

Copyright is owned by the Author of the thesis. Permission is given for a copy to be downloaded by an individual for the purpose of research and private study only. The thesis may not be reproduced elsewhere without the permission of the Author.



**Polycultural Capital
and the Pasifika Second Generation:
Negotiating Identities in Diasporic Spaces**

**A thesis submitted in partial fulfilment
of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy**

**in
Sociology**

**at Massey University
Albany
New Zealand**

Karlo Mila-Schaaf

2010



Abstract

This research examines the ways in which the Pasifika second generation who have grown up in Aotearoa are operating culturally and explores the conditions in which they construct identities. The study took a positive deviance approach focusing on existing strengths within the Pasifika generation and learning from success.

Taking a sequential explanatory mixed-methods approach, the project analysed data from the Youth2000 Survey, which included over one thousand Pasifika participants (n=1114). This showed that pride in Pasifika identities, reporting that Pasifika values were still important, feeling accepted by other people within one's own ethnic group and outside it, and continuing to speak Pasifika languages were all associated positively with advantageous health, educational or wellbeing variables. Individual interviews with fourteen high-achieving, second generation Pasifika professionals, further explored connections between identity, acceptance and belonging.

Second generation participants talked about performing identities across many spaces of symbolic interaction where they were called into relation with multiple others. These were local, cross-cultural, national and transnational relational spaces made possible via migration, diaspora, and relocation resulting in complex negotiations of sameness and difference. In these spaces they encountered competing narratives about who Pasifika peoples ought to be.

The diasporic second generation often had to negotiate belonging from beyond the limits of what was validated as having most symbolic authority. Symbolic struggle and the politics of cultural reproduction came to the fore, as did the contested nature of Pasifika imaginaries. Identifications were further complicated by demands for cross-cultural coherence and legibility across spaces, and shifting politics of recognition.

Polycultural capital was coined to describe the ability to accumulate culturally diverse symbolic resources, negotiate between them and strategically deploy different cultural resources in contextually specific and advantageous ways. Performing strategic essentialism, strategic ignorance, strategic hybridity, dialogic distance, and bridging, were just some of the patterns identified. Manulua describes an aesthetic of shifting multidimensional cultural resolutions across many spaces in-between.

Acknowledgements

This thesis is dedicated to my parents.

My deepest acknowledgement to Auntie Tupou, the trailblazer, I walk in your wake.

To my father (Semisi) Maka 'Ulu'ave Mila, who came from Tonga to Aotearoa with only dreams in his pockets. And to my mother, Lynda Hunt, who guided and helped me every step of the way. A special thanks to both of you for all the many hours of childminding and support that made completion of the thesis possible.

To Nana, for your editing advice and the many grammatical lessons, thank you for modelling such grace, generosity and goodness. Where would I be without my Nana? To Dawn, for your proof-reading, perseverance and patience, I am indebted. What a difference it made to have your careful eye look over it. To my wider family, who supported me through this, minded my children, and gave me gifts of time and space, much love.

To my supervisors, Paul Spoonley and Cluny Macpherson, thank you for seeing me through the hard yards and high jumps. To Suzanne Phibbs, you were the light at the end of my tunnel. Thank you for everything you have given so freely and generously. I am so incredibly grateful.

To Lita and Moera, advisors and guiding stars, thank you for lighting my way.

To my academic colleagues, the Youth2000 Team for the dataset access; Elizabeth Robinson who ran the SAS analysis; Maui Hudson who mused on negotiated space; Manase Lua who was my first reference for all things "Tongan", and Michelle Schaaf my DIY study-buddy.

To all the learned Tongan and Pacific academics whose work has sustained me: 'Epeli, Langi, 'Okusi, Futa, Konai, 'Ana, Teena, Teresia, Margaret, Albert R., Albert W. and Tui Atua Tupua Tamasese Efi. I stand on the shoulders of giants indeed.

To the community that let me off lots of "hooks" to complete this and were cheerleaders from the side (Luamanuvao Winnie Laban, Melino Maka and others) - thank you.

To the Health Research Council of New Zealand – thank you for the money! But more importantly the wonderful people who kick-started it and believed in me: Bruce, Patricia, Jacinta and Kiki. To Colin and MPIA, thank you for your tautoko.

To all the random stuff that helped keep me going, day after day (homemade espresso, poetry, Nina Simone, Facebook, Alice Walker’s blog). And the not-so-random stuff (my dad driving the boys to pre-school every day, my mum doing quality time with the boys when I couldn’t, the company of good friends: Rauna, Mon, Emma, (wines, talks, walks and internet chat!) Also, to my virtual cheerleaders, Ruth, Philip, Kiri (not so virtual), and others, thank you.

And of course, to Dr Dave, the barista: For all the pep talks, the coffees, the weekends, the washing, the picked up clothes, the commuting, the patience, the income-earning and the helpful epidemiological advice - we’re square mate. We make a good team. Thank you for *always* believing in me, for *always* being there to pick me up when I failed and fell, and *always* expecting me to kick ass! (You are so *sure* of my abilities sometimes I even believe it myself.) What a lot of sacrifices we’ve made to achieve this goal.

And finally to the boys - you’ve made the biggest sacrifices of all. Karlos and Nikolas, it doesn’t seem like it now, but it’s all for you in every way. Much love, Mummy.

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	2
Acknowledgements	3
Table of Contents.....	5
CHAPTER 1	13
Introduction: Negotiating Space for “who we are”	13
Who am I? Shifting Standpoint(s) / Sinking Sand	14
A Tangle of Terminology: Who do we mean?	22
Pasifika: A Pan-Pacific Approach.....	22
Pasifika: New Zealand-born or Second Generation?	25
Introduction to the Methodology	27
Strengths-Based Approach	27
A Mixed-Methods Approach	28
Structure of the Thesis.....	31
Conclusion	34
CHAPTER 2	37
Methodology	37
Confessions of a Pacific Health Bureaucrat	37
Introduction.....	39
2.1 The Quantitative Phase.....	41
Confessions of a Pacific Health Bureaucrat: The Research Context	41
The Youth2000 Dataset	44
A Participative Process: Focus Groups	46

A Strengths Based Approach	49
Odds Ratio testing	51
2.2 Crossing Over	52
Straddling Epistemic Disjuncture and Making Leaps of Faith	52
2.3 The Qualitative Phase	55
Rationale for Identity Stories and Narrative as a Mode of Analysis	56
The Interview Process: Creating Shared Spaces for Identity Stories	61
The Dynamics of Co-constructed Identity Stories	65
Process of Analysis	72
2.4 My Own Positioning: Who the Hell Are You?	75
CHAPTER 3	83
Identity, Acceptance and Belonging.....	83
Introduction.....	83
The Quantitative Results	84
The Role of Socio-Economic Status	84
The Role of Churchgoing and Spirituality	85
The Role of Speaking Your Own Pasifika Language	87
The Role of Ethnic Pride and Values	88
The Role of Acceptance by others	88
Crossing from Quant to Qual: A Bridge over Troubled Waters	89
A Focus on Culture and Ethnicity, Identities and Belonging	93
A Focus on Culture.....	93
A Focus on Ethnicity	95
Identity / Identities and Identification: “Who do we think we are?”	97

A Focus on Identity and Belonging.....	98
Conclusion	99
CHAPTER 4	101
Literature Review	101
Introduction.....	101
PART 1: Identity-in-relation: Pasifika Styles	103
PART 2: Acculturation and Assimilation.....	111
Acculturation and the Pasifika literature.....	118
PART 3: Diaspora	126
Diaspora, Hybridity and Third Spaces in the Pasifika Literature:	133
Conclusion	140
CHAPTER 5	143
The Conceptual Narrative	143
Introduction.....	143
Doing Theory: The problems with cultural cartography	144
Moving Beyond the Binaries	146
Deconstructing What is Privileged as Pasifika	148
Relational Identities: The Constitutive Other	154
Negotiated Space.....	157
Social Spaces and Symbolic Struggle	163
Bourdieu, Social Space and Capital	164
Diasporic Social Spaces.....	165
A Definition of Polycultural Capital	167
Manulua Aesthetic	170

Conclusion	173
CHAPTER 6	175
Negotiating Identities in Relation to the Palangi Other	175
Introduction.....	175
The Relational Context.....	176
“A Dream Deferred?” Precarious Positions.....	178
Identity Stories.....	180
Where Are You From? What’s In You?	180
Other People’s Stories: Racialised Discourse	184
Finding Voice	190
Counter-performance and Counter-narratives.....	195
A Changing Story.....	198
Conclusion	204
CHAPTER 7	206
Negotiating Identities in Relation to Significant Others	206
Introduction.....	206
No hea koe? Negotiating Identity in Relation to Maori.....	208
The Relational Context.....	208
Identity Stories.....	211
Negotiating Identity in Relation to Pasifika Homeland Others.....	218
The Relational Context.....	219
Identity Stories.....	220
Conclusion	234
CHAPTER 8	236

Negotiating Identities in Relation to the First Generation	236
Introduction.....	236
The Relational Context.....	237
Identity Stories.....	238
The Contested Terrain of Fa’aSamoa.....	240
Negotiating Voice without Language	248
Symbolic Struggle	252
Negotiating Belonging and Recognition from Beyond the Limits.....	257
Conclusion	262
CHAPTER 9	265
Synthesis.....	265
Introduction.....	265
Multiplicity	266
Strategic Identities.....	267
Power and Polycultural Capital.....	270
Negotiation.....	274
Many Patterns of Possibility	278
Dialogic Distance	279
Bridging.....	280
Negotiating Turf.....	281
Critical Relationality: Culture Brokers Changing the Story	283
Strategic Ignorance and Strategic Hybridity	288
Facilitating Noa and the Manulua Aesthetic	289
Conclusion	293

CHAPTER 10:	295
Reflections, Limitations, Recommendations	295
Negotiating Spaces Between	295
Polycultural Capital.....	297
Cultural Cartography.....	298
Research limitations and recommendations	299
References	303
Glossary	339
Appendix One:.....	344
Interview Schedule.....	344
Appendix Two:	348
Further Quantitative Information and Tables.....	348
Further information about median variables selected from the Youth2000 Survey.....	348
Further information about outcome variables selected from the Youth2000 Survey.....	349
Summary of Pacific and NZ European comparisons across nine outcome variables	352
Summary of Relationships between Demographic Variables and Median Variables for Pacific students	354
Summary of Significant Median Associations (Odds ratio testing results)	361
Appendix Three:	368
Ethics Information.....	368
Participant Information Sheet	368
Participant Consent Form	373

Non Disclosure Agreement for Focus Group Participants	375
Non Disclosure Agreement for Transcriber	376
Ethics Approval (MUHEC)	377

CHAPTER 1

Introduction: Negotiating Space for “who we are”

A place to stand

it was on the marae atea
in the blue-veined moonlight
somewhere near Halcolm
I learned
turangawaewae

i felt the earth
beneath me tremor

a wiri
a wero
a haka

it was
named
known
sure of itself
connected
to awa
maunga
iwi

rich red mud
shuddering

haemoglobin
in the soil

transforming
landscape entire
into urupa

i
could not
stand upright
there

‘ka mate ka mate’
beating eardrum
in the earth

enter
Oceania
her blue body
promising
distant shores

a blue taupou

follow that star

seek
unfamiliar
constellations

speak alien tongues

follow the bloodlines
to the terra incognita
of your own body

flat-footed
i began to swim

(Mila, 2008, p. 10-11)

Who am I? Shifting Standpoint(s) / Sinking Sand

Malo e lelei, Talova lava, Kia orana, Fakalofa lahi atu, Ni sa bula vinaka, Namaste, Taloha ni, Talofa, Tena koutou, tena koutou, kia ora hui hui mai ano tatou katoa.

When I introduce myself in formal contexts in public, this is often my greeting of choice. It is deliberately not in English. The string of greetings represents the linguistic diversity of the ethnic groups that comprise ‘what constitutes Pasifika’ within Aotearoa, New Zealand. The list of greetings begins with the Pacific ethnic group I predominantly identify with (Tongan) and then it follows a demographically democratic pathway. I choose to include the greeting of “Namaste” to be inclusive of the Indo-Fijian presence in the Pacific region. The closing in te reo Maori deliberately grounds the greeting in the language of those who are indigenous to Aotearoa. Its inclusion not only acknowledges and respects their position as tangata whenua or indigenous to this region, but it alludes also to the whakapapa and familial ties between Polynesians and across Oceania.

You could say that this is window dressing perhaps. It is cultural and identity politics. Yes, all of this is political. Deliberate, strategic, and it provides an allusion towards

(rather than the less sympathetic descriptor “illusory”) cultural diversity and a basic indicator of polycultural¹ capital. I make the best of what I have.

Yet in the end my tongue is English. All I have is fragments of Pacific languages. Yet these fragments are ‘culturally legible’ and they are ‘recognised’ (see Butler, 1995). As tokenistic as the fragments may be, in English language dominated environments, these greetings do create a space, they create space for who I am about to be, which is something that is slightly beyond and outside the constraints of the English language even though this is my mother tongue.

I am the daughter of a Tongan father and migrant to Aotearoa, Semisi Ulu’ave Mila (Maka) and a Pakeha² / Palangi³ settler woman (with ancestral links to Samoa) Lynda May Hunt. My father made a choice not to teach the Tongan language to me or my sister, believing strongly in the “alchemy of English” (Kachru, 1995, p. 295) and thus my mother tongue was exactly that, the language of my Mother.

I will not deny the alchemy of English. Part of its power allows me to write this thesis, using language that describes and articulates with dignity and clarity, the complex cultural and social realities, challenges and opportunities facing the second generation Pasifika population in Aotearoa. Having said that, I am disappointed that I do not speak Tongan more fluently; despite living in Tonga for months on end trying to learn the language, I know only the most basic conversational phrases.

As I have a Tongan Father, and a Palangi / Pakeha Mother, this positions me as both Tongan and Palangi and to some degree neither fully or ‘properly’ Tongan nor Palangi. To be half, to be both, to be less than one and more than one, disrupts the notion of a singular ‘standpoint’ or the notion that inclusion in one category requires exclusion from the other.

My subject position itself disrupts the binary between self and other, Pasifika and Palangi, native and coloniser, insider and outsider. I hold all of this within my body.

¹ The term polycultural (capital) will be defined later in the thesis. It draws from Kelley’s (2003) use of the word and Bourdieu’s (2007) concept of capital.

² Pakeha: refers to people of European descent or things ‘Western’, specifically the white settler society in New Zealand. (Maori)

³ Palangi: refers to people of European descent or things ‘Western’. It translates as ‘sky breakers’ (those that broke the sky with their boats, referencing the first explorers to arrive in the Pacific and be seen on the horizon). (Tonga) Note: Palangi, the Tongan spelling is used unless I am referring to a Samoan participant and then the Samoan spelling of Palagi is used.

Partly, this is because of my precarious and unsettling positioning on the edge or in-between (see Webber, 2008). As a “half-caste”, I am the embodiment of the (much rejected⁴ term) “hybrid”: to playfully quote Bakhtin, (1981) I am the embodied outcome of that pregnant potential.

As a “half-caste”, so woefully named, I am proof that not only can the binary between Pacific and Palangi be disrupted, but actually these polarities have come into contact before and rather dramatically; as Young (1995) points out, they had sex. The difficulty of finding a singular and ‘whole’ (rather than halved) subject position or a straightforward standpoint - a space which I can legitimately claim as a place to speak from - and the problem of *turangawaewae* (or place to stand) is almost a defining characteristic of my subject positioning. As Lee (1995, p. 389, 400) writes:

If we live in a space which is radically in question for us, that makes our barest speaking a problem to itself. For voice does issue from a civil space. And alienation in that space will enter and undercut our writing, make it recoil upon itself, become a problem to itself...

Perhaps our job was to not to fake a space of our own and write it up, but rather to find words for our space-lessness. Perhaps that was home.

This feeling of “space-lessness” resonates strongly with me, as perhaps it does for many who cannot so easily source “roots” because of the migratory “routes” of their forebears (see Diaz and Kauanui, 2001). Yet also traced to this sense of ambivalent space and that elusive place ‘to stand’ is what Winduo (2000) describes as the “double cartographic movement” evident in colonising projects of mapping and taking over territory. Winduo (2000) argues that the colonial project of cartography involves a double movement of erasure followed by over-inscription. This necessarily erases what was there before (framing it as empty and undiscovered) and then over-inscribes this with new markings, new text, new discourse, new geopolitical and cultural stories (see Winduo, 2000, who cites Ryan, in the development of this idea).

In many ways, for those of us who are far from traditional roots, and via routes, are raised in diasporic spaces, attempting to tell our stories (of trying to figure out who we are) forces us to reckon with not having a legitimate place from which to stand and speak from: nor a taken-for-granted subject position. We must also deal with the

⁴ See Wendt (1999), Anae (1998), or Stevenson (2008), who reject hybridity in a Pacific cultural context. Further detailed discussion of hybridity is in Chapter 5.

textual conditions of erasure and over-inscription wrought not only by colonisation but by migration. The migration story is another powerful narrative shaping the contemporary dynamics of who we are. Many of these issues are evoked in the following poem written by Tafea Polamalu.

Diasporic Dream: Letter to Grandfather

I am the end product of opportunity
the final result of your foresight
I am what they call
“second-generation US Samoan”
that generation who has
never been to Sāmoa
I am first-world
fully-developed
fully-civilized
I am born and
raised among them
melted into them
fluent in their language and ways
I am Educated,
Modernized,
American
I am the quintessential neo Samoan
a walking wealth of Western knowledge
I know my pledge of allegiance
my presidents
all fifty state capitals
I can solve quadratic equations
formulate a thesis
type over 60 words per minute
dissect a frog and identify all of the vital organs
And discuss the theory of continental drift
I can tell you the difference between
Polynesia, Micronesia, Melanesia
I am well versed in the Lapita theory
I know all about Sāmoa
population, climate, geography
average life expectancy
I am the vision
the progress
a masterpiece of assimilation
The world is at my finger tips
I am the future
woven of fear and survival
the fully evolved immigrant
the diasporic dream
I have forgotten what is useless
and learned what is important
I am what eventually becomes of

those who left,
not native like you
but settler like them,
but not one of them
nor one of you
I am lodged between worlds in
the war zone where mine fields and
razor wire connect cultures
I wish I would have known you
I would like to show you this place,
but I do not remember you
or Samoa
or speak your language
or know your ways
I do not remember why I am here
I will never return

By Tafea Polamalu (2010, p. 62-63)

In many ways, this poem encapsulates the issues discussed in this thesis: the ambiguities, the tensions, the privilege, the loss. The most poignant lines in the poem, for me, are: "I have forgotten what is useless and learned what is important". These lines haunt and taunt. I am vested in this work, in this research, in this poem, in a way that belies a detached, scholarly perspective. Teresia Teaiwa writes that: "Pacific studies is not only an academic field; it is an especially intimate field that people enter, often with highly personalized stakes" (Teaiwa, 2001, p. 352).

There is no doubt that my own stakes are high, both personally and professionally. In many ways the questions that I ask in this thesis are the most significant questions of my own life story and experience. "Who am I?" which is closely shadowed by the more troubling question: "Who are *we*?" How do I make sense of myself? Where am I from? How am I the same? How am I different? How do I operate culturally? Where am I from? And again: who are *we* and where are we?

These are large, looming and life-defining questions. I believe that the answers are not worth trading for the loss of the ability to keep on questioning. Even open ended answers are not an adequate trade for the closed end of an important line of interrogation.

After reading Tafea Polemalu's poem I "googled" him and sent an email, identifying myself and thanking him for the poem. I asked permission to use it at the beginning of the thesis. It is indicative of the nature of the diasporic Pacific community (both imagined and virtual) and my positioning within it, that despite this being my first

contact with Tafea, he already knew who I was. He responded by email that he had read my poetry and described himself as ‘a diasporic "afakasi" mutant’. Immediately, in this diasporic “afakasi” (or “hafa kasi” in my case, to use the Tongan equivalent) mutant solidarity, we connected.

At the outset I acknowledge my positioning as an insider, with highly personal stakes, but also with recognisability as an outspoken and highly visible member of the diasporic Pasifika community. I have two books of poetry published. I have a regular Op-Ed column in a leading New Zealand newspaper. I have written journal articles, spoken at conferences, featured in public debates, and am sought regularly for my opinion on radio. I am an active, vocal and visible member of the second-gen Pasifika community and this has affected my research, what was shared with me, how it was shared, who was willing to talk to me and what they were willing to say. In the methodology section, I will further unpack the dynamics of interviews and recognise that there were both advantages to, and limits upon, my personal positioning.

The poems in my second published collection, “A Well Written Body”, were written while I was researching this thesis. I will quote them widely throughout the thesis, as they contain many poetic responses to the academic work I was engaged in.

The lines in Tafea Polumalu’s poem: “I would like to show you this place” invokes the heart-work of this thesis. Yes, there are intellectual and academic aims: to draw from empirical, socio-historical and theoretical knowledge, as well as from the lived experiences and stories of my peers, in order to better try to understand “who we are” and this place or space in which we operate and within which, we identify. In some ways it feels like an in-between space, what Gupta and Ferguson (1992, p. 18) refer to as “marginal zones, thin slivers of land between stable places”. But I am also clear, that it must be more than just a space of marginality. Part of the methodology of this research involved consulting my peers, bringing a group together to make sense of the data generated within the Youth2000 Survey about Pacific young people. Group members were adamant that my research should not be focused on mining deficit; that despite the many negative statistics, the research should focus on strengths; not as a whitewash but rather as a deliberate positioning, a conscious focus and a bottom line.

Therefore, this thesis aims to explore in a strengths-based way, what it means to “come of age” as Pasifika peoples in Aotearoa⁵ / New Zealand to better understand the conditions in which they /we construct identities and operate culturally. In difficult textual conditions, spaces are claimed for the listening, recording and telling of identity stories. “Not simply as narrative forms, but as tales which have their time” emphasising “the historical production of stories and the communities within which they are generated and to which they subsequently return” (Plummer 1995, p. 179).

Identity stories feature throughout the qualitative sections of this thesis. Plummer (1995, p. 161) writes that “with every new story, there is a rival old one”. There is an exploration of the competing stories about “who we are” (supposed to be). We are the children of migrants from Pacific nations, islands and territories. I make the distinction that while we may be considered indigenous to the Pacific region or Oceania, we are not indigenous to Aotearoa.

The key research questions are as follows: What are the ways we identify as members of Pasifika ethnic groups and how do we operate culturally in Aotearoa? Does culture count? Is it a determinant of health and wellbeing? What can we learn from a small sample of high achieving second-gen Pasifika peoples about how they identify and operate culturally?

Immediately, these questions must be subjected to further scrutiny. Not only the tangle of terminology which needs to be broken down into more manageable pieces, but also and perhaps more troubling, the use of the word “we”. Not because it positions me, the author, as a self-proclaimed “insider”, but rather because the use of the term “we” also evokes the sense of a shared story, a potentially singular response to questions that cut across many diverse and possibly irreconcilable lived experiences.

This presupposes the possibility of a unified, collective answer, written and spoken in one authoritative voice, which is problematic. Not only is there the questionable authority of my own personal voice, but also any suggestion that there might be a singular adequate response to collective questions of “who are we” and “how do we operate culturally?”

The German poet Rainer Maria Rilke (1984, p. 34) famously once said that we must “try to love the *questions themselves*”. Rilke (1984) advocated in the same breath that we

⁵ The indigenous term Aotearoa is used in this thesis to refer to New Zealand.

must always hold on to the “difficult”. Holding on to complexity, in preference to the gloss of simpler, easier answers, is consistent with the way Southwick (2001) approached understanding the challenges faced by Pasifika peoples negotiating Pakeha institutions in Aotearoa. She steadfastly refused to resolve the complexity, arguing that what is important is not the resolution, but rather the opening or space that deconstruction and critical analysis of such complexity creates (Southwick, 2001).

This thesis has an extended focus on space and spatiality as model and metaphor, and an emphasis on negotiating the many openings Southwick (2001) refers to, but it also focuses on the politics of the “we”. Who do we mean by “we”? Who is “in”? Who is “out”? Who is included and who is excluded? Who is recognised and who is deliberately misrecognised? “We” and the power to claim it; the ability to name it; the capacity to feel acceptance and experience belonging: ultimately, the problems and politics of ‘who we are’ are powerful themes to emerge from the research.

This introductory chapter began, necessarily, with a focus on ‘who I am’; recognizing the centrality of my subject positioning and the way this impacts upon and influences the research. The next section of the introduction provides further clarity about the terminology used in the thesis. After wrangling with the tangle of terminology, there is a brief introduction to the methodology. This is followed by information about the overall structure of the thesis which integrates the main arguments advanced.

Finally, I freely acknowledge that, by asking questions about how we are operating and identifying culturally, I am asking questions which can never be adequately answered. I am asking questions which must always remain open for as long as we are alive, breathing and evolving, and beyond. For “who we are” is a cyclic series of questions and answers passed among us, tied to the intergenerational politics of cultural reproduction. The stories that we tell about ourselves, who we are, where we are and which stories about us are recognized, listened to, and mandated, are political and personal, individual and collective, social and cultural. They are the stories of our lives (see Plummer, 2005). The identity stories told here are deliberately positioned as counter-narratives, countering erasure, countering over-inscription, and narrating within the textual conditions of the double cartographic movement, recognizing that there are new and other forces of erasure and over-inscription at play, as well as the continuing legacies of colonization and migration.

A Tangle of Terminology: Who do we mean?

Pasifika: A Pan-Pacific Approach

The 2006 New Zealand Census recorded that 265,974 individuals identified with Pasifika ethnic groups⁶, constituting 6.9 percent of the total population (Statistics New Zealand 2008, p. 5). The largest Pacific ethnic groups are (in order of size): Samoan (131,103), Cook Islands Maori (58,011), Tongan (50,478), Niue (22,476), Fijian (9,864), Tokelau (6,822) and Tuvalu (2,625) (Statistics New Zealand, 2007). The nature of Pasifika ethnic groups residing in New Zealand tends to reflect historical and colonial relationships that New Zealand has had in the Pacific region (see Gershon, 2007). The term Pasifika also tends to be inclusive of Vanuatu, New Caledonia, Tahiti, Hawai'i, Palau, Solomon Islands, Bougainville, Papua New Guinea and other Pacific populations who reside in smaller numbers in Aotearoa.

As Albert Wendt once famously joked, there is no such thing as a Pacific Islander until one arrives at Auckland airport. He suggested that prior to arriving in Aotearoa, such a label made little sense; there were only Samoans, Tongans and so on. Of course, the unified term "The Pacific Way" had already been invoked in an international context by Ratu Sir Kamisese Mara in 1970 (Va'ai, 1999, p. 32). Crocombe later attempted to define this pan-Pacific concept as "Organic - a 'living, growing field of meaning' - open to change, modification and amendment... the concept was fluid - as having 'soul - with room to manoeuvre'" (Crocombe 1975 cited Samu 2007, p. 11).

At best, pan-Pacific terms encapsulate both unity and diversity. At worst they homogenise and gloss over cultural, linguistic and experiential diversity in a manner that captures all, but relates to none. Wendt asserts:

There are many Pacific Ways... What we want to encourage is the variety of voices, ways of seeing the Pacific. I don't encourage one Pacific Way, because there are hundreds of them - there were hundreds of ways - even pre-European (cited Va'ai, 1999, p. 338).

In an Aotearoa context, the official pan-Pacific term used by the Ministry of Pacific Island Affairs is 'Pacific peoples' which is necessarily pluralised in order to capture the range of Pacific nation states and territories that sit beneath this 'umbrella term'. The

⁶ This figure does not include non-permanent residents.

Ministry of Pacific Island Affairs (2006, p. 2) issued the following statement about terminology:

Terms used to describe peoples living in New Zealand who have migrated from the Pacific Islands or who identify with the Pacific Islands because of their ancestry or heritage, vary considerably (e.g. Pacific Island, Pacific Nations person, Polynesian, Pacific Islander etc). There is no officially sanctioned term to describe this group of peoples. However, the Ministry of Pacific Island Affairs uses the term “Pacific peoples” to describe this group. The term “Pacific peoples” does not refer to a single ethnicity, nationality or culture. The term is one of convenience used to encompass a diverse range of peoples from the South Pacific region.

In contrast, the Ministry of Education (2007) choose the word ‘Pasifika’ as its preferred ‘term of convenience’. Pasifika is a transliteration of the word Pacific which has developed in a localised Aotearoa context, its lack of depth and meaning has been criticised (see Samu, 2007). Stevenson (2004, p. 31) made the following observations about the term Pasifika:

The term ‘Pasifika’, coined by New Zealand-born Pacific Islanders, reflects a lived urban reality... Pasifika speaks to the urban reality of islanders and their attempts to balance notions of identity and loss, migration and place, youth and age, tradition and change.

Many other terms are used to describe the Pacific ethnic group, including: Pacific Islanders, Pacific people⁷ (Macpherson, 2004a), Pacificans, PI’s (Fairbairn-Dunlop and Makisi, 2003), Pasifiki (Mafile’o, 2005), and, increasingly there is a call to return to indigenous languages and use terms such as Tangata o te Moana Nui (Macpherson, 2001), Moana (Ka’ili, 2008) Moanaakea (Maielua, 2010).

There is also a preference expressed for purely ethnic-specific identifications and terminology, such as Samoan or Tongan: Anae (1998, p. 110) suggests that pan-ethnic identities are “inevitable” and are a “youth phenomenon but that on reaching maturity, this self-identity will change” to ethnic-specific identities. Holt (1999) similarly concludes that pan-Pacific identities are something that one grows out of. Borell (2005, p. 203) rejects this kind of patronising approach, arguing, in the case of Maori and Polynesian (or “Nesian”) young people that the way they identify is often “sophisticated in terms of discursive and narrative tools employed to create positive

⁷ Macpherson (2004) writes about the shift in terminology from Pacific Islanders to Pacific people (singular).

identity markers while also reflecting a wider societal context of marginality". Mok (2000, p. 96) argues that such a pan-Pasifika identity is: "A primarily associative identity that does not require ethnic homogenisation". Her research shows that among New Zealand-born youth, particularly those who were socio-economically depressed, pan-Pacific identities were experienced as particularly meaningful (Mok, 2000, p. 17).

Newer research has shown that even ethnic-specific designations, such as Samoan, may not be seen as flexible enough to name and contain the growing diversity that is held within it: the term "Kamoan" has been coined to describe a Kiwi Samoan identity (Higgins and Leleisi'uao, 2010) and "Hamo" is another designation deployed by rappers such as King Kapisi and Dei Hamo.

Mok (2000) argues that pan-Pacific identities are held pragmatically and politically strategically alongside ethnic-specific identities and that these mutually co-exist without necessarily being positioned as competing identities. It is important to note that the tensions between ethnic-specific and pan-Pacific approaches cannot be resolved adequately in this thesis. However, a pan-Pacific approach has been nominated, partly in the spirit of Mok's (2000) assertion that these identifications co-exist and do not have to be framed as mutually exclusive or in competition.

Given that the research is pan-Pacific in orientation, the term Pasifika is used in this thesis in preference over many other possibilities, on the basis that it is a term that has developed within a localised Aotearoa context. As Boyce Davies (1994, p.5) points out, the terms we use to name ourselves (and there are many: Pacific peoples, Pasifika, Pacificans, Moana people, Tongans, Kiwis, Islanders, Samoan, Hamo, Cook Islanders, Cook Islands, Cookies, Rarotongan, Pacific Islanders, Fijians, Oceanians, Niuean, Niue, 'afa kasi, New Zealand-born, FOBS, Pasifiki, Polynesian, P.I.'s, Poly, New Zealanders,) "each represents an original misnaming and the simultaneous constant striving of the dispossessed for full representation".

All these terms are under strain and may be problematic for different reasons. 'Polynesian' in particular is shadowed by an original misnaming, a false division based on imagined colonially perceived differences between Melanesia, Micronesia and

Polynesia. This has become increasingly resisted by scholars⁸ of Oceania as unnecessarily divisive, colonial and derogatory (see Gegeo, 2001). Yet, at the same time, the Pacific population resident in New Zealand is considered to be 94% Polynesian (personal communication, Principal Research Analyst, Ministry of Pacific Affairs). This means that what is constituted and imagined as Pasifika carries the weight of Polynesian (and Samoan as the largest ethnic group) dominance. As Pulu Brown (2007, p. 5) writes, “As a consequence of demographic privilege, the concept of Pacific Peoples in New Zealand is bound to an aesthetic crafted by the Samoan-Polynesian living in Auckland story”. The translation of ‘Pacific’ into a Polynesian transliteration in some ways reflects this dominance and also intra-Pacific dominance and politics. For example, Pasifiki, is favoured by Mafile’o (2005) because it is the Tongan transliteration and she was advised by Tongans to use this term (although this was in the case of Tongan ethnic-specific research). There is community debate about the spelling of Pasifika, and in some quarters a preference for Pasefika. For me, the term Pasifika carries all of these tensions, echoes and politics which is partly why I choose to use it. Boyce Davies (1994) suggests that names both fit and don’t fit, that they carry the weight of earlier echoes and inscriptions, can only be used provisionally, and must always be subject to interrogation. One of the reasons why ‘Pasifika’ appealed as a preferred term for this thesis, was because it has a stronger echo of the social imaginary and the way we imagine ourselves as a unified ethnic group here in Aotearoa.

Pasifika: New Zealand-born or Second Generation?

Thus far an effort has been made to draw attention to the fact that the Pasifika population in New Zealand is not a singular, homogenous entity but contains much diversity (see Macpherson, 1996, Anae et al., 2001, Health Research Council of New Zealand, 2004). As Anae et al., (2001, p. 7) argue:

There is no generic ‘Pacific community’ but rather Pacific peoples who align themselves variously, and at different times, along ethnic, geographic, church, family, school, age/gender based, youth/elders, island born/NZ born, occupational lines or a mix of these.

⁸ As Albert Wendt writes, “We all belong to the Moananui-a-Kiwa, the Pacific Ocean, which encompasses Polynesia/Melanesia/Micronesia; its atolls and volcanic islands inhabited by peoples who possess a cultural diversity more varied than other regions in the world” (1991, p. 182).

While there are many ways to slice the pan-Pasifika cake, the focus of this research is on those Pasifika people who were born and/or raised in Aotearoa. What does it mean to be New Zealand-born?

The term 'second generation' is deployed in the international literature to refer to the children of migrants⁹ (Portes and Rumbaut, 2001, Waldinger et al. 2007). However, this term is rarely used in an Aotearoa context and the designation New Zealand-born (hereafter, NZ-born) is commonly used. Such a term, Macpherson (2001, p. 75) argues, recognises:

Pacific heritage and local New Zealand upbringing... creating an identity shared with other Pacific young people and which was built around their experiences in playgrounds, schools and malls of urban New Zealand.

I have chosen the term "second generation" to refer to the subjects of my research even though it is rarely used within an Aotearoa context or by the population itself. In part, its emptiness appealed. I opted to use it (or the abbreviated second-gen) largely because of the ambivalence felt by the research participants about the term NZ-born. Although many of them used this term in our conversations, often quite self-consciously, it was clear that NZ-born was loaded with baggage, tension and problems. NZ-born as a term has been explicitly rejected by some researchers (Tupuola, 1998) and embraced by others (Anae, 1998). While it has been a shared term, in that all know what it means, it cannot be described as a preferred term. It felt wrong to use a label that so many participants struggled with, so it was not adopted.

In addition, the participants interviewed were second generation, not third or fourth. Finally, the term second generation is used widely in the international literature. The shift of emphasis from the NZ-born Pasifika as an ethnic minority within Aotearoa, to a second-gen Pasifika population (and cultural imaginary) explicitly open up a realm of international second generation peers. And it potentially heightens the sense that this is a diasporic population connected to the experiences of other "second generation" Pacific populations and migrant populations located elsewhere in the world. On a personal level, I think of the connection established so easily and warmly between myself and the poet Tafea Polumalu (author of *Diasporic Dream*). Although he is a

⁹ This term tends to be inclusive of native-born children of foreign migrants, as well as foreign-born children of migrants who were very young (e.g., pre-adolescent) at time of migration (Portes and Rumbaut 2001, p.23).

Samoan “afa kasi” and was raised in the United States and I am a Tongan “hafa kasi” raised in New Zealand, the overlap in experiences, challenges, issues and emotions is immediately apparent.

Introduction to the Methodology

Strengths-Based Approach

“To the real question, how does it feel to be a problem? I answer seldom a word.”
(W.E.B. DuBois 1903, cited in Zuckerman 2004, p.5)

In much of the international scholarship, the second generation has been associated with dismal prospects, adversarial outlooks, and permanent poverty traps in environments with declining economic opportunities (Gans, 1992, Perlmann and Waldinger, 1996). International theorists examining native born children of migrants have coined the terms “second generation decline” (Gans, 1992) and “second generation revolt” (Perlmann and Waldinger, 1996).

It was decided that a “strengths-based” approach would be taken in this research; the project sought to learn from achievement and success rather than failure. When a strengths-based approach is applied to youth, it tends to emphasize the way young people are actors, trying their best with the resources they have to negotiate difficult environments and stresses (Ministry of Youth Development, 2002).

This is consistent with a “positive deviance” approach which recognises that solutions to problems already exist within communities, and the aim is to identify potentially transferable behaviours and enabling factors which are useful (Marsh et al., 2004). Nominating a positive deviance approach had implications for both the quantitative and qualitative components of the research. It required focusing upon, and learning more about, the existing strengths of Pacific peoples in both data sources. For example, in the qualitative component a commitment to a strengths-based and positive deviance approach meant choosing to interview a sample of successful, second generation Pasifika professionals about their identities and cultural orientations.

This approach contrasts sharply with the body of scholarship which focuses on Pasifika peoples in Aotearoa in a context of criminality (Suaali’i-Sauni, 2006), addiction (Gray and Nosa, 2009, Nosa, 2005, Lima, 2004) or suicidal tendencies (see Samu, 2003, Tiatia, 2003). In the quantitative component it meant analysing a Pacific dataset to

identify factors associated with existing advantage, rather than focusing on the disparities or reasons for gaps between the performance of Pacific and New Zealand European students.

A Mixed-Methods Approach

The research followed a sequential mixed model design: “whereby the second phase of the study emerges as a result of, or in response to, the findings of the first phase” (Tashakkori and Teddlie, 2003, p. 687). The first quantitative phase of the research involved analysing the Pacific sample of the Youth2000 Survey, New Zealand’s first national secondary school student health and wellbeing survey. This contained a valuable cross-sectional snapshot of High School students across New Zealand (see Adolescent Health Research Group, 2003, for more detailed information and the methodology section). I began the first phase by working with the Youth2000 team to conduct a broad analysis of the Pacific students with ethnic comparisons made with NZ European students and ethnic-specific reports of Pacific students (see Mila-Schaaf et al. 2008). These results were generated as part of a large research team.

The findings were then shared with a focus group of twenty Pasifika peoples, selected using the networks of the Ministry of Pacific Island Affairs, the emerging Pacific leaders network and my own Pacific community network. They were chosen from a range of Pacific ethnicities, regions, and professions, and worked in a range of fields, including: public service, journalism, education, health, law, youth work, academia, research, accounting and finance. Many had demonstrated a passion for Pasifika youth and were advocates for the next generation of Pasifika peoples.

This group convened twice and advised on the focus and nature of further analysis. Predominantly second-gen members discussed what the data meant to them, how they made sense of it, and what ought to be the focus of the qualitative research component. In brief, they recommended a positive deviance approach, that is, an effort to analyse advantage rather than mine ‘deficit’. This will be further discussed in the methodology section.

On this advice, the quantitative data was then re-analysed focusing only on the Pasifika sample of the Youth2000 Survey. The results of this analysis eventually became Chapter Three of the thesis. Multiple logistic regressions were used to test for statistical relationships between cultural and socio-economic variables with educational or health outcomes or profiles. Because of the ‘single point in time’

manner of cross-sectional surveys, this research cannot determine causality. Rather, it seeks 'proof of' association between variables.

Odds ratio [OR] statistical tests were conducted using SAS (version 9.1) software. The focus of this testing was the cultural variables and to what extent they could be proved to have associations with outcome variables, rather than the health or educational outcomes themselves. In many ways what was ultimately put to the test, was whether culture and identity variables could be demonstrated to operate statistically as a determinant of health, education and wellbeing for a diasporic Pasifika youth population.

While it has been well established that culture is an important determinant of health and wellbeing (National Health Committee, 1998), there is very little research available specific to Pasifika peoples in Aotearoa. The significant associations established in the odds ratio testing were incorporated into the individual interview schedule.

Interviews were conducted with fourteen members of the focus groups convened using the networks of the Ministry of Pacific Island Affairs and my own community networks. This was consistent with the positive deviance approach which involves identifying role models "who use uncommon, but demonstrably successful, strategies to tackle common problems." (Berggren and Wray, 2002, p. 1178)

The interviews were characterised by open-ended questions with prompts. They were face-to-face interviews were conducted consistent with a talanoa approach: "A talanoa approach is a traditional Pacific reciprocating interaction, which is driven by common interest, regard for respectfulness and are conducted mainly face to face" (Morrison and Vaoleti, 2008, p. 11). The information shared in these interviews was woven into Chapters Six, Seven, Eight and Nine of the thesis. Thirty short stories told by fourteen participants are reproduced in full throughout the text. More information about the interviews and the mode of analysis is provided in the methodology section.

The transition between the quantitative and qualitative stages of research was not as smooth as anticipated, because the second set of interviews was not with a high school population, but with Pasifika professionals in their twenties, thirties and early forties. This was a challenge. However, the main difficulty was the jarring of paradigms, whereby the two different components of the research were "rooted in distinct paradigms... mixed throughout a single research project" (Teddlie and Tashakkori, 2003, p. 11).

The quantitative component of the thesis was firmly rooted in a post-positivist (Rocco et al., 2003) health research paradigm (HRC, 2008) where it is assumed that a scientifically generated evidence-base (Oxman et al., 2007) can provide “politically neutral” valid, reliable and proven “solutions” to “burdensome health problems” (Lavis et al., 2004, p. 1616). The quantitative analysis provided “single figure” endpoints (Neylan, 2008) which related to Pasifika peoples constructed as a “demographic” (Flores, 2003) but there was much which could not be explained. For example, why did some Pasifika people feel accepted and not others? What was the influence of social and cultural conditions?

The second qualitative phase of the research involved face-to-face interviews in a “symbolic interactionist” and “social constructionist” paradigm (De Andrade, 2000). It focused on identity stories (Plummer, 1995) as “socially situated ontological narratives” (Phibbs, 2008) co-constructed in the relational space between interviewer and participant.

In this paradigm, it is argued that all knowledge and all identities are socially constructed in the context of human interaction (Somers, 1994). Identities are performative (Butler, 1988) and relationally dependent, are subject to the burden of recognition (Butler, 1995) and are constructed in relations of power.

With regard to Pasifika peoples, we are led to believe that identity stories were once simple, straightforward affairs, determined by genealogy, gender, family, village and “roots” (Howard, 1990). Via migration and relocation, we enter into new relationships where to adopt the words of Said (2001, p. 457) “relationships are not inherited, but created.” I have argued that second-generation Pasifika peoples construct their identities in relation to many others, on both an individual and collective level. I find Clifford’s (1988, p. 344) description of identities as “a nexus of relations and transactions of actively engaging subjects” particularly useful.

Therefore, in a diasporic context in Aotearoa, it is argued that Pasifika second generation identity stories, as “stories of our lives” take on a multidimensional, polyglot quality of heteroglossia (Allen, 2000) as they are performed for multiple audiences. The local, cross-cultural, national and transnational relational spaces possible via migration, diaspora, and relocation, makes the process of identification and recognition a much more complex experience of symbolic interactions. The concept of *va* – the space of relating – has been useful for thinking about how these

relationships are not only characterised by absorption or resistance to the other. It is described by Refiti (2010, p. 1) in the following way:

This is a new kind of *va* relationship that tries to make new relations from tensions between things once based on village or *nuu* local polity to what is now a global urban and cosmopolitan shared space.

It is argued that identities are produced in relational spaces which are inter-dependent, co-constructed, mediated and negotiated in multiple ways.

Structure of the Thesis

The thesis is divided into ten chapters. Following the introduction, Chapter Two provides detailed information about the strengths-based and sequential mixed-method approach. This is followed by Chapter Three which provides a summary of the quantitative findings, discussion about the implications of these findings for the qualitative research and the difficulties with crossing over between paradigms. The methodological dilemma of drawing productively and working effectively across conflicting epistemic paradigms sets the scene for both the theoretical framing and the key findings of the research. In Chapter Three, emergent themes of pride in identities, ethnicity, culture, language, values, acceptance and belonging, are discussed.

Chapter Four reviews the different approaches to second generation identities found in the literature, commencing with a review of the way identities have traditionally been constructed in Pasifika societies. It examines the acculturation and assimilation paradigm which has framed a range of understandings about second generation culture and identifications. Diasporic approaches to identity and culture are then reviewed. Concepts of diasporic and double consciousness, hybridity, third spaces and transnational identities are explored. The local literature relevant to Pasifika identities is systematically reviewed.

Chapter Five is the theoretical chapter. This focuses predominantly on space and spatiality. Bhabha's (1990, 1993, 1994, 1996,) concept of third space and Bourdieu's (1985a, 1985b) theory of multidimensional social space, subject to a number of revisions, are drawn upon to frame the social and cultural dynamics in which second generation Pasifika peoples construct identities. It is argued that Pasifika diasporic social spaces in Aotearoa renegotiate and re-territorialise ways of knowing and the social organisation of Pasifika homelands. Akin to Bhabha's (1994) notion of "supplementary spaces", here Pasifika "worlds of meaning somehow hang together"

(Sewell, 2005b, p. 93). It is asserted that the second generation move between culturally divergent spaces, occupy multiple subject positions and therefore, accrue many cross-cultural resources.

The theoretical component of this thesis focuses on movement between culturally differentiated social spaces and the potential of accruing capital associated with those spaces (Bourdieu, 1985b). It develops the concept of polycultural capital. The term polycultural capital has been coined to emphasize the way that what has profit and advantage is culturally distinctive and changes across culturally specific social spaces. It focuses on the negotiation of intercultural spaces (see Smith et al., 2008). There is also focus on Bourdieu's (1985a) ideas about the production of social meaning within these spaces, symbolic struggle and the politics of cultural reproduction.

The second generation, it is argued, construct their identities in relation to multiple communities with conflicting ideas about "who you ought to be" in-relation-to. The following three chapters of the thesis focus on the relational spaces between the second-generation Pasifika participants and their significant others.

Chapter Six deals with negotiating identities in relation to Palangi others. Chapter Seven focuses on negotiating identities in relation to the indigenous population of Aotearoa and in relation to those living in Pasifika homelands. Chapter Eight focuses on negotiating identities in relation to the first generation, the migrant Pasifika generation in Aotearoa.

It is argued that across multiple relational spaces of symbolic interaction and struggle, identities and hierarchies are negotiated and disputed. There is symbolic struggle over the ability to produce and close the open meaning of the social present of each of these relational spaces, and contested representations of self and other.

Chapter Nine is the synthesis chapter. This brings together the key themes from the participants' narratives in the previous chapters. It shows how participants identified with many others across many relational spaces, negotiating both sameness and difference. Identifications were burdened with the pressures of being cross-culturally coherent and legible, and were subject to changing politics of recognition.

It is argued that the more cross-cultural knowledge and capital the second generation acquired, the stronger and more powerful their resource base and negotiating position. The less likely they would be forced to make default choices (Swinburn et al., 2003) and

the more likely they could deploy identity strategies (Butcher, 2004) which suited their purposes.

Polycultural capital is associated with an ability to make contextually responsive strategic cultural choices and identifications. This might involve strategic essentialism (Spivak, 1990), strategic hybridity (Noble et al., 1999), strategic ignorance (Gershon, 2000, 2007) and choices of bridging or maintaining dialogic distance (Gurevitch, 1990). The wider the variety of resources, knowledge, capital and intertextual skills, the more possibilities unfolded. This represented fluidity, but one which required negotiation, labour and the stigmata of effort; learning different ways of knowing; accumulating distinctive forms of capital, and coping with the shifting goalposts of different hierarchies.

It is argued that capital is variously configured and that the ways in which it is symbolically recognised and validated are culturally determined. What is rewarded and privileged in one space, is rejected as inferior or inauthentic in another. These spaces (and second-generation identities within them) were often already over-narrated, over-inscribed with enduring social narratives about Pasifika peoples and “who they were supposed to be”. The identity stories shared by participants referenced symbolic struggle: trying to change the story, challenge stereotypes and exceed the limits of ethnic roles and identities they’d been ascribed. They sought to be symbolically recognised even if their cultural representations were beyond the limits of what was currently constituted and authenticated as truly Pasifika

In this sense, in the opening up of discursive boundaries the pushing of cultural limits, the participants had a role as edgewalkers (Tupuola, 2004) or operated “on the edge” (Teaiwa, 2001). Being on the edge meant facing penalties and the stress of negotiating inclusion, when their own life experiences and behaviours set them outside the limits of what might normally be readily recognised and accepted as Samoan or Tongan or Pasifika or “New Zealanders”. In some ways they could be described as “cultural brokers” who contribute towards shaping “new ethnicities in the New Zealand context” (Spoonley and Fleras, 1999, p. 214).

Manulua¹⁰ is the term deployed to describe the aesthetic of constantly (re)negotiated resolutions across relational spaces. This is a pattern signalling a process of re-arranging cultural connections and difference across spaces. It is argued that cultural complexity was never solved or completely resolved, but constantly negotiated in temporal, time- context- and purpose-specific ways. Manulua or two birds is a stylised motif or kupesi (pattern) which can be traced to the Lapita culture (Stevenson, 2008) and is sometimes referred to as a vane swastika. Manulua represents endless patterns and arrangements of connection and difference across multiple spaces. It represents the ambivalent tension between sameness and difference, connection and distance, union and separation, occurring across many spaces and many different modalities of power and the many different ways this is resolved.

Finally, Chapter Ten of the thesis reflects on the key findings and limitations of the research. It makes recommendations for future research.

Conclusion

This thesis sets out to better understand the way in which the Pasifika second generation who have grown up in Aotearoa are operating culturally and identifying ethnically. It seeks to examine the conditions in which they are constructing identities and it focuses on the relationship between culture, identity, belonging and wellbeing. It is recognised that a large body of scholarship has associated lasting exposure to more than one culture with pathology and marginalisation (see Park, 1928, Furedi, 2002, Waldram, 2004).

The research seeks alternative ways of theorizing and conceptualizing how the Pasifika second generation operates and identifies culturally. There is a deliberate attempt to provide counter-narratives to existing stories, both theoretical and otherwise, especially those telling tales solely of marginalization, cultural loss and corresponding addiction and criminality.

With the choice of a strengths-based and positive deviance approach, the focus is upon the cumulative advantage possible from ongoing exposure to more than one culture (see Benet-Martinez et al., 2002, Benet-Martinez et al., 2006, Hong et al., 2007, Tadmor et al., 2009).

¹⁰ "Manulua is a Polynesian design traced back to the Lapita people. Detailed information about the pattern Manulua can be found in Chapter 5.

A mixed methods approach is taken that follows a sequential explanatory model (Tashakkori and Teddlie, 2003). The Youth2000 Survey of secondary students provided a pre-existing dataset, with a large Pasifika sample tested to seek associations between cultural variables and nine health and educational outcomes. The quantitative findings point to the importance of acceptance and belonging, pride in identity and maintaining Pasifika languages and values in a diasporic context.

Interviews with fourteen second-generation Pasifika professionals focus on their personal narratives and identity stories. Bourdieu's concept of social space and Bhabha's third space are reworked to frame the conditions in which second generation Pacific peoples construct identities, belonging and acceptance.

Ali 'I Sia, Ala 'I Kolonga is a Tongan proverb which translates as, "skilled on the mound; skilled in the hut" (Māhina, 2004, p 177). According to Ka'ili (1997, p. 1, emphasis in original), the proverb can be interpreted in the following way:

A person's ability to master more than one environment was highly valued among the early Tongans. This esteemed ability is reflected in the well-known Tongan proverb: *Ala 'I Sia, Ala 'I Kolonga* or translated as *Skillful at Sia, Skillful at Kolonga*. This indigenous Tongan proverb derived its meaning from the pigeon trappers' practice of *heu lupe* or the snaring of pigeons. The mound on which the pigeons were trapped was called the *sia*, and the cooking place for the pigeon trappers was called the *kolonga*. Thus, the proverb, *Ala 'I Sia, Ala 'I Kolonga*, was phrased to honour the trapper who was not only skilful in snaring the pigeons but also skilful at cooking the pigeons. Later, this Tongan proverb became applicable to individuals that have the ability to successfully function in multiple contexts.

That concept lies at the heart of this thesis. The ability to be "skilled on the mound" and "skilled in the hut" and to function successfully in multiple contexts is re-theorised here using the concept of polycultural capital. That is, having capital and resources sourced to more than one culturally distinctive space.

The thesis focuses on the politics of cultural reproduction and the symbolic struggle over the way we imagine ourselves, as members of ethnic groups and as part of Aotearoa. *To be* and *not to be*: ideally this is the prerogative of the second generation, with multiple identifications and subjectivities, although always within constraints and rarely in conditions of their own choosing.

Manulua is the term deployed to describe the aesthetic of many cultural resolutions, which was sometimes considered attractive enough to be (sometimes begrudgingly)

symbolically recognised by others. It was in the act of being claimed, owned, accepted, recognised and included as “Pasifika” or as “New Zealanders” that the cultural boundaries and cultural signifiers of what constitutes the Pasifika imaginary, as well as the national imaginary, became more inclusive.

Participants’ narratives illustrate the ways that Pasifika second generation identities were burdened with the desire to be symbolically recognised, to meet social demands for coherence and to be culturally legible across discrepant audiences. It is clear that certain symbols and identities were privileged as most “true” or most “authentic” whereas other representations were penalised for lack of compliance. The issues of symbolic struggle, power and agency come to the fore, as does the contested nature of Pasifika imaginaries. I argue that having polycultural resources and discourses puts second generation Pasifika peoples in stronger positions to negotiate critical relationality (Boyce Davies, 1994), mediate multiplicity (Mani, 1990) and negotiate the spaces between selves and other, at an individual as well as a collective level.

A focus on capital, power, creativity and cultural agency among the second generation is a deliberate attempt to “change” the conceptual story. It aims to move beyond binary and deficit-oriented models of loss and pathology. It negotiates space for more empowering conceptual narratives (Somers, 1994). After all, these are the “stories of our lives” (Plummer, 1995). The stakes are high. This is the contested terrain of “who we imagine ourselves to be”. In the words of the late Epeli Hau’ofa (2008, p. 60): “all social realities are human creations... if we fail to construct our own realities other people will do it for us”.

CHAPTER 2

Methodology

Confessions of a Pacific Health Bureaucrat

Yes, (this is a confession)
I will tell the awkward truth
some mornings
at the Mangere fleamarket
they seem less to me
like distant relations
and more like
health statistics on legs
this is where the people
breathe through the bars of the DALY graphs
Disability Adjusted Life Years lost in the faces of the crowds

Life years
lost
in the loose change
chucked at the blind boys
who sing raising funds
for their schools

lost
in the cheapness of the shoes

lost
in the \$2 dollar-shop stretch
of headbands
holding back
long hair
fit to be cut for the kafa
of a princess

lost
in the snowy flaps freezer
of the indian owned supermarket
de-unionised
where a few samoans have lost fingers in the butchery
never mind all that hype about nakedness and knives

some mornings
more cliché than reality TV
the policy documents
I spend my days writing
play out in front of me

I feel so far away
from the roots
and tubers
and grasses
for sale
on these front lines

I feel like a potato
brown on the outside
white on the inside
although we are here to buy taro
and three colours of kumara
as we do every Saturday

this is where I speak Tongan
bruised with hesitations
to the man selling perfect apples
Pacific Grose
the sign says
a grose by any other name
tastes as sweet

we mock the fobby spelling
it's our job
as insiders
who live outside
the suburb of Mangele
to make fun
and tell jokes about lo'i hoosi
that is sold
untranslated

we use sarcasm to keep us all safe
if we are the first to criticise
and if we mock with wit and skill
it disarms and deflects
those clumsier missiles of prejudice

we are a part of all of this
we own it and carry it home in plastic bags
we take it to the CBD on Monday mornings

we eat the fruits of this labour
at play-lunch
in our high-rise buildings

and is hope
like
warm golden coins
held in little hot hands
sticky with purpose
feverish with pocket money options and choices

this is where the free market meets the fleamarket
it's all keynesian mystical

can you find hope
in the loose change
chucked at the blind boys
singing for their school

we crowd around them
on Saturday morning
and drop silver sympathy
into the open guitar cases
hoping that the south american guys
will be back with their flutes and burned CDs
next week

and is that the answer

do I want to see
silver sympathy rain down
on this whole show
to stop the poverty encores for ever

throwing money at them is not the answer
they say in the high rises
like the one where I work

how about a gentle silver rain
that falls like manna
from Sky City

(Mila, 2005, pp. 117-120)

Introduction

In this section I tell my own methodology story. It is a narrative of a difficult journey, not one that was smooth or perfectly planned. It is a story of changing questions, casting open nets, becoming clearer over time, about exactly what I was fishing for. It is a record of angling and anxieties, of crossing seeming impassable divides and experiencing epistemic disjuncture. It will hint at the despair of deconstructive forces pulling the very ground I stood on, out from under me. In many ways I would describe my research journey as a three steps forward, two steps back, kind of stumbling, but I got there in the end. It is also a victorious story of hard-won resolutions, innovation in the face of crisis, participative solutions to isolation and much help from the literature, which assured me, time and again, that I was not the first to face such problems and not alone in my inadequacy to address key challenges.

This was a mixed methods project which involved, “multiple approaches to data collection, analysis, and inference and employed in a sequence of phases” (Tashakkori and Teddlie, 1998, pp. 149-150). This mixed-methods project had a sequential explanatory design meaning that the results of the quantitative analysis informed the qualitative inquiry (Tashakkori and Teddlie, 2003). It was anticipated that the qualitative component of the research would assist in explaining and interpreting the results from the quantitative component of the study (Creswell, 2003).

The first research question was “How are second generation Pacific peoples operating culturally?” This was investigator-initiated. The research project was located within the discipline of sociology, supervised by Paul Spoonley and Cluny Macpherson at Massey University, with help from Suzanne Phibbs. In many ways the second question: “Under what sort of conditions are the second generation operating culturally and constructing identities?” reflected a sociological approach to the subject at hand.

My doctoral fellowship was funded by the Health Research Council of New Zealand. The next question: “Does culture and identity count? Does it have an impact on health, wellbeing or educational outcomes?” can be understood as aligned with a public health research agenda and correlating with the expectations of the funding body. The question “Does culture count?” is one that only really makes sense within an epidemiological or quantitative paradigm, where things are measured and associations either meet the criteria of statistically significant, or they are discounted and not believed to be ‘real’. In some disciplines, to ask “Does culture count” could be considered a stupid, naïve, reductive or arrogant question. In other disciplines, this is considered a valid question and researchers remain interested in seeking quantified answers.

This project moved across and drew from many disciplines (sociology, social anthropology, epidemiology, post-colonial studies, English literature, cross-cultural psychology, cultural studies, public health,) and it shifted between quantitative and qualitative modes of inquiry. To have different components of the research “rooted in distinct paradigms... mixed throughout a single research project” is a classic challenge of mixed methods research (Teddlie and Tashakkori, 2003, p. 11). The methodological dilemma of working effectively across conflicting epistemic paradigms is discussed in detail in this methodology section. There is a section called “Crossing Over” which is

dedicated to outlining some of the challenges of working across paradigms and both quantitative and qualitative research.

The fourth and final overarching question was “What can we learn from the way high achieving members of the Pasifika second generation operate and identify culturally?” This question (alongside the previous three) drove the qualitative component, and was to some extent, a participant-initiated focus of inquiry (Onwuegbuzie and Teddlie, 2003).

I will start and end this chapter with reflections on my own positioning. I will begin with the story of how my role as former health research bureaucrat and my involvement within a broader political-level public sphere of policy and government administration influenced the way that I shaped the research approach and agenda. I will then explain the process of the quantitative component of the research and the use of the Youth2000 findings. I will explain how I involved focus groups to assist with developing and refining the quantitative research findings and the decision to conduct further odds ratio testing.

The overview of the methodological issues associated with the quantitative component is followed by a discussion of the difficulty of “crossing over”. That is the dilemma associated with most mixed-methods research projects, the challenges of achieving synthesis across competing epistemic paradigms.

This section is followed by information about the qualitative component of the research. The rationale for a narrative approach and a focus on identity stories is provided. The ethical issues, mode of analysis, the interview process and the relationship between the analysis, identity stories, narrative and the overarching theoretical or conceptual narrative developed in this thesis is discussed. The chapter ends with an interrogation of my own positioning, further exploration of the impact of being an ‘insider’ on the research dynamics and research outcomes and my own resolutions to many of the tensions and research challenges.

2.1 The Quantitative Phase

Confessions of a Pacific Health Bureaucrat: The Research Context

I began this PhD after serving as the Manager, Pacific Health Research, of the Health Research Council of New Zealand for three years. The Health Research Council (HRC)

is the primary government funder of health research in New Zealand and it funded my own research project. The Health Research Council is a Crown Entity that administers a funding process which determines which research is worthy of receiving government funding. It has a role in defining and maintaining the standards and criterion of what constitutes quality research (see HRC, 2008).

I became very familiar with the arguments of requiring a robust evidence-base in order to make good health policy decisions and recommendations (see Oxman et al., 2007). It was frequently argued that research was a “politically neutral” source of valid, reliable and proven “solutions” pre-assessed for their applicability to “burdensome health problems” in the ‘real world’ (Lavis et al, 2004, p. 1616). The underlying assumptions were post-positivist (Rocco et al., 2003), the health world could be ‘known’, there were better ways of knowing (methodologically dependent) and these were genuinely applicable to health problems. As Foucault (1991, p. 73) writes:

Each society has its regime of truth, it’s “general politics” of truth: that is, the types of discourse which it accepts and makes functional as true; the mechanisms and instances which enable one to distinguish true and false statements, the means by which each is sanctioned; the techniques and procedures accorded value in the acquisition of truth; the status of those who are charged with saying what counts as true.

After my time working as research bureaucrat, I was well aware of how quantifiable knowledge was accorded value, the ways in which it often “trumped” qualitative research and the ways in which this knowledge was sanctioned and made functional as ‘more true’ amidst competing claims to knowledge and authority. I was very familiar with what Neylan (2008) calls the “culture of quantification” prevalent among policymakers and public administrators. I watched “evidence-based” knowledge (that which could be quantified and qualified as reliable, valid and empirical) be given authority over other ways of knowing, dismissed as opinion, anecdotal knowledge or lived experiences.

I worked in an environment which did not stop to pause or question post-positivist or post-empiricist (Rocco et al., 2003) assumptions and an environment which was vested in existing rigid hierarchical ideas about scientific merit. This strongly influenced the shaping of my own research agenda. I wanted to be able to answer the question, ‘does culture count?’ amidst many other competing determinants of health, with statistically significant certainty.

There were important stakes of representation and resources within this context. With regard to Pasifika health research, it was recognised that there was a paucity of statistical and quantified knowledge readily available (see HRC, 2006) and therefore it was difficult to enunciate through the language of quantification on Pasifika peoples' behalf. In Pasifika research circles there was a sense of urgency for evidence, because of the "paucity of research" which could reliably inform policy, further compounded by a disproportionate health burden (see Ministry of Health, 2001, 2004,). Inequalities in Pasifika peoples' morbidity and mortality when compared with the total population had already been well established (Blakely, et al., 2005, Ministry of Health, 2004, Craig et al., 2008). But when it came to NZ-born or second generation interests and differences, as Anae (2001) pointed out, while there was recognition that the NZ-born population constituted more than half of all Pasifika peoples, the aggregate generic pan-Pacific population remained the focus of most research, statistical and quantitative analyses.

As a Pasifika person, vested in the stakes of how Pasifika peoples are represented (as a demographic, analytic or imaginary) and resources are allocated, I could not forego the desire and opportunity to speak through the language of quantification. To have been so centred within the research, evidence and policy triumvirate and working as a government administrator meant that it was difficult to transcend these competitive stakes and question the role of the state and the role of statistics. Foucault (1991) identifies that statistics are an important tool in the 'science of the state' associated with knowledge, administration and power. It is argued that statistics play quite a pivotal role in lending neutrality, legitimacy and authority to state decision-making, surveillance and control, within a system which "presumes that empirical evidence is systematically injected into a rationally proceeding cycle of policy-making" (Neylan, 2008, p. 17).

Brown Pulu (2007, p.89) interrogates the impact of state interests and power as it converges to influence and shape the nature of Pasifika identifications, pointing at: "the economic and political expediency, cost effectiveness and convenience of packaging multiple ethnic, cultural and language groupings in a critical mass branded with and bordered by Pacific sameness". Brown Pulu (2007, p. 90) argues also that within a context of competition for limited state resources, there is "discourse rivalry over whose Pacific way informs Pacific Peoples in New Zealand". She positions this as a competition for voice and the authority to compel "the logic of majoritarian rule to

supplant ‘Other’ competitors” with “ethnic-specific solutions” (Brown Pulu, 2007, p. 90).

In many ways Brown Pulu’s (2007) approach strips my project of its clothes and forces it to contend with its own naked ambitions. My own theoretical framework focusing on symbolic power, capital, symbolic struggle, voice, authority, legitimacy and competing stories has immediate applicability when analysing my own project and position. I did wish to enunciate through the language of quantification and to “compel the logic” of majority and mainstream policy-think and power. This required constructing Pasifika as a nameless, aggregate demographic in order to speak of “us” to “them” with the authority and prestige accorded a quantified knowledge product. Yet this did not feel like an adequate project in itself, nor a particularly empowering conversation to have. For the conversations that I wanted to have were conversations in shared spaces with my generational peers, about ‘who we are’, ‘where we are’, ‘where we are going’ and ‘how we feel about it’. The trickiness of moving across paradigms, from “post-positivist” assumptions about a demographic to an “interpretivist constructivist paradigm” about a social imaginary (Rocco et al., 2003) is discussed more fully in the next section called “Crossing Over”.

I was not trained as an epidemiologist or a quantitative researcher, and learning how to read SAS data, to deduct odds ratios, compile tables, understand confidence intervals, and enunciate confidently through the language of quantification absorbed more than a year and a half of my thesis time. It was the Youth2000 dataset that was selected to provide the quantitative platform for the research project. The reasons for this choice, background information about the survey and the findings generated from it, are discussed next.

The Youth2000 Dataset

The Youth2000 was New Zealand’s first national secondary school student health and wellbeing survey, including many (523 possible) questions about different aspects relevant to young people’s health and wellbeing.

In 2001, one third of the 389 secondary schools in New Zealand with more than 50 enrolled students were randomly selected and invited to participate in the Youth2000 survey. In total, 12,934 students were invited to participate in the survey. Three-quarters (9,699) agreed to take part, and data was obtained for 9567 students. This number represents four percent of the total 2001 New Zealand secondary school roll.

Just over 1100 students (n= 1114) in Youth2000 identified with one or more Pasifika ethnic groups. This constituted 12 percent of the 9567 participants in the final dataset. The survey information was collected anonymously using a youth-friendly multimedia computer assisted self-interview (M-CASI) programme (see Mila-Schaaf, et al., 2008, for detailed information about the Youth2000 methodology and Pasifika participants).

Although the Youth2000 team had collected a large amount of data on Pasifika high school students, they had not analysed or interpreted this data for Pasifika young people or published findings specific to Pasifika participants. Given the limited time and resources, accessing this particular dataset appeared to be a pragmatic way of achieving the research goal of a quantitative component for this thesis. At the time the Youth2000 was the only large Pasifika youth dataset, unprecedented and unparalleled in scale and nature. The fact that it was a ready-made dataset which did not involve time-intensive data collection was an obvious advantage.

I approached the research team and offered to write the report as a consultant. I also applied for access to the dataset for my PhD. The Youth2000 team agreed to both.¹¹ I worked closely with the Youth2000 statistician, Elizabeth Robinson and was supervised by the Pacific Investigator, David Schaaf and advised by Simon Denny and Peter Watson. The Youth2000 team worked in a collaborative way and I was provided copies of their other reports and given the task of writing a report that summarised the key findings of the Pasifika data.

The analysis established a pattern of significant and consistent ethnic differences between Pasifika participants and New Zealand European participants in numerous health and wellbeing domains (Mila-Schaaf et al., 2008). The findings showed that Pasifika participants experienced considerable disadvantage: socio-economically, educationally, as well as across many health indicators. A detailed summary is provided in the "Youth2000 Pacific Report" (Mila-Schaaf et al., 2008) and additional supplementary information is provided in Appendix Two.

These findings support well established research patterns that Maori and Pasifika peoples experience considerable disparities with poorer health outcomes and higher mortality rates than other ethnic groups (Ministry of Health, 2002, 2004, Craig, et al., 2008). Yet, the quantitative findings (see Mila-Schaaf et al., 2008) did not provide me

¹¹ Permission was sought in writing and research protocols adhered to.

with the immediately clear steer that I was expecting. In fact, the overwhelming list of health disparities and socio-economic disadvantage and the many options for further focus and sustained inquiry left me at a stand-still.

My decision to enlist a group of Pasifika peers to help me make sense of the data and what it might mean for us, what to do with it and how to interpret it, was motivated by a nervousness and overwhelming anxiety about what to do with the data. Its aggregate conclusions of disparity and disadvantage were useful in the generating resources stakes of policy and funding, but what did it say to the other audience – the audience who were by proxy supposedly represented by those findings, the audience who embodied, lived and breathed the consequences of the impact of its findings (the audience which included me personally)?

A Participative Process: Focus Groups

“Research is too important to be left in the hands of a small group of academics” (Castellano, 2004, p. 112).

I was able to secure funding from the Ministry of Pacific Island Affairs (MPIA) to bring a focus group together to consider the key findings of the Pasifika Youth2000 Survey. This coincided with a review conducted by the MPIA about its own direction and how it might approach policy advice regarding youthful Pasifika populations. MPIA funded the meeting and twenty Pasifika people were purposively selected to participate, using the networks of the Ministry of Pacific Island Affairs and my own Pasifika community networks which including the ‘Emerging Pacific Leaders Network’. This network had been formed after the first ‘Emerging Pacific Leaders’ conference and involved a loose group of informal members (up to forty) who met regularly. My involvement in this network introduced to me to a number of participants who were recruited into the study. Only one person approached declined to participate because they were too busy.

Although the purposive sample was not representative in a statistical sense, there are established guidelines for setting up an ‘advisory body’ in a research context (Health Research Council, 2004). It is recommended that the gender and ethnic distribution of the membership (across different Pasifika communities) should be considered, as well as the need for regional representation/balance (across New Zealand locales) (Health Research Council, 2004, p. 25). This advice was heeded.

Representing a range of ethnicities, regions, and professions, the majority of this sample maintained ties to Pasifika communities and were visible within community, identifiable by the Ministry of Pacific Island Affairs or through the Emerging Pacific Leader network or through my own personal and professional networks. During the time I'd spent at the HRC funding PhD scholarships and working as a bureaucrat, I had put into contact with a number of the participants.

Many were sought as spokespeople in the media or at public forums and conferences to talk about Pasifika issues, particularly youth issues. Some were a part of the media, some were lecturers and researchers. Some had public servant roles with titles like "National Manager, Pacific." Others were general managers in large Pasifika (social service or health, non-governmental) providers or general managers in corporate businesses. Others were well known and highly respected youth workers, and passionate advocates for Pasifika young people in a variety of forums. Most had achieved rapid social and occupational mobility. They represented high achieving individuals from a range of Pasifika ethnicities, regions, and professions.

Koloto (2003, p. 6) advocates that Pacific centred research should ensure that the researchers are empowered to work with their own communities and that participants are also empowered to provide information. This group was asked to respond to the Youth2000 findings and to reflect on what the implications of the statistical data might be. They were asked to identify priorities, talk about what works, think about what the Ministry of Pacific Island Affairs might do, and develop some key messages for the incoming Chief Executive. The group was also asked for advice about how best to progress my PhD thesis.¹²

I recall at the first meeting, standing up and giving a power point presentation of the Youth2000 findings to a room full of articulate, bright Pasifika people. As I moved through my slides of ethnic disparities, statistically significant proof of less money, more violence, sexual abuse, underage sex, risky behaviour, overweight and obesity, poorer educational outcomes and so on, I recall that one of the participants groaned loudly. He said, "I feel like I'm in a dark place; a dark, dark place at the Ministry of Social Development" (where he had formerly worked). He sat with his head in his hands and was slouched, deep in his seat. His reaction to the aggregate picture I was

¹² Ethics approval was sought and the intellectual property agreement with the Ministry of Pacific Island Affairs granted full access to the data generated.

providing him with, of nameless numbers swelling the bad news of the bar graphs, was perhaps the most dramatic reaction, but everyone in the room was reacting vocally with sadness and despair at the statistics I presented to them.

“Oh,” the women in the room would say in response to extraordinary high rates of sexually transmitted diseases for Pasifika female students. There were gasps and sighs and silences. It was a relief for me to be able to share the burden of the findings with peers who had compassion and commitment to the issues and the population group, rather than respond with a distancing or further stereotyping. They were a safe audience.

Their reactions also helped me to realise why I had stalled so long with the quantitative findings, not knowing exactly what to do with them. I was very relieved to have this opportunity to share the findings. This focus group was “reconvened” to “give participants time to react to information”, to enable them “to delve into a deeper discussion” recognising that they were working with “complex material” (Morgan et al., 2008, p.195, 198). The second focus group was much more productive. In many ways the first meeting involved a “sinking in” and I was relieved that I’d had the foresight that it might take more than one meeting. At both meetings the proceedings were recorded, and a scribe had been employed to take minutes. The transcripts of the meetings were not ever recorded in full, in part because the group discussion was collectively directed towards some clear consensus. This was in part because all participants were aware that MPIA required some clear recommendations and because I facilitated the group towards some core agreements and messages, so that I could continue my own research with some confidence.

In the second meeting the participants were broken into small groups. Each had a discussion about the Youth2000 findings, the priorities, the key issues and points arising and recorded these (using butcher’s paper). They then presented back to the whole group with their ranked top five issues. Following the group presentations a large facilitated (and much more animated) group discussion elicited further feedback. Some debate ensued and consensus was sought over what the key messages, issues and priorities were. The small group work was a success and I floated around each group listening to their conversations or “talanoa”. The group did come to an informal consensus about a list of key issues and identified clear priorities.

This approach was “participative” in the sense that the themes and focus of further data exploration and follow up qualitative work was instigated by participants, as opposed to being generated from the literature or being investigator driven (Onwuegbuzie and Teddlie, 2003, p. 351). The decision to take this “participative” approach to my research was driven in part by own awareness as an insider researcher, cognisant of very high stakes, that there was a danger and risk in an entirely investigator driven agenda.

In order to determine which questions to explore (from a potential 523 questions) and analyse from the Youth2000 Survey I had relied on existing youth and Pasifika literature about priority areas to guide me (Adolescent Health Research Group, 2003, Ministry of Health, 2002, 2008b, Ministry of Youth Development, 2002, Ministry of Pacific Island Affairs, 2003, Secretariat of the Pacific Community, 2006,). Convening the focus groups meant that any further data exploration and follow up qualitative work was instigated by participants, as opposed to being generated from the literature or being investigator driven (Onwuegbuzie and Teddlie, 2003).

A Strengths Based Approach

One of the clearest messages from the focus group was that the next generation of Pasifika people were not problems to be solved. The next generation were the future of Pasifika communities and needed to be conceptualised as valuable “resources” to be developed to their full potential. I was encouraged to work in a strengths based way. At the time of the meeting, Paea Wolfgramm, an award winning Tongan journalist, had written an article in SPACIFIK Magazine (2007, p. 12) titled “What about the Zebras who climb trees?”

In this article, Wolfgramm wrote about attending a Pasifika education lecture, in which the lecturer described the New Zealand schooling system as a tree.¹³ This education specialist went on to describe different ethnic groups trying to climb the tree. Some were monkeys; some were zebras, and a range of other animals. The point the lecturer made was that some animals were designed to climb trees whereas others - such as

¹³ It is recognised that, drawing on a post-colonial critique, there is an assumption here about which epistemologies count. If it was another tree based on Pacific ways of knowing then the majority of the Pacific children would be the monkeys and the European children more likely to be the zebras. This is acknowledged as a useful contribution to education and Pacific achievement.

zebras – were not. This education lecturer likened Pasifika peoples to zebras who were not designed to climb trees.

Wolfgramm, in his article, struggled with the analogy of Pasifika peoples being likened to zebras, who are not anatomically designed to be tree-climbers. Wolfgramm referred to the small proportion of zebras who do manage to climb to the top of the tree. He writes: “I thought quietly. Why don’t we look at the how those ‘zebras’ did it?” (Wolfgramm, 2007, p. 12)

This article was discussed at the focus group meeting. What about the Zebra’s who can climb trees? The room was full of them, full of Zebras, many who had climbed to lofty heights. Couldn’t I focus and learn from success rather than failure? Why “mine deficit” one person asked me, why not learn from achievement rather than failure? I understood immediately what the focus group participants were talking about. In part my despair in embarking on a project of explaining the disparities evident in the Youth2000 data was because a focus on why Zebras can’t climb trees held very little appeal on a number of levels. The discussion by the focus group triggered a memory of another education lecturer I had heard, who mentioned the concept of positive deviance.

“Positive deviance is the observation that in most settings a few at risk individuals follow uncommon, beneficial practices and consequently experience better outcomes than their neighbours who share similar risks” (Berggren and Wray 2002, p. 9). Initially “positive deviance” was used and applied to a setting of poor nutrition within a relatively poverty-stricken environment in Egypt. The researchers recognised that there were a few members of this community who were not malnourished and decided to focus on their eating practices. The nutrition solutions that were generated by these local “positive deviants” were transferable across to other members of this society and had a number of advantages over “external” approaches to the problem (Berggren and Wray 2002). Positive deviants then, are “individuals with better outcomes than their peers” (Marsh et al., 2004, p. 1177).

Learning from positive deviance recognises that solutions to problems already exist within communities, and identifies potential transferable behaviours and enabling factors (Marsh et al., 2004). Such solutions are proven in their own context and are generally found to be practical and affordable (Berggren and Wray, 2002). Central to the ‘positive deviance’ approach is identifying role models “who use uncommon, but

demonstrably successful, strategies to tackle common problems.” (Berggren and Wray 2002, p. 1178) When a strengths-based approach is applied to youth, it tends to emphasize the way young people are actors trying their best with the resources they have, to negotiate difficult environments and stresses (Ministry of Youth Development, 2002).

My commitment to the participants’ vision of a strengths-based and positive deviance approach meant that I approached the statistician of the Youth2000 Study and asked her if she would consider undertaking another statistical analysis. This time I asked her to analyse only the Pasifika dataset, and to try to identify factors associated with existing high performance, moving away from a focus on the disparities or gaps between Pasifika and NZ-European students.

Odds Ratio testing

Focusing only upon the Pasifika sample, multiple logistic regressions were used to test for variables which might be associated with better educational outcomes or profiles. Because of the ‘single point in time’ manner of cross-sectional surveys, this research cannot determine causality. Rather, it seeks ‘proof of’ association between variables.

The variables selected for testing included: a) pride in own Pasifika ethnicity and placing importance on Pasifika cultural values, b) speaking own Pasifika language, c) acceptance by own ethnic group and acceptance by others, d) economic prosperity and e) churchgoing and spiritual beliefs. The nine dependent variables included: **Mental health / Wellbeing:** Meets RADS criteria for depressive symptoms; Suicidal thoughts in previous year; Suicide attempt in previous year. **Substance Use:** Smokes cigarettes daily; Binge drank in previous month; Ever tried marijuana. **Educational Variables:** Usually try hard at school; Achieve around the middle / above the middle at school; Have plans for further study / finding job after school. More detailed information about the questions and responses is provided in Appendix Two.

Odds ratio [OR] statistical tests were conducted using SAS (version 9.1) software. In these analyses the participants who answered with ‘negative responses’ to the median variables were the reference groups (i.e., I do not speak my own Pasifika language). Therefore, an odds ratio greater than 1 [OR>1] indicates that the factor of interest is more likely to occur in the ‘positive responses’ group than in the ‘negative responses’ group. Likewise, an Odds Ratio less than 1 [OR < 1] indicates the factor of interest is

less likely to occur in the 'positive responses' group than in the 'negative responses' group. All of these tests were controlled for age and gender.

2.2 Crossing Over

Straddling Epistemic Disjuncture and Making Leaps of Faith

In many ways, the odds ratio findings provided me with what Neylan (2008) describes as "single figure" endpoints that would accrue the privileges associated with claims of neutrality and authority. Lavis (2005) identifies something similar in a much more celebratory manner as "actionable messages". (These lie at the pinnacle of his translational research hierarchy (Lavis, 2005). The much anticipated magic single-figure data bullets had fired, but I was left feeling like a flare gun had gone off, showing a signal in the sky, nothing more.

There was still much the quantitative data could not identify. For example, why were some people proud of their Pasifika ethnic identity and Pasifika values and not others? How had this come about? Under what conditions did Pasifika peoples construct identities and negotiate acceptance? Onwuegbuzie and Teddlie (2003) explain that typology development involves analysing one data source which yields a set of themes or typology which can then be applied to an analysis of another data type.

The quantitative component signalled a "legitimate" focus on acceptance, and the politics of belonging. It also provided a stepping stone towards a focus on "identity" which would not slip under my feet, leaving me on empirically shaky or slippery or self-interested ground. Because the "numbers" told a quantifiable story of identity, cultural pride and values, and acceptance being statistically associated with health, wellbeing and education outcomes, from a post-positivist position, this gave me "proof" and "permission" to explore this further.

While beginning with a quantitative component created an empirical platform for the research (and this was what I had originally intended) I did not realise how difficult it would be to move from this post-empiricist ground. How do you move from a measured and modelled post-empirical stance of the knowable world, to something less grandstanding, more localised and grounded within specific lived experiences? How do you hold onto the difficult, conscious that: "to construct an inclusive grand narrative would downplay the significance of different lived, racialised, historical,

social and cultural complexities within and without diasporic interwoven communities" (Ifekwunigwe, 2001, p. 45).

Beginning from an epistemological position which assumed that the social world is both knowable and map-able, it created pressure that the rest of the project would commit to working within this paradigm. I realised that the quirks, peculiarities and specificities smoothed over and out by statistical modelling were important. There was also the problem that the very subject-matter (and subjects) I had selected to study were much more dynamic, fluid, slippery, ever-changing and evolving, than this empirical ground allowed for. As other scholars have pointed out, the diversity and experiences of Pasifika peoples are as vast and as fluid and as ever-moving as the Pacific Ocean. (Teaiwa, 2003, Wood, 2003) The tensions of attempting to fix, grid, map this fluidity and multiplicity and the act of bringing the flux and "woof of human motion" (Appadurai, 1991, p. 191) to a forced and fake intellectual stasis was problematic.

When I was working at the HRC, it was common to hear talk of world-class science, gold-standards, international benchmarks and that the more "international impact" knowledge products had, the more scientific merit they were accorded (see HRC, 2008, p. 6). The alternative perspective to knowledge generation argues that the idea of "universally valid knowledge" is an "imperialist conceit" (Wood, 2003, p. 341). And in the case of the Pacific region, as Wood (2003) points out, many localities correspond with many knowledge perspectives. In response to the complexities, fluidity and diversity of locales, cultures, experiences and perspectives - knowledge, evidence, empirical solutions and truths must be correspondingly be fluid, multiple, and complex (see Wood, 2003).

The tensions of cultural cartography are strained to breaking point when it is recognised that, as Ifekwunigwe (1999, p. xiii-xiv) points out: "In de/territorialised places, which "mixed race" cartographers map, the idea of "home" has, by definition, multilayered, multitextual and contradictory meanings" which represent both an ambivalent sense of place and misplaced belongings. As Boyce Davies (1994, p. 1) describes, her mother's migrations "redefine space".

My own positioning as a cultural cartographer, given that I was located and embedded within the very territory that I sought to scribe (and re-inscribe) from an impossibly imagined 'birds-eye-view' posed yet another problem. It is recognised that the

empirical map that I initially sought to create, with its gridlines, p-values, and odds ratios was in the end, only able to provide the faintest of suggestive outlines. At best it led me to ask questions, with confidence that these questions had some empirical authority, that at a very basic level, they were questions worth asking. But the contours of the empirical map provided dogged parameters, rules and foundations that made much of the qualitative project demand – and impossibly demand – that it could only make it to the page if it could prove that it empirically imitated life.

Jones and Jenkins (2008, p. 482) write, “The modernist project of mapping the world, rendering it visible and understood, that is, accessible, is an expression of a Western Enlightenment desire for coherence, authorization, and control. (Jones and Jenkins, 2008, p. 482) They see such a project as derived from an epistemological presumption that the world is knowable, and counter that such desires are also fantasy, “a redemptive fantasy of unity” (Jones and Jenkins, 2008, p. 482). Where to from here? I stood at the impasse between positivist statistical surety and the post-modern position of the fantasy of the knowable world.

This “incompatibility” problem, also characterised as “paradigm wars” has challenged mixed methods research from the outset (Teddlie and Tashakkori, 2003). A number of ways to manage competing epistemological paradigms have been advocated. One of these is pragmatism (Teddlie and Tashakkori, 2003). While many of the decisions made in this research approach are characterised by a spirit of pragmatism, ultimately the dialectic (Greene and Caracelli, 2003) approach to resolving this conflict fits most accurately with the philosophy and approach taken in the research. A dialectic approach (which is not framed as teleological) is based on the premise that “all paradigms are valuable and have something to contribute to understanding” therefore the use of multiple paradigms within one project can lead to more multifaceted and complex understandings than is able to be achieved by the use of quantitative data alone (Greene and Caracelli, 2003, p. 96).

It is through a dialectic approach that these tensions were if, not resolved, at least reckoned with. In many ways this struggle between competing paradigms and different epistemic assumptions and the negotiation of this conflict, cut to the heart of the PhD findings as well as the methodological predicament. This will become more apparent throughout the thesis. Recognition that the subject matter was complex, that the target population was constructed in many ways, that disciplines themselves can be traced back to a founding discursive constellation which provides a range of

strategic opportunities for certain thoughts to be thought (Foucault, 1972/1989), these were ideas that I'd developed to understand the conditions in which the second-gen operated culturally. I was not expecting that they would apply to my own methodological intentions and outcomes. Yet, the 'best of both worlds' in many ways is my own personal discursive agenda, which patterns this thesis in more ways than one.

2.3 The Qualitative Phase

These are the New Legends

We seek each other's stories
like compass points
your unfamiliar
is so familiar
to me.

(Mila, 2008, p. 21)

The second phase of the research was qualitatively oriented. Individual narrative interviews with fourteen second-gen professionals were used for the qualitative component of the thesis. The interview schedule is provided in Appendix One.

From the twenty focus group participants, interviews were held with eighteen participants. Nobody declined to participate, but there were two male participants whom I could not locate after the focus group meetings. This was made more difficult because I shifted from Auckland to Palmerston North and had to pin down dates and travel to conduct interviews. I was unsuccessful in making contact to arrange interviews with these two participants.

After conducting all of the interviews, I learned that four participants had grown up overseas (Australia, United Kingdom, Niue and Cook Islands) and not primarily in Aotearoa. I made the difficult decision to not include this data. This left me with only four male participants and eight female participants. To address this gender balance, I recruited two additional male participants.

Information about the individual participants is deliberately withheld so as to protect confidentiality. It is a small community and these people are potentially identifiable. Pseudonyms are used. The female participants are: Simone, Leilani, Isabella, Lola,

Margaret, Tiare, Sina and Salote. The male participants are: Alipate, Tama, Pita, Bill, Dylan and Leo.

These individual interviews were conducted in a manner consistent with a *talanoa* approach: "A *talanoa* approach is a traditional Pacific reciprocating interaction, which is driven by common interest, regard for respectfulness and are conducted mainly face to face" (Morrison and Vaiioleti, 2008, p. 11). One of the first questions was: "Can you tell me a little bit about your story?" It has been argued that research which enables and allows narratives to be spoken is particularly effective with Pasifika peoples (Williams et al., 2003). The process of storytelling is believed to be appropriate because of a long history of storytelling within an aural and oral culture (Williams et al., 2003). Eastmond (2007, p. 261) argues that, "Such stories, properly situated, can rather bring out more clearly the ways in which experience and agency are socially and culturally mediated phenomena". I have framed the stories relayed to me in the interviews as "identity stories" (Plummer, 1995). The reasons for this and the mode of analysis are further described in this section which discusses the co-construction of knowledge, mutually achieved coherence, ethical issues, the influence of a 'positive deviance' approach and my own positioning as a peer and insider.

Rationale for Identity Stories and Narrative as a Mode of Analysis

Frank (1995, p. xiii) suggests that postmodern times are characterised by an ethic of voice, a plurality of stories, where those who were previously constructed as the objects of other's reports, now tell their own stories. Frank's (1995) ethic of voice fits with the textual conditions of the double-cartographic movement of colonisation which involves erasure of indigenous Pasifika knowledge traditions, followed by an over-inscription of discourses which define, name and 'know' that territory (Winduo, 2000). The thesis attempts to provide an analysis of the textual conditions in which identity stories are told.

Identity as Ontological Narratives

Identity stories are understood to be: "Ontological narratives. These are the stories that social actors use to make sense of - indeed, to act in - their lives" (Somers, 1994, p. 618). Alongside ontological narratives, Somers (1994) also distinguishes public narratives (social stories), metanarratives (akin to master narratives within which social and

ontological stories and actors are embedded) and conceptual narrativity, which refers to the theoretical narratives that we consciously construct in our academic work.

The conceptual narrative that I have developed examines the way that competing identity stories vie for legitimacy and authority to speak about who we are, drawing on Bourdieu's (1989) ideas about symbolic struggle. As Plummer (1995, p. 128) writes:

Identity stories... move out from a small space of imaginings into a language, through a few tellers and into a community ripe and ready to hear... To work at their best they will be the 'stories of our lives' not stories of others co-opted, although in the early stages these may be of value. Hence the stronger stories will be of community – providing programmes and maps where others may be able to sense themselves. Highly individualistic stories without a sense of community will just 'float' with less chance of reaching a critical take-off point. Grounded in this will usually be a story of identity – of who one is, of a sense of unity yet difference. At this moment, the experience and a faltering language gains a voice and personhood... the narratives of this new personhood start to enter public worlds of talk. The basis of a politics of identity is formed.

This thesis aims to explore the conditions in which second-gen Pasifika peoples construct identities and tell identity stories. As Archibald (2002, pp. 65-66) points out:

Words are not merely a means of expression; words are the raw material of thought, of self consciousness, and of story. Without words there are no memories, and without memories there are no "stories of me" for anyone. Thus, words are not incidental to memory or to narrative. And narratives are how we construct ourselves and how we order the world around us.

Therefore, to focus on identity stories as ontological narratives demands a focus not only upon the stories "of our lives", but the *way* we story our lives, choose words, sequence events, establish causal connections and represent continuities over flux (Johnstone, 2008). The interviews with participants involved a retrospective positioning whereby participants looked back over their trajectories and chose stories to share. Johnstone (2008, p. 156) argues that the act of "highlighting what was important" provides insights into how we represent the experience of own lives "as meaningful". Plummer (1995, p. 40) writes that on a personal level our memories may be seen to be "our best stories". It is our "best stories" says Plummer (1995) which we repeat and ritualise that help us to organise the past. Brown Pulu's (2007, p. 62) thesis on Tongan identity stories recognises the role of memories as a site of production of cultural truths and she "probes the cultural politics of *bending the rules* [crossing

boundaries] to reproduce *counter* systems of memory and meaning". (emphasis in original) Identity stories also help us to organise the flux of the present.

Identity Stories as Discourse Dependent

As Frank (1995, p. 3) states in very simple terms, "People do not make up these stories by themselves". Frank (1995, p. 3) writes that with all stories:

The shape of the telling is moulded by all the rhetorical expectations that the storyteller has been internalising... as storytellers we have learned formal structures of narrative, conventional metaphors, and imagery, and standards of what is and what is not appropriate to tell. Whenever a new story is told, these rhetorical expectations are reinforced in some ways, changed in others.

And as Hall (1996) points out, there is a wide range of discourses and historical resources available to draw from in order to construct identities. Hall (1996, p. 4) writes: "identities are about questions of using the resources of history, language and culture in the process of becoming rather than being". Narrative has been identified as an important "social resource" for creating and maintaining identities (Linde, 2003).

Somers (1994, p. 614) writes:

People construct identities (however multiple and changing) by locating themselves or being located within a repertoire of emplotted stories; that "experience" is constituted through narratives; that people make sense of what has happened and is happening to them by attempting to assemble or in some way to integrate these happenings within one or more narratives; and that people are guided to act in certain ways, and not others, on the basis of the projections, expectations, and memories derived from a multiplicity but ultimately limited repertoire of available social, public, and cultural narratives.

There is limited availability of some narratives and symbols, and others that are readily available. The conditions in which we "choose" resources (either "empowered" choices or "default" choices) must be examined. It is recognised that not all cultural resources are considered equal, nor can be equally accessed.

Some discourses require considerable capital in order to enunciate through them, for example, competencies in (Pasifika and English) language and knowledge traditions which Bourdieu (1985b, p. 726) defines as capital because it is "paid for in work, in efforts and above all in time". In the qualitative chapters of the thesis there is a focus on second-gen participants' access to symbolic resources in their narratives and how

they deploy discourses, cultural resources and symbols within identity stories and their power and capacity to enunciate through and invest in discourse.

Identity Stories as Competing Narratives

Plummer (1995) suggested that some identity stories are so individualistic that they 'float'. In contrast, some identity stories are deeply anchored within and safely embedded within broader and normative "public narratives" (Somers, 1994). These could be considered part of the accepted canon of public narrative about Pasifika or New Zealand identities, which to use Bourdieu's (1985b, p. 731) term have achieved "doxa" ascribed as a "legitimate mode of perception". Such narratives of deprivation, cultural loss and marginalisation are explored in the literature chapter.

Other identity stories divert from these doxa public narratives. They compete and contest public stories and are forced to float, or are silenced, or are met with penalties and "mis-recognition" (Wacquant, 2008). Bourdieu (1985b, p. 734) argues that ultimately people are vested either in "conserving or transforming" the existing status quo. To tell identity stories requires the power to deploy symbolic resources, to enunciate through discourse, to impose recognition (Bourdieu, 1989) and it also invokes the pressure of being culturally "legible" (Butler, 2003). The struggle is over "the right to signify" (Bhabha, 1994, p. 2). For the power of naming (Bourdieu, 1985a) is political and associated with privilege and symbolic power.

Somers (1994, p. 630) writes that "which kind of narratives will socially predominate is contested politically and will depend in large part on the distribution of power". This is the contested ground of cultural reproduction, where "Every minute we are alive, we are negotiating a space for ourselves in our world" (Lopez 1999, p. 4). The qualitative chapters within this thesis examine identity stories *of* symbolic struggle and identity stories *as* a form of symbolic struggle. Therefore the content of stories and the personal tales of inclusion and exclusion are examined. And then there is a focus on the symbolic struggle between identity stories and their ability to "impose recognition" (Bourdieu, 1989). Some stories are met with symbolic recognition and accorded symbolic value. Others are considered beyond discursive limits; they may be marked as "hybrid" implying both the story and the story-teller are less authentic, dismissed as

fiepoto¹⁴, Palangi loi¹⁵ or fie Palangi¹⁶, or met with social misrecognition or cultural penalties. They may be silenced, or along with the narrator, left to “float”.

When Bourdieu (1985b, p. 730) argues that “agents clash over the meaning of the social world”, competing narratives is one of the ways in which we engage in symbolic struggle. There are narratives and counter-narratives. Identity stories that we tell about ourselves are not understood to be “innocent”, but “always an accomplishment and a ceaseless project” (Mendieta, 2003, p. 407).

Identity Stories as Stories of Being in Relationship

Johnstone (2008, p. 139) writes: “People constantly create and renegotiate their relationships with each other in the process of interacting, via discourse moves that make claims to equality, inequality, solidarity and detachment”. In the qualitative component of this thesis, there is focus not only on the discursive resources deployed to self-identify through but also the politics of relationships, and the discourses used by others to identify you back. Identity stories are never simply stories of self, but stories of self-in-relation, of mutual entanglements, relationships and connections.

When identity stories are recast as “stories of interaction” as Clifford (1988, p. 344) writes, they emphasize: “a nexus of relations and transactions actively engaging subjects” instead of boundaries between self and other. Clifford (1988, p. 344) describes these stories as necessarily “more complex, less linear and teleological.”

Somers (1994, p. 621) writes:

The approach builds from the premise that narrativity and relationality are conditions of social being, social consciousness, social action, institutions, structures, even society itself; the self and the purposes of self are constructed and reconstructed in the context of internal and external relations of time and place and power that are constantly in flux. That social identities are constituted through narrativity, social action is guided by narrativity, and social processes and interactions - both institutional and interpersonal - are narratively mediated provides a way of understanding the recursive presence of particular identities that are, nonetheless, not universal.

¹⁴ Wanting to be (too) clever (Tongan)

¹⁵ Pretending to be white / European but failing (Tongan)

¹⁶ Wanting to be white / European (Tongan)

More than anything, it is argued in the qualitative chapters of this thesis that second-gen participants used strategic identifications as a way of connecting with others. Their identities were never singular or fixed, but storied in order to make connections and find common ground. These were open ended, constantly renegotiated for context and adapted for audience. For the most part, such identifications were in order to establish connection, shared ground and to stimulate warm and effective relationships, although identifications could also be tactical and about maintaining or rehearsing boundaries and difference. Somers (1994) emphasis on narrativity and relationality fits well methodologically and theoretically, lending a coherence and synergy to the overall conceptual narrative developed within the thesis.

The Interview Process: Creating Shared Spaces for Identity Stories

Plummer (1995, p. 145) notes that, “Stories and narratives depend upon communities that will create and hear those stories: social worlds, interpretive communities, communities of memory”. If it is recognized that we exist in an era of many voices, many stories, co-existing and competing to be heard, in that context of pluralism and multiplicity, I was committed to creating the space for these identity stories to be told and heard. These have already been styled as counter-narratives, counter to the kind of identity stories predominant in the public domain; those which privilege migrant experiences and those which present NZ-born or second-gen stories within a lens of pathology, negativity, cultural loss and decline.

It feels important for me to own the ways in which I created the spaces for these identity stories to be told. I secured the Health Research Council funding by making a convincing case for funding. There is no doubt that the kind of knowledge that they viewed as having scientific merit and considered worthy of being funded, shaped the nature of my research agenda. I chose the topic and subject matter, thus it was investigator initiated. I designed the interview schedules based on the findings of early stages of the research which directed the course of the interviews. I helped choose the venues and most importantly I co-created the space between myself and the participants. I was the first audience of the stories which are reproduced in text form herein.

Settings

The kinds of physical settings in which people were interviewed were generally private, quiet enough so that we could speak without being overwhelmed by other people or noises. We almost always talked over food or after food. We shared meals and conversations. I would bring refreshments with me to people's homes or workplaces or we met in restaurants and cafes.

It felt important that I provided the refreshments or paid the bill. It was very clear to the participant that this was "my shout". This only backfired once, when I intended to take a participant out for a meal but in the end we decided to stay at her house. In this case, she provided cake and coffee and later wine. This felt awkward for me at the time, as it was not as I had planned it and I felt I'd come empty-handed. This was one of the participants who I'd met a number of times before, but it was the first time I had ever been to her home. I knew that her hospitality was consistent with the way she would receive any guests to her lovely home. I knew that there would be a time in the future where I could reciprocate, quite outside of the researcher/researched relational context. But I still left feeling uncomfortable about the balance of the transaction.

Ethical Issues

The interviews were informal and relaxed at the same time as being controlled and structured by interview schedules and ethics approval (See Appendix Three). This tension between personal intimacy, warmth and familiarity and things being "on the record" was one that had to be managed carefully. After recording stories I sent them back to participants and a number were surprised at how candid they had been. The main concern was the way in which they'd represented others in their talk, very candidly, and without varnish or carefully, tactfully worded descriptors. The transition to formal and frozen text was not without its problems. This was a tension between the personal and the public. A few requests were made to change or alter words and phrases so that they did not sound so brutal in their honesty or cavalier in areas that required perhaps more sensitivity (in hindsight). As the warmth and intimacy of our fluid engagement froze into an official text, the throw away comments and bitchy remarks made in the heat of shared understandings appeared stark and inappropriate. One participant wanted to change aspects of talk so that it appeared more formal, with less colloquialism and informal chatty kind of language. Given that she was being represented in a formal text, where my language is carefully chosen,

edited and coherently formal, I could understand this desire. The desire of the participant in my view, over-rode the desires of the project.

Even though the purpose of the interviews was clear and the voice recorder was obviously taping, and we were sitting there, me holding my interview schedule and they answering questions, the blurring between professional and personal, mutual acquaintances and friendships, human connections and research agendas were all intertwined and woven into a thread of no-return. Two participants requested the removal of information which they felt might reveal their identities too easily for readers who would be able to put different identity markers together.

Even before these requests, I had embarked on a process of omitting obvious identity markers. I omitted things which felt too revealing or which I felt exposed participants in ways that crossed lines of vulnerability. There were some exchanges, when stories were told with wavering voices which I would not re-tell. They did not feel like mine to share publicly. The boundaries between public and private were not always clearly drawn. Even though I thought I had drawn this line carefully, for some I had overstepped it: on their advice, I re-drew lines of telling and keeping. It was somewhat ironic and a learning experience for me, when one of the participants who had been so vocal in celebrating the stories being “in good hands” given that I was the (trusted insider) researcher, turned out to be one of the participants who requested further edits. She was uncomfortable with what I had chosen to include in the thesis. So even though the participants were aware that the conversations were “on the record” and being taped, the emotive nature of our engagement, the energy of stories and the drive for narratives to be told (in uncomfortable but suspenseful “up and down” detail) meant that things that spilled into the transcripts were not to be shared on public pages.

The ability to check back with participants and show them the way I’d presented their stories and what I had “taken from them” was a necessary part of the ethical process. I had to feel that they were comfortable and satisfied with the final product and be transparent about the way in which I had transformed their lived realities into knowledge product. Southwick (2001, p. 7) describes the experience of being ‘insider’ researcher in a Pasifika context in the following way:

This complexity challenges me to be able to locate myself, and then find the right ‘voice’ as a researcher and as co-participant. Finding the right voice means finding a way to explain without explaining

away, to illuminate without trivialising and to reveal without exposing.

Being connected to these participants, the fact that via involvement in the Pasifika community (imaginary and otherwise) we would meet again, know each other for much longer than the temporal status of researcher / researched, also had bearing on my care and their trust.

Va as Ethical Framework

The interviews all occurred within a context of ongoing relationship. All research was conducted using the guiding principle of “*tauhi va*” that provides a framework for the relationship between the researcher and researched (see Health Research Council, 2004). To nominate *va* as a guiding framework for all action, interviews and research interactions, requires putting relationships first. This is consistent with the principles described in the HRC Pacific Health Research Guidelines (Health Research Council, 2004). In addition, Halapua states that the maintenance of good *va* is integral to the *talanoa* process (defined as frank expression without concealment in face-to-face storytelling) (Halapua cited in Ka’ili, 2005).

Tala means talking or telling stories. I draw on Mahina’s translation of *noa* which refers to balance rather than the nothingness (or without concealment) which zero or *noa* can imply. *Noa* is described by Mahina (2009, personal communication) as zero-point or harmony or balance, where two sets of equal and opposite forces are mediated to a state of equilibrium.

This sense of maintaining balance in my relationships with participants was very important. Before the interview, I had met many of the participants previously, but had never spent time with these people in such an intimate way, asking such probing questions. What was really important was that the conversations felt like what Siataga (2010, p. 4) calls “mana enhancing conversations”. Williams et al., (2003) write that storytelling has the purpose of a) strengthening connections to identity, culture and values; b) building self esteem and confidence through sharing stories; c) building common narratives from collective experiences; d) building a sense of belonging and group; and e) drawing out common issues and themes for advocacy (Williams et al., 2003). There was a strong sense of solidarity of shared cultural experiences in the interviews and the next section reflects on the co-constructed nature of the identity stories.

Even though I met many participants for the first time, since the interviews, we have remained connected as acquaintances 'who are known to one another'. Even though others were people whom I barely knew, after the interviews, we knew much more of each other and it made our relationships closer. Those whom I know a little bit about, I then knew much more about and this solidified into a closer friendship or relationship.

This is the nature of connections with people and in many ways the moment shared with the participant, overrides the purpose of the thesis and its outcome. My relationships with these people are ongoing. At some point, the thesis ends.

The Dynamics of Co-constructed Identity Stories

The Influence of the Audience

Stories are "social" in that they are "told to someone" (Frank, 1995, p. 3). And that someone was me. How did I as a listener, as primary audience, affect the identity stories that were told? What was considered appropriate and not appropriate to tell, what might participants have felt were my rhetorical expectations? As the immediate audience of these stories, there was some relief in our solidarity of shared experiences. That I was an insider, not the 'other' who needed the subtext explained. Things did not need to be articulated in such a way that they had to rise to the strain of educating the other. Yet, it would be wrong to conclude that this created a dynamic of "truer" stories being told to someone who "truly" understood them. De Andrade (2000) identifies that her research participants evaluated her own status as insider and constructed their "race" and identities in the context of this interaction. In her reflections on being an insider researcher, Alcoff (1991, p. 9) writes:

This act of representation cannot be understood as founded on an act of discovery wherein I discover their true selves and then simply relate my discovery. I will take it as a given that such representations are in every case mediated and the product of interpretation (which is connected to the claim that a speaker's location has epistemic salience).

As Teaiwa (2001) points out, the stakes of representation are high in Pasifika scholarship and in Pasifika communities. The participants and I shared a community space. They knew that to some extent my project would have some (probably limited) symbolic power to shape and define and provide answers to culture and identity questions. This was not just idle talk. This was going somewhere. The conversations were being recorded and transcribed. There was an awareness that "we" were co-

constructing a conceptual narrative about “who we think we are” as a particular generation of Pasifika peoples. In addition, because they were responding to me as a person who identified as having Pasifika ethnicity, asking questions about Pasifika ethnicity, they were more likely to construct ethnic identity as salient in ways that might not happen in other interview contexts. As De Andrade (2000, p. 271) notes in the context of her interviews, the participants: “evaluated her status in relation to the group, they also gave this group meaning”. My role as primary audience, the dynamic of co-constructions and intersubjectivity is further analysed here.

Inter-subjectivities and Co-operative Coherence

The ‘quality’ of discursive information provided by the participants was influenced by a context of shared experiences, discourses and meanings as generational peers. Denzin (1997, p. 283) calls this “intersubjective knowing” which “rests on shared experiences and the knowledge gained from having participated in a common experience with another person”. At the same time, my positioning was as someone who identified as ‘Pasifika’, a part Tongan / part Palangi English-only speaker who – and this is the significant but unstated dynamic – *identified with* the participants as a generational and Pasifika peer. My assumptions of a shared (Pasifika imaginary) ethnic experience may have also resulted in a co-construction which privileged ethnic identity as more salient than other conversations (with others) may have elicited. Similarly, there may have been a pressure to identify back, with me, my sense of the Pasifika imaginary, and with my ideas.

Linde (2003, p. 12) writes: “Coherence must be understood as a cooperative achievement of the speaker and the addressee; it is not an absolute property of a disembodied, unsituated text”. It is a useful insight to apply to the dynamic of the face-to-face interview. Framing coherence as co-operative achievement illuminates why the coherence and co-operative constructions and understandings achieved by myself and participants or “peers” would be different to the sense of coherence achieved possible with those with less first-hand knowledge and assumptions of shared ethnic experiences.

This intimacy and the subsequent dynamic is evident in the following story told by Salote (with many interruptions from me).

Story 1: Who the hell do you think you are?

Salote:

When I go back to Tonga, and I do so quite regularly, I come to appreciate what Tonga is about. When I go to the village I think “wow things are really simple here”. Then I go to Nuku’alofa and think “wow things are a bit faster here” and then you hear of people coming from the village straight to Auckland even to Mangere – you can only imagine what these people are thinking; that life around them is extremely fast! You can see why all these problems -social problems are rising so rapidly people are just so....

Karlo:

It’s so full on.

Salote:

It’s so full on and all of a sudden it’s just a shock to their system. Being born in NZ, growing up with Pacific Island - Tongan - parents and also being educated in the NZ system, then wanting to give back to the Pacific Island community, you do come across that whole cultural thing like ‘am I doing the right thing’? Or ‘can I actually say that’? When I’m opinionated on a matter; or ‘am I being real fiepoto¹⁷ to this (my Tongan) community? Fortunately, I believe that if you always continue to do good it benefits the Pacific community. I think people in general will come to respect the work you do I mean...

Karlo:

Backstabbing you all the way [laughter]

Salote:

Backstabbing you all the way thinking ‘who the hell is she, making up all these lies.’ But if you just keep true to yourself and what you believe and stand for - you just think ‘oh forget it!’ You don’t let such things worry or get you down.

What is interesting/funny is you don’t really get the recognition from older people (elders) in the community unless you’ve somewhat achieved something on the way or you have proven yourself in your work. It seems that you have to prove yourself. You have to go through the lion’s den to be acknowledged and even that’s a mission. You would know that...

¹⁷ Fiepoto – (translates as: arrogant, ‘knowing it all’ and wanting to be more knowledgeable than you are and telling others what to do when you don’t really know what you are talking about.) (Tongan)

Karlo:

Yeah, it's funny actually because someone else was saying exactly the same sort of thing and she said just what you said like 'who the hell do you think you are', you know 'who do you think you are'. She was saying how, she gets that from the Cook Islands people. 'Who do you think you are?' It's just such a destabilising - potentially destabilising - question. And it's funny too because when she was talking, I was thinking, "Yeah, I'm sure that in Palangi culture people don't really kind of say *who do you think you are* in the same kind of way that we do."

Salote:

It's the tall poppy syndrome. It's funny really because either you can respond and say '*who the hell do you think...*' You just have to know your work and stand by what you're saying and have a good argument and then people will respond positively and even say, 'ok I like you'. Or you take the spirit of humility of 'forgive me' and then they go 'oh ok'.

My responses as an interviewer were not scripted but spontaneous. They were notably not neutral responses necessarily, but conversational responses based on my own experiences and ideas and based on 'balance' and 'exchange' between two subjective subjects mediating a dynamic specific to our interaction. And because Salote and I were known to each other, we may have also been less candid and *more careful* because what was shared might have social repercussions for both of us.

This requires reflexive examination of "What gets left out of the story? How do I 'hear' the story, and what do I do when I hear it?" This recognises that "it is not simply what people say that is my concern, but the complex social processes involved in the tellings" (Plummer, 1995, p. 13).

I have already written about how my views and politics were relatively well known because of my poetry, presence and participation in the wider Pasifika community. The platform of shared experiences, knowledge and social spaces was a strong foundation for quality interactions. But it may have also constrained what people felt free to share, because this *temporary* research context was trumped by the awareness that the participant and I would be situated in relation to each other afterwards in a Pasifika community context. Consciousness of this longer-life relationship necessarily overrode the context at hand. In the Pasifika community context, personal knowledge is often power and to share it may be risky. In order to facilitate a balance of exchange

it required my own disclosures about myself and the telling of my own stories (see De Andrade, 2000).

Initially, in the transition between talk and text, I edited my own stories out, seeing these as interruptive and not the “real data”. On thinking this through, I have become more conscious that it was in the dynamic of our interaction that the knowledge we produced was situated. This is a “symbolic interactionist” and “social constructionist” reading of the situation (De Andrade, 2000, p. 271). Thus my stories are part of that exchange, or interchange in which our co-constructions are generated. The longest story that I told myself, when interacting with participants, is now recorded in the text of this Chapter Eight as a story which is just as legitimate and *worth telling*. I was also in the process of constructing my identity. It appears to me now that the ways the participants identified with me and connected their experiences to mine, was perhaps also part of their successful strategies generally. That is, the ability to connect across difference. The ability to have a wide range of symbolic resources that they can draw upon in order to make connections, as Alipate explained:

I think to make a connection with someone you need to have something you can relate to about. And more the experiences you have you know the easier it is. I mean when I first started at (well-known transnational financial company). I would have to go and start talking to big CEO's and, you know, old men, like fifty year old men, that would have a big gut you know. And they'd see me come in as a twenty-three year old and we'd just talk about rugby. They'd ask if I played and I'd say “Yep, I play.” And then all of a sudden they're my mate you know. And then once they're my mate, I can do my job. A lot of people I would interview would be Indian women, Asian women and you have to have something. You know, because I played soccer (you know there's a lot of people that don't like rugby but who would like soccer) and if you can listen to people as well that helps.

I will raise this issue, (of the ability to find common ground and connect across difference) because on reflection all of the participants were very gifted, not only at connecting with me, but generally moving with relative confidence across intercultural spaces, putting people at ease and connecting and relating to “others”. It is fair to say, however, that I felt the spaces created in our interactions were characterised by solidarity, empathy, recognition and intimacy of experience and shared understandings.

Critics of the development of intimacy within a research context (Kvale, 2006) have argued that a relational approach to interviewing and the research process may result

in research participants' feeling obliged to support the researcher's own interpretations and assumptions. De Andrade (2000) suggests that the intimacy that developed in the course of her interviews where she was positioned as insider were not normative, compared to what is standard in social science research. Yet, I would argue that just because it is not standard it doesn't mean that it is an inferior way of operating in a research context. In fact, I suspect the need to describe Pasifika research approaches using terminology like "talanoa" (Morrison and Vaiotei, 2008) is because in these contexts, objective, detached approaches do not work as well, or as effectively as warm interpersonal interaction. However, what I must be mindful of is that in the context of telling, representing and consuming identity stories, the drive for achieving coherence is not unlike Butler's (2003) concept of the pressure for cultural legibility. That is, the pressure on the participants to tell a good identity story, a culturally legible and coherent identity story or *one that I recognised (and could represent)*.

Alcoff (1991, p. 25) writes that "We must also interrogate the bearing of our location and context on what it is we are saying, and this should be an explicit part of every serious discursive practice we engage in." I argue that all co-constructions within interviews are dependent on the nature of the interactions (Gubrium and Holstein, 2003) and the relationship between the researcher and participant. Phibbs (2008, p. 51) writes, "Narrative research involves co-producing particularistic, socially situated ontological narratives through the interaction between individuals, stories and the interview context." My sociological research is negotiated within this dynamic interplay between temporally and spatially contingent stories and identities. If identities are shifting and contingent, and different settings require the enactment of different relational selves, then the narratives about self that we tell in those settings will also shift and change. We story ourselves according to our mood, our audience, our emotional and intellectual state of mind at the time, and the options and resources at our disposal.

Obviously, identity stories are performed to, and represented for, particular audiences (Butler, 1988). It is argued here that when performing and representing identities, people and writers may be forced to fit within predetermined lines, stereotypical scripts, audiences may silence what they do not expect to hear, or are only able to hear stories within the constraints of their own discursive practices. Not to apply this awareness and critique to my own interviewing dynamic and representation of stories within the thesis would be foolish. In this particular case, the most predetermined

discourse (that was clearly visible to me) was one that rejected a deficit positioning and consequently framed these interviews as narratives of success. The next section will explore the influence and weight of that expectation.

The Quest for Heroes and the Pressure for Happy Endings

The participants had been involved in the focus groups and were aware of the negative statistical picture and had been collaborative participants in the suggestion for a focus on achievement and success. This previous trajectory combined with the blurb at the beginning of the interview, which I often stumbled over awkwardly “You’ve been chosen for this interview because you are successful” (I would often add, as some kind of disclaimer, to ease the awkwardness, “You know, like you’re not in prison or unemployed or really representative of those bad stats” and we would laugh a little bit (the anxieties not really assuaged). I like to think my own positioning as someone similarly used to being held up as a “Pasifika role model” alleviated some of this uncomfortable sense of positioning. In Pasifika communities it is often not really done to proclaim yourself as a success or a leader; this must be a cause that others champion on your behalf. As one of the participants Pita said to me:

Pita: ‘Cos the moment you do something that will enhance your status as a Tongan, immediately puts yourself down at the same time you know.

Karlo: Yeah, yeah, yeah, yeah.

Pita: You know what I mean?

Karlo: Yeah, I do know exactly what you mean.

Pita: It’s catch 22.

In this exchange, between two diasporic Tongans, we reflect on the safety of staying in your allocated place in the Tongan social hierarchy. To try and aspire beyond this and elevate your status, immediately results in social penalties. This is just one of the cultural reasons why raising yourself up as successful is considered distasteful. The question “who do you think you are” is one which was reflected on and talked about by many participants.

Despite the discomfort with the positioning as successful, as people who have “made it” and who can tell a successful identity story which performs as a counter-narrative to discourses of Pasifika peoples as underachievers, there was a strong desire among

participants to perform identities and construct stories that did just that. Somers (1994, p. 631) argues that “writing counter-narratives is a crucial strategy when one's identity is not expressed in the dominant public ones”. Sina’s “We’re not all street kids you know” story is a good example of the importance of counter-narratives.

There was an acute awareness on the part of participants of public narratives and the limited repertoire of representations (Somers, 1994) and perhaps preferred public narratives available to people who identify as Pasifika. The participants’ desire to tell counter-narratives was supported by my conscious agenda to seek and represent narratives that worked to empower people rather than pathologize them (see Plummer, 1995).

Inevitably, in the positioning of these interviews as positive stories, there were things that would have been silenced and left out by participants. As Alipate points out:

In my interview it probably sounded like I was in control of myself all my life. And I was sweet. But I had times when I was down and used to drink too much and used to do stupid shit and get into fights. But that’s part of growing up you know.

The pressure of “representation” is upon all participants in this kind of controlled interview setting. The decision to reject acculturation as a paradigm that emphasised cultural loss and marginalisation, meant that the discourse of the “best of both worlds” operated with less critical analysis than was perhaps warranted. In part, “we” choose these alternative personal (as well as conceptual) stories because they are our “best stories” (Plummer, 1995) or our best possible stories and because they deviate from the stories being told about us.

My challenge was to ensure that I did not edit away the poly-vocal quality and diversity of voice in order to create just another master narrative or perhaps, even worse, just ‘my’ story, in which all other stories are but echoes. To provide further transparency of process, my method of analysis is outlined next.

Process of Analysis

The interviews were transcribed by a third person bound by a confidentiality agreement. As transcripts arrived, I relived the conversations, replayed them in my head as I read the texts and sometimes altered the placement of commas and grammatical markers of the transcription because I remembered exactly how the cadence and rhythm of sentences and conversation were patterned – having been there

- in that moment. I found myself searching, as I read, for the things that I remembered people saying. These had often struck me as profound or important during the conversation and I searched through the transcribed text for these nuggets.

The first step of analysis was to identify the key themes which emerged in the stories and responses provided by participants. Boyzatis (1998, p. 4) suggests:

If sensing a pattern or "occurrence" can be called seeing, then the encoding of it can be called seeing as. That is you first make the observation that something important or notable is occurring, and then you can classify or describe it... The seeing as provides with a link between a new or emergent pattern and any and all patterns that we have observed and considered previously.

I preferred to work with the transcripts as word documents and I began by highlighting areas of text, according different colours to different themes which emerged. After highlighting and coding the many bits which I could, in Boyzatis' (1998) words "see" and "see as", I ended up with multi-coloured documents. These colours were then cut and pasted and collated into new master documents of single colour, titled by their themes.

While thematic analysis was useful to identify common issues, I also found that this process was limited, because by proxy it involved an elimination of the counter-stories, the alternative answers and downplayed the diversity of experience. Potter and Wetherall (1987, p. 42) warn of using themes to organise and analyse open ended material via selective reading, as they argue that this process can result in versions that are in alignment with the researcher's own preferred story being reified and others, which are in conflict with it, may be silenced.

Sociological inquiry is as much about what is omitted as what is included in stories that are told through research. I chose particular narratives from the interview material because they could be read in a variety of different ways or because they illustrated particular themes at work within the thesis. In the substantive chapters I use material from the interviews to raise questions and indicate alternative ways of theorising about second gen Pasifika identities. The purpose is to provide a sense of the similarities and differences in the narratives of participants in order to compare and contrast different opinions on the same issue. My research is not meant to be representative of the experiences, discourses and practices of the total population of people who identify as second gen Pasifika. Instead of generalising from these examples, I focus on specific cases that problematise theoretical and cultural

generalisations about Pasifika identity that are embedded in the limited repertoire of representations (Somers, 1994) and stories that are available to people who identify as Pasifika.

Re-reading the full interviews as whole texts (and directed stories) was also invaluable. This provided a sense of how answers fitted within life stories and larger trajectories. What became clear to me was that the participants were skilled storytellers, who had told a series of small stories to answer questions within greater interview narratives. These were succinct and short accounts that had a narrative shape comprised of events ordered into a sequence (Lapsley et al., 2002) and they often conveyed a “take-home-message” or a “moral of the story”.

By choosing some of these stories and reproducing them “word-for-word”, I felt better able to resist the transformation of individual lived experiences into standardised categories of sameness and generalisation (Kenney, 2009). This tactic also enabled the voice of the storyteller’s to emerge, rather than slicing and dicing stories into sound bites or chunks that supported my own conceptual narrative. To use whole stories not only enabled distinctive voices to appear through the text, but also provided more of an opportunity to witness the storyteller as subject within the story. As Eastman (2007, p. 250) writes:

As representation, rather than documentation of reality, narratives become methodologically more complex, but also open up theoretically more interesting possibilities: for one, they make room for a more dynamic view of the individual as subject, acting in the world and reflecting on that action.

The use of whole stories enabled the “more dynamic view” not just as “individual as subject” in action, but as individual-in-relation, as individual within the context of mutual entanglements. Somers (1994, p. 607) suggests that narratives enable a way of mapping the complex ways that social relations are organised and made meaningful, recognising that networks of relations evolve over time and space, in contradictory as well as predictable ways.

Thus, instead of breaking down the interview texts into small pips that proved “my points” I used short stories where participants had reflexively sequenced events. I gave these stories ‘titles’. These met my own criteria of what a title ought to reflect, something attention-grabbing or ironic, but which clearly alluded to the topic of the

story and used words spoken by the participants themselves, rather than my own naming of their stories. Somers (1994, p. 620) writes

The challenge of conceptual narrativity is to devise a vocabulary that we can use to reconstruct and plot over time and space the ontological narratives and relationships of historical actors, the public and cultural narratives that inform their lives, and the crucial intersection of these narratives with the other relevant social forces.

The concepts of narrativity (Somers, 1994) and identity stories (Plummer, 1995) as competing stories in a context of cultural reproduction and symbolic struggle (Bourdieu, 1989) have been very useful in helping me to find my own way forward in this project of conceptual narrative. The transcript material of individual interviews has been analysed as having ontological potency (Somers, 1994). They are identity stories (Somers, 1994, Plummer, 1995) that are discourse dependent (Hall, 1996, Johnstone, 2008) and compete for authority and power to name, know and produce social and cultural meaning (Bourdieu, 1985b) as well as the terms of acceptance and belonging.

2.4 My Own Positioning: Who the Hell Are You?

(from) Five Poems on not being a real Tongan

Before the tape recorder is turned on
the Radio New Zealand Pacific Correspondent
asks me if I am famous
because he has never heard of me.
I tell him that I am not.

When the tape recorder is
turned off
he says
that I do not sound
like a Pacific Islander.

I smile
politely
noting
neither
does he.

(Mila, 2008, p. 13)

One of the defining themes to emerge in this thesis was the politics of the “we”. Part of this politicking involves the “who the hell do you think you are?” dynamic. Who the hell was I? In many ways, the insights Bourdieu has about symbolic capital are

relevant here when I interrogate my own position and the authority to name, to theorise and to represent. Bourdieu (1989, p. 23) recognises that:

Firstly, as any form of performative discourse, symbolic power has to be based on the possession of symbolic capital. The power to impose upon other minds a vision, old or new, of social divisions depends on the social authority acquired in previous struggles. Symbolic capital is a credit; it is the power granted to those who have obtained sufficient recognition to be in a position to impose recognition. In this way, the power of constitution, a power to make a new group, through mobilization, or to make it exist by proxy, by speaking on its behalf as an authorized spokesperson, can be obtained only as the outcome of a long process of institutionalization, at the end of which a representative is instituted, who receives from the group the power to make the group.

The ability to enunciate through discourse, the ability to be heard, the politics of recognition and the power of speech acts: this is symbolic struggle (Bourdieu, 1989). With my own investment in education, gaining a Bachelors degree and then a Masters degree, all of this can be described as a long process of institutionalisation. Yet it was more than just institutionalised learning that brought me to a position whereby I dare to theorise, seek the space for it, find the funding and enunciate through all I have learned, both informal and formal learning.

I have been a participant observer in the cultural dynamics of second-gen Pasifika peoples my whole life. This does not make me an expert but it means that I bring my own lived experience as a resource (Denzin and Lincoln, 1994). I bring what is instinctive and what *intuitively* felt “to be right” and “feasible” and “valid” alongside other forms of scrutiny. This scrutiny included proof of statistical associations, other scholars’ persuasive logic, and Latour’s (1999) descriptor of the circulation of verified references. But undeniably, I mediated all of this knowledge through the personalised sieve of my own lived experiences. Alcoff (1991, p. 21) writes:

We cannot neatly separate off our mediating praxis that interprets and constructs our experiences from the praxis of others. We are collectively caught in an intricate, delicate web in which each action I take, discursive or otherwise, pulls on, breaks off, or maintains the tension in many strands of a web in which others find themselves moving also. When I speak for myself, I am constructing a possible self, a way to be in the world, and am offering that to others, whether I intend to or not, as one possible way to be.

In this project, I am not only speaking for myself and participants, but via the theoretical framework, I am speaking for multiple others and constructing culturally

possible ways of being in the world. Alcoff (1991, p. 10) warns: "I would stress that the practice of speaking for others is often born of a desire for mastery, to privilege oneself as the one who more correctly understands the truth about another's situation."

Mastery, cultural cartography, authority, the power to produce meaning, all of this is uncomfortable to examine. I would like to think that this final filter, this intuitive sense of "it feels right to me" provides an additional rigour to the tests of validity and reliability, rather than an un-interrogated personal bias throughout the research.

I do not have adequate answers to many of these difficult and challenging questions. I do take some comfort that I come from a long tradition of scholars who did not have adequate answers to these questions. And there is still a number within that tradition who do not pause to ask these questions.

I have some answers. As a member of the second generation of Pasifika peoples, I am directly accountable in various ways to the communities that I am a part of it. I am part of a network of people who will not hesitate to penalise or criticise me, either face-to-face or behind my back. As other Pasifika scholars have pointed out, this level of accountability is not only vested in the here-and-now but moves beyond me personally, to all whom I am related to, and beyond me spatially, to ancestors and to generations to come (see Wong, in Mila-Schaaf, 2008).

To be bold enough to write and theorise and generalise a *shared* experience requires deliberation and care. This is in part why the methodology has been structured the way it has. To share ideas, to check them out, both statistically, and via focus groups. To then check out statistical associations via in-depth interviews. The collaborative nature of the process arises out of respect for the stakes.

Yet, ultimately, it is me who is responsible, who is the moving target and owner of all mistakes and misplaced or buried stories. I am the mistress of this conceptual narrative. As Lorde (1984, p. 42) writes: "the transformation of silence into language and action is an act of self-revelation, and that always seems fraught with danger". Yet Lorde writes that in a context of being "socialized to respect fear more than our own needs for language and definition" her silences have never protected her (Lorde, 1984, p. 44). She writes:

I have come to believe over and over again that what is most important to me must be spoken, made verbal and shared, even at the risk of having it bruised or misunderstood. (Lorde, 1984, p. 40)

Therefore, I develop a conceptual narrative here, at the risk of it being bruised and misunderstood. At the risk of having my motives questioned. At the risk of being accused of developing just another master narrative. I admit to drawing on my learned intuition and my own lived experiences, on my peers as well as on quantitative data sources, on the work and ideas sourced to learned institutions and on “what feels right to me”.

I am not unfamiliar with having someone else stamp their authority over my own lived cultural experiences, aiming to name, know, map, model and manage this territory. So I seek to tread lightly and yet speak with confidence. I had to carry the assurance from peers that I have heard them and am able to share their identity stories with confidence.

I would like to think that I am a witness to the stories of the participants, stories as representations of lived experiences, recognising that: “In stories, the teller not only recovers her voice; she becomes a witness to the conditions that rob others of their voices” (Frank, 2005, p. xiii). The conditions that rob others of their voices emerged as a research finding and theoretical theme, as well as a methodological consideration. Frank (2005, p. xiii) writes that:

Stories of people trying to sort out who they are figure prominently on the landscape of postmodern times. Those who have been objects of others’ reports are now telling their own stories. As they do, they define the ethic of our times: an ethic of voice, affording each a right to speak her own truth, in her own words.

Once again, we return to the politics of troubling possibilities of the “we” and the politics of who has the right to try and shape and define “our story”. Bourdieu (1989, p. 730,-731) writes,

It becomes clear why one of the elementary forms of political power, in many archaic societies, consisted in the quasi-magical power to name and to make-exist by virtue of naming... But with the growing differentiation of the social world and the constitution of relatively autonomous fields, the work of producing and imposing meaning is carried on in and through the struggles within the field of cultural production (particularly the political sub-field); it becomes the particular concern, the specific interest, of the professional producers of objectified representations of the social world or, more precisely, of methods of objectification.

The politics associated with the power to name, to enunciate, to represent in a Pasifika context, impacts upon my own positioning and capital as a PhD student, a poet, a

community member and a funded researcher. It influences my ability to enunciate through discourse. It both enables me and limits me. I make no apologies that, as I have analysed, read, listened, tested, re-read, re-worked, there has been an intuitive bottom line which reads something like: “it must *speak to me* personally and to the experiences of others that I have witnessed - and it must resonate - *or it will speak for none of us.*”

This thesis is not so open that it can contain every truth that needs to be spoken. But it is my offering. The offering of one second-gen Tongan / Palangi (NZ-born) Pasifika scholar, trying to understand who “we” are, knowing that any theoretical response and empirical answers will inevitably not fully answer the question.

Tui Atua Tupua Tamasese Efi writes that: “*Tofa* means wisdom. *Sa’ili*, means ‘to search’. *Tofa sa’ili* alludes to the idea that one is forever searching and searching for knowledge within the ethical imperatives of humility and love.” (Tui Atua Tupua Tamasese Efi, 2008, p. 10) As soon as you stop searching and think that you have arrived at knowledge, he suggests, you are in trouble (Tui Atua Tupua Tamasese Efi, 2008). The development of my conceptual narrative does not suggest that I have arrived at the end of my questioning. Rather, I treat it as a map that marks my way and shows that this is where I have been. As Jolly (2007, p. 508) writes:

The maps we draw are never reflections of the world as it is, but always partial representations of it—representations powerfully shaped by who we are, where and when we are, and what motivates our interests in that place.

What I will not do is succumb to the silences demanded by one version of postmodernity which is described by Latour (1999, p. 21-22) as focused on “its rejoicing in virtual reality, its debunking of master narratives, its claim that it is good to be stuck “stuck inside one’s own standpoint, its overemphasis on reflexivity, its maddening efforts to write texts that do not carry any risk of presence”.

I also take note of the irony that at the point in history where there is an ethic of voice (Frank, 1995) there is a corresponding destabilisation of the authority of any voice and the point of speaking (Parker, 2001). Finally there is room for my voice, and those of my peers, and the conversations that we have with each other about who we are and where we are going, to be articulated and recorded and taken seriously. However, at the very moments of recognising the ontological potency of our own accounts, without being mediated through the interpretive lens of an “objective” and “detached” third

party, the epistemic rug is pulled out from beneath us. Toni Morrison (cited in Alcoff, 2006) writes about this eloquently, describing the textual conditions of postmodernity in the following way:

We are already being asked to understand such a world as the destruction of the four-gated city, as the end of history. We are already being asked to know such a world as aftermath - as rubbish, as an already damaged experience, as a valueless future. Once again, the political consequences of new and threatening theoretical work is the ascription of an already named catastrophe. It is therefore more urgent than ever to develop non-messianic language to refigure the raced community, to decipher the de-racing of the world. It is more urgent than ever to develop an epistemology that is neither intellectual slumming nor self serving reification. (Morrison, cited Alcoff, 2006, p. 84)

While self-serving reifications may have a seductive appeal, I hope to achieve more than that in the development of my own conceptual narrative. I recognise that in many there are rewards for staying silent, just as much as there are rewards for telling a good conceptual story. There are always dangers in opening one's mouth, whether "on paper" or "in person". Ultimately, I take comfort in Frank's (1995) approach to theory and developing conceptual narrative. He writes:

I prefer the idea that this theory awaits further living and the stories of those lives. This theory has been shaped by the stories I have been privileged to live and hear, and I encourage readers to reshape it in the same spirit. (Frank, 1995, p. xiii)

Therefore, the conceptual narrative and ideas advanced in this thesis await further living. Text, even the most carefully crafted, creates a stasis which cannot capture what Appadurai (1991, p. 191) calls the "woof of human motion". My agenda is one of cultural cartography with many, many caveats and contradictions. In many ways it feels appropriate to end the methodology chapter with a story from one of the participants.

Story 2: Tama and the Next Generation: 'Come as You Are'

It's about being able to be okay about 'where you are'. I think it's about affirming our young people, particularly, where ever they are, and where ever space they are at. I think that's an important place to start. I think that if we start trying to move young people into these pigeon holes (what we think it is for them to be Samoan, Tongan, Pacific in New Zealand), I think we are making a bit of a mistake. Because this current generation coming through, I would see as being young, brown talented - well, that's *quite different* to what we saw what being 'young, brown and talented' was.

And I think we have to say to ourselves that *that's cool*. You know, I always hear from bureaucrats in Wellington. I hear about the shit that goes down in South Auckland and the youth gangs and stuff. They said, "Oh look at this copy-cat gangster American wannabe stuff".

And I said, "Listen, hold on, if you say that you're trivialising. You're making light, actually, of some issues that *are* going on, that *are* happening for some of the young kids in our communities." You know?

And I said, "Yeah gangster life is not the way, but I think that's a symptom of something else. And that is, I think, a sense of wanting to belong to something. I think if we are wanting to send a positive message out to our young people, it's about knowing where they are, and where they are currently at, and accepting them for where they are. And that's a starting point of where to move them."

I think we've tested that a little bit with some of the things that we are trying to do. I'm involved in some Youth Days. There's a whole group of us, (in fact it was with Sione and a few others, a group of us went to Australia and brought this programme back to New Zealand and it wasn't a Pasifika programme it was a programme for *all*).

I think that was one of the things that we talked about, about targeting Pacific and Maori audiences. Because initially the strategy was to make different for *our* kids and I thought, 'Well is that really the right way?' I mean are we excluding our kids from other opportunities by distinguishing? You know, by saying ok, we are inviting all school leavers but Pacific leaders come this way and all Maori prefects go that way and anyone who doesn't fit into those two canvases should have their own thing?

I think what we *want* to say is now, "Where ever you are at, that's cool. And we will meet you where ever you're at." I think that's message for us, that our generation, we just try to be cool with that, and not try to move kids and move our people into categories that they won't necessarily fit in. I don't know if I'm making any sense?

Karlo:

You're making heaps of sense.

Tama:

Because I think what will be Pasifika in the next 20 years, Karlo, is yet to be determined. I think that's really the most exciting part about it. I don't think we should feel threatened, I don't think there's a sense that we need to put a stake in the ground or whack it down as hard as we can, and say "this is Pasifika" and this is what it is, and thou shall not move from this space for the next few years.

And yeah, I think it's quite cool. You know, I look in my son's eyes, this may sound really corny - but I do I look in them and I think, 'Man, your going to be *something different*'. And that's exciting. And I'd love to see them, sitting with your kids, or whatever, a group of them, in thirty years from now. And what are going to be some of their experiences? What's going to constitute being Pasifika growing up in the 21st century? And that, to me, is quite an exciting prospect.

CHAPTER 3

Identity, Acceptance and Belonging

(from) Five Poems on not being a real Tongan

PhD 1.
The Tongan
lecturer
in linguistics
tell me that you can only be Tongan
if you speak Tongan.
There is lipisitiki
on her smiling teeth.

(Mila, 2008, p. 13)

Introduction

This chapter presents the quantitative contribution to the research. The quantitative component involves the analysis of a large scale survey, containing more than one thousand Pasifika participants. In many ways, because of my insider positioning, conducting this quantitative inquiry shifted me away from my own assumptions associated with my own lived experiences, towards a focus on what was statistically significant within a large randomly selected sample of Pasifika students.

This was a useful exercise which closed the doors on some areas of focus and opened up other pathways of exploration. The quantitative findings reported here frame the broad themes of further focus, and helped formulate the qualitative research questions.

There are three sections to this chapter. The first focuses on the Youth2000¹⁸ findings which provided the quantitative evidence base for the research (see Mila-Schaaf et al., 2008). The results of odds ratio testing are reported; these examined the role of a range of (mostly cultural) variables upon wellbeing outcomes.

The second section of this chapter focuses on the process of bringing these quantitative findings into a qualitative realm which is dominated by quite different epistemic

¹⁸ Further information is available in the methodology section and Appendix Two.

assumptions. Some of the resolutions required to effect this transition or “crossing over” are unpacked and discussed.

The third section of this chapter focuses on way that the concepts of culture and ethnicity, identity and belonging have become positioned as pivotal in the qualitative research as a result of the quantitative findings. It is recognised that that these terms require further clarification and interrogation. The third section focuses on what is commonly meant by these terms and the definitions which are privileged in this thesis.

The Quantitative Results

This section addresses one of the research questions, which makes most sense in the “culture of quantification” (Neylan, 2008). This question is, “Does culture count?” Does it have an impact on health, wellbeing or educational outcomes?

The variables selected for testing included: a) pride in own Pasifika ethnicity and placing importance on Pasifika cultural values, b) speaking own Pasifika language, c) acceptance by own ethnic group and acceptance by others, d) economic prosperity and e) churchgoing and spiritual beliefs. The nine dependent educational variables were: ‘usually trying hard at school’; ‘achieving in the middle or above the middle compared to other students’; ‘reporting future plans for tertiary study or getting a job’; meeting Reynold Arnold Depression Scale criteria for depressive symptoms; reporting suicidal thoughts in previous year; reporting a suicide attempt in previous year; smoking cigarettes daily; binge drinking in the previous month and reporting having ever tried marijuana.

The Role of Socio-Economic Status

The influence of socio-economic status upon the trajectories of second generation Pasifika peoples was an important consideration, given that considerable socio-economic disadvantage was evident in the Youth2000 Pacific Report (Mila-Schaaf et al., 2008). Socio-economic status was tested as a median variable alongside cultural variables. To test the impact of socio-economic status in a strengths-based manner, a super-variable combining socio-economic status measures was created. This super-

variable incorporated four positive responses to four socio-economic questions¹⁹ so that participants who experienced relative prosperity or cumulatively advantageous socio-economic profiles could be measured against those who were more economically disadvantaged.

Approximately one third (36%) of Pasifika participants met all four criteria and were consequently classified as “relatively prosperous”. Among Pasifika participants, meeting the criteria of ‘relatively prosperous’ was associated with a range of positive outcomes²⁰. The “relatively prosperous” students were more likely to report trying hard²¹ and doing well²² at school and they were half as likely to have depressive symptoms²³. However, consistent with other research associating higher income (Casswell et al., 2003) and more disposable income (Darling et al., 2006) with alcohol consumption among young people, they were more likely to report binge drinking²⁴.

These results showed that socio-economic status did have an influential role in relation to some of the nine outcome variables. This led to an emphasis on socio-economic status in the interview with second generation narrative participants. However, testing of the cultural variables also demonstrated significant associations, suggesting that indeed culture *did count*. This supports international research which points to a plurality of protective processes operating in peoples’ lives (Ungar, 2006, 2008).

The Role of Churchgoing and Spirituality

The Youth2000 findings showed that Pasifika participants were much more likely than their Palangi counterparts to identify with a religion, attend church²⁵ and place

¹⁹ Who reported that their household has a working car and a working phone and has at least one parent employed and reported never worrying about having enough money for food. See methodology section.

²⁰ Those Pasifika participants who reported that their household has a working car and a working phone and has at least one parent employed and reported never worrying about having enough money for food (relatively prosperous), compared with those who did not meet all of these criteria.

²¹ More likely to report “trying hard” at school [OR 1.30, CI 95% (1.01-1.67), p=0.0424].

²² More likely to report doing well at school (“about the middle” or “above the middle”) [OR 1.85, CI 95% (1.12-3.07), p=0.0167].

²³ Half as likely to meet the Reynold Arnold Depression Scale criteria indicating depressive symptoms [OR 0.51, CI 95% (0.31-0.84), p=0.0090].

²⁴ More likely to report binge drinking (defined as drinking five or more alcoholic drinks in one session, i.e., within four hours, in the previous four weeks) [OR 1.39, CI 95% (1.10-1.75), p=0.0050].

²⁵ Pasifika participants were approximately four times as likely to attend church ‘often’ compared with NZ European participants [OR 4.0 95% CI (2.9-5.4) p < 0.0001].

importance on their spirituality²⁶ (see Mila-Schaaf et al., 2008). In addition, just over a quarter (27%) had attended a place of worship once in the previous week, fifteen percent (15%) twice in that week, and more than a quarter (29%) three or more times in the previous week (Mila-Schaaf et al., 2008). This indicated that a large proportion of Pasifika young people were spending a considerable amount of time at church. It has been theorised that the relationship between churchgoing and spirituality is instrumental to wellbeing for Pasifika youth (see Ministry of Social Development, 2005). It was important to test the influence of churchgoing and spirituality to see what impact it might have on the outcome variables.

It is recognised that churchgoing and spiritual beliefs are not a measure of the same thing. However, the strongest results were when the two variables were combined (see Appendix Two). That is, Pasifika students who attended church and reported that their spiritual beliefs were important to them²⁷ were compared with those who did not report either²⁸. Churchgoing and spirituality were positively associated with substance use variables. Those Pasifika students who attended church and placed importance on their spiritual beliefs were two thirds less likely to smoke cigarettes daily²⁹, two thirds less likely to report binge drinking³⁰ and three quarters less likely to report having ever tried marijuana³¹.

On the basis of these findings, further questions were asked of the narrative participants about the role of churchgoing and spirituality in their lives. However, it was noted that the religious variables were only associated with substance use and not mental health or educational outcomes.

²⁶ They were three times as likely to say that their spiritual beliefs are important to them [OR 3.0 95% CI (2.4-3.7) $p < 0.0001$].

²⁷ After controlling for age and gender, those who went to church (sometimes, often) and reported that their spiritual beliefs were important to them, when compared with those Pasifika participants who did not report either.

²⁸ Tests were also conducted for those who reported churchgoing only and/or spiritual beliefs only. The results of these associations can be found in Appendix Four. Both had significant associations but were weaker than those who both attended church and placed importance on spiritual beliefs.

²⁹ Less likely to smoke cigarettes daily [OR 0.35, CI 95% (0.21-0.61), $p < 0.0001$];

³⁰ Less likely to binge drink (defined as drinking five or more alcoholic drinks in one session, i.e., within four hours, in the previous four weeks) [OR 0.34, CI 95% (0.24-0.49), $p < 0.0001$].

³¹ Less likely to have ever tried marijuana [OR 0.26, CI 95% (0.15-0.43) $p < 0.0001$]

The Role of Speaking Your Own Pasifika Language

Census data shows that Pasifika peoples born in New Zealand are less likely to speak a Pasifika language compared with those born overseas (Statistics New Zealand, 2008). The relationship between the ability or inability to speak Pasifika languages and its impact upon wellbeing has been tentatively explored in a Pasifika context (Poutasi, 1999). Monolingualism has been associated with stress in the second generation in international literature (Romero and Roberts, 2003). There have been concerns about the role of language loss, discrimination and identity confusion with regard to Pasifika peoples' mental health and wellbeing (Anae et al., 2002, Foliaki, 1999). Hunkin-Tuiletufuga claims that "the maintenance of Pacific languages is critical for the retention of Pacific identities" (Hunkin-Tuiletufuga, 2001, p. 200). Mailei (2003) and Anae (2003) point to the importance of trying to learn Pacific languages for secure identities.

The Youth2000 Findings show that half (49.8%) of all Pasifika students reported speaking their own Pasifika language at 'an average or better' level, with slightly more (56.8%) reporting they could understand their own Pasifika language at an 'average or better' level³². The participants who spoke their own Pasifika language at an average or better level were compared with those who did not speak their own language at an average or better level³³. Those who spoke their Pasifika language were more likely to report trying hard at school,³⁴ were less likely to report binge drinking,³⁵ and were less likely to have ever tried marijuana³⁶. Speaking their own Pasifika languages was not associated with mental health variables. As a result of these findings, narrative interviewees were asked about their ability to speak their own Pasifika language and their perspectives on the associated advantages or disadvantages. The role of speaking Pasifika languages is carried over into the conceptual analysis of identities, legitimacy and the politics of symbolic recognition.

³² There were considerable ethnic differences among Pacific groups with regard to language retention (see Mila-Schaaf et al., 2008)

³³ After controlling for age and gender

³⁴ "Usually trying hard" at school [OR 1.33, CI 95% (1.04-1.71), p=0.022].

³⁵ Less likely to binge drink (defined as drinking five or more alcoholic drinks in one session, i.e., within four hours, in the previous four weeks) [OR 0.63, CI 95% (0.49-0.81), P=0.0003].

³⁶ Less likely to have ever tried marijuana. [OR 0.58, CI 95% (0.44-0.77), P=0.0002].

The Role of Ethnic Pride and Values

The next area tested was that of ethnic pride and values. Could Pasifika participants who reported feeling proud of their ethnic identity and who placed importance on Pasifika (Samoan, Tongan, Cook Islands, Niue) ethnic values, be determined to have better outcomes than those who did not? Odds ratio testing confirmed that in some areas they did³⁷ have better outcomes. Being proud of Pasifika ethnic identity and placing importance on Pasifika ethnic values was associated with being twice as likely to report doing well at school³⁸. It was associated with being one and a half times more likely to have plans after school had finished³⁹. Ethnic pride and values were also associated with being half as likely to report a suicide attempt in the previous year⁴⁰. It was not associated with substance use variables.

These results pointed to the importance of being proud of one's Pasifika ethnic identity and continuing to place some importance on Pasifika ethnic values in a diasporic context was significantly associated with a selection of positive educational and wellbeing outcomes. The areas of ethnic pride and Pasifika values were further explored in the narrative interviews. Narrative participants were asked whether they felt proud of their ethnic identity and whether Pasifika values were important to them and how and why this was the case.

The Role of Acceptance by others

The final area tested was acceptance by people from your own Pasifika ethnic group (Samoan, Tongan, Niue, Cook Islands) and from others. The vast majority of Pasifika participants (87%) reported that they felt accepted by members of their own ethnic group. In response to a far more generic question: "Do you feel accepted by other people?" approximately half of Pasifika participants (52%) responded in the affirmative.

³⁷ After controlling for age and gender, Youth2000 Pacific participants who reported pride in ethnic identity and that the values of their Pacific ethnic group were important or somewhat important, compared with those who did not.

³⁸ Twice as likely to report doing well at school (either 'about the middle' or 'above the middle' at school) [OR 2.01, CI 95% (1.26-3.23), p=0.0036].

³⁹ One and a half times more likely to report having future plans after school (either 'further training' or 'getting a job') [OR 1.53, CI 95% (1.06-2.20), p=0.023].

⁴⁰ Approximately half as likely to report having made a suicide attempt in the previous 12 months [OR 0.56, CI 95% (0.33-0.93), p=0.027]

Those Pasifika participants who felt accepted by their own ethnic group and by others were compared with those participants who did not report feeling accepted⁴¹. Reporting feeling accepted in response to both questions was associated with⁴² being more likely to try hard at school⁴³, more than twice as likely to report doing well at school⁴⁴, being half as likely to report suicidal thoughts⁴⁵ and being seventy percent less likely to report a suicide attempt⁴⁶ in the previous twelve months, compared with those who did not feel accepted. It was not associated with substance use variables.

This result showed that feeling accepted by members of your own ethnic group and others was associated with trying hard at school and reduced risk of suicide. In effect, feeling accepted *counted*. Another variable tested looked at feeling comfortable in Pakeha settings and in Pasifika settings. Feeling comfortable was not significantly associated with any of the nine selected variables and was subsequently dropped. Given that approximately half of NZ-born Pasifika participants did not feel accepted, this led to questions about the conditions under which the second generation must try to obtain acceptance. The narrative interviews focused on whether participants felt accepted and whether it mattered to them.

Crossing from Quant to Qual: A Bridge over Troubled Waters

The Youth2000 data was instrumental in determining the priorities and emphasis within the research. What was determined evidentially was that a range of cultural variables was significantly associated with a selection of better educational, mental health and substance use outcomes.

However, there was much the quantitative could not reveal. For example, why were some people proud of their Pasifika ethnic identity and Pasifika values and not others? How had this come about? Did the discourses or doxa about Pasifika peoples

⁴¹ All variations were tested and the strongest association was established when reporting acceptance in response to both questions. Detailed findings are presented in Appendix Two.

⁴² This was also significantly associated with reduced depressive symptoms but because the question "Do you feel accepted by others" is taken from the RADS scale, the bias from using a measure from the scale is likely to confound the results.

⁴³ Were more likely to report usually or always trying hard at school [OR 1.52, CI 95% (1.03-2.24), $p = 0.0514$].

⁴⁴ Were more likely to report doing well at school ("about the middle" or "above the middle") [OR 2.47, (CI 95% 1.21-5.04), $p = 0.0005$]

⁴⁵ Were approximately half as likely to report having suicidal thoughts in the previous 12 months [OR 0.48, CI 95% (0.28-0.83), $p = 0.0028$].

⁴⁶ Were approximately seventy percent less likely to report a suicide attempt in the previous 12 months [OR 0.30, CI 95% (0.14-0.64), $p < .0001$].

predominant in New Zealand social spaces have some bearing on whether one was proud of their ethnic identity? And why exactly was this related to wellbeing? What more could be known?

Many such questions were stimulated by the quantitative material. What was it about speaking your own Pasifika language that was advantageous? Could this be considered cultural capital? Acceptance by others and by one's own ethnic group was significantly associated with the lower risk of suicide. But how did people manage to feel accepted and under what conditions? What were the dynamics presenting to the second generation, within which they must try to achieve acceptance and develop ethnic pride?

The quantitative results provided useful signposts and pointers, but not in-depth understandings about the cultural orientation and identification of second generation Pasifika peoples. As a result of these findings, issues of identity, acceptance, language, culture and values dominated the interview schedule designed for narrative participants. Underpinning these questions were the beginnings of theoretical threads about social spaces, capital, hierarchies, discourses, and doxa.

The quantitative findings provided signals relevant for the rest of the research but also provided the parameters of a post-positivist paradigm (Rocco et al., 2003). Transcending these post-positivist assumptions moving into the second phase of the qualitative research grounded in a "symbolic interactionist" and "social constructionist" paradigm (De Andrade, 2000) was not an easy transition.

For example, the quantitative work is focused on identity, culture, ethnicity, values, pride, acceptance, as if these are simple and solid unproblematic markers of meaning in the world. There is little room for, or discussion of, the ambiguity of meaning, diverse interpretations, or the politically contested nature of these concepts or the discourses within which they are embedded. As we transition into the qualitative literature about culture, acceptance, identity, belonging, ethnicity and values, none of this certainty that we all know what we are talking about remains. Terms lose their innocence. The contested nature of socially produced meaning, the possible deconstructions and the chasm between the written, discursive word and "reality" opens to trouble many assertions, assumptions and silences in the quantitative work.

The "reconciliation, integration of different methods" sourced to different and sometimes seemingly incompatible paradigms is considered "a hallmark of mixed

methods orientation" (Teddlie et al., 2008, p. 391). Mixed methods theorists have "countered the incompatibility thesis" by taking a "pragmatist" position (Teddlie and Tashakkori, 2003, p.7) or by nominating a "dialectic" approach which recognises that "all paradigms are valuable and have something to contribute to understanding" and that the "use of multiple paradigms leads to better understandings" (Greene, and Caracelli, 2003, p. 96).

This approach argues that: "There are contradictory oppositional ideas and forces to contend with" and that, "It is in [this] tension that the boundaries of what is known are most generatively challenged and stretched" (Greene and Caracelli, 2003, p. 97). As Irwin (2008, p. 418) points out in his argument for nominating mixed methods, "Most of our research problems are complex and multifaceted". And in response, within a mixed model research project, questions and answers may be rooted in distinctive paradigms (creating dialectic) "and might make multiple inferences corresponding to different worldviews, mixed throughout a single research project" (Teddlie and Tashakkori, 2003, p. 11).

While pragmatism has been necessary, the notion of the dialectic has most resonance for this particular project. For example, Flores (2003) argues that when studying an ethnic group it is helpful to distinguish among conceptualising the group as a demographic, an analytic and an imaginary. He suggests that all three invoke different but complementary methodological and epistemological emphases. Flores' ideas are particularly relevant for this thesis, which has a mixed methods approach that brings together information sourced to different epistemic positions.

Firstly, Flores (2003) argues that a "demographic" approach constructs a "population group" which is an aggregate that can be counted, and therefore it exists. Flores (2003, p. 98) explains that the demographic is constructed with a sense of political expediency and commercial interest as a voting bloc, a consumer group, a target demographic, and a "homogenous passive mass" with the barest of pragmatic concerns for internal diversity.

Flores also traces to positivist social science the analytical approach to an ethnic group, recognising that this approach attempts to disaggregate the rather rudimentary demographic approach and to recognise diversity, and "presumes to move closer" to "reality" (Flores, 2003, p. 98). Yet, ultimately he argues the 'analytic' rests on "socially

constructed statistical evidence and an objectification of collective historical actors” (Flores, 2003, p. 98).

Finally, Flores (2003) describes the ethnic group as cultural imaginary. Here an ethnic group is considered as “a process of historical imagination and a struggle over social meaning at diverse levels of interpretation... the ongoing articulation of a pan-ethnic and transnational imaginary” (Flores, 2003, p. 102). This approach very clearly draws upon Anderson’s (1991) concept of the “imagined community” and Appadurai’s (1991) notion of the “ethnoscape”.

The ethnic group cast as cultural imaginary resonates most with me personally. Yet this is a mixed-methods project which incorporates statistical and demographic data and a theoretical analysis which does involve the objectification of a collective of actors. The distinctions Flores (2003) makes are useful. The measurable Pasifika demographic (or analytic) from the quantitative component which spoke using the language of the culture of quantification and post-positivist assumptions was traded for a Pasifika imaginary (Flores, 2003) in the qualitative component, with a focus on the symbolic struggle over how an ethnic group is imagined. Flores (2003, p. 100) appears most sympathetic to the ethnic group as cultural imaginary: “the “community” represented “for itself” a unity fashioned creatively on the basis of shared memory and desire, congruent histories of misery and struggle, and intertwining utopias”. But ultimately he recognises that all three invocations, the demographic, analytic and imaginary, work effectively together, mutually co-existing “to complicate and deepen our understanding of cultural expression, identity, and politics” (Flores, 2003, p. 97).

The more the work progressed, the more I realised that what was required was a deconstruction of what is privileged within this imaginary, particularly what are constructed as authentic Pasifika identities and values, and why certain representations have the most symbolic authority. This is further discussed in the theoretical chapter and literature review of the thesis. However, it is recognised that to cross over from quantitative to qualitative paradigms, requires an acknowledgement that terms such as culture, ethnicity and identity cannot be taken for granted as innocent symbols of shared meaning. The remainder of this chapter is devoted to clarifying what is meant by these terms, given that they are critical to the focus of the thesis.

A Focus on Culture and Ethnicity, Identities and Belonging

The quantitative findings point to the importance of acceptance and belonging, pride in identity and maintaining Pasifika languages and values in an Aotearoa context. Culture, ethnicity and identity come together to create a triumvirate of over-lapping concepts which are sometimes conflated. This section focuses on what is meant by these terms, what *I mean* by these terms and the definitions which are privileged in this thesis. Culture, in particular, seems a word that is *exhausted*. It means too little and it means too much. It is invoked in ways that are too open and in ways that are too limiting, making conceptual clarity challenging. Yet it is hard to do away with culture. There is too much vested in what it might mean. It is very hard to write about the position of Pasifika peoples in New Zealand without invoking culture, ethnicity or identity. To some extent, once the “can of worms” of squirming and wriggling definitions is opened, one wonders how we could have ever relied on the leap of assumptive faith required in the quantitative section, that this complexity could be adequately captured in one statistical variable. It is this kind of realisation that makes the crossing from quantitative to qualitative so difficult, even when one deploys dialectic to rationalise the pendulous movement of friction between epistemic perspectives.

I take some relief in the corresponding complexity of human life, identities, imaginaries and ethnicities. Disjunctive discourses about these terms do exist, struggle with each other, and offer contrary meanings which are potentially complementary as well as contradictory, and which add to the complexities of lived experiences. I realise, also, that much of this will never be settled on the page.

A Focus on Culture

Mitias and Al-Jasmi (2004) write that culture makes sense only as a system insofar as it is actually “lived”, that is, the way it:

Thrives in the daily lives of a people, in the way they pursue their goals and realize the meaning of life...

It is obvious that a culture as such, or a culture as an entity in and by itself, does not exist. If such an entity exists at all, it exists in the minds of anthropologists and philosophers as a concept or as a system of concepts. (Mitias and Al Jasmi, 2004, p. 146, 144)

Segall et al., (1998) write that conceptions of culture have changed over time, from something coherent and external (transmitted from one generation to another) to new conceptions of culture as dynamic and inter-subjective, arguing that people have agency in relation to culture as interpreters and creators of culture.

Culture is defined here as a dynamically constructed and contested system of meaning; a “knowledge tradition” (Hong et al., 2000) through which ultimately, you “know” things and the world. Therefore it provides an associative network of ideas, values, beliefs, and knowledge (Benet-Martinez et al., 2002) which influences how we know things and how we attribute meaning.

Culture is understood to be a range of symbolic resources (Adams and Markus, 2004). These are not “fixed or coherent”, nor “shared equally by all in a given context” yet they “create and maintain the social level of reality that lends coherence to behaviours and renders actions meaningful within a given cultural context” (Markus and Hamedani, 2007, p. 12). The invocation of coherence is both simultaneously useful and problematic. Sewell (2005b, p. 92) argues that, “Cultural coherence, to the extent that it exists, is as much the product of power and struggles for power as it is of semiotic logic.” While Sewell (2005b, p. 93) is willing to accept that a set of symbols may possess coherence, it “is continually put at risk in practice and therefore subject to transformation”. Sewell (2005b, p. 93) describes culture, with some ambiguity in the following way:

A sense of the particular shapes and consistencies of worlds of meaning in different places and times and a sense of that in spite of conflicts and resistance, these worlds of meaning somehow hang together. Whether we call these partially coherent landscapes of meaning “cultures” or something else – worlds of meaning, or ethnoscapas, or hegemonies – seems to me relatively unimportant so long as we know that their boundedness is only relative and constantly shifting.

This definition privileges culture’s role as “providing meaning” even if it is understood as contested and only partially coherent, landscapes of meaning. Hong et al., (2000) define culture as a knowledge tradition. This recognizes that cultural meaning has accumulated in the form of an evolving (contested) knowledge tradition which has been reproduced over time and history and which continues to evolve. It exists (as a *thing*) but is brought into meaningful existence only insofar as people are able to transform it into an action and “know” through it.

Taking a definition of culture which privileges knowing via knowledge traditions and symbolic resources, or a network of associative ideas, I find it helpful to draw on both Foucault's approach to the archaeology of knowledge and understandings of discursive unity (Foucault, 1972/1989) and Bourdieu's (1991) analysis of the struggle over the production of meaning. Foucault asserts that a system of meaning is bound by a set of strategic possibilities; from this a range of dispersed discursive formations is governed by rules that produce meaning and objects, and set limits on what is possible within that framework of meaning (see Foucault, 1972/1989). All of what is possible within a cultural system of meaning, its logic, a range of discursive combinations, ways of producing objects, ideas, and meaning may be traced back to a specific discursive constellation at a higher order (Foucault, 1972/1989).

Bourdieu (1985b, pp. 730, 731) argues that "agents clash over the meaning of the social world... The labour of production and imposition of meaning is performed in and through struggles in the field of cultural production." Therefore, a knowledge-based definition of culture is privileged over many other competing definitions of culture. Culture is understood to be a knowledge tradition which has discursive unity and which is always evolving, always contested, involving political struggle over the production of meaning.

A Focus on Ethnicity

Spencer (2006, p. 45) writes "Ethnicity has come to be generally used as a term for collective cultural identity". To some extent this feels like a veritable merry-go-round of slippery terms. What is meant by culture and identity, exactly? Flores' (2003) work may be applied to different constructions of the Pasifika ethnic group as a demographic, analytic and imaginary. All of these three invocations can be conflated under the term imaginary; they each imagine an ethnic group in different ways, based on different epistemic assumptions.

While an ethnic group can be approached as an imaginary that does not deny its force or impact on social worlds. As Spickard and Burroughs, (2000, p. 1) write: "Ethnicity is one of the most important forces organising individual understandings of reality and the grouping and dividing of peoples in the world today".

The term ethnicity is a preferred term, in that it provides a way of avoiding the terms "race" which has been scientifically discredited. It also provides continuing energy to such organizing categories (Spencer, 2006). Song (2003, p. 12) points out, "People's

ethnic identities are often informed and shaped by the ways in which they are racially categorised.”

Constructs of ethnicity tend to emphasise self-identifications and the opportunity to opt in and identify (or not) as opposed to “race” which is rigidly tied to phenotype, and biological features. This focus on a collective and group that identifies and is identified, emphasises group boundaries with some recognition that these are permeable and can shift. Yet, ethnicity as a construct has been criticised for continuing to rely on essentialist notions, lacking historicity (see Anthias, 1998).

This thesis seeks in part to trouble some of the assumptions of unity and coherence associated with ethnic groups. “Shared meanings” are re-framed as contested sites of symbolic struggle marked and patterned by power relations. For example, Sewell (2005b, p.89) explains that culture is often imagined as “logically consistent, highly integrated, consensual, extremely resistant to change and clearly bounded” yet he argues that it is more useful to see the ways in which it is “contradictory, loosely integrated, contested, mutable, and highly permeable”. The same insights apply to an ethnic group as a culturally grouped collective. I am particularly interested in the symbolic struggle that takes place over what are constituted as legitimate signifiers of ethnicity, and the politics over “the right to signify” (Bhabha, 1994, p. 2). The ability to identify with ethnic groups, the experience of being identified and accepted as part of an ethnic group; what does this mean for second-generation Pasifika peoples?

Mara (2006) argues persuasively for a social constructionist model of ethnic identity to frame the experiences of Pasifika peoples. I am particularly interested in “identity strategies” (Butcher, 2004), “situational ethnicity” and “the self-conscious use of cultural and symbolic categories” (Wessendorf, 2007). Wessendorf’s (2007, p. 346) research on migrant youth shows: “some celebrate and reify their ethnicity, some distance themselves from people of the same background, and some situationally create new cultural repertoires and draw on multiple cultural frameworks”. I am interested in the relations of power and the politics of symbolic authority that play out in relation to second-generation Pasifika peoples who may be seen to move beyond or past established and accepted signifiers. Kedell (2006, p. 54) writes:

I found that the idea of situational ethnicity was impossible to extricate from demands for legitimacy, that is, to prove themselves a “real Samoan”, whether it be to Pakeha or Samoan others. It can be concluded from this that the decision to be either Samoan or Pakeha in a particular situation is intrinsically tied to the social dynamics

which force that choice, in particular, that of being seen as legitimate or “authentic”.

Identity and identification becomes crucial, as Holland et al., (1998, p. 287) write:

Identities are our way of figuring the interfaces among these dimensions of collective life; our way of naming the places where society organises persons and persons in turn reorganise, albeit in modest steps, societies; the pivots of our lived world.

Identities as ways of figuring out the interfaces of collective life, as pivots, as the nexus of relationships, has resonance for second generation identities. The politics of recognition, demands for legitimacy and “who the hell we think we are” emerge in this thesis as defining themes.

Identity / Identities and Identification: “Who do we think we are?”

Hawaiian scholar, Osorio (2001, p. 376) argues:

Identity (who we think we are) is the foundation on which Native cultural studies is based. No other question is as important to us, and no other question is so seriously contested by others.

Notably, Osorio’s language deploys plural tactics: “Who we think we are” as opposed to “who I think I am?” Mallon and Pereira (2002, p. 8) also assert the centrality of identity in a Pasifika context, similarly invoking a collective aspect:

Perhaps the most pervasive theme in the arts of Pacific peoples in New Zealand is that of identity. Questions asking ‘who are we’; individually and collectively...

‘Who am I’ is closely shadowed by ‘Who are we?’ The politics of that relationship, between self and other(s); between individual and collective; between this collective and others (imagined) collectives; agency of self to author and define self in relation to the collective (or not); the power of the collective to ‘name’ and story ‘self’ within broader social narratives - all of these are issues which arise in relation to Pasifika identities.

Hall (1996) argues that identities are at that point of intersection between the psychic and personal, and the discursive and social. Mohanty (2003, p. 398) argues that: “Both the essentialism of identity politics and the scepticism of the postmodern position seriously underread the real epistemic and political complexities of our social and cultural identities.”

A Focus on Identity and Belonging

Weeks (1990, p. 88) writes:

Identity is about belonging, about what you have in common with some people and what differentiates you from others. At its most basic level it gives you a sense of personal location, the stable core to your individuality. But it is also about your relationships, your complex involvements with others and in the modern world these have become ever more complex and confusing.

Even the 'stable core' of identity is interrogated, critiqued and questioned, as is the surety of a locatable location (see Gupta and Fergusson, 1992). In the context of strong statistical associations between feeling accepted by your own ethnic group and feeling accepted by others, the emphasis on cultural legibility and the ability to achieve symbolic recognition emerged as crucial, bound to culture and power. Mendieta (2003, p. 407) writes of identities:

They are always constituted, constructed, invented, imagined, imposed, projected, suffered, and celebrated. Identities are never univocal, stable, or innocent. They are always an accomplishment and a ceaseless project.

It is argued here that identities are dependant on the symbolic resources available, subject to the burden of recognition, the politics of cultural reproduction, the pressure of cultural legibility and are always constituted in relationship to others, many distinctive others. As Butler (1999, p. 189) writes, "The deconstruction of identity is not the deconstruction of politics, rather, it establishes as political the very terms through which identity is articulated". Issues relating to cultural reproduction, legitimacy and (mis)recognition are taken up and discussed by participants in the qualitative chapters of the thesis.

Gilroy (1997, p. 315) cites Battaglia (1995) who states:

There is no selfhood apart from the collaborative practice of its figuration. The 'self' is a representational economy: a reification continually defeated by mutual entanglements with other subjects' histories, experiences, self-representations; with their texts, conduct, gestures, objectifications.

In this thesis, there is a focus on representation, the entanglements and interactions with other subjects, and the new identity stories that are told, recognising that these are often rival stories (Plummer, 1995, p. 161). Once again I return to Clifford's (1988, p. 344) question:

What if identity is conceived not as a boundary to be maintained but a nexus of relations and transactions actively engaging subjects? The story or stories of interaction must then be more complex, less linear and teleological.

Ultimately it is argued that all knowledge and all identities are socially constructed in the context of human interaction (Somers, 1994). Identities are performative (Butler, 1988) discourse dependent (Hall, 1996) and formed within the epistemic parameters of the knowledge traditions (Hong, et al., 2000) we are familiar with. They are relationally dependent, are subject to the burden of recognition (Butler, 1995) and constructed in relations of power and within the contested politics of shared meanings.

Conclusion

This thesis set out to better understand the ways in which the second generation of Pasifika people, who have grown up in Aotearoa are operating culturally and identifying ethnically. In Chapter Two a positive deviance (Marsh et al., 2004) approach was nominated; this demanded a focus on existing strengths which recognises that solutions to problems already exist within communities, with the aim being to identify potentially transferable behaviours and enabling factors which are useful. This has led to a focus on analysing those aspects that contribute to positive deviance among second-generation Pasifika in the Youth2000 Pasifika sample. Associations between cultural variables and nine health and educational outcomes were tested, trying to determine whether “culture counted” and whether associations between culture, identity and wellbeing could be quantified. Odds ratio testing showed that culture and identity variables did have a range of associations with health and educational variables.

Pride in Pasifika identity, reporting that Pasifika values were still important to you, feeling accepted by other people within one’s own ethnic group and outside it, and continuing to speak Pasifika languages were all associated positively with advantageous health, educational or wellbeing variables. However, one of the challenges of mixed-methods research is moving across distinctive paradigms within the scope of one research project (Teddlie and Tashakkori, 2003). Following a sequential explanatory model (Tashakkori and Teddlie, 2003) requires taking the quantitative findings and further exploring them in a qualitative context.

The odds ratio tests confirmed and affirmed a focus on culture, ethnic identities and belonging. In particular, the cultural politics of acceptance or rejection, inclusion or

exclusion, became an area of sustained focus. It is recognised that a transition from quantitative to qualitative is often not smooth, and it can be troubled by incompatibility and paradigm wars (Teddlie and Tashakkori, 2003). Making distinctions between approaching the Pasifika population as demographic, analytic and imaginary (Flores, 2003) was helpful in assisting with the traverse between paradigms underpinned by quite different assumptions. Similarly, terms which are taken for granted as symbols of uncontested meaning, require a much more critical interrogation when they are deployed in other paradigms. The qualitative component is expected to provide depth, nuance, and a sense of the ambiguity and politics of identities.

In the methodology section, I described my desire to speak through the language of quantification (Neylan, 2008) in order to participate in the stakes of the Pasifika demographic, enunciate and participate, recognising that quantifiable knowledge is associated with authority and power. However, as a Pasifika person, steeped in insider knowledge, both consciously and unconsciously, undertaking quantitative testing meant putting aside my own assumptions and focusing instead on what evolved from the analysis. Ultimately, the odds ratio findings operated in this thesis to open up a vein of inquiry which was unsatisfactorily answered by the numbered endpoint answers. The “single figure endpoint” (Neylan, 2008) and social statistics in general, often provide a sense of finality, closure or ending of issues, which are rarely settled or closed in reality. But in this case, the quantitative findings here opened up many questions about the importance of acceptance and belonging, pride in identity and maintaining Pasifika languages and values in an Aotearoa context. The contested nature of terms relating to culture, ethnicity and identity signal the complexities of lived experience in comparison to single figure endpoints. Struggles within the field of cultural production were taken up and discussed by participants in the qualitative chapters of the thesis. These tensions relate to relationships between self and other(s), experiences of being misrecognised or identified and accepted as part of an ethnic group and issues relating to cultural reproduction and legitimacy. The next section reviews literature about culture and identities among second generation populations, examines the debates relating to Pasifika identities and engages systematically with the scholarly work in this area.

CHAPTER 4

Literature Review

(from) Five Poems on not being a real Tongan

PhD 2.
The Tongan
anthropologist stares
when I ask
what impact the world wide web
has on conceptions of ta and va
when ideas travel across time and space
faster than the speed of light.
He suggests I am suffering
from a NZ-born identity crisis.

(Mila, 2008, p. 13)

Introduction

In this chapter, different approaches to understanding, framing and theorising second generation identities and cultural orientation are reviewed. There are many conceptual narratives (Somers, 1994) that tell different stories about what it means to be second generation and many debates relating to Pasifika identities. A systematic review of some of the conceptual narratives and key ways that second generation identities have been framed and approached is conducted.

This chapter is divided into three parts, which review three different conceptual narratives about second-generation culture and identities. The first component reviews what various authors have written about how identities have historically been constructed in Pasifika societies (Tamasese Efi, 2002, 2007, Taufe'ulungaki, 2004, Ka'ili, 2005, 2008, Nabobo-Baba, 2006, Refiti, 2002). This is followed by a review of interrogation and deconstruction of what has been constructed as "traditional" (Brown Pulu, 2007, Keddell, 2006, Hokowhitu, 2008).

The second part of the literature review focuses on one of the most dominant conceptual narratives relating to the identity, wellbeing and culture of the second-generation: the paradigms of acculturation (Redfield, et al., 1936, Berry, 1980, 2001, Portes and Rumbaut, 2001) and assimilation (Park and Burgess, 1924, Gans, 1997,

Portes and Zhou, 1993, Zhou, 1997). This is followed by a critique of this paradigm (Waldram, 2004, Steinberg, 2000, Furedi, 2001, Rudman, 2008a, 2008b). The scholarly tradition of associating acculturation with pathology and disadvantage is examined (Gans, 1992, Escobar, 1998, Romero and Roberts, 2003, Perlmann and Waldinger, 1996). This is followed by a review of the new associations between biculturalism and advantage (Hong et al., 2000, 2007, Cheng et al, 2006, Leung et al., 2008, Tadmor et al., 2009). Finally, an examination of acculturation in the local Pasifika literature is conducted (Tiatia, 2003, 2006, 2008, Samu, 2003, Paterson et al., 2007, Foliaki et al., 2006, Kokaua et al., 2009, Gray and Nosa, 2009, Ministry of Health, 1997, 2004, 2005, Le Va, 2009). There is a particular focus on the work that conceptualizes the second-gen as being “caught between cultures” (Tiatia, 1998, 2003, Samu, 2003) or as going through “identity journeys” from liminality towards maturity (Anae, 2001, 2004, Holt, 1999).

Part Three of the literature review focuses on diaspora as a conceptual narrative and heuristic device (Clifford, 1997, Gilroy, 1993, Hall, 1990, 1992, 1996, Anthias, 1998). Diaspora tends to emphasize historical and cultural continuity with migratory places of origin (Clifford, 1997, Appadurai, 1991) and transnational connections (Vertovec, 2007). The concepts of double consciousness (Du Bois cited Zuckerman, 2004), third person consciousness (Fanon, 1992) and diasporic consciousness (Cohen, 1997, Duarte, 2005) are reviewed. Ideas about hybridity (Young, 1995, Gilroy, 1997, Pieterse, 2001, Meredith, 1998, Ang, 2001), hybridised identities (Hall, 1990, 1992) and third spaces (Bhabha, 1990, 1994) are also examined. This is followed by an exploration of the ways some of these ideas have been approached in the local literature about Pasifika identities (Anae, 1998, Wendt, 1999, Stevenson, 2004, 2008). There is particular focus on Tupuola’s (1998, 2004) work on fluid, hybrid identities and edge-walkers, and Brown Pulu’s (2007) experimental auto-ethnography on transnational identity stories. The final area of literature reviewed is closest to my own positioning. This is the Pasifika literature which focuses on identities and the “space between” (Southwick, 2001, Whimp, 2010, Webb-Binder, 2010, Higgins and Leleisu’aso, 2010).

PART 1: Identity-in-relation: Pasifika Styles

"To give up a whole way of seeing...

The loss, the loss, it is immense. It is the size of God's wisdom...

Once all was a circle, a sacred circle,

a unity of tree, bird, earth, fire, air, water, man, rock, atua, aitu.

All was blessed with mana. Together, dreaming, giving meaning to one another."

(Wendt 1991, 215-216 cited Va'ai 1999, p. 51)

"Traditional" Pasifika identities

Drawing from the literature about traditional Pasifika identities in-relation, requires drawing from multiple Pasifika ethnic-specific understandings to generate an imagined coherence of commonalities. In contrast to the smooth coherence presented here, it is recognised that Oceania contains a rich and dynamic "sea of knowledges" (Wood, 2003, p. 340) which construct worlds via multi-lingual mediations which are specific to locale, history and experience.

Whilst these depersonalised, de-contextualised constructions are necessary to create what Somers' (1994) calls a "conceptual narrative", I am conscious of the way the specific and local become framed within a totalising, generalised and abstracted discourse. It is acknowledged that the tensions between local and generalised, intersubjective and purportedly objective approaches to knowledge production permeate the thesis.

Traditional indigenous Pasifika identities are characterised as being "rooted in relational networks based on genealogical ties and locality" (Howard 1990, p. 273). Samoan Novelist Sia Figiel (1996, p. 135) writes: "I" does not exist. I am not. My self belongs not to me because "I" does not exist. "I" is always "we". One often cited quote to illustrate this is from Tui Atua Tupua Tamasese Efi (2002, p.6):

I am not an individual, I am an integral part of the cosmos. I share divinity with my ancestors, the land, the seas and the skies. I am not an individual, because I share a Tofi with my family, my village, and my nation. I belong to my family and my family belongs to me. I belong to a village and my village belongs to me. I belong to my nation and my nation belongs to me. This is the essence of my sense of belonging.

Therefore, it is considered that via connection and relationships with others, one sources identity. It has been postulated that the definition of the self is interdependent in collectivism and independent in individualism (Triandis, 1995). Markus and Kitiyama (1991, p. 225) explore the ways in which people from different cultures have strikingly different constructions of the self, arguing that within collectively oriented societies “the self is viewed as interdependent with the surrounding context, and it is the “other” or the “self-in-relation-to-other” that is focal in individual experience”. A research project comparing Samoan and Palagi conceptualisations of self (Bush et al., 2005) concluded that Samoan conceptions of self were collective, spiritual, holistic and relativist; whereas Palagi conceptions were individual, secular, reductionist and universalist.

Pasifika constructions of identity-in-relation can be traced back to cosmogony and cosmology⁴⁷. Creation stories from Polynesia were often “expressed in genealogical terms” as a union between the passive elements and active⁴⁸ elements (Poignant, 1967, p.29). Craig (2004, p. 41) writes that all Polynesian creation narratives involve forms of (pro-creative) union, conceive of evolution within a genealogical frame⁴⁹ and for the most part, “they (Polynesians) were a part of it”. The Samoan Head of State explains this in the following way:

For the indigenous Samoan, time-space, the *va-tapuia*, and its origins, are unequivocally linked to God Tagaloaalelagi, the Absolute, the Creator Progenitor, the source of all biological life...

The Samoan word, *va tapuia*, includes the term *tapu* within. The term literally refers to the sacred (*tapu-ia*) relationship (*va*) between man and all things, animate and inanimate. It implies that in our relations with all things, living *and* dead, there exists a sacred essence, a life force beyond human reckoning. The distinction here between what is living and what is dead is premised not so much on whether a ‘life force’, i.e. a *mauli* or *fatu manava* exists in the thing (i.e. whether a ‘life-breath’ or ‘heart-beat’ exudes from it), but whether that thing,

⁴⁷ Cosmogony and Cosmology are read as: “Deliberate constructs employed by the ancient seers and sages to encapsulate and condense into easily assimilable forms, their view of the World, of ultimate reality” (Marsden and Henare, 1992, p. 3).

⁴⁸ In the Samoan cosmogony narrative such unions are evident where Tagaloa created Ilu (immensity) and mamao (space) to make humanity more comfortable (Fraser, 1892, p175). Immensity (male) and space (female) were paired together to bring forth children, “night and day, whom by their united action, produced the Sun and the Stars” and ‘Le-Langi’[sic] the clear blue sky (Fraser, 1892, p. 169).

⁴⁹ Jolly (1997, p. 532) argues that the contrasts between indigenous and foreign representations and conceptualisations of the Pacific “we might telegraphically encode as genealogy versus cartography”.

living or dead, has a genealogy (in an evolutionary rather than human procreation sense) that connects to a life-force. The *va tapuia*, the sacred relations, between all things, extends in the Samoan indigenous reference to all things living or dead, where a genealogical relationship can be traced...

The Samoan indigenous reference asserts that while man might be the most evolved and intelligent of all Tagaloa's creations, he is, nevertheless, the 'younger brother' in Samoan genealogical terms. As such his relationship to all earlier creations must be one of respect.

The respect or *faaaloalo* that must be shown by man to all things is a respect for the sacred essence, the sacred origins, of their beginnings. This is the cornerstone of Samoan indigenous religious thought. (Tui Atua Tupua Tamasese Efi, 2007, pp. 2-3)

Tui Atua Tupua Tamasese Efi outlines the implications of a cosmogony that constructs creation within a genealogical framework. This invokes *va tapuia*, sacred relations between all life forms. It premises a system of interconnection guided by the sacredness and tapu which governs genealogical relationships.

Within cosmogonies, metaphysical unions of complementary elements, passive and active, light and dark, female and male, moisture and soil, to produce new creations and the subsequent genealogical linking of all things, is inherent in the narratives. The perspective that all life is interconnected and genealogically linked is deeply embedded within this premise, which locates all human behaviour within divinely ascribed and genealogically connected systems of relationship (see Tui Atua Tupua Tamasese Efi, 2007).

Taufe'ulungaki (2004, p. 6) writes, "Humans make up but one component or strand of that holistic mat of inter-woven interdependent and reciprocal relationships. The concept of 'fonua', 'vanua' and 'whenua' sums up these relationships." This emphasis on synchronicity is echoed by Nabobo-Baba (2006, p. 42) who refers to the Vugalei of Fiji, writing: "Life is complete and wholesome when all elements – air, wind, seas, rivers, plants, animals, fishes, people, the dead – are 'synchronised'. Within a system of interconnection, equation and alignment with other people and parts of life is integral to an ordered, balanced system of interconnection (Tui Atua Tupua Tamasese Efi, 2007). Within this genealogically connected system, relationships are conceived of spatially (Ka'ili, 2005).

Ka'ili (2008, p. 105) finds evidence of the use of the *va* or *wa* (meaning space between) in the following Polynesian languages: East Uvean, Rarotongan Maori, Tuamotuan, Maori, Hawaiian, Samoan, Tikopian and Tongan (p. 105). He notes that it is a root word for spatial concepts in Rotuma and that it is applied socio-spatially to relationships in Tonga, Niue, Samoa, Tokelau and Uvea-Futuna.

Ka'ili (2005, p. 84) asserts that “*tauhi va*”, the art of caring for sociospatial relations is a “core principle” of “high cultural value”. There has been a growing body of scholarship which references *va* as a core concept, (Thaman, 2003, 2004, Mahina, 2002, Ka'ili 2005, Lilomaiva-Doktor 2006, 2009, Mila-Schaaf, 2006, Poltorak 2007, Anae 2007,) with Ka'ili's (2008) own PhD dissertation making a significant contribution. Wendt writes:

Important to the Samoan view of reality is the concept of the *va* or the *wa* in Maori and Japanese (*ma*). *Va* is the space between, the between-ness, not empty space, not space that separates but space that relates, that holds separate entities and things together in the unity-in-all, the space that is context, giving meaning to things.

A well known Samoan expression is ‘*la teu le va*’, cherish/nurture/care for the *va*, the relationships. This is crucial in communal cultures that value group, unity, more than the individual person / creature / thing in terms of group, in terms of *va*, relationships. (cited Refiti, 2002, p. 185)

Va is the space between, notably not empty space, but space which is imbued with meaning. “This is fundamentally different from the popular western notion of space as an expanse or an open area.” (Ka'ili, 2005, p. 89) Mila-Schaaf (2006) describes this as the space that we ‘feel’ as opposed to ‘see’. Refiti (2000, p. 209) writes, “The *va* is the spatial ordering concept that exists between things. It administers a code of good (ideal) behaviour, an invisible language that enables space and things to be configured in a positive manner”.

In a Samoan context, “The term *Va Fealoaloa'i* refers to the various spaces and places within which Samoan people interact in a meaningful and non-coincidental way” (Health Research Council, 2004, p. 14). Within the Samoan indigenous reference, bad and good contain value judgments which do not carry into the original meanings: *Leaga* (which is often now translated as bad) comes from *le* (not) *aga* (behaviour), that is, behaviour which is not becoming or which compromises the state of *va*; alternately, *teu* or *tausi le va* - is behaviour which enhances, adorns, adds value, maintains the *va* (Maiava Carmel Peteru, personal communication, 12 December, 2008). Lemi Ponifasio,

a Samoan choreographer and dancer, describes va as: “The lived and cognisant body relationship with the world. The va or the body’s intentionality is the foundation of all expression, including dance” (cited in Taouma 2002, p. 140).

Va (and its various qualifiers) has ontological and existential applications, while the ‘in the moment’ engagement may be between individuals or groups, these people bring the presence of ancestors and descendents (Maiava Carmel Peteru, personal communication, 12 December 2008). Taufe’ulungaki (2004, p. 6) writes about va from a Tongan perspective and in the following excerpt explains how va is contextual, temporal and relational:

In Tongan culture ‘relationship’ is described by the concept ‘va’. Literally it means ‘space’. But in Tongan communities, relationships or the space between any two individuals, groups or between communities and nature are defined by the context in which the interaction occurs. Thus, when the context changes, the relationship changes also, even in the case of the same two individuals or groups and maintaining, nurturing and developing that va, so that it remains strong and flexible, is behaving appropriately in each and every variation of the context. The well-being or health of the community is measured, therefore, by contextualised and acceptable behaviour and actions that are meaningful, worthwhile and beneficial to others.

Tending the va, nurturing it and caring for it – maintaining an optimal and equitable balance of reciprocity and interconnection – is an intergenerational responsibility considered crucial to a society premised on sacred inter-relationship (Taufe’ulungaki 2005).

While everything is possible in the va, recognition of va invokes cognizance of an ongoing relationship, mutuality and a desire for reciprocal and balanced interactions. Ka’ili (2008, p. 37) writes: “For Tongans, relations of exchange that are symmetrical (potupotutatau) create malie, beauty. In contrast, relations of exchange that are asymmetrical (potupotukehekehe) produce tamaki, disharmony.

Therefore, it is via connection and relationships with others, that people source identity, position and place. A person is genealogically connected, geographically anchored, associated with family, village, and nation. This determines how a person is positioned and ranked within social space.

It has been argued that social space was stratified in all Polynesian societies (Sahlins, 1958). The stratification of societies, genealogically determined hierarchies and power

relationships that pattern social relationships inevitably impacts upon identities. For example, in a Tongan context Kaeppler (1971, p. 174) writes that, "The most pervasive concept in Tonga is that of hierarchical ranking. All interpersonal relationships in the island kingdom are governed by principles of rank, and material culture and language reflect this ranking."

Kaeppler (1971) writes that there are multi-dimensional⁵⁰ ranking principles which interchange with different levels of influence dependent on different contexts⁵¹. These multidimensional ways of ranking, hierarchies and markers of social status had / have implications for identity and identifications. The constraints upon self definition and identification are perhaps illustrated by the following quotation from Campbell (2001, p. 50):

Concepts of rank in Tonga were so hierarchical that it may be said that no two people were of precisely the same rank. When two people meet, even though of the same social class, the balance of birth order, age and mother's personal rank would ensure that one would be the senior to the other.

Yet, as Pulu Brown (2007, p. 12) points out critically, it is a mistake to believe that these inventories have been "imposed" over Tongans "as a standard measurement of fixed non-negotiable rules". As a Tongan, Pulu Brown (2007, p. 78) writes about experiencing "symbol shock" of "being repetitiously subjected" to representations of Tongan-ness or *anga fakatonga* as "ethnographic doctrine".

Troubling the "Traditional"

Although I have attempted to provide a review of "traditional" Pasifika identities, there are criticisms of such broad generalisations and of making sweeping comparisons between Western and non-Western orientations as too "culturalist" and as forms of "social essentialism" (Fuss, 1989). Constructing identities as traditional and Pasifika can also be criticised as rehearsing binaries which ultimately reinforce dominance and difference, rather than troubling such binaries as false (Holland et al., 1998).

⁵⁰ Mahina (2002) perceives this cross-cutting as a multiplex "interplay" between "celestial" 'eiki and tu'a concepts and "terrestrial" fahu and 'ulumotu'a principles, across "vertical and horizontal axes" which provide cultural order as well as restructuring change in human relationships (p.181).

⁵¹ Evans argues that: "Although chiefly power and authority suffused the system, it was limited, constrained, crosscut, and diffused by the ideological and kinship systems in which this power was embedded" (Evans 2001, p. 43).

Brown Pulu (2007) resists “fixed” constructions of Tongan-ness, preferring much more fluid realities of performative, situational and relational ways of approaching culture and identity. She writes:

Morton (1996, p. 126) has integrated other writers’ impressions of the traditional Tongan father and his kin to describe her understanding of the formal structure that defines familial rank and order. Her inventory has not been imposed over me as a standard measurement of fixed non-negotiable rules by my Father, my Mother and their respective families. (Brown Pulu, 2007, p. 111)

Pulu Brown (2007) resists the way that traditional Tongan identities are fixed and writes a counter-narrative. Pulu Brown (2007, p. 67) is interested in “the cultural politics of *bending the rules* [crossing boundaries] to reproduce *counter* systems of memory and meaning” (emphasis in original). She argues with regard to her own family, that, “we endure as a family because of social change, not in spite of its presence, perseverance and pragmatism.” (Brown Pulu, 2007, p. 67)

Resisting “traditional” constructs of identity, some have argued for the right to choose lifestyles and self-define identities in a context of migration, mobility and late modernity (Reynolds, 2010, Keddell, 2006). The right to self-determine identity versus having your identity constructed for you, via relational criteria, is one of the key debates associated with Pasifika second-generation identities (see Keddell, 2006).

It is recognised that there are problems with representing traditional categories, as “frozen in time” snapshots, stable and unchanging. Referring to the context of Africa, Hall (1990, p. 231) implores:

We must not collude with the West which, precisely, normalises and appropriates Africa by freezing it into some timeless zone of the primitive, unchanging past. It is nowhere to be found in its pure, pristine state. It is always already fused, syncretised, with other cultural elements. It is always-already creolised.

Hokowhitu (2008, p. 134) argues that it is impossible to distil the essence of what is authentic and traditional, that we must interrogate the way such constructions are “produced for us and by us”. He argues that we must be particularly wary of constructions of traditional, fixed identities particularly when Western identities are privileged with fluidity (Hokowhitu, 2008).

Pulu Brown’s (2007) critique and Hokowhitu’s (2008) assertion that any reproduction of traditional essentialised identities is an illusion, mean that one must question

whether the categories of the past are as stable as they are presented, or whether they were always negotiated, changing and resisted, just as much as we understand these constructions to be contested and re-negotiated today.

Mahina's (2002, p. 54) research troubles the notion of an inflexibly structured Tongan hierarchy when he admits that:

Although Tongan society is rigidly multi-strata, social mobility is nevertheless possible. This, as a kind of buffer, is formally facilitated by the accident of birth (fa'ele'i), and social, economic and political antecedents such as to'a (bravery in the form of a successful rebellion), fa 'a (economic prowess) and talavou hoihoifua faka'ofa (physical beauty).

Mahina's (2002) research also shows that highly individualistic and aggressive, assertive behaviour was the privilege of chiefs and leaders, whereas obedience, loyalty and duty were the values of commoners. This implies that individualism was not unheard of, but rather it was a condition of privilege. I wish to draw attention to these contradictions rather than impose a false coherence of rigid hierarchies upon traditional Pasifika societies.

Hokowhitu (2008) points out that a deconstruction of what is "traditional" and "authentic" may disrupt the very core of how we currently give meaning to ethnic signifiers and categories. The positioning of Pasifika identities as most true and more authentic when they closely resemble these traditional forms has also been criticised (Waldram, 2004). Hokowhitu (2008, p. 133. 134) takes this argument further, proposing that to subscribe to the notion that identities can be "authenticated" is "to align with the colonizer".

Alcoff (2006, p. 271) argues that, "Indigenous cultures are commodified, fetishized, and fossilized as standing outside of history and social evolution" and are subjected to fixity, rigidity, "an unchanging order, daemonic repetition". A construction which privileges stable, pure, authentic identities (Alcoff, 2006) and fixes them, subjecting them to repetition of what Hokowhitu (2008, p. 134) calls "out-of-date performance" must be interrogated.

The value judgments between identities considered stable and those considered liminal, fragmented, hybrid also must be interrogated. The way that past and present are organised in relation to Pasifika identities similarly requires interrogating. Many binaries operate which privilege settler societies with change, the future and

individualism, forcing this to rub with constructions of Pasifika identities as stable, collective and past. This positions and produces Pasifika identities as most authentic when they repeat, rehearse, re-perform “past” identities, rather than being able to signify the future. This tendency to equate non-Western identities and cultures with the past is illuminated by Clifford (2008, p. 69) when he makes the following point:

What would it require, for example, consistently to associate the inventive, resilient, enormously varied societies of Melanesia with the cultural *future* of the planet? How might ethnographies be differently conceived if this standpoint could be seriously adopted? Pastoral allegories of cultural loss and textual rescue would, in any event, have to be transformed.

The next part of the literature review examines a conceptual story which focuses almost exclusively on cultural change and could be criticised for the ways it represents or erases cultural continuity.

PART 2: Acculturation and Assimilation

Acculturation was first defined by American anthropologists as “what happens after a process of ‘continuous’ first hand contact between two different cultural groups, with subsequent changes in the original culture patterns of either or both groups” (Redfield et al 1936, p.149 cited Berry 2002, p. 349). Redfield et al., (1936, p. 152) distinguished acculturation from cultural change, writing: “of which it is but one aspect, and assimilation, which is at times a phase of acculturation”.

It was Park and Burgess (1924, p. 375) who defined assimilation as: “A process of interpenetration and fusion in which persons and groups acquire the memories, sentiments and attitudes of other persons and groups, and are incorporated with them in a common cultural life”. Park and Burgess distinguished between four different types of interactions: competition, conflict, accommodation and assimilation, with accommodation denoting rapid cultural change and assimilation occurring incrementally over time (Rumbaut, 1997). Gans (1997, p. 877) distinguishes between assimilation and acculturation in a contemporary context by explaining that acculturation focuses on “newcomers’ adoption of culture” and assimilation denotes the movement out of ethnic networks and into mainstream “host society” social institutions, networks and “equivalents”.

One approach to assimilation stresses the possibilities of upward mobility and integration into mainstream (Alba and Nee, 2003). This is referred to as straight line

assimilation (Waters et al., 2010) and is distinguished from the concept of “segmented assimilation” (Portes and Zhou 1993, Portes and Rumbaut 2001, Zhou, 1997). Segmented assimilation involves a stronger analysis of the unequal nature of host societies, recognising that societies of settlement are not level playing fields and that children of immigrants become incorporated within existing inequitable and stratified societies (Zhou, 1997). Existing societal inequality is understood to be influential in pathways of downward mobility amongst the second generation (Zhou, 1997).

Berry (1980, 2001) is one of the most influential acculturation theorists. Berry (1980, 2001) has distinguished four different acculturation strategies which represent different coping styles or modes of adaptation to the acculturation process: integration, assimilation, separation and marginalisation. Under Berry’s (2001) model:

Assimilation involves fully adopting the cultural practices and beliefs of the dominant (host) culture at the expense of those from the migrant culture.

Separation involves maintaining migrant heritage and culture and not affiliating with the dominant (host) culture.

Marginalisation describes a situation of alienation and lack of affiliation with either migrant or dominant (host) culture.

Integration represents a strategy of maintaining features of migrant culture and also affiliating and adapting effectively to the host culture.

Berry and his associates have endorsed integration as the ideal acculturation strategy (see Berry et al., 2006). This was reinforced in a recent multi-national research project on youth in transition [International Comparative Study of Ethnocultural Youth (ICSEY)] which concluded: “the core message for individuals is to seek ways to follow the integrative path as much as possible, in preference to other ways of acculturating (Phinney et al., 2006, p. 233). Notably, ICSEY included a cohort of Pasifika youth from Aotearoa, New Zealand.

Another set of acculturation categories has been devised by Portes and Rumbaut (2001) which includes dissonant acculturation, selective acculturation and consonant acculturation: Dissonant acculturation is when the second generation adapt to the host society culture much faster than their migrant parents, which is associated with the risks of downward mobility. Consonant acculturation occurs when the children and parents adopt and abandon home cultures and language at the same pace. Selective

acculturation is said to occur when culture and language are maintained, a strong migrant network or community acts as buffer and “individuals and families do not face the strains of acculturation alone but rather within the framework of their own communities” (Portes and Rumbaut 2001, p. 54).

Critiques of Acculturation and Assimilation

Early theoretical work on acculturation and assimilation was ethnocentric and uni-dimensional in nature (Berry, 2002). Such approaches are now criticized for the way they emphasized simplistic one-way traffic movement “from traditional culture to majority culture” (Organista et al., 2002, p.141). Teaiwa (2006, p. 75) writes:

I am fairly confident in saying that the majority of social changes taking place in the Pacific are being analyzed as movement from being more Pacific to less Pacific, less European to more European, less modern to more modern, more exotic to more familiar.

This is constructed as a teleological movement of progress described by Suarez-Orozco (2001, p.8) as a “directional, unilinear, nonreversible and continuous” process. These approaches are also criticised because they downplayed mutual cultural change (Rumbaut, 1997) and/or ignored the nature and dynamics of host societies⁵² (Berry, 2001). Both assimilation and acculturation have been criticised for the way that they place too much emphasis on individuals and their strategies of adaptation, and not enough on societal dynamics (Steinberg, 2000, Furedi, 2001, Waldinger et al., 2007). Steinberg (2000, p. 68) concludes that these are essentially victim-blaming ideologies which shift, “the onus of moral and political responsibility for social change away from powerful institutions that could make a difference onto the individuals who are rendered powerless by these very institutions”.

Defenders of both concepts argue that with some sociological imagination or adaptation they can be redeemed (see Gans 1997, Berry, 2001). Rumbaut (1997, p. 953) continues to deploy the concept of assimilation, describing it as “seductive” rather than coercive, about “discovery” and not just loss, about “conflicts of loyalties” and “not just conformity to pressure” and “taking the path of least resistance”.

Critics describe acculturation as “a system under strain with a limited range of resolutions to resolve the culture conflict facing the native” or migrant (Seltzer, 1980, p.

⁵² Later versions of Berry’s typologies incorporated analysis of the society of settlement as he has further developed his ideas about acculturation (Berry et al., 2002).

174, cited Waldram, 2004, p. 133). ICSEY and Berry's theoretical approach was critiqued by Rudman (2008a, p. 231) who argued that the "4-scale method of trying to independently measure the ipsative constructs of assimilation, separation, integration, and marginalization" should be "put to rest" on the basis of low validity, low reliability, the lack of divergent validity, confounding of factor analysis and "bias towards integration as best outcome". Rudman (2008b, p 522) also argues that the ICSEY data shows that in relation to young immigrants who fit an "ethnic profile" classification (i.e., endorsing the separation attitude) "analyses found the ethnic strategy to be as good as or better than integration".

The limited range of resolutions and simplistic categorisations remove the possibility that all of these strategies and possibilities may be employed, experienced or activated in varying degrees and measures by the same individuals, depending on context, situation and motivation.

A systematic critique of acculturation and assimilation is provided by Waldram (2004, p. 305) who argues that it constructs "seriously disturbed individuals living disordered lives in dysfunctional communities, suffering from cultural anomie, marginality and maladaptation", drawing upon a European "primitivist discourse" which idealises traditional societies as static, unchanging and free from stress of any kind. Waldram (2004, p. 117) writes:

Acculturation theory, with its emphasis on trait diffusion and replacement, is clearly the driving force behind the caught-between-two-worlds paradigm. Trimble et al (1996, 204-5) critiqued the standard view of the paradigm, which posited that "there is an assumed inherent conflict between the values, beliefs and behaviours'. They continued, "Furthermore there is an assumption that whatever new is adopted, must automatically replace something of the old. In other words, a person only has so much capacity for "culture". According to this view, in the transition to the new culture all of the old is replaced.

The 'quid pro quo' (this for that) approach to culture is a defining feature of both assimilation and acculturation, as is the assumption that people have a limited capacity for culture. It also, as Hokowhitu (2008) points out, assumes that privilege of fluidity and the freedom of ever-evolving cultural experiences is the privileged domain of white and western culture.

The false categorisation of the culture of the native, migrant, "other" as authentic only when it is traditional, unmoving, frozen in time, can be traced to what Said (1978)

famously called “orientalism” and which Waldrum (2004) traces to a European “primitivist discourse”. It is argued that anything other than this traditional authentic positioning is cast in the pathology of loss and marginalisation.

Acculturation and Disadvantage

There is a long academic history of associating undesirable states of acculturation or assimilation with poor health outcomes (Vega 1998, Ortega, 2000), educational achievement and disadvantaged socio-economic trajectories (Furedi, 2001, Waldrum, 2004, Berry, 1980, 2001, Portes and Rumbaut, 2001). International theorists examining the native born children of migrants have coined the terms “second generation decline” (Gans, 1992) and “second generation revolt” (Perlmann and Waldinger, 1996).

This research focuses on stresses associated with identity, marginalisation, intergenerational acculturative gaps, within-group and out-group discrimination, and mono-lingualism (Romero and Roberts, 2003). There have been suggestions that first generation migrants are advantaged due to a “protective” or “buffering” effect of traditional culture” (Escobar, 1998, p.782) (see Foliaki, 1999, for a New Zealand example). In contrast, “bicultural stress” is associated with stress due to discrimination, prejudice, immigration and acculturation (Romero and Roberts, 2003). Increasingly in the psychology literature, it has become acknowledged that biculturalism is highly dynamic and “there is not just one way of being bicultural” (Phinney and Devich Navarro, 1997, p. 9). In addition, it is recognised that future research ought to advance understandings of: “The bicultural context of coping to improve our understanding of the positive factors that result from a bicultural context” (Romero and Roberts, 2003, p. 181). The next section briefly reviews this growing area of recognition of bicultural advantage.

Acculturation and Bicultural Advantage

Biculturalism as it is applied in a cross-cultural psychology context, “Assumes that it is possible for an individual to know and understand two different cultures as well as to alter one’s behaviour to fit a particular social context” (Vargas Reighley, 2005, p. 39). Bicultural individuals are seen to possess two or more cultural interpretive frames or schemas, networks of discrete specific constructs (Hong et al., 2000). It is also argued that bicultural people can engage in a process called cultural frame switching, where they shift between their two cultural interpretive frames in response to cues in the social environment (Hong et al., 2000).

Hong et al (2000, p. 701) write: "To capture how bicultural individuals switch between cultural lenses, we adopt a conceptualization of internalized culture as a network of discrete, specific constructs that guide cognition only when they come to the fore in an individual's mind". This argues that instead of one singular worldview, people can have internally distinctive systems, schemas or networks of meaning or "knowledge traditions" (Hong et al, 2007).

Increasingly, researchers are recognising the benefits associated with immersion in more than culture (Tadmor et al., 2009, Fowers and Richardson, 1996, Hong et al., 2000, Leung et al., 2008). Cultural duality or plurality can lead to a way of operating culturally which goes "beyond the respectful acknowledgement of difference to a fusion of horizons in which we both learn from others and are grounded afresh in our own best values" (Fowers and Richardson 1996, p. 620).

It is acknowledged that some bicultural individuals have a "greater ability to activate and utilize knowledge and skill sets acquired from both identities" and are consequently "better able to reap the benefits of being in a diverse environment" (Cheng et al., 2008, p. 1182). It is also posited that the ability to "cultural frame switch" may have meaningful cognitive consequences (Martinez et al., 2006, p. 386). Hong et al. (2007, p. 325) propose that, "the meeting of more than one knowledge tradition in a person can increase flexibility in cognitive and behavioural responding, and bring forth a stream of cultural innovations and creativity".

There has been a focus on integrative complexity and techniques of integration which have parallels with other acculturation literature. A measure of bicultural identity integration (BII) has been developed, which measures the extent to which individuals conceive of their two cultures as being oppositional and antagonistic (lower BII), or alternatively view their two cultures as congruent and complementary (higher BII) (Cheng et al., 2006). Lower bicultural identity integration is associated with numerous stressors, such as linguistic stress (stress from being misunderstood or negatively perceived because of one's language), relational stress, discrimination stress and cultural isolation. It is suggested that an inability to manage 'bicultural stress' is potentially linked to a susceptibility to internalizing negative ethnic stereotypes (Cheng et al., 2006). The same criticisms which argued that acculturation and assimilation did not focus on the conditions of the environment or power dynamics, and located too much responsibility (or blame) within the individual, could clearly be argued here. In addition, this literature could be criticized for taking Berry's assertion

that integration is the best possible acculturation outcome, and then running as far as one could with it. The preoccupation with integrative complexity is evident. Tadmor et al. (2009, p. 174) write:

Within the cross-cultural context, integrative complexity refers to the degree to which a person accepts the reasonableness of different cultural perspectives on how to live, both at the micro interpersonal level and at more macro organizational-societal levels and, consequently, is motivated to develop integrative schemas that specify when to activate different worldviews and/or how to blend them together into a coherent holistic mental representation.

What is interesting about this literature is that it critiques assumptions about a singular and unified mind with limited capacity for cultural complexity, arguing instead for internal plurality and multiple schemas which are not automatically associated with disorder but rather, possible advantage. Leung et al. (2008, p. 173) write that:

Multicultural experience may foster creativity by (a) providing direct access to novel ideas and concepts from other cultures, (b) creating the ability to see multiple underlying functions behind the same form, (c) destabilizing routinized knowledge structures, thereby increasing the accessibility of normally inaccessible knowledge, (d) creating a psychological readiness to recruit ideas from unfamiliar sources and places, and (e) fostering synthesis of seemingly incompatible ideas from diverse cultures.

It is my position that acculturation frameworks ought to be revisited; they are rejected as a way of framing how second generation Pasifika peoples are operating culturally. However, the bicultural literature examining multicultural minds is useful for thinking about the second-generation from a positive deviance or strengths-based approach to second-generation culture. This describes “the power of second culture exposure to stimulate integratively complex cognitions that give people the flexibility to shift rapidly from one cultural meaning system to another” (Tadmor and Tetlock, 2006, p. 173). It focuses on the “cultural cues” in the environment and how they moderate the way “biculturals shift between multiple cultural identities” (Cheng, et al., 2006, p. 742). This research claims that it can “empirically demonstrate that exposure to multiple cultures in and of itself can enhance creativity” (Leung et al., 2008, p. 169) and points to a host of positive cognitive and creative associations. Fundamental ideas in this literature are the assertions that people can accumulate disparate (cultural) knowledge traditions, access these as distinctive ideas in relation to cultural cues, as well as destabilize them, or integrate them to foster synthesis. These ideas have been useful in

framing my own ideas about the Pasifika second-generation and how they operate culturally in Aotearoa.

Acculturation and the Pasifika literature

When the culture of the Pasifika second generation, especially culture as a determinant of health, is under scrutiny, the term “acculturation” is often readily invoked (see Tiatia, 2008, Ministry of Health, 2004, Le Va, 2009). In 1997, it was predicted with “reasonable confidence” that the NZ-born generation would be faced with the following challenges: the weakening of the church; the weakening of the extended family structure; growing up in relative poverty; and experiencing a weakened cultural base (Ministry of Health, 1997, p. 25). The Ministry of Pacific Island Affairs (2003, p. 13) wrote:

The issues of Pacific self-identity and cultural preservation have emerged as key issues for Pacific people, particularly for Pacific youth. For some second-generation Pacific peoples, the bonds of Pacific culture are not as strong or dominant, and have resulted in a loss or weakening of Pacific identity, particularly for those of mixed marriages, who increasingly do not identify as Pacific. This has implications in terms of cultural and language preservation, Pacific identity and traditional Pacific values.

In 2004, the Ministry of Health wrote that “negative impacts” of “significant acculturation” experienced “especially” among “New Zealand-born generations” would lead to a “loss of identity and social support” (Ministry of Health, 2004, p. 178). Notably, the language deployed in many of these passages is the language of loss, weakness and dilution.

Another Ministry of Health (2005, p. 178) publication states: “Long term migrants and especially New Zealand-born generations of Pacific peoples have undergone significant acculturation, which is a continuing process”. In this publication, acculturation is measured using two indicators: language retention and participation in faith based organisations (churches) (Ministry of Health, 2005). “Responses to acculturation” are viewed to be “modifiable”, implying that there are optimum (health-promoting) patterns of acculturation, versus ways of acculturating that impact negatively on health and wellbeing (Ministry of Health, 2005).

In a more recent publication about Pacific cultural competencies, “acculturation” is defined in the following way: “the process of acquiring, adapting to or adopting a second culture, whereby two distinct cultural groups have continuous first-hand

contact, resulting in subsequent changes in the original cultural patterns of either or both groups” (cited Tiatia 2008, p. 5). One of the key recommendations of this document was the need to take account of the impact of acculturation on Pacific culture (Tiatia, 2008).

Paterson et al., (2007) apply Berry’s model of acculturation to Pasifika mothers in their longitudinal study measuring their cultural orientation using an adapted acculturation measure⁵³. After measuring and classifying Pasifika mothers using Berry’s four typologies they then associated acculturative states with tendencies towards interpersonal violence (Paterson et al., 2007).

In a Pasifika context, acculturation tends to be readily associated with a range of social ills, deviance and pathology such as violence (Paterson et al., 2007), diabetes (Foliaki and Pearce, 2003), obesity (Swinburn et al., 2003), mental illness (Foliaki et al., 2006, Kokaua et al., 2009, and addiction (Gray and Nosa, 2009). Acculturation is associated in a Ministry of Health (2005) report with a rise in substance abuse, mental health problems, lack of physical activity and a (detrimental) change in diet among Pasifika peoples. For the most part acculturation is not “measured” as in the Paterson et al. (2007) study. A higher prevalence of mental health disorders⁵⁴ among New Zealand-born Pasifika peoples has been established (Foliaki et al., 2006). Kokaua et al, (2009, p. 15) write that recent NZ-born mental health findings: “may suggest that early exposure to the New Zealand environment is strongly associated with high levels of mental disorder among Pacific people”. While acculturation is widely invoked, the actual relationship between acculturation and disadvantageous health outcomes is not always well articulated and in some cases poorly understood (see Mila-Schaaf and Schaaf, 2005).

Caught Between Cultures

Tiatia’s (2003, 2006) qualitative research into NZ-born Pasifika population most closely characterises the “caught between cultures” approach which Waldram (2003) associates with the acculturation paradigm. This approach is also characterised by Samu’s (2003) research which examined the social correlates of suicide for New

⁵³ They report that this measure was developed by Tsai et al, (2000) for Chinese Americans.

⁵⁴ Suicide rates amongst New Zealand young people remain high by international standards⁵⁴ (Ministry of Health, 2002) and Pacific suicide mortality (2000-2004) is similar to the NZ European rate (Pacific rates 19.14 per NZ European 18.03 per 100,000) (Craig et al., 2008) ⁵⁴.

Zealand-born Samoan Youth. Samu (2003, p. 74) writes: “Many NZ-born Samoan youth are forced to grow up in an environment that produces cultural and identity conflicts. They are exposed to sometimes conflicting values and practices of both the Samoan and mainstream cultures”. Both Samu and Tiatia identify a range of conflicting cultural values which are presented in the table below.

Table 1: Conflicting Cultural Values identified in Samu and Tiatia’s research

Pasifika values	Mainstream New Zealand values
Family cohesion	Personal freedom
Subjugation of needs of individual	Autonomy
Reciprocity	Individuality
Gerontocratic	Meritocratic
Religious authority	Secular authority
Communalism	Individualism
Respect, obedience	Critique, questioning
Fa’a Samoa / fakaTonga / fakaNiue etc	The Palangi way

Samu (2003) concludes that the existence of two sets of value orientations results in significant tension for the young NZ-born Samoan generation who must seek to reconcile them or suffer stress. Samu (2003, p. 112) suggests that this situation of uncertainty is similar to Durkheim’s concept of anomie which can result in suicidal ideation. Tiatia’s (2003) research also explores the relationship between culture and suicide, citing anomie, and normlessness as a consequence of such cultural conflict.

Samu (2003, p. 111) concluded that the “identity crisis” faced by many NZ-born Samoan youth was significant enough to warrant being identified as a “new stress issue” adding a “new dimension to the list of stress items” associated with suicide.

Both these perspectives place the burden and crisis upon the NZ-born youth and their mental states, which Furedi (2001) argues is a character flaw of the “marginal man” literature. This minimises societal discrimination and Furedi (2001, p. 27) points out that a characteristic of “marginal man” literature aligns the “problem” with “the failure

of colonial people subject to westernization to adjust to the new circumstances (not imperialism or racism)” emphasizing that “those who could not adjust became racially conscious, anti-white or unstable”. Steinberg (2000, p. 68) writes that placing the burden of the problem within the individual creates “victim-blaming” ideologies which he describes as the cultural fallacy of ethnic studies.

Waldram (2004, pp. 303, 304) is critical that the “caught-between-two-worlds” argument relies on a belief in pure “coherent” traditional cultures, so that cultural liminality, cultural incoherence and even culture-less states can be invoked in comparison.

The challenge that one has “no culture” is an interesting and inherently paradoxical idea which is akin to Subramani’s (2001, p. 161) negative descriptor of “empty symbols” (considered to be undesirable in the Oceanic Imaginary). Sinavaiana-Gabbard (2001, p. 174) critically question Subramani in response, asking: “What constitutes an empty symbol?” This alludes to an implicit (or explicit) hierarchy of symbols, and the politics of whether they are recognised or rejected.

Is lack of agency central to this problem, or is it, as Brown Pulu (2007) suggests, the conflation of ethnic identity with lower social-economic experiences? For example, the concept of segmented assimilation theorises about the dynamic of downward mobility into the poorer, lower rungs of inequitable host societies or underclasses (Zhou, 1997). Is this disdain for “empty symbols” or “no culture”, a reaction against what Steinberg (2000, p. 66) describes in the following passage?

We can readily observe the poor living by values and codes of behaviour that are divergent from those of middleclass society... what *looks* like a shared culture is, on closer examination, similar responses of discrete actors to the exigencies and circumstances that define and limit their choices. This is not culture pursued for its own sake, or prized for its intrinsic worth. Properly defined, it is not a culture at all, but only the defensive and reactive responses to structures of inequality as they impinge on the personal sphere of life. If it is a culture at all, it is the culture of last resort.

Quite aside from the dynamic that Steinberg (2000) draws attention to, which describes cultural (or acculturation) choices as “default choices⁵⁵” (Swinburn et al., 2003), the charges of “no culture”, “empty symbols” or ‘culture of last resort’ devalue some cultural experiences and expressions compared to others. This is difficult territory to wade through. Who has the right to identify some cultural symbols as desirable and to reject others as “empty”? Surely, to some extent, we all have this prerogative. The politics of cultural reproduction are evident. This invokes the symbolic struggle over cultural continuity and change. Sahlins writes: “Surely there is a cultural continuity. But continuity is not the same thing as immobility; indeed *the strongest continuity may consist in the logic of the cultural change.*” (2000, p. 419, emphasis in original)

This debate touches on how “acculturation” is framed as the poor cousin of “real” culture (dominant, centred, privileged, and possibly essentialised). It is also consistent with liminality being frequently associated with disorder, as opposed to proper or real secured culture. McIntosh (2005, p. 46) identifies that “fluid/fusion” identities, when contrasted with traditional identities, are “often dismissed as an indicator of societal /cultural /dysfunction” because they do not meet “formal criteria” associated with authentic identities.

Traces of these assumptions can be found in Anae’s (1998) approach to NZ-born Samoan identities whereby she describes the journey from liminality and immature identities to secure identities.

Identity Journeys towards Maturity

Anae’s (1998) research focuses on the journey away from liminality towards a secured identity for NZ-born Samoans. Anae (1998, p. 333) references Turner (1967) for her definition of liminality, which is characterised by the double negative “the not-Samoan, not-New Zealander” which is represented by the “interstructural inbetween” of “relatively fixed stable” categories. She writes:

NZ-borns during the liminal period of the identity journey are structurally if not physically invisible. Neither Samoan society nor New Zealand society provides us with definitions to allow for the existence of a not-Samoan and not-New Zealander person.

⁵⁵ Swinburn et al. (2003) write that the idea of people with limited resources being forced to take “default choices” on offer in an obesogenic environment may be more useful in understanding the situation of Pacific peoples, than notions of ‘lifestyle’ which imply unrestrained freedom and power to make choices that affect life, health and wellbeing.

Consequently the liminal NZ-born exists in a confused state of ambiguity and paradox until a secured identity is reached. (Anae, 1998, p. 358)

This journey of identity from “liminal” to “secured” Anae (1998) styles as a rite of passage, whereby a person has “successfully negotiated all challenges and arrived at a final understanding” (Anae, 1998, p. 359). The journey itself is described by Anae (1998, p. 338) as being characterised by rite of separation involving realisation of difference, to a “disordered liminal period of identity confusion” experience of liminality, to a rite of aggregation, characterised by security and reconciliation.

The idea of identity as destination is an interesting one. Anae (1998, p. 359) posits that when one has arrived at a secured identity, “when challenged, they are able to reconcile the oppositional forces behind the challenges” and “have developed coping strategies able to remain firm in their convictions; and demonstrate “differences in levels of awareness”. She also identifies that ability to move across both “Papalangi worlds and Fa’a Samoa” is one of “the most empowering” outcomes for “NZ-borns with secured identities” (Anae, 1998, p. 263).

Yet for those with a secured identity, the destination is restricted to being Samoan. These are, according to Anae (1998, p. 363), “Exclusive identities shared with all other Samoans – they are not shared with any other Pacific ethnic group”. Anae (1998) argues that Samoan ethnicity is redefined (i.e., Samoan remains a persistent identity as opposed to branching out into new ethnicities) and its categories stretched to embrace new and diverse forms of ethnic identity within its bounds.

Her framing of identity as maturity, whereby younger people are associated with liminality and maturity is associated with secure identity destinations, is mirrored by Holt (1999). In 1999, Holt investigated culture, ethnicity and identity among the NZ-born Samoan population in New Zealand. He looked at the way people crafted their identities at different stages of life and associated psychological states with age-cohorts. Thus he ascribed feelings of liminality and marginalisation to adolescence, using comments like these from his participants: “Where do I belong in this world, stuck between two worlds but never in any?” (Holt, 1999, p. 111)

Holt (1999, p. 157) correlated adulthood as a life-stage whereby participants were able to “identify both as a New Zealander and a Samoan, and coincides with the ability to move between cultures... the ability to deal with different cultures and take advantage of what each has to offer”. Holt’s (1999) approach involved applying life-stages

derived from human development and psychology paradigms to Pasifika identities. The rigidity of typologies and stage-like progressive models or identities is cast within the frame of “maturity” (inevitably towards a better, privileged, preferred form of identity).

Although Anae’s (1998) work is not so tightly bound to age or life stages, similar assumptions are made when she argues that a secure identity can come about via rites of passage with a secure New Zealand-born Samoan identity as destination. In her construct of movement from confusion to security, Anae (2001, p. 110) suggests that, “Inability to speak Samoan, or *Leo fa’asamoa*,” is a “prime source of identity confusion”. The journey between identity confusion and secure destination appears, in part, to be modelled on her own personal experiences, she writes:

My identity is now secure – as a New Zealand-born Samoan I know my roles and responsibilities to my family, *‘aiga* both in New Zealand and Samoa and my church in terms of *alofa*, *tautua*, *fa’aaloalo*, *feagaiga* and *usita’i* in the *va fealoafani* and *va tapuia*. As well as this I know my roles and responsibilities in *palagi* spaces in using my education, skills and knowledge to help other young Pacific peoples to succeed. It hasn’t been easy. I use and acknowledge both lifeways. (Anae, 2003, p. 101)

Anae’s conceptualisation of journey from liminality and confusion to stability and security is easy to appreciate, although I resist the positioning of identity destination fixed as a “final understanding”, preferring an approach that allows more fluidity and opportunity for alternatives.

What particularly concerns me is the marking of particular identities as less real than others, invoking the dilemma of the “empty symbol”. A particular type of identity is privileged by Anae (1998) and given power, cast as the destination to which you must “arrive” or be liminal, lost and confused. She writes:

The New Zealand-born finds meaning only in the relationship – *va fealoaloa’i* and *va tapuia* with both Samoan people and New Zealanders, and derives its sense of wholeness and wellbeing from its place of belonging in its *aiga* and church, its genealogy and language, the New Zealand environment and the Samoan persistent identity system. This New Zealand-born persona also draws its sense of control and worth when it is able to carry out its appropriate roles and responsibilities as a New Zealand-born Samoan and New Zealander spaces. (Anae, 1998, p. 363)

Anae's (1998) emphasis on relationships resonates. She acknowledges that identities are relational and make most sense in the context of *va*. In an Aotearoa context, she asserts this relational positioning must also contend with New Zealanders. Anae (1998) privileges identities associated with the church, family, Samoan language and genealogy as a secure 'destination'.

There are a number of criticisms which can be made of Anae's approach. The linear nature of the identity imaginary, inevitably moving in a teleological way, appears bound to modernist assumptions of uni-linear development and progress. Hereniko (1999) argues that Pacific peoples share a circular view of life, in which past and present merge, with no beginning and no end. He suggests that this "nonlinear-view of life contrasts with the Western view of the evolution of civilisation, marked by development and progress" (Hereniko, 1991, p. 140).

Another problem is the conceptualisation of identity as destination and the sense that one arrives at a final understanding. Hereniko (1999) and Hall (1996) argue that identities are always process, never product. Hall (1996, p.2) also asserts that identity is 'not a theory of the knowing subject, but rather a theory of discursive practice' arguing that identity should not be deployed in essentialist terms, but as strategic and positional. Hall (1996, p. 4) also argues that:

identities are never unified and, in late modern times, increasingly fragmented and fractured; never singular but multiply constructed across different, often intersecting and antagonistic, discourses, practices and positions.

Anae (1998) equates that which is liminal, fragmented and fractured with immaturity and disorder. These "identity as maturity" approaches have been criticised for their lack of fluidity and for the fact that this fluidity is read as identity diffusion and pathologised (Tupuola, 1998). Anae (1998) argues that Samoan identity is enduring (referencing Spicer, 1971) and suggesting that *fa'aSamoa* is a persistent identity. An over-reliance on *fa'aSamoa* as a stable category, without examination of power relations which reproduce and privilege a certain version of Samoan identity, is another weakness of Anae's approach. However the persistence and endurance of a particular form of Samoan identity was one of Anae's research findings. Continuity is often understated within acculturation paradigms which focus exclusively on change. I am also inclined to recognise that the way we stay the same is of just as much interest as the ways in which we change.

PART 3: Diaspora

An alternative framing to acculturation is generated via the heuristic device of diaspora. This component of the literature review examines some of the key ideas that sit within the concept of diaspora, transnational relations, historicity, hybridity and double or diasporic consciousness. This is followed by a review of how these ideas have been deployed in relation to Pasifika identities.

The concept of diaspora is understood to bring a historicity (Clifford, 1997) to the position of ethnic minorities who have migrated to new nation states, breaking the minority / majority dichotomy.

Clifford (2006, p. 453) writes, “Diasporist discourses reflect the sense of being part of an ongoing transnational network”. Brah (2006, p. 444) identifies that these transnational networks are characterised and patterned by power relations, writing:

...the concept of diaspora concerns the historically variable forms of relationality within and between diasporic formulations. It is about relations of power that similiarise and differentiate between and across changing diasporic constellations. In other words, the concept of diaspora centres on the configurations of power which differentiate diasporas internally as well as situate them in relation to one another (Brah’s emphasis).

For Brah (2006) the concept of diaspora provides a way of examining a transnational configuration of power relations. The term transnationalism (Vertovec, 2007, p. 964) has also been deployed as way of re-thinking “notions of culture in light of global flows and modes of deterritorialization”. Vertovec (2001) argues that the concept of transnationalism ought to be juxtaposed with understandings of identities.

The concept of diaspora requires focus on the slippery process of relocation and cultural continuities. As Appadurai (1991, p. 191) observes,

As groups migrate, regroup in new locations, reconstruct their histories, and reconfigure their ethnic “projects”, the ethno in ethnography takes on a slippery, non-localised quality, to which the descriptive practices of anthropology will have to respond.

Appadurai’s (1991, p. 192) concept of the ethnoscape refers to “transnational, cultural flows”. This emphasises how cultural flows have moved beyond borders of nation states and aims to provide a way of envisioning the dynamics of “changing, social, territorial and cultural reproduction of group identity” (Appadurai, 1991, p. 191). The use of the word “ethnoscape” and the way it shadows notions of landscape is

described as purposive by Appadurai (1991, p.191) who explains that “certain ambiguities” were “deliberately built into it” to capture “dilemmas of perspective and representation”.

Diaspora has also been associated with hybridity. Hall (1990, p. 235) writes:

Diaspora does not refer us to those scattered tribes whose identity can only be secured in relation to some sacred homeland to which they must at all costs return⁵⁶... The diaspora experience as I intend it here is defined, not by essence or purity, but by the recognition of a necessary heterogeneity and diversity; by a conception of identity which lives with and through, not despite, difference; by hybridity. Diaspora identities are those which are constantly producing and reproducing themselves anew, through transformation and difference.

It is argued that hybrid cultures predominate as new technologies, widespread migration and other social forces have enabled “new phases of intercultural contact” and “the pace of mixing” accelerates (Pieterse, 2001, p. 223). In a context of increasing intercultural contact, Hermans and Kempen (1998, p. 1111) write that “the conception of independent, coherent, and stable cultures” becomes “increasingly irrelevant”.

Critiques of “diaspora” as a route to understanding identities argue that, as a heuristic device, it privileges “point of origin” too much in its framing and emphasises transnational bonds at the expense of trans-ethnic solidarity and experience within nation states (Anthias, 1998). The assumption that “points of origin” are stable and not hybrid themselves is also criticised by Anthias (1998).

Clifford (2006, p. 255) also argues that a focus on diaspora “gives a strengthened spatial/historical content to older mediating concepts such as W.E.B Du Bois notion of “double consciousness”.” Double consciousness is the focus of the next part of the review, which is followed by an examination of diasporic consciousness, hybridity and third spaces, and then turns to how these concepts have been approached in the Pasifika literature.

Double Consciousness

W.E.B. Du Bois (1868-1963) was the first black sociologist and has been credited with single-handedly initiating: “serious empirical research on blacks in America” (Rudwick

⁵⁶ Note: Hall (1990) deems this to be the “old, imperialising” and “hegemonic” version of diaspora and ethnicity.

1974, p. 46). Lemke (2000, p. 69) observes that Du Bois “anticipated the post-modern discourses of identity formation”.

Du Bois described “double consciousness” as “a double life, with double thoughts, double duties and double social classes” (Du Bois cited Zuckerman, 2004, p. 168). Du Bois describes double consciousness as the competing of two inner consciousnesses. He stated:

One ever feels his twoness as an American and as a Negro: two souls, two thoughts, two unreconciled strivings; two warring ideals in one dark body, whose dogged strength alone keeps it from being torn asunder. (Du Bois cited Zuckerman, 2004, p. 24)

Du Bois identified that a “double-life” was the “life every American ‘Negro’ must live... From this must arise a painful self consciousness” (Du Bois cited Zuckerman, 2004, p. 168). Du Bois describes this as:

To merge his double self into a better and truer self. In this merging he wishes neither of the older selves to be lost. He would not Africanize America, for America has too much to teach the world. He would not bleach his Negro soul, for he knows the Negro blood has a message for the world. (Du Bois cited Zuckerman, 2004, p. 24)

This is the crux of “double consciousness”: the ability to transcend contradiction, the desire “to merge” without loss⁵⁷ to co-exist without integration or absorption. Du Bois also writes that an aspect of this double consciousness involves being explicitly racialised and ‘othered’ by another ethnic group:

A world which yields him no true self consciousness, but only lets him see himself through the revelation of the other world. It is a peculiar sensation, this double-consciousness, this sense of always looking at one’s self through the eyes of the others, of measuring one’s soul by the tape of a world that looks on in amused contempt and pity. (Du Bois cited Zuckerman 2004, p. 8)

Du Bois’ term “double consciousness” evokes a “third person” perspective of self, as well as describing the situation of internal “doubleness”. It is Frantz Fanon (1925-61)

⁵⁷ Gates (2003) is critical of the negativity inherent in the concept of “double consciousness” writing: “Du Bois yearned to make the American Negro one, and lamented that he was two. Today, the ideal of wholeness has largely been retired. And cultural multiplicity is no longer seen as the problem, but as a solution -- a solution to the confines of identity itself. Double consciousness, once a disorder, is now the cure” (Gates Jr 2003, p. 2). I do not agree that Du Bois constructed double consciousness as solely a malady, but rather that the concept also incorporated hope and positive aspirations.

who famously wrote of “third person consciousness” which has some parallels with double consciousness.

Fanon’s (1992) third person consciousness describes the experience of forming identity influenced by a third person’s perspective. He stated: “As long as the black man is among his own, he will have no occasion, except in minor conflicts, to experience his being through others” (Fanon 1992, p. 220). Yet he recognises that when operating within white-dominated societies, “Not only must the black man be black. He must be black in relation to the white man.” (Fanon, 1992, p. 220) This extract specifically focuses on the prejudices and impact of racism and racialisation, and its influence upon identity.

Richard Wright (1908-1960), another early black scholar, wrote of the condition he called “double vision”. Wright stated:

My point of view is a Western one but a Western one that conflicts at several vital points with the present, dominant outlook of the West. Am I ahead or behind the West? My personal judgement is that I’m ahead (cited Gilroy, 1993, p. 161).

This comment by Wright suggests, as Du Bois, that he has access to more than one outlook or worldview (in one body). However, he clearly perceives this to be an advantage. Gilroy (1993, p. 161) describes Wright’s concept of “double vision” as a “special condition, not a disability, nor a consistent privilege” that was partially characterised as inner ambivalence. He also infers that he is in a position to manage different points of view. One point of view (derived from a different belief system) conflicts and breaks with the other.

Gilroy (1993, p. 188) suggests that concepts which emphasize “doubleness” and “split consciousness” have had limited currency against unitary conceptions of ‘blackness’ which operate politically as organising tools with strategic potency. He writes, “this option is less fashionable” and that “appeals to the notion of purity as the basis of racial solidarity are more popular”. Gilroy (1993) suggests that such splitting disrupts the (political) project of unitary blackness. “Splitting” and hybridity as a threat to the ethnic group ‘as project’ is a theme that arises repeatedly within this literature review.

Diasporic Consciousness

Diaspora “as type of consciousness” or diasporic consciousness (Cohen, 1997, p. 184) focuses on the way that “enduring group consciousness about the homeland, and

feelings of solidarity more or less shared by the members of a diasporic collectivity in the host country" influence and shape the construction of identities. A recent study of diasporic consciousness among Brazilians in Australia argued that four interrelated patterns were indicative of an emerging diaspora consciousness (Duarte, 2005). These were described by Duarte (2005, p. 319) as,

the co-presence of 'here' and 'there' (Clifford 1999, p. 264); the re-creation of 'Brazilian spaces' in Australia; 'othering' in relation to the dominant culture; and increased reflexivity about the homeland.

It is argued by Duarte (2005, p. 334) that the liminality of being in-between is a typical condition of diasporic consciousness and he concludes:

The findings of the study indicate that 'dwelling in displacement' is a complex process that entails negotiation and re-conceptualisation of cultural identity in order to adjust to life away from the homeland. It also entails persistent attempts to create a suitable habitus in the host country, and to come to terms with the inevitable ambiguities of living 'in the between's'.

These conclusions are uncannily foreshadowed by Du Bois, the negotiation, the ambiguity, the "contradiction" of double aims (Du Bois cited Zuckerman 2004, p. 168) and the striving for a merger without loss. The sense of in-between, splitting, and experiencing liminality are recurring themes which will be further explored later in the literature review.

Hybridity and Third Spaces

Hybridity is according to Young (1995, p. 69) "the rearticulation, or translation, of elements that are *neither the One nor the Other but something else besides* which contests the terms and territories of both" (Young's emphasis). Thus, hybridity always involves the union of two distinctive elements to produce a third. Bhabha (1990, p. 211) writes:

For me the importance of hybridity is not to be able to trace two original moments from which the third emerges, rather hybridity to me is the 'third space' which enables other positions to emerge. This third space displaces the histories that constitute it, and sets up new structures of authority, new political initiatives, which are inadequately understood by received wisdom.

However, as Pieterse (2001, p. 226) points out, hybridity is "meaningless without the prior assumption of difference, purity, fixed boundaries... without an existing regard for boundaries, it would not be a point worth making... Without reference to a prior

culture of purity and boundaries, a pathos of hierarchy and gradient of difference, the point of hybridity would be lost"

Similarly, Gilroy's invocation of hybridity demands the production of something new: "A mix, a hybrid, recombinant form, that is indebted to yet reproduces neither of the supposedly anterior purities that gave rise to it in anything like unmodified form" (Gilroy 1997, p.323). Hall (1992, p. 258) writes that the "black experience is a diaspora experience", the consequences of which carries a "process of unsettling, recombination, hybridisation and 'cut-and-mix' – in short, the process of cultural diaspora-ization (to coin an ugly term)".

The term hybridity involves a re-imagining and fresh deployment of a term rooted in nineteenth-century eugenicist and scientific-racist thought (Young, 1995). The 'baggage' associated with the term hybrid, which signifies a grafting of two, otherwise disparate, elements into a new fusion, has provoked some strong reactions. Papastergiadis (1997, p. 258), however, counters these, questioning: "should we use only words with a pure and inoffensive history, or should we challenge essentialist models of identity by taking on and then subverting their own vocabulary?"

Approaching a definition of hybridity from an alternative angle, Meredith (1998) defines hybridity as what happens when colonisation and Western appropriation is not successful in assimilating non-Western culture. He writes that within a postcolonial context, "Hybridity is the process by which the colonial governing authority undertakes to translate the identity of the colonised (the Other) within a singular universal framework, but then fails to produce something familiar but new" (Meredith 1998, p. 2). In a similar vein, Ang (2001) writes that hybridity marks the irreconcilability of Chinese-ness and Western-ness. For Ang (2001, p. 30), "Hybridity (in-between-ness) is not the solution, but alerts us to the incommensurability of differences, their ultimately irreducible resistance to complete dissolution" in a context of "complicated entanglement".

There are many possible responses to the issues which the notion of hybridity raises. Can any culture ever be conceptualised accurately as pure and not-hybrid? And based on the premise that all peoples and all societies are culturally specific and culturally marked, that is local, is it not a vital function of *all cultures* to adopt and adapt by incorporating new experiences, new technologies and new influences within ever-evolving systems of meaning? Surely, the survival and potency of cultural meaning

requires the ability to negotiate and incorporate change. Does hybridity refer to what cannot be assimilated easily, to what, as Ang (2001) and Meredith (1998) imply, must be spat out rather than swallowed? It is also useful to consider Bhabha's (1994, p. 2) observation that:

The social articulation of difference, from the minority perspective, is a complex, on-going negotiation that seeks to authorize cultural hybridities that emerge in moments of historical transformation.

This recognises the role of authorising, the function of power, legitimacy and recognition. Whereas some hybrid combinations may be rejected as outside the parameters of cultural boundaries, others are granted inclusion and are recognised as new cultural developments. Noble (1999, p. 343) writes that for the second generation the struggle to be recognised "is felt in acute ways".

Therefore the term hybridity itself is subject to manipulation in the politics of cultural reproduction (and the term may be deployed to describe change that falls outside the parameters of more acceptable, less threatening and sometimes incremental change).

Noble (1999) deploys the concept of "strategic hybridity", for example, which does not mark all cultural choices and orientations by a second generation population as hybrid. Instead, cultural multiplicity and fluidity is recognised and "strategic hybridity" is recognised as a tactic of mixing "often in contradictory ways" alongside tactics of "strategic essentialism" which involves "assertions" of an "irreducible otherness" (Noble, 1999, pp. 29, 31).

Bhabha (1990, 1994) is recognised as a key author in the hybridity literature, particularly his concept of third space. Bhabha (1994, p. 39) argues that "it is the 'inter' – the cutting edge of translation and negotiation, the *in-between* space – that carries the burden of the meaning of culture". This is the third space, which Bhabha (1995, p. 209) describes:

It is in this space that we will find those words with which we can speak of Ourselves and Others. And by exploring this hybridity, this 'Third Space', we may elude the politics of polarity and emerge as the others of our selves.

It is here, that "the overlap and displacement of the domains of difference – that the intersubjective and collective experiences of nationness, community interest, or cultural value are negotiated". Bhabha (1995, p. 211) argues that this third space, "gives rise to something different, something new and unrecognisable, a new area of

negotiation of meaning and representation.” The emphasis on negotiation is clearly articulated by Bhabha (1994)

While Bhabha (1995) deploys the term hybridity, it is the concept of the “third space” and the in-between (rather than hybrid) that Pasifika scholarship has concentrated on. I turn now to the ways that these ideas have been used or rejected in the Pasifika literature.

Diaspora, Hybridity and Third Spaces in the Pasifika Literature:

Diaspora as metaphor, as imaginary, it is argued, is one of the most useful ways to deploy the concept (Anthias, 1998). This brings to mind Hau’ofa’s (1998, p. 391) vision of an enlarged and expanded Oceania. Hau’ofa (1998, p. 411) has put much effort and work into re-conceptualizing the Pacific as a social imaginary by using the metaphor of the Ocean and invoking Oceania as “our common heritage”, “our major source of sustenance”, our “pathways to each other and to everyone else”. He writes,

Most of us are part of this mobility, whether personally or through the movements of our relatives. This expanded Oceania is a world of social networks that crisscross the ocean all the way from Australia and New Zealand in the southwest, to the United States and Canada in the northeast. It is a world that we have created largely through our own efforts (Hau’ofa 1998, p. 391)

Hau’ofa’s (2008) vision of a much enlarged Oceania does not require one to have plans to return. The concept of diaspora allows Pasifika peoples to be positioned and imagined as part of an enlarged Oceania, often configured in transnational family networks (Gershon, 2007) rather than as small ethnic minorities within the confines of one nation state. The concept of Pasifika peoples maintaining va relationships across national boundaries has been explored (Lilomaiava-Doktor, 2009, Ka’ili, 2005, 2008). The shift from identities rooted in land, genealogies and relational networks to new diasporic identifications has been framed as a “roots versus routes” dynamic (Diaz and Kauanui, 2001, Clifford, 1997, Teaiwa, 2001). This not only encapsulates a rather decisive shift in the traditional ‘identity story’ but also examines the epistemic challenges of identity constructions as “rooted” in genealogy, land and relationship. Plummer (1995, p. 160) writes that:

Traditional identity stories of gender stability, age boundaries, religious tribalism, family lineage and moral character start to shift ground dramatically for some people. Once clear and fixed, identities are dramatically destabilised.

What is the impact of “routes” upon ideas about “roots” and what are the associated issues for identities? One of the diasporic challenges for Pasifika peoples in Aotearoa is not being indigenous to the land they live in. Makasiale (2007, p. 79) writes:

For Pacific peoples, identity has traditionally been drawn from a rootedness in the land and a sense of belonging to the kainga (extended family)... The challenge for us is to weave something new and fresh out of the position of ambivalence and landlessness here.

Identities are “rooted” in ancestral land in Pasifika nations. In Aotearoa, the Pasifika population lives predominantly in urban centres (Statistics New Zealand, 2007). Macpherson and Macpherson (1999, p. 279) question:

the portability of forms of social organization which originally evolved in small islands and how these function when the social and economic conditions in which they develop are altered.

Va’a’s (2001) research on the diasporic Australian context focuses on how Samoan spaces are recreated within Australia. He writes:

From the community the individual Samoan migrant gains stability, security and identity – a comfort zone.... Opportunity to participate in what one may call the ‘traditional’ economy... a traditional economy within the boundaries of a larger palagi economy. (Va’a, 2001, p.253)

Va’a (2001, p. 3) also writes about the impact of deterritorialisation upon fa’aSamoa, writing:

It is not situated in one place but in many places simultaneously, especially among migrant communities. It is not immutable, for it is ever subject to change, both at home and in receiving countries.

Va’a (2001) emphasises the enduring qualities of fa’aSamoa as transnational and subject to change, but he does not deploy the language of hybridity. Although the term polyfusion is coined (Mallon and Pereira, 2002) and the third space is embraced (Brown Pulu, 2007, Bolatagici, 2004) hybridity is, to a large extent, explicitly rejected in local literature (see Anae, 1998, Wendt, 1999). To quote Stevenson, (2004, p. 23) “The postcolonial has not arrived and hybrids are cultivated in laboratories”. Hybridity is rejected as a frame by Stevenson (2008, p. 180) who writes:

The negotiation of two cultures underlies the practice of a number of Pacific artists – artists whose identity is a foundation of their work. This blending is not hybrid – those involved do not position themselves in that dialogue.

Anae (1998, p. 171) also rejects hybridity and is critical of an “ideology” where “NZ-borns are imperfect hybrids of fa’a Palangi and fa’a Samoa”. As Wendt (1999, p. 411) explains:

You'll notice I use the term blend or new development and avoid the term 'hybrid/hybridity,' a term which sprouts prolifically in a lot of papers and student essays. Why? Because it is of that outmoded body of colonial theories to do with race, wherein if you were not pure Caucasian or 'full-blooded' Samoan or what-have-you, you were called 'half-caste,' 'quadroon,' 'mixed race,' 'coloured,' 'a clever part-Maori,' and inferior to the pure product. When Picasso developed cubism from African art and other influences was cubism called a hybrid, or a new development?

It appears that one of the reasons why hybridity may be so strongly rejected is that it requires any cultural change, or purposive adaptation of that which is new or foreign to be marked and categorised as *hybrid* and therefore *incommensurate* with that which produced it, rather than a normative process of cultural development. The ability to integrate new elements into a knowledge tradition is critical to its ongoing relevance. As Smith et al., (2008, p.7) write, “Drawing conceptual links between what is already known and what becomes known, a process to validate new knowledge while retaining metaphorical synchronicity, ensures that the cultural identity of the people remains secure while society develops”.

To have this process constantly categorised and ‘marked’ as ‘hybridity’ (and invariably exclusively in relation to non-Western cultures) assumes a stasis of culture, a false fossilisation which forces all ‘change’ to be conceptualised within a binary of purity and impurity (see WalDRAM, 2004). That which does not reproduce the criteria of one or the other, is marked as hybrid. ‘Hybridity’ requires that that cultural change is framed as a third incommensurable product rather than the normative and necessary expansion of cultural boundaries and parameters. Sahlins (2000, p. 488) argues that cultures, “are always universal in compass and thereby able to subsume alien objects and persons in logically coherent relationships”.

While I have put forward reasons why hybridity may have been rejected, it must also be asked whether hybridity undermines the power of ethnicity as political organising tool (Gilroy, 2003). It is recognised that arguments for a unified or singular Pasifika (Samoan, Tongan and so on) identity, based on what are considered “traditional” (Mailei 1999, Anae 2001) and essentialised ideas about identity, must also be similarly interrogated. The next part of the literature review focuses on three local Pasifika case

studies by scholars who have deployed some of the ideas sourced to diaspora, hybridity, third spaces and identities in-between in their work.

Floating, Fluid and Global

Tupuola's (1998, p. 171) research on Samoan young women aged 16-18 presents them as: "Cultural hybrids, affected and influenced by media and globalisation, weaving in and out of different cultures". Tupuola (1998) argues that the young women she interviewed resisted ethnic and cultural identities that were imposed upon them. She explicitly rejects the much prized hyphenated "New Zealand-born Samoan" resolution advocated by Anae (1998), stating that it is "out of tune with the experiences of the third generation" which drew on "contemporary music" and "multiple realities" characterised by more complexity than this label could encapsulate (Tupuola, 1998, p. 167). Vaoiva (1999) also writes about the increasing Americanisation of Pasifika youth identities.

Tupuola argues that the identities of her participants were not "fixed" but rather "floating" and involved identification across and between multiple cultural sources, creating identities that were "postmodern", "non-static", "unpredictable" "crossed over and new" (Tupuola, 1998, p. 171, 186, 187). Rather than describing these identities as bi-cultural, (which reinforced an overly simplistic duality) she described them as cross-cultural and characterised by movement and fluidity (Tupuola, 1998, p. 186). Tupuola (1998) also rejects the three options that she perceived to be pre-existing categories for organising Pasifika identities: New Zealand-born, Island-born or having dual identities; arguing that these young women moved within and "in-between" cultures drawing on global elements.

Tupuola writes of shifting boundaries and finds resonance in Hall's (1992, 1996) approach to "new ethnicities". Similarly, Tupuola (1998, p. 188) emphasizes multiple influences, resists mono- or bicultural ethnic identities and suggests the label "Niu Sila Samoa" framed as a "new ethnicity". This was described as, "dissecting, selecting, combining, making, blurring old cultural boundaries, creating new culture and ethnic identity in the process" (Tupuola, 1998, p. 169).

Tupuola's (2004a, p. 4) later work also focuses on shifting identities and the "complex cultural negotiations" that occur "intra-culturally, cross-culturally and transnationally". She continues to stress that self-identifications of Pasifika youth are increasingly global, they "are adopting identifications far removed from their

genealogy and local geography" (Tupuola, 2004b, p. 96). She refers to the fluidity of "preferred identities" which change in relation to what is considered "cool" by peers (Tupuola, 2004b).

Tupuola (2004b, p. 96) distinguishes between those who have not "mastered the process of negotiation" and those "who seem to be able to weave in between both the collective and personal and local and global cultures seem to have holistic and integrative identities where social and cultural identities are considered integral components of the personal identity." Tupuola's work contrasts significantly with Anae's, in that she refuses to associate fluidity, hybridity or liminality with disorder or identity diffusion.

Remembering and Re-creating Identity Stories

Brown Pulu (2007) uses experimental auto-ethnography to focus on her family stories as competing narratives of history and memory. This focus on family complements the argument that, "In the Pacific, it is families and their transnational connections that sustain diasporas" (Gershon, 2007, p. 474).

Clifford (2006, p. 453) writes that diaspora invokes a connection which "must be strong enough to resist erasure through the normalising processes of forgetting, assimilating, and distancing." Pulu Brown's (2007) focus on memories and family stories and the politics of remembering and forgetting fits within this frame.

Brown Pulu (2007, p. 15) argues for a performative, relational, and situational identity "as defined by the particular, that is, a set of social factors and circumstances which situate how and why an inter-generation family understand and engage with culture and its relationship to power in certain ways." Her emphasis is on power, narrative, memory, and competing discourses of memory and history. In Brown Pulu's work, counter-stories, rule breaking, and the unravelling of dominant discourses about Pasifika peoples in Aotearoa abound. She argues that the dominant discourses of Pasifika are Samoan-centred, privileging a particular experience which is not shared by all. Her thesis does not just involve the self-described activities of "constructing stories, writing culture and performing identity" but also 'writes back' (Brown Pulu, 2007, p. 4). Brown Pulu's (2007) auto-ethnography, locating family stories as well as social narratives through interrogating the impact of power relations, has the impact of challenging the reduction of complex, contextualised lives into stereotyped, generalised and decontextualised understandings (also see Campbell, 2005).

Identities In-between

Although all the literature so far reviewed has been influential in different ways, the last area of Pasifika literature reviewed is closest to my own position. Using a Radical Hermeneutic framework, Southwick's (2001) research focuses on Pasifika nurses who had to learn how to mediate the boundaries between "two worlds" of university institutions and home cultures. "Negotiating the discontinuity" is a key focus of Southwick's (2001, pp.86, 84) work: some participants were described as being "able to negotiate the gap" and others were described as having "limited negotiating power"

Southwick (2001, p. 58) argues that those people who locate themselves within "the taken-for-granted constructed sense of social order" of "social worlds" have a sense of "ontological security". Southwick's (2001, p. 58) key question is:

How is 'identity' possible for those who are marginalised and stand in the between space? For these individuals, do notions of 'belonging' and 'identity' become issues of profound ontological insecurity?

Southwick (2001, p. 30) writes, "I want to understand the experience of people who get marginalised *between traditions*." (emphasis in original) Southwick (2001, p. 62) argues that innovation and change "occurs in the inter-structural space between". She describes this as "the site of all possibilities unmediated or ordered by social structure" (Southwick, 2001, p. 62). Southwick (2001, p. 93) concludes that her participants developed "a range of different coping strategies" and "some level of accommodation and adaption was achieved between their home context and the context of the polytechnic environment". Her focus on negotiating the dissonance between spaces, and the creative possibilities of the inter-structural in-between resonate with a number of other scholarly approaches to intercultural experiences of diasporic Pasifika peoples.

There are critics of dualistic models of identity (Tupuola, 2004b) who see this as being complicit with binary logic (Lye, 1998), rehearsing the binaries (Holland, et al, 1998) and reinforcing stable polarised categories (Hekman, 1991). Bhabha (1994) is very quick to identify that the third space is where polarities are displaced and restructured.

Bolatagici (2004) writes about claiming the neither/nor of third spaces. She describes the "possibility of the 'third space' as an empowering concept for those of us who sit

outside and in between essentialised notions of race in Western societies” (Bolatagici, 2004, p. 82). In-between third spaces are also frequently mentioned in the work of Brown Pulu (2007) and are central to the work about Maori and Pakeha identities in Aotearoa by Webber (2008). Culbertson and Agee (2007, p. 90) also refer to spaces between in their research on Pasifika identities, with a participant, Sui, in their study reported as saying:

Connecting, disconnecting. I don't know what's so transforming about that, but maybe this is what people who are 'in between' have in common: that place, it's a distinct place, and I know that place.

Tamaira (2009) has recently edited a University of Hawaii anthology on the space-between. She notes in her preface:

The *space between* is a prevalent metaphor in the Pacific, including within its scope indigenous concepts such as *va* (in Samoan and Tongan culture) and *wa* (in Māori and Hawaiian culture). It has been referred to as an intermediary site--a liminal zone marked not only by tension and transformation but also by confluences and connections. (Tamaira, 2009, p. 1)

She then turns directly to reflect on her own personal experience, writing:

The space between is uncomfortable. The space between is deeply personal. It is also transformative. In the last several years, I have grown to accept my in-between status. I have even found it to be in many ways liberating; I have the advantage of moving between cultures, although that requires constant negotiation on my part. (Tamaira, 2009, p. 1)

There are many papers which reflect on the resonance of the space between for Pasifika identities, art and culture (e.g. Whimp, 2009, Webb-Binder, 2009, Higgins and Leleisu'aso, 2009). Whimp (2009) argues that “interstitiality” and an “interstitial cultural space” is a useful concept. He draws on both Bhabha's (1994) and Calvet's (1994, 28-29) definitions of the interstitial “as a place of cultural passage, transition, and as a space in which to claim identity in a variety of forms” (cited in Whimp, 2010, p. 19).

Higgins and Leleisu'aso (2009, p. 38) write of “Kamoans” (a blend of Kiwi/Samoan) in Aotearoa:

They are confronted by a reality markedly different to that of their cousins in Samoa, and of their Kiwi peers (that is, those born and bred in New Zealand, Maori and Pakeha [Europeans] included). For all intents and purposes, they exist in the space between. Although

this dual identity requires constant negotiation, Kamoans have been creating their own space for their voices to be heard.

The focus on the space between, on negotiation, on encounter, on creative possibilities and the politics of claiming space (to be heard and in which to be recognised) are constant themes in this work. In a position of being neither / nor, rather than choosing between, the option was instead to “strike a balance” (Higgins and Leleiuaso, 2009, p. 43). The qualities of this space are described as cross-cultural, overlapping, dynamic, uncertain, unruly and creative. Webb-Binder (2009) focuses on the art of Lily Laita, and she quotes Laita talking about her concept of ‘*Va i Ta*’ as:

the space in between, it’s a context for when spirits [aitu] are running around and everything is going on, it’s the space between dark and light...it’s the space where anything can happen.

Webb Binder (2009, p. 29) concludes of Laita’s work:

Multiple geographies, histories, and identities converge in the space and time that is *Va i Ta*. Laita has drawn on a range of epistemologies to compose the layered meaning of the painting. The viewer must filter through these multiple realms in order to gain a comprehensive understanding of the work in its entirety.

The evocation of Laita’s painting in this way gives a sense of requiring stereoscopic vision, of requiring intertextual skills to read the multiple cultural and symbolic layers and meanings. The focus on identities in-between, *va* and spatiality resonates most with my theoretical approach which will be discussed in the following chapter.

Conclusion

To commit to a positive deviance and strengths-based approach to understanding the identities and culture of second generation Pasifika peoples requires an interrogation of the paradigms within which they are theoretically framed and the assumptions which prevail within this scholarship. This literature review covered much ground. It began with examining the ways that identities were “traditionally” framed within Pasifika cultures and homelands, and then “troubled” some of these constructions. It is questioned whether assumptions of past ‘stable’ categories and societies are re-imagined as more “stable” as we revisit them, during the process of reconstruction. There is considerable support for the idea that contemporary identities are marked by heterogeneity, cultural mixing, change and flux in ways that they never were in what is framed as the simple, mono-cultural past. I admit that I am somewhat suspicious of

this fixity; but am similarly suspicious of assertions of free floating fluidity. Hereniko's (1999, p. 161) assertion that Pasifika identities are "*contested, transformed, and negotiable*" has much more resonance.

After reviewing and interrogating the "traditional", this chapter focused on two distinct conceptual narratives used to frame second generation culture and identities. The first was what I called the acculturation and assimilation paradigm and the second focused on the heuristic device of diaspora. Under these conceptual umbrella sub-headings sat a variety of different approaches and ideas about second-gen identities and culture. Both international and local literature was reviewed.

One of the themes to emerge was the jarring juxtaposition between the construction of some identities as pure, stable, traditional, authentic, ontologically secure and whole; and others considered fragmented, liminal, acculturated, insecure, hybrid and in-between. Unspoken hierarchies and assumptive ideas about race, ethnic groups, superiority and inferiority, appeared to underpin and influence the thinking and the framing. The pervasive reliance on binary logic, essentialist assumptions resulted in the privileging of some identities and the pathologising of others. This was most noticeable within the acculturation and assimilation paradigms but its continuing energy could be found throughout the literature. For example, "The assumption that some cultures are not hybrid" (Anthias, 1998, p. 575) must be interrogated, alongside the rejections of hybridity as a threat to unified ethnic projects.

Frameworks which rely on binaries (between past and present, primitive and civilised, partial and whole) to represent cultural difference have been critiqued and rejected. It is argued that the concept of diaspora is a useful way of examining the means through which ideas, social ways of organising and identities have continuing energy, as well as the ability to adapt and transform via migration and transnational connections. There were too many ideas reviewed to adequately summarise them all in this conclusion; however a number of key debates in relation to Pasifika identities could be discerned. For example, tensions between identities that privilege "roots" or "routes" in the way they are imagined. Identities understood as relationally determined or as self-authored. Second-generation framed as acculturating or assimilating ethnic minorities within a nation state, or as part of transnational diasporic imaginaries. Identity conceptualised as a linear journey of maturity towards achievement, or identity as situated and performative. Identity as fixed or fluid; as "caught between" or doubled; as dual or as characterised by multiplicity; as bicultural or cross-cultural;

as hybrid or as whole and part of a unified ethnic project. Identity as associated with advantage or disadvantage, healthy or disordered. The theoretical chapter continues to engage with many of these debates, and outlines much more clearly my own position on Pasifika identities within this thesis.

CHAPTER 5

The Conceptual Narrative

(from) Five Poems on not being a real Tongan

PhD 3.
The Tongan
education specialist
says that she can tell the difference
between
real Tongans
and those who are not.
Real Tongans say
'Donga'
Like, Doe a Deer a female deer.

Those who are not real Tongans
say 'Tonga'
like, tea, a drink with jam and bread,
and have
Fa
a
long long way to go.

(Mila, 2008, p. 13)

Introduction

This chapter outlines the theoretical framework developed in this thesis. Following on from the literature review it focuses on moving beyond binaries while maintaining the ideas sourced to the third spaces or the space in-between. It attempts to deconstruct what is privileged as authentic and represented as stable within the Pasifika cultural imaginary. It examines how relationships are sites of knowledge production, of symbolic interaction and symbolic struggle where the differences and similarities between self and other are negotiated.

Space and spatiality is deployed throughout the thesis as a "broad metaphorical" strategy invoking "visuality" as a way of "representing social complexity" (Lopez, 2001, p. 93). Of course, spatiality is more than a metaphor, space is "one of the axes along which we experience and conceptualise the world" (Massey, 1992, p. 67).

This draws substantially upon Bourdieu's (1977, 1985a, 1985b, 1989a, 1989b, 1993, 2008) concepts of social space, capital and doxa. Bhabha's (1990, 1993, 1994, 1995) third space and the idea of the negotiated space (Smith et al., 2008, Mila-Schaaf & Hudson, 2009a, 2009b) are discussed and developed. Drawing on ideas of va, relational spaces, as sites of encounter between self and other, are examined. Durie (2002, p. 20) writes:

The use of space is a necessary accompaniment of encounters, providing not only physical territory but also the psychological space to rehearse identity and to confirm the relationship between self and others.

The metaphor of space provides "a visibility" (Lopez, 2001), invokes the liberal freedom of the inter-structural in-between and literally describes the space between people of intercultural encounter.

The role of power within relational and intercultural spaces is specifically focused on. Drawing on Bourdieu's concept of capital being associated with profit in social spaces, the idea of polycultural capital is developed to refer to cross-cultural resources and intertextual skills associated with advantages in intercultural, relational spaces.

Doing Theory: The problems with cultural cartography

This theoretical imagining and intended "visibility" of spatial metaphors is akin to the map or "fantasy of unity" which Jones and Jenkins (2008, p. 482) criticise as a "Western Enlightenment desire for coherence, authorization, and control." In defence of a desire to embark on a project akin to cultural cartography, I would turn to the double cartographic movement, invoked by Winduo (2000), of erasure and over-inscription and demand the right to re-inscribe that territory, to tell "our" stories alongside those that already exist about us.

Yet, it is not enough to invoke authority in my own insider positioning, and it is not enough to replace one-dimensional rendering of a complex and moving world with another. This is not an adequate response, even in a context of competing cartographies, narratives and theories vying for authority to produce social meaning about who we are.

It is Latour (1999) who writes that the question of correspondence between words and the world has become tired. He says that we cannot expect science to make "an exact copy of the world", but argues instead that, through successive stages, if we can "forfeit resemblance" we can see the way in which through "an endless sequence of

mediators" and "discontinuous transformations" which "verified reference circulates through constant substitutions", we can come to "link ourselves" to an "aligned, transformed, constructed world" (Latour, 1999, p. 78, 79). By agreeing with Latour and his carefully worded description of the process of cycles of circulated verified knowledge, through which "we can link ourselves" to an (albeit) transformed and constructed world, I position myself as a critical realist. Although, to adopt the words of Alcoff (2006, p. 171), a critical realist who carries a "hermeneutics of suspicion in regard to what looks natural".

Part of the point of this thesis is to illustrate how social worlds are constructed in culturally distinctive ways, through a different series of mediators, verifiable according to different reference points, and how knowledge traditions may be circulated among peoples in quite a different fashion. This perspective is similar to what Parker (2001, p. 258) describes as a "dialectical critical realism" which is open to plural knowledge systems, tolerates contradictions, and recognises that radically different and even incommensurable ideas may have equal "practical adequacy".

Dealing with the epistemic uncertainty created by such contradictions, and the conflict generated by rival ideas associated with contrary epistemic positions is, I argue, a defining characteristic of ongoing exposure to more than one culture and the predicament faced by second-gen Pasifika peoples.

Therefore, alongside the hermeneutics of suspicion, I assert that all knowledge is first and foremost local knowledge (Okere et al., 2005); generated in specific social, cultural and political contexts, territorial locales, and environmental conditions. I am also conscious of Trouillot's (2002) proposition that the 'West' tends to project universal relevance, while hiding the particularities of its own marks and origins, which Trouillot refers to as "the North Atlantic universals" (i.e. development, progress, democracy). "By hiding their specific localized, North Atlantic, and thus parochial - historical location" - they take on a "guise of universality" which Trouillot describes as "seductive" (Trouillot, 2002, p. 221).

Yet, at the same time, I draw on this seductive, purportedly generalisable knowledge and theory in order to create my own local map. The flawed nature of the resources at hand, the erasure of my own Pasifika indigenous knowledge, the vast amounts of over-inscription - the screeds and screeds of it available, and its many problematic assumptions and inheritances, all contribute to the challenges of 'doing theory'.

Given that the social and cultural demographic, analytic and imaginary of Pasifika peoples has already been produced in a myriad of different ways, and given that non-Pasifika peoples have long enjoyed the privilege, time and space to develop written theories to assist their thinking about the social; I am not ashamed to claim a project of conceptual narrativity (Somers, 1994) and cultural cartography, albeit with some caveats. Somer's (1994, p. 620) writes:

The challenge of conceptual narrativity is to devise a vocabulary that we can use to reconstruct and plot over time and space the ontological narratives and relationships of historical actors, the public and cultural narratives that inform their lives, and the crucial intersection of these narratives with the other relevant social forces.

The conceptual narrative I have developed theorises, imagines and reconstructs, using metaphors and techniques invoking visuality and spatiality, the social conditions and power relationships in which Pasifika second-gen peoples are constructing identities and operating culturally. The "conceptual narrative" (Somers, 1994) relies heavily on metaphors to invoke ways of seeing the complex social and cultural dynamics facing second generation Pasifika peoples (Lopez, 2001). When we look at a map, despite its two dimensional rendering, its flaws and its potential failings, we know that it is merely a map, not the territory itself. It is a tool, a guide, an impression, a reproduction, a construction; we do not expect it to be any more than that, but we do expect it to be as accurate as possible (within a particular context and set of expectations) and we expect it to be helpful.

Frank (1995, p. 29) argues that theory will no doubt prove inadequate to what is "really real", but that the singular truth of the "really real" is in itself questionable, and despite all these limitations, "theory is still useful in approaching the bewildering complexity of that really real". It is not exactly a neat resolution. Yet Frank (1995, p. xiii) writes,

I prefer the idea that this theory awaits further living and the stories of those lives. This theory has been shaped by the stories I have been privileged to live and hear, and I encourage readers to reshape it in the same spirit.

Similarly, I prefer the idea that the theory I have developed awaits further living.

Moving Beyond the Binaries

A review of the literature points to the recurring motif of being in-between but also the problems with envisioning disordered liminality between two stable categories. The

notion that such stable categories actually exist has been called into question (Boyce Davies, 1994). The reliance on binary logic to create two polarised categories is also criticised (Hekman, 1991).

Without depending on a framework conceptualising stable categories in a binary relationship, I argue that within cultural imaginaries, certain discourses are privileged, or “centred”. These are accorded high symbolic value tend to be considered to be most authentic. Bourdieu (1989b) would call this *doxa*; other theorists such as Gramsci would invoke the word hegemony.

What has become privileged is not stable, but is rather subject to counter-narrative, heterodoxy and competing ideas and discourses which also vie for symbolic recognition. This draws on Bourdieu’s analysis that there is symbolic struggle over the “legitimate mode of perception... such an important prize at stake in social struggles” (Bourdieu, 1985b, p. 732).

Doxa is a Greek word meaning common belief or popular opinion. Bourdieu (1977) appropriated the word to refer to that which appears self-evident and which petrifies social limits. *Doxa* is the “taken for granted” and “ordinary order” within a field (Bourdieu, 1985b, p. 734). Wacquant (2008, p. 270) describes *doxa* as the “natural attitude of everyday life” which “hinges on the close fit between the subjective categories of *habitus* and the objective structures of the social order”.

Rather than accepting cultural categories as stable or truly authentic, it may be more productive to focus on the social and material conditions and the political and symbolic struggle which results in particular aspects being considered to be the most legitimate and the most “true”. Bourdieu (1993, p.73) argues that “heterodoxy” functions “as a critical break with *doxa*” which then “brings dominant agents out of their silence and forces them to produce the defensive discourse of orthodoxy, the right-thinking, right-wing thought that is aimed at restoring the equivalent of silent assent to the *doxa*.” When this is applied to culture, defined here as a knowledge tradition, it refers to what has settled and crystallised as traditional, as having most cultural authority, as being authenticated as pure culture.

What is most privileged, and is accorded the highest symbolic recognition, is always subject to challenges and to change, to movement and displacement. To maintain a position of privilege and authority requires mechanisms to contain, to absorb, accommodate and adapt change, but within its own logic. A parallel strategy for

maintaining dominance is to present a discourse as “stable”. There is symbolic advantage in being represented as “stable” and “as the truth” or as being authentically representative of “fa’aSamoa” or “Tongan”, and thus validated by those with symbolic authority. This is part of the privilege of being considered the “legitimate mode of perception” (Bourdieu, 1985b p. 732).

To take this tack requires deconstruction (Spivak, 1988) as to why particular ideas, values and beliefs are privileged within a cultural imaginary as most “authentic”, or “best” or most “truly representative” (of a culture) without being required to think of them as “truly” authentic, simultaneously recognising the power and scope of their influence. It involves the examination of how particular ways of doing things become institutionalised and legitimised, whereas other discourses and ways of doing things are marginalised (Nicole, 1999).

Bourdieu (2008, p. 85) suggests that there is always “direct profit derived from doing what the rule prescribes,” recognising that “perfect conformity to the rule can bring secondary benefits,” such as “prestige and respect.” It is also recognised that deviation from what is symbolically recognised as most legitimate is associated with penalties. In the second generation literature, it is clear that deviation from what is imagined as “real” and “pure” culture, that which is privileged and considered most legitimate, is not only associated with inauthenticity but also with a whole host of negative associations such as: instability, liminality, disorder, disease, hybridity, marginalisation, diffusion and anomie (Anae, 1998, 2004, Samu, 2003, Tiatia, 1998, 2003, Waldram, 2004, Furedi, 2001, Romero & Roberts, 2003, Domanico et al., 1994).

Deconstructing What is Privileged as Pasifika

What are privileged as Pasifika culture and values? Certainly, the notion of pure, bounded cultures has continuing energy. For example, Lee (1998, p. 24) writes the following passage about Tongans:

Despite the earnest debates in anthropology about the viability of the concept of “culture” (see Brightman 1995), it is certainly alive and well for the Tongans I have met in both Tonga and Australia. As exemplified in many of the quotes in this paper, they readily used terms such as culture, tradition, and identity in our interviews and conversations, most often in relation to the concept of *anga fakatonga*. As was shown in `Ana's comments at the beginning of this paper, the essentialist notion that “the Tongan culture” exists as some kind of stable, bounded entity is readily accepted. This is

confirmed in the way Tongans measure themselves and each other against this norm, as being more or less Tongan.

Rather than accepting that a stable bounded entity exists, I consider it is more useful to interrogate why certain aspects of fakatonga are privileged as being “authentic” and having high symbolic value when compared to others. Waldram (2004) argues that what is frequently constructed as authentic for native non-Western cultures draws heavily from primitivist discourse embedded within Western knowledge traditions. This endorses Said’s (1978) arguments about orientalism, which criticizes the way European culture has generated and produced knowledge about non-Western cultures. Notably, contemporary constructions of Pasifika identities by Pasifika peoples which deploy Western notions of the noble savage and primitivism (especially those seen to be politically motivated) have been criticised as “invention” (see Linnekin, 1992). Another counter-argument is that any conceptualization of “authentic” or “traditional” is an “illusion” which must be interrogated as “produced for us and by us” (Hokowhitu, 2008, p. 134). To try to culturally authenticate anything, Hokowhitu (2008) argues, is to align with the coloniser and to deny the fluidity which colonising cultures claim for their selves.

Constructing a Pasifika imaginary using primitivist, orientalizing discourses can be represented as related to the over-inscription process inherent in colonialism described by Winduo (2000). Interrogation of these historical discourses shows the ways in which they rely upon modernist binaries which construct polarised differences between native and coloniser, primitive and civilised, past and present, savage and saved, traditional and contemporary. These binaries continue to have energy and impact upon the ways that we imagine ourselves and others. As Howard (1990, p. 276) suggests:

Perhaps the most pervasive form of symbolism employed throughout Oceania... is white colonial society itself... with its emphasis on individualism, material consumerism, and racialism, provides an oppositional category that allows clearest self-definition.

It is my position, that all social meaning and identifications are constructed in a relational context and that our identities are informed, in part, by other people’s ideas about us. The question is not so much whether this happens or not, but the degree of influence of the ‘other’ and the power dynamics that privilege and reproduce certain constructions. Recognition of symbolic struggle and co-construction requires “an analysis of the strategies of power and subjection, inclusion and exclusion, the voiced

and the silenced, and how some of the discourses are legitimized and become institutionalised.” (Nicole, 1999, p. 266)

Foucault (2008, p. 75), in an analysis of subjugated knowledge, writes of a process whereby ‘local’ knowledge, ideas and beliefs are held up against the “claims of a unitary body of theory which would filter, hierarchise and order them in the name of some true knowledge”. Through this process, selected ideas, beliefs, logic and discourses are disqualified as illegitimate and become confined to the margins of knowledge (Foucault, 2008).

Gegeo (2001) points to a history which has been characterised by colonial culture’s domination over, appropriation of, and dismissal of, Pasifika knowledge. If the contemporary Pasifika cultural imaginary is imagined only via a “third person consciousness” filter (Fanon, 1992) which draws heavily from orientalist and primitivist Western representations, or is primarily defined by how it is differentiated from “white colonial society”, then it is a poorly imagined imaginary indeed (see Gegeo, 2001, Hau’ofa 2008, Subramani, 2001). In the words of Gegeo (2001, p. 278), “It’s about our ontology, and what we want to create for our future generations. What good is political independence if we remain colonized epistemologically?”

Alongside the impact of colonisation and the influential, constitutive relationship between the Pasifika imaginary and its most dominant colonising other, focusing on the internal symbolic struggle over the way “we imagine ourselves” is also critical. Bourdieu (1985b, p. 730) writes:

Knowledge of the social world and, more precisely, the categories that make it possible, are the stakes, par excellence, of political struggle, the inextricably theoretical and practical struggle for the power to conserve or transform the social world by conserving or transforming the categories through which it is perceived.

To turn to a Tongan example, Lee (1998, p. 13) points to the notion of “respect” being given by a participant as a definitive example of a Tongan value. She observes, “Yet there are seemingly infinite variations in the definition and practice of respect” (Lee, 1998, p. 13). Lee (1998, p. 13) writes that: “Because anga fakatonga is such a broad concept, there is a “Tongan way” to do almost anything, from the simplest ordinary activities to the most elaborate ceremonial events.

This fluidity and ability to manipulate symbols and their meanings, “Not just mechanically apply it – but also the means to elaborate it, to modify or adapt its rules

in novel circumstances” is, according to Sewell (2005b, p. 88), “part of what gives cultural practice its potency”. Sewell (2005b, p. 87) also argues that:

When a given symbol system is taken by its users to be unambiguous and highly constraining, these qualities cannot be accounted for by their semiotic qualities alone but must result from the way their semiotic structures are interlocked with other structures – political, social, spatial, and so on.

Respect is often claimed as a core Tongan value, and was mentioned by most Pasifika participants within this research project as a core Pasifika value. Why is “respect” considered to be so salient, and why does it have such gravitas as an authentic Pasifika value? Here, a deconstructive interrogation is possible and productive, because as Spivak (1988, p. 28) writes:

Deconstruction does not say there is no subject, there is no truth, there is no history. It simply questions the privileging of identity so that someone is believed to have the truth. It is not the exposure of error. It is constantly and persistently looking into how truths are produced.

In a speech delivered in 1920, Queen Salote of Tonga addressing her people, said:

What is the real meaning of Love of Country? It means to work, to cling to our own peculiar customs that are good and ought not to be abandoned. The things to be prized by us are love, respect, and mutual helpfulness (Queen Salote Tupou 1920, cited Wood-Ellem, 1999, p. 89).

Wood-Ellem (1999, p. 89) goes on to comment that, “The love, respect, and mutual helpfulness” the Queen referred to were ‘ofa (love tinged with fear), which she sought from her subjects, faka’apa’apa (respect) that the inferior owes the superior, and the mutual helpfulness was ideally the interdependence of chiefs and people”. Campbell (2001, p. 55) writes,

Rich though the soil of Tonga was, its productivity and fine state of cultivation were the result of much hard work. The people had to produce more than their own needs in order to meet the heavy demands of chiefs and the requirements of ceremonial occasions... Every Tongan had an obligation (fatongia) to pay certain quantities of produce to his chief from time to time, and especially in July and October for the ‘inasi ceremonies, when tribute was paid to the god Hikule’o through the Tu’i Tonga in acknowledgement of the fruitfulness of the soil and sea.

Sahlins (2000, p. 83) argues that “chiefly due” was common across Polynesia, writing “Polynesian chiefs had rights of call upon the labour and agricultural produce of households within their domains... Economic leverage over a group was the inherent chiefly due”. This illustrates the role of power in the political processes whereby certain values become associated with the dominant view.

In Tongan society, high value was placed upon respect, knowing your place, not overstepping social boundaries '*Oua 'e hikihihi kau'a* (Do not overstep your bounds) (Mahina, 1992, p. 54). Mahina (1992) argues that values of respect, loyalty, obedience, warm heartedness and duty were encouraged among commoners, whereas values of aggression, courage, bravery, and dominance were encouraged among chiefs. It does not require a sharp, deconstructive critical analysis to see how encouraging respect for the superior by the inferior supports the existing configuration of power.

Bourdieu links capital and privileged subject position with the power to “determine, delimit, and define the always open meaning of the present” (Bourdieu, 1985b, p. 728). Even the Tongan value of love or “*ofa*”, defined by Kavaliku (1966, p. 74) as being a defining Tongan value, “very akin to Christian love” may be deconstructed to see how it is reproduced as central. While *fatongia*⁵⁸ obligations were outlawed by King George I, *kavenga*⁵⁹ (voluntary obligations) persisted. Helu (1999, p. 193) writes, “Kainga commoner members still subsidise, or produce for, their chief’s private projects”. The practises of *fatongia* and voluntary *kavenga* relied heavily on the discourses of the labour of love, or love (to quote Wood-Ellem (1999, p. 89) “tinged with fear”.

Values of love, respect and mutual helpfulness also facilitated the smooth running of extended kainga (family) which were organised into units of production and consumption⁶⁰ (Helu, 1999). Evans (2001, p. 153) describes production in contemporary Tonga is now being “individuated” but argues that consumption or “the distribution of the production and productive resources was still mediated by social ties experienced and understood within an ideology of love, respect, and mutual assistance”.

⁵⁸ Redistribution to others, or meeting obligations with resources that was ‘forced’ or ‘binding’.

⁵⁹ Redistribution to others and meeting obligations with resources that is ‘voluntary’ in nature.

⁶⁰ Helu writes consumptive socialism is: “Collective enjoyment of members’ production as common property and causes pooled products to be consumed and/or distributed there and then. Consumptive socialism is governed by traditional rules which relate to social hierarchy (Helu, 1999, p. 196).

Love, respect, mutual helpfulness, and knowing your place continue to be reproduced as authentic and legitimate Tongan values both in Tonga and among the Tongan diaspora. It is possible to deconstruct how these values are privileged within Tongan social, material and economic conditions and relations of power as most legitimate. This provides a way of recognising their energy, centrality and continuing influence without resorting to reifications, binaries or constructing these as essential or stable categories.

Bourdieu (2008) argues that there are rewards for complying with what presents itself as legitimate and most authentic. To quote Nicole (1999, p. 271), “Any deviation or departure from this stereotypical norm represents a threat to the legitimacy of the discourse and is greeted with unrestrained violence, physical or discursive.” The experience of discursive violence is an interesting one which has resonance for the lived experiences of the participants interviewed for this thesis. Butler (1988, p. 524) also argues that what is privileged as authentic operates to serve as “a model of truth and falsity” which not only contradicts “performative fluidity” but also serves as a mechanism of “regulation and control”.

To continue with the Tongan example, when a particular version of Tongan-ness is privileged as representing its most legitimate manifestation, Tongans across the diaspora must either comply with it or run the risk of being symbolically mis-recognised or penalised as being inauthentic, Palangi loi, fie Palangi or not “real” Tongans. Alternatively, they may create counter-narratives as Pulu Brown (2007) describes, bending and breaking rules and seeing what one can get away with. Pulu Brown (2007, p. 259) notes that, “Newness carries the social burden of *not* ‘fitting’ with, or fettering, conventional markers of identity”. She suggests that there is real risk in resisting “categories” supposed to “define the ‘truth’ of an individual and group’s *actuality*” (Pulu Brown, 2007, p. 259). Makasiale (2007, p. 79) also writes of this risk:

I think in this process, we have deified culture to the point that the people have become comatose... It’s very painful to swim upstream in a culture where people get their identity from the collective. It’s very risky: I could be turfed out... You get disqualification messages: you’re fie palangi; you’re not a good Tongan or Samoan or whatever. You’re showered with messages of shame...

In this thesis, I argue that many of the second-generation participants transcended these symbols of authenticity, collapsed categories, trespassed against them and troubled binaries. They were able to persuasively show how “the alleged polarities

inhabit each other" (Hekman, 1991, p. 47), disrupting existing narratives of who Pasifika people are and how they are different.

This collapsing and inhabiting of polarities resonates with Du Bois' concept of double consciousness and Rushdie's concept of the stereoscopic. Rushdie (2006, p. 433) writes, "We are at one and the same time insiders and outsiders in this society. This stereoscopic vision is perhaps what we can offer in place of 'whole sight'."

Doubling, morphing and stereoscopy are also identified by Jolly (1997, p. 509) who writes of Oceania:

Indigenous and foreign representations of the place and its peoples are now not so much separate visions as they are "double visions," in the sense of both stereoscopy and blurred edges.

There are multiple visions of the imaginary and selves within, which are co-constructed in relation with multiple others. Many identifications are possible, mediated in relation to different others. This does not refute the notion that some visions of the imaginary and versions of identities are accorded more symbolic value and often trump other representations. Cultural meaning and difference is understood to be constantly renegotiated and unsettled. It is also argued that this renegotiation occurred in the context of relationship, of *va* with others. The role of relationships as sites of knowledge production, of symbolic interaction and symbolic struggle is focused upon next.

Relational Identities: The Constitutive Other

It is argued that individual and collective ethnic identities are constructed in the context of relationships with significant others. In Aotearoa, for the diasporic second generation, the Palangi imaginary (the Pakeha / European settler society as they are constructed in relation to Pasifika people) provides a significant constituting other. The Tangata Whenua, the indigenous (and Polynesian) people of Aotearoa provide another pivotal relational other. The Pasifika homelands, as they are imagined, also have considerable symbolic influence, as do Island-born Pasifika people, "the migrant generation".

It is argued that all of these ethnic groups as imaginaries form defining constituting co-constructing relationships for the diasporic second generation. This recognises that the way that we imagine and experience others, impacts upon the way we imagine and

experience ourselves. These are ongoing relationships, influenced by material conditions, historical trajectories and shaped by power. This draws on Clifford's (1988, p. 344) descriptor of "a nexus of relations and transactions" of "actively engaging subjects". Within these many relationships, multidimensional understandings of self and other, sameness and difference, occur.

Howard, (2000, p. 371-372) explains "that the interactionist literature on identity articulates the construction, negotiation, and communication of identity through language, both directly in interaction, and discursively". Therefore, across multiple interactions and discourses, multidimensional identities and constituting relationships are formed. Within different spaces, power operates in different modalities, according to different discursive logics and dynamics (Sewell, 2005a).

An examination of interaction requires not only a focus on language, but also recognition of the visibility of Polynesian bodies and the ways that appearances are attributed (often racialised) meaning by others in the context of encounter. Which narratives and discourses are deployed to identify Polynesian bodies in intercultural encounters? Embodiment draws upon the fairly straightforward feminist premise that "people do inhabit their bodies", that "embodied difference" is experienced and that "diverse embodiments" count in movement across place and space (Escobar & Harcourt 2005, p.7). The challenge is, according to Underhill-Sem (2003, p. 16) to "work with understandings of the body as simultaneously a site of inscription and struggle but also as socially constructed and known by how it 'performs'".

Ashcroft et al. (2006, p. 289) write that, "bodily presence and awareness in one sense or another is one of the features which is central to post-colonial rejections of the Eurocentric and logocentric emphasis on 'absence'". They point to Fanon as the critical thinker whose focus on the "inescapable fact of blackness" and "the 'fact' of the body" as an "inescapable visible sign" leads theory development in this area (Ashcroft et al. 2006, p. 289). Fanon (2006, p. 292) describes the black body as being 'overdetermined from without'.

Feminist theorists similarly bring the body into the theoretical equation, writing: "In calling attention to bodies as political subjects, it is recognized that 'we are our bodies', and that every rational, emotional or other experience or filtering of experience is ultimately had through the body" (Harcourt & Escobar, 2005, p.10). A focus on embodiment recognises that, "the body itself is a political site or place that mediates

the lived experiences of social and cultural relationships (Harcourt & Escobar, 2002, p. 10).

As bodies move through different spaces, they have discursive 'meanings' attributed to them, which may affect their movement and experiences, their relationship to capital. Bodies as 'signs' can be unmarked or "over-determined" (Fanon, 2006) and attributed 'fixed' meanings or permitted detachment from meaning (Hall, 2006). In his article examining 'the body as cultural signifier' McDougall cites T.O. Ranger who argues that at the core of the colonial relationship is the "successful manipulation and control of symbols" (Ranger 1975, p.166 cited McDougall 2006, p. 300). This can be seen as the struggle of cultural reproduction. The right to name and signify, define, determine and delimit the meaning of signs and symbols, including the meaning of ethnic markers.

It is argued that the body is a sign, or rather, is 'signified' discursively. In each field, bodies, as signs, are interpreted, organised and understood differently, depending on the way different discursive formations arrange and attach meaning to them. Underhill-Sem (2003, p. 16) recognises that Polynesian bodies are "constituted differently in different places and spaces". In every space, Pasifika people's bodies, colour, gender, ethnic markings, 'race', appearance, are attributed meaning dependant on the discursive formations that predominate in those spaces. Mani (1990, p. 32) writes how:

Moving between 'different configurations of meaning and power' can prompt 'different modes of knowing'... The politics of simultaneously negotiating not just multiple but discrepant audiences, different 'temporalities of struggle'...

Mani (1990) describes participating in many conversations, not all of which overlap, with discrepant audiences, thus requiring multiple mediations. This emphasis on mutual entanglement and multiple mediations, (Mani, 1990) and a focus on power, supports Alcoff's (2006, p. 277) assertion that "a simplistic promotion of fluidity will not suffice". She argues, "To be a free floating unbound variable is not the same as being multiply categorised, or ostracized, by specific racial communities" (Alcoff, 2006, p. 277).

For example, when Tupuola (1998) writes of multiple and floating hybrid identities that weave in and out of cultures, drawing from the global, from media sources, from traditions, locales, and cultures, there is little corresponding analysis of power. What is discursively available in the media and privileged requires an interrogation of

symbolic struggle and power. Tupuola (2004, p. 96) questions the “relevance of ‘indigenous’ and ‘native’ theories of identity when researching or working with youth of transient and multiple identities” and argues that a “new ethnicity” is created by appropriation and localisation of the global. It is my position that an analysis of the symbolic and material conditions which influence the availability of discursive and symbolic resources, and the capital and power to articulate through discourse, is necessary.

Negotiated Space

Smith et al. (2008) coined the term “the negotiated space” which “acts as an intermediate stage in the process of encountering, understanding and then incorporating new knowledge into a worldview and provides a means of examining the nature of this knowledge exchange” (Smith et al. 2008, p. 6). I first heard of the “negotiated space” concept when attending a UNESCO conference on the ‘Ethics of Pacific knowledge production’ in Samoa. I was the Chief Rapporteur at this conference and it was my job to listen carefully to the speakers and record what was said. A talk was given by Maui Hudson about his research, which had examined the relationship between individual rights and collective rights in a Maori research and ethics context.

He began from the standpoint that ethics are derived from world-views and that “cultural interpretations of ethical concepts are not merely related to a difference in understanding or knowledge, but rather a fundamental difference in the cultural conceptualization of the universe and the way they view the world” (cited Mila-Schaaf, 2008). Hudson went on to suggest that indigenous and western world-views were often constructed in an intensely polarized manner and that the nature of such differences was often determined by ‘Western’ world-views. He advocated the idea of a negotiated space between world-views (Smith et al., 2008). This was described as an open space of encounter; a neutral zone for dialogue and understanding of what constitutes the cultural divide between knowledge systems (Hudson, cited Mila-Schaaf, 2008). He went on to argue that this was a space for negotiating the interface and place of engagement between the ethical and epistemological parameters of culturally distinctive knowledge and value systems (Hudson, cited Mila-Schaaf, 2008).

A number of things attracted me to what Maui Hudson was talking about. Firstly, he suggested that the negotiated space could represent “shared” knowledge and understanding, or alternatively could be the place where discussion takes place about

how to reconcile differences (or not). This appeared to me to be much more useful and constructive than an intercultural dynamic of extremely polarised conflict, whereby you were forced to choose one way of knowing over the other (an either/or dynamic which can be traced to Aristotle's logic (Allen, 2000). Secondly, he was very clear that differences in cultural ideas could be seen as complementary, rather than competing. This is a philosophy which appears to be captured quite well by the Hegelian term of 'dialectic', as long as it is not constructed rigidly as teleological, because it recognises that having multiple ways of looking at the same thing is valuable. The problem with the notion of dialectic is that its classic formation of thesis and anti-thesis (providing synthesis as resolution) has been criticised as providing too much closure, too much unity, too much resolution, which ought not to be, it is argued, viewed as teleological.

I made contact with Maui about my summary of his presentation for the conference and we began to correspond about the negotiated space concept. I learned that it was an idea that a research group he was a part of, called Te Hau Mihi Ata: Matauranga Māori, was exploring. A research project, led by Linda Tuhiwai Smith, was exploring ways to link matauranga Māori and western science. It brought together Māori educated in western-based science and experts in matauranga Māori and aimed to facilitate in-depth dialogue at the interface between these knowledge holders (Hudson, 2008). The purpose was to open a new creative knowledge space to enhance innovative thinking and cross-cultural connections and they styled this as "negotiated space" (Hudson et al., 2008).

Immediately I could see the parallels with Bhabha's concept of the 'third space'. Maui and I corresponded over the course of a year, sharing ideas about the negotiated space and eventually we wrote two papers together (Mila-Schaaf and Hudson, 2009a, 2009b) detailing our ideas. We developed the negotiated space to apply to a Pacific context and described this as a "*conceptual* space - a junction of intersecting interests and negotiations in-between different ways of knowing and meaning making" (Mila-Schaaf and Hudson, 2009b, p. 1). We described the negotiated space as a place of purposive re-encounter, for reconstructing and balancing ideas and values in complementary realignments which have resonance for Pasifika peoples living in Western oriented societies.

Southwick (2001) has also written at length about ideas very similar to the negotiated space in a Pasifika context. Southwick (2001, p. 62) writes:

In the writings of others such as hooks (1990), Fine (1992 and 1994) and Anzaldua (1986), I found people who also seem to understand the power of the space, even when they have named it differently as margin, hyphen or borderland. What is common in the writings of these authors is their understanding that the 'space' is the location of creative possibility.

A growing literature citing the space between in relation to Pasifika identities has emerged (Southwick, 2001, Bolatagici, 2004, Tamaira, 2009, Whimp, 2009, Webb-Binder, 2009, Higgins & Leleisu'aso, 2009).

The earliest reference to ideas similar to those articulated in the negotiated space concept is from Foucault (1994/1970 p.xx) who writes that beyond the "already encoded eye and reflexive knowledge there is a middle region which liberates order itself". He describes this middle region as a "domain" whose role is primarily "an intermediary" one (Foucault 1994/1970 p.xx). It is characterised by being free from order, described as the "inner law, the hidden network" the "fundamental codes of a culture - those governing its language, its schemas of perception, its exchanges, its techniques, its values, the hierarchy of its practices" (Foucault 1994/ 1970, p.xx). Foucault argues that while this intermediary space is characterised by being liberated from order, paradoxically it heightens the awareness of order, of the sense that "order exists" and that "these orders are perhaps not the only possible ones or the best ones" (Foucault 1994/1970 p. xx).

Foucault perhaps most famously described his awakening to the awareness of order (i.e., of the "epistemological field" upon which all thought is referenced, that which "grounds" all "positivity"; that which provides the "conditions of all possibility" 1970, p. xx) in the following illustrative quote. He wrote:

As I read the passage, all the familiar landmarks of my thought – *our* thought that bears the stamp of our age and our geography – breaking up all the ordered surfaces and all the planes with which we are accustomed to tame the wild profusion of existing things, and continuing long afterwards to disturb and threaten with collapse our age-old distinction between the Same and the Other. This passage quotes a 'certain Chinese encyclopaedia' in which it is written that 'animals are divided into: (a) belonging to the Emperor, (b) embalmed, (c) tame, (d) suckling pigs, (e) sirens, (f) fabulous, (g) stray dogs, (h) included in the present classification, (i) frenzied, (j) innumerable, (k) drawn with a very fine camelhair brush, (l) *et cetera*, (m) having just broken the water pitcher, (n) that from a long way off look like flies'. In the wonderment of this taxonomy, the thing we apprehend in one great leap, the thing that, by means of the fable, is demonstrated as the exotic charm of another system of thought, is

the limitation of our own, the stark impossibility of thinking *that*" (Foucault, 1970, p. xv).

In many ways this thesis seeks to theorise the stark impossibility of thinking *both this and that*, of having access to more than one system of thought or knowledge tradition. Du Bois' notion of double consciousness, Bakhtin's vision of the pregnant double-accented hybrid and Rushdie's idea of the stereophonic resonate, but the person who has imagined and written about the "intermediary" space the most is arguably Bhabha (1990, 1993, 1994,). Bhabha (1993, p. 169) describes this as:

the contaminated yet connective tissue between cultures--at once the impossibility of culture's containedness and the boundary between. It is indeed something like culture's "in-between," bafflingly both alike and different.

Bhabha (1993, p. 169) writes of the "borderline negotiations of cultural difference". The metaphor of border has been deployed to theorise the in-between of Latino identities in particular (Anzaldua, 2006). Anzaldua's borderlands mestiza consciousness resonates with the ideas advanced in the negotiated space concept. Anzaldua (2006, p. 209-211) writes:

She learns to juggle cultures. She has a pluralistic personality, she operates in pluralistic mode - nothing is thrust out... Not only does she sustain contradictions, she turns the ambivalence into something else... That focal point at fulcrum, that juncture where the mestiza stands, is where phenomena tend to collide. It is where the possibility of uniting all that is separate occurs. This assembly is not one where severed or separated pieces merely come together. Nor is it a balancing of opposing powers. In attempting to work out a synthesis, the self has added a third element which is greater than the sum of its severed parts. That third element is a new consciousness - a mestiza consciousness - and though it is a source of intense pain, its energy comes from continual creative motion that keeps breaking down the unitary aspect of each new paradigm.... The future will belong to the mestiza. Because the future depends on the breaking down of paradigms, it depends on the straddling of two or more cultures.

Notably Anzaldua invokes a 'third element' which is similar to Bhabha's (1990, 2004) concept of third space and also Du Bois' notion of double consciousness. Anzaldua (2006) recognises the third element, but contrary to hybridity which suggests a third, (singular) incommensurable product, "nothing is thrust out" and the creative motion continues, forever breaking down the unitary aspects of each paradigm.

It has been argued that this restoration of singularity and unity to the thesis and anti-thesis tension is false (Allen, 2000). If the poles are cast in rigid binaries deploying a logic traced to Aristotle, of true or false, of “A and not-A” (Allen, 2000) or a subject / object dichotomy and duality presently prevalent in modernist thought (Hekman, 1991), then again something is lost.

If instead there is a focus on the ways in which differences are negotiated, mutually sustaining and contested, then reified endpoints are seen as an imagined product of symbolic struggle and agreements. These are only perceived as stable in so much as this is a strategy associated with hegemony and doxa.

This recognises the dangers of essentialised and reified difference, but also accounts for its potency, recast as a rhetoric of polarised difference. This rhetoric has continuing energy and force in the production of meaning and in people’s daily lives.

To demonstrate that polarities inhabit each other, and to implode differences, so that they lose all vitality and meaning, is threatening to the status quo of relations which are constructed using binaries and which rely on difference to emphasise purity, authenticity and difference.

Rather than “third products” arising as something “new” from a process of hybridization produced when pure components meet, to focus on relational space emphasises instead the rub of a history of ongoing relationships and interactions with multiple others. Boyce Davies (1994, p. 47) describes “critical relationality” which involves “negotiating, articulating and interrogating simultaneously a variety of resistant discourses relationally and dependent on context, historical and political circumstance.” Boyce Davies (1994) asserts that this is not characterised by opportunism, convenience or tactic, but rather involves multiple articulations from a variety of positions in the face of many dominant discourses.

The negotiated space concept focuses explicitly on harnessing Bhabha’s third space concept and using it consciously with a strengths-based focus. “The negotiated space is conceived of as less liminal and more purposeful.” (Mila-Schaaf, 2010, p. 138) It conceptualises a way of operating within more than one culture without concluding that this would lead to marginalisation, pathology or being hopelessly ‘caught between’. Bhabha (1993, p. 170) does recognise the emancipative and reconstructive power of the third space, writing:

At the point at which the precept attempts to objectify itself as a generalized knowledge or a normalizing, hegemonic practice, the hybrid strategy or discourse opens up a space of negotiation where power is unequal but its articulating may be equivocal. Such negotiation is neither assimilation nor collaboration. It makes possible the emergence of an "interstitial" agency that refuses the binary representation of social antagonism. Hybrid agencies find their voice in a dialectic that does not seek cultural supremacy or sovereignty. They deploy the partial culture from which they emerge to construct visions of community, and versions of historic memory, that give narrative form to the minority positions they occupy: the outside of the inside; the part in the whole.

The key question is, how do we use the intercultural relationships between self and other (individual and collective, discursive and cultural) to reconstruct positive visions and versions of ourselves? That is, how we come out of the dialogic encounter unharmed, not annihilated, erased or assimilated, but buoyed and reassured in our sense of sameness and difference. How do we take the concept of Bhabha's third space, Foucault's intermediary middle domain, Anzaldua's *mestiza*, and use these productively to meet our own personal interests, as well as those of our ethnic project, the empowered imaginary? What can be considered as productive and positive, and worth taking from this encounter? What are the potential benefits of intercultural interaction?

The intention is to learn the lessons taught by postmodernity and deconstruction but avoid its nihilism. We were taught by Lorde (1984, p. 112) that "the master's tool will never dismantle the master's house". And yet much of the post-colonial academic work and critiques of orientalism, by Said (1978), Fanon (1992), Bhabha (1994), Hall (1996), and Gilroy (1997), is characterised by exactly this process. I believe the negotiated space model shifts decisively from deconstruction to reconstruction. You try to rebuild a frame for your own lived experiences and realities and revision the terrain of your own imaginaries using broken tools and what remains standing of deconstructed ideas. Subramani (2003, p. 5) describes such a project as epistemological work, involving vitalising local ways of thinking and "confronting and dealing with the confusing, chaotic, contradictory ideas and theories emanating from the west that tend to become entangled with our thinking about our own part of the world". Subramani (2003, p. 5) writes:

The Pacific region is already too diverse, has always been diverse, and cultural homogeneity is neither possible nor desirable. No one believes that our cultures can be restored in their pristine identity. In order to reclaim discourses and to reconstitute an appropriate

language that reflects oceanic cosmologies, Pacific islands scholars and researchers need great intellectual *flexibility and vitality to negotiate between co-existing cultural practices*. Reverse orientalism is as dangerous for Pacific societies as allowing present hegemonic structures to continue. (My emphasis)

I argue that the negotiated space model opens up the confined quarters of the “caught-between” model of intercultural clash. It provides a larger landscape of different ways of tending, resolving, negotiating and mediating a *relationship* (that is, *va*) between. It focuses explicitly on the negotiated nature of relational space, symbolic interactions between self and many others, between cultural practices, cultural texts and bodies of knowledge. It is open to many patterns of possibility. The aesthetics of this space are the focus of the final section of this chapter. However, in emphasising negotiation and the intercultural encounter, it is argued that a focus on power is necessary. It is recognised that these are never equal relationships and it is argued that different cultural hierarchies are in operation simultaneously. Next, Bourdieu’s ideas about social space and capital are sourced to theorise the role of power.

Social Spaces and Symbolic Struggle

Focusing on power relations and symbolic struggle assists in understanding the conditions in which second generation Pasifika peoples construct identities. This requires a focus on the historical, social and material conditions in which relationships are produced and maintained. It is not argued here that subjects are located in one particular or singular standpoint, but that they are located, situated and embedded in many relationships which are shaped according to different dynamics of power. Singular cultural identifiers are rejected in favour of multiplicity, recognising that multiplicity does not equal complete freedom to pick and mix. Fixed identities are rejected in favour of fluid ones, but it is acknowledged that there are many efforts to force and fix (McIntosh, 2005) identities. While recognising fluidity, there must be also an adequate reckoning with location, subject positions and identities, which are situated but also shift. There is never one singular standpoint or location, but many locations-in-relation. That is, different subject positions in culturally differentiated fields configured according to different hierarchies. Subject positions, in association with an analysis of power, remain useful heuristic devices in relation to Pasifika identities. Those draw on Bourdieu’s concept of capital and field which are outlined below.

Bourdieu, Social Space and Capital

Bourdieu (1985a, pp. 725-726) emphasises the primacy of relationships when examining and understanding society:

What does exist is a space of relationships that is as real as a geographical space, in which movements are paid for in work, in efforts and above all in time (moving up means raising oneself, climbing, and acquiring the marks, the stigmata, of this effort).

Bourdieu invokes spatial sites of competition and the struggle for position, for capital within fields, the power to name the legitimate order of the field, as well as the struggle over the structure and divisions of the field itself (Bourdieu, 1985b, 1989).

Wacquant (2008, p. 268) writes that:

A field is an arena of struggle, through which agents and institutions seek to preserve or overturn the existing distribution of capital – a battlefield wherein the bases of identity and hierarchy are endlessly disputed.

Therefore spaces are imagined spatially, as a site of struggle between positions, ordered by hierarchies and patterned by power. Bourdieu (1985b, p. 724) writes:

The social field can be described as a multi-dimensional space of positions such that every actual position can be defined in terms of a multi-dimensional system of co-ordinates... Thus, agents are distributed within it, in the first dimension, according to the overall volume of the capital they possess and, in the second dimension, according to the composition of their capital - i.e., according to the relative weight of the different kinds of assets within their total assets.

For Bourdieu (1993, p. 72), a field is organised: “synchronically as a structured space of positions”. While agents involved in a field “share a certain number of fundamental interests” their position and relationship to capital dictates whether theirs is a struggle of conservation or subversion (Bourdieu, 1993, p. 73). As Wacquant (2008, p. 269) describes, “position in the field inclines agents towards a particular pattern of thought and conduct” suggesting that those who are dominant will be disposed to conservation and those subordinate will likely be disposed to subversion. McNay (1999, p. 106) elaborates on the field, writing,

The configuration receives its form from the relation between each position and the distribution of a certain type of capital. Capital - economic, social, cultural and symbolic - denotes the different goods, resources, and values around which power relations in a particular

field crystallise. Any field is marked by a tension or conflict between the interests of different groups who struggle to gain control over a field's capital.

Capital is crucial to Bourdieu's theory of social space, and to understanding the unequal dynamics of positioning in relation to others. According to Bourdieu (2007, p. 84) "Economic capital is immediately and directly convertible into money". Social capital is, "the aggregate of the actual or potential resources which are linked to the possession of a durable network of more or less institutionalised relationships of mutual acquaintance or recognition" (Bourdieu, 1985a, p. 248). "Cultural capital" is described as "embodied" and as being "convertible on certain conditions, into economic capital and may be institutionalised in the form of educational qualifications and as social capital, made up of social obligations (connections) which is convertible in certain conditions, into economic capital and may be institutionalised in the form of a title of nobility" (Bourdieu, 2007, p. 84). It may involve a way of dressing or speaking.

Finally, he describes symbolic capital: "commonly called prestige, reputation, renown, etc., which is the form in which the different forms of capital are perceived and recognized as legitimate" (Bourdieu, 1985b, p.724). When forms of capital are validated and legitimated in a field, they are transformed into symbolic capital.

All these forms of capital are likened metaphorically by Bourdieu (1985b, p. 724) to "aces in a game of cards" or "powers that define the chances of profit in a given field". Bourdieu (1985b, p.724) relies heavily on the metaphor of 'the game' to explain many of his concepts. "For every field, there corresponds a particular kind of capital" and the "volume" of capital "determines the aggregate chances of profit in all the games" in which capital has influence and sway.

Diasporic Social Spaces

Migration and globalization has brought together ever-widening ranges of people into spatial proximity and relationships of economic interdependence. Castles and Miller (2009) describe this phenomenon as the 'globalization of international migration' whereby societies have become increasingly ethnically diverse and cosmopolitan. One of the outcomes of this transnational movement is that people have experienced unprecedented contact with cultures which differ from their own (Markus & Kitiyama, 1991). There are also new shared spaces which reflect plurality and "the simultaneous

coexistence of others with their own trajectories and their own stories to tell" (Massey 2005, p. 11). Bhabha (1995, p. 169) explains:

It has become a common ground, not because it is consensual or "just," but because it is infused and inscribed with the sheer contingency of everyday coming and going, struggle and survival.

Bhabha (1994, p. 162) also describes distinctive "supplementary spaces" within nation states which "come after" the original, or "in addition" to it. He writes:

We must always keep open a supplementary space for the articulation of cultural knowledges that are adjacent and adjunct but not necessarily accumulative, teleological or dialectical. The 'difference' of cultural knowledge that 'adds to' but does not 'add up' is the enemy of the implicit generalisation of knowledge or the implicit homogenization of experience, which Claude Lefort defines as the major strategies of containments and closure in modern bourgeois ideology. Bhabha (1994, p. 162, 163)

Citing Gilroy (1987), Clifford (2006, p. 251) describes these as "Alternative public spheres, forms of community consciousness and solidarity that maintain identifications outside the national time/space in order to live inside, with a difference". Macpherson (1984, 1996, 1997, 1998, 2001, 2002,) has written at length about the conditions which supported Pasifika peoples to effectively recreate social organisation, values and moral communities in New Zealand. He cites concentration in similar occupations, neighbourhoods; widespread involvement in churches, enduring extended family kinship ties, commitment to the values and norms of Pasifika sending societies and the comfort and strength sourced from migrant solidarity in often bewildering and sometimes discriminatory new settings, as contributing to moral and social integration within migrant enclaves (Macpherson, 2002). Other writers have pointed to the ways in which diasporic Pasifika communities create networks in new countries which reproduce relationships from Pasifika homelands. (Va'a, 2001, Macpherson, 2002) It is argued that Pasifika migrants have created social spaces which de-territorialize (Gupta & Ferguson, 1997) replicate and revision fields from places of origin (see Macpherson, 2002).

In these Pasifika spaces within Aotearoa, it is argued that the relationships or networks are patterned in ways similar to those generated within kin oriented, rural, agricultural and marine-based economies of the Pasifika islands and archipelagos (Macpherson 2002). The socio-economic sustainability of such societies traditionally depended upon extended family co-operatives, cultivating and maintaining strategic reciprocal

relationships bound within a system of exchange (Helu, 1999, Campbell, 2001, Evans, 2001).

Different forms of capital are symbolically recognised in these spaces. For example, in the case of Tonga, Evans (2001, p. 154) argues, "The maintenance of effective gift exchange relations with God and others is the mark, and the result, of social competence and prestige". Within these Pasifika spaces are forms of Pasifika capital, non-financial assets, skills, knowledge which have been acquired over time and are associated with forms of power, status and/or advantage. Capital is the "accumulated product of past labour" which is directly associated with income, profit and advantage (Bourdieu, 1985b, p. 724). Capital always represents "power over the field" (Bourdieu, 1985b, p. 724).

McNay (1999) and Adams (2006) argue that Bourdieu under-theorises movement across fields and McNay (1999) is critical that Bourdieu has no conception of "multiple subjectivity". Yet in many ways Bourdieu's theory of social space provides rich material for alternative ways of thinking about people who operate simultaneously in multiple fields. Both Adams (2006) and McNay (1999) argue "that contemporary society is in fact much more routinely marked by the 'crises' emanating from movement between fields than Bourdieu allows" (Adams 2006, p. 518). As Bhabha (1994, p. 62) writes of Frantz Fanon:

In occupying two places at once – or three – in Fanon's case – the depersonalised, dislocated colonial subject can become an incalculable object, quite literally difficult to place.

The impact of occupying multiple locations, the influence of constantly moving across culturally divergent spaces and the shared space of the intercultural in-between are key theoretical ideas in this thesis.

A Definition of Polycultural Capital

An emphasis on polycultural capital emphasises the position of having culturally diverse forms of capital, which correspond to different situations. Mani (1990) explains the process of moving between different modes of power which privileges different ways of knowing. What is recognised as symbolic capital⁶¹ is strongly culturally

⁶¹ "The form in which the different forms of capital are perceived and recognized as legitimate" (Bourdieu, 1985, p.724)

determined. Different forms of capital have different impacts and effects across different (discrepant) audiences. Polycultural capital provides a way of conceptualising why some second-generation people might be positioned more strongly than others to identify and negotiate in ways that serve their interests. Polycultural capital is associated here with cross-cultural resources, knowledge, skills and agency to potentially realise cumulative advantage (Mila-Schaaf and Robinson, 2010).

The term polycultural capital also shadows earlier doubling concepts, such as double consciousness (Du Bois, cited in Zuckerman, 2004) and double vision (Wright, cited in Gilroy, 1993). This supports some of the ideas associated with bicultural advantage, cognitive complexity and enhanced creativity in the bicultural literature (Hong et al. 2000, 2007, Leung et al., 2008). It also supports research approaches which highlight “the repertoire of “cultural competences” available to members of the subsequent migrant generations as they negotiate their lives in plural cultural contexts” (Skrbis et al., 2007, p. 263).

Polycultural captures the more-than-one doubling dynamic, but unlike the term bicultural it is not limited to just two. Kelley (2003) argues that the term polycultural captures cross-cultural interrelationship, overlap, fluidity and shared spaces, rather than reified multi-cultural differences. Not all invocations of multicultural reify difference, but the term polycultural is more open to new incarnations of meaning and provides a pun on the word ‘Polynesian’. Here, the term ‘polycultural capital’ also encompasses agency and the ability to negotiate multidimensional resolutions to intercultural situations.

It is argued here that intercultural movement requires knowledge, capital and power. The ability to communicate and engage in multiple conversations with discrepant audiences, to connect, to build relationships and adapt to situations requires, I argue, symbolic and cultural skills and knowledge, capital and power.

While there is some freedom to identify, identities are burdened with the need to be culturally legible (Butler, 2005), meet social demands for coherence (Plummer, 1995) across discrepant audiences (Mani, 1990) and to be symbolically recognised (Wacquant, 2008). When there are rigid ideas about what constitutes appropriate identifications, and penalties for lack of compliance by others (Makasiale, 2007), and risks in counter-narratives, heterodoxy and newness (Brown Pulu, 2007), issues of

power and agency come to the fore. It is argued here that having polycultural resources and discourses puts the Pasifika second generation in stronger positions to negotiate critical relationality (Boyce, 1994) and mediate multiplicity (Mani, 1990), or to negotiate the spaces between selves and other, at an individual as well as a collective level.

Polycultural capital is associated with the power to identify strategically through a range of contextually appropriate cultural resources that confer advantage and profit. The concept moves away from the individual cast as being “caught between cultures” and instead sees them as having “strategies of identity” available to them (Butcher 2004). This is similar to what Wessendorf (2007) describes as the self-conscious use of symbolic categories and the ability to draw on multiple cultural repertoires. This approach is consistent with Noble’s (2007) observations of the Arabic-speaking second generation in Australia:

They are maximising the resources they have to act in the world, and the worlds in which they can act. These resources provide a basis for functioning in a range of sites and social domains, extending a sense of control and autonomy crucial to their capacity to manage their life-worlds and the social relations of power in which they find themselves.

Butcher (2004, p. 226) argues that “strategic choices are made at sites of power that attempt to control the direction of change”. For example, strategic essentialism (Spivak, 1990) is one of many strategies available, as are “strategic hybridity” (Noble et al., 1999), “strategic ignorance” (Gershon, 2000, 2007) alongside multiple other possibilities. Butcher (2004, p. 226) argues “that movement between cultural spaces” requires “management of strategies of identity” including “fulfilling the requirements of continuity” by adopting tradition or “innovative” and “hybrid” representations. The agency to perform identities (Butler, 1998) in contextually responsive ways, as well as deploy counter-performances in reaction to stereotypes and to rupture racialised or essentialised social narratives.

The concept of polycultural capital also draws on ideas sourced to the psychology literature which argues that there are bicultural advantages of multicultural minds (Hong, et al., 2000, 2007, Leung et al, 2008). It provides a way to theorise how people acquire intertextual discursive skills, and speak in ways that are characterised by heteroglossia. The term “heteroglossia” refers to “language’s ability to contain within it many voices, one’s own *and* other voices” (Allen, 2000, p. 29). Similarly,

“intertextuality is meant to designate a kind of language which, because of its embodiment of otherness, is against, beyond and resistant to (mono)logic” (Allen, 2000, p. 45).

This resonates with Du Bois’ (cited Zuckerman, 2002) and Bakhtin’s (1981) ideas of doubleness, Wright’s double vision (cited Gilroy, 1993) and Rushdie’s (2006) stereoscopic vision. Where hybridity emphasises a one plus one equals three dynamic, concepts of heteroglossia, intertextuality and the stereoscopic move towards multiplicity, having multiple possibilities, not just the mixed, already-integrated ‘more-than-the-sum-of-its-parts’ third product. Rather than the over-determined hybrid outcome, the parts remain pregnant with their potential; the lost in translation, as well as the gain, the hybrid fusion, the strategically ignorant or strategically essential remain possibilities.

I find intertextuality a useful concept, although definitions are variable and contested (Orr, 2003, Allen, 2000). In this particular context I use the word intertextual because it implies, in ways that other words invoking cultural multiplicity do not, a sense of the relationship (the “inter”) between cultural texts. I see it as the ability to move beyond a text, recognise multiple texts (various cultural interpretations) and an awareness of the inner workings of the relationship between texts. This may stretch the meaning of intertextuality beyond ways in which it is typically applied, but the origins of this concept in the field of literature and its focus on the relationships (connections, differences, cross-references, mimicry, departures) between texts is useful. It evokes the process of making sense of the relationships between cultural texts (discourses, knowledge traditions) that proffer multiple interpretations (or readings) of the same situations. Intertextuality in this sense recognises that to have more than one form of capital and set of cultural or symbolic resources is not enough; rather an understanding of the complex ways that these ideas and discourses may relate to each other, (i.e., may be integrated and separated, may trace and cross-reference each other) is critical to advantage.

Manulua Aesthetic

To invoke relational space, inevitably traces the concept of *va* and I believe that this is appropriate given the target population. Refiti’s (2010, p. 1) assertion of a “new kind of *va* relationship, that tries to make new relations from tensions between things once based on village or *nuu* local polity to what is now a global urban and cosmopolitan

shared space” fits here. Everything is possible in the va, both connection and disconnection.

Nabobo-Baba (2006, p. 111) writes of the Vugalei in Fiji, “space is physical, sociocultural, spiritual and abstract”; she asserts that one can understand “space as a way of knowing”. Va is used interchangeably to describe aesthetic balance in art and architecture, as well as aesthetic balance in relationships; according to Refiti (2002, p. 209), va “governed traditional aesthetic appreciation in Samoa, Tonga, Cook Islands and Aotearoa. Ka’ili (2008, p. 16) writes:

Vaha is the open sea space between two islands, and vaha'a is the intervening space between two things/persons. Vaha indicates the relational space between the two islands, and vaha'a signifies the relations between things/persons.

After studying Polynesian artforms, Neitch (1983 p. 248-249) argues that, “Every work of art creates its own universe which is necessarily a whole built upon a time-space network.” Hanson (1983, p. 215) similarly argues that in cultures which do not have the written word, the “language of form” is used “to communicate messages about the *quality* of life and the world”. I believe Pasifika approaches to spatiality, art and symbols provide rich multidimensional and creative understandings with which to conceptualise and theorise about the experiences and cultural patterns of diasporic Pasifika communities. Stevenson (2008, p. 95) writes of the Pasifika indigenous aesthetic:

The complexity of the design, and the pattern of the relationship between positive and negative space interact not only to reinforce the notion of balance but also the aesthetic, cultural and scientific knowledge of Pacific peoples.

Stevenson (2008) argues that the codes, symbol and spatial arrangements in Pasifika (or Polynesian) artworks hold knowledge:

The patterns created in lashings are also seen in tatau, barkcloth, plaiting and on Lapita ware. This suggests the designs were more than a pleasing aesthetic: they are integrally entwined into Pacific lives and have been part of this cultural whole for millennia. Referencing astronomical, navigational and environmental knowledge, these abstract concepts have become mnemonic devices that allowed for the dissemination of cultural knowledge. (Stevenson, 2008, p. 84)

Kaeppler (1985, p. 108) similarly asserts that, “Artefacts and works of art are products of human action and interaction and are visual manifestations of social relationships”. She suggests that, “an in-depth study of spatial patterning in various Polynesian societies would almost certainly illuminate the underlying structures of those societies, and might even provide insight into the question of what makes Polynesian societies Polynesian (Kaeppler 1989, p. 225).

Tongan approaches to understandings of spatiality and patterns across relational space privileges beauty, symmetry, harmony and aesthetic (Ka’ili, 2008, Mahina, 1992). Ka’ili (2008, p. 37) writes: “For Tongans, relations of exchange that are symmetrical (potupotutatau) create malie, beauty. In contrast, relations of exchange that are asymmetrical (potupotukehekehe) produce tamaki, disharmony”.

Hanson (1983) writes of the ambivalent tension between union and separation in Polynesian art. Focusing on recurring “bilateral symmetry broken by elements asymmetry” he suggests this reflects,

ambivalent tension – between identity and difference, attraction and repulsion, union and separation. In bilateral symmetries of art, pairs of forms are drawn together by their near identity, and yet they are held apart by their asymmetries. A tension is set up because they do fit together, and yet they do not. (Hanson, 1983, p. 215-216)

If this is viewed as occurring collectively, rather than singularly, occurring across many spaces, many different modalities of power, there is not just one print or colour or pattern, there is multiplicity, many cultural texts and patterns. This also adds the dimension of intertextuality in between these texts.

Across many spaces and encounters, there are relational dynamics characterised by the ambivalent tension between attraction and repulsion, union and separation and many patterns of possibility. Manulua represents ways of connecting through difference; it represents endless patterns and arrangements of connection and difference. Tongan artist Filipe Tohi believes, “that these patterns have been modelled into symbols of human interaction, so that the designs can teach us how to live, how to interact, to be” (cited Stevenson, 2008, p. 94). It is argued that for the second-generation Pasifika imaginary, Polynesian patterns, symbols and ways of organising space provide rich offerings to theorise the intercultural spaces of encounter and cross-cultural complexity.

Conclusion

In this chapter, relational spaces are described as sites of symbolic interaction, struggle and knowledge production. The intercultural spaces between self and other are negotiated in a shifting interplay of identification and recognition, across different modes of power. This supports Clifford's (1988) approach to identities associated with a nexus of relationships and many interactions. To have a dialogic dynamic with multiple others engenders many complex possibilities. It is possible to establish connections as well as breaks across discrepant audiences and different modes of power and knowing. This refutes linear identity teleological journeys, particularly those imagined from liminality to wholeness (see Anae, 1998).

These relational spaces are understood to be mutually constructed and sustaining which can be characterised by struggle (as well as agreement) over the production of meaning and are rarely characterised by equality of power, rather power differentials. This emphasises the productive (as well as erasing) rub of the relational space with many significant others, multiple negotiations of sameness and difference across different configurations of power.

The negotiated space, insofar as it is positioned as the exclusively liminal space between polarised stable categories is problematic. However, if it is considered as the constituting relational space of co-construction between both imaginaries and individuals, (*the va*), then the patterns of that power dynamic and its politics become a defensible area of focus. If this relational space is positioned as only in conflict, without the potential for attraction, connection, seduction and complementary dynamics, then something is lost.

Polycultural capital has been coined to as a term to describe a position of advantage when one moves across many relational and intercultural spaces. To have polycultural capital is to have cross-cultural resources, intertextual cultural skills, and agency to signify and strategically identify across discrepant audiences.

Manulua is a visual representation of the patterns of resolution across spaces. These are temporary, contextually specific ways of balancing connection and difference, as well as competing cultural discourses, across multiple spaces. There is not an emphasis on these patterns as final product or outcome, but rather as a process of arranging, balancing and deploying different cultural resources, symbols and discourses in interaction with many others. In some situations, certain symbols and

resources are brought to the fore, in other interactions, they are not so prominent and different patterns are performed. Manulua, in this sense refers to the many possibilities afforded by a process of balancing many cultural resources, multiple connections and points of difference. It is an aesthetic that may emphasize harmony, but also requires contradiction and disharmony to stimulate the motion of shifting resolutions produced across many relational spaces and modes of power. What is critical is that the pregnant potential of cross cultural resources and polycultural capital remains present, able to reproduce multiple patterns of possibility across variable contexts and relational spaces.

In alignment with the theoretical framework, the next chapters explore the relational spaces between the second-gen Pasifika participants and their significant others: Palangi, Maori, Pasifika homeland and diasporic first-generation (migrant) others. Each of these chapters begins with a brief discussion of the historical context, material conditions and power relations which provide the relational context. Then identity stories of encounter, negotiations of sameness and difference, identification and recognition are provided.

In each chapter, there is a focus on the common discourses and social narratives that are used by each party to story these interactions between self and other, individually and collectively. It is argued here that power and symbolic struggle reproduces discourses and privileges particular ideas and beliefs, repeating and widely disseminating some discourses and subjugating others. There is also a focus on what is centred and privileged as authentic or as having most symbolic authority in each relational dynamic. There is an emphasis on the ways in which the second generation has developed strategies to negotiate, counter or cope with these fixed or forced roles in other peoples' stories. Stories about identity presented in the qualitative chapters within this thesis separate out what is occurring simultaneously in different relational spaces, pointing to the way in which second-gen Pasifika identities are simultaneously personal, local, national, transnational and global.

Negotiating Identities in Relation to the Palangi Other

Where are you from?

Where are you from?

the palangi asks

“originally”

“My father is Tongan”

I say, my eyes locked on hers

“and

my mother

is Pakeha”

(the p-word

her face is pink

eyes averted

embarrassed

by

what

we have

in common)

(Mila, 2008, p. 12)

Introduction

Bhabha (1994, p. 44) argues that: “To exist is to be called into being in relation to an otherness, its look or locus”. This chapter focuses on second-generation Pasifika stories about being called in relation to Palangi others, and it focuses on the discourses prevalent in the social narratives constructed by this particular ‘other’, arguably one of the most dominant ‘others’ in a numerical and hegemonic sense. The chapter focuses on the desire of the ‘other’ to locate Pasifika peoples within their grids. The identity stories describe the experiences of finding yourself located within ‘Other People’s

Stories'. Finally, the chapter ends by focusing on 'A Changing Story' and the symbolic struggle of how imaginaries of Pasifika and the national narrative of New Zealand are produced. Identity stories of encounter and interaction provided through the reproduction of individual vignettes in this chapter illustrate the durability of powerful public narratives of sameness and difference that are embedded within the structural categories associated with ethnicity, gender and class. As Somers (1994, p. 606) writes, "all of us come to be who we are (however ephemeral, multiple, and changing) by being located or locating ourselves (usually unconsciously) in social narratives rarely of our own making."

This chapter begins with a brief overview of the relational context between Pasifika peoples and the Palangi other. This privileges the socio-historical context of migration, which provided the material conditions in which the relationship between Pasifika peoples and the Palangi other (individually and collectively) is negotiated.

The Relational Context

When one thinks about the ways second generation Pasifika peoples negotiate identities in relation to the white settler society of mainstream New Zealand or 'Pakeha' or 'Palangi/Palagi', Papa'a other, the socio-historical trajectory stretches all the way back to points of first contact. Winduo's (2000) metaphor comes to mind: the double-cartographic movement of colonization which sought to erase what was there before; characterize it as empty and ripe for discovery, followed by a period of intense over-inscription.

This inscription began with the earliest ethnographies, which differentiated between Polynesia, Micronesia and Melanesia and developed racial plots, gradations and typologies: "ranking peoples in temporal stages, and associating the stages with infancy, adolescence and adulthood" (Jolly, 2007, p. 517). These rankings inevitably relied on racial comparisons made with the irrefutably superior unmarked European 'other' (Jolly, 2007).

Ifekunigwe (1999, p. 13) describes racism as a process whereby: "Biology and culture are inaccurately conflated and specific social meanings attached to physical characteristics create politically charged, manufactured hierarchically ranked conceptions of Blackness and Whiteness which in turn govern inter-group relationships". The second-gen stories represented in this chapter show that Pasifika peoples continue to be racialised and that racism continues to have an impact on the

way that they imagine themselves, collectively and individually. Connell (2006, p. 60) writes: "Migration is largely a response to real and perceived inequalities in socio-economic opportunities, within and between states". The opportunities for migration to New Zealand were considered important, especially in a context of "few opportunities for socioeconomic advancement" in Pacific countries such as Tonga (Lee, 2004, p. 135).

The rapid growth of the Pasifika population was stimulated by a labour shortage in New Zealand in the late 1960's and early 1970's (Ongley, 1996). Pasifika peoples were targeted and encouraged to come from Pacific nations to fill unskilled and low skilled jobs in expanding secondary industries (Ongley, 1996). Well established "chains" of migration brought Pasifika peoples to New Zealand in unprecedented numbers to work within a restricted range of industrial sectors (Macpherson 1996, p. 126).

Lay (1996, p. 13) writes: "In most cases these immigrants did the jobs Pakeha New Zealanders no longer wished to do or had been educated beyond: shift work, factory work, assembly line production, processing, cleaning, work involving long hours in unpleasant conditions".

As one of the participants, Tama, said:

I think my parents were similar to lots of Samoan or Tongan or migrant parents. I think that they come here for that sole reason, I think for my parents, it was to be able to educate their three sons... Education and being able to make money, those were the two drivers.

Most participants alluded to the 'migrant dream' of realising success, prosperity and capital in a land of opportunity. As Lola alludes:

I mean how brave to immigrate to New Zealand and work their butts off, taking every job, and doing anything, so that our generation could get an education and get ahead.

Parental aspirations and the intergenerational pursuit of capital were keenly felt among the interviewed participants. New Zealand was perceived to have fields rich with resources, capital and opportunities for social mobility. This was a strong aspirational discourse which many participants drew encouragement from. As Dylan says:

I think we have that advantage where we are not hindered by - oh there is no way that I could start up my business in Samoa knowing

the standards of my mum who never went to school. I just wouldn't - I wasn't - I was too far down the hierarchy in bloodlines to even think of doing anything like that. But in New Zealand, you can do it, you know.

Because of the limited opportunities for permanent entry into New Zealand for Pasifika peoples⁶², many entered as temporary visitors and overstayed their permits (Ongley, 1996). It is said that this practice was tolerated by the state and encouraged by employers as long as there was a need for low-skilled labour in secondary industries (Trlin, 1987).

"A Dream Deferred?" Precarious Positions

In 1973-74, an oil crisis changed the nature of the global economy and New Zealand faced a recession (Ongley, 1996) during which unemployment rose from 0.1 percent to 5.6%, and the secondary industries, where the majority of Pasifika workers were concentrated, were hit hardest (Ongley, 1996, p. 20). Jobs, once plentiful, became scarce. The field became more competitive.

It has been argued that one of the responses to this economic downturn, loss of jobs and competition for scarce resources, was to "racialise" workers from the Pacific (Spoonley 1994, p. 87). Certainly, the New Zealand government's approach shifted and it embarked on an 'overstayers campaign' which lasted from 1974-1976 (Spoonley, 1994). Pasifika peoples were targeted as illegal immigrants in New Zealand and were seen to be threatening "New Zealanders'" rights to jobs (Spoonley, 1994). This included policies that identified Pacific Islanders as "overstayers" and involved arresting "anyone that did not look like a New Zealander" on the streets (requiring Polynesians to carry passports at all times) (Ballara 1986, p. 160). Lay (1996, p. 13) writes: "Xenophobic feelings were fomented by the National Government during the latter half of that decade and the word 'Islander' came to assume a pejorative aspect".

The chain of events described above shows where Pasifika peoples became positioned in New Zealand society, economically, culturally, socially and symbolically. Pasifika migrants were encouraged to come to New Zealand to fill unskilled or semi-skilled jobs in predominantly secondary industries. In competitive markets they occupied devalued positions associated with limited capital. Then the recession brought large

⁶² Note: Pacific peoples from Niue, Tokelau, Cook Islands, as NZ citizens, faced no limitations.

scale chain migration to a grinding halt. The recession was followed by a period (1984 to 1992) of intense restructuring and neo-liberal reform which had significant and negative repercussions for Pasifika peoples (Ongley, 1996). Manufacturing industries had relied on tariffs to protect them from competitive imports and the removal of these tariffs resulted in massive job losses, among Maori and Pasifika peoples especially (Bedford, 1994). Hundreds of thousands of jobs were lost in the primary and secondary sectors (Ongley, 2004). This was paired with growth in the tertiary sector which required technological, professional, business skills or capital which most Pasifika workers did not have (Ongley, 2004).

Within a decade, the unemployment rate of Pasifika peoples rose from 6% to 29% (Ongley, 2004). In the late eighties, Pasifika peoples were more likely to be participating in the labour market compared with the total population (de Raad and Walton, 2007, p. 8). By the mid nineties their participation was well below the average and has remained so ever since (de Raad and Walton 2007, p. 7).

Pasifika peoples were racialised and targeted as overstayers. Highly concentrated in low skilled occupations in vulnerable industries, they were particularly susceptible to economic fluctuations and structural reform (Spoonley, 1996). In 1986, Pasifika peoples earned a real median income that was 89 percent of the national real median income (Statistics New Zealand, 2002). By 1991, this had dropped to a ratio of 69% of the national real median income (Statistics New Zealand, 2002). During the early 1990s there were net losses of Pasifika citizens to Pacific homelands (Bedford, 2007, p.2).

Some sociologists blame capitalism and its competitive struggle for scarce resources as stimulating racial discrimination against Pasifika migrants (see Loomis, 1990). This perspective argues that capitalism dehumanizes migrants as ready-made units of human capital (Miles, 1984), who can be dispensed with when demand for their skills is low. Darity and Nembhard (2000) conducted a multi-country analysis of labour market discrimination which included New Zealand. They cited “persistent discrimination in all twelve countries studied” and “institutional racism and cultural discrimination” saying “those who get the ‘short stick’ continue to face poor prospects for full economic inclusion and justice” (Darity and Nembhard, 2000, p. 310).

Brah (2006, p. 444) writes, “The manner in which a group comes to be situated and how groups become relationally positioned occurs through a wide variety of discourses, economic processes, state policies and institutional practices, and is critical to its

future". Brah's (2006) invocation of being 'situated' is analogous to Bourdieu's sense of being positioned within social space. The impact of this marginal Pasifika positioning was felt by many second generation participants. As Leo said:

I'm tired, aye, I'm really tired. Because I guess all I see are the negative stats, the prisons and our young people falling out of school. I've had enough. There has to be a better way. But in order for me to make a dent - hopefully - in order for those of us who might deem ourselves able, we have to win that other world. We have to be able to move in that other world and negotiate it. Because then it begins, hopefully, to feed into our Samoan world.

"Winning that world" was an aspirational dream and motivator shared and expressed by many second-gen participants. Participants told stories about their parents' hard work in low paid jobs. Their parents' "tours of duty" (Tonga, 2007) were often used as motivational narratives. This thesis focuses on a small sample of the Pasifika 'second generation' who, to some extent, did realise the intergenerational migrant dream, and in part at least, experienced considerable economic and social upward mobility. As Dylan says:

I'm lucky because where I *come from*, you know, to *where I am now* - I think it is pretty cool. I had a guy working for me and he grew up over the shore, went to Takapuna Grammar. He said there were people who he knows from school who probably earned more money than me, but he said: "*It's more than money, it's more than that. What you've achieved. It's amazing.*" I think it's all relative. It all depends on what you regard as success.

Most participants I interviewed had generated considerable economic success and capital relative to their parents. Most were from relatively poor working class families. However, the focus in this chapter is on how they came to form identities in relation to Palangi others and the conditions under which they constructed their ethnic identities and negotiated acceptance.

Identity Stories

Where Are You From? What's In You?

In the passage below, Lola identifies how being of Pasifika descent in a New Zealand context, to some extent demands or forces an engagement with 'who you are' (culturally, ethnically, racially) and 'where' you fit. She says:

Being Samoan in New Zealand, I think you do think about your identity in a way that Palagis often don't. They will go through their whole lives not thinking about it much. But I think to be Samoan - you do - at some stage think about what that *means*.

I do think that NZ-born Samoans at some stage access "who they are and how they fit in New Zealand?" That's probably something that we will all go through.

Lola's use of the language of 'fit', place and location suggests an understanding of position within a broader New Zealand order and the need to claim space. This is congruent with Hall's (1996, p. 3) suggestion that identity is "strategic and positional" although Lola's quote also alludes implicitly to the dynamic of being 'positioned' as 'ethnic'. Palagi, she suggests, are free not to have to think about race or ethnicity in the same sorts of ways, which supports Fanon (1992) and Du Bois' (1994) assertions of third and double consciousness respectively. A sense of being defined by others as ethnically different and their desire to position her is described more explicitly by Leilani as she tells the following story.

Story 3: There's Something 'In Me'

In New Zealand, people know there is something *in me* so if anyone said to me - you know you just have that sense of someone saying, "So where are you from?"

I would respond, "Do you mean geographical or ethnically?" More often that not they'll say ethnically. And if you said New Zealander they're like: "Yeah, but, what *else* is in there?"

You know, you go to America they've got such a huge brand that all they care about like: "Where're you from, I'm from America" and *that's it*.

Americans I've talked to have said, "I can't believe how many times you're asked '*Where are you from?*'" You know, when you come to New Zealand, "So where are you from?"

"I'm from America."

"Yeah, but *what are you?*"

So "I'm American".

"But no, what are you? What are you - a black or a Mexican? I can see *something* in you".

New Zealanders just have this obsessive-ness with “*Who are you?*”
And they want to tie your colour to something.

I don’t know whether I’m experienced enough to know whether that happens in other countries, but *the number* of people who have said to me!

I find myself doing it too, “Where are you from, you look like you could be...?”

I don’t know! It’s a big thing in New Zealand. And so this could also be one of those things that impacts on having to find somewhere *where you fit*.

Leilani observes that (other) New Zealanders wanted more, and specifically ethnic, information to know how best to ‘other’ her. How to place her? How to ‘mark’ and make meaning of ‘who’ she was? She is somewhat ambivalent about the process and the motives. Yet she admits that she finds herself doing it. While she does not frame this negatively, she is alert to how often it happens and aware of how much it seems to matter in Aotearoa.

Both Leilani and Lola allude to the notion that it is desirable, to have some kind of considered response to questions from others about ‘who’ or ‘what’ they are. As Bill said:

You have to be aware that because of where you are, you actually are a little flag-bearer for people, whether or not you like it or lump it.

This dynamic of ‘questioning’ and ‘answering’ is associated with the need to define, explain, place or locate ‘difference’ – that *something in you* that potentially makes you different from a (white?) referential (that is not made explicit). This is consistent with the idea of a ‘relational’ identity, which examines the ways that identities are shaped via interactions, connections, and relationships with others. Mara’s (2006, p.223) research on Pasifika ethnic identities shows that interactions with the dominant group serve to: “highlight and reinforce cultural and ethnic differences, boundaries and meanings of their ethnic identity”.

The second-gen participants found that their Polynesian appearance was associated with a wide range of social and public narratives about their ethnic group and its abilities. Participants managed these discourses and public narratives in different ways. For example, Dylan also talks about the way in which people tried to place him in the following story.

Story 4: We Were like Bogan Westies

I never really had an issue mixing with white kids because that was the sort of neighbourhood we grew up in. People would always ask us, people who didn't know my mum, and they'd say: *"What are you?"*

I used to say "I'm a New Zealander."

"Nah what are you really? Are you a Maori, Cook Islander, Tongan?"

"My Mum's a Samoan".

But you wouldn't say "I'm a Samoan."

Because I grew up as a Kiwi and I grew up wanting to play for the All Blacks and I'd never been to Samoa. Mum had never been back to Samoa since the fifties. It was back then airfares were ridiculous most people would have never thought of ever going back to the islands and she thought it was a waste of time. We were like Bogan Westies so the idea of learning your Samoan culture and all that, it was totally sort of foreign to us.

In this story Dylan shows how accessing a transnational identity was out of reach for him. His mother had not returned to Samoa, and he had never been. Because of socio-economic constraints and his own Mother's perception that "it was a waste of time" a transnational identity was not realized. Rather Dylan locates himself as a "Bogan Westie" which is a suburban identity. To be a Bogan, to be a Westie, is loaded with connotations that are local, working-class and proud. His talk of "learning your Samoan culture" being "sort of foreign to us" carries a light linguistic irony. But it is clear here that he places "Samoa" as distant, foreign, he identifies as "not- a Samoan" but as a Kiwi.

Dylan also talks about the difficulty that people have with placing him. Notably, all of the participants who talked about people trying to 'locate' them had one Palangi parent and one Pasifika parent. Their very embodiment of a collapsed binary between Palangi and Pasifika and the troubling of supposedly stable categories led to such probing from others: "What are you? Where are you from?"

Dylan talks about his ambiguous appearance, saying:

I've never had a problem with my identity or crisis. Even when I didn't acknowledge or know much about my Samoan past, I was never uncomfortable. I was brown, you know, and that was it.

I don't want to sound egotistical but I think the fact, even when I was really young, girls used to like me. White girls or brown girls, and I guess I was lucky because I wasn't born looking like a frog. A lot of people, even now, they don't think that I'm Polynesian. Even now, they think *where are you from?* From the Mediterranean or from the Middle East or what - they don't really know, they find it hard to categorise me, when they don't know me. You know it's almost like a surprise half the time when I say I'm Samoan.

I'm quite lucky because by sort of modern Western standards you know, I sort of fit in, sort of presentable, good-looking young guy...

Dylan explains that to some extent he can 'pass'. He 'fits in' to the norm of what is considered attractive within mainstream. And while it is also clear that he has *something in him* he represents this as being in his favour. He suggests that for the most part, he is considered attractive. He says: "You've got the exoticness about you. That makes you even more sort of, I don't know, mysterious?" Dylan is not the only participant to note that appearing "exotic" which represents a particular vein of orientalist and primitivist discourse, is considered "mysterious" and sexually attractive. The next section focuses on some of the discourses prevalent in other people's stories and the ways that second-gen participants respond.

Other People's Stories: Racialised Discourse

Leilani, like Dylan, talks about being cast as 'exotic', by Palangi others. She recognises that there are both disadvantages and opportunities in these social narratives which both racialise and sexualize her. Leilani tells the following story:

Story 5: Leilani and Jungle Fever

I worked in the public service and when I first came in it was a very Pakeha-male dominated environment and I was a young Polynesian woman, quite innocent. But I learnt quite quickly how your sexuality, having confidence in your sexuality and your gender can get you places easily with white men. Because they have that bloody *jungle fever thing*.

I think back to my career and I faced a lot of racism in the workplace but I never really put it down to racism I just put it down to ignorance. You know, people said to me "You speak English really well. Can your parents speak English?" Or, "Don't read that Leilani, it's far too comprehensive for you. Maybe you should try reading this?"

If I wasn't secure in who I was, in my Pacific-ness, I could have thought, "Oh God, I don't want to be that because that means you're

stupid.” But I personally laughed at it and found it quite funny. So that was the negative side to it, but there’s also a positive side to it, because I kind of felt that I got a lot of opportunities because of the way I looked. I was a friendly looking Polynesian face rather than the, ‘oh, no, big floral dress and a flower in your ear’. So I got opportunities. I had scholarships and Pacific Island people who looked far more Polynesian than me, and were brighter than me, in my opinion - but because I looked friendlier in terms of what’s acceptable by mainstream European - I was given an opportunity over the top.

But I didn’t really realise it at the time. But it’s almost like a type of racism that benefited me because I looked better. And I don’t say that in a vain way at all, I know it’s a totally, “Okay, we can deal with *this kind of Polynesian*, because, thank God, that’s someone who relates to our level”.

Leilani identifies in this passage that her ‘fit’ with the ‘kind of Polynesian’ that mainstream (discourse) finds acceptable has advantaged her. She is also multi-ethnic, her father is Palangi. She sees that her fit with the “exotic” and attractive Polynesian female archetypes can be used to her advantage in the workplace. Once again we see an orientalist Pasifika discourse at play. At the same time, however, Leilani is fully aware of the stereotype readily attributed to her - that she was likely to be “dumb”. And that being “dumb” was very readily associated with being Polynesian.

The participants were very familiar with a discourse that associated lack of intellectual capacity with Polynesian ethnicity. Many participants recognised how dominant discursive practice might locate them, and had ways of resisting or rebelling against these limits. For Leilani, as well as resisting constructions of her as dumb and intellectually challenged, she strategically identified through racist and highly sexualized discourse about Pasifika women, although not without reflexive awareness. Leilani performs an identity through the discursive resources available. Aligning with some stories (in this case an orientalist and primitivist discourse which can be tracked back to colonial inscriptions and constructions of the Pasifika imaginary) and rejecting others. She says:

You learn as a Pacific person, you’re adapting. As a woman you’re adapting all the time and you’re making and breaking things. You could choose then, as I say making and breaking, you can choose then, not in a sexual way, but to encourage a male Palangi colleague. They’ll put everything out, because, gosh, we’re soft spoken, we’re actually interested, we’ve got sweet faces. They’ll give you everything. So you can make a choice... They’re just not used to that level of soft femininity that you can put out so easily and then cut off

so easily as well. And I think that I've used that really well. Sometimes I feel a bit, no - I *don't* feel guilty about it.

Leilani turns the stereotype around to suit her. She operates within the discourse and performs it at the same time. From one perspective, she is framed and trapped by the discourse. From another perspective she chooses to perform it, to be represented through it and to use it to her own advantage. With a range of constrained choices and with social narratives that are not necessarily empowering, she makes some strategic choices using what she feels she has. Hekman (1990, p. 51) is critical of what she calls "a Cartesian concept of agency" but argues that "subjects who are subjected to multiple discursive influences create modes of resistance to those influences out of the very discourses that shape them". Leilani's strategy to play on her physical appearance as a Polynesian woman, deploying the "soft spoken" dusky maiden, the "sweet face" and flower behind her ear may be considered inappropriate and self-defeating to some. Yet it also indicates an assertion of power within a constrained range of discursive options (many of them racist) to strategically deploy the very discourses that others used to story her.

Leilani tells another story whereby she thinks she is being invited to a large work function and she is very excited about this. However, she learns that the reasons why she's been invited aren't quite what she expected.

Every Christmas the Chief Executive would host a function for all the other Chief Executives, you know, important stake holders, but only the top dogs. And everyone in the department, it was kind of unspoken, they wanted to go because it's where you hob-nob with all the top public servants. And when you're in the public service you do get caught up in all of that.

And the Chief Executive's secretary came in front of all the other staff in the office and said "Leilani, would you like to come to the Chief Executive's function?"

And I was like, "Okay".

And she was like, "Okay, can you come and see me after?" And then she walked off and everyone was like "Oh My God", you know. And "what have you done?" And "What did you do this year?" And giving me a hard time... So, anyway so then I went around to see her and I said, "Okay, what did you want to see me about?" And she said "We'd really like it if you wore a white shirt and a black skirt, you know, because they really like the young, attractive dark ones there".

She wanted me to be a waitress! I thought that she was inviting me to the function. Okay, right, so I thought fucking cheek of this, but guess who was there in a white shirt and a black skirt? Helping? And it wasn't because of ambitiousness it was because she had asked me to do a job and my Pacific side said that they need help so I'll go and help them. But fuck man, that's really!!!

So I said, "I would have helped out, you know. You didn't have to make a comment like that because that's really rude, you know. Do you realize what you're saying?"

And she's like "Oh". Absolutely no idea about it! Who else would go and actually do that? I wouldn't say it was nice. I wouldn't say I was a nice person, but part of me was like 'she doesn't know what she's saying to me, but they need a hand', you know. Who else is going to do it? I was invisible, like handing out the drinks. I was just a server.

In this story Leilani talks about being invisible, as well as being too highly visible as a "young attractive dark one" who ticks the boxes for perfect corporate waitress. She is too visible as a sexualized waitress 'of colour' suggesting that she is invisible as an equal bureaucratic colleague and then further invisible as a server at the periphery of the party, rather than being at the party. There are a number of ways that Leilani is storied in this situation, by a greater social narrative which equates young, brown, pretty women with waitressing and serving; then there is the racist comment from the CEO's receptionist, who Leilani challenges, making the racism of her comment "visible" or at least trying to do so. Leilani agrees to give them a hand despite all that is "wrong" in the story. She attributes decision this to her "Pasifika side". She puts the bad behaviour of the receptionist down to ignorance and overlooks the slur, feeling that it is her responsibility to educate this woman and point out that it is unacceptable. My response to this story in the interview with Leilani is as follows:

But one of the things that is interesting to me though, is that you were able to work out her psyche and not go like: "Oh my God, that's the most racist thing I've ever heard and you're just a fucking racist".

I'm just thinking about parallel sort of experiences - but not that overt - with like the HR person where I worked. She really came out with shocking things but I don't think that she was that racist compared with some other people, but she was just like that woman, completely ignorant.

This exchange, as I reflect on it now, shows how we were both practiced at responding to and dealing with very difficult, limiting and racist discourse. We were familiar with

the racist constructions, understood them as well as the people who represented us through these discourses, understood how these discourses operated and how these 'others' thought through them. Leilani suggests that the receptionist "didn't know what she was saying to me". As if she was not educated or aware enough to see the problems with the discourse she articulated. Yet at the same time, Leilani has to deal with the consequences of the force of it. She ends up, in a black and white outfit, serving drinks at the function. This is her own choice and she attributes this choice to serve and help, to her 'Samoan' values bringing another level of social essentialism to the story.

The way in which Leilani is "othered" and racialised by the receptionist, and how this becomes one of her identity stories shows how her own sense of identity is negotiated in relation to others. This is indeed an entanglement, a complicated negotiation which involves a play of powerful social narratives, social constructions of identity that sit with socially essentialist ideas about skin colour, culture and ethnicity. In many ways Leilani operates in the spaces between, whereby she draws from and rejects different stories about who she is supposed to be, and tries to emerge with something that serves her own purposes but doesn't always succeed. Even though she felt like it was possible that she could be chosen to attend the Christmas party because of her professional skills, she is reminded by the receptionist that a more common story for young Pasifika women is that they are waitresses not skilled bureaucrats. Even as she tries to live another story, these social narratives and the discourses that underpin them confound her role as protagonist.

Tama talks about attending university as a Samoan male from South Auckland. Even though he has made it to university level training, the public narratives about Pasifika men and South Auckland have discursive influence. He says:

I think, in particular, Samoan or Tongan males in New Zealand, people look at you in a certain way. And whether they know it or not, they expect you to react, to act a certain way as well. And we take that on.

You know there's this badge of honour from being from the South-side. Being at Varsity, that was definitely the case. So certainly I think being Samoan, being male, definitely shapes the way that you are and how you are perceived and how people expect you to act.

This reflects the dynamic of other's 'expectations' of the 'marked' Polynesian body (Underhill-Sem, 2003, 2005). Tama and Leilani talk about taking "that on" to some degree which reflects the co-constructive nature of identities in relation to others.

Within these stories and racist discourses, there are a limited number of valid ways "to be" as a Polynesian male or female. To extend beyond these given roles results in reminders of your subject position within other people's ethnic imaginaries and stories. Dylan believes that he is for the most part able to escape such prejudice by his ambivalent (and attractive) appearance but this is not a constant. He tells the following story:

Story 6: Dylan, the Hoodie and the Cop

I'm not underestimating or playing it down for people because I know it happens. It was really weird. I remember I'd just got our car cleaned. I was driving, it was the weekend and I just wore a hoody and I hadn't shaved.

You'll look at me now, I am sort of presentable. But sometimes, you know, when you can't be bothered dressing up, you do actually come across - I remember I was stopped because I was speeding. I was coasting down this hill. The cop asked me, he said,

"Is this your car?"

And I said, "Yes".

He said, "Oh, I'm just going make sure that you're telling me the truth."

I'm sure that if I was white he wouldn't have said that. You know if I was dressed *like this* (pointing at his work attire) he wouldn't have questioned me. I can change that, you know, by dressing nicely, shaving, you know being groomed. But I think some people will always be judged with their looks. And they will always get that. So I don't doubt for one minute that it happens...

When you're brown, just by looking at you - they don't say anything, people just automatically assume. And I do honestly feel for people like that. It's because I know what it's like, I feel for them and that's why, you know, that's why I help Pacific people out. I know they have it tough and I have it easy.

I'm the last person, although we grew up poor, to moan about race or to play the brown card. I'm the last person who has got any right to do that...

Dylan alludes to the idea that he can 'pass' – not necessarily for looking white - but for not looking like a 'Polynesian' form of trouble. He recognises that his relatively fair skin and olive appearance makes him 'racially' ambiguous. He explains that by the way he does his hair, the clothes he wears, he is able to 'change' and be chameleon-like and attract less negative attention. But he also identifies that other people can't change their appearance as readily as he can. This "visibility" (Alcoff, 2006) shows the salience of appearances, of embodiment, of biological markers of identities and the way these are socially mediated. As Alcoff (2006, p. 269) writes, "Appearances "appear" differently across cultural contexts". Salote refuses to internalise feelings of inferiority, saying,

In the mainstream world, Pakeha world, yeah, I believe I'm accepted. I think if I was to go about life thinking that I'm someone inferior to the Pakeha people then I will believe it and start behaving that way...

I've just got to really believe and be optimistic. I think that that's what Pasifika people need to do. They can't sort of feel: 'are they accepted / are they not accepted'? They just have to believe that they are who they are. And they've just got to contribute best they can.

Salote's choice of words, "I've just got to really believe" and *choose* not to subscribe to inferiority suggests that although she does not choose it herself, this option is readily available in the public discourse. Salote (like Leilani) puts negative and limiting Palangi representations of Pasifika peoples down to ignorance.

Finding Voice

The following story told by Isabella tells of encountering racialised discourse and having to respond to it. It mirrors the stories above of encountering racialised differences yet involves an explicit countering of this discourse.

Story 7: Isabella and the Voice

I still get this thing around Palangi males, you know. I do get this feeling of feeling inferior to them. You know, that internal stuff that you do to your self, thinking *I am just a Pacific Island girl*.

I don't know if it's real or imagined, created by me. So sometimes I really sort of work at how I talk and how I sit. If I know I'm going to be in situations like that, how I dress and do all the tricks that I think I need to do, to show them that I'm an intelligent equal to them.

I do that in lots of ways. Like when I had to rent places. I would always try to have conversations on the phone before I go and view a place, because I can articulate really well and really confidently and people can't hear that I'm Pacific, hopefully, on the phone.

And then I'd always make sure particularly (when I was working for a governmental organisation and we had to wear corporate wear) that I would go dressed in corporate wear. And on occasions when I hadn't done things like that, I've had the reactions I thought I'd get. Even one time, I went with a girlfriend. The guy was talking to us talking about the flat, turned to my girl friend and said, "So are you free to move in now?"

And she went, "Oh no, it's my friend Isabella," and he totally backtracked.

He went, "Oh, ok, well we do have other people coming in, I did actually have someone through today and I think they might be taking it, you know". But stuff like that, people aren't blatant but *they are...*

I've been in a training session where there were only maybe six participants. The tutor directed all the questions to all the other participants and not me. He even did the round-robin where everyone got a say. And when it got to me, he then continued on talking and like totally excluded me....

So, those are times you know and I guess this is part of my ego too but when I feel invisible that's when I feel the sting of you know, that I don't belong some where...

I had this time where I would just confront everyone about everything. You know anything unjust or unfair or racist. So yeah, I made a formal complaint and then we had to go to mediation and then we sat down at this table. He just denied that that was what had happened. But I totally got this energy from him that I was just this dumb Pacific Island girl in his session...

But the good outcome was, that this little Pacific Island girl that he underestimated, had a voice! And I did something with that voice, you know. And so what I felt was, whether he did, or whether he didn't, but now *every time* he sees a young Pacific Island girl in his sessions he will behave differently, you know. Because he underestimated me. And I proved him wrong, that actually I did have a voice and I could assert myself.

In this story, Isabella explains that to some extent she has internalised feeling like she is 'just a Pacific Island girl'. This has parallels with "third consciousness" (Fanon, 1992). She recognizes that this represents her as someone who people don't want to rent houses to and someone who is not a thinking, intelligent participant (with something

valuable to contribute) in a workshop. Like Leilani, she invokes the feeling of invisibility, whereby she is not accepted on the same terms as everyone else. This invisibility is confounded by hyper-visibility as a Pasifika woman, where others are ethnically un-marked. She also talks about the sting of feeling that she is not supposed to be there (in a workshop) that somehow she has stepped beyond her limits as a Pasifika woman and thus will not be recognized by the workshop facilitator.

This negative discourse is pervasive, especially for someone living in the South Island where few Pasifika people live. Wacquant (2008, p. 264) describes the “subtle imposition of a system of meaning that legitimise and thus solidify structures of inequality” as “symbolic violence”. Isabella has experienced other people reinforcing these kinds of discourses, ideas and powerful social narratives that inform what being a ‘Pacific Island girl’ is supposed to mean. Yet in this situation Isabella rejects the way she is discursively constituted and instead of being storied in this way she asserts her own voice. She becomes active rather than passive in the situational dynamic and she suggests that this was unanticipated by that man. “I proved him wrong” she says, referring to his expectation that she would just sit back and take it. That “actually I did have a voice” and “I could assert it”.

To some degree the interaction between Isabella and the workshop organizer is a co-construction but an antagonistic and competitive one. There is no smooth agreement. The two different representations co-exist awkwardly in disjuncture. However, Isabella resists being storied by the disempowering social narrative and dares not only to create a counter-narrative, but also to articulate it.

The focus on enunciation and the significance of the right to speak and be heard has been theorised as significant by many others (Bourdieu 1985, Foucault, 1972/1989). Frank (1995, p. xiii) writes, “Those who have been objects of others’ reports are now telling their own stories. As they do, they define the ethic of our times: an ethic of voice, affording each a right to speak her own truth, in her own words.”

Many second generation participants were not only finding their own voice within antagonistic situations and constrained discourses which sought to silence and story them, but they were also acutely aware of the responsibilities of representation. Sina talks about the importance of having a voice. She recognises that to be *the voice* or *a voice* refers to a privileged subject position. She says:

I acknowledge the work that was put in through the migrant generation in terms of giving us a voice. So I guess the challenge for us now, is actually keeping that space for ourselves and also being the voice, or being a voice.

This opportunity to represent, and to 'speak' and to be in a position to challenge stereotypes and change the narrative was in many senses an earned privilege. Bourdieu argues that symbolic capital is required in order to have the capacity to be a contender in influencing, appropriating and investing in discourse. Leo talks about the importance of advocating for other Pasifika peoples if you've managed to reach a privileged subject position. Dylan notably shared this sense of responsibility for the wellbeing of other Pasifika people. Leo said:

You know all the white people, they go: "Oh yeah, he's got a couple of degrees," and they say, "Oh, haven't you done well." And so, as much as I hate that kind of patronising approach, you've got to milk it because no one else is going to listen to you. Who else is going to be able to? If you're not writing, people think, "Well then, they are all thick, you know, because they can't write."

We need writers. We need outspoken mongrels on TV or whatever. We need people strategically placed everywhere and doing what they *do well* - to an audience that would otherwise just write us off as kind of *thick* and *unemployed*. And I'm sure, you know, you know it well. You know what you have to do.

Leo talks in this passage about how the capital he has acquired has created the opportunity for him to be listened to, so that he can speak and articulate a counter-discourse. Foucault (1972/1989, p. 68) observes: "The rules and appropriation of discourse - in the sense of the right to speak, ability to understand, licit and immediate access to the corpus of already formulated statements, and the capacity to invest this discourse in decisions, institutions and practices, is in fact confined".

Symbolic power "is the power granted to those who have obtained sufficient recognition to be in a position to impose recognition" and "by speaking on its behalf as an authorized spokesperson, can be obtained only as the outcome of a long process of institutionalization" (Bourdieu, 1989, p. 23).

Leo's ability to speak (and be heard) has been hard-earned - to use a classic definition of capital - the accumulated product of past labour. The power to impose recognition involved accumulating capital. Leo talks about his role as an outspoken advocate and public critic.

It's the space I can occupy and be the critic... I do a lot of social commentary on Radio New Zealand... To be able to speak up and that's what I've always wanted and I don't think there are enough of us... There are not enough of us, in my opinion, who are standing up. And I thought what a waste of a damn tertiary education if we can't even.....you know, I don't care if you *say it* or you *write it*, you *act it out*! But my problem is that so many of us are getting well educated, but we're not turning around and saying: "*That's not good enough*"; "*You can't say that*"; "*That's not the truth!*" Now, there's what, two or three of us who do it?

Leo makes references to voicing, writing and acting out, being the voice, telling the counter-narrative, changing the story. Other participants talk about their roles of representation in Palangi-dominated situations. In these situations they sometimes acutely sense the burden of representation. Tama also talks about how difficult it is when you feel like you are the token representative. This is combined with his feelings that for the most part he is comfortable with what he calls non-Pacific environments.

I don't think I've had any problems working in a non-Pacific environment... Yeah, it's never really bothered me in that regard but it is, I think, it is extremely difficult. And there have been times when I haven't been so shy about expressing my opinion in those settings. Particularly when you're the token, *especially* when you know you're the token person there. That's been difficult. It's something I'm always mindful of. But I think this current generation that we have, Karlo, is going to break some of that. It's going to challenge some of those stereotypes.

And Margaret explains:

I like to do things, like I might be in a formal committee meeting and I like to - you know, you're talking away - and then every now and then I like to throw something in there, like "*Oh Shot!*" I'm consciously doing it. Just so that I'm reminding them, as well as letting myself know, that it's not all "*fantastics*" and "*wonderfuls*", you know what I mean?

Tama, Margaret and Leo all talk about using their voice to rupture the stories they encounter or as Leo says "they" would "otherwise just write us off as kind of *thick* and *unemployed*". This is seen to be particularly difficult "when you're the token, *especially* when you know you're the token person there". As Margaret explains, "I'm reminding them, as well as letting myself know, that it's not all "*fantastics*" and "*wonderfuls*". Rupturing the story requires challenging stereotypes and expressing contrary opinions. Margaret alludes to disrupting the narrative of middle-class culture and privilege which is supposedly neutral to ethnicity and socio-economic background. This process

of “reminding” them that there is another world (and she is ‘of it’) by self-identifying as “other” involves using deliberately colloquial “street” language or performing as “other” and unsettling the sense of “same”. Notably these are stories of sameness and difference, challenged, troubled and bothered in different ways depending on the situation and relationship. The next section focuses on counter-narratives and counter-performance in the context of critical relationality (Boyce Davies, 1994).

Counter-performance and Counter-narratives

Earlier stories told by Isabella and Dylan they described manipulating their appearance to minimise being stereotyped. Isabella calls this “the tricks”. Bourdieu would call this a trick of “cultural capital”; a form of capital that is embodied and which represents “power over the field” (Bourdieu, 1985b, p. 724).

This could be read as performing “whiteness”, but I reject this notion and position it instead as a strategy of counter-performance. This involves deliberately confounding stereotyped social narrative. To consider it mimicry or copying whiteness (as seduction) does it a disservice, for its purpose is to rupture social narratives, to show the way that the polarities in fact inhabit each other, to break down and trouble the binary. Rather it is deliberately and self-consciously asserting a similarity that disrupts stereotypes of the exotic or differentiated ‘other’. As Simone explains in the following passage, it is not altering her appearance that changes Palangi people’s ideas or expectations about her, it is the revelation through dialogue that she is very highly qualified. She says:

With Palangi people that know me and I’ve got some sort of relationship, I feel very much accepted. If they don’t know me they’re quite apprehensive or always see that sort of stereotypical view. Until you have a conversation with them. You know, the typical question: “Oh what do you do? blah blah blah.” And then once they hear that you’ve got some sort of tertiary qualification, all of a sudden they’ll keep talking to you.

Simone explains that it is through dialogue that she is able to influence or change the “stereotypical view” that she feels others have of her. The act of dialogue can be described as: “Waking the presence of self vis-a-vis an Other, of calling the Other and via the Other, the self into presence” (Gurevitch, 1990, p. 182). Through dialogue, Simone is able to call her self into the presence of the ‘other’ and leave their ‘other’ behind. This ability to counter ‘othering’ stereotypes and make effective connections with people who may once have chosen to exclude or stereotype you was a common

theme. The second-gen participants were able to engender recognition and make connections, even in difficult circumstances.

I argue that counter-performance and the development of counter-narratives are strategic tactics, developed in reaction to powerful discourses or social narratives which exclude Pasifika peoples or story them in negative ways. Sina explains:

Story 8: Sina, We're Not All Street Kids You Know

So many people look at us and think, "Oh gosh, typical, rah, rah, rah," but when you can say "No, I'm *actually* doing this." Or you don't even have to say it. It kind of gives me a bit of confidence.

I'm proud to say, "Yeah, I'm Pacific, you know, you got a problem?" That type of thing. We're not all street kids you know [laughter].

Let's not play victim, get over this victimisation thing. It's crap. Yeah, it's hard. But get over it. I mean, we used to have these kids on our programme, "Oh we were born in South Auckland, rah, rah, rah."

And I said, "So! So was I. What are you talking about?"

I didn't have the druggie parents, and the parties constantly every week and all of that stuff, but there's got to be some, something to move beyond it, to be able to do better.

Sina explains how she refuses to be positioned within negative and limiting discourses about Pasifika peoples from South Auckland and how colluding with those representations feels abhorrent to her. Sina resents the idea of internalising or buying into fixed ideas about what it might mean to be a Pasifika person from South Auckland. She refuses to be cast negatively or sympathetically within this discourse and she takes some confidence in subverting the image. I note that this disassociation comes at the cost of displacing all forms of victimisation, including a lack of sympathy for those who might legitimately feel aggrieved or victimised. Sina chooses counter-performance to break stereotypes and disrupt discourses.

Participants were aware that just by going about their daily, high profile, business they confounded stereotypes and shifted ideas about what Pasifika peoples were supposed to be (capable of). As Lola explains:

For example, when I started chairing a particular committee - those meetings are huge! You have your internal auditors and external auditors and managers and the board people and the committee people.

I remember sitting down in a room, looking down this long table of this meeting that I was chairing and realised I was the youngest person in the room, I was the only one of colour, and the only woman and thinking, oh shit! [laughter]

Every now and then I forget. But every now and then, I get in that situation and go ahhhhhh and then just get on with it. Because I have to! After all, they're all sitting there waiting for me to start the meeting.

This excerpt shows how Lola both disregards and confounds stereotypes, but simultaneously cannot help but respond to them on some level. For some participants, being the first, or one of the few, to achieve in Palangi dominated fields or areas did become a point of pride, a source of confidence or a position of advantage. More often than not, a heightened sense of the burden of representation was articulated by participants, together with the responsibility and anxiety that came with that privilege. As Leo explains:

I'm tired, aye, I'm really tired. Because I guess all I see are the negative stats, the prisons and our young people falling out of school. I've had enough. There has to be a better way. But in order for me to make a dent - hopefully - in order for those of us who might deem ourselves able, we have to win that other world. We have to be able to move in that other world and negotiate it. Because then it begins, hopefully, to feed into our Samoan world.

Leo's use of the words, "win that other world", the Palangi-dominated world can be interpreted as accruing Palangi power and capital to engender movement (upward mobility as well as inter-cultural) and the power to negotiate, as well as "feed into our Samoan world". The next story, by Salote, talks about the way she tries to negotiate in a Palangi dominated environment, provide counter narratives and change the level of awareness and understanding about Pasifika peoples.

Story 9: Salote and Educating the Palangis

I currently have a client where the whole organisation is predominately... oh well it is white/pakeha! I'm the only Pacific Islander doing work there. It's really different. Particularly coming from four years in community across the board, working with Pasifika and Europeans and even government personnel, all of a sudden it's just all European people again. It is European people that are doing community work in the not-for-profit sector. You can see where they're (European) aspiring to go, yet sometimes I think, *'Stuff! You've so got it wrong when it comes to community!'*

I'm going away for a week to this community leadership retreat organised by people with great heart, great passion, but it is all about *community*! And coming from community myself, you think [Salote grimaces] "Oh gosh what are they trying to achieve here?"

I believe as a Pasifika person when you're in mainstream employment you need to stand steadfast in what you believe in. We need to share what we know with these non-Pacific people. Non-Pacific people, Pakeha people come to respect and appreciate what you have. I always believe non-Pacific people are just unfamiliar with where we come from. We just assume non-Pacific people know everything about us. I definitely don't take the approach "I'm a Pasifika person, feel sorry for me." Definitely not! I just always try to share success stories and the realities of Pasifika people in community...

I know Pakeha people also see this window of knowledge, "Oh wow! I didn't know that about Pasifika People"... I guess they do know about the deficit model of Pasifika People. It's not until we as Pacific people share our stories, inform and educate them correctly – it is then they become more compassionate about our community. It is then they allow new doors to open and there is access to more opportunities for Pasifika People.

In this passage, Salote talks about educating and shifting Pakeha people beyond the limits of their (discursively framed) assumptions, knowledge and narrow categorisations. She sees this as her role, to subvert and challenge the established social narratives which construct Pasifika peoples in 'deficit' terms. Salote is familiar with these discourses and she refuses to internalise them. She actively works to subvert and educate people away from discriminatory and limiting discursive ideas about Pasifika peoples. This does not mean that Salote can escape them entirely, nor their impact upon her life and the lives of others, but it is very clear that she is not going to accept or reproduce such discourse. Salote's own capital, her qualifications, skills and training to be in this role of influence are also evident in the story. The relationship between capital, voice and the power to articulate counter-narratives which not only challenge and rupture dominant stories, but which are heard and recognized is demonstrated here.

A Changing Story

Many participants alluded to witnessing a fundamental shift in mainstream public narratives about Pasifika peoples over their lifetimes. As Tiare stated:

There has been this real kind of shift in society, probably in the last twenty years. There's been this brown pride. I think that there was

a global shift too, because even the African Americans had the shift as well, socially. There's a multitude of things happening all at once: Pasifika festival, Pasifika fashion awards...

There's a whole lot of things that have helped that shift along and helped emphasise the value of us - and the wealth of us - and you see it. I never forget, it was about ten years ago, everyone *wanted* to wear lavalavas and jandals and have brown skin in Mangere.

Lola agrees with this sentiment:

I remember when I was a kid you never saw any brown faces on TV, not Maori or Pasifika or anything. But now it's just saturated with all these beautiful brown faces. It's so wonderful. And our kids just don't, my kids just have no idea what it was like not to have that. They just completely take it for granted, which is cool, it is really cool.

Also there's all that kind of *brown and proud* revival that's happened over the last 15 years, which is just so wonderful for our kids. Which I think, really does give them that opportunity to have the best of both worlds and to draw the richness from both cultures, and reject the negative bits that are in both cultures.

For Lola, this shift in public narrative, where there have been more positive discourses about Pasifika peoples readily available in the public arena, puts the next generation in a stronger position to negotiate and make positive purposive cultural choices about continuity and change. The previous lack of Pasifika peoples represented positively (or at all) in the New Zealand mainstream media has been well documented (see Spoonley and Hirsch, 1990). For example, Bob Harvey was quoted as saying: "There are more dogs shown on commercials than there are Maoris and Polynesians. It is deliberate... the view is they have no image appeal - except in association with fast food. There is a whole class of clients who would be horrified if you showed a Maori or a Polynesian in their showroom" (cited Scott, 1990, p. 84). Macpherson (2001, p. 79) identifies that the media is a powerful medium of representation: "writing, radio, television, music, print media, drama, communicated messages about what it means to be a Pacific person".

The symbolic struggle for the meaning of the social order is perhaps most publicly played out in the media. Appadurai (1991) writes about the importance of the media-scape, which provides a vast amount of material which we can deploy in order to imagine ourselves, often extending the limits of what we might once have imagined possible. He argues that we must consider the impact of moving images, the role of

the imagination, and the imaginary, in a media-saturated increasingly globalised world (Appadurai, 1996). Tupuola's (1998, 2004) ideas about Pasifika identities emphasize the increasing role of the media and global images in these constructions.

In 1990, Scott (1990, p. 86) argued that in a New Zealand context, "By exclusion or negative stereotyping, the advertising industry tells non-white kids not to bother with dreams of success. At the same time, it tells Pakeha that Maori and Pacific Islanders are not capable people". Scott (1990, pp. 88-89,) goes on to say:

The positive potential of advertisement cannot be overestimated. Several years ago, I saw a small Maori/Niuean child respond to a community 'let's-all-be-good-Kiwis' type ad. At the first sound of the jingle, the boy rushed to the set, pointing to the screen. Presently, in one small corner, there appeared a shot of a Polynesian father and his son going fishing. It was over in a flash. "That's me. That's me and my dad! My dad!" He was light on his feet with the novelty: *I exist*. The father disguised a smile. (Emphasis in original)

I remember reading this passage as an undergraduate student in Palmerston North and being struck by its power. I also recall the surprise of seeing the Polynesian boy and his father, represented in a positive light on television. Many years later, I re-read this passage and my participation in the Pasifika community is such that not only can I identify the boy that Scott (1990) refers to, but I realize that I have met him. There is no doubt that there has been a decisive shift in the New Zealand imaginary and the way it is now willing to include Pasifika peoples.

Spoonley (2001, p. 92) argues that there has been, "Growing visibility and participation of Pacific peoples in New Zealand... National identity has not only incorporated a Maori presence, but a Pacific one". One participant, Dylan, commented:

Sport has broken down so many barriers because we dominate our national game and that is a huge plus. Never underestimate that!

Yet Spoonley (2001, p. 91) also identifies that in the New Zealand media, Pasifika peoples were: "Obvious in certain areas of the public domain, and painfully absent in others". Tama, another participant, talked about Spasifik Magazine which is targeted to Maori and Pasifika audiences. He talked about asking the owner of this magazine why it had captured such a large market. He relays that the owner responded that Spasifik is "non-threatening and affirming of where people are at". Tama states that such a magazine is the kind of "vehicle that could really drive some change". Tama says,

And it's not a slowly, slowly approach to it, but I think it's an approach that can make a difference for our Pasifika communities. But it also ensures that we are bringing others alongside with us.

Two participants I interviewed had dedicated their professional lives to the media arena. Both were involved in the symbolic struggle within the media to improve the representation of Pasifika peoples. Dylan talked about how important it was that he could share Pasifika success stories in the public domain.

I just see it through the stories that we tell. Those are the stories from the people themselves. You know, successful people, how they did it. It's not all gonna be, 'this is how I did it'. It's not all the same sort of pathway. Everyone chooses or makes their own path to success. And when you read a success story, some of them you relate to, others you don't. So that's all you can do.

For Dylan, "all you can do" is put out competing, counter-narratives of success. This provides another, more empowering, set of discourses for Pasifika peoples to draw from.

Bill was another media professional who was concerned and angry about the limited ways Pasifika peoples continue to be represented and stereotyped (and in his view devalued) especially via the media. He is critical of representations that feature "cartooney bro-towney kind of Pacific people". He says:

If you look at the current push-play advertisement on the television, what are the Pacific Islanders doing? They're playing volleyball. They're not playing tennis. A friend of mine is really, really angry about some of the Pacific women's smear tests advertising. She said, "It just shows that whole kind of thing *time and time* again." Rubbish that it is! One of the challenges that young people face is to eventually be able to shift that, plus hang on to what is authentic.

Bill is angry at the repetitive images of Pasifika peoples which are readily consumed by mainstream audiences. Images and narratives about Pasifika peoples are constantly reproduced within the same sorts of discursive limits. Bhabha (1994, p. 66) writes of such "fixity" saying that it:

connotes rigidity and an unchanging order as well as disorder, degeneracy and daemonic repetition". Likewise, the stereotype, which is its major discursive strategy, is a form of knowledge and identification that vacillates what is always 'in place', already known, and something that must be anxiously repeated.

Bill and I talk about these repetitive images at length. They are images that are lampooned in cartoons or involve fleshy actors: overstayers, overweight, eating KFC, broken English, wearing bright colours or big beanies, child-beaters, pious church mothers, drunken fathers, occupying manual or low paid jobs, living in poor suburbs or state houses, laughing loudly, alternating between eating, praying, violence and goofing. For Bill, it is the ways in which Pasifika peoples are often *not framed* that are telling.

Story 10: Bill, the 'Brand' and the Hermes Bag

One of the biggest challenges for the next generation is holding onto culture - however you define it - because it is not valued or recognised in the right kind of way. I've always used the bag analogy. If you go into Hermes you can pay three grand, or four grand or nine grand, for a handbag and yes, they are beautifully made, they are absolutely beautifully made, but there is an expectation that you can get a bag woven in any one of the Pacific Islands and pay \$20 for it and that's probably too much.

So what is going to be really difficult for the generation coming through is retaining some sense of pride and understanding and recognizing the value. And that's value in a cultural sense in a historic sense as well as in a financial sense because what you're talking about is the culture. All of those attendant things come from who you are, ultimately as an economic value, because everything eventually comes back to some form of transaction. That's gonna be the really hard thing.

Part of that is hanging on to language, recognizing that it has a value that's not immediately evident in a monetary sense but will be at some stage, in a sense that if you speak your language, you are likely to have better self-esteem and all of those things. I think that's going to be the big challenge, trying not to become like some of those well known comedians, who I think are absolutely appalling. I think they are cultural criminals and you don't want to be that to please other people. Yeah, a cultural criminal, I just made that up, but that's what they are. I find them horrid, because I think they're very disruptive. I think everything they do is deeply disruptive, wrong, really wrong to the letter, and that's what you don't want to be. You want to be broad enough, sophisticated enough, proud enough, *smart* enough, to recognize the difference between shit and chewed dates.

Bill's desire is for Pasifika people / objects / items / products / language and so on, to have symbolic status and recognition although he is not explicit about from "whom". One gets a sense, given his comparison with an international label 'Hermes' he means on a global stage, and yet his examples speak to the stakes of local, ethnic and national imaginaries as well. He is determined to change the stories and the ways that Pasifika

peoples are placed or located within them. For Bill the challenge is to ensure that such representations (whether they are images made by ourselves or others) do not reproduce and reinforce inferior stereotypes, or marginalised subject positions with the social imaginary.

Bill advocates the importance of resisting such fixity, and nominating counter-discursive strategies, refusing to let representations of Pasifika be constructed within discriminatory and devaluing discursive practice. This requires considerable critical analysis, attention, energy, effort and discretion.

Bill with his elite cultural capital and social advantages argues that it is acutely important to find ways of making Pasifika heritage and culture prestigious and desirable within the dominant New Zealand discursive context. Bourdieu would argue that one must accumulate symbolic capital before being given the opportunity to have 'the power to name' and effectively and influentially engage in symbolic struggle. Dhooleka (2003, p. 197) writes about the Indian diaspora in Great Britain:

Only as we fit in, did we actually begin to open up space and reinvent. We couldn't just do whatever we wanted. And it is only as we have become more confident that we reinvented and, in effect, we have reinvented the country.

While to re-invent the country is a grand claim, numerous writers have pointed to the ways that the national narrative is more inclusive of Pasifika representations (Scott, 1990, Spoonley, 2001, Macpherson, 2001) and this was attested to by a number of participants. Although there was criticism of the limited and repetitive nature of these representations, a number of participants felt that we had come a long way and this put the next generation in a much stronger position to resist assimilation and make richer cultural choices. Bhabha (1990, p. 208) writes critically,

Although there is always an entertainment and encouragement of cultural diversity there is also a corresponding containment of it. A transparent norm is constituted, a norm given by host society or dominant culture, which says 'these other cultures are fine, but we must be able to locate them within our own grid'.

The extent to which some Pasifika representations were selected and others were marginalized, the extent to which these decisions were filtered through the lens of dominant culture, subjugating what was not chosen, an interrogation of why particular images and stories were repeated over and over again at the expense of others, all of these require interrogation. Once again Bourdieu's ideas about the symbolic struggle

of cultural reproduction and the power to produce meaning are useful. Second-gen participants talked about purposively trying to change discursive terms of inclusion and exclusion, finding voice to enunciate counter-discourse and pushing for more open cultural signifiers.

Conclusion

Throughout this chapter, there was an emphasis on the dynamics of self and the Palangi other, at an individual level as well as at a collective level. This was focused at the level of the symbolic interactive va between one individual and another. It was focused on the way one ethnic imaginary is imagined in relation to another, and the enduring storylines and rhetoric of sameness and difference that participants both constructed and encountered.

Within individual to individual interactions, symbolic struggle over identities, hierarchies and discursive stories was evident. Identities were co-constructed and appearances were mediated at the level of individual interaction. These co-constructions were not necessarily characterized by symbolic recognition and agreement, but could be fraught with disjunctive stories, and sometimes characterized by overt symbolic struggle and symbolic violence. The ways individuals drew on social and public narratives, rarely of their own making, was apparent (Somers, 1994). Some of these powerful social narratives were so limiting, racist and fixing of Pasifika peoples and things as inferior, that a considerable amount of counter-performance and counter-narrative was deployed. Being stuck in other peoples' stories and represented through limiting and racialised discourse was resisted by participants and responded to in a variety of different ways.

These discourses storied them as dumb, as street kids, as sexualized dusky maidens, as aggressive South Auckland males, as token brownies and so on. Many identity stories were about finding voice in these situations, deploying a range of different strategies, reacting with counter-performance and trying to change the story.

Ultimately, the second-gen participants framed themselves as being a part of a shifting story, where they felt it was their job to challenge stereotypes, disrupt negative narratives, and educate and inform others about their expectations of out-of-date performances. Some had dedicated their professional lives to this symbolic struggle, recognizing that while things had improved, there was still a long way to go. It is argued that the imagined relationship between the dominant Palangi 'other' and

Pasifika imaginaries, as well as actual relationships and encounters, have a constituting influence on the way we imagine ourselves and identify as a collective. Close attention must be paid to the power dynamics that characterize these relationships and reproduce identities that are partly forged in relation to each other. The participants were working towards transforming those stories of sameness and difference. Identities constructed in relation adjust to “changing power relations - or history itself - as they are constituted and reconstituted over time” (Somers, 1994, p. 611). As the demographic, market power, and socio-economic contexts of Pasifika peoples in Aotearoa shift, the relationships will be adjusted and reframed, potentially privileging new stories in the future.

Negotiating Identities in Relation to Significant Others

(from) Mother of Pearl

They teach you that in Aotearoa
your koloa⁶³ is carried within
our ie toga⁶⁴ are our families
woven with patient, faithful hands
our ngatu are our stories
lavish with symbol and sign

(Mila, 2008, P. 30)

Introduction

This chapter is split into two sections. It focuses first on the relationship between Maori and the Pasifika ethnic imaginaries and then on the relationships between diasporic second generation Pasifika peoples and those in Pasifika homelands. Both are considered significant others in terms of referential ethnic imaginaries and in terms of influential co-constructive symbolic interaction at an individual level. All of the relationships with constitutive others, it is argued, must be analysed from a socio-historical perspective, understood as rooted in ongoing relationship and have emerged in specific material and social conditions.

It is argued that the relationship between white settler society and the indigenous people of Aotearoa provided an influential cultural context and relational dynamic into which Pasifika peoples entered as a third relatively visible and sizeable ethnic minority. After briefly reviewing the history of the relationship between Maori and Pasifika, the identity stories told by participants relating to Maori are shared. These narratives of encounter and interaction once again illustrate the durability of powerful public narratives of sameness and difference that are embedded within the structural categories associated with ethnicity, gender and class.

After the discussion on negotiating relationships with tangata whenua, the chapter focuses on how participants negotiated identities in relation to Pasifika homeland

⁶³ Koloa: non-perishable valuables (usually produced by women, fine mats, tapa etc) (Tongan)

⁶⁴ 'Ie Toga: Fine mats (Samoan)

imaginaries. It is argued that the Pasifika homelands, as they are imagined, have considerable symbolic influence as an “authentic” referential, against which forms of (diasporic) Pasifika Tongan-ness and Samoan-ness and so on, are measured. Across transnational relational space patterned by power differentials (Brah, 2006) connections and comparisons, affinities and differentiations are made. Once again powerful social narratives about sameness and difference are encountered and certain representations of Pasifika identities are reproduced within contexts of symbolic struggle and power.

No hea koe? Negotiating Identity in Relation to Maori

No hea koe?
the east-coast eyed
kuia says to me
“Palmerston North” I reply
*(this means I whakapapa to nowhere
here, don’t be mistaken by the face
that looks like one of your own)*

(Mila, 2008, p. 12)

The Relational Context

A historical focus on Maori and Pasifika peoples takes us back to a place of shared genealogical and cultural origins. All Polynesians were considered to descend from the Lapita culture bearers who settled West Polynesia (Samoa, Tonga) emerging with a distinctive Polynesian culture emerging around 1000 BC (Irwin, 2008). East Polynesia was later settled from the West by about 700AD and the final migrations were to the most distant points of Polynesia: Hawaii, Easter Island, New Zealand and South America (Irwin, 2006). Belich (1996, p. 17) reports, “The Polynesians voyaged further and earlier than the Vikings”.

It is commonly recognised that around 1300 AD Polynesians used subtropical weather systems to navigate their way to New Zealand (Irwin, 2006). These migrants were the ancestors of the Aotearoa / New Zealand Māori iwi and hapu (tribes and sub-tribes). Therefore, Aotearoa was first inhabited by iwi and hapu (tribes) of Polynesian ancestry from Oceania (named ‘Te Moana Nui a Kiwa’ in the Māori language).

The hapu and iwi of Aotearoa have recognised genealogical links, and linguistic and cultural commonalities with neighbouring Pacific countries, in particular East Polynesia (e.g., Cook Islands, Marquesas, Hawai’i, Tahiti.) It is also unlikely that the Maori who settled New Zealand came from one location: current knowledge points to several canoes, from several locations, possibly over several generations and centuries (Irwin, 2008).

Durie (2005, p. 8) writes that as a Polynesian people, “Maori had been part of the Polynesian indigenisation of the Pacific for more than three millennia, and continue to value the Polynesian tradition as integral to their own sense of place and identity”. Durie (2005, p. 10) identifies that on arrival in New Zealand, (between approximately

800AD-1200AD) the dramatically different environment of Aotearoa set the stage for cultural transformation and adaptation: “the evolution of tikanga, based on a system of knowledge now widely called ‘matauranga Maori’ laid the foundations for a distinctive type of indigeneity”.

The indigenous population, defined in law as any descendant of a New Zealand Maori, is now described as a non-sovereign ethnic minority who constitute approximately fifteen percent of the population (14.6 percent) (Statistics New Zealand, 2007). As indigenous peoples, Maori are considered to have special rights and privileges, and the role and implications of the Treaty of Waitangi continue to be negotiated between Maori and the Crown (Orange, 1987). The gap between Maori and Pakeha interpretations and expectations of the Treaty of Waitangi “remains unabridged” (Orange, 1987, p. 5)

Armitage (1995) distinguishes between the first phase of policy (1847-1960) advanced by Governor Grey as being that of “assimilation” or ‘amalgamation’. This approach is perhaps best summed up by Maui Pomare who said in 1906 in the House of Representatives: “There is no alternative but to become a pakeha” (cited Armitage 1995, p. 144).

The second phase of policy, ‘integration’, began in 1960, and was stimulated by the Hunn Report which officially recognised that the policy of assimilation had not achieved its expected goals (Armitage, 1995). Integration involved recognising that there would be some continuation of Maori culture, the facilitation of Maori contributions to policy formulation, but also the greater integration of Maori into mainstream Pakeha services (Armitage, 1995).

Miles (1984, p. 238) suggests that only once the settler state was dominant and capitalism firmly entrenched was there room for some state accommodation to “inferior races”. Orange (1987, p. 5) states that Maori resistance and protest has, “kept the treaty alive more than any other single factor”. Armitage (1995) notes that in 1975 Matiu Rata introduced the Treaty of Waitangi Act which signalled a shift to a new era. Armitage (1995) does not label the next phase of policy as biculturalism. He moves on to compare the aboriginal assimilation policies of New Zealand with those of Canada and Australia. Armitage (2005, p. 238-239) concludes that,

The attempt, during the last 150 years, to apply European social policy to aboriginal peoples must be considered a failure... In the

place of these failed social policies, an alternative set is being developed. Its principal tenets are:

Aboriginal cultures are recognised as having integrity and as deserving of respect;

Aboriginal peoples have the right to change and to adapt European ideas to their cultures;

Aboriginal peoples have the right to the legal and material resources needed to ensure that alternative social policies will be effective.

I argue that the institutional relationship between Maori and the Crown provided one of the most important cultural contexts with regard to Pasifika migration. While I have touched only briefly on the relationship between Maori and Pakeha, I argue that the relationship between Maori and Pakeha, and more specifically, Maori and the Crown, provided the cultural context into which Pasifika peoples migrated. When Pasifika migrants arrived in large numbers, in the sixties and seventies, the New Zealand government had already recognised that a policy of assimilation for Maori had not worked. A shift towards integration policies, which recognised that parts of Maori culture ought to be recognised and encouraged, had begun.

It is recognized that in an Aotearoa context, for the most part Maori and Pasifika peoples are differentiated, as Jolly (2007, p. 531) points out, as “rooted” and “routed”, as indigenous and as diasporic. It is argued here that the institutional relationship between the Crown and Maori was a defining influence on the cultural and political context into which Pasifika peoples arrived. Fairbairn-Dunlop (2003, p. 23) explains that the Department of Island Territories (Island Territories Act 1943) was abolished in 1968 to be amalgamated with Maori Affairs and became the Department of Maori and Pacific Island Affairs. Fairbairn-Dunlop (2003) explains that in 1974 ‘Island Affairs’ removed from the mandate of the Department of Maori Affairs. This shows that Pasifika peoples shared with Maori, similar institutional recognition of having distinctive cultural issues and status, rather than simply be subjected to aggressive assimilation policies.

Many participants spoke about their relationship with Maori people and Maori culture as influencing the shape of their own ethnic identity. In this section of the interviews there were no prompts or questions about relationships with Maori, but the relationship was frequently raised.

Most talked about closeness and affinity. Some talked about feeling most comfortable around Maori people because of shared experiences, intermarriage and familial connections. Some participants talked about how their parents tried to stop them from making Maori friends and viewed Maori people pejoratively. Often participants mediated their own sense of difference, self-consciously recognising that they were not Maori and not indigenous to Aotearoa. Many commented that they were often mistaken for Maori and felt that they received the same kind of discrimination as their Maori peers.

One of the reasons why I wanted to go into detail about the relationship between the colonial administration and the indigenous people and the failed strategies of forced assimilation is because of the results found in the ICSEY study of international second generation immigrant youth (Phinney et al., 2006). The findings of this comparative study showed that compared to all participants, Pasifika second generation youth from New Zealand were the most likely to identify positively with their ethnic and national identities. New Zealand at 0.31 ($p < .001$) (Phinney et al., 2006, p. 92) led all the countries with positive correlations between ethnic and national identities, followed by Australia (.18), the United States (.15), United Kingdom (.10) and Canada (.09) (Phinney et al., 2006, p. 90). All other countries studied had negative correlations (Germany, Finland, France, Israel, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal and Sweden). A positive correlation with high scores on both identities was considered by the research group to suggest the likelihood of being bicultural, whereas a negative correlation means that when one identity is strong the other is weak (Phinney et al., 2006, p. 89). It is both possible and likely that the relationship between the Crown and Maori and the Maori political struggle which led to the abandonment of an overt assimilation policy and a policy shift to integration, coupled with institutionalised ways of addressing separate Maori aspirations, within which Pasifika peoples were granted space, has helped to create a situation where Pasifika second generation peoples demonstrate a high level of comfort with identifying both ethnically and nationally.

Identity Stories

Margaret, who grew up in provincial New Zealand, talked about very close associations with local Maori. She attended a bilingual unit and felt that this first-hand insight into things Maori was formative and influential. She says in the interview that at one point, "I think when I was younger I felt like I was Maori." Part of her learning about what it meant to be Pasifika involved discovering that she was different from

Maori (perhaps the other's 'other' as suggested by Mane-Wheoki, 1995, p.16 cited Stevenson, 2008, p.24).

Margaret identifies that her relationships, connections and exposure to tangata whenua were important and formative.

Story 11: Identifying with Something (Even, if it's not your own)

Margaret:

When I went to intermediate I was in a Maori bilingual unit which not many Pacific people could say that they did, but I think that was really important for me.

Karlo:

Yeah, in what way?

Margaret:

Like when you're the only Pacific person and being able to identify with something even if it's not your own. It's quite important and even to this day, just having that understanding - like not just being in that bilingual unit - but being in quite a strong Maori community, just having that insight into the Maori community and that side of things.

From what I see, the difference in Auckland is that you have your Samoans, you have your Tongans, and you can pretty much stick within that group and have very little to do with anyone outside of your ethnic group... I guess we all have unique kind of upbringings and we're all raised in unique kind of environments and I think that as a Pacific person and - or even on my other side as a Palagi person - to have been around Maori culture as much as I was, that was really unique and so I feel really privileged that I had that.

But also being one of so few in this group you know, being so unique in terms of being a Pacific person, you know, you kind of feel special with that.

Margaret describes a sense of solidarity and the feeling of being part of, or belonging to a Maori community. At the same time, she acknowledges her sense of difference, framing this as "special". Margaret understands her relationship with Maori as important, especially in the context of retrospective positioning. It is her observation that in an Auckland context this relationship with Maori might not occur to the degree it did in rural New Zealand. We discuss this further:

Margaret:

I don't know how it is growing up in Auckland because I mean if you're half-caste growing up in Auckland it might be different from when you're 'mixed' growing up down the line. But you become more comfortable in lots of different circles. Whereas if you are living in Auckland, I've seen this with like family members and friends, you know your family can be Samoan, your whole church is Samoan, everyone at your school is Samoan, and so when you finally venture out of there and go to university or something like that you're completely out of your depth. I mean, I was when I went to university but I don't think to that extent.

Karlo:

Yeah, it's called the migrant enclave.

Margaret:

Is that what it's called? Yeah.

Karlo:

There's a special word for it. Yeah, a sociological term that my supervisor talks about. I mean that's how my partner's mum has lived here for many, many years and has never learned to speak English. Because she didn't have to!

Margaret:

I've got an uncle that can barely speak English too. I mean my dad and one of my uncles can speak well. But the other one, who has always been up here [in Auckland], I can't understand what he's saying half the time. I'm sure it's vice versa.

Latour (2005, p. 36) is critical of the role of sociologists as the purveyors of a "master vocabulary". He writes: "We have to resist pretending that actors have only a language while the analyst possesses the metalanguage in which the first is 'embedded'" (Latour, 2005, p. 49). This interaction shows how being positioned as an insider, as someone trying to make sense of my own social worlds and cultural experiences, I was interested in what this "master language" might have to offer in terms of illuminating my own experiences and the experiences of my peers. My research participants were never treated like unknowing actors embedded in a reality that I pretended I could see from some lofty height. Rather we were embedded together in shared experiences and the metalanguage and master vocabulary was instead construed as a toolbox to articulate our own experiences. Margaret and I both grew up "down the line" which is a colloquial way of referring to anywhere south of Auckland. And here we share our theories about the impact growing up outside of

Auckland may have on identity. This dynamic shows the energy and flow of co-construction in action.

Isabella, who also grew up outside Auckland expresses a similar affinity with Maori. She says:

I was brought up in Upper Hutt, Hutt Valley, Wellington in a predominately European school. So you know, anyone who was brown was a Maori. They didn't know much about Pacific Islanders. And we just sort of thought about ourselves as part of the Maoris, because you know we were comfortable around Maori kids. And we had all the stuff I guess that brown kids in New Zealand get, which was (you know) all the names. We got called peanut brownie and coconut and nigger.

Isabella talks about a context of sharing discrimination in solidarity and affinity with Maori. This common ground was found in relation to racist Pakeha others. She felt comfortable with Maori peers. She did not at that time differentiate herself and recognises that differentiations were not often made, between themselves or by racist others. A number of participants who grew up in Auckland in areas like Grey Lynn and Mangere described feeling 'normal' alongside all the other 'brown' kids, where they felt that everyone was "the same". This was a common story. Anyone 'brown' was included, whether they be Pasifika or Maori or of multi-ethnic descent. Two participants, Dylan and Tiare describe this in the passages below:

Dylan:

They were like me... We had a real mixture of mates, because when I went over to Olo's place they talked Samoan, it was all sort of foreign to me. When I hung out with the Tala family, or whatever, yeah, they were like me, they, we, couldn't speak. My mates they couldn't speak Tongan or Māori. We were just the brown boys and stuff like that. And there was another guy who lived behind us, Cook Island guy. We had a few white friends.

Tiare:

But everyone in our street - the majority was Polynesian - mixed - and we just used to do all the same things. No one was any richer than anyone else. We all went to the same high school.

This solidarity in feelings of being brown and fairly much indistinguishable from one another was mentioned by a number of participants. Isabella talked about how her close relationships with tangata whenua has been sustained as an adult, as her siblings have almost all intermarried with Maori. She goes on to explain:

When we are home the most common spoken language is actually Maori because the children are fluent in te reo and they all went through Kohanga and Kura. And when my mum was alive she would actually speak Cook Island Maori to them and they would speak New Zealand Maori back to her and they, that's how close the language is. I see New Zealand Maori as a gate way to Cook Island Maori so I'm quite keen to do some stuff around te reo myself because I think it's a good step towards my Cook Island language.

In this passage, Isabella refers to the linguistic commonalities of Cook Islands Maori and Maori from Aotearoa. This shows how commonalities may extend beyond shared discrimination and connectedness as visibly 'brown' by cutting across similarities of language and culture. She says:

I feel a real connection with Maori in terms of non-Pacific. With Pacific people, absolutely, oh well - some Pacific! Maori, I have a, I do feel an affiliation with and maybe because of my own family background too in connections with Maori. And because Maori have that connectedness thing happening too like us.

Isabella states that she feels a strong affiliation to Maori compared to non-Pasifika people. Then when she reflects on her relationship with Pasifika people, she hesitates, pauses and qualifies this connectedness by saying that she only means 'some' Pasifika people. Isabella's experiences of interacting with Pasifika peoples are further explored later. She also identifies that Maori have a "connectedness thing happening" as opposed, it is assumed to the relatively individualistic approach (of the unidentified other).

While Isabella affirmed commonalities, Lola made differentiations. Lola voices an acute awareness of the differences between what it means to be Pasifika and what it means to be Maori. As Lola says:

Because being Samoan is not to be Maori and we have such different experiences than Maori and a different history and a different place in New Zealand from Maori. But we often look Maori (especially half castes). And people often ask me, "Are you Maori?"

Lola is clear about a different historical trajectory and distinctive subject position from Maori. She uses this sense of difference to make sense of her own positioning. Lola refers to situations of mistaken identity as Maori, and having to respond in the negative to recognition of her identity as Maori. In the following passage Lola also alludes to a hierarchy that privileged her as non-Maori where she grew up. She says:

Me and my brother are brown and we're not Maori. And Maori were treated like shit in the seventies in a small town. But we were kind of 'better than that', because we were Samoan and our dad was white, so that's how people treated us. It really wasn't until I became a teenager and really started thinking about it.

Once again, this shows a positioning which makes sense in relation to Maori, but instead alludes to a racial hierarchy in which there are taxonomies and degrees of exclusion. Tama talks about the racism expressed towards Maori within his own family. He explains that a deliberate distance from Maori was maintained.

Karlo, we didn't bring any friends home. We didn't you know. And we were told that you know do not have any, do not bring, do not have any Palangi friends, and sad to say, don't, in particular, have any Maori friends, like that's a sin you know.

"Only good to play with at school but don't you bring a Maori kid home".

And I think it was that fear that Palanginess or that Maoriness and the word Maori was used as quite a derogatory term, aye.

My mother has this reputation for being fiercely protective of her flock, you know, like she made sure that we didn't, gee, we couldn't really have Maori and Palangi friends.

Likewise you weren't allowed to sleep anywhere else growing up, you know, so she kept us and protected us...

In other stories told by Tama, he explains how his parents sheltered their family within church and extended family networks, reproducing a very strict and specific version of fa'aSamoa in New Zealand. He explains their fear of dilution or contamination by mixing with outsiders. Tama's talk also alludes to a hierarchy of racialisation, whereby Maori and Samoans are placed differently rather than sharing common ground as "Polynesian".

The experiences and stories of association and identification with Maori changed from person to person. Yet the presence of Maori as a significant other was keenly felt by most, for different reasons and entailing different transactions and positioning depending on discourse and power.

With regard to the culture and identity politics and Maori aspirations for self-determination and cultural maintenance, Lola theorised that the cultural experiences of

the Maori have had an influential impact on Pasifika cultures in New Zealand. She explains:

I think what the next generation has really been able to do quickly is to realise the value of retaining as much of the important cultural dynamics from the Pacific. And we've been helped along in that by seeing what has happened to Maori in New Zealand and how, and certainly in my generation, how perilously close Maori came to losing their language. We've seen that whole Kohanga Reo, Kura Kaupapa movement and that reclamation of language and a culture and a confidence that happened, I think, within my generation. We've had the benefit of the importance of that being played out by our Maori cousins here and so I think that's the advantage the next generation has, that so many of us do see the importance of that.

Cultural politics were also alluded to by Tama, as he explained that Pasifika, as an ethnic minority which can be mobilised for political purposes, must imagine itself differently from a Maori imaginary. He explains:

We have got this situation in New Zealand where there's a group of particularly (sometimes) older school but this growing number of really strong NZ-born who are fluent Samoan or fluent Tongan, who really believe that they are owed the same rights and privileges as Maori. I think there's a group like, I don't know, myself, I think who although acknowledge the importance of our Samoanness and our place in the Pacific, but recognise we have quite a different relationship with New Zealand than Maori do. And therefore our approach has to be different.

In this passage, Tama is talking about political mobilisation and the recognition that the Pasifika imaginary cannot consider that it has the rights of the indigenous imaginary in Aotearoa. This shows that the ways that we imagine ourselves draws upon our understandings of others. It is a timely reminder that the "Communities, Benedict Anderson argues in *Imagined Communities*, are to be distinguished, not by their falsity/genuineness, but by the style in which they are imagined" (Hall, 1990, p. 235).

Although I did not ask my participants any direct questions about Maori, it became apparent that Maori were a significant and influential other, both on the ground (in terms of shared spaces and close proximity at school, at work, at play, in neighbourhoods) and with regard to the ways that we imagine ourselves. Connections were made across shared experiences of discrimination and exclusion by Pakeha New Zealanders. Feelings of solidarity and sameness, comfort with each other were expressed. Linguistic and cultural connections were also cited. Some participants

were conscious of racial hierarchies whereby they felt Pasifika peoples were elevated or privileged in relation to Maori, and others spoke of their parents and families practising deliberate distancing and exclusionary tactics based on these racist assumptions. It was clear that individual interactions and experiences of Maori, alongside powerful public narratives and cultural politics that placed them as indigenous “other”, informed ideas about selves, both individually and as a collective. The following section explores the way that second generation participants talk about crafting identities in relation to discourses about Pasifika homelands and encounters with Pasifika nationals.

Negotiating Identity in Relation to Pasifika Homeland Others

this is the twist

you weren't expecting

fleeing tall glass cities

in search of fonua

only to find yourself

foreign

you will turn up to a funeral

wearing the wrong colour

sit in the wrong place at church

eat something on the road

while you are walking

after seeing yourself slant

upside down, inside down

not quite right

you will take a chisel

to your own body

carving away at all that was

ingrained

upsetting the sediment of
yourself, splitting bedrock
tracing fault lines back
to birth

Mila (2008, p. 15)

The Relational Context

Identity stories that focus on exposure to Pasifika homelands and Pasifika nationals are considered in this next section of this chapter. The literature review noted that approaches to migration as a one-way phenomenon have increasingly been re-evaluated with concepts of transnationalism capturing the “multiple attachments” (Clifford, 1997, p. 251) of the second generation (see Lee, 2006). Spoonley and Macpherson suggest, for example, “Tonga provides one example of long-distance nationalism” (Spoonley and Macpherson, 2004, p.183).

The stories here illuminate a sense of the hierarchy within and across the diaspora (see Brah, 2004). Participant experiences in Pasifika homeland spaces often involved huge learning curves and major adjustments. Once again the pattern of mediating both commonality and difference was evident.

A brief history of Pasifika migration has already been provided. It has not been possible to conduct a detailed analysis of sending societies, although in the theoretical framework a deconstruction of what is privileged in the Pasifika imaginary sources ideas associated with Pasifika homeland contexts. It is argued here that transnational relationships can be described using the term coined by Teaiwa and Mallon (2003) of “ambivalent kinships”. I argue that the hierarchies of what is privileged as most truly Pasifika (values and behaviours) tend to favour those in the Pasifika homelands. Yet it was also clear that participants felt privileged to be living in Aotearoa. Diasporic relationships with Pasifika homelands were complicated to negotiate, illuminating different hierarchies interplaying and alternative power configurations colliding and colluding to create ambivalent but simultaneously intertwined kinships. As Alipate said:

Like I said I’m a New Zealander... The first time you go to Tonga you’re pretty shocked, you know. Not until you get used to it a little bit and see that it’s not as bad as it originally looks. Yeah, no, I couldn’t even comprehend being born in Tonga to be honest.

Identity Stories

A number of participants talked about their experiences of going to the islands and visiting or living there. Leilani talks about how she went to live in Samoa when she was in her mid-teens. This was an eye-opening experience for her.

Story 12: Leilani does Apia

When I was at college my cousin got expelled from school. And he was sent to Samoa to go to a Samoan college. And he wrote to us and said, "You've gotta come over here, it's great." So I asked my mum if she could send me to Samoa and she thought it was the next best thing to sliced bread.

What I didn't realise, is that life in Samoa for a male is quite different from life in Samoa for a young teenage girl. And I actually ended up getting in lots of trouble, um, and when I look back on it I think it's because I was a bit culturally insensitive.

My parents raised me to be independent here and then over there it's the opposite. You're chaperoned everywhere. You're expected, you know, you don't go to town just to have a look around. You go for a reason and come straight back again. And, so my family just thought I was out of control and when I look back I was, you know, just a teenager and quite a good teenager.

But the stories that my Mum was getting was that I was having sex with the sailors on the boat and like I was gone, I was one foot in hell.

And so when I came back from Samoa - I was there for two years, boarding at Samoa College, when I came back from Samoa, I came back quite damaged. I put on a lot of weight from not playing sport and eating taro and drinking coke and I think I was quite emotionally damaged as well because I just wasn't equipped to deal with all the talking.

I wasn't mature enough to deal with it. And I felt guilty like a good Catholic would. I think even now when I look back I am still working through some of those issues. Which is amazing considering it's over twenty years ago.

What Leilani talks about could be described as culture shock⁶⁵ compounded by experiences and discourses related to gender. Leilani has to reconcile what is

⁶⁵ Oberg's classic definition of culture shock which "regarded cultural shock a negative, passive reaction to a set of noxious circumstances" has been revisited and is defined in a contemporary context as "people's responses to unfamiliar cultural environments as an active process of dealing with change" (Ward et al., 2001, p. 271).

privileged as normative and taken for granted behaviour associated with young women within an Aotearoa context, with that centred in a Samoan context. This challenging dynamic forced her to reckon with the limits of her own understandings (and cultural capital) as a Samoan raised in New Zealand.

In Samoa, Leilani faced the challenges associated with not deeply understanding a culture or knowledge tradition, yet being subjected to its ideas and norms. The cultural capital she has accumulated is not associated with profit in Samoa, instead she is penalised for not meeting the Samoan doxa ideal. Leilani's gender discourse of equity and autonomy that she has absorbed in a "girls can do anything" society in New Zealand is not as readily applicable in Samoa. Leilani explained this as a very challenging time when she had to recognise that what she had learned as appropriate could be measured according to a very different set of rules.

Having to deal with "the talking" whereby some Samoans from Samoa expressed disapproval of her behaviour was hard to deal with. She reflects later in the interview: "At the time I thought it was the worst thing that my parents could have done." But also she recognized that, "It was the best thing that they could have done for me. Because it taught me so much about how you can be Pacific, and how you can be any culture, and not actually understand the culture that you're from." She also added "that language is important, but it's not the be all and end all of being a Pacific person".

Leilani's reflections about the importance of understanding the culture and the importance of being able to know what is right or is appropriate according to a particular worldview or culture, aligns with a knowledge-based definition of culture. 'Knowing' for Leilani (what to do, what was appropriate), was more important than being able to speak the language. And as Leilani learned, possibly in one of the hardest and most challenging ways, what is considered appropriate changes across cultural spaces.

Leilani learned at first-hand that behaviour which is considered perfectly reasonable and which makes discursive good sense in a New Zealand context – and even in a New Zealand Samoan context – may be represented and read differently within Samoan homeland discourses. She recognises that to operate safely in *both* environments,

required *more than one way of knowing*. Effectively, she needs to acquire the dispositions, schemas and cultural capital associated with both sets of spaces, have the agency to draw on them both, or endure the discomfort associated with not knowing. Her embodiment as visibly Samoan makes the choice of 'not knowing' even more uncomfortable and less desirable. Her embodiment is tied to a variety of expectations of cultural knowledge and abilities.

Through this uncomfortable experience, Leilani comes away with a sense of who she is and perhaps even more, with a sense of who she is not. The next story is told by Tiare about her experiences of visiting the Cook Islands. She finds it a somewhat bewildering experience, where she feels short of the kind of cultural capital that counts.

Story 13: The Mamafia and the Deep Fried Fritters

(In the Cook Islands) we say Mama or Papa for an Aunty or an Uncle. My Aunties, we joke about how *scary they can be!* We call them Mamafia because they're seriously scary. I remember the first time we went to Rarotonga and my Aunties all came to the airport. My husband's like, so how long do I have to wear this on my head for?

And I said *all day*.

They were so lovely, so warm and embracing. But then they said, "Where are you staying?"

And I said, "The Edgewater Resort."

"Who do you think you are? You don't belong there! You belong on the land."

Which was kind of a compliment but when I did go and spend the second week on the land, I certainly did feel the difference. I was literally house-girl. Cooking for every family function that was on that whole week, and deep frying banana fritters which were kind of flour and banana basically and deep fried in fat (which I'd never eat in a thousand years). And that was my job, which did make me feel included...

But they are so very much "*who do you think you are*" constantly. Who does she think she is? I'm not going to impress them with my academia, I'm not going to impress them with that I played representative sport for New Zealand. Maybe it's a Cook Island thing? But there is this tall poppy syndrome. It's kind of like we don't, in Cook Islands old-school, we don't celebrate each other enough. We really, really don't. And if we do, they think, who does she think she is?

I think what that means is that *everything* is about the way that we serve – maybe? Maybe that’s one of those Pacific values we talked about. But at times it feels exclusive and it can feel down-putting. To be honest, to this day, the Mamafia – I’m not sure how they regard me or my siblings or my cousins...

They never pass on the stuff around genealogy easily, because they’re always fearful, they’re always scared that people are going to take their land. My understanding is the more you know about your genealogy the more right you have to the land.

Tiare talks about a sense of “ambivalent kinship” here. (Teaiwa and Mallon, 2005) The way that she is asked to come and stay on the land but how that translates into doing housework and domestic service at her family home. Several times she repeats the phrase “who do you think you are?” which suggests that to some extent the Mamafia feel that she does not have the right answers to this question. Tiare is challenged about her understandings of how she fits within a Cook Islands extended family context. Tiare is very aware that her cultural capital does not travel. Even though she has played sport at a representative level and has a university degree, these achievements do not appear to be symbolically recognised or validated by her Aunts. Instead, different hierarchies and knowledge traditions are deployed to place her and answer “who she is” and, in this context, she appears to be lacking the key skills and knowledge to assert her own clear subject position. In some ways it shows the disjunctive experience of when power configurations do not translate across contexts. The forms of capital which are prized in an Aotearoa context are trumped by forms of capital she doesn’t have. Tiare is aware that knowledge of genealogies, language and land ownership form the backbone of capital in the Cook Islands, and all have been withheld from her. In response to Tiare’s story, I share the following:

Karlo:

That put down, I mean, the put down question “who do you think you are?” is a real Tongan question as well. It’s like the most derailing kind of horrible kind of thing. It’s kind of interesting. When you were talking about your Aunties it just kind of reminded me of my Aunties when I first got the job at HRC. It was the first time really I had been in and around all these Dr’s and Professors. Everyone just had the biggest brain and I was so nervous that my hands literally shook for the whole first month that I was there. I was telling my Tongan Auntie about how my hands were shaking and she looked at me like I was crazy. She was like, “You are from Kolofo’ou (our village in Tonga)”. “You are an ‘Ulu’ave” (our family

name). Why on earth would you even at all feel inferior whatsoever to any one else?

And I was just like, that is kind of freaky that you're saying that. And it doesn't help me in any way but that's freaky. Because you know they really do have that kind of Mamafia presence that to be is enough. And you know what, I thought, why did I get my Palangi mum who raised me with all this insecurity? I don't have the sense that actually who I am *is enough* and therefore I would never shake in anyone's presence. I don't have that and I just wonder.

In my response to Tiare, I am talking about identities rooted in genealogy, land, village and relationship. No one ever asks you "who the hell you think you are" because it is a given that this is understood and fairly rigidly determined. My Aunts saw this as a source of strength. This identity position was unquestionable and could not be challenged, unless, of course, one tried to transcend this subject position. Like Tiare, I observe that this sense of confidence in who one was born to be, had not travelled across contexts and had no power for me in Palangi dominated workplaces where other forms of capital were prized.

The emphasis in this section is on narratives and hierarchies whereby diasporic identities and culture were considered a diluted, inferior, or inauthentic version of the homeland 'original'. But there is no doubt that identities "rooted" in genealogy, land, village and family position also had limited power and influence in Palangi spaces. This paradox and the possibility of double jeopardy (or double whammy) was a very real threat. As Tama explains:

Here I am proud Samoan and I tell you what, when I go back to Samoa. I know how you feel when you go back to Tonga, or you know, to your roots back in Samoa. They don't see you as a Samoan. They see you as something *quite different*.

Now like I said, I always grew up being called: "You're not Samoan are you?" ...They can pick up the Kiwi accent in my Samoan. So, in New Zealand, I'm extremely proud of my Samoan-ness.

And back in Samoa? Yeah, I'm proud of being Samoan. But also, they make it quite clear that I'm also something *else*. I'm Samoan *and* a New Zealander.

In this passage, Tama alludes to being something outside the discursive limits of what is centred and privileged as Samoan in Samoa. There they recognise that you are "something quite different". Tama alludes to cues they can pick up in his accent and lived experiences. So while he describes himself as an "extremely proud" Samoan, the

hesitation or pause in his story is felt. He identifies as Samoan but they “make it quite clear that I’m also something *else*”. This is described as additive in his last statement. He is a Samoan *and* a New Zealander. While the addition of also being a New Zealander may be seen as “a bonus”, there was also a sense that this addition troubled a form of Samoan “wholeness” and a legitimate claim to an easy, taken for granted pride in being Samoan. His Samoan identity needed to be further qualified. This exact sentiment is shared by Salote who talks about a Tongan context.

I feel Tongan-born Tongans, I don’t know whether it’s just a bit of a laugh, but they just don’t regard you as a Tongan. They just think that because you don’t speak Tongan, you’re not really Tongan. You’re actually a Palangi Tongan. You’re a Palangi Loi.

Palangi loi is a fairly commonly used Tongan term that is often used in a teasing or joking context. Loi translates literally to mean “lie”. So to use the term has the effect of accusing someone of being a fraudulent Palangi. It is quite a playful term, teasing rather than insulting, although this depends on context and tone. The inference is that you cannot really be a Palangi because you are Tongan. It is often quite an affectionate (and subtly inclusive) dig at someone but it is also far from being considered an authentic Tongan. Like Tama, Salote’s conversation holds a small hurt, the sting of wanting to identify as Tongan but not being identified back, not being regarded as Tongan enough.

Salote talks about her lack of Tongan language being the main reason why she is not considered a Tongan by Tongan-born Tongans. She tells the following story.

Story 14: I Think We Just Do Our Best

My parents met at a dance here. They got married. They didn’t raise us to speak Tongan. They didn’t realise that we could actually pick it up hearing them speak to Tongan to each other but they didn’t speak Tongan to us. But my mother actually instilled in us Tongan values and cultures. You know, like what was important in the Tongan culture. I guess thirty odd years later my parents look back and they did not even imagine - I don’t think any of our parents back in those days would have imagined - that their children would be somewhat immersed in community, immersed in their culture.

We do, well, they do have some regret but they thought they were doing the best that they did. My sister and I talk about the fact that we wish they had spoken Tongan to us because it might have helped us a bit along the way. Because and now we are sort of termed as NZ-born Tongans, that don’t really qualify as Tongans by Tongan-born Tongans’ [laughter], but anyways I think we just do our best...

My child will be a NZ-born Tongan but I will probably raise my child to be more like a Tongan-born Tongan because now I've sort of seen as a NZ born growing up, I can see where the gaps were as a NZ-born Tongan. And I think the biggest gap was the language, not learning the language.

I was born in New Zealand, but raised as a 'Tongan' in New Zealand. I identify myself as a Tongan ethnic person. Travelling the world I've met Australian-born Tongans, UK-born Tongans, and I've met Tongan-born Tongans, and there's such a huge difference in dynamics between these people! Like, you just find that Aussie, I think Aussie Tongans are just Aussies really but they've just got Tongan in them! Fortunately there's the connection between us, but we're all really different.

Salote is pragmatic that her parents were doing what they thought was best and she recognises that few Pasifika parents anticipated that their children would continue to be so immersed in Pasifika communities. But it is clear that her generation's lack of ability to speak Tongan has resulted in other Tongans not really recognising them as Tongans. Like Tama before her, her version of Tongan-ness must be qualified by the weight of being New Zealand-born. She alludes to a taxonomy of Tongan-ness which suggests that the Tongan-born Tongan constitutes the most authentic and doxa versions of Tongan identity. Or possibly, as Sahlins (2000) suggests, traditional Tongan-born Tongan-ness serves as a yardstick upon which it is determined what kind of change is appropriate. What is certain is that taxonomies and hierarchies of Tongan-ness are readily invoked and Salote does not at all see herself as sitting at the peak of that pyramid. Salote also differentiates across Tongans in different diasporic locations describing "a huge difference in dynamics". She identifies sameness and difference. The way that she describes herself is distinctive as "Tongan-raised" in New Zealand, distancing herself from the New Zealand-born discourse and all of its associations of dilution and change.

Salote's identity talk supports Brah's (2006, p. 444) assertion that "the *concept* of diaspora concerns the historically variable forms of *relationality* within and between diasporic formulations". Being in the position of not fitting the doxa ideal was a fairly common experience for the second generation participants. Even though most expressed a desire to identify as Tongan or Samoan or Cook Islands, these identifications carried the burden of recognition and frequently resulted in embarrassing or humiliating situations of mis-recognition. For example, as Salote says:

I would probably say most would probably experience cultural identity at one point in time in their journey as a NZ-born Pacific Islander. At one point, we didn't even know. We just thought, we thought we were Tongans. Then someone put a label on us and said, "Oh, actually you're NZ-born Tongans".

And you're like, "*Oh*."

"But, if you can't speak the language, you're not really Tongan."

All of a sudden the issues starting rising and you're like, "*Oh*."

Obviously, I do have identity issues with the fact that I'm in crisis - where I don't know the language - and I wish I did know the language. If I knew the language, things may have been a little bit different.

For Salote, the inability to speak the language is one of the keys as to why she feels in "crisis". The sad thud of Salote's "*Oh*" sentiments emerges as uncharacteristically flat in her bubbly talk. She says to me:

I actually think it would have made a huge difference had we learnt the language because I think it just makes a big difference. I definitely know that when I have children that they will be taught the Tongan language. It's going to be completely imperative for any of my children.

Salote is adamant that her own children will speak fluent Tongan and will not be subjected to the same sorts of qualifiers and challenges that "you're not really Tongan". The next story is also about a Tongan but someone who has gone to great lengths to learn the Tongan language and culture.

Story 15: Pita, the 'Hardcore' Tongan

Being Tongan and being a real staunch Tongan at that, I think it has a big bearing on how I operate. I take what I know from the Tongan culture and use that as a guide, or lens, in terms of my own behaviour and my own sort of actions. That has a major bearing because I'd like to think that I'm very firm and sure-footed about the cultural aspects. I mean no one is ever a 100% knowledgeable about anything. But that's one place where I know that I'm on safe ground. There's some of that old knowledge and that's just really during the last decade where I've learned from my cultural mentor and also just my personal research into stuff...

I've gone out of my way. I haven't actually just woken up and known all this stuff. I actually put in the effort. I went in there and researched. I did the rounds in the kava bowls, collected all the stories. I played it backward and forward and in a way it's become a

bit of a lifestyle for me. I live and breathe some of the stuff that I've learned or with the help of certain people that are knowledgeable in that area. You know it's sort of helped instil that pride to the point where it's probably getting ridiculous because I tend to go to kava clubs expecting to hear something wonderful...

That's part of the thing that I love, I love about our culture is that there are those little nuances that are sort of imperceptible. But once you get a glimpse of it, everything starts fitting into place.

Pita talks about how his knowledge of things Tongan became an important resource that he uses to place himself, identify with and understand his place in the broader world, notably not only the Tongan world. This is consistent with Sahlin's (1985, p. 155) definition of culture as: "precisely the organisation of a current situation in the terms of a past". Pita explains:

It took approximately twenty-five years to get to that little arrogant point where I'm at now, where I don't care, you know. Because it took work and it took a passion to try and learn it. Even the language I had to pick up on my own. I wasn't taught the Tongan language. Most of the time we spoke in English at home; even though Mum and Dad spoke to us in Tongan, so I even had to learn that.

This sense of his effort is emphasized here which fits with the definition of capital as the accumulated product of past labour. He goes on to say:

But it comes from within, you know. And the mechanisms to defend yourself against whatever, that comes from within as well. I think that's something important that our young people should learn too, is how to shield themselves. Not to be indifferent or not care, but to protect themselves, and to project an identity because it doesn't have to be a hardcore Tongan like me. You can have that same Tongan attitude on something else, it's transferable. Like in a context you know if I'm with a group of boys who happen to be Samoan, I'll transfer that arrogance in a Samoan context. I think that's something that I think is a skill, a gift from our culture is that ability to adapt. That's the word, adapt.

In this passage, Pita talks about his ability to mobilise his identity with reference to Tongan cultural knowledge and pride as a shield. But he talks about more than that: an inner sense of certainty, confidence and agency. He alludes to his identity shield being both protective and defensive. He says it is important for Pasifika young people to transfer this sense of security and sureness across contexts. And the strength he draws from his sureness of Tongan identity and knowledge is useful across contexts.

When I question Pita about whether he feels accepted by other Tongans, we have a long exchange reprinted below. The interview with Pita shows how he managed to end up feeling that being a Tongan outside of Tonga paradoxically made him feel more Tongan. The transcript of our conversation about this teases out his rationale:

Karlo:

Do you feel accepted by other Tongan people?

Pita:

Yes and no. I think in certain circumstances when it suits me or them, yes, you know [laughter]. Yeah he's a Tongan.

'Oh yeah, he's a Tongan' and then the other view 'Nah he's raised here'. You know in other words he wouldn't really be Tongan. It all depends really on the situation and how embarrassing the incident was and how proud they were and that sort of thing.

Karlo:

Would you say that you feel accepted more by some than compared with others?

Pita:

Personally I don't care but... [laughter]

Karlo:

Because you're Tongan [laughter]

Pita:

Because I have livedseriously I don't really care. I, I, I am Tongan and I know I'm Tongan and that's it, and that's sort of how I think. And in some arrogant way I think I'm more Tongan than the Tongans who live in Tonga.

Karlo:

Yeah?

Pita:

But then anyone can say that and how do you sort of justify it, I don't know.

Karlo:

Is that because...do you say that because you are here and you actively choose it?

Pita:

Yes. I choose it. It's not by default, I work at it... I try and understand it. Whereas a Tongan in Tonga, they take it for granted...

Notably, Pita argues that in a diasporic context identifying as Tongan is a conscious choice. It is not something that is taken for granted. He has had to learn to speak the language and seek out Tongan cultural knowledge. Despite mastery of both, he acknowledges that he isn't always accepted: "yes and no". But he has his own ways of dealing with this and putting a positive spin on it so that he feels confident. He expands on this further later on in the interview, saying:

I think that had I been in Tonga, I wouldn't have been as pro-Tongan as I am now. So this environment has allowed me in a way to sort of get that self-discovery.

Whereas in Tonga, you'd be so inside the system that you can't realise that you're already there. And I think it has a lot to do with displacing. You know when you are displaced your immediate natural instinct is to place yourself back.

What Pita unpacks, as he talks, is the idea that not only is his Tongan identity chosen self-consciously in New Zealand; in part, it can be attributed as a reaction to being displaced. Pita talks about deliberately seeking and acquiring knowledge about things Tongan that he can then use these as personal resources for numerous ends. These are knowledge resources for identity, for philosophical theorising, for understanding his place in the world. He references identity as shield as well as identity in response to being displaced. In this sense, for Pita, identity challenges can be understood as having the possibly unintended effect of consolidating his sense of identity. He says of living in New Zealand,

I think it forced me to find my own little niche within it you know. And it's natural, I think, for humans to try and find a footing or two, to mean or be significant somehow.

When Pita talks about being forced to find his own cultural niche, this echoes earlier identity stories whereby participants spoke of constant questions from others about who they were and how they fit. Pita also identifies that living in New Zealand means that he is exposed to other cultures and he says:

It's valuable to have something to compare against I suppose? I think the only thing that makes sense to me, is that you don't really know your own culture unless you have something to compare it against.

This alludes to the role of the constitutive other. While ongoing exposure to the dominant New Zealand culture was a pervasive influence, it also provided a contrast which assisted with shaping and defining and consolidating Pasifika identities. Throughout the identity stories have been negotiations of sameness and difference. Pita's exposure to non-Tongan cultures, he argues, has given him a stronger sense of what he thinks constitutes Tongan culture.

Identities were developed that made sense in-relation, via first-hand experiences of cultural comparison and informed by enduring public narratives about cultural selves and others. This is consistent with Ewing's (1990) ideas about how the self responds in relation to multiple others and Boyce-Davie's (1994) concept of critical relationality.

In relation to many others, Pita chooses to be Tongan as he understands Tongan-ness, both in relation to Palangi others and Tongans in Tongan homelands. In his own way, and via a number of rationales, Pita has negotiated his claim to Tongan identity regardless of possible challenges. His ability to become fluent in the Tongan language and accumulated knowledge traditions are central resources that he deploys in relation to his identity. This required a serious sustained inquiry into Tongan history and language. His in-depth knowledge and cultural capital puts him in a strong position to be discriminating and selective among different representations of what it means to be Tongan. He is committed to seeking, developing and creating his own discourse about what constitutes Tongan-ness. While this involves complying with ideas about what is authenticated as Tongan, he is savvy enough and critical enough to turn this to his advantage. Pita suggests to me that the doxa ideal of Tongan-ness is perhaps not even realised in Tonga. He says:

Their actions, the things that are happening in Tonga, the whole way the culture's slowly being undermined, eaten from within, it just shows that that whole...it's, it's gone.

Pita is able to draw on his vast knowledge of things Tongan to establish this critique and deflect any form of identity challenge or negativity from the homelands. In this case, knowledge is power. The more knowledge resources Pita has, the more he is able to critique, deflect and negotiate his own understandings, which serve his interests.

Again these stories reinforce the way that Pasifika language and cultural knowledge were important forms of capital in Pasifika diasporic spaces. Identities “rooted” in homelands experiences were often considered most authentic on a discursive continuum which placed NZ-born identities “rooted” through New Zealand experiences, without language and in-depth cultural knowledge, as least prestigious.

He acknowledges,

I'd rather be accepted in my Tongan world than in the Palangi one. Yeah, it is important. I would be absolutely devastated if I didn't feel accepted anywhere. But especially, you know, in the culture that I think I'm from - that I'm proud of.

This sense of the importance of being accepted by other Pasifika peoples was shared by Leo.

The acceptance of my people means a lot more to me than the acceptance of - when you talk about other worlds I guess you're making the assumption - Western New Zealand society?

I do feel accepted in both worlds, but the world that matters most to me is the world of the Samoans, the world of P.I.'s and it has to be, otherwise the cause is useless, aye, otherwise you may as well be out there on behalf of the white folks.

Like Pita, for Leo, his Samoan heritage is a way of making sense of who he is in the world and an identity that he draws strength from. He says:

I think it's given me a base, somewhere I can actually attach who I believe I am to. And say this is my way of defining who I am.

Leo also speaks Samoan. Like Pita, this has not come about easily but has required effort on his part. He says:

I tried to read as many Samoan books as I can. Mum just mocks me. But it's my attempt to try and learn the language again.

These attempts to build Pasifika cultural capital required effort and hard work. Both Leo and Pita suggested that their parents had not transmitted Pasifika cultures to them at home. They had made the effort themselves. As Leo said:

We practice the culture a lot, we're speaking it more at home but it's taken this journey. It's been over that eighties period where all the girls become secretaries and learn typing and don't speak Samoan. So now all our nieces and nephews encourage them to speak Samoan as much as possible and get them to think about university.

So I think we've taken the best of both worlds and we've, hopefully, what we've done is aligned western society into how we live our Samoan lives as opposed to kind of negotiate them and then you end up living a new life.

In this passage, Leo talks about a significant shift whereby Pasifika cultural capital has become more valued and central. He also alludes to the problems with a model of hybridity that oversells the "newness" factor of negotiated cultures and doesn't emphasise cultural continuity and the ability to develop Samoan culture, in this instance, to adapt and accommodate new things (by aligning western society into how we live our Samoan lives). This critique of hybridity is made by many scholars in relation to Pasifika culture (Anae, 1998, Wendt, 1999, Stevenson, 2008, Sahlins, 2000).

The final story in this section is told by Tiare. Not fluent in Cook Islands Maori language, here she talks about the importance of cultural knowledge in constructing her identity. In the story below she talks about the limits of this knowledge and how this bears on how she identifies.

Story 16: Tiare and her Kete of Knowledge

I used to feel like I had to justify the colour of my skin or the language I spoke and the little amount of dancing I used to do and that sort of thing. But what I do know I heard from Papa Jon Jonassen, an anthropologist at a university in Hawaii. He talked about the cornerstone of our identity being cultural knowledge.

And I kind of *get that*. The cultural knowledge stuff for me is not necessarily the language. But it's the icons and some of the songs I know. It's the way I know, that it is obvious to me, in my Cook Island family that there's real order and I know and understand that order. Whereas my Palangi family is just chaos!

It's almost like we have our values and my values are the same for Palangi, the way my mum brought me up. They are very similar values to my dad. And nothing can change that, that's kind of foundational, but then there's the other, and those are my reference points. There is knowledge and then there are skills. So I don't have the knowledge of the language or skill of language, but I have a lot in my *kete*⁶⁶, a lot of cultural knowledge, which manifests into skills.

But what I'm also aware of is the little amount of knowledge I have in terms of my Rarotongan-ness. I think the thing that shifted for me, in terms of being ok with who I am and my identity, was actually knowing the gap in knowledge.

⁶⁶ Kete – bag (often woven) Cook Islands /Maori

So I know I don't have the knowledge or skill associated with being an *Ariki* (which is a Chief). I know that I don't have the amount of knowledge and skill yet to be an *Ariki*. So I'm not going to try and live that out or take on a role like that. So I'm happy with the amount I have. And I'm happy knowing that I need to build on that. That just helps me be ok with who I am. I think that supports how I see myself and my identity.

In this story, Tiare comments on the centrality of knowledge and knowing, considering this to be the cornerstone of identity. She also talks about how her visible embodiment, that is, the way she appears, *is supposed to be* associated with certain cultural skills, knowledge and behaviour (which notably she feels short of). Tiare explains that her foundational knowledge is relatively Palangi, but that she has another kete of knowledge, a Cook Islands' body of knowledge, which provides her with "reference points". Tiare finds comfort in recognising and affirming what she does know and partly in accepting her limits. She uses these to delineate the contours of her own identities. Thus she is not an *ariki*, a chief, with much cultural capital and knowledge so she will not try and perform that identity or role. But she has more than one basket of knowledge, one basket she understands as foundational and another which provides a referential, an alternative toolbox of interpretation and representation.

Conclusion

I have ended this section with this story because it is one of resolution, a way of coming to terms and reckoning with situations that require cross-cultural knowledge and skill. The second generation participants had varying volumes and distribution of Palangi and Pasifika forms of capital. They had to make do with what they had, or as Salote inferred, "I think we just do our best". This chapter sought to look at the way second generation Pasifika peoples negotiated their identities in relation to multiple significant others. The focus on relationships with Pasifika people from Pasifika homelands and with Maori people in Aotearoa attempted to show the multidimensional nature of these negotiations. Over and over again, participants mediated their sense of sameness and difference. They made connections as well as experiencing distancing and exclusion. Identifications were burdened with the politics of recognition. Relationships were influenced by historical, social and material conditions, racial hierarchies, modes of power and enduring public narratives about ethnic selves and others. This theme will be continued in the next chapter which focuses on intergenerational intra-Pasifika relationships and symbolic struggle within the diaspora about how the Pasifika imaginary is imagined.

Negotiating Identities in Relation to the First Generation

Where you from?

Where you from?
the Tongan lady asks, her hair
austere, eyebrows high
like question-marks

“Kolofo’ou” I reply,
“My mother is a Palangi.”
(She can tell where I come from
vowels tight
like they could fit
square
on any sans-serif font.)

“Are you a Tongan?”
she asks.

I am not sure
if this is a question.

(Mila, 2008, p. 12)

Introduction

This chapter focuses on identity stories told by the second-gen Pasifika participants about being “NZ-born” and constructing identities in relation to Island-born others within Aotearoa. This was a relational dynamic characterised by intergenerational politics and symbolic struggle over how Pasifika culture is imagined and reproduced in an Aotearoa context. This struggle often occurred at an ethnic-specific level, where representations of fa’aSamoa or fakatonga were contested.

A key theme running through these stories are claims to authenticity and the tension between the construction of Pasifika cultures as logically consistent, highly integrated and resistant to change. The second-gen participants had to negotiate identities in relation to what was authenticated as traditional and were often mis-recognised for not

performing these identities. This chapter begins with a brief discussion of the relational context between diasporic Pasifika generations.

The Relational Context

Analyses of Pacific migration shows some consistency in the findings that most Pasifika peoples migrated with the ultimate goal of becoming better positioned within the locus of their own cultural frameworks (see Evans 2001, Small 1997). Evans (2001, p. 15) points to earlier research by Lockwood (1971) arguing that the “real incentive” of Samoan migration “is effective participation in fa’aSamoa or the Samoan way of life”. Small (1997, p. 186) explains this somewhat contradictory position:

From the vantage point of a village in Tonga, Tongans left Tonga to be better Tongans – to develop themselves and their families and to improve their lot and status among other Tongans.

The politics of cultural continuity and what is considered acceptable ways to change are played out in the identity stories reproduced here. Macpherson and Macpherson (1999, p. 285) write of Samoan migration:

It is difficult to imagine a set of circumstances more likely to deal a fatal blow to a system of extended kinship based on common ownership of resources and which had evolved in a small, rural village-based society.

Yet, Macpherson and Macpherson (1999) are able to cite several studies which show that extended kinship remained a central feature of migrant community organisation. They argue persuasively that the circumstances of chain migration, the resulting concentration in the same industries and neighbourhoods, widespread involvement in church congregations and the enduring extended kinship structure, facilitated “critical masses” of migrants forming enclaves in which they reproduced social organisation patterns from the homelands.

Appadurai (1991, p.191) writes, “As groups migrate, regroup in new locations, reconstruct their histories, and reconfigure their ethnic ‘projects’, the ethno in ethnography takes on a slippery, non-localised quality”. It is argued that in Aotearoa, Pasifika social spaces are renegotiated and re-territorialised as spaces where “worlds of meaning somehow hang together” (Sewell, 2005b, p. 93). This emphasises a focus not only on the “people, goods, objects, messages” but also on the “flows of ideas and practices” (Werbner, 2004, p. 896).

The identity stories told in this chapter talk of the symbolic struggle over the way these “worlds of meaning” do “hang together” in Aotearoa and the politics of cultural reproduction. The configurations of capital and “the form in which the different forms of capital are perceived and recognized as legitimate” appear to be strongly culturally contextual (Bourdieu, 1985b, p.724). For example, describing the Samoan diaspora in Australia, Va’a (2001, p. 253) writes that, “Ironically, it seems that the goal of the average Samoan migrant is not wealth in itself but esteem”. This observation is consistent with traditional Pasifika approaches to capital whereby wealth can add to mana or esteem, but mana is more valuable than wealth (see Evans, 2001).

Participants’ lack of Pasifika cultural capital, the regulation of authenticated ways of performing Pasifika identities and the penalties for operating outside these limits emerge as commonly shared second-generation stories. These are stories about the rhetoric of difference, trying to have a voice without access to language, rehearsing division and negotiating belonging and acceptance.

Identity Stories

Story 17: Simone and “I Can’t Change the Fact that I was Born Here”

I can’t change the fact that I was born here in New Zealand. I suppose I fall into that *typical stereotype* or label that we’re not fluent and we don’t have any access to our P.I.⁶⁷ language, even though I was fluent when I was a child and I can understand it, I just can’t confidently speak Samoan. I have no fluency in Tongan language whatsoever. I’d be totally lost if I had to go to Tonga and try and get around the Islands. No problem reading Samoan and speaking it if I had to read it and I could conduct a conversation but I would not be confident to get up there and speak in a formal context without knowing I’d be ridiculed or mocked.

Being NZ-born I suppose is a journey of something that is always evolving, who I am... Because people ask you who you are and the context in which you go is always changing. People, I think, often use that label NZ-born and Island-born to create or divide. Or perhaps keep that divide between us going.

And you know we’re just as bad as Island-born: you know they see us as being Palagi and we see them as being “fresh” or from “the bush”.

⁶⁷ P.I. stands for Pacific Islander and is often used colloquially to describe “Pacific Islanders”. It is used as a term of preference by Fairbairn-Dunlop and Makisi (2003)

I really think it really depends on your relationship and what type of relationship you have with your extended family too, back in the islands and how you perceive each other. I remember when my grandmother was still alive and some of my cousins go, “oh you’re fia Palagi⁶⁸, you’re from this, and you’re from that.” And I remember my grandmother goes, “It doesn’t matter what you say about her being fia Palagi. You can’t change the colour of her skin. And you can’t change the fact that her heart is Samoan and her ways and her mannerisms.”

So you might not have access to the language but the way that you conduct yourself and your role in how you participate in your immediate and extended family has a lot to do with who you are in terms of your identity and whether you *feel NZ-born*.

In this identity story, Simone identifies the way in which she is both recognised, as well excluded, as a NZ-born Samoan. She comes up against a form of social essentialism about what it means to be Pasifika with which she does not comply. In this story, she is accused of being fia palagi and deemed not to have the cultural capital or competence to claim or be recognised as Samoan. In this passage, Salote also talks about her Grandmother’s defence of her as Samoan, in terms of her skin-colour, heart and mannerisms – which both make reference to an embodied Samoan-ness.

Yet at the same time, there is a questioning of biological essentialism when second generation people are considered to not really be Pasifika, if they do not have the right cultural competences and skills. Social constructions of identity that are symbolically privileged and socially essentialist sit alongside ideas (sometimes awkwardly) about skin and heart and mannerisms. This sentiment, of the importance of the heart, was shared by other participants. A number of people referred to a willing heart trumping inability to speak the language and lack of other skills sets and important forms of Pasifika cultural capital. As Sina said:

I initially did feel intimidated in Pacific forums not being able to speak or understand Samoan but a number of Samoan women elders, three of them, have all said to me at different times ‘if anybody says to you that you are not Samoan, tell them to come and see me’ because its not about the language, although they truly, I’m sure they do believe that you need to speak it. But it’s not about the language, it’s the *heart*.

Not having the necessary cultural capital to be recognised as “real” Samoans or Pasifika people, “feeling NZ-born” and all the “stereotypes” this engendered, and not

⁶⁸ Fia Palagi – wanting to be like a white person (disparaging term) (Samoan)

speaking the language were recurring themes of second-gen narratives. Yet the participants I spoke to generally felt supported, accepted and defended by their own extended families. As Alipate said:

Once you relate to them genealogically, then they will really take ownership of you.

But many felt less secure moving outside of the family arena. The politics of recognition were much more fraught. Outside of the family realm, many had to negotiate their position and their ability to belong. Wacquant (2008, p. 265) writes that “recognition” represents a “thirst for dignity which society alone can quench”. This recognition and acceptance was not always easy to attain. As Simone explained:

I feel very much accepted by New Zealand-born, my generation, not so much perhaps from those that are first language speakers - unless they know me and they know my parents. Then I don't have a problem. But if it's in a context outside what I call my *safety zone* then it's very different. They probably wouldn't care two hoots who I am, and would probably just look down at me.

This sense of safety zone was also alluded to by Leilani:

Having a Palagi partner means that now I'm very much involved in a lot more Palagi things than I would have been if I had a Pacific partner. And you know I do feel comfortable in that. Whereas if I had a Pacific partner and had to go to Samoa a lot more often, or Tonga, I'd have totally no idea. All I know is just stay invisible or keep your head down, you know, you go back to the very raw Pacific concepts which are not based on anything but, (sorry, not based on anything specific that I can name) but I know: keep your head down, stay invisible, don't step out of your circle of security.

The need to “keep your head down, stay invisible and don't step out of your circle of security” shows the way that the spaces outside familial safety zones were sometimes dangerous and highly contested grounds of representation and social meaning.

The Contested Terrain of Fa'aSamoa

Fa'aSamoa is one powerful ethnic specific transnational imaginary. In the following two stories, participants talk about their encounters and experiences with fa'aSamoa in an Aotearoa context.

Story 18: Simone and the Cups of Tea

Having been raised in white provincial New Zealand, the only time I got to be Samoan was in the church context. I suppose the lack of

access to language and culture and one of the ways that my parents thought that they could bridge the gap was actually joining the Samoan community church. So this was sort of our link to normality and what we had known back in Auckland and in the Islands. And it was one of the few opportunities where they got to practise Samoan culture and speak Samoan language and actually practise the cultural rituals of fa'aSamoa as we know it today.

In a sense, when we weren't there, we were very much Pacific Island people living in a sort of Western Society, really Palagi dominated. For the few days that we were part of the community we were Samoan in a sense: sort of code switching or wearing different hats in different contexts...

I'd say that my life at the time as a teenager and an adolescent wasn't typical of a Pacific Islander at the time. I mean I swam for a start, not very many Pacific Island people swim, that exposure of the body and always being in the water. I did speech and drama, so you know quoting Shakespeare and growing up with poetry is probably not seen as the norm or something that other Samoan girls would be doing at the time. And the number of sports that I played, and I also found in our Samoan church community people would look down at us in the sense that, because Mum and Dad allowed us to go home and get our homework done and ensured that anything to do with school they allowed us to participate in.

Well my other cousins and peers would be at the church hall meeting those cultural obligations. They'd be there to make cups of tea, be there all night and support the housie and what ever it is the Pacific church was doing at the time. We weren't quite seen as pulling or doing our bit and in a sense were questioning our authenticity as being Samoans or NZ Samoans. And the fact that we weren't fluent in the Samoan language, so those issues of, "Oh, well you might be successful at school and university, but you're still not Samoan because you're not fluent in the Samoan language, so *you really can't contribute* to the community in terms of church and fa'aSamoa".

Simone describes service (tautua) in a gerontocracy being a duty, and not an option. It also demonstrates a form of deference to age and seniority. She alludes to the possibility that her parents' decisions may have resulted in penalties for them in this Samoan church community. Almost all participants reported attending church when they were growing up. Many described the churches they attended in their youth as places where their ethnic, cultural and religious identities were developed and affirmed. Simone talks about her church community and the way it provided a link to "our normality". Pasifika churches have been described as the 'new villages' in a diasporic context (see Va'a, 2001). For example, Fairbairn-Dunlop (2003, p. 26) identifies the Pacific Islands Presbyterian Church (PIPC) with its emphasis on "Pacific

solidarity” and “other churches became the home, community, source of identity and solace for many PI families”. Similarly, Lee (2003, p. 43) argues that the churches, as well as extended family networks “have helped Tongans to cope with migration”.

At the same time, the church was a source of pressure to comply with the norms and sanctioned ideals represented and recognised as fa’aSamoa. Macpherson and Macpherson (2001) write at length about how churches are contested sites of intergenerational struggle. Macpherson (2001) points out different denominations replicate Pasifika homeland governance structure, theological preferences, gender divisions, Samoan language use and ways of worshipping in varying degrees⁶⁹.

Tiatia’s (1998) research identifies a powerlessness that many young people feel within a church context which reproduces gerontocratic and traditional Pasifika hierarchies. She writes:

The youth voice has been suppressed to such an extent that Island born church members subjugate, ignore and belittle the significance of the ideas and values the New Zealand-born wish to implement in order to cater to their own needs. (Tiatia, 1998, p. 9)

Pasifika churches are contested spaces where cultural continuity and change and the politics of cultural reproduction are sometimes explicitly struggled over and stressfully renegotiated. Identity politics are keenly felt in these spaces.

Simone identifies that church was a place where you could “actually practise the cultural rituals of fa’aSamoa as we know it today”. The next story also reflects on fa’aSamoa and the way it is imagined and continues to be practised in Aotearoa.

The following story is told by Tama whose family took active measures to keep external influences away from their home. He describes his upbringing, and the way his family life was revolving around church activities and extended family networks.

Story 19: Tama Does the Dishes until Midnight

I’m one of seven children, born and raised in Mangere in a very strong, staunch Church community. First language at home was Samoan. I distinctly remember not being able to speak a lick of English by the time I hit school.

⁶⁹ For example, the Samoan Congregational Christian Church or Ekalesia Fa’apotopotoga Kerisiano o Samoa (EFKS) “conducted all of its activities in the Samoan language and according to Samoan theological organisational and theological models” (Macpherson and Macpherson, 2001, p. 30)

What was really important in our family was fa'aSamoa... My parents wanted what the Western (what the Palangis) were saying was good about New Zealand. But they also wanted to retain their Samoan-ness. When I look back as to what kept us together, what was keeping us together in our neighbourhood in Mangere - Mangere wasn't easy I wouldn't think - so fa'aSamoa in the New Zealand context was really, really important.

To be Palangi means that you really *sold your soul*, you would forget your Samoan-ness, and I think for my parents it was always a threat.

This insular pro-Samoan approach was rejected by Tama who admitted he was, "Probably least receptive to it. I chose not to go to Sunday school which was sacrilege at a young age". Yet he also acknowledges:

Looking back now I realise why my parents did that. They sort of shoved your identity down your throat whether you wanted it or not. You know, it was there... I am really glad about what they did because it gave me one a sense of identity. Not only the spiritual kind but also that "Samoan-ness" - I think that Church was a vehicle that really hammered it home with us.

Tama's narrative shows how integral the church community was as a source of cultural and symbolic resources. Church and family were seen as tightly intertwined, and each to be integral and mutually sustaining sources of Samoan identity. This is consistent with Mara's (2006, p. 222) research on Pasifika identities which suggests, "The social settings of family and church are where the formation of cultural identity takes place". Tama explains that while this provided good grounding for identity, at the same time, he experienced difficulties as he moved into dominant social spaces, such as school. He started primary school without any English comprehension. Later, as a high school student, he was often frustrated as expectations from home and school seemed contradictory and values and ideas from the different cultural spheres would collide. The following narrative illustrates this.

Much to my family's surprise I got a diligence award. I think I got an academic award year ten, 3rd form. I think I freaked the shit out of my parents. They thought, 'Tama's not going to amount to much'.

They just thought I was this... you know, and I didn't think I was that bright actually. Like many good Samoan families they beat that sort of stuff out of you. They say how silly and stupid you are. And I think that's part of that reverse psychology too. Where they think that by being so hard on you it will drive you.

I always remember when I was in year thirteen and I became Head Boy. The Principal called me into his office asking, "Tama you probably want to call your parents"... I called from the office and told my father and his response to me was:

"What bus are you coming home on?"

So they never ever acknowledged any success. I found that really difficult. But I think I realised, years later, that that was just their way of not being able to humble you, keep you - you know - keep.... And I think silently that really drove me - that really, really drove me - that sort of ignoring of, um, that just ignoring of any acknowledgement of any - anything else - really, really, silently, really pushed me...

I remember vividly coming home and saying to my parents, "Oh can you come to prize giving?"

Because my parents had told me all the way since school that for them the pinnacle of, the reason why they came to NZ, was to see one of their kids get a prize at prize giving.

Well, I distinctly remember on a Thursday afternoon giving my mother this letter and her just bawling her eyes out on the side of the road. And then her sort of wiping her tears away, and sort of not saying much to me. But I knew then that they were quite proud. I think that all through my secondary school years, from year 10 to 13 that really drove me.

They didn't say well done, son. Or give me a pat on the back. I love you or anything... But I think from then, I think, they in their very silent way really, really supported me.

Tama demonstrates an ability to translate and interpret the meaning behind his parents' behaviour. The indirect⁷⁰ communication style adopted by his parents is understood by Tama, who had a sense that quietly his parents were proud. He also recognised that they had a desire to humble him. Humility was described as a core Pasifika value by many participants. It is expected of young people who do not traditionally have high status. Tama is also aware that in some aspects of his life in New Zealand, and more specifically at school, his parents were powerless to humble him which perplexes them. This capacity to interpret makes Tama very skilled in dealing with cross-cultural or intercultural dynamics. It hard to know whether this is

⁷⁰ A preference for "indirect verbal interaction" has been noted among collectively oriented cultures, in contrast to the preference among individualistic cultures for "straight talk" (Ting Toomey 1988).

retrospective positioning, or an inter-textual ability (to interpret according to more than one cultural text and to make sense of, or connect across the relational space in-between these different texts) that he acquired at a young age.

Tama is aware of the disjuncture between his status at school as a school leader and his status at home as a youthful male and younger son. There are two different hierarchies he must contend with: the school's hierarchy which is child- or youth-centred and merit-based, and the one he experiences at home, where his age is associated with relatively low status, requiring humility, service and respect. He learns to play different roles and draw from quite different cultural texts about how to behave in different situations. The disjuncture between power configurations, and the meritocracy at school and the gerontocracy at home, is frustrating for him.

You know here I am at school, I'm supposedly this leader and yet I go home and I'm a younger son, and told to do the dishes the day before my bursary English exam. All my other Palagi mates are studying, and I was only one of two guys in my stream of bursary! And here I am doing dishes at church till one in the morning!

I mean I think I've arrived at 17, as being this young school leader. And I was probably the first Pacific School Captain the school had ever had. Yet, hey, my other Palagi mate, and he was my Deputy Captain, you know had BBQ's galore and his parents were proud.

And here I was thinking, we go home and have a rosary. That was the extent of our celebration. Yeah, so I wasn't depressed but I think I was *'Really, gees what is this?'*

This frustration is heightened by his awareness that his parents may be rich in Samoan cultural capital, but they lack Palagi cultural capital or understanding of how to support him academically at school. He recognises that other Palagi parents appear to be more institutionally savvy and supportive. His Palagi mates seem to have a seamless cultural capital transfer where their home environments mirror the values and ideas of school.

Tama talks about struggling with the way his parents' actions feel unjust or unfair, or even unwise, using a Palagi yardstick. Tama still shakes his head about being forced to do church dishes the night before an exam. Yet at the same time, he has enough understanding of his parents' approach to be able to feel motivated and supported by them. Tama concludes that: "They pushed me in an indirect way and some would say, quite mean, in many ways. But looking back now I know what they were trying to

do, they hardened me up in many ways.” At the same time, however, Tama identifies the huge pressure that he and many of his peers faced:

Because I think when our parents came, I think that was their way of trying to *keep it real* you know. Which means no Palagi friends, no Maori friends; don’t speak any English. Because you would lose your Samoan-ness!

So, we want you to have the good stuff - but you have to *keep it real*. How you did that? I don’t know!

I think that’s why a lot of my mates went off the rails really.

Tama sees that his own parents set very narrow parameters around what kind of behaviour, conduct and orientation was considered Samoan and therefore acceptable. In order to be Samoan in his parents’ eyes, maintaining a particular formula of Samoan-ness was necessary. They required rigid replication of the doxa Samoan identity and behaviour believed to be most authentic. This meant discounting many of the influences encountered on a daily basis in New Zealand and devaluing their diasporic lived experiences. It involved being extremely selective about what could be adopted from New Zealand society, privileging things that were discursively constituted as Samoan - and rejecting the rest.

However, Tama’s exposure to school and the values and norms he became familiar with in New Zealand society, made fulfilling his parents’ expectations difficult. Tama suggests that having to “keep it real” within these rigid doxa ideals of Samoan-ness and fa’aSamoa in a deterritorialised and diasporic context was almost impossible. The disjuncture between this unrealistic, often nostalgic, and narrow discursive constitution of Samoan-ness in relation to actual Aotearoa-based diasporic realities, he believes, was why many of his mates “went off the rails”.

This highlights the way that fixed or forced identities are associated with inclusion / exclusion criteria. It also highlights the ways that representations privileged as authentic and truly fa’aSamoa were used to monitor and regulate identity performances, either granting them symbolic recognition and validation or refusing to recognise them. Tama himself is convinced:

Fa’aSamoa takes on a different shape in this context of Aotearoa.

This is echoed in the literature. Va’a (2001, p. 3) writes about the impact of deterritorialisation upon fa’aSamoa, writing:

It is not situated in one place but in many places simultaneously, especially among migrant communities. It is not immutable, for it is ever subject to change, both at home and in receiving countries.

Suaali'i (2006, p. 273) writes:

Monolithic claims of a spirit of faa Samoa, about what the Faa Samoa is and about what being Samoan means, are problematic to the project of opening up the continent and contested terrain of the faa Samoa.

Both Tama and Simone embraced and transcended the values and philosophies of fa'aSamoa. Both expressed emotional affinities as well as concerns about the rigid limits set by this set of discourses.

Fa'aSamoa was seen to be the source of rich cultural resources. Pasifika churches provided cherished opportunities for Pasifika solidarity and community. But both churches and fa'aSamoa were also sites of struggle. Failing to meet the doxa ideals and authenticated norms resulted in penalties and exclusion. Hall (1996, p. 5) argues that:

Identities can function as points of identification and attachment only *because* of their capacity to exclude, to leave out, to render 'outside', abjected. Every identity has its 'margin', an excess, something more. (p.5)

Tama and Simone both adopted behaviour and practices considered to be outside the limits of what is constituted as 'Samoan'. Both had their authenticity, identity and right to be recognised and belong challenged. Simone used the term "code-switch" in her identity talk, and Tama talked of moving between school and home as disjunctive cultural spaces. This was not an effortless transition, characterised by ease and fluidity, it was negotiated with cross-cultural capital and skills and bearing the burden of disparate cross-cultural pressures.

Both Tama and Simone work hard to ensure that a double jeopardy or lose / lose dynamic does not ensue. Simone explains:

That's something that I've always battled with but - oh maybe it's not battled with - but have been challenged to find balance between the two. I think I've come out all right at the end of it, bit of a struggle.

When I ask Simone if she feels accepted by other Pasifika peoples, she says:

I know with some Island-born people I'll never be accepted, it wouldn't matter how many degrees I had, what post I had in New Zealand society or what job I had, the fact that I didn't learn the

language just counts for, you know, I'm *nothing*. And I don't know, most people think I'm all right. I feel pretty much accepted. It's just *that generation*. And if they're in positions of power you haven't got a hope in hell of ever getting any respect or being accepted by them.

Simone realises that her New Zealand cultural capital does not necessarily travel. Nor will it be recognised or converted into symbolic capital in some Pasifika cultural spaces. She also recognises that without being able to speak a Pasifika language, to some people, she will "count for nothing". She goes on to say:

The Pacific Island community they're accepting in terms of what you can do for them and how well you make them look. Or how successful you make them look, in terms of what you are able to do and your status, in terms of a University qualification.

But in terms of actual fa'aSamoa and the cultural context - they are still able to use the language as the tool to decide whether they want you to be part of - you know - to be accepted or to be seen as *at the same level*. But I'm really lucky in terms of my own community that they see that we don't have the language but we've got other sorts of skills that we can bring to the community. I don't know if I'd have that same acceptance if I moved somewhere else and was part of another church community.

Simone recognises that her own community accepts that she has other skills, but not having the language, as Salote noted in the previous chapter, is always going to be a barrier to acceptance or validation that she is "at the same level". This sense of fractured or partial acceptance, but not full or whole hearted recognition was a recurring theme.

Negotiating Voice without Language

The importance of speaking Pasifika languages was another key theme and one which was signalled in the odds ratio testing as significant. The majority of participants (ten of fourteen) I interviewed did not speak their own Pasifika language fluently. Hurtago and Vega (2004, p. 150) write: "Shift happens, shift is inevitable". Their research on language shift among second generation migrants supports and extends other work showing that language shift among second generation populations is a "systematic, predictable and comprehensible phenomenon" (Hurtago and Vega, 2004, p. 150).

However, by some people in diasporic Pasifika social spaces, this shift was lamented and was often considered unacceptable. Speaking a Pasifika language was an influential form of Pasifika cultural capital associated with advantage and profit.

Consistent with the research findings (Lee, 2003, Poutasi, 1999, Tiatia, 1998) it was also considered an important signifier of an authentic doxa Pasifika identity. Anae (2001, p. 110) suggests that, “Inability to speak Samoan, or *Leo fa’asamoa*,” was a “prime source of identity confusion”. Poutasi (1999, p. 5) argues that:

The ability to speak *gagana Samoa* differentiates those who are perceived to be ‘full’ Samoans from those who are perceived to be either culturally destitute or as possessing a tenuous or less legitimate connection to being Samoan.

As one of the participants, Isabella, said:

At the end of the day I’m NZ-born. I don’t have a language. You know this is what you’ll hear all the time, you’ll hear the, ‘I do have a language / I don’t have a language’ stuff. And you know I’m a star without stars...

And I’ve had that slung at me, as you do! That *oh you’re a Pacific person but you don’t even have a language*, oh you don’t speak your own language... *You’re not really Pacific*.

Not speaking a Pasifika language was associated with in-authenticity, a lack of legitimacy, and a basis for exclusion. The ten participants I interviewed who could not speak their own language talked about being on the receiving end of many challenges from other Pasifika peoples. As Tiare says:

A lot of it, like, “How can you call yourself Pacific without the language?” And I just hear traditional voices just trying to protect the language and grow it. And also feeling quite threatened of a New Zealand born who they possibly perceive as someone who can walk in both worlds in confidence.

I’m just trying to understand it and appreciate things. You try to understand why people are like that. I used to really wear it closely to my chest and get really, really angry and get upset and ruminate over it and never get much sleep. But you know after like 15 or 16 times of it being done to you, it’s impossible to personalise it as much as you did the first few times.

When Tiare talks about “it being done to you”, she is talking about the discomfort of identity challenges and situations where your ability to identify is challenged and you are deliberately mis-recognised or excluded. The following story told by Tiare illustrates how her inability to speak the Cook Islands language results in humiliation and rejection.

Story 20: The Role Model Who Wasn't

We were asked to go down to Napier to speak to a whole lot of High School students who were on the fringe of leaving school and choosing a career pathway and that sort of thing. We were asked to be motivational speakers. It was only for forty minutes. The guys that were asked to come down were the Adeaze guys, the two brothers. They were the men that were there as motivational speakers. So feeling quite honoured really, kind of like pleased to be there!

This woman afterwards came up to me. She said, "How can you call yourself Cook Islander when you don't know your language?" Then she did this real patronising thing like, "Oh, your parents probably didn't teach you."

And I just really wanted to *do things* to her. I was *so* angry with her.

So, anyway, I came home and I told my dad. He knew her as well. And I told him: "I said to her, Dad, that she can't deny the blood that runs through my veins. Because you know, I am Cook Islands'. I'm of your line."

He says, "Yes, but you must understand where she's coming from, that she has every right to say what she says." So he was agreeing.

And I said, "Well it's your fault because you're the one that never taught me."

And he said, "Yes, but I thought I was doing you a favour." He seriously thought that!

In this story, Tiare calls on genealogy to determine her right to identify as Cook Islands. Yet Tiare's inability to speak the language puts her outside of the limits of what is privileged and constituted as Cook Islands for this particular elder. Even though Tiare's father is from an ariki (chiefly) family, this counts for nothing in the dynamic that occurs. Tiare is deliberately mis-recognised (Wacquant, 2008, p. 265) because she does not speak the language. Tiare says:

It was just really in my face, that I was New Zealand-born Polynesian who couldn't speak her language and it was a real put down.

While Tiare identifies as a Cook Islander in this situation, she is not identified back. Hall (1996) argues that identities matter so much because identity is where the psychic and social meet. Identities are connected to deeply personal feelings about belonging, exclusion, acceptance and rejection in the social world. Butler (1995) suggests that

identity carries the burden of recognition. In many ways, it is the politics of recognition that Tiare is talking about. She says:

I feel more accepted in the *Papa'a*⁷¹ world than the Pacific world... I don't feel fully accepted by your traditional lot. I wonder what it will take to prove myself worthy. Or how much submitting it requires (on bended knee)...

I do believe there is a significant amount of gate-keeping that goes on. Maybe that's a power thing? Because they know that they carry this wealth of knowledge...

The wealth of knowledge, along with proficiency in Pasifika languages can be considered key forms of Pasifika cultural capital. Tiare recognises that there is a power dynamic involved. She suggests that she feels more accepted in the Papa'a world, and like other participants before her, explains that she does not feel "fully accepted" by the "traditional lot". This echoes Simone's sentiments and other participants' awareness, that they may achieve partial recognition, but not full acceptance. All of the participants who could not speak the language expressed some regret and sadness associated with this. Participants who could not speak the language talked about having to find other strategies to negotiate inclusion and belonging. Margaret said of not being able to speak Samoan:

You have to find other strategies; you have to, I think you have to become more hypersensitive in terms of what's going on so that you can work out what's going on around you. If you can't understand the language then you have to become more strategic in terms of finding out what's going on and like even within my own family now, often I know more about what's going on than anybody else. Even between my dad and my uncles and my cousins, because I'll find out from one person, then I'll go and talk to someone else, not gossiping but I'll just get the whole picture.

To compensate and cope with her lack of language, Margaret deploys other strategies which she explains involves a heightened awareness and interest in family matters and finds ways of connecting that are possible for her given her lack of language. Tiare, in the previous chapter, also talked about drawing upon her cultural knowledge instead of language. Bill talks about being at a family funeral. He says:

I looked at my cousin speaking about his father and I heard him speak in Cook Island Maori at the beginning and I thought, yes you

⁷¹ Papa'a – person of European descent or gloss for Western things (Cook Islands)

are a successful lawyer, you've gotten out and have all of those kinds of 'get ups'. But actually, your father and your mother (who was European), did you a bit of a disservice *like my parents did* by not encouraging more of the use of the language and stuff... I just sat there next to my cousin and she said: "Do you want me to translate for you?"

And I said, "No, I can understand". But then I just thought, yeah, this is one area where we haven't been well equipped.

The awareness of a lack of cultural capital and not feeling well equipped, or less accepted in Pasifika settings, was relatively common. In the intergenerational cultural politics of reproduction, second-gen participants faced penalties and the stress of negotiating inclusion, when their own life experiences and behaviours set them outside the limits of what might normally be accepted as Samoan or Tongan or Cook Islands or Pasifika.

Symbolic Struggle

Tiare and I had quite a long conversation about an incident at a workshop where there was a relatively public interplay of intergenerational conflict. She tells me her story and in response, I tell a long story about my own experience.

Story 21: Rehearsing Division

The lecturer on the first day created this facilitated discussion around who we are and what our strengths are. And there was this huge division amongst the group. A whole lot of things were said, and subtly said, about NZ-born or from those with a more traditional upbringing. And I really just kind of picked up on that and I started to become really angry (just internally) thinking 'Yeah, who the hell do they think they are they're always bagging us?' It was almost quite patronising, "Oh you know, the NZ-born what do they know? And they're just *young*. Don't have enough of the language or culture, and so that was the kind of tone.

At the end of it I became pretty angry and I decided I just needed to just *stop this*. So I thought I'll just have a chat with one of the support people and I said "This is happening and this is not ok blah blah blah. This needs to stop! Someone needs to address this issue."

And she never answered me, she took me on this huge journey and I love this woman, for the way that she responds and it was kind of random. We went on this - and then I realised - I had this epiphany that this needs to happen. It's almost like when we talk about respect that *that's* what it is. It was like that I needed to, as part of that group NZ-born children, I needed to respect where they were coming from

even though I found it quite offensive. I had to allow it to take its course and its journey.

What's been interesting, like in the next workshops, I was kind of ok with that, but through the next few workshops that divisional stuff was really addressed. Which was really amazing - that there was awareness from the traditional who were bagging the NZ-born about the way they are. They become aware of the hurt that they impart or some of the division that they create. Yeah it was amazing right at the end of the three days. We had this real open discussion and it was facilitated really, really, well. But it was about that. There were tears, real emotional apologies and it kind of just needed to, that needed to happen. I think it needed to be talked about quite bluntly and in a real *rehearsing division* kind of way. It certainly came to the surface in the 1st workshop and then in the 2nd workshop it was just a natural thing. I don't think it was the intention of the facilitators or lecturer but it just unfolded.

But when I saw this process unfold and really reflected on it and I thought well I'm always going to be confronted by this attitude of you don't know enough, you don't speak the language unless we go through this journey together, and sit at the same table and sit on the same mat and that sort of thing. I'm always going to have those tension-filled experiences, if that makes sense, and there's no other way around it really. We need to, unless we sit on a mat and really hash these things out and get really deep and personal.

And I'm happy with that, we're always going to have this people practising the division with their tongues and rehearsing it over and over again. So there is that and maybe they feel that they need to protect themselves some way? Or feel less threatened by these very savvy, I think they're quite savvy, and that we navigate quite swiftly in NZ in terms of the systems. But we also have an insight enough more than our Palangi colleagues, to survive I think, in the Pacific systems.

Karlo:

It's interesting that you told me that story Tiare, because a friend of mine did that leadership course a few years ago. She talked to me about how they got a bollocking by the traditional lot. Actually it was Ahiohio, who is absolutely, you know, a creator of those sorts of divisions. You know how some people can do it, but Ahiohio took it to a whole other destructive level. I asked her what happened, did any one get up and speak? And she said, "Oh no, we were all just to faka'apa'apa⁷², like too respectful. We just all kept quiet.

Tiare:

⁷² Faka'apa'apa – Tongan word for respectful.

Interesting isn't it because I remember at our first work shop we had one person come and she came to basically speak about her experience of the course, and where she is now basically. And she said that she hated it... She said it was just revolting and she wanted to cry and leave and they were really mean to her.

The facilitators of the course have commented on this being an incredible group, and that we have been open to going really deep and sharing our feelings. What we have in our group is a real mix of this generation (NZ-born) and the traditional. There's enough of us to find that balance I think, and enough of us, and in fact I must admit that NZ-born are much more, I think if it wasn't for the way in which we responded then maybe that whole process of coming to the mat and being ok and resolution possibly wouldn't have happened. Because when I look at my colleagues and they're standing up and saying, we want your help, we respect you and tears are flowing. And they're saying, "We know that sometimes we get it wrong and we embrace you but we are trying to get it right. And we really want you to teach us. And time and time again I've heard them get up in our group and say this. And I've never once heard the traditional group say, "Well, we need you guys too."

But there has been this kind of softening and without it we wouldn't have been able to dialogue on that last day. But I think it has taken the grace of our group to get to that place which is an interesting process. Almost as though we have to show submissiveness because that is kind of, at the end of the day, what traditional Pacific expect aye, is submissiveness?

Karlo:

I had heard that had happened. Funny, I was at a conference and it was a Pacific education one. I wasn't used to being around the education sector. Anyway, Ahiohio was there. They were talking about *who* was a Pacific person? He stood up. (I was there to write the document. That was my job, contracted to sit there, type it up and turn it into some guidelines). And he stood up and said, "We've really got to start thinking seriously about what we mean by Pacific. I mean, who is in? And who is out? Because we are letting in all these people who can't even speak the language. And they can't do this. And they can't do that. And we really need to get down to the nuts and bolts of who is in and who is out."

And I stood up and said, "I know I'm here just to take the minutes, but I can't put up with that. I just can't put up with that."

And he said, "Can't you at least give the dignity of completing what I have to say?"

And then I said, "You shall have the dignity of completing what you have to say and then I will stand up and disagree with that."

So I sat down and he finished and then I stood up and said "I can't believe that you have the absolute sheer arrogance and audacity to stand up and say that people are *out* because they don't speak the language". I said, "Do you know fifty percent of our young people can't speak the language. Fifty percent! So you are disinheriting and dispossessing fifty percent of our young people." I said, "How can you? I don't even understand how you can rationalise that?"

Anyway, it was funny because he didn't even have a particularly good come-back. And I had all these people come up to me afterwards who said to me that they were so grateful that somebody said it; a range of people, like Palangi lecturers as well as Pacific people there. And then one woman came up to me and said that she was so offended. She was part-Pacific, like there was only one white person there really. This Pacific woman said to me that she was so offended, so deeply offended by what Ahiohio said, that she just couldn't even be in his presence. And that she was going to skip the dinner in case she had to sit next to him.

I said to her, "Don't worry about Ahiohio. He's just like that." And then I said to her, "Anyway the reason why he likes to say that is because that's where his power is you know. He doesn't have power in the other space." And then Ahiohio was sitting there (he was quite close). And he said to me, "The reason why you like to talk about non-Pacific, New Zealand-born blah-blah is because that's where *all* your power is."

I just started laughing and I said, "You know what Ahiohio. This women just came up to me and said that she was so offended by you that she wouldn't even sit next to you at dinner, and I said to her, don't worry about him that's where all his power is." Like straight to his face. But the funniest part of this story is, I think; which is where the whole complexity of it emerges - is that I lost my wallet while I was there. I lost it. I left it behind in a shop. I got it back eventually, but I was there with my nanny and my kids and had lost my wallet. I had no money and was totally freaked out thinking, "What the hell am I going to do? Who can I borrow money off?" Ahiohio, he was first person I thought of, because of the connection as Tongans. Like, we know each other. And that's the weird thing, like I had all these other people who I'd connected with and who I agreed with, but he was the immediate person who I wouldn't feel an ounce of shame or embarrassment about going to borrow money off.

Tiare:

But obviously there's a real maturity there you know that you can have those real robust discussions.

Karlo:

You see, no. This is the thing! This is the thing! I was thinking I don't have that pull-back of *respect*, that thing, like when my friend

said to me that they were too respectful. Oh, I just thought there's just no way that I would have kept quiet. Now if I had stood up in your group and started to have a go at that person, whoever it was, you would have never got your balance. Because it would have just become more adversarial, so that's what I'm reflecting around as you talk.

This discussion is about symbolic struggle in action. Who is in? Who is out of the Pasifika imaginary? Who and what is cherished and beloved, centred and privileged? And what is considered of low value or outside the discursive limits? The different ideas at play, including that one must be respectful as opposed to having a clearly enunciated opinion and voice, and being silenced and feeling disempowered with very few options and resources or opportunities for assertion. Tiare talks about the rehearsal of division, the rhetoric of difference and the negative representations of the second generation. She analyses the situation and sees that respect was necessary for the older generation to come to terms with the impact of their rejection of the NZ-born population. I tell another story, of confrontation and vocal symbolic struggle that was played out publicly. My own sense, to disregard silence, submission and respect because I felt it was not earned or owed is quite different from the strategies taken by my friend and by Tiare.

This long passage also illustrates the difficulties of gaining acceptance when strict limits and boundaries are placed around "who is in" and "who is out". In many senses, the participants and my own self in this case, are casualties of boundary wars in symbolic struggle. Tupuola (2004) refers to edgewalkers and Teaiwa (2001) refers to being on the edge. I see that as being similar to being on the cusp of the discursive limits of what is currently constituted or centred as authentic Pasifika identities. In many ways, the second-gen participants provided threats to the stability of who we imagine ourselves to be as a collective. These "inauthentic" or "improper" representations were represented as diluting or contaminating the pure imaginary. The contested terrain of who we are, how we are imagined and who is included and who is excluded is the intergenerational politics of cultural reproduction in a diasporic context.

It is Tiare, who argues that we must sit on the same mat and hash this out. It is Tiare who identifies that this tension is generated in-relation to each other and that the relational space between the two generations will be tension-filled. She also identifies the dynamics of power. For example, the second-gen was numerically dominant in this workshop but was seen to be culturally weak and low status in terms of their

youthful age and lack of cultural capital. In a space governed by principles of respect for elders and expectations of submission and service there were highly constrained options of response, like silence, conformity, deference, or the alternatives route of conflict associated with penalties, and potentially even more marginalisation. My assertion in my story was that the stakes were too high, to leave people behind because they did not fit or comply with what Pasifika people were supposed to be. I lost my wallet later at the conference and found that the only person I felt comfortable to borrow money from, was the adversary that I had challenged. This did leave me wondering about the nature of “family” where there is infighting but connections are still strong. Teaiwa and Mallon’s (2003) concept of ambivalent kinship raises its head again.

Negotiating Belonging and Recognition from Beyond the Limits

Amidst symbolic struggle was the challenge of negotiating acceptance while living out change. Many participants talked about the way they tried to earn acceptance. As Lilomaiva-Doktor (2009, p. 8) writes, from a Samoan perspective:

“Being kin” is not enough—one has to *live* it through participation, reciprocity, and obligation, whether one resides in one’s birth village or away from it. One may be part of a kindred, but if not maintained and expressed in *tautua* (service) and *vā fealoa’i* (balanced social space), the *‘āiga* loses legitimacy.

Bearing witness to the above quotation, participants referred to an expectation that to engage in relationships with Pasifika community and family networks requires considerable effort and labour. As Alipate explained:

You know, looking after other people, just being generous with your time if you can - *this is coming from an accountant who charges by the hour!* But trying to look after, I guess, just more than your nuclear family a little bit... it’s good to have the connectedness with the other family and extended cousins.

Emphases on service, respect, duty, rather than individual gain, were articulated by participants as important governing principles. Social and cultural capital took time to accumulate. A track record of labour and service to the collective was closely associated with the granting of symbolic capital and status. As Salote said:

I just totally believe that Pasifika people want to see results, they want to see...you know stop talking and like show us what you can do. And then you’ve got to prove it and it’s a long journey but once

you do it, then you build up your credibility. But the unfortunate thing is when you do one thing naughty! That's it, *laters, you're outta there!*

So, I know it's terrible. You've got to be really resilient, that's for sure, and you've got to really just know who you are. If you've got a real identity issue and you don't know who you are [laughter] you're doomed from day one.

Salote alludes to the ruthlessness of a community which wants to see results from its young people and demands hard work before symbolic recognition is granted. A number of the participants talked about needing to work hard to obtain recognition and acceptance in Pasifika social spaces. They were expected to meet their obligations and to participate in communally oriented life. This required some compliance with what was considered to be appropriate in those spaces and recognises that there were rewards for complying with what presents itself as legitimate and most authentic (Bourdieu, 2008). As Salote alludes, tolerance for deviation from the sanctioned norms was low: "if you do one naughty thing" that's it, "you're outta there".

Yet what about those who would not or could not comply? As Lola explained:

There was no one really like me around. Because all the Samoans were (that I knew, even if they were New Zealand-born)... had that whole fa'aSamoan up-bringing. And then all the Palagis assumed I was Samoan and different and really didn't engage in that.

I sort of think about my crisis of identity that I went through as a teenager, about who am I and where do I fit...

Lola explains that, with maturity, she arrived at a point of "crystallising my own identity". This involved accepting that:

I am not 'a-go-to-church-every-Sunday' and 'sing-the-gospel' Samoan. And I'm useless at sports and I do have views about gender and homophobia and about certain political things...

I really was able to practise my own persona and figure out where I fit in all of that, that I'm not Palagi, that *I'm this type of Samoan...*

I really do strongly identify myself as Samoan, even though my dad's white... I suppose for ages I didn't feel like a real Samoan, because I'm so fair and because I don't speak Samoan, and had quite a different up-bringing, and I have different views. But it's been a gradual process I suppose over the last ten years, so many aspects of my life are Samoan first and Palagi second. And to be successful in the Palagi world and being able to navigate the Palagi world - it's fine. It doesn't detract from my identity as a Samoan.

In Pasifika social spaces, Lola recognises that she is challenged about whether she has the right to claim a Samoan identity.

Although I'd still meet a whole lot of Samoans who will say that I'm not a real Samoan. And people will say that you've been successful because you're not a *real Samoan*. You know, because you've been raised by Palagi and you don't speak Samoan and serve the Palagi. I've met many Samoans who think that. But that's part of maturity I suppose, isn't it, to cast them off.

Lola talks about the importance of not internalising these negative discourses, but rather being: "Fiercely proud of being Samoan and claiming it!" This involves claiming and owning a Samoan identity, even when you depart from the doxa of Samoan-ness and even though others might challenge your right to identify.

Isabella has her own response to these sorts of identity challenges:

I used to really get: "You're not really Pacific or you know you don't have your language, so therefore you're not!"

You know, I'm really clear that *I am*, actually that *I am*. If you really want to talk numbers, do the numbers and then come back to me and tell me how many Pacific people in New Zealand are just like me, because there are plenty, yeah, over half! Yeah, so then you're telling all of them too that they're not Pacific enough?

There was a strong insistence from a number of participants that NZ-born and multi-ethnic versions of Pasifika were just as valid as other ways of being Pasifika. Sometimes, particularly for multi-ethnic participants, their 'mixed' embodiments were associated with negativity and racism. As Margaret says:

All of our experiences are just as important, you know, and my experience is just as important as someone that was born in Samoa and vice versa.

Yet she also acknowledges:

I'm really aware of the kind of stigma attached to being half-caste. I feel that. It doesn't hurt my feelings or anything. But I'm still aware of it... I was talking to someone about it the other day and how it was a factor in something, and they thought I was just being silly. But I know, you have to earn your stripes a lot more than you would do if you were full Samoan. And there's less room to make mistakes too. Because people are going to be watching you hoping that you do...

The final story told is by Alipate which illustrates an incident of being mis-recognised and deliberately excluded as a Tongan. Alipate explains his background.

Story 22: More Tongan than I Thought: Alipate

My father's from Tonga and he came to New Zealand to go to University, he was the first in his family to come in the 60's... Mum and Dad are both university educated. I guess I had a really happy childhood. No problems.

My dad didn't want me to learn how to speak Tongan. There were no other Pacific Islanders at primary school. There were a couple of other families at high school, half-caste Tongans and some Rarotongans as well, no Samoans. We pretty much grew up and didn't really know too much about the Tongan culture. Just that I was half Tongan obviously, and went to various family things...

A lot of Tongans would be introduced to me and they would go, oh yeah, you're the Palangi one.

I'd be like, "Oh yeah," didn't really mind.

But this guy, and he's a smart guy, and I really respect him. He said "Guys, he's probably more Tongan than you, the way he was brought up."

He used to come down to the farm and I'd organise the meat and set it all up. You know, looking back, my dad brought me up real - not - he didn't speak to me in Tongan - but you know, basically, respect your father. He used to tell me all these stories. "Don't hit your father," and all this.

And I used to go, "Why is he telling me all this?" But the more I learn about the Tongan side of things, it was real important for him to do that. Just the way he used to teach us. It used to really annoy me! He would never tell me what to do. He would just tell me off when I did it wrong.

When I was at uni, I had to start learning more about Tongan stuff. So, I found out that I was more Tongan than I thought, but I just wasn't brought up in the language. When I went to uni, I made a real conscious effort to explore that side, which I guess you do at that age. I joined the Tongan Students' Association and I made a lot of lifelong friends through that. They're probably my best friends now.

Then I went to Tonga. I made my dad take me to Tonga. He hadn't been to Tonga since I was about four... And it's just coming out now. He was telling me all the things that happened. He's pretty bitter

about it. Like the family things. And that really influenced how he brought me and my brother up. He's pretty dark on it all.

But I basically told him that I totally understand and respect that. But he has to respect why I can't go on with it. And, why, potentially I want to bridge the gap back...

So I think, my dad always says: "Don't be like a Tongan," you know. There are certain things he doesn't like. But he's actually, he can't help it. It's him. He is a Tongan. You know it's just one of those things, it's kind of a denial but actually it is just part of us.

When I went to Tonga with him, it was great to meet all my cousins over there and see the family homes. Then I went back by myself and got to meet the boys and play rugby with them. I went and connected with them that way and now I just relax.

I talk Palangi, I don't talk Tongan. But I also know that I'm accepted and part of the family. They come to me for help a lot now. They see me, as maybe - not that I want to take anything from my dad - I just think that they come to me for help sometimes because I'm a little bit more relaxed about it.

Despite the sentiment of denial of Tongan culture in this narrative, this is complicated, ambiguous, and is certainly not fully realised. As Alipate acknowledges, while his father articulates a denial of Tongan culture, his actions and practices belie adherence to some practices which are considered typically Tongan. "He can't help it. It's him. He is a Tongan."

The pressure to perform a particular version of Tongan identity leads to Alipate choosing to claim an identity as "Tongan but not *a* Tongan", saying in response to my question about what ethnicity group he identifies with:

I think ethnic group I'd say Tongan, I'd always say Tongan. I'd say Tongan New Zealand. But I don't think New Zealand's an ethnic group, so Tongan-Palangi maybe? But I think of myself as a New Zealander. It's like Sione told me once, I'm not, I'm Tongan - *I'm Tongan but I'm not a Tongan*, this is before he got smart and started doing his post grad studies.

Alipate makes a joke here, because we both know Sione whom he refers to. We also all (Alipate, Sione and myself) have one Tongan parent and one Palangi parent. So our status as Tongans is further complicated by that. When I ask Alipate which ethnic group he identifies with primarily he responds with: "Do you choose one?" I immediately see how my question is loaded towards a singular answer which isn't really very sensitive given my own complicated ethnic positioning. I respond: "You

don't have to, you definitely don't have to." But the question has already been asked, and regrettably it does ask the participant to "choose".

His response, like so many responses from participants with slips of tongue "I'm not, I'm Tongan" and then second time around, clearer, more sure, shows the way in which it is difficult to articulate something that troubles the binary, or perhaps just difficult to do identity talk with all of its possible slips and lack of accommodating language. But Alipate, guided by Sione's thinking on the matter, has found a tricky linguistic device which provides a way to describe both belonging and not quite fitting. "I'm Tongan, but not *a* Tongan".

I immediately knew what Alipate meant. Perhaps this is where my insider positioning of shared meanings and experiences do me a disservice? If I was another interviewer who was not also, in many ways "Tongan but not *a* Tongan", I may have asked Alipate to further explain this rationale. But I understood exactly what he meant and did not ask him to elaborate.

Conclusion

The second-gen identity narratives of relational space with first generation or island-born Pasifika peoples shows how these dynamics were patterned by power relations, hierarchies, politics of inclusion and exclusion. These spaces privileged Pasifika forms of capital which often disadvantaged young NZ-born Pasifika peoples. Language, age, cultural knowledge, gender, genealogy, family, service, these were all forms of capital in Pasifika social spaces. Participants had *some* of these forms of capital, in varying volume and degrees. Speaking your own Pasifika language was an influential form of cultural capital in Pasifika social spaces. It was associated with doxa Pasifika identities. The second generation without the ability to speak their own Pasifika languages in some situations struggled for recognition, identification and inclusion.

The narratives showed that for the second generation participants I interviewed, acceptance within Pasifika social spaces was not always easy to gain. They might *identify* but to be *identified* back was never a given. It was possible for the second-gen to find their identities just as fixed and framed negatively within island-born Pasifika discourses. Many second generation participants operated beyond the limits of what was constituted as Pasifika. This threatened discursive rules and resulted in misrecognition (Wacquant, 2008), identity challenges, exclusion and penalties for non-compliance. Butler (1995, p. 440) refers to the importance of "recognisability in both

linguistic and political terms” in relation to identities. For second generation participants, not being able to speak in their Pasifika language meant little recognizeability in linguistic terms.

The second generation participants were faced with the challenge of grappling with how subjects are “formed ‘in-between’; or in excess of, the sum of the ‘parts’ of difference” (Bhabha, 1994, p. 2). The participants I interviewed did their best with the resources they had. They had to find other ways of belonging and renegotiate the very terms of inclusion. They had multiple strategies, including deploying biological and strategic essentialism, making genealogical claims, pointing to shared skin colour. They spoke of willing hearts, dutiful service, deference and respect. Some offered their Palangi cultural capital, which could often be in limited supply, in Pasifika social spaces. At times this was considered prestigious. At other times it was rejected as insufficient.

Macpherson (2001, p. 73) argues that, “In Aotearoa, new social spaces encouraged individuals to deconstruct all forms of orthodoxies and traditions openly”. However the range of possibilities, and the ability to contest more openly, does not detract from particular cultural identities, values, ideas, and ways of behaving having a hegemonic ‘doxa’ status over others. One could argue that to some extent, adherence to ‘doxa’ identity ideals may be monitored and regulated more rigidly in diasporic spaces fuelled by nostalgia and the desire to ‘authentically’ reproduce Pasifika homelands.

This ambivalence - the potential spaces in-between choices - and the ability to bridge this space or re-weave new discursive meanings across it, and the constraints or agency to do so; these were the defining issues facing many of the second generation participants.

Relationships with the Pasifika island-born generation provided important opportunities and resources for constructing identities and a sense of place and self (positioned and connected to others) in the world. These relationships could also be battlegrounds, annihilating and erasing. Powerful and enduring public narratives about what Pasifika people were supposed to be were deployed and retold and rehearsed again and again, in reaction to the performative fluidity of the second-gen. The rhetoric of difference was often wielded in ways that sought to exclude and punish this generation for trying to change the Pasifika identity story. While in many ways the second generation may have been invested in subverting the established orders

which placed them at the margins of these spaces, at the same time many participants desired the benefits, belonging and rewards associated with compliance.

To recognise and identify the second generation as Tongan (Samoan, etc) required a revision, shifting of the discursive criteria and extension of its limits. The numerous stories of identity challenges relayed by second generation participants touched on threats from those who protected what was centred in Pasifika spaces and maintained cultural boundaries. Yet by their very inclusion, discursive rules constituting Tongan-ness or Samoan-ness and so on were broken.

The majority of participants I spoke to were claiming their ground, labouring hard to acquire Pasifika social, cultural and symbolic capital, in some cases negotiating turf for belonging and to tell new stories. These narratives sat alongside the old ones, vying for recognition and space to be heard and claimed. Bhabha (1994, p. 162) writes, "The very possibility of cultural contestation, the ability to shift the ground of knowledges, or to engage in the 'war of position', marks the establishment of new forms of meaning, and strategies of identification."

For those willing to engage in the battles of cultural reproduction, this involved claiming their right to signify, to identify and to be symbolically recognised. The stakes were high, involving the way that we imagine ourselves, through struggles over the production of social meaning including the politics of changing or shifting the story – of opening up a space of relating, (re)negotiating the va.

CHAPTER 9

Synthesis

after many years of
moving wounded
between the back-slap
of different worlds

you will decide
there is nothing to do
but wear home
on your back

crawl land
swim sea

amphibious genealogy

swim past the lizards
walk by the fish

shell thicker
than
water

(Mila, 2008, p. 15)

Introduction

This chapter brings together and synthesises key themes from participants' stories. It shows how identities were not conceived of as singular but were rather characterised by multiplicity and flexibility. It shows the way that participants had many identity strategies (Butcher, 2004) that changed in relation to audience, context and across different modes of power (Mani, 1990). It then focuses on the role of polycultural capital, knowledge, agency and power to realise rich, purposeful, and multidimensional cultural ways of operating. Polycultural capital is understood to be critical to having agency to negotiate between cultural ideas, texts and discourses. Stories of negotiation are analysed. This is followed by an examination of the many patterns of possibility across relational and intercultural spaces identified including in participant narratives, including: dialogic distances, bridging, negotiating turf, strategic ignorance, strategic essentialism and strategic hybridity. These patterns are

not necessarily understood to be exhaustive, but they illustrate how, depending on context, power and audience, different strategies are deployed which are temporal and context-specific. The chapter seeks to describe the culmination of the impact of negotiating critical relationality (Boyce Davies, 1994) with many significant others as detailed in the previous three chapters.

Multiplicity

Bourdieu argues that: "Agents are endlessly occupied in the negotiation of their own identity" (Bourdieu, 1989, p. 21). But what happens when identity is negotiated in relationships with *many others*, across many relational spaces, disputed according to *multiple* hierarchies and modes of power, resulting in *multiple subjectivities*? Ewing (1990, p. 262) writes:

The self (I would say "self-representations") and its relationship to the other are subject to constant negotiation during the course of interaction... Self constitution is actually a dialectical process in which individuals experience themselves from the standpoint of the other, so that self-experience is always changing. This model has served as an alternative to the model of an enduring, cohesive, unitary self, which is assumed in many cultural studies of concepts of self.

The narratives of people who contributed to this research talk about what it means to move across relational spaces that are organised differently, and the resulting multiplicity. As Bill said:

I don't have a single identity if that makes sense, I don't. I just I think we are much more complex... It's the way we have been brought up, which is to be proud of who you are. And '*who you are*' is not *one thing*, you're not a singular being...

This was also articulated by Lola. She explains:

I suppose that would be the first thing, figuring out who you want to be... I suppose it's that idea that there isn't one way to be. You know, there are so many different people within the subset Pasifika that that idea of figuring out *who it is that you want to be* and *what it is that you want to take* from the different cultures and then move from there...

There is that reoccurring theme of forging ahead without compromising your core cultural values, but that presupposes that you have identified and owned those core cultural values. And I suppose that is the first step, identifying *who you are*, *who you want to be* and *what that means*.

So that's not just a Pacific thing: that's a journey that everybody goes through. But I think for Pasifika in New Zealand there are the added elements and the added dimensions to that, which adds complexity to that process. But it also adds richness and reward to that process as well.

Lola refers to a process of critical relationality (Boyce Davies, 1994) whereby in the context of relationship, you figure out "what it is that you want to take" and move from there. Lola identifies a sense that there isn't just one way to be, just as Bill explains he is not "a singular being". Lola goes on to say:

I do adjust myself to the different situations and part of it is unconscious cultural cues. But part of it definitely is what's going to suit my purpose in this context. And then the question is, I suppose, *when am I truly myself*, if that's what I'm doing in all the different contexts?

And what I'm heading towards is that I'm finding I can be truly myself in all of those different forums, in the same way that anyone would act more formally at a wedding than they would at a McDonalds or at meeting a friend for drinks. You know you just do adjust yourself to the different situations.

The gnawing question, 'when I am truly myself?' is associated with the discursive pressure for a singular, unified and mono-culturally coherent and rational sense of self. Yet ultimately, Lola's lived experiences, intuition and reflexive analysis trouble and reject a construction of the self as a stable, unitary subject. Rather, she describes self representations which are negotiated in relation to many others (Ewing, 1990). These pick up on "unconscious cultural cues" and respond to them. Lola talks of being strategic enough to ask "what's going to suit my purpose in this context?" The next section expands on this.

Strategic Identities

Lola's reference to strategically asking "what's going to suit my purpose in this particular context?" speaks of agency and power. She expands on this in the following story.

Story 23: Lola and the Judge from Africa

A really amazing woman I met once was a judge from Africa. She had been born in the village and then sent to school in London and got a law degree and then came back. One of the questions I asked her was, "How do you navigate that traditional up-bringing versus

being a judge within what is essentially a Westminster Western world judicial system? How do you manage those different roles?"

And she said, and I just loved her answer, she said, "You just pick what's going to get you farthest in the context that you're in." She says, "Sometimes that suits me to be the woman sitting cross-legged at the back of the room. And so I participate in that context because that's going to achieve my purposes. In the next breath, it's going to be the judge looking down my nose and ordering people to do this or that. That's going to suit what I'm doing in that context."

I really liked that answer because I think that is what we do. We lend ourselves to a situation and have a hand in achieving what it is we want to do. I think that one of the things I like about getting older is that I feel I can do that without compromising myself, whereas twenty years ago I would have had a point to prove.

Whereas now, I feel a bit more, well I suppose it's a confidence thing too. I'm ok and I know what it is I want to achieve and so this is what I'm going to do to achieve it. I feel absolutely fine being in a situation when I'm in the kitchen cooking and cleaning and doing whatever, while all the men are in the living room talking. Because in that context that's where I want to be and do, then that's fine. But I'm also equally ok about putting down the tea towel and going in there and sitting down and saying, "Right". And I'm one of the decision makers.

I suppose that has been an advantage of being different. Like in that context, I could say, 'This is my Palagi side, this is what I'm doing'. Whereas in the other context I might say, 'Well this is the Samoan thing that I'm going to do'. And either side is kind of viewed as ok because that's my point of difference.

In this story, Lola talks about identifying through difference (Hall, 1996) and using this as an opportunity. She aligns strategically, sometimes conforming to discourses, sometimes deliberately breaking the rules and opting instead for difference. This behaviour accords with research conducted by Noble et al., (1999), who argued that Arabic speaking youth in Australia deployed "strategic essentialism" (Spivak, 1990) as well as "strategic hybridity". Noble et al., (1999, p. 43) write, "Essentialism and hybridity and points in between and beyond, provide these boys with a repertoire of socially useful subject positions appropriate for different uses in different subject positions."

A key question is what gives Lola agency to make strategic decisions and arrive at a position whereby she claims her Samoan identity despite challenges from others and enjoys the benefits of strategically identifying through difference. Lola acknowledges:

It just stresses me that a whole lot of kids and young people and people who are my age in New Zealand, they're getting the worst of both worlds... So, what I would hope for the next generation is that we can leverage off the best of both, but I do see a distressing number of people who are covering the worst of those really.

Macpherson (2004b, p. 455) warns that human agency: "occurs within a set of economic and social constraints that limit the range within which people are able to negotiate and construct identity". As Margaret observes:

The best of both worlds, depending on your circumstances and everything else; because if you were Samoan/Palangi, but you never had anything to do with your Samoan side, and then you hit twenty-two, you know you really haven't got the best of both worlds because you haven't lived that. You're kind of missing half of you really.

Missing half of you was a sentiment also expressed by Sina, who notably had two full Samoan parents.

You would only be limited to one half of who you are, not even who you are, but who you want to be. It would limit opportunities, it would limit exposure. It would inhibit your own ability to communicate, to build relationships, to adapt.

Relationships with Pasifika people, island-born and in the homelands, were seen to be critical to second-gen Pasifika identities, even if these were sites of struggle. It was sentiments such as those expressed by Margaret and Sina, and indeed all the participants, which made me think about the strategic value of cross-cultural capital and connections. The ability to relate: "to communicate, to build relationships, to adapt". For adaptation and accommodation occurred in the context of relationship and interaction. This is what Bhabha (1994) refers to as the interstices, the intersubjective spaces of engagement. He argues that "All cultural statements and systems are constructed in this contradictory and ambivalent space of enunciation" (Bhabha, 1994, p. 37). Ultimately, I emphasise the relational nature of this space. I do not see it so much as ambivalent, but rather vested, configured by power relations and competing narratives which seek to limit, define and produce the social meaning of that context. This is always a co-construction of sorts but never on equal terms. The co-construction is framed by the discursive and symbolic resources available and influenced by the dominance of particular narratives which can be deconstructed as influenced by particular historical and material conditions.

Lola argues:

There is an opportunity to have the best of both worlds and to draw the richness from both cultures, and reject the negative bits that are in both cultures.

However, I suggest, along with Sina and Margaret, that this requires cross-cultural knowledge, skills and resources, which leads me to theorising about polycultural capital.

Power and Polycultural Capital

Bourdieu (1990, p. 64) writes: “the art of estimating and seizing chances... are dispositions that can only be acquired in certain social conditions” and which are “defined by possession of the economic and cultural capital required in order to seize the ‘potential opportunities’ theoretically available to all”. The term polycultural encapsulates how some people realise the potential opportunities of cumulative advantage from cross-cultural contact, which is theoretically (although perhaps not practically) available to all. Polycultural capital refers an accumulation of distinctive cultural resources; intertextual skills (a sense of how these relate to another), the power to negotiate between them and the ability to deploy these cross-cultural resources strategically in different contexts. Polycultural capital can be associated with having a range of strategic choices at your disposal, including: dialogic distance, bridging, strategic ignorance, strategic hybridity, strategic essentialism. It is also associated with having the intertextual skill to make purposive choices and arrive at resolutions, if and when, cross-cultural conflict arises. Noa is understood to be a way of finding a temporal equilibrium between multiple options and competing forces. Manulua refers to a cultural aesthetic patterned by many different noa resolutions of balance across many spaces. These resolutions are created in interaction with specific others, and “hold” for as long as they are useful, and are then rearranged to suit in another context. Manulua does not represent the already present and determined hybrid resolution, but the ability to pattern and arrange the knowledge and symbols one has accumulated in many different resolutions, dependent on context and the relational space. It reflects a rich, purposeful, and multidimensional cultural way of operating. Margaret says:

We can put on caps and take them off when we want to and it’s not even the best of both worlds, sometimes it’s the best of many, many different worlds.

How is this realised? What became clear to me after listening to participants talk about their experiences was that this was a privilege earned. Fluidity and movement had to

be achieved in a context of mutual entanglement and multiple attempts to fix and force their identities and representations, and powerful attempts to “determine, delimit, and define the always open meaning of the present” (Bourdieu, 1985b, p. 728). The public narratives that were sought to story the participants changed across context, depending on what was dominant in that ethnic imaginary, with fixed ideas about sameness and difference, rigid boundaries and constant assertions about incommensurability highly prevalent. To double, to trouble, to trespass or transcend, and *get away with it*, required cross-cultural knowledge, skill, savvy and resources. As Tiare said:

The best of both worlds - it almost sounds like the worlds are handed to us on a platter! I don't know whether that's true. I certainly do think that there's a richness in both but it can be a stressful journey as well. It's not that easy.

Undeniably, knowledge, cultural resources, and capital were accumulated in the context of cross-cultural relationships. Lola explains:

I feel so lucky that I've had enough of a range of experiences that I can feel completely comfortable and at home in all of those different environments. I think I've met people who are only comfortable in one or another of those and freak out a bit if they're out of their comfort zone. I think that's been one of the real assets of having the advantage of both cultures, that I can feel comfortable in all of those different contexts.

Leilani also talks about a level of comfort and confidence that she has gained and sustained from cross-cultural relationships or moving between differently configured relational spaces.

I can walk into a senior management boardroom and feel comfortable, not feel like, “Oh my god, I'm going to have to speak, I won't be able to understand what they're talking about”. I feel equal to the people around the table. Likewise I can go to certain Pacific things and know my place totally.

Sometimes in Pacific things, I do feel a bit sweaty because I think, shit, they're going to ask me something really quickly in Samoan and expect an answer really quickly. Because I'm obsessing about that, I totally miss, it's inevitable, you become a self-fulfilling prophesy. Because you obsess about it, it's going to happen. So you know, I have that fear of making that mistake and fear of the reprimand because the reprimand will always come. But at the end of the day, you learn from it. It's just a different way of learning.

This reinforces Mani's (1990, p. 32) assertion that: "Moving between 'different configurations of meaning and power' can prompt 'different modes of knowing'." Leilani describes a sense of ease in both situations and a sense of knowing her multiple places. Notably, despite a fluidity of movement in between, location and knowing 'your place' remains salient. This is not your only 'place' however. Multiple subject positions are inferred. Leilani says of movement between:

It took me some time to learn how to modulate myself but now that I can, you know, I do feel quite comfortable.

Once again, the sense of effort, skill and resources to adapt in between social and cultural environments is stressed by the participant. Bill explains:

It means that I can dip in and out of things very easily and I can have a lot more choices. So I'm able to be comfortable, very comfortable in a Pacific environment, however you define it. I'm very comfortable in a European environment, however you define it. I'm very comfortable in an upper socio economic, I just am able to be comfortable and at the same time I am able to be referencing - so I can get white peoples' jokes 'cos white people do have a form of humour. I can get brown peoples' jokes because brown people have their own sense of humour. I think that makes me culturally literate.

It's backed up with quite a good basic education in terms of reading, writing, arithmetics, quite a good cultural education in terms of theatre, opera, music, swimming lessons, knowing how to ride a horse, how to shoot, how to do a triathlon. All of those sort of things which inform your behaviour. So I don't feel out of sorts in any environment, and it does let you dip in and out of things. I think that's it and I don't really have a label for myself and I don't say I'm a half caste or I just, I don't even think about that.

In this passage, Bill alludes to a sense of fluidity and multiplicity and the ability to be "culturally literate". He then theorises why this is, noting that it is "backed up" with education, cultural capital and a range of cumulative experiences that "inform his behaviour". He talks of "referencing" which is similar to Tiare's notion of "reference points" in Chapter Seven. The reference points are defined by Bill as education, exposure to music, the arts, sports and a variety of experienced and accumulated knowledge so that he feels that he has agency and doesn't "feel out of sorts" in different environments. This meets the classic definition of cultural capital, although Bill pluralises this suggesting that he is able to draw from more than one cultural referential. These 'referentials' do not just exist but are "paid for in work, in efforts and

above all in time (moving up means raising oneself, climbing, and acquiring the marks, the stigmata, of this effort)" (Bourdieu, 1985b, p. 726-727).

It is having diverse forms of cultural capital which gives him the power to "dip in and out" of things. When Bill uses the term "culturally literate" in this context, he gives the sense of being able to read the cultural texts of different situations. In the following story Bill shows the way that he draws upon his Pasifika cultural capital.

Story 24: Bill and the Baker's daughter

My mother had always said, "Your family is 5,000 years old. Who is this person's mother? Who is this person? I don't know who they are." So I could bring that - so I had that big kind of foundation - it wasn't like I was some newbie on the social scene and that gives you a sense of confidence, doesn't it?

I remember when I was going out with somebody. She was the most beautiful girl and her parents have got, money, they've got more money than - they're fucking rich! She had dinner at our house and she's lovely, she's really lovely.

My mother said to me, the next day, I think, "She's absolutely charming and beautiful, but *who is she?*" she said. "Who is she? I don't know who she is? I know that her father is a wealthy baker," she said, "but you don't come from a family of bakers. Your family was crossing the Pacific. You've done this and that; you've got nothing to prove to her. Her parents might have a lot of money in the bank but have they got your bloodlines; your relations; your family history?"

Bill is able to draw upon and mobilise his Pasifika cultural capital, its logic of biological essentialism and genealogical and relational hierarchies, and also transfer this sense of advantage to influence relationships with dominant and even elite others. The following story told by Tama shows how he is able to mobilise his professional and educational cultural capital in spaces where he might be marginalised for lacking Pasifika cultural capital. He talks about being appointed to a high-profile Pasifika-oriented job which confers considerable status. He talks about his predecessor and some of the struggles he has had in taking over the position.

Story 25: Tama and the "Oldest Samoan Card"

I'm not a pastor. I think he was a pastor. He had some standing in the church. So here I was, and I think people have this image of anyone Pacific, in any position of responsibility in New Zealand, had to fit this profile. I think a few of us have shattered that now.

I know my strengths are around professional capabilities, as well as my cultural capabilities. But certainly my professional capabilities are where *my strengths are*. That's what I can bring to the role, what I can bring to the Pacific community. And at this point, I think that's what is required.

You've also got to balance it out with some cultural stuff. Even my brothers' generation and my older brother's generation who - *that's all they were allowed to do!* You know, you have to know your place.

I mean I'm constantly reminded of some of the older Samoan ladies and they try to hold my hand. They speak Samoan to me. I said, 'You know you don't work for the Ministry of Samoan Affairs?' Ha! Every now and again they try to play the, 'I'm the oldest Samoan card' on you. A few years ago, I think I would have felt a bit threatened by that. It doesn't bother me at all now.

What the narratives show is that the second generation participants had varying volumes and distributions of different forms of capital which were unevenly associated with different kinds of profit and advantage in different spaces. Consequently, their capacity to invest in, enunciate and identify through discourses in both spaces tended to be unequal. It is argued here that having more than one form of culturally derived capital positioned the second generation strongly to reap the possible advantages of cross-cultural movement, draw upon polycultural forms of capital and have agency to adopt, adapt, communicate and establish connections across discrepant audiences in order to meet their needs in different contexts.

Negotiation

Hekman (1990, p. 51) argues that "subjects who are subjected to multiple discursive influences creates modes of resistance to those influences out of the very discourses that shape them". Having polycultural capital, it is argued, is associated with agency to assert "critical relationality" (Boyce Davies 1994, p. 47) and negotiate, articulate, and interrogate simultaneously a variety of resistant discourses relationally, rather than passively being storied by these discourses. Acquiring more than one cultural way of knowing and interpreting the world, provides many options to select from, sometimes creating conflict associated with such choices. As Pita said:

Yep, I think negotiating is probably the apt term. Because you know I grew up in this society and then you realise that there's also another one, my traditional Tongan one. In saying that though, you know it's also about options and you have those options to defer, to switch.

I think that it's also good to know *how the other person thinks*. They don't know how you think, on the other side... I think it's a benefit having the ability to experience and know both sides.

The following story, told by Simone, provides a clear example of how she feels she needs to negotiate between competing discourses, values and ideas.

Story 26: No More Willy Nilly

I suppose I come from a very poor family, so in order to actually complete high school and complete a tertiary degree, there have always been financial contributions from the family. So in a sense you're indebted to the extended family when you finish and you reciprocate that. In order to do that we've housed people and paid for their airfares to come over and work and provided opportunities for other members of the family to migrate here and to actually become NZ residents. And so the cycle keeps continuing through the generations and it's just an expectation...

At Christmas time, or Easter, their priority was to send money back home (to the islands). So quite often we would do without. Christmas wasn't the fun time for us. The time and the celebration were great, but in terms of gifts! We always knew, you know, *not to expect much*.

Probably the only negative experience is the amount that they gave to the church and the consistent support of the family. Like, our house was like a hotel sometimes. This person would come and stay for six weeks and then they'd go. They would always be paying for people's airfares. Maybe we could have been more affluent, or I might have had access to probably different things or other experiences because of that? But that's probably the only negative side of things...

That indebtedness, I have a house that I don't even live in, that my parents live in and I'm still paying the mortgage off. So that's really hard for people to reconcile or come to terms with.

You've got another sort of expectation and responsibility that you have to live up to, you know, which is: how are you going to use that success to better your immediate and extended family? And even as far as, you know, how is that going to improve life for the village back in Samoa? And quite often it's measured in your attendance at church, so how much you are able to contribute on behalf of your immediate and extended family in terms of your church community? Whether that be, in time, meeting cultural obligations or just being able to provide financially? And in terms of the extended family, success for them is being able to reciprocate what your extended family has done for you - or have given you during that time when you have been schooled or educated....

You know, quite often in the past I've just handed over money willy nilly. But you know there's that pull of accountability! I want to see the bill first. And while my parents got used to it, first it was "how dare you question how I use my money!" But it's just that *I've* earned that money.

I'm very willing to contribute to the family but I need to know that it's going that *particular*, you know, to that *fa'alavelave*⁷³... I quite often support different things in our family. But now I want to know who it's for? How are we related? How have they benefitted - you know - what have they given to my parents? Or what have they done for our family? So it's almost like I have to know, how close are they? How are we connected? So, I've brought that concept of accountability and that's probably seen as a real *Palangi* thing. But you know I'm not unquestionably going to give over this money... I'm getting better at saying 'no', and it's really hard because I almost cry and go, "No". Because I know it's the best thing to do. And it breaks my parents' hearts but that's just something we've had to negotiate.

In this story of Simone's, the competing ideas about individual achievement and collective efforts, individual earnings and reciprocal responsibilities jostle and rub against each other. Simone has found compromises, middle ground and ways of resolving completely disjunctive ideas about what money is for, who owns it and how it ought to be spent. The pull between collective and individual orientations has been widely cited in literature focusing on Pasfika identities (Tiatia, 1998, Samu, 2003, Tau'akipulu 2000, Suaali'i-Sauni, 2006, Southwick, 2001). Tau'akipulu (2000, p. 94) concludes in her research, of the tensions between individual and community oriented ways of life: "These tensions are at the heart of what it is to be Tongan in New Zealand." In the following excerpt, Leo and I have this exchange:

Karlo: You have used the word negotiating quite a lot, what were you negotiating?

Leo: Ok. Probably the values - the values of pushing the individual society versus values pushing the family - that's what I think is that big negotiation...

A number of participants felt that the descriptor of negotiation had some fit and resonance with how they operated culturally. When he was asked about negotiating culturally, Bill said:

⁷³ Donation or obligation to give resources (e.g. money, fine mats, food, items of value) to others, such as family members, church, community etc (Samoa)

Oh, all the time, all the time and that's, but that's sort of *what you have* that ability to just do that.

Margaret answered:

I feel like I'm doing it all the time.

Negotiating between more than one cultural way of doing things was considered *modus operandi* by some, as Simone explained:

I think it's a constant thing, I don't think it will ever go away - *still negotiating*.

As Alipate explains:

I think I negotiate, like for myself, I think I've come to my own resolution of how I want to live and my family. My wife and I discuss it all the time. We have our own little debates. I try and help my younger nephews and cousins too. Because they're more competent in the Tongan things than me, but I try and encourage them not to be shy of achieving in the Palangi world. Some of them think that going to Uni is hard, and I say that it is hard, but it is do-able.

Alipate, like many others, has limited Tongan or Pasifika cultural capital, but he negotiates with the knowledge and resources he has at his disposal. He finds his own balance, influenced by his capital, his knowledge, the resources passed down to him, and those which he has struggled to acquire.

The participants' narratives attest that access to both sets of discourses was uneven and unequal. And despite having more than one set of discursive formations to draw from, negotiation was rarely within conditions of their own choosing. However, I argue that for the participants interviewed for this project, capital and ideally 'polycultural' capital was always associated with advantage and a relatively high level of agency, rather than with being "caught between cultures" without any power to negotiate, mediate or orchestrate an outcome that (to use Lola's earlier words) "suits your purpose in that context".

Bhabha (1990, p. 216) writes:

You must negotiate – negotiation is what politics is all about. And we do negotiate even when we don't know we are negotiating: we are always negotiating in any situation of political opposition or antagonism. Subversion is negotiation; transgression is negotiation; negotiation is not just some kind of compromise or 'selling out'

which people too easily understand it to be... hybridity is precisely about the fact that when a new situation, a new alliance formulates itself, it may demand that you should translate your principles, rethink them, extend them.

It is argued here that resolutions were created as a result of this negotiation. I choose not to use the language of hybridity for reasons outlined in the literature review. But I concur with Bhabha's (1994, p. 24) descriptor of negotiation:

When I talk of *negotiation* ... it is to convey a temporality that makes it possible to conceive of the articulation of antagonistic or contradictory elements: a dialectic without the emergence of a teleological or transcendent history.

I agree with Bhabha that this negotiation can be framed as dialectic without subscribing to teleological movement, but rather emphasising the temporal, contextual and situated nature of specific and local resolutions. The next section will focus on the nature of such resolutions.

Many Patterns of Possibility

If we revisit acculturation paradigms, these typically envisage four possible strategies, separation, accommodation, integration and marginalisation (Berry, 1980). I argued earlier that all these are possible strategies which can be deployed by one individual depending on context. Yet acculturation is criticised here as a system under strain, with a limited number of resolutions. The preferred alternative is a myriad of opportunities, limited only by agency, human creativity, social conditions, capital, cultural resources and the politics of response, reaction and recognition.

While constructing cultures as overly reified, unitary, stable and separate categories has been rejected in this thesis, it is clear that participants separated out what they considered to be "Palangi" or "Tongan" as illustrated in the above comment by Alipate. Separating out these cultural discourses as distinctive (coherent bodies of knowledge or ways of doing things) appeared to be quite a common organising tool among participants. However, despite this separating out, they all operated in the intercultural in-between, and never described themselves as aligned only within either of these reified and separately imagined states. Noble et al., (1999, p. 37) who focused on Arabic speaking youth in Australia wrote that they invoked "crude stereotypes of self and other" and a "categorisation that requires a simplification of the complexity of the world". I would not describe my participants as deploying crude stereotypes or

simplistic binaries, because participants were acutely aware of the ways in which they complicated and troubled such stereotypes.

Suaali'i-Sauni (2006, p. 239) deploys the ethereal metaphor of "spirits" and writes about the collective self of the spirit of fa'aSamoa "jarring" against the free, enterprising individual of the spirit of neoliberal risk management. She suggests that these spirits are marked by "real and invoked differences" and by "distinctiveness and competition" and argues that the spirits "cannot be reduced to each other" (Suaali'i-Sauni 2006, p. 237, 260). This incommensurability is emphasised by other writers (Ang, 2001, Meredith 1998). Bhabha (1994, p. 231) writes, "For what is at issue in the discourse of minorities is the creation of agency through incommensurable (not simply multiple) positions". I believe that this is a valuable insight.

Dialogic Distance

The negotiation of what is incommensurably different can perhaps only result in dialogic (Gurevitch, 1989, 1990) awareness. This is not an integrative process and to use the words of Gurevitch (1989, p. 183) it resists acts of familiarizing and appropriating "the other into the controlled world of the self, to own the other". "Dialogic distance" (Gurevitch, 1989) acknowledges the "distance between" which resonates with *va* as a spatial way of framing relationships. This results in mapping distance without mediating it. Gurevitch writes (1990, p.189) "Presence requires not only understanding, but also an ability to not-understand, to assure the respect for the other's otherness, which may indeed be obscured and sublated by understanding."

Acknowledging dialogic responses to intercultural interaction affirms that hybridity, integration, doubling, mixing and fusion are not the only options for cross-cultural contact. Separation strategies, distancing, a stronger sense of knowing what you don't know and how much you don't understand, are also outcomes. Gurevitch (1990, p. 189) stresses the power of not-understanding and writes:

The dialogic connection created by listening involves then, both oneness (being in contact and in understanding) and separateness (being at a distance and postponing understanding in calling the other and letting the other be distinctly present).

Many participants saw themselves as able to traverse dialogic distance, and bridging was another dynamic possible across intercultural relational space.

Bridging

The metaphor of a bridge between cultures brings to mind Hereniko's (1995, p. 11) assertion that "the bridge" is "where the view is best". Leilani explains this in the following story.

Story 27: Being the Bridge

You're also always learning about how this world operates: how the other world operates. You know you've got the best of both worlds but you know you don't know everything about each world.

Once you come to that level of understanding, you have a responsibility. You know that if you really do know the best of both worlds, you know that you also have a responsibility to help people from both of those worlds understand how each one operates.

So I think there's a bridge; there's a bridge between these two worlds, New Zealand-born and migrant. And you become a consensual vehicle that goes across these bridges. You take understanding between them, it's a huge responsibility. There are speed-bumps on that bridge but those speed-bumps are your ongoing learning. The thing is, as a consensual vehicle you're actually protecting the people inside your car from feeling the impact of those speed-humps. So, because you're going through that process, you're learning over each bump and you're protecting. That is what makes your bridge bigger and longer.

Leilani refers to dialogic distance and the chasms and disjuncture between different ways of knowing. She suggests that being able to bridge this distance comes with responsibilities. She also acknowledges clearly that "you don't know everything about each world". Awareness of the limits of understanding and the power in not-understanding is grasped by Leilani. She uses the metaphor of the bridge and the role of a consensual vehicle, being able to absorb the speed-bumps. This absorption of speed-bumps suggests a resiliency and toughness, coming from personal experience of the shock of such bumps, and learned experiences about how to absorb this so that others do not have to. The protecting means that cross-cultural traverses are smoother and less fraught. Leilani tells me this story of the bridge after I have talked at length about the process of taking my Palangi family to Tonga. She describes about our roles as "consensual vehicles" to facilitate intercultural exchange and cross-cultural crossings. She talks about the ability to make your bridge "bigger and longer" and the skill to eventually connect people across ever deeper cultural channels and chasms. In the intercultural interface, second-gen participants saw themselves as having

significant roles as bridges, translators, negotiators, the caretakers of the in-between, the keepers of the third spaces (Bhabha, 1994). As Salote said:

A lot of the work that I have been involved in has always involved a connecting/bridging type role. I didn't realise initially. But it has been the whole 'connect-four' type role. Someone just recently said to me that they saw me as a person as a bridge, that was bridging, but it was more to do with generations like the young and the old, and like the two different cultures, like home and New Zealand.

Operating at the cusps of cultural boundaries, not being centred totally in either imaginary, but practiced at operating in between, afforded them this ferrying role. Although second-gen participants may have felt the alienation of existing beyond the limits of cultural boundaries, their rewards were the return tickets they had earned which allowed them to move with relative ease through in-between spaces. As participant narratives illustrate, this often came with a sense of responsibility for translating, connecting, explaining and communicating across the cultural divides.

Negotiating Turf

Bridging and distancing were not the only responses to intercultural contact. What was also clear was that second-gen participants would, as a result of symbolic struggle, negotiate new turf. That is, within Pasifika spaces that felt antagonistic or unsafe because of their lack of cultural capital, participants would create turf which was affirming of their cultural representations rather than judgmental. This kind of turf was like an oasis or space of respite from the usual power configuration and hierarchies at play in existing spaces. Two stories illustrate this. One story is told by Leo about a mentoring and student support space he created within a New Zealand university which deliberately mirrored Pasifika church youth group space. The following story told by Isabella shows the way in which she responded to the discomfort of not having Pasifika cultural capital and the lack of safety she felt in Pasifika social spaces. Both provide examples of new turf being negotiated within Pasifika social spaces.

Story 28: Isabella and I don't know the words to this song

I went to this big Pacific conference in Auckland. The Ministry of Pacific Island Affairs put it on, called "Pacific Vision"... We were in the big conference hall and they started singing and all of a sudden the whole conference starting singing. I was standing there feeling like I was a white person amongst all of these Pacific people. There was just this united, strong Pacific identity in this song. It just

slapped me in the face. All I wanted to do was to burst out crying because I thought I don't have the words to this song.

I've heard it sung by people before. But I don't know the words to this song. You know, I just felt so disconnected from being Pacific, like I didn't belong there because I couldn't sing this song. I just felt like in that moment that I was such a fraud. What the heck was I doing there? I don't even speak my own language and I can't sing this stupid song. Honestly, it was all I could do. I actually couldn't stop crying. The tears were just rolling down my face. I just felt like I didn't belong there.

Anyway, I met another young woman there and she was from my hometown. I'd sort of seen her around but hadn't had much attraction. Then I met another girl and we decided that we would meet when we got back home. When we met up, we talked about our whole experience of being there. I talked about being quite isolated in terms of my Pacific identity. We found out from our stories that we had lots in common in terms of all of that. We were all New Zealand-born.

I started meeting other women locally who had similar stories. Out of that came a fantastic collective. We created this environment where we could all discover our Pacific identity, what ever that was, together. It provided an opportunity to connect with people who could answer some of those questions and who could also connect us to some things that were considered 'cultural' and related to identity. We learned how to dance. We brought people in to teach us how to do hula. We did some stuff with craft. We did little projects. So, the Samoan contingency, they did some stuff around Samoa. We did these little projects. But what we created was this safe environment in which we could ask these questions without that: *Oh don't you know that stuff, or, oh you should know that about yourself.*

Isabella shares her experience of feeling out of place within a Pasifika social space, as if she doesn't belong. Yet in the midst of these feelings of isolation and alienation, Isabella recognises that she is not alone in feeling like this. Isabella, with others, sets up a small collective where they can build their cultural knowledge together. They create a learning environment and an opportunity to acquire knowledge and skills fundamental to Pasifika cultural capital which feels 'safe' and free from identity challenges.

Story 29: Leo Negotiates Turf

After Leo completed his studies, he worked for the university as a liaison officer trying to increase the proportion of Pasifika students at university. A job which he eventually left, saying: "I didn't believe that that was a genuine attempt to educate our kids." Rather it looked good for them to have "Pacific bums on seats" and "they got the

university more money". Leo continued to work with trying to support Pasifika students to participate at university. He was instrumental in setting up mentoring programmes for Pasifika students. Leo felt he "could negotiate between them and wanting more PIs and my genuine desire to see them educated. They provided the resources in order for me to enact those mentoring possibilities."

One of the things I did at university was I just took all the stuff I learnt at church and just applied it in a university setting. So camp was *big* for our youth at church and that's what I ended up running at university, was camps. Mentoring one-on-one was *big* at church so I did it at university. I think my faith has been something that I've been able to hold onto and it's given me a bit of hope.

Leo transports practices from Pasifika church fields to the field of university, in that, he brings a sense of the familiar to the unfamiliar. He brings 'what works' from one field into another, with the hope that it will assist Pasifika students to achieve, feel supported, and navigate unfamiliar settings. In many ways, Leo is able to recognize the 'lack of fit' between the cultural capital of many Pasifika students and the forms of cultural capital privileged in the field of university. Because he himself has had to deal with managing this 'lack of fit' he is in a strong position to find innovative solutions around minimizing that discrepancy, or at least mediating the sense of disjuncture. Recognising the importance of social capital and strength in solidarity of experience, he is active in developing these networks for Pasifika students at university.

Critical Relationality: Culture Brokers Changing the Story

Constant exposure to different discourses meant that many participants were critical of aspects of 'Western ways of doing things,' and sought to introduce Pasifika ideas, thinking and logic. They were also critical of Pasifika ways of doing things and sought to introduce Western ways of thinking. This was a double-edged sword in some cases. In the opening up of discursive boundaries and pushing cultural limits, the participants had a role as "edgewalkers" (Tupuola, 2004).

The value of a continued emphasis on collective and extended family wellbeing was widely articulated by participants as advantageous to Palangi ways of doing things. For example, Bill tells the following story about his friend, Bob, and what happens when Bob's close friend's father-in-law dies.

Story 30: Bill, Bob and the Funeral

Bob said, "Yeah, that's really sad, I'd better send them a card."

I said, "What do you mean you're gonna send them a card?" I said, "You have to ring Leon right now."

Bob said, "Oh he'll be busy." And I said, "Well send a text and say, *sorry to hear that*. (I dictated what to say). And Leon rang back and said, "Yeah, oh it's a bit hectic and blah blah blah and thanks for the text."

Bob said, "Oh I would have just sent them a card."

I said, "Well you've got to do that as well." The next day, he made his secretary clip out the death notice and go out and get some sympathy cards...

I said, "Now you're going to the funeral, he's a really good mate of yours."

He said, "Yeah, but I never knew the father."

I said, "No, but *you know them*."

And he said, "Oh, I wouldn't know what to do. What do you wear to a funeral?"

And I said, "Well, you've been to a funeral before?"

He said, "One."

And I said, "Well." [laughter]

No, no, it is really funny, but it's also that's where 'we' get it right.

Bob said, "What do you do?" I sort of explained it...

I said, "He's your mate, you go surfing with him, you've got to be there to support him..." I got a phone call from him afterwards and I asked, "How was it?"

And he said, "Oh I went to the burial, I've never been to one of those... I chucked some flowers in... It was amazing... I'm really glad I did that, I learned a lot."

So where does that take us? I think that's where *we're really good* - at that kind of reaching out to people. And being able to be supportive and understand what is needed. But when it comes to other things, we're really bad. So we're really good at that kind of collective communal stuff. But when it comes to organizing yourself - and let's just park for the moment all of that - lower wages, lower education and - we just, we put (sometimes) the community in front of our own wellbeing. I think that's to the detriment of us.

Because if you look after yourself, then you can look after the community - without being dismissive of either things! But I wouldn't give up that Pacific stuff to *not know what to do when somebody dies*. For one minute I just wouldn't do it.

Bill shows the way that he continues to value Pasifika ways of doing things but he also talks about influencing Palangi others and educating them, not about Pasifika peoples, but about what he believes is an optimal way of being in the world. He goes on to say:

The behavior of my immediate family fusillades between being Pacific in-between being white. So if you come to our house for dinner or anything, if you come to our house for dinner, you sit at a table with a linen table cloth, linen napkins and silverware and stewart crystal glasses and all of that kind of get up. We have enough of that kind of get up to do dinner for 30 or 40 people. And we can do that whole soup, spoon blady blady blah kind of white thing. But we approach it with a generosity that you don't see (in my experience) from your standard Kiwi New Zealand family... There is a sense of celebration, a sense of sharing and bounty, rather than, we've got 20 people for dinner - that means we need 40 sausages.

I know that sounds kind of nasty, but if you come into our house you are not gonna go away hungry! Because there is that kind of sense of, 'I need to provide for you and I need to do it in the best way that I possibly can'. And that is not about scrimping or saving or budgeting. And I think we work as a family in a very inclusive way.

Bill claims values of hospitality and sharing bounty with guests that he identifies as part of his Pasifika inheritance. There is an assertion that the "sense of bounty and sharing" and providing for people "in the best way that I possibly can" in inclusive ways is far superior to "scrimping and saving".

From reading Bill's stories, it is clear that he considers that he and his family model a Pasifika way of being in Palangi circles which challenges their sensibilities around "what is best". In his discussion of the funeral he says quite forcefully that despite the poor statistics and so on, to become so individualised and disconnected that you "don't know what to do when somebody dies" is an anathema to him. Bill articulates a critical relationality with the Palangi Other which critiques Palangi ways of doing things and consciously models Pasifika values as attractive alternatives.

Criticism of Pasifika values and ways of doing things was also evident. As Lola says:

I think one of the things that I struggle with and in fa'aSamoa in particular, is how judgemental a whole lot of people are in terms of how *we ought to be living our lives* and on a whole lot of different levels; intolerance under the banner of Samoa... But I think there are

certainly things about fa'aSamoa that we have, or I have, consciously have said, *well I'm not going down that path.*

The mediation and negotiation of what was constituted or privileged as Pasifika, alongside values represented to be Palangi was constant.

As Salote explains:

There are values that can be somewhat detrimental to a Pasifika person's development and growth, such as loyalty to the family, the financial expectations. My husband and I just experienced a number of funerals all in one bang. All of a sudden, the expectation was we've got to give this and give that. I don't know if that's a value in itself but you kind of feel like you've got to do that, as part of being Tongan. You've got to go over there and show some sort of support financially. But we would do it anyway because that's inherent in us.

But then I guess as a New Zealand-born educated Pasifika person we know the limits. It's sort of like we can only give what we can, and we can actually give in other means. So it's like time and love. Not necessarily monetary, but it's maybe just food parcels. But I haven't found Pasifika values to be detrimental to me. Maybe the Church thing could be a little bit, but it never was to me. But when I see my other friends, they spend too much time at church. But anyway my Pacific values are pretty strong. I think my parents were pretty cool.

Salote talks elsewhere in her interview about how her parents ensured that time at church and financial obligations were not overly burdensome. Salote has to find her own balance or point of noa or equilibrium, between competing discourses. And yet at the same time the contradictions and conflict are very present in her talk. She suggests that being NZ-born and educated means knowing "limits". At the same time, she talks about "doing it anyway because that's inherent in us". Are these incommensurable? In this passage, the weight of the cost of several funerals, the creative tensions of competing ideas and the difficulty in negotiating, is very present. Multiple perspectives co-exist. Salote speaks of such obligations being detrimental to her financial situation, but also talks of her Pasifika values being "pretty strong". There may be creative ways of resolving this. Salote suggests "time and love" and "food parcels". But when she spoke, I remember how hollow these compromises sounded. The sense of conflict persisted and was managed rather than being resolved. In many ways this passage shows how categorising something as "integration" or "hybridity" over-determines the continued existence of conflicting ideas and discourses. Rather than being permanently resolved, these ideas remain. Salote's passage is characterised by heteroglossia, different ideas speak with different tongues in one speech act. The

tension between these is not resolved, their disharmony requires renegotiation and balance according to each emerging situation.

Therefore, I did not get the sense that there was an “integrative recipe” that could be followed every time. Rather I got a sense that participants possessed a range of cultural ingredients on their shelves which had the potential to create many different things. This might be a highly innovative fusion, or it might be a traditional or mainstream dish. Each time, depending on context, something was created that had to take stock of the many ideas in their cupboard and come up with something that would work. This required considering multiple tastes and preferences. The ability to strategically draw on cultural repertoires and symbolic resources is consistent with research by Wessendorf (2007), Noble (2007), Noble et al, (1999) and Butcher (2004).

The question of “what will work in this situation” is similar to what Parker (2001, p. 258) describes as the question of what has “practical adequacy”. Parker (2001) writes that “dialectical critical realism” is open to plural knowledge systems, tolerates contradictions, and recognises that radically different and even incommensurable ideas may have equal “practical adequacy”.

Depending on the different situations and people involved, different values and cultural ideas came to the fore as having most “practical adequacy”. Sometimes what wasn’t “practical” was also chosen. Isabella talks about the fact that even if you can’t afford to participate, you *just do it*. You find a way. She says:

My Palangi partner, he’s amazing you know from his Pakeha perspective. Particularly financially *what we are like* as Pacific people. We still have had conflicts around, “we can’t afford it”.

I’m going, “We can you know. We’ll find it somewhere, but not a lot!” I just say to him, “I need to.”

My Mum’s unveiling is coming up next week. You know, we can’t afford to fly up there. We’re going to stay for a week because my sister’s over from Perth. There’s going to be a big feed and we have to give to the family members and all of that. Well, we can’t afford to do any of that. But we can afford it, because that’s just what we do! So you make it happen...

When Isabella and I talk about Pasifika values, she identifies that:

It is hospitality, you know, to the point of ridiculous. Like we’re having visitors and we’ll give them a good feed and then we’ll just eat toast for the rest of the week.

Strategic Ignorance and Strategic Hybridity

In the following conversation, Pita explains how he uses the Western culture and his New Zealand upbringing as a resource, so that he can achieve what he wants to within a Tongan context. He is a bit embarrassed to admit to this. And he jokes that it is a bit like cheating. As Pita says:

At a family function because my dad, he's the eldest, he expects that you will give a certain amount at a funeral. If I like that person, yeah, I'll do it because it's a culture thing. If not, I'll defer to the Western one and say nah [laughter].

It's convenient, you know, and the people will just say '*oh he was raised here by aunty*', you know, they'll just dismiss it that way. That's something that's a useful little weapon. You know you can use that to your advantage because you're not expected to understand the cultural mores having been raised here when you know completely well what's expected. That's an example of not negotiating that's probably just cheating [laughter].

But for Pita, having more than one set of discourses provides options and choices. This may mean choosing to 'opt out' of *some* practices *sometimes*. This has resonance with Gershon's (2007) concept of "strategic ignorance". Gershon (2007, p. 490) writes:

To think about certain ignorances as strategic or productive is to move away from analyzing diasporic families in terms of cultural gains and cultural losses. Instead, the focus shifts to the ways people are engaging reflexively and recursively with the multiple social orders they encounter in their daily lives.

Sina reflected on how her father negotiated with *fa'alavelave* obligations, so that they would not be too onerous on his nuclear family. Sina says:

He would have a NZ-born attitude to the traditional cultural practices such as *fa'alavelave*. For example, he was the only one in his family that said, "I can't afford that. I'm giving you this." You know, what we could afford.

So they, I guess, were out of the norm for a lot of people in their generation, although they still gave. I saw them struggle and the pressures that were put on finances for them to contribute. But they didn't do it to the extent that our wellbeing was compromised.

Notably, Sina glosses her island-born father as having a "NZ-born" attitude. Simone, whose story of "No More Willy Nilly" was recounted earlier, says:

You know my generation, and where I work, and in terms of where my money goes, my children will never miss out. I will never ever give money away instead of paying the power bill you know, common sense! I'm really adamant that I'll look after my immediate family first. But in terms of money, I still probably think I'm over generous in terms of how I use it... Mum and Dad are both retired now and they're on a pension so it's 'good old me' who meets those obligations. I've continued that sort of practice on. I'm meeting those obligations so in a sense it hasn't really left me. It definitely has shaped who I am.

Simone makes pragmatic decisions on a case by case basis, and while she talks of *continuing that practice on ("sort of")* she transforms that practice at the same time as she renegotiates it. Discourses of accountability and responsibilities to immediate family so that "my children will never miss out", contrast with her own childhood experiences where she learned "not to expect much" because extended family were often the priority. Noble et al., (1999) would describe this as strategic hybridity, where a fusion of values come together to form a multidimensional resolution. I prefer to use the Tongan term *noa*. Mahina (2009, personal communication) describes *noa*, as zero-point or balance, where opposing forces are mediated to a point of equilibrium. *Noa* and other concepts sourced to Polynesian ideas about space and aesthetic are discussed in the final section of this chapter.

Facilitating Noa and the Manulua Aesthetic

Facilitating a sense of 'balance' was referred to by a number of the participants. As Tama told me, as another second generation person, about our circle of friends:

You look at all your friends' networks and I'll look at all mine now, I would say almost with certainty that they all fit that bill, that regardless of their fluency in their home language or whatever. They all have learned somehow to balance that and bring it together.

Balancing and bringing it together involved skilled negotiation, which addressed and mediated multiple accountabilities and conflicting ideas. As Leilani said:

It's a little bit complicated. If those things are all in balance then I think that you are a success. Some days they may be totally all out of kilter and you don't feel successful and then six months later they all come back into balance. It's not a static thing.

Participants articulated a sense of ongoing negotiation with the aim of balance that they could live with. This was not just one grand integrated balance, but multiple points of balance negotiated across many contexts. Achieving balance or satisfactory

resolutions was temporal, time- context- and purpose-specific. Nobody talked about having arrived at their final, fixed and secured destinations on an identity journey.

Rather, a plethora of different discourses and ideas was available to them, providing contradictory as well as complementary advice or options for reading or dealing with a particular situation. To return to Bill's comments about being "culturally literate" this was awareness of different textual readings of situations. Like the example given by Salote, whereby all of these different ideas co-existed all at once, providing an ambiguous tension even among assertions of resolution. I think that the notion of resolution and closure is problematic. For largely, cultural complexity was never solved or completely resolved, rather all of the multi-perspectives co-existed with their assertions of "practical adequacy" (Parker, 2001) and possible applicability.

The constant negotiation, dependent on the symbolic resources available, the persuasiveness of the discourses and the context, meant that many (sometimes unsatisfactory) resolutions of *noa* (zero point, equilibrium) were sought.

'Noa' is often glossed as meaning 'nothing' or zero. For Mahina (2009 personal communication) "In another sense, the notion of *noa* depicts a state of harmony, of balance, of proportion, and of equilibrium". He writes:

This is evident in architecture, where forces move in opposite ways meeting at a common point, i.e., *noa* or zero-point or harmony or balance or proportion or equilibrium, as seen in a stationary house, and if one or more of the forces is or are being upset, the whole building collapses.

Points of conflict *do not simply wane away* – rather they are lying dormant, only to be made manifest when that whole state of balance is being upset (Mahina, 2009, personal communication).

Therefore, *noa* is always temporal and specific to particular situations. The inherent conflict does not dissipate. Its energy is harnessed and equalised in a state of 'noa'. In the above example, it provides pivotal force for the structural support of a building. The concept of *noa* recognises that conflict could be made manifest again should the balance of forces shift. *Noa* represents a temporary, although potentially enduring arrangement, to suit time, context and purpose. I think this temporal, localised, non-teleological, context-specific sense of *noa* is very useful. In particular, the conflict is transformed into strength. But only temporarily, only for as long as the equilibrium holds. When the situation and dynamic changes a new balance must be sought.

Notably, although the concept of noa is found in many Pasifika languages this is a Tongan translation of the word noa. Both noa and va provide different ideas about patterns of possibility across relational space.

The concept I draw upon to make my final point is Manulua. The Manulua motif can be traced to the Lapita culture (Stevenson, 2008, p. 62). Kaeppler (2002, p. 297) writes:

Manulua is a design constructed from a combination of three or four triangles that meet at their points. It is formed from a square divided by cross-wise and perpendicular lines to form triangles that are alternately coloured resulting in a design widely used throughout Polynesia (and elsewhere, sometimes termed a vane swastika). The word manulua in Tonga means two birds (manu = bird, lua = two) and as a design takes its meaning from the analogy of two birds flying together. Manulua is a heliaki for the chiefly status derived from intermixing chiefly descent from both parental lines (as from two birds).

What appeals to me most about the manulua motif, other than the fact that it is widely recognisable, pan-Pasifika and traced back to common Lapita origins, is that it balances and sets different shapes and distinctive colours into a complementary arrangement. