefore, the cultural hierarchy plays a role in the leaders' status as leader. There is a question if the work these *Ladino* leaders undertake is, in some way, reproducing the cultural hierarchy. Ignacio particularly works with indigenous Maya communities and has noted he works to "bring forth the voices" of the indigenous. Is it acceptable for Ignacio to be in this position? There are scholarly arguments questioning such acceptability, problematizing the situation, because it upholds a very damaging system of power that has devastated Guatemala's indigenous Maya. There is no resolution to this question within this study, but brings forward potential future investigation.

The above should not undermine the connection the leaders hold to Guatemala or the work they undertake. The leaders are their own best cheerleaders with their rather contagious enthusiasm expounding, "we can do it," or, "we should do it," countering the emphasis placed on the capabilities of North American nonprofit efforts for Guatemala. These leaders uphold the capabilities of Guatemalans, making certain others know the

achievements of Guatemalans, with the ultimate concentration on the importance of education. There may be an underlying element of re-education associated with the leaders' educational emphasis considering museum exhibits explaining Guatemalans were an educated and advancing people prior to Spanish invasion and subsequent subjugation preventing access to education, though this is only researcher speculation. Still the reality is Guatemala is a diverse country even while discursive representations promote only *Ladino* and Maya. While a cultural/ethnic demarcation still clearly exists in Guatemala, the demarcation may be becoming less settled, blurrier. The native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leaders are one small element that may be blurring this demarcation.

Nonprofit. Findings note the native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leaders do not undertake a nonprofit mission but a “project” filling a niche where government is not taking (required) responsibility. Nonprofit work does not necessarily mean the intent to operate as a nonprofit, but rather, intent to find the legal, legitimate structure by which the project can take place. Neither does choosing to do nonprofit work indicate a prior familiarity with the sector. As such, they have adapted the nonprofit model to work within a Guatemalan context. The leaders are acting with, not for, other Guatemalans. There is the sense that the leaders believe when people are involved in the project, they will take ownership of the project, take care of it and preserve it. The organizations serve, or accompany, partners.

As participants note, the native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leaders are attempting to change Guatemalan culture by introducing them to nonprofit giving and stewardship. It is unclear how this culture-change dynamic works in relation to the

notable number of foreign nonprofits operating in the country. However, it should be noted Ignacio's determination in knowing the right path through his nonprofit work tends to operationalize as an expectation that others should also see the importance of the work accompanied by their willingness to invest. At present, this model of operation appears to have had mixed results. This is not to say Edwin's more relational model works better. Help for Schools struggles for money just as much as Nahual. It should be noted at the time of this study, both organizations were facing precarious financial positions. Edwin was uncertain if Help for Schools would continue past this year, although he has been recently successful in finding a new president to relieve him and is hoping for a positive trajectory.

Meanwhile, Nahual is trying to re-establish itself following Ignacio's time in Canada. The time and distance has had a noticeable affect on the organization. Ignacio is attempting to find permanent, salaried work within Guatemala. He has recruited volunteers to help redesign the organizational website and has been busy making contacts to see how they can obtain sponsored funding. These developments are interesting considering Ignacio has stated adamantly he does "not want to do what other nonprofits are doing," meaning he wishes to take efforts to maintain the grassroots/ground-level engagement with a preference for informal management processes. He states he would like to see someone come forward to be a director or administrator for the organization freeing him to focus on his community organizing work. In speaking with Ignacio, however, it is unclear how much authority he would actually relinquish in such an arrangement.

Funding toward sustainability is a problem for a majority of nonprofits, local and international. For example, North American supporters of both native/indigenous transnational nonprofit organizations stated attempts to raise interest for the organizations among North American acquaintances and colleagues have been unsuccessful. An indirect relational plea may be the best these native/indigenous transnational nonprofits can maneuver at present. Culture plays a large role in this preferred solicitation method. If asking directly is akin to begging, it must be questioned why the direct ask is the preferred ask? That is, in speaking with North Americans working in Guatemala and who noted they attempt to build the capacities of Guatemalans, are they asking Guatemalans to do something they cannot do without offending the Guatemalans from which they are asking support? Isn't it easier, culturally safer, to let North Americans do the direct asking? Maybe this is an area where North Americans can assist. They can make the direct ask.

Development. Development for the native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leader means a sustainable process of equal distribution of resources to live adequately, or at least access to resources equally distributed, with citizen ability to hold the government responsible for necessary social service provision and societal supports. The definition favors Guatemalans partnering to help Guatemalans as a desired, higher quality, more productive, and sustainable form of development to include provision for emergency service injections when necessary. Findings suggest at present in Guatemala, there is little demarcation between commerce, employment, and development work as all three must provide or support a means by which Guatemalans can earn a living.

This definition leads to the question of what development looks like and who gets to set the discursive definition? Contrary to North American stereotypes, the researcher noted Guatemalans did not appear lazy or incapable of improving themselves and finding ways to earning a living. This observation does not diminish the amount of poverty in Guatemala or the high migration rate. This also does not release development agencies from responsibility for the bad they impart (experimentation, forced sterilization, kidnapping in the name of adoption, infantilizing the “Other”), which has caused criticism and suspicion among Guatemalans. However, the topic of development does not appear to extend to North America because it is considered developed – a complete project – by Guatemalans and North Americans, though at least two participants related specifically how Guatemalans and North Americans share many similar disparities. Unless participants, Guatemalan and North American, were prompted to think about how North America benefits from the work of the international or transnational organizations, the benefit was presented as a one-way exchange. If current development discourse promotes empowerment through collaboration and partnership between Guatemalans and North Americans, as voiced by many participants, does the current discursive development definition undermine these desired outcomes? This study does not answer this question but does perhaps indicate the need for a better definition that does not defeat empowerment by indicating, knowingly or unknowingly, Guatemalans do things wrong, do not know what they are doing, and do not have the skills to do things correctly, or even promoting North America is a sustainable development model, particularly considering Guatemalans are restricted from opportunities to travel in order to build contextual knowledge and understanding, establish contacts, and develop networks.

