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Around the world, adolescents increasingly grow up as members of local and global cultures. Little is known, however, about how precisely adolescents in rapidly globalizing societies blend local and global cultures. Interviews with 40 (16- to 19-year old) Thai adolescents, evenly divided between rural and urban communities, were analyzed alongside participant observation data for the interplay between local and global linguistic and dietary practices. Results revealed that urban adolescents inhabited differentiated selves, alternating between local and global practices based on interactional partner. The activation of each assisted them in navigating—and in some cases, reshaping—hierarchies encountered in everyday relationships. Findings contribute to the developmental science of globalization and point to the utility of interrogating cultural practices as sites of self-negotiation in rapidly changing cultural contexts.

Psychologists have in recent years increasingly highlighted the culturally situated nature of human development. Scholars of identity (Berry, Phinney, Sam, & Vedder, 2006; Nguyen & Brown, 2010), morality (DiBianca Fasoli, 2017; Jensen & McKenzie, 2016; Miller, 2005), cognition (Correa-Chávez & Rogoff, 2009), and intelligence (Stenberg, 2014) have foregrounded the role of culture in shaping fundamental developmental processes. This article points to the role of cultural change in shaping adolescent practices, framings of self, and negotiations of social hierarchies encountered in their everyday lives. Focusing on ethnographic data gathered in rural and urban communities in northern Thailand, this study explores adolescents’ practice-based realities and how their framings of these practices inform our understanding about the developmental implications of globalization.

Globalization is presently defined as “the increasing flow of trade, finance, culture, ideas, and people brought about by the sophisticated technology of communications and travel. . . and its local and regional adaptations to and resistances against these flows” (adapted from Lewellen, 2002, p. 7). This definition conveys the economic, sociocultural, and ideological components of globalization as well as the uniqueness of globalization at present. Globalization is not an entirely new phenomenon, as contact among culturally diverse people has existed—to some degree—for centuries. It is the degree and intensity to which culturally diverse products, people, and ideas are in contact that typify modern globalization (Arnett, 2002). Importantly, this definition foregrounds local adaptations to and resistances against globalization-related processes—of great interest for developmentalists.

The Developmental Psychology of Globalization

Although having taken some time to join sociology, anthropology, geography, and economics in studying globalization and its consequences (e.g., Appadurai, 1996; Inda & Rosaldo, 2008; Lewellen, 2002; Robertson, 1992; Sassen, 1998; Sen, 1999), psychology has recently witnessed an emerging study of the developmental implications of globalization.

Shifting Ecological Landscapes, Values, and Identities

Globalization-related transformations in sociodemographic conditions affect cultural values and
developmental patterns (Greenfield, 2009). Drawing from terms introduced by German sociologist Tönnies in 1887 (1957), Greenfield uses Gemeinschaft (community) and Gesellschaft (society) to describe two distinct ecologies. Each represents an environment that includes a set of dimensions, with the prototypical Gemeinschaft environment being rural, small scale, low in technology, and internally homogenous. It also has a relatively poor, subsistence-based economy. The prototypical Gesellschaft environment, meanwhile, is urban, large scale, high in technology, and internally heterogeneous. It also has a wealthy, commerce-based economy. Although there have been cases of movement in the opposite direction, current globalization-based shifts are overwhelmingly transforming Gemeinschaft communities into Gesellschaft societies.

Theoretical work has yielded a number of insights about the psychological impact of globalization. Scholars have proposed its impact on youth in particular, including the formation of a bicultural or hybrid identity that blends global and local cultures (Arnett, 2002; Hermans & Kempen, 1998), the dialogical navigation between global and local identities (Hermans & Dimaggio, 2007), shifting cultural practices and beliefs (Jensen, 2003), and shifting cultural values and learning environments (Greenfield, 2009). It has furthermore been proposed that individuals in urban areas experience globalization with much greater intensity than do those in rural areas (Arnett, 2002) and that adolescents are both uniquely affected by and affect globalization (Arnett, 2002; Schlegel, 2001).

Empirical studies have primarily examined globalization’s impact on adolescent and emerging adult identity development (e.g., Chen, Benet-Martínez, & Harris Bond, 2008; Ferguson & Bornstein, 2012; Ozer, 2015; Rao et al., 2013). Such work has focused on identification with local and global cultures, and on the outcomes of these identifications. Rao et al.’s (2013) study of urban middle-class Indian adolescents largely supported theoretical proposals of hybridity. They found that adolescents had “remixed” identities, simultaneously identifying with traditional and individualistic values, beliefs, and practices. Results demonstrated that a traditional identity orientation was positively associated with engagement in religious practices and subjective well-being, and negatively associated with frequency of material consumption. The opposite pattern was found for adolescents who endorsed a minority-world (more globalized) identity orientation.

In their work on globalization-based acculturation, Chen and colleagues (2008) focused on identification with Western culture as a result of intercultural contact via education, travel, or employment. They found that Chinese and Western bicultural identity integration was positively associated with psychological adjustment among Chinese college students residing in Hong Kong. In their work on remote acculturation, Ferguson and colleagues (e.g., Ferguson & Bornstein, 2012; Ferguson, Muzaffar, Iturbide, Chu, & Gardner, 2017) have focused on identification with and participation in global cultures from exposure to media, consumer products, and tourists. Remote acculturation, then, is a nonmigrant acculturation that arises from indirect or intermittent intercultural contact with geographically and historically separate culture(s). Among urban Jamaican adolescents, Ferguson and Bornstein (2012) found that one-third were remotely acculturated, endorsing both American and Jamaican identities. More recently, Ferguson et al. (2017) found that Jamaican adolescents with stronger American identity and behavioral practices ate more unhealthy food.

Such work has uncovered distinct patterns of adaptation to globalization among urban youth and shown that such patterns impact well-being. Though a critical starting point, measuring the endorsement or occurrence of these phenomena does not yet demonstrate how—and for what purposes, in what circumstances, and with what consequences—identities are remixed and the role of practices in self-negotiations. Qualitative data collection and analytic strategies are poised to address such process-oriented questions.

**Shifting Cultural Practices**

Cultural practices such as language (including what languages are and are not spoken, and with whom) and food consumption (including what, when, and with whom one eats) underlie conceptions of self and identity. These practices are relevant for this study given both their link to self and identity (Jensen, Arnett, & McKenzie, 2011; Nguyen & Brown, 2010; Valentine, 1999) and their potential to dramatically transform as a result of globalization (Bogin et al., 2014; Ferguson et al., 2017; Heller, 2003).

The effects of globalization on diet are wide-reaching and complex. On the one hand, rising incomes and food availability have positively affected health, with malnutrition having receded in many developing countries over the past 30 years—including Asian countries (Kearney, 2010). On the other hand, rates of overweight and
obesity are rising rapidly—particularly in Southeast Asia (Popkin, 2006). The pandemic of obesity in developing countries, labeled the “nutrition transition” (Popkin, Adair, & Ng, 2012), refers to the transition from traditional to Westernized diets (including processed foods, refined carbohydrates, and added sugars, fats, and sodium) of low- and middle-income countries.