Findings indicate, particularly in light of the above, the discursive development definition does impact the work of the native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leaders and in many ways they are disrupting the definition. For example, Help for Schools has redefined developmental sustainability by seeing the injection of school supplies as supporting education as a path to sustainable development. Furthermore, with education closely related to the leaders' experiences, they appear to be fostering a conversation about what education looks like. As brought forward by participants, there are questions if the dominant model of schooling is the best path for Guatemala's development. Participants indicate education comes in many forms and can be experiential or vocational in order to help more Guatemalans. These were peripheral discussions to the study but they demonstrate how the native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leaders facilitate knowledge transmission on a local to international levels thereby contributing to the development discussion.

Bridges. Native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leaders occupy formal or informal, known or unknown, privileged spaces representing the leaders' insider/outsider situation. Bridging is the leaders' act of creating connection between different locations and across contexts. Bridges allow the native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leaders to do their work as a part of accessing resources, conveying information, and forming cross-border connections. However, the bridge must be tended to and if the bridge is weak, the connection will collapse. The native/indigenous transnational leaders sometimes place gates to contain or regulate information about their organizations. Referred to as gatekeeping describing the process of maintaining a preferred understanding, the leaders take measures to control the message about their

organizations, take efforts to stay on message, and are conscious about what or whom they place at the center of the message.

As indicated, a bridge must be tended, which is part of the reason for placing gates. The leaders must be able to substantiate the credibility and legitimacy of themselves and their organizations over many contexts. The process of tending the bridges can produce interesting negotiations that help or hamper the leaders. For example, it continues to be a presiding question whether the organizations register in North America, Guatemala, or both. Furthermore, there is tension when Guatemalan and North American contexts are combined. For instance, there is a question of whether or not white North Americans and Guatemalans would feel comfortable if whites attended the Guatemalan Independence Day celebration, and it appears questionable how much professional North American influence Nahual and its primarily indigenous Maya beneficiaries would welcome. In some ways, the spaces may be too great for the native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leaders to bridge.

It was also observed Guatemalans at times seek out the leaders because they have access to North American resources. The researcher noted Guatemalans appeared to be very gracious people being always very giving and hospitable. If this is characteristic of the people in general, a characteristic valued by Guatemalans, request for connection to North America is an exchange the leaders negotiate. The leaders may not have the North American connections sought, though it appears they try to make the connections when able. However, if the leader is unable to help, these requests must be deflected in a manner certain to retain the connection and not insult the requestor. If they do not take efforts to foster the connection, it could be detrimental to the organization. Yet,

connections can and do end, particularly in North American culture. It is not clear if this can be translated adequately to a Guatemalan understanding.

Accountability. With no Spanish word for accountability, accountability appears to relate to taking the responsibility to accomplish, though not actually accomplishing, the action proposed at an appropriate scale to benefit Guatemalans. Accountability reporting is more relational and informal rather than formally written or standardized. This general definition is problematized when stakeholders, particularly beneficiaries, take advantage of the relational definition to obtain extra afraid they will not get enough or their fair share while leaders attempt an even distribution. However, because these are small organizations, stakeholders have more trust in the leaders because accountability visibly (either seeing direct results or direct interaction) meets their expectations. The native/transnational nonprofit leaders feel accountability should include equal access to resources (or the equality of opportunity to secure resources), an elimination of corruption, as well as having proof that the work was completed, or that a supporters' contribution is impacting change. It also means inclusivity or accessibility to options for individual betterment, collaboration with those served/helped, being motivated to take action, and taking personal responsibility to seek action.

The leaders acknowledge they have the greater fiscal responsibility for the organization. Still, even in North America, supporters indicated they like how these small nonprofits do business. Some voiced preference small-scale actions because a small-scale across long distances is more visually transparent than a balance sheet. They feel a closer connection to the giving even while they know the work is not making a tremendous impact. Scale refers to the size of these grassroots/ground-level

organizations informing the leaders of the amount of work these organizations are able to reasonably undertake. The scale also assures supporters the organization is not taking on more than they can handle. Scale keeps the work do-able.

However, the relational-over-formal reporting opens the path for discrepancies in what is recalled (i.e., stated) between leaders and stakeholders. At one school delivery, the count for needed supplies kept fluctuating. Edwin was noticeably upset because he did not want the error to be the organization's or leave any child out. However, Edwin understood there is the strong possibility the school was misrepresenting numbers in order to acquire more supplies. This is a difficult situation for the leader to negotiate. In the definitional sense of the native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leaders, there must be accountability defined as doing with the money what it was intended to do, thus, corruption cannot be allowed. Edwin was able to determine upon returning to the U.S. the organization was not in error. Yet, the insider/outsider negotiation did not stop at that point. Edwin stated he understood the school's logic and did not necessarily fault the school for the actions, but could not justify the deception. This situation opens further inquiry. Since in Guatemala findings indicated there is a feeling corruption exists all the time as indicated by participant responses, how is corruption defined? Particularly as there was indication of a Guatemalan tendency of the oppressed, once becoming established socially and economically, becoming the oppressor. While there may be no Spanish word for accountability, Guatemalans appear to have a clear sense of what corruption means perhaps bringing additional nuance to leader and organizational accountability the researcher's questioning failed to uncover.

Advocacy. Advocacy is a word related specifically to Guatemala human rights

work. However, native/indigenous transnational advocacy relates to speaking for the collective betterment of society through a project helping that collective betterment. As such, the leaders display difficulty advocating for their organizations. Storytelling is often used to relate the leaders' organizational point or purpose relying on word-of-mouth to spread the message. Advocacy practice works to raise a sense of obligation in another so the individual takes on the leaders' project. This is an individual approach rather than group activity to expose others to the realities, as the leaders understand them, of Guatemala. The person, often referred to as a friend, is generally invited to "accompany" the leaders in their efforts.

Perhaps it can be argued by merely being adaptations of the nonprofit sector the native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leaders are advocates for their work. After all, the leaders appear to interact with and/or attract individuals who have a degree of familiarity with Guatemala in Guatemala and North America. This connection between leaders and supporters may help the leaders overcome any lack of nonprofit experience and allowing advocacy efforts to be less direct. Additionally, supporter recruitment appears to be a form of advocacy since they "invite" people to be part of their organizations and the tasks of the organization. However, this indirect approach has a danger of being misconstrued by North Americans who may not quite understand the purpose of the invitation finding they are in the midst of something they had not planned. Alternatively, the North American more direct style of interaction may impede the ways in which the native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leaders are attempting to advocate for their organizations and its work.

Effectiveness. For the native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leaders, effectiveness relates to doing the chosen work on an adequate scale, accomplishing proposed and planned projects, and ensuring money raised goes to its intended purpose. Supporters often relate effectiveness to a leader's skill set. However, the leaders voiced developmental effectiveness should include increased organized collaboration between entities with a clearer, greater, and interactive connection between North America and Guatemala even while both leaders stress it is Guatemalans responsibility to develop Guatemala. Furthermore, effectiveness does not include formal substantiation of results since such results would possibly hold little meaning for their supporters, but is best relayed as representing a connection to the organization and its activities.

It was clearly noted study participants consider their respective organizations to be effective. This unified response across all participants, considering the myriad ways in which effectiveness can be measured, may reflect (a) how truly differently organizations measure effectiveness, (b) how differently individuals within the same organization measure effectiveness; and/or (c) an habitually advocacy-propelled response. Given the informal relational nature preferred by the native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leaders, there is indication different individuals associated with these organizations are defining effectiveness differently but the organizations are, more or less, meeting these individualized expectations. The organizations are utilizing the relational way of doing business effectively. However, there is one clarification to study findings defining effectiveness. It was noted the North American organizations have more access to research institutions to study their organizations and measure the effectiveness of their programs. This dissertation in and of itself disrupts this finding.

The research for this dissertation was undertaken with both native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leaders expressing the desire the outcome would increase public exposure to their organizations and increase the credibility and legitimacy of their work. Furthermore, Nahual has, in years past, had university students intern for and study its community organizing efforts, and one resulting thesis was part of the data analyzed within this dissertation. This information indicates the organizations are aware of the possibilities and potentialities of structured effectiveness measurement.

Professionalization. As previously noted, professionalization is not a theme readily appearing in the data analysis. The data had to be read for what was missing in relation to the nonprofit conversation to uncover where professionalization exists, if at all, for the native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leader and his organization. Outwardly, the major extent of any openly professional practice the leaders undertake is maintaining legal registration of their organization in their respective country of primary operation. Findings indicate the small-scale, ground level native/indigenous transnational nonprofits have not extensively adopted professional nonprofit business practices.

This is not to say the lack of professionalized behavior serves the native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leaders and their organization well. For example, it was observed while neither organization has an office, building, or headquarters, this deficit seems more detrimental to Ignacio in his Guatemalan location than to Edwin in his North American location. In Guatemala and North America, a Guatemalan organization may not be considered a legitimate organization unless it has an office. For Edwin to be located in North America, this form of legitimacy seems irrelevant. And, to be fair, Ignacio is adamant the mayor of each community should

provide free public space for the trainings; however, training space is not the same as office space. The lack of a permanent place, a central location of doing business, may be one reason Nahual has experienced notable difficulties re-establishing its organization and its programs. Professionalized behavior, even if it is symbolic in nature like an office, presents potential benefits for the native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leaders and their organizations.

It must be clarified the lack of professionalized behavior does not indicate a lack of professional nonprofit business management. One of the notable difference between small organization management and the professionalized sector is these smaller organizations adapt and change practices rather quickly making decisions according to the context presented, whereas professionalization tends to hamper quick changes or adaptation because the bureaucratic decision-making processes involved. Each native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leader manages their organization, though each manages their organization differently. Edwin is a southern California property manager by profession managing Help for Schools according the business practices with which he is familiar taking a more North American best-business-practices model. Ignacio has openly voiced his displeasure with the professionalized nonprofit sector claiming he does not want to do what the other nonprofits are doing, which has potentially created difficulties for Ignacio and Nahual. Research noted, for example, Nahual is called Asociación Nahual, Nahual Asociación, Nahual Foundation, Fundación Nahual displaying a confusing inconsistency of branding. Ignacio seems uncomfortable with formalized management, reminiscing about the work he was able to do in the past with very little, voicing preference for a director to come forward to take on the management

role. Yet, Ignacio seems to want to retain control over the organization and the work. Ultimately, whatever the preferred management style and whatever tensions they are negotiating about management style, the leaders appear to recognize the nonprofit sector has become professional in operation and they appear to be adapting their skills and organizational operations to fit professionalized expectations.

The above is not to say a professionalized perspective does not raise questions. One example relates to capacity building. Capacity building is a professionalized nonprofit term; however, native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leaders do not use the terminology, either for themselves or in relation to their stakeholders. Findings indicate the leaders are building their own capacities using their access to resources to figure things out as they go along. The terminology the leaders use with stakeholders is communal in nature and situates the leaders among the community. In working with Guatemalans, the leaders state they, as a group, are growing and developing “ourselves.” Findings further indicate capacity building is a term among North American organizations but appears to be without substantive meaning in process or action. In analyzing the data, the researcher began to ask about the capacities the organizations wished to raise, more specifically, who in the organization determines the current and needed capacities the Guatemalans do not have, and how is the achievement of these capacities measured? Findings indicate there is a general lack of clear definition or indication of an end-point measurement despite the use of terminology. Meanwhile when capacity measurement is flipped within data analysis, it is brought forward a North American student spending a volunteer exchange in Guatemala could see at least some capacity increase. S/he could add the experience to his/her professional resume, which

can lead to greater educational and professional opportunities potentially prepping them to take leadership roles in nonprofit organizations. The issue regarding professionalization and its terminology, such as capacity building, remain open ended. The questions of how the professionalized perspective is serving or not serving the beneficiary communities are not questions answered in this study, but open space for future inquiry.

Suggestions for Future Research

Before moving forward, it should be noted the researcher's extensive travel through Guatemala meeting with various nonprofits opened space for an anecdotal survey. At locations visited, the researcher inquired if individuals were aware of any native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leaders. Considering the territory covered within the relatively small country, the researcher is fairly confident the phenomenon of the native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leaders is unique consisting of a small cohort at this time. Four additional leaders meeting the definition of the population studied were discovered. One leader, Julio Cochoy of Maya Skills, was interviewed for this dissertation and his comments assisted in the formation of the dissertation's findings. Julio is indigenous Maya disrupting the *Ladino* influence in the understandings formed; however, the researcher was unable to observe the leader or speak to his stakeholders minimizing his potential contributions to research findings. Two additional leaders were contacted and preliminary agreements of interviews were secured but appointments in time for this dissertation's due date were not possible. One of these leaders is Frank LaRue, a native Guatemalan who began Centro Para la Accion Legal en Derechos Humanos (CALDH) as a grassroots, ground-level human rights organization developing

it into the internationally-renowned nonprofit organization prosecuting the human rights violators of Guatemala's civil war. The second leader is a Guatemalan native and professor in Texas who runs a nonprofit organization in Guatemala. It is hoped these two interviews can take place in the near future. The fourth leader is a Guatemalan immigrant to the United States and a professional businessman in Florida. This connection simply dissipated after attempts were made to secure a full name and/or introduction. It should be noted that in addition to the population consisting of a small cohort, all known native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leaders are men. This study did not investigate gender dynamics, but given the above, gender is obviously a dynamic requiring further inquiry.

This study presented several suggestions for future inquiry. These include allowing the North Americans to make the direct ask on behalf of the native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leader, a clearer definition of accountability incorporating Guatemalan's understanding of corruption, *Ladino* influence as the privileged leaders of native/indigenous transnational nonprofits, and gender dynamics. These are worthwhile clarifications to this dissertation's findings. However, there are three topics of specific interest: what would an re-definition of empowered development look like for Guatemala?, what is the impact of North American professionalization on Guatemala's nonprofit sector?, and how do donor preferences influence Guatemala's nonprofit sector? These three broad questions challenge the tilted discourse preferencing North American influence, terminology, practice, and understanding. This study suggests the dominant discourse may not be translatable to the Guatemalan context. If a true participatory,

collaborative nonprofit sector is preferred, as findings indicate, the sector discussion requires a more deliberate injection of Guatemalan perspectives.

Conclusion

This dissertation brought the native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leader into the nonprofit conversation. An exploratory case study defined the native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leaders as skilled leaders original to a country outside of North America or Europe who frequently cross borders to obtain resources and foster relationships, both locally and internationally, to achieve their nonprofit mission benefitting their country of origin (Mitchell, Ochoa, Villela, in press). The exploratory study concluded the leaders' actions on behalf of their organizations were a relational process between the leaders, the leaders' transnational interactions, and the leaders' understanding of this interaction based on each leader's identities and lived experiences (i.e., the leader's positionality). This study expanded exploratory findings to ask how does the native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leaders' positionality, as insider/outsider, inform the leaders' organizational actions.

The purpose of this qualitative case study was to explore the insider/outsider situation of the native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leaders in Guatemala and North America. The study focused on interviews and observation to uncover how the leaders negotiated their insider/outsider situation to understand topics found within current nonprofit discourse. Situational analysis, a grounded theory methodology based on an ecological frame, was utilized to analyze the data finding the methodology appropriately engaged the complex local to international situation of the native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leader. Data was read to uncover the leaders' meanings of

accountability, advocacy, development (as the type of nonprofit activity the leaders' undertake), effectiveness, leadership, nonprofit, and professionalization. It was discovered the leaders may or may not directly engage the nonprofit terminology but create negotiated understandings of nonprofit operation.

The native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leaders occupy a number of privileged spaces allowing them to undertake their nonprofit work. These privileged spaces, termed bridges, encompass access to Guatemala and North America, availability of resources, ability of movement, established local to international networks, having a shared culture, and access to technology. It was also determined these privileged spaces require maintenance to continue the nonprofit work. Part of this maintenance includes the installation of gates to ensure the nonprofit and its work is presented in the best light to local and international audiences. These gates control the organizational message, keep the message about the organization on target, and makes certain the message is centered on the preferred individual or subject.

The space over the bridges and between the gates is where the leader adopts a new normal. That is, each leader adopts a comfort with the discomfort required to negotiate his insider/outsider situation. It is in the negotiated space the leaders form their understandings of their nonprofit work. When studied, this area uncovered collisions between the native/indigenous transnational nonprofit leaders understandings of nonprofit topics and the nonprofit sector's understandings. Findings suggest the leaders understandings are nuanced understandings disrupting present nonprofit conversation. The study concludes the dominant nonprofit conversation may not be translatable to a

Guatemalan context suggesting a more proactively participatory and collaborative discussion is needed.

References

- Ahmed, S. (2000). Home and away: Narratives of migration and estrangement. In S. Ahmed, *Strange encounters: Embodied others in post-coloniality*, pp.77-94. London, UK: Routledge.
- Ahmed, S., Castañeda, C., Fortier, A. M., & Sheller, M. (Eds.). (2003). *Uprootings/regroundings: Questions of home and migration*. Oxford, UK: Berg.
- Alcoff, L. (1988). Cultural feminism versus post-structuralism: The identity crisis in feminist theory. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 13(3), 405-436.
- Alexander, M. J., & Mohanty, C. T. (1997). Introduction: Genealogies, legacies, movements. In M. J. Alexander, & C. T. Mohanty (Eds.), *Feminist genealogies, colonial legacies, democratic futures*, pp. xiii-xlii. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Alvarez, S. E. (1999). Advocating feminism: The Latin American feminist NGO 'Boom'. *International Feminist Journal of Politics*, 1(2), 181-209.
- Anheier, H., & Salamon, L. (2006). The nonprofit sector in comparative perspective. In W. W. Powell, & R. Steinberg (Eds.), *The nonprofit sector: A research handbook*, pp. 89-114. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Anheier, H., & Themudo, N. (2005). The internationalization of the nonprofit sector. In R. D. Herman (Ed.), *The Jossey-Bass handbook of nonprofit leadership and management* (2nd ed.), pp. 102-127. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Anthias, F. (2015). Interconnecting boundaries of identity and belonging and hierarchy-making within transnational mobility studies: Framing inequalities. *Current Sociology*. Advance online publication. doi:10.1177/0011392115614780.
- Anzaldúa, G. (1987). *Borderlands: The new mestiza = la frontera*. San Francisco, CA: Spinsters/Aunt Lute.
- Anzaldúa, G. (2003). La conciencia de la mestiza: Towards a new consciousness. In C. R. McCann, & S. -K. Kim (Eds.), *Feminist theory reader: Local and global perspectives*, pp. 179-187. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Basch, L., Glick Schiller, N., & Szanton Blanc, C. (1994). *Nations unbound: Transnational projects, postcolonial predicaments and deterritorialized nation states*. New York, NY: Gordon and Breach.
- Banks, J. A. (2007). Researching race, culture, and difference: Epistemological challenges and possibilities. In J. A. Banks, *Educating citizens in a multicultural society*, pp. 773-793. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

- Bass, B. M. (1960). *Leadership, psychology, and organizational behavior*. New York, NY: Harper & Rowe.
- Bass, B. M., & Bass, R. (2008). *The Bass handbook of leadership: Theory, research, and managerial applications* (4th Ed.). New York, NY: The Free Press.
- Beck, E. (2011). *Las ONG y las Mujeres: Los Pros y Contraste de las ONG en Guatemala. Más que Desarrollo: Memorias de la Primera Conferencia Bienal sobre Desarrollo y Acción Comunitaria*. Bethel, VT: Wuqu' Kawoq.
- Beck, E. (2014). Countering Convergence: Agency and Diversity Among Guatemalan NGOs. *Latin American Politics and Society*, 56(2), 141-162.
- Bies, A., & Forte, D. (2011). Policies and procedures for leaders: Conflict of interest, transparency, and accountability. In K. A. Agard (Ed.), *Leadership in nonprofit organizations: A reference handbook*, pp. 367-376. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Blum, L. (2001). International NGOs and the Guatemalan Peace Accords. *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 12(4), 327-353.
- Bourdieu, P. (1977). *Outline of a theory of practice*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1998). *Practical reason: On the theory of action*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). *The ecology of human development: Experiments by nature and design*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Browning, F. A. (1993). *Políticas de relación y cooperación entre CEBEMO y sus contrapartes*. Working document.
- Browning, F. A., Guerra, M. C., & Girón, A. (1999). *Perfil de las Organizaciones No Gubernamentales en Guatemala*. Guatemala: Coordinación de ONG y Cooperativas.
- Bryson, J. M. (1995). *Strategic planning for public and nonprofit organizations: A guide to strengthening and sustaining organizational achievement*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Bubolz, M. M., & Sontag, M. S. (1993). Human ecology theory. In P. G. Boss, W. J. Doherty, R. LaRossa, W. R. Schumm, & S. K. Steinmetz (Eds.), *Sourcebook of family theories and methods: A contextual approach*, pp. 419-448. New York, NY: Plenum Press.
- Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York, NY: Harper & Row.

- Burns, J. M. (2003). *Transforming leadership: The pursuit of happiness*. New York, NY: Grove Atlantic.
- Butler, J. (2004). *Precarious life: The powers of mourning and violence*. London, UK: Verso.
- Butler, J. (2012). *Parting ways: Jewishness and the critique of Zionism*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.
- Carothers, T., Brechenmacher, S., & Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. (2014). Accountability, transparency, participation, and inclusion: A new development consensus?. Washington, DC: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.
- Central Intelligence Agency. (2015). Guatemalan country profile. Retrieved March 2016 from <https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/gt.html>
- Central Intelligence Agency (Cartographer). (2015). Area comparison [Map]. Retrieved from <https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/gt.html>
- Chaudhury Bezboruah, K. (2011). Professionalization of leadership and the rise of formal management and leadership education. In K. A. Agard (Ed.), *Leadership in Nonprofit Organizations: A reference handbook*, pp. 796-804. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Chowdhury, E. H. (2011). *Transnationalism reversed: Women organizing against gendered violence in Bangladesh*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Clarke, A. E. (2003). Situational analysis: Grounded theory mapping after the postmodern turn. *Symbolic Interaction*, 6(4), 553-576.
- Clarke, A. E. (2005). *Situational analysis: Grounded theory after the postmodern turn*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, Publications.
- Clarke, A. E. (2007). Feminism, grounded theory, and situational analysis. In S. N. Hesse-Biber (Ed.), *Handbook of feminist research: Theory and praxis*, pp. 345-370. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, Publications.
- Coe, N. M., & Bunnell, T. G. (2003). 'Spatializing' knowledge communities: Towards a conceptualization of transnational innovation networks. *Global Networks*, 3(4), 437-456.
- Coleman, J. S. (1990). *Foundations of social theory*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.

- Comisión para el Esclarecimiento Histórico (Guatemala), & Higonnet, E. (2009). *Quiet genocide: Guatemala 1981-1983*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.
- Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry & research design: Choosing among five approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Dickinson, C., & Morgan, S. (2015). Dwelling in diaspora: Judith Butler's post-secular paradigm. *European Legacy*, 20(2), 136-150.
- DiMaggio, P., & Anheier, H. (1990). The sociology of nonprofit organizations and sectors. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 16, 137-159.
- Diener, A. C., & Hagen, J. (2010). *Borderlines and borderlands: Political oddities at the edge of the nation-state*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Drainville, A. C. (1998). The fetishism of global civil society: Global governance, transnational urbanism and sustainable capitalism in the world economy. In M. P. Smith, & L. E. Guarnizo (Eds.), *Transnationalism from below*, pp. 35-63. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.
- Ebrahim, A., & Weisband, E. (Eds.). (2007). *Global accountability: Participation, pluralism, and public ethics*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Edwards, M., & Hulme, D. (Eds.). (1996). *Beyond the magic bullet: NGO performance and accountability in the post-Cold War world*. London; UK: Macmillan.
- Elliott, E. D. (1998). *Gaspar Ilom: Maya resistance to the western ideology of nature* (Master's thesis). University of San Diego, San Diego, CA.
- Faist, T. (2010). Diaspora and transnationalism: What kind of dance partners? In R. Baubock, & T. Faist (Eds.), *Diaspora and transnationalism: Concepts, theories and methods*, pp. 9-34. IMISCOE: Amsterdam University Press.
- Featherstone, D. (2003). Spatialities of transnational resistance to globalization: The maps of grievance of the Inter-Continental Caravan. *Transactions Institute of British Geographers*, 28(2003), 404-421.
- Foucault, M. (1972). *The archaeology of knowledge and the discourse on language*. New York, NY: Harper.
- Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings 1972-1977*. (C. Gordon, Ed.). New York, NY: Pantheon.
- Friedman, E. J. (1999). The effects of 'transnationalism reversed' in Venezuela: Assessing the impact of UN global conference on the women's movement. *International Journal of Feminist Politics*, 1(3), 357-381.

- Galaskiewicz, J., & Bielefeld, W. (1998). *Nonprofit organizations in an age of uncertainty: A study of organizational change*. New York, NY: Aldine De Gruyter.
- Geertz, C. (1983). *Local knowledge: Further essays in interpretive anthropology*. Basic Books.
- Glick Schiller, N., & Faist, T. (2010). *Migration, development and transnationalization: A critical stance*. New York, NY: Berghahn Books.
- Grandin, G. (2000). *The blood of Guatemala: A history of race and nation*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Greenleaf, R. K. (1998). *The power of servant leadership*. Oakland, CA: Berrett-Koehler Publishers.
- Guarnizo, L. E., & Smith, M. P. (Eds.). (2002). *Transnationalism from below*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.
- Hands, C. M., & Hubbard, L. (2011). *Including families and communities in urban education*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publications.
- Haraway, D. (1988). Situated knowledges: The science question in feminism and the privilege of partial perspective. *Feminist Studies*, 14(3), 575-599.
- Hargadon, A. B. (2002). Brokering knowledge: Linking learning and innovation. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 24, 41-85.
- Harris, A., & Bartlow, S. (2015). Intersectionality: Race, gender, sexuality, and class. In J. DeLamater, & R. F. Plante (Eds.), *Handbook of sociology of the sociology of sexualities*, pp. 261-271. Switzerland: Springer International Publishing.
- Hawken, P. (2007). *Blessed unrest: How the largest movement in the world came into being and why no one saw it coming*. New York, NY: Viking Penguin.
- Heisler, B. S., & Heisler, M. O. (1986). From foreign workers to settlers? Transnational migration and the emergence of new minorities. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* (Special Issue), 485(1), 9-206.
- Hesse-Biber, S. N. (Ed.). (2007). *Handbook of feminist research: Theory and praxis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Jenkins, J. C. (2006). Nonprofit organization and political advocacy. In W. W. Powell & R. Steinberg (Eds.), *The nonprofit sector: A research handbook* (2nd ed.), pp. 307-332. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

- Katz, D., & Kahn, R. L. (1966). *The social psychology of organizations*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons Publishing.
- Keck, M. E., & Sikkink, K. (1999). *Transnational advocacy networks in international and regional politics*. UNESCO.
- Klenke, K. (2008). *Qualitative research in the study of leadership*. Bingley, UK; Emerald Group Publishing, Ltd.
- Knight, S. D. (2011). Using narrative to examine positionality: Powerful pedagogy in English education. *English Teaching: Practice and Critique*, 10(2), 49-64.
- Kriesberg, L. (1997). Social movements and global transformation. In J. Smith, C. Chatfield, & R. Pagnucco, (Eds.), *Transnational social movements and global politics: Solidarity beyond the state*. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.
- Kvale, S., & Brinkman, S. (2009). *Interviews: Learning the craft of qualitative research interviewing*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage Publications.
- Lacroix, T. (2009). Transnationalism and development: The example of Moroccan migrant networks. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 35(10), 1665-1678.
- Lather, P. (1991). *Getting smart: Feminist research and pedagogy with/in the postmodern*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Levenson-Estrada, D. (2013). *Adiós niño: The gangs of Guatemala City and the politics of death*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Lewis, D. (2012). Across the little divide?: Life histories of public and third sector "boundary crossers." *Journal of Organizational Ethnography*, 1(2), 158-177.
- Lewis, D. (2015). Contesting parallel worlds: Time to abandon the distinction between the 'international' and 'domestic' contexts of third sector scholarship? *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary & Nonprofit Organizations*, 26, 2084-2103.
- Levitt, P., & Merry, S. (2009). Vernacularization on the ground: local uses of global women's rights in Peru, China, India and the United States. *Global Networks*, 9(4), 441-461.
- Lewis, D., & Mosse, D. (2006). *Brokers and translators: The ethnography of aid and agencies*. Bloomfield, CT: Kumarian Press.
- Loucky J., & Moors, M. M. (2000). *The Maya diaspora: Guatemalan roots, new American lives*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

- Marín, G., & Marín, B. V. O. (1991). *Research with Hispanic populations*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Marshall, J. H., & Suarez, D. (2014). The flow management practices: An analysis of NGO monitoring and evaluation dynamics. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 43(6), 1033-1051.
- McCall, L. (2005). The complexity of intersectionality. *Signs*, 30(3) (Spring 2005), 1771-1880.
- MacIndoe, H. (2011). Advocacy organizations. In K. A. Agard (Ed.), *Leadership in nonprofit organizations: A reference handbook*, pp. 155-162. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- McDonald, M. B., Mitchell, C., & Elliott, E. (2014). *Granito de Arena: Case Study Research on the Role of An Indigenous Nonprofit Organization in Post-Conflict Guatemala*. San Diego, CA: University of San Diego.
- McNevin, A. (2006). Political Belonging in a Neoliberal Era: The Struggle of the Sans-Papiers, *Citizenship Studies*, 10(2), 135-151.
- Merriam, S., Johnson-Bailey, J., Lee, M. -Y., Kee, Y., Ntseane, G., & Muhamad, M. (2001). Power and positionality: Negotiating insider/outsider status within and across cultures. *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, 20, 405-416.
- Merry, S. E. (2006). Transnational Human Rights and Local Activism: Mapping the Middle. *American Anthropologist*, 108(1), 38-51.
- Ministero de Gobercacion. (2016). *Registro de las Personas Juridicos*. Retrieved 01/22/16 from http://uip.mingob.gob.gt/laipmingob/index.php/COMUN:Indice_Registro_de_Personas_Jur%C3%ADdicas.
- Minkler, M. (2004). Ethnical challenges for the “outside” researcher in community based participatory research. *Health Education and Behavior*, 31, 684-697.
- Mitchell, C. E. (2012a). Congolese women: We're not just victims. *Peace X Peace: Raise Women's Voices, Build Cultures of Peace*, January 2012. Retrieved from <http://www.peacexpeace.org/2012/01/congolese-women-were-not-just-victims/>
- Mitchell, C. E. (2012b). Out of sight, out of mind: A conversation with grassroots women in the Democratic Republic of Congo. *Peace Studies Journal*, 5(2), 4-21. Retrieved from <http://peaceconsortium.org/peace-studies-journal/archives/psj-vol-5-issue-2-2012>
- Mitchell, C. E., Ochoa, I., & Villela, E. (in press). *Being Guatemalan: Transformative research on positionality and the nonprofit sector*.

- Moser, C. O. N., McIlwaine, C., & World Bank. (2001). *Violence in a Post-Conflict Context: Urban Poor Perceptions from Guatemala*. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- Murphy, J. P. (2011). Theories of nonprofit and organizational leadership. In K. A. Agard (Ed.), *Leadership in nonprofit organizations: A reference handbook*, pp. 295-302. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Nahavandi, A. (2012). *The art and science of leadership*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Nations Online Project. (2016). *Political Map of Guatemala*. Retrieved April 11, 2016, from <http://www.nationsonline.org/oneworld/map/guatemala-political-map.htm>
- Ott, J. S. (2001). *The nature of the nonprofit sector*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Palencia Prado, T., & Holiday, D. (1996 trans.). *Towards a new role for civil society in the democratization of Guatemala*. Montreal, Canada: International Centre for Human Rights and Democratic Development.
- Pallas, C. L., Gethings, D., & Harris, M. (2014). Do the Right Thing: The Impact of INGO Legitimacy Standards on Stakeholder Input. *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary & Nonprofit Organizations*, August 2014.
- Plasterer, R. (2011). Transnational philanthropy: Somali youth in Canada and Kenya. *New Issues in Refugee Research, Paper 222*. Geneva, Switzerland: UNHCR. Retrieved from <http://206.155.102.64/pdfid/4e980a272.pdf>
- Popkin, E. (1999). Guatemalan Mayan migration to Los Angeles: Constructing transnational linkages in the contest of the settlement process. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 22(2), 267-289.
- Portes, A., Escobar, C., & Radford, A. W. (2007). Immigrant transnational organizations and development: A comparative study. *International Migration Review* 41(1), 242-281.
- Portes, A., Guarnizo, L. E., & Landolt, P. (1999). The study of transnationalism: Pitfalls and promise of an emergent research field. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 22(2), 217-237.
- Proyecto Interdiocesano Recuperación de la Memoria Histórica (Guatemala), Catholic Institute for International Relations, & Latin America Bureau. (1999). *Guatemala, never again!* Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books.

- Risse-Kappen, T. (Ed.). (1995). *Bringing transnational relations back in: Non-state actors, domestic structure and international institutions*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Rose, G. (1997). Situated Knowledges: Positionality, reflexivities, and other tactics. *Progress in Human Geography*, 21 (3), 305-320.
- Saidel, J. (2000). Resource interdependence: The relationship between state agencies and nonprofit organizations. In S. J. Ott (Ed.), *The nature of the nonprofit sector*, pp.380-390. London, UK: SAGE Publications.
- Salamon, L. M. (1987). Partners in public service: The scope and theory of government-nonprofit relations. In W. W. Powell (Ed.), *The nonprofit sector: A research handbook*, pp. 99-117. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Salamon, L. M. (2012). *The state of nonprofit America*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.
- Salamon, L. M., Sokolowski, S. W., & Anheier, H. K. (1998). *Social origins of civil society: An overview*. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins Center for Civil Society Studies.
- Saldaña, J., & Miles, M. B. (2013). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers + qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook*. London, UK: Sage Publications.
- Schelesinger, S. C., & Kinser, S. (1983). *Bitter fruit: The untold story of the American coup in Guatemala*. New York, NY: Anchor.
- Shaefer, H. L., DeLand, M., & Jones, T. R. (2011). Leading collaboration: Creating strategic alliances and restructuring via mergers, acquisitions, and integration. In K. A. Agard (Ed.), *Leadership in nonprofit organizations: A reference handbook*, pp. 559-567. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Spivak, G. C. (1988). *Can the subaltern speak?*. Basingstoke, UK: Macmillan.
- Spivak, G. C. (1999). *A critique of postcolonial reason: Toward a history of the vanishing present*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Spradley, J. P. (1979). *The ethnographic interview*. New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.
- Sridhar, A. (2007). Tax Reform and Promoting a Culture of Philanthropy: Guatemala's "Third Sector" in an Era of Peace. *Fordham International Law Journal*, 31(1), 186-229.

- Steinberg, R. (2006). Economic theories of nonprofit organizations. In W. W. Powell, & R. Steinberg (Eds.), *The nonprofit sector: A research handbook*, pp. 117-139. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Stoll, D. (2013). *El Norte or bust: How migration fever and microcredit produced a financial crash in a Latin American town*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
- Suárez, D. F. (2010). Collaboration and professionalization: The contours of public sector funding for nonprofit organizations. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 21, 307-326.
- Takacs, D. (2003). How does your positionality bias your epistemology? *Thought & Action*, Summer 2003, 27-38.
- Tarrow, S. (2005). *The new transnational activism*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Trinh, T. Minh-ha. (1992). *Framer framed*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Willems, J., Boenigk, S., & Jegers, M. (2014). Seven trade-offs in measuring nonprofit performance and effectiveness. *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary & Nonprofit Organizations*, 25(Online), 1648-1670.
- Wolcott, H. F. (1995). *The art of fieldwork*. Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press.
- Yakushko, O., Badiie, J., Mallory, A., & Wang, S. (2013). Insider outsider: Reflections on working with one's own communities. In K. L. Norsworthy, & E. Kaschak (Eds.), *Global border crossings: Feminist activists and peace workers collaborating across cultures*, pp. 69-82. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Yin, R. K. (2009). *Case study research: Design and methods* (4th Ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Sage Publications.

Appendix A
Interview Protocol

Appendix A

Interview Protocol

Script:

[BEGIN TAPE]

My name is Christina Mitchell. I am a doctoral candidate at the University of San Diego. It is ____[day]____, ____[date]____.

This interview serves as part of a dissertation research study. The purpose of this interview is to broaden my understanding of transnational nonprofit leaders native to Guatemala by looking at how the leader uses his trans-border situation to support his organizational mission. The interview will last approximately one hour. I have asked and received your permission to digitally record our conversation so that I do not miss any of the important parts of our conversation, is that correct?

You are invited to participate in this study by granting the interview. You will be asked to discuss your perceptions, your feelings, and your thoughts about, or your experiences \concerning the work of ____[name of organization]____. While there may be no direct benefit to you for participating in this interview, it will potentially benefit the whole nonprofit sector as it informs the work of other nonprofits and scholars.

This interview is being recorded and notes will be taken. I will transcribe this interview. I am asking permission to use your name and the name of your organization in the reporting of the findings as an outcome of the interview and of my research. However, your confidentiality will be protected. All information and identifying records will remain confidential and kept in a locked file or a password protected computer file for the standard five years as required by the university. The results of the whole research project may be made public and the information recorded in professional publications and meetings, but the information from this study will be reported in the context of the broader nonprofit sector. Therefore, even while I am requesting to use your identity, it is up to you the terms upon which that identity is used. If you choose to remain anonymous, I will honor that anonymity.

Your participation in this research is entirely voluntary and you can refuse to answer any question and you can quit the interview at any time. Should you choose not to participate or quit the interview, I am not going to be upset. If you quit the interview, all of the information I have received from you will be destroyed.

There are no anticipated risks or discomforts for this interview that I know of. I do have to inform you that sometimes when people are asked to think about their feelings they may feel sad or anxious. If you would like to talk with someone, please let me know and I will secure referral information to a professional counselor.

Lastly, I will provide you with my contact information. Please feel free to contact me at any time with any questions that you might have.

Do you have any questions? Did I explain everything to your satisfaction so you are comfortable?

Do you agree to this interview?

How would you like to be identified for this project?

[STATE THE FOLLOWING AS PER INSTRUCTIONS OF INTERVIEWEE;
NAMING MATRIX FOR ANONYMOUS INTERVIEWEES OUTLINED IN
QUALITATIVE CODE BOOK.]

*I am interviewing _____ [name] _____, _____ [title/position] _____ of
_____ [name of organization] _____. This interview is being conducted in
_____ San Diego/Guatemala _____ with the permission of the interviewee.*

[PROCEED WITH INTERVIEW GUIDE]

Christina E. Mitchell, M.S.
Doctoral Candidate
University of San Diego
School of Leadership and Education Sciences
Department of Leadership Studies
5998 Alcalá Park
San Diego, CA 92110
+011 775.340.6839
CMitchell@SanDiego.edu

Appendix B

Situational and Social Arenas Mappings

Appendix B

Situational and Social Arenas Mappings

Table 3

Situational Mapping of grounded theory codes.

Topic/Theme/Code	Situational Elements											
	Discursive Constructions of Actors	Human (Individual/ Collective)	Local to Global	Major Contested Issues	Nonhuman	Organizational/ Institutional	Other Empirical Elements	Political Economic	Popular/ Other Discourses	Socio- cultural	Spatial/ Temporal	Symbolic
Bridges												
Bridge												
Access		✓	✓				✓	✓			✓	
Border Defined		✓	✓								✓	✓
Border Designation	✓	✓	✓								✓	
Bridging			✓		✓					✓	✓	✓
Ceremony/Celebration										✓		✓
Citizenship	✓	✓						✓		✓		✓
Knowledgeable "Other"	✓								✓	✓		✓
Local to global	✓		✓								✓	
Location											✓	
Movement			✓								✓	
Network		✓	✓			✓					✓	
Popular Representation/Story					✓				✓			
Privilege		✓	✓							✓		
Resources		✓	✓		✓		✓					
Technology			✓		✓		✓					
Time			✓								✓	
Trust	✓								✓			
Gate												
Caution		✓										
Center												✓
Competition												
Conflict		✓		✓								
Controlling the message		✓					✓					
Conveyance of knowledge		✓										
Gatekeeping	✓		✓			✓						

Table 3 *cont.*

Topic/Theme/Code	Situational Elements									
	Discursive Constructions of Actors	Human (Individual/ Collective)	Local to Global	Major Contested Issues	Nonhuman	Organizational/ Institutional	Other Empirical Elements	Political Economic	Popular/ Other Discourses	Socio- cultural, Spatial/ Temporal, Symbolic
Importance of getting it right Limitations to Access							✓			✓
Staying on message		✓					✓			✓
Collisions										
Accountability										
Accountability		✓	✓	✓		✓		✓		✓
Cloud of corruption	✓							✓		
Funding		✓				✓				
Advocacy										
Advocacy		✓	✓	✓		✓		✓		✓
Sense of Obligation		✓				✓				
Supporter Exposure		✓				✓			✓	
Recruitment (Accountability)		✓	✓							✓
Development										
Capacity Building	✓		✓	✓		✓			✓	
Collective/Holistic	✓					✓				
Commerce	✓							✓	✓	
Development			✓	✓				✓	✓	
Education		✓	✓	✓	✓			✓	✓	
Marketization			✓					✓	✓	
Service Delivery vs. Empowerment Project	✓			✓				✓	✓	
Effectiveness										
Effectiveness				✓	✓	✓			✓	
Nonprofit					✓					
Building/Office/Headquarters					✓					✓
Culture			✓			✓			✓	
Direct Plea		✓							✓	
In-Direct Plea		✓							✓	✓

Institutional Review Board Project Action Summary

Action Date: June 22, 2015

Note: Approval expires one year after this date.

Type: ☐ New Full Review ☒ New Expedited Review ☐ Continuation Review ☐ Exempt Review
☐ Modification

Action: ☒ Approved ☐ Approved Pending Modification ☐ Not Approved

Project Number: 2015-06-277

Researcher(s): Christina E. Mitchell Doc SOLES
Dr. Hans Peter Schmitz Fac SOLES

Project Title: When Worlds Collide: Bringing the Indigenous Transnational Nonprofit Leader to the Conversation

Note: We send IRB correspondence regarding student research to the faculty advisor, who bears the ultimate responsibility for the conduct of the research. We request that the faculty advisor share this correspondence with the student researcher.

Modifications Required or Reasons for Non-Approval

None

The next deadline for submitting project proposals to the Provost's Office for full review is N/A. You may submit a project proposal for expedited review at any time.

Dr. Thomas R. Herrinton
Administrator, Institutional Review Board
University of San Diego
herrinton@san Diego.edu
5998 Alcalá Park
San Diego, California 92110-2492

Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost
Hughes Administration Center, Room 214
5998 Alcalá Park, San Diego, CA 92110-2492
Phone (619) 260-4553 • Fax (619) 260-2210 • www.sandiego.edu