The food people consume is changing rapidly in less developed regions of the world. One study that examined the diets of adults in 187 countries from 1990 to 2010 found increased consumption of unhealthful foods, particularly among middle-income and poor countries, and among younger generations and men, over the 20-year period (Inamura et al., 2015). Hence, it is low- to middle-income country’s residents whose diets are worse off than 20 years ago. As a result, rates of overweight and obesity in low- and middle-income countries have skyrocketed in recent years. One study reported that 62% of the world’s overweight or obese population now resides in developing countries (Ng et al., 2014). The reasons for increasing obesity rates in the developing world include urbanization (Mendez & Popkin, 2004), rising incomes (Dinsa, Goryakin, Fumagalli, & Suhrcke, 2012), media (Ferguson et al., 2017; Prentice, 2006), time poverty (Kelly, 2016), American junk food (Norris, 2013), and processed food exports (Jacobs & Ritchel, 2017)—all related to globalization.

Languages spoken also transform as a result of globalization. People—and particularly youth—are increasingly exposed to a wide array of languages, and expectations of fluency in global languages (e.g., English, Mandarin) have transformed mediums of communication. It has been predicted that by 2050, half of the world’s population will speak English proficiently (The Triumph of English, 2001). Local languages, too, are likely to transform. It has been predicted, for instance, that by the end of the twenty-first century, at least half of today’s 6–7,000 languages will have become extinct (Enduring Voices, n.d.; Living the Language, 2014). As people increasingly grow up bi- and tri-plus-lingual, it is of course not a matter a choosing between local or global languages. Indeed, research has shown that bilingualism is adaptive in multicultural environments (Chen et al., 2008).

While developmental research has shown that dietary and linguistic practices are altered as a result of globalization (e.g., Ferguson & Bornstein, 2012; Ferguson et al., 2017; Rao et al., 2013), most of this work has examined these practices as predictors or as outcomes of acculturation. We know far less about the process of managing multiple languages and diets in rapidly globalizing cultural contexts. How precisely are local and global practices integrated or navigated within individuals? Although this question has not been addressed by scholars of globalization, theoretical and empirical work on biculturalism among immigrant youth may be an important starting point.

Drawing from the work of Ogbu and Matute-Bianchi (1986), who suggested the internal coexistence of, and alternation between, two cultural frames of reference among immigrant youth, LaFromboise, Coleman, and Gerton (1993) delineated an alternation model of biculturalism. Unlike models of assimilation and acculturation, the alternation model focuses on bicultural individuals’ choiceful behavioral alternation to fit into the cultures to which they belong. Individuals, then, are agentic in determining which behaviors (e.g., language, food, dress) are employed according to the situation. Hong, Morris, Chiu, and Benet-Martinez (2000) found that bicultural individuals in Hong Kong engaged in cultural frame switching, shifting between “interpretive frames rooted in different cultures in response to cues in the social environment” (p. 709). By experimentally modeling frame switching via priming bicultural individuals, they demonstrated that multiple cultures can direct cognition within the mind of one individual and that internalized cultures can be activated by contextual and symbolic cues.

In sum, youth around the world increasingly engage in global dietary and linguistic practices. These shifting practices likely affect conceptions of self. We currently know very little, however, about how youth growing up in rapidly globalizing contexts navigate local and global languages and diets, the meanings ascribed to this navigation, and its link to self-construction and identity hybridity. We know something about how individuals who are bicultural as a result of immigration navigate between two sets of cultural practices. We do not yet know if this process is relevant for bi- and tri-plus-cultural youth as a result of globalization.

**Thailand as a Context of Globalization**

Thailand has undergone dramatic economic, social, and cultural change over the past 30 years—moving from a low- to upper-middle income country in less than a generation (World Bank, 2017). Thailand has also experienced rapid rates of urbanization...
and expansion of major cities, increased educational attainment, expanded career opportunities, and movement away from traditional agricultural livelihoods (Rigg & Nattapoolwat, 2001; World Bank Group, n.d.). It has been proposed that the rapid expansion of, and movement to, cities abruptly exposes previously rural-dwelling Thais to an industrial and capitalist work ethic, which are “entirely alien” to rural ways of life (Ganjanapan, 2003, p. 132). The urban middle class, then, is likely uniquely affected by the disjuncture between Thailand’s historically collectivistic values and its increasingly individualistic globalized culture.

Intercultural contact in Thailand has also shifted rather dramatically in recent years. International tourism has seen a dramatic increase over the past 20, and particularly in the last 7, years. In 1996, the number of international arrivals was roughly 7.2 million; in 2009, the number of international arrivals was just over 14 million. By 2016, this number had skyrocketed to over 32.6 million (World Bank Group, 2017). In 2015, Thailand joined the Association for Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN), whose aim it is to promote regional and economic integration among 10 Southeast Asian nations by facilitating trade and immigration between countries. Such shifts within Thailand and in its relationship with proximal and distal nations render this cultural context a natural laboratory for psychologists studying the developmental implications of globalization.

**Shifting Cultural Practices**

Rapid economic and social development have altered the diets of Thais in positive and negative directions. On the one hand, Thailand has seen significant declines in maternal and child malnutrition since the 1980s due to improved access to health services and successful community-based nutrition programs (Winichagoon, 2013). On the other hand, Thai households are now less likely to produce their own foods, and the increasing numbers of minimart stores and supermarkets are transforming food access and consumption (Winichagoon, 2013). With over 32% of its citizens being overweight, Thailand is the second most overweight country in Asia (Lalande, 2016). This is especially problematic in urban cities, where a speedy pace of life and resultant need for convenience, as well as comparative wealth and the concomitant ability to afford expensive fast food, influence dietary decisions. Of particular concern is the accelerating overweight and obesity prevalence rates among youth; in just 5 years, there has been a 36% obesity growth rate among Thai preschoolers (Sommuko, 2013).

An estimated 74 languages are spoken in Thailand (Lewis, Simons, & Fennig, 2015). Rapid economic and social development in this country have altered linguistic practices and expectations rather dramatically. Globalization and regionalization have rendered national (Standard Thai), regional (particularly Mandarin Chinese), and international (English) languages increasingly important in the lives of Thais (Kosonen, 2008). Indeed, schools and professional or middle class Northern Thai parents may suppress their children’s use of local languages, believing that this will interfere with children’s mastery of Standard Thai (Howard, 2009). Local languages, which play a major role in the management of community identity (Kosonen, 2008), may have increasingly limited roles in the lives of ethnolinguistic minorities who are now expected to communicate in Standard Thai and English. Despite Thailand’s heavy investment in English teaching and learning, and its booming tourist industry, English proficiency in Thailand remains very low (EF EPI, 2017; Thailand Ranks Near Bottom, 2013). Some reports indicate that Thai students’ English language proficiency is the lowest in the ASEAN region (Khaopa, 2013).

In sum, rapid economic, social, and cultural shifts have transformed the developmental landscape—including expectations, practices, and values—for Thai youth in recent years.

**This Study**

We now know that globalization affects youth identity, values, practices, and beliefs—particularly among those residing in urban, Gesellschaft environments. Research suggests that adolescents in rapidly globalizing cultural contexts grow up as members of local and global cultures, that there are individual differences in identification with global cultures, and that such identification affects well-being. Yet, strikingly little is known about how adolescents blend local and global cultures, whether and how rural youth navigate local and global cultures, and how hybridity reshapes adolescent development. To advance our understanding of the developmental implications of globalization, an expansion of geographic locations is essential, as is the inclusion of diverse youth (e.g., rural, low socioeconomic status, little schooled). To investigate adolescent participation in local and global cultures, the processes that underlie their participation, and
the functions they serve, qualitative data analytic techniques are invaluable.

About Thailand, we know that rapid economic growth in recent decades has transformed individuals’ lives, livelihoods, and practices. Empirical research thus far, however, has not studied the process through which Thai youth navigate local and global practices. Focusing on diet and language, this study examines practices that are at once culturally significant, linked to identity, and likely to change as a result of globalization—particularly among youth. It furthermore examines discourses surrounding these practices among youth residing in two prototypical sociodemographic environments (urban Gesellschaft and rural Gemeinschaft) that, although geographically nearby, are differentially affected by globalization. This study investigates the following research question: What are urban and rural Thai adolescents’ local and global practice-based realities, and how do their framings of these practices illustrate the implications of globalization on adolescent conceptions of self?

Before proceeding, two terminological clarifications are in order. First, “self” henceforth refers to adolescent framings of self in relation to social others and of present and future selves. This is informed by literature that points to the self as constructed alongside others (e.g., Callero, 2003; Gergen, 2011; McLean, 2015) and to the utility of examining adolescent conceptions of present and future selves across cultural contexts (Hart, Fegley, & Brengelman, 1993), for self-understanding is fundamentally cultural. Second, “local culture” will refer to regional (Northern Thai) and national (Thai) language and cuisine, and “global cultures” will refer to proximal (Japan, Korea, China) and distal international (U.S., European) languages and cuisines. The plural “global cultures” conveys the internal heterogeneity of cultural practices to which youth in this rapidly globalizing sociocultural context are exposed (McKenzie, in press).

**Method**

**Field Sites**

The rural field site was Mae Kiaw (a pseudonym to protect the identities of those in this small community), and the urban field site was Chiang Mai. Both in the Northern Thai Province of Chiang Mai, these districts share a common history, language (Kam Muang: คำเมือง), and cuisine (Ahan Muang: อาหารเมือง). In spite of these similarities and their mere 25 miles in geographic distance, they constitute distinct sociodemographic ecologies.

Mae Kiaw’s six subdistricts have a total population of roughly 21,000. Rice fields and low-lying mountains pervade the district. The predominant profession is farming, and census data show that over 67% of the population has a primary education or less. Because there is only one high school in the entire district, many students who wish to complete secondary school must drive 1 hr up dangerous mountainous roads (typically on motorbike, the most common form of transit in the district) to reach their school. In part for this reason, but also for supplemental income and assistance on farms and in homes, it is not uncommon for adolescents to drop out before completing secondary school.

Chiang Mai’s 16 subdistricts have a population of just over 234,000. This district is also home to Chiang Mai city, the largest city in northern Thailand. The city’s cultural and Buddhist significance (there are over 30 temples in the small city center alone) make it a popular tourist destination. Professions in Chiang Mai are highly diverse; the two most common professions are wage laborers (typically in the service industry) and students. Census data show that over 61% of the population have completed at least some high school, and a sizeable chunk of the population (22.8%) has a bachelor’s degree or higher. High school students have a wide variety of schools from which to choose, including government, private, and international schools.

**Participants**

This study was part of a larger project on the developmental implications of globalization in northern Thailand. Recruitment for this project began with visiting high schools in each location. To attain comparable samples, a government (rather than more expensive international or private) high school was the focal school in each location. After building rapport with students, teachers, and administrators, adolescents interested in being interviewed provided contact information for themselves and their parents. Potential participants were then vetted according to the following criteria: (a) adolescents must reside in the district, (b) Chiang Mai adolescents must reside within a 10-mile radius of the school (to ensure a sufficiently “urban” sample); Mae Kiaw adolescents must reside within a 20-mile radius of the school (an expanded radius in this community was necessary due to very low population density), and (c) a parent of the adolescent must consent to their child being interviewed.
A total of 40 adolescents (16- to 19-year old, $M_{\text{age}} = 17.30, SD_{\text{age}} = 0.56$), evenly divided between the rural and urban communities, were interviewed. All adolescents were entering their final year of secondary school. Rural and urban participants alike included more girls than boys (15 and 12 girls, respectively).

Evincing the distinct ecologies across field sites, parent education levels and annual family income (gathered from parents when they provided consent for their child to be interviewed) varied widely. Although most rural parents (12) had either primary-level or no education, most urban parents (15) had a bachelor’s degree or higher. The average annual household income of rural families was $2,250; the average annual household income among urban families, in contrast, was $16,480. These income differences reflect the reality that poverty in Thailand is overwhelmingly concentrated in rural areas (World Bank, 2017). The median self-reported household income in Thailand is $7,029 (Phelps & Crabtree, 2013).

**Materials**

Adolescent interviews were the primary data source. Additional data sources—field notes taken during participant observation in schools, at a selection of participants’ homes, and during outings with participants—were analyzed for the purpose of triangulation.

Individual semistructured interviews covered participants’ daily lives and practices, perceptions of morality, and perceptions of globalization. When discussing Thai values critical to pass on to future generations, participants often referred to Northern Thai (“Muang”) language and food. This study, then, focuses on practices deemed key to Muang culture.

Language questions included: “What language(s) do you speak at home, and with friends? Do you like speaking other languages? Why or why not?” Diet questions included: “Where do you shop for food? How often do you go out to eat? When you go out to eat, where do you like to go?” and “Do you and your parents eat similar foods? How about your friends?”

**Procedure**

Ethnographic fieldwork was conducted in Chiang Mai and Mae Kiew from January—December 2012. During this time, I engaged in participant observation in each school and community, in a selection of participants’ homes, and during outings initiated by participants. Data collection was preceded—this visit and while residing in Thailand several years prior—by my learning Thai and Kam Muang, making preliminary site visits, and building relationships with informants.

Interviews began several months after the initiation of my fieldwork. To ensure comfort, participants chose interview location and language. In the rural setting, the overwhelming majority of adolescents requested interviews at home (90%) and in Kam Muang (95%). The single rural adolescent who requested an interview in English quickly abandoned this due to speaking and comprehension challenges. In the urban setting, most adolescents requested interviews at school (65%) and in English (75%). A local research assistant accompanied me for each interview, and a native speaker of the participant’s preferred language led each interview. When in Kam Muang or Thai, I asked follow-up and clarification questions on occasion during the interview and conversed with participants before and after interviews.

Interviews were administered after written consent was obtained from adolescents and their parents. Following the interview (which ranged in length from 76 to 208 min [$M = 113, SD = 26$]), participants received a “thank you” gift (e.g., hat, notebook, wallet).

**Analytic Approach and Procedure**

Latent thematic analysis (Boyatzis, 1998) was used to analyze interview and participant observation data. This approach, grounded in a social constructionist epistemology, entails the identification of underlying ideas, assumptions, and conceptualizations that shape participant discourse (Braun & Clarke, 2006).

Interviews were first transcribed by a native speaker of the interview language. For interviews that took place in Thai or Kam Muang, a native-speaking research assistant first transcribed and translated the interview into English. I then compared interview transcripts to original audio records to ensure transcription accuracy and detail.

Given the research question that guided this study, data analysis began by generating initial codes for participants’ local and global linguistic and dietary practices as expressed in interviews and during participant observation. For instance, five initial urban adolescent codes included choice, agency, subverting authority, parents, and teachers. After codes were generated, they were revisited with the aim of seeking connections between, and examining the meanings of, codes. At this stage,
both evidence that was and was not consistent with codes was noted. Conceptually related codes were collapsed, refined, and named—resulting in a total of 57 codes (26 for rural and 31 for urban adolescents; e.g., “Choice and agency in language and food practices”, “Global practices to subvert, challenge, or sway authority”). Codes were then combined in order to generate, name, and define themes (three each for rural and urban adolescents) that centered on discourse surrounding adolescent practices and its relation to self in the context of social others. Following the above example of initial and final codes, these and other related codes were combined and the theme was named: “Intact and transformed social hierarchies.”

Themes were then finalized (see Tables 1 and 2) by assessing fit between each theme and the overarching research question. At each stage, data were analyzed with goals of conveying participants’ lived realities and the unique challenges and opportunities experienced by adolescents in each cultural community. (Tables S1 and S2 in the Online Supporting Information display final codes accompanying each theme and a coded interview data extract for each participant group).

Four qualitative validity procedures (Creswell & Miller, 2000) were employed in this study: data triangulation across multiple sources, prolonged engagement in the field, thick description of participant discourse, and the inclusion of disconfirming evidence. Disconfirming evidence—or counterexamples—are integrated into the results section and revisited in the discussion section.

Results

Rural Adolescents

Uniform Self Across Relational Domains

Rural adolescent discourses pointed to a uniform self squarely centered on local northern Thai (Muang) practices. They reported engaging in Muang dietary and linguistic practices with family, friends, and teachers.

Speaking about what and where they eat, rural adolescents framed eating Northern Thai food with their families as central to their dining practices. This participant group reported dining at home with rare exception, seldom or never dining out. In fact, the concept of eating out was so distant from their lives that some misinterpreted the question. Below is one such example (here and throughout, “I” indicates interviewer and “P” indicates participant):

I: And do you go out to eat often?
P: Not often. I usually eat inside my house.
I: Going out to eat here doesn’t mean you eat here—
P: Ohhh.
I: —at the area outside your house. I mean go out to eat somewhere else.
P: Oh, no! Not often at all.

On the rare occasion that rural adolescents did dine out (for special occasions such as a family member’s birthday or the new year), they did so with the whole family at the same local barbecue pork restaurant. Asked where she goes when eating out, one participant stated the aforementioned restaurant—then followed, “I don’t know where else to go.”

Fast food was decidedly not a part of rural adolescents’ lives. Asked if they eat McDonalds, KFC, or Pizza Hut, many laughed at the question as if to convey its ludicrousness. Some reported that they had “never tried it.” Of those who had, it was typically dismissed for its unappealing taste or lack of viability (due to costliness, distance from home, or lack of nutritive value). One rural adolescent explained that eating McDonalds is “pointless—it tells you that you don’t love yourself, because you do something bad for your health.” Another scoffed and said she does not eat at KFC because she “can cook [fried chicken] at home.” One rural adolescent,

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rural Adolescent Theme Titles and Descriptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Theme title</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniform self across relational domains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intact social hierarchies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global present and future: Structural barriers to participation in global cultures</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
however, noted that although her parents do not eat fast food (and thus, for the most part, nor does she), her sister (who had been residing in Denmark with her Danish husband for the past 10 years) takes her to eat fast food when she visits Thailand once a year. Among the rural sample, fast food was consumed only in the presence of social others with considerable global exposure.

Rural adolescents reported shopping for food at small local and mobile markets (“[I] buy whatever my mom wants me to take care of”) and growing their own vegetables and animals for consumption. Notably, they typically responded to the question about their food shopping by referring to their family’s food shopping (or growing). Several explained that their family planted and foraged for food, only exchanging money for food when absolutely necessary. One such participant explained, “If we really, really want to eat [vegetables] right then, we eat the one in the package. For something like lettuce, mom plants it and grows it herself.” Another explained that her father goes to

if I

attain Thai spoken, some explained that everyone in their class speaks “very Muang.” In fact, many rural adolescents reported rarely, if ever, speaking Thai. One exception to this was a participant who practices K-Pop cover dance (imitating Korean pop artists’ dance choreography) in Chiang Mai city. She explained that while she speaks Kam Muang with her family, “if I’m with friends in the city, I speak standard Thai.” Like food, then, non-regional languages were spoken by rural adolescents only in the presence of social others with considerable global exposure.

English and Mandarin (henceforth referred to as “Chinese,” as it was called by participants in this study) were widely recognized by rural adolescents as “global languages” that will be important for Thailand and their futures due to ASEAN. In spite of purportedly learning these languages at school, however, rural adolescents reported either not being able to speak them, or being “afraid” to speak them for fear of doing so incorrectly.

Those who spoke English “a bit” tended to qualify their practices in some way. Some stated that they “pretend” to converse in English. Regarding speaking English with her friends, one participant explained, “We speak according to what we understand. I don’t know if it’s right or wrong.” Another said, “Well, sometimes I pretend [to speak English]. (laughs) Sometimes I have an assignment—if the teacher tells us to practice speaking English, then we have to speak English to each other.” Still others framed Thai and foreign languages as reserved for “play.” One such participant explained: “Thai—I don’t speak it as much as I speak Kam Muang. For fun, when playing with my friends, sometimes I speak Thai-English or Thai-Korean. (laughs)” She
concluded by reiterating, “It’s for play—it’s not serious.”

Intact Social Hierarchies

The above theme refers to intrapersonal convergence among rural adolescents, with diet and language alike centered on Muang practices. This theme refers to interpersonal convergence among rural adolescents and those in positions of authority, which illustrates the extent to which social hierarchies are intact in this setting.

Rural adolescents couched their dietary preferences in light of their family’s practices. Emphasizing the similitude between her dietary practices and those of her parents, one adolescent explained, “Whatever mom cooks, I eat.” This was, in fact, a strikingly common sentiment for this participant group. The only incongruence to which rural adolescents pointed between self and parents’ food preferences was typically a single flavor or vegetable (e.g., chili paste, bitter gourd) their parents liked but they did not.

When speaking about what they eat, several referred to their parents’ teachings. One such participant explained that she eats the same food as her parents “because my parents have been teaching me since I was young. (Interviewer: What have they been teaching you?) ‘Whatever the parents eat, the child has to eat the same.’” Another participant said that he eats the same as his parents because, “in this family, well, if mom makes chili paste and I don’t eat it. . . I have to cook by myself. I can’t complain—I have no right to complain, like, ‘I’m not eating this or that.’”

Language, meanwhile, was framed as the teachers’ domain. Without prompting, rural adolescents discussed their teachers and school. Some spoke at length about Monday, a day designated for students to speak English. Asked why she speaks English for play, one participant explained, “The teachers teach us to do it. The teachers say that we have to speak English one day a week—that we should practice with our friends to get stronger.”

Rural adolescents emphasized their teachers’ teachings about the importance of two languages in particular:

The teachers said that in the coming years China will be a powerful nation, so I think Chinese is important. Also, their population is big. For English, well, it’s set to be an international language that the majority of people can speak.

In addition to mentioning the importance of these two languages, framing this in light of the impending necessity to communicate with “many people from different countries coming here” due to ASEAN was nearly ubiquitous. Rural adolescents—who themselves could not speak foreign languages—suggested that being able to communicate only in Kam Muang and Thai is a disadvantage and will result in losing benefits to foreigners who may exploit them. The fact that this shared discourse existed across rural adolescents further illustrates the power of teacher socialization in this context. This theme, then, points to intact social hierarchies, with parents playing a critical role in rural adolescents’ dietary practices and preferences, and teachers playing a critical role in rural adolescents’ linguistic practices and perspectives.

Global Present and Future: Structural Barriers to Participation in Global Cultures

As demonstrated in the above theme, rural adolescents both recognized the importance of global languages for their futures and relied upon their teachers for learning global languages envisioned as keys to their future success. This theme refers to the roadblocks they encountered in this regard due to lack of resources and lack of opportunity.

As previously noted, rural adolescents recognized that speaking only the local dialect and national language is “a disadvantage,” but it was rare indeed for members of this participant group to be able to speak other languages deemed necessary. For the most part, though, their inability to do so was not due to lack of desire. Nearly every rural adolescent expressed dreams of being able to speak foreign languages. One participant explained, “I don’t understand [English TV], but I want to get the accent. . . and I want to learn Chinese. I learned it in school—just a little bit. I want to learn many languages.” Another, while laughing, said, “English? I can’t speak it—not at all. Well, I like English, but I’m no good at it.”

Rather, lack of opportunity was to blame. Although rural adolescents did not outright criticize their teachers (which would serve to disrupt intact hierarchies), several participants who mentioned their teachers or school when discussing foreign languages shared a discourse of lacking. Those who spoke about their teachers focused on inconsistency in language learning. Some in the class who had previously studied Chinese recalled that when their teacher quit, they simply stopped learning the language. One participant explained:

P: I could speak Chinese a little bit, but I’ve forgotten it. That’s because it’s not constantly
studied. Actually, our specialty is Chinese. But when we finished grade 10, going into grade 11, the teacher was not—was not available. She left.
I: Oh, that’s why—the teacher left, so it wasn’t continued. Do you like speaking languages other than Thai and Kam Muang?
P: Well, I don’t quite like it.
I: No? Why?
P: Well, I do like it, but it’s—we don’t get to speak it often. I don’t know in which occasion I should speak those languages. Around here, we speak Kam Muang and Thai. If I were to speak it with people, they’d be like, ‘What is this girl talking about?’ Like this. So in the end, I just read other things. I just leave it behind, as I don’t need it. . .But actually, I want to be able to communicate using many languages.

This adolescent speaks to lack of access to learn, lack of requirement to speak, and lack of opportunity to practice other languages. In fact, rural adolescents also had little English instruction in school. The English classes I attended at their school seldom had direct instruction. Several times when I went to class, less than half of the students were present and the teacher was nowhere to be seen. Some 6/2 (the class that specialized in languages, mentioned in the quotation above) students reported that they had not had an English lesson in nearly a month.

During one visit, English midterms were being returned to students. The highest score was a 53%, with a far lower average. A group of students began quietly grumbling, stating that the test was far too difficult. Finally, they pleaded with the teacher to decrease the midterm point worth. One student made the following case on behalf of her classmates: “How can we be expected to get the answers right if we didn’t learn about this in class? You always speak to us in Thai, and you even made English mistakes on the exam, so how can we be expected to get a good score?” Teachers in this community were often conceived of as untaoled to ensure student success.

Beyond school, there were few opportunities for rural adolescents to expand their foreign language skills. There were no language tutorial schools in the area, so if youth wished to improve their English and Chinese, there would be little means in which to do so. The lack of Internet (or very slow Internet, for those who had it) in participants’ homes further limited rural adolescents’ means to seek it out on their own. The single adolescent who was enrolled in an English tutorial class in Chiang Mai city at the time of my fieldwork dropped out due to insufficient funds to travel to and from the city each day for class. He recognized that this hindered his ability to study English in university as he had hoped, but there was simply no way to make it work.

Rural adolescents, then, were consistently exposed to messages regarding the critical importance of speaking other languages, and they relied on their teachers to tool them with this ability. They faced significant barriers, however, in achieving this due to lack of resources and opportunities.

Urban Adolescents

Differentiated Selves Across Relational Domains

Urban adolescent discourses indicated their inhabiting differentiated selves, shifting between local and global practices based on interactional partner.

Urban adolescents shared that they eat Thai, Muang, American, Japanese, Korean, Chinese, Italian, and French food. The type of food consumed, however, varied widely depending on dining companion. For this participant group, Thai and Muang food was eaten primarily with family, and American fast food was eaten primarily with friends. (There was, however, one adolescent who reported going to the McDonalds Drive-Thru with his mother on occasion.) Here one participant discusses her compartmentalized practices:

I: What do you normally eat when you eat out? Thai food? Muang food? Western food?
P: Mostly, I eat Thai food when I’m with my family. But I eat fast food with friends when we hang out.
I: Ah, and what kind of fast food?
P: I like burgers and pizza. . .I eat it every month. (laughs)
I: So you eat Western food with friends when going out?
P: That’s right—when we hang out.

In fact, eating out with friends—particularly at McDonalds (which some referred to simply as “Mc”), KFC, and Pizza Hut—was a common occurrence for this participant group. Some reported doing so once a week or more; one participant explained that she goes out to eat with her friends every day when school is not in session. When dining out, foreign (as opposed to Thai) restaurants were typically preferred. As one participant put it, “If I go a restaurant, I want to [go to] a foreign restaurant. I like French restaurants, and I like American food—spaghetti.” For this participant
group, dining out with family members occurred less frequently—typically on weekends or special occasions, and typically at Thai restaurants. The most common food shop frequented by urban adolescents was, by far, 7–11. They tended to go there alone to purchase food for themselves; many said they go there every day. Some also reported shopping at supermarkets and local markets with their parents on occasion.

With regard to language, urban adolescents typically spoke four languages, including Thai, Kam Muang, English, and one other language (Chinese, Japanese, Korean, German, French, Spanish, or Italian). Some spoke five languages. Like food, language spoken was framed as compartmentalized depending on with whom one speaks. Urban adolescents tended to communicate with family in Kam Muang and Thai. Some further differentiated their home-based linguistic practices by generation, indicating that they speak Kam Muang with grandparents and Thai with parents. Others were not fluent in Kam Muang and attributed this to their being encouraged to speak Thai and foreign languages both at home and in school (a point to which we will return in the next theme). Urban adolescents reported speaking Thai and English with friends and peers—including those they met while studying abroad, those they met as a result of their parents or school hosting study abroad students, and Thai friends.

Urban adolescents did not just speak English, however; many actually reported preferring to speak it (and other foreign languages) to Kam Muang or Thai. One participant explained, “I love English! It’s... charming. I think it’s more beautiful than other languages, and it’s easy to learn.” Another stated, “I love [foreign] languages. It’s like I adore them—I want to speak them.” Another explained, “I prefer English [movies]—music as well. I also love English novels. . .And Thai songs, they’re kind-of boring. (laughs)”

Conversely, Kam Muang was framed by some as a language not to be taken seriously. One participant said, while giggling, that he and his friends speak Kam Muang “when we want to be funny.” Another participant explained that she and her friends speak Kam Muang only “when we want to joke. But some people I used to know would speak Kam Muang because they wanted to—like, it’s not joke. It’s real.” So, whereas the local dialect carried little status in this sociodemographic ecology, English was deemed useful insofar as it provided adolescents with social capital among their peers.

Consuming global cuisines and speaking global languages, then, were framed as integral components of urban adolescents’ practices. For diet and language alike, local was mostly reserved for family, and global was mostly reserved for friends.

**Intact and Transformed Social Hierarchies**

This theme points to the manner in which traditional social hierarchies have been at once maintained and transformed in the urban context.

As noted in the above theme, urban adolescents tended to highlight the similitude between their friends’ and their own preferences. On the other hand, they often pointed to divergences between their parents’ and their own dietary preferences. One participant explained:

I can eat Korean food, but my parents don’t like it. I like Japanese food, too—but my mom doesn’t like it. I also like spaghetti, but my mom prefers Thai dishes. Old people prefer Thai dishes, but younger generations [prefer] spaghetti, pizza. . .If I want to go to a Japanese or Korean restaurant, I have to go with my friends. My mom just lets me go because she doesn’t want to eat it.

In spite of the dissonant preferences, this adolescent is granted autonomy by her mother, who allows her to engage in preferred practices with her friends—framed here as allies of sorts.

Like their rural counterparts, urban adolescents spoke of key authority figures’ influence when discussing their practices often and without prompting. As illustrated in the above quote, however, the discourses surrounding their influence were distinct from their rural counterparts. Speaking about the role of school in their foreign language practices, urban adolescents shared a discourse of choice and opportunity. As one participant explained, “Basically, our school gives us choices. I’m in the international program, and we need to choose one language out of three. Here we have French, Chinese, and Japanese. I chose French.” Another, who chose Chinese as her additional language, could also speak German because the school offered a German club.

The school furthermore provided opportunities for students to exercise their knowledge of global languages. During the school’s extravagant celebration of the opening of ASEAN, a group of students stood at the school entry gate and, speaking English and Chinese, invited foreign travelers to visit their school for this special occasion. Meanwhile, in the technology room, there was an ongoing Skype call with Malaysian high school students who had received a “Culture-in-a-Box.” (This is a box...
prepared and sent by students from one ASEAN country to students in another ASEAN country. Boxes include items such as traditional recipes and ingredients, and traditional clothing. This ongoing project has been instituted by urban high school administrators for the purpose of cultural exchange.) While the Malaysian students cooked a traditional Thai dish with ingredients they had received from the Thai students, they communicated in English. During the school’s annual French Bastille Day, students performed plays in French and spoke with French diplomats who were invited on campus for the occasion.

In turn, the school limited opportunities to speak local languages. One participant explained that although she likes to speak Kam Muang, she rarely does so because her teacher warned her that it will be unacceptable at university. She went on to share a story about her friend who speaks “real Kam Muang,” but was reprimanded for doing so during a presentation. She explained, “My friend speaks Kam Muang almost all the time. And last year during her presentation, she and the teacher fought about it a little bit. So now [my friend] hates her because it’s her style—everyone knows that!” As we see, then, hierarchies are intact (with urban adolescents’ practices being influenced by teachers and school); they are also, however, transformed (with the school emphasizing global practices and adolescent choice).

Parents, too, redirected their children toward speaking global, and away from speaking local languages not infrequently—even if they were not able to speak global languages proficiently themselves. One urban adolescent shared that she watches movies in English at her mother’s request. An urban parent, who had vented to me about her son’s unwillingness to speak English with her no matter how much she tried to change the language spoken at home, subsequently asked that I surreptitiously “test” her children’s English-speaking ability during an outing with her and her sons. Shortly after picking me up, she pulled me aside and explained that although she knows I prefer to speak Thai when in Thailand, she was instituting a “rule for the day” that I speak only in English with her boys and report back to her on their proficiency.

The above example illustrates the manner in which parental hierarchies were at once intact and transformed in the urban context. That is, his mother’s instituting this “rule for the day” about the language that all family members (and myself) would speak demonstrates her perceived role as an authority figure. Yet, that she had to do this in secret because her son refused to speak English with her suggests a transformation, whereby a child declining his parent’s expressed wishes is a viable option.

Renegotiated hierarchies were also evinced in other manners. Some adolescents suggested that engaging in global practices provides an opportunity to subvert family. One participant who otherwise framed herself as behaving in accordance with her parents’ wishes explained, with a muffled giggle, that she “like[s] speaking in English because my parents don’t understand it when I do.” Speaking English, then, enabled a space for quiet rebellion, where she could go over the heads of those who otherwise exert considerable control. Others discussed providing feedback on their parent’s cooking, couched in a comparison to fast food. Speaking about her penchant for 7–11, one urban adolescent explained that 7–11’s rice is “verrrry good. Better than at home! (laughs) I told my mom, ‘OK, you have to [make] rice like that!’” These examples illustrate urban adolescents’ agency and control—not just over their own linguistic and dietary practices but also their perceived capacity to sway their parents’ practices.

Global Present and Future: Opportunity, Comparison, and Competition

Like their rural counterparts, urban adolescents recognized the importance of global practices for their futures. Unlike rural adolescents, they spoke of global practices as an integral component of their present and future realities, and shared a language of opportunity where global practices are concerned. (As seen in the previous theme, there was not a language of opportunity where local practices were concerned; recall the teacher who restricted adolescents’ use of Kam Muang in the classroom.) They also shared a discourse of comparison and competition when discussing the role of global languages at present and in the future.

Urban adolescents tended to frame their global practices as benefiting the present self, for such practices provide social capital and coolness among friends. For this participant group, American fast food was in some ways required of them in peer relationships. As previously noted, several urban adolescents explained that they eat fast food when “hanging out.” The few who reported not liking fast food still eat it; as one participant put it, “I don’t really like it, [but] my friends eat it, so I have to eat with them.” Another said she thinks fast food is bland, but continued, “Sometimes we’ll go to like
Pizza [Hut] or KFC, yeah. It’s OK for me—I can go
with them.” Here, we see that even if American fast
food was not a preference per se, it was still an
urban adolescent practice, for it was deemed a re-
quisite for peer acceptance.

Speaking English was similarly framed as bene-
fiting the present self, and doing so was a perceived
requisite for trendiness. Asked why she likes speak-
ing English, one participant explained, “Because I
think it’s cool—I don’t know why. (laughs) It has
this up-down, up-down tone. Yea—it’s cool.” In
the same breath, she brought up her friend who “is,
like, obsessed with English.” Another said that
“English just slips out” when with her friends. She
went on to say, “I was just joking with them that
we’re the gifted children, so we should speak Eng-
lish.” Some referred explicitly to earning peer
acceptance by engaging in global practices. Explain-
ing his reasons for speaking English with friends,
another participant said, “it makes me cool or
something, right? Or awesome or popular when I
use English.” Speaking English, then, afforded
urban adolescents status, for this language acted as
a symbolic marker of coolness and modernity.

English was furthermore deemed imperative for
urban adolescents’ future selves. Participants dis-
cussed the importance of being able to communi-
cate in English (as well as in Chinese and a variety
of other foreign languages) as a result of ASEAN, as
well as for their own studies, future careers, and tra-
vel plans. One participant first pointed to the impor-
tance of English, Chinese, and Japanese before
mentioning German and Italian. She explained, “The
teacher said that Italians will extend their trading, so
learning their language will benefit us—like [if we]
go to Italy to look for jobs.” Asked why he likes to
speak English, another participant responded, “Camb-
obdia, Laos, the Philippines. . .they have the skill of
speaking English. And with ASEAN, Thailand
[must] fight them about English—must be competi-
tive. If Thai people can’t speak English, they can’t
find jobs.” Still another adolescent compared Thai-
lant to Singapore, Vietnam, and Malaysia, highlight-
ing Thailand’s English language deficits. She then
stated matter-of-factly, “Now, it’s a competition. If
people don’t know English, they lose profit.” As the
final two quotations reveal, urban adolescents’ dis-
course when speaking about foreign languages
and their futures was overwhelmingly one of comparison
and competition.

As it turned out, this language of linguistic com-
petition among urban adolescents was not reserved
for those from other nations; for some, it pervaded
their interactions with friends. Out for dinner one
evening with a group of urban adolescents, one
boy who was usually rather talkative did not say a
word for the duration of the meal. When we spoke
after dinner, he confided in me that that he was
uncharacteristically taciturn because he had felt
“stressed because my friends can speak better En-
lish than me.” Speaking English, then, afforded
opportunities to gain social capital among, and
acceptance from, friends. It also, however, carried
risks of judgment and falling short of friends’—and
one’s own—expectations.

Discussion

The practices examined in this study are both inter-
twined with adolescent identities and conceptions
of self, and susceptible to change as a result of
globalization (Ferguson et al., 2017; Jensen et al.,
2011; Nguyen & Brown, 2010). Examining dis-
courses surrounding dietary and linguistic practices
has thus afforded a window into the nature of ado-
lescent conceptions of self in relation to local and
global cultures, and in relation to social others.
Comparing the discourses surrounding these prac-
tices among adolescents in overlapping—and yet
distinct—sociodemographic ecologies (Greenfield,
2009) has contributed to the emerging understand-
ing of how globalization reshapes adolescent self-
hood. It has in turn illustrated the complex realities
for adolescents in each ecology, as well as how tra-
ditional power structures are at once intact and
reshaped in the urban Thai ecology as a result of
globalization.

Rural and Urban Adolescent Practices and Selves

In the rural setting, cultural practices are passed
on across generations from older, and thus more
powerful, cultural members to youth (e.g., parent
to child, teacher to child). On the one hand, this
transmission serves the historically adaptive func-
tion of cultivating a unitary self that is grounded in
cultural inheritances. In fact, as we saw in the first
two themes, rural adolescents hardly spoke about
their practices without also speaking about the
practices and teachings of their parents and teach-
ers. Hence, in this context, adolescent practices are
deeply intertwined with the practices of those who
maintain positions of authority. With just one year
remaining in their high school education, however,
they were also on the brink of participation in an
adult economy—an economy far more global in
composition than their teachers and parents have
traversed. Thus, rural adolescents are at once reliant on intact power structures, and limited in preparation for their impending participation in a global society as a result.

Rural adolescents in some ways dismissed both foreign languages and foods. Although generally recognizing the importance of English and Chinese (and in so doing, repeating their teachers), these languages had limited utility in their lives. Referring to English as reserved for “play and ‘pretend,’” the English-speaking self was thus framed as artificial and useful exclusively for the purposes of amusement and entertainment. Although decidedly less integral to future success, foreign food, too, was cast aside as impractical, unnecessary, and artificial. That those rural adolescents whose discourse suggested a differentiated self in language and diet were those with considerable global exposure speaks to the influence of globalization.

Meanwhile, the differentiated selves inhabited by urban adolescents illustrate both the presence and the contours of hybridity as a result of globalization. That is, for adolescents growing up in this Gesellschaft ecology, local and global cultural practices (Arnett, 2002; Hermans & Kempen, 1998) are activated based on interactional partner. In this sense, urban Thai adolescents are not so different from bicultural immigrants, who engage in cultural frame switching (Hong et al., 2000). Indeed, urban adolescents possess multiple national, regional, and international frames of reference from which to alternate (LaFromboise et al., 1993). In the urban context, then, global practices and self-presentations are less fluidly blended with local than they are additional tracks onto which adolescents jump at particular times and in the presence of particular people. Importantly, these additional tracks are not singular; urban adolescents in this sample revealed the range of proximal and distal global cultures that constitute the “global.” We saw, too, that there were multiple layers of local (regional and national) in the urban context.

Urban adolescents’ dining at foreign and fast food restaurants can be meaningfully understood in light of the global nutrition transition (Popkin et al., 2012). Importantly, however, this study points to layers that lie beneath this transition, at least for adolescents. That is, urban Thai adolescents eat Westernized food primarily with friends, and they do so not only due to time poverty, wide availability of American junk food and processed foods, and media (among other reasons discussed in the introduction) but also to obtain peer acceptance. Among urban adolescents, regional practices are reserved for family and (in the case of language) for making jokes with friends. Such linguistic and dietary compartmentalization clarifies how young urban-dwelling Thais employ multiple selves to navigate the disjuncture between local and global cultures (Ganjanapan, 2003). This compartmentalization, however, causes considerable strife for urban parents, who envision this as indicative of cultural loss and who spoke at great length with me about what they saw as an eroding Thai identity among the current generation of teens. Yet, as proposed by Howard (2009), this study also found that some urban parents and teachers redirect adolescents away from speaking regional and toward speaking national and international languages. This illustrates the complexity of navigating local and global cultures for adolescents; it also points to unique complexities experienced by older community members.

The Developmental Implications of Globalization

This study has engendered three key conclusions about the developmental implications of globalization and one conclusion about the empirical study of the microlevel consequences of globalization.

First, globalization engenders an increasingly differentiated self. Although rural adolescent practices were uniformly local across contexts, urban adolescent practices alternated based on interactional partner. By illustrating urban adolescents’ negotiations of local and global, and the manner in which each cultural channel is tuned to particular audiences, this study supports Hermans and Dimaggio’s (2007) proposal that globalization engenders an increasingly multiplicitious self, whereby different cultures exist within the individual. It further extends the alternation model of second-culture acquisition (LaFromboise et al., 1993) by suggesting that alternation applies not only to bicultural immigrant youth but also to global youth who alternate between more than two cultures.

This study engenders a new model of cultural acquisition as a result of globalization-based intercultural contact. Namely, it proposes that global youth not only acculturate to nonlocal cultures as a result of globalization but that they agentially alternate between local and global cultures based on interactional partner. Remote and globalization-based acculturation research speaks to the presence of, and implications for, global youth who are strongly oriented toward local and global cultures (e.g., Ferguson & Bornstein, 2012; Ferguson et al., 2017; Chen et al., 2008); this study illustrates the
process through which global youth navigate local and global cultures. By pointing to alternation of the self’s practices based on the social others with whom one is in contact, this study further indicates the purpose and function of alternation.

Second, globalization renders an increasingly agentic self. The urban adolescents in this study framed their linguistic and dietary practices not as inevitabilities but as choices that serve the self now and in the future. Namely, urban adolescents’ engagement in global practices enabled both the accumulation of social capital among friends at present, and tooling for participation in a global economy in the future. Rural and urban adolescents received similar messages from their schools about the critical importance of being able to converse in global languages for their futures. Yet, such messages were framed in distinct manners by adolescents across contexts of globalization. Rural adolescents spoke about this with a language of resignation and longing, whereas urban adolescents spoke about this with a language of opportunity, comparison, and competition.

Third, traditional age-based hierarchies are at once maintained and transformed with globalization. Like rural adolescents, urban adolescents spoke unprompted about the influence of parents and teachers in their linguistic and dietary practices. Yet, their framings were distinct. In the rural setting, parents served as power holders in the home sphere, and teachers served as power holders in the educational sphere. Moments of pushback in the rural educational sphere were, as shown, reserved to pleas to lower grading standards to match the level of education received. Although parents and teachers surely possess power in the urban setting, there was also evidence of adolescent subversiveness, and of adolescents’ perceived impact on parents’ practices. Engaging in local and global practices with particular social others enabled urban adolescents’ negotiation of power structures, and afforded the opportunity to transform age-based hierarchies, thereby affecting cultural change. As illustrated in the results section, urban schools and parents encouraged adolescents to engage in global practices, and enabled choicefulness in determining which global practices to engage, to succeed in a globalized world. In turn, this global tooling allowed adolescents to subvert traditional authority, thus challenging cultural traditions of fundamentally hierarchical relationships (Eberhardt, 2014). This study therefore speaks to the process through which adolescent cultural practices, conceptions of self, and intergenerational relationships are transformed as a result of globalization.

Finally, this study carries implications for the empirical study of the developmental implications of globalization. In linking external practices and internal conceptions of self and other, it has pointed to the utility of interrogating behavioral practices imbued with cultural meaning as sites of self-negotiation. In locating the unique and shared experiences of urban and rural adolescents, it has pointed to the utility of comparative study designs that examine youth residing in settings that are geographically nearby but constitute distinct sociodemographic ecologies. In uncovering both multivoicedness and the meanings and functions those voices carry, it has pointed to the indispensability of inductive qualitative analytic techniques.

Limitations and Future Directions

This study qualitatively examined whether and how adolescents in rapidly globalizing northern Thailand negotiate local and global cultures. The results of this study therefore should not be misinterpreted as generalizable to adolescents growing up in all rapidly globalizing world regions. The key conclusions about the developmental implications of globalization described above need to be examined across diverse cultural contexts. Indeed, research on cultural practices and self-negotiation in other locations is necessary if the developmental science of globalization is to progress. Furthermore, diet and language are not the only practices that are culturally significant, linked to self and identity, and undergoing change as a result of globalization. Future research would do well to investigate additional practices, such as dress. Future research would also do well to ask adolescents about their dietary practices in an even more open-ended fashion. It is possible that asking adolescents if and how often they go out to eat, for instance, could have elicited inflated rates due to the status of eating out.

The participant matching across urban and rural communities meant that no unschooled or little schooled adolescents were included in the current sample. Particularly in the rural community where dropping out is not uncommon, this sample would yield additional understanding about adolescent negotiations of local and global cultures. Similarly, recruiting high socioeconomic status adolescents (e.g., those attending expensive international schools in the urban community) would contribute
valuable information about variations across social class lines. Finally, this study interviewed adolescents at one time point. Many rural adolescent participants had dreams of relocating to an urban city for university the following year, at which point they will be submerged in a new set of discourses surrounding “the global.” Conducting follow-up interviews after their relocation would contribute to our understanding of continuity and change as a result of migration-based globalization.

**Conclusion**

This study has identified discourses surrounding local and global practices among adolescents in various globalization Thai communities, and interpreted the functions these practices serve. Findings suggest that hybridity as a result of globalization is perhaps less a fusion than a compartmentalization of global and local cultures, with each activated based on interactional partner. The activation of each, in turn, assists urban adolescents in navigating—and in some cases, reshaping—social hierarchies encountered in relationships with family members, teachers, and friends. This study thus points to the ways in which urban adolescents are both affected by, and affect, cultural change.

As developmental researchers increasingly foreground culture, and study it not simply as properties of individuals but as processes with which youth interact and dynamically construct, and as our discipline continues to widen the hitherto narrow portion of the globe that has long been its focus (Arnett, 2008), the urgency of examining globalization’s microlevel consequences will become ever the more apparent. With its ethnographic situatedness, data triangulation, and qualitative analytic approach, this study contributes to our burgeoning understanding of the developmental consequences of globalization and provides methodological and analytical suggestions about where and how to look for it.
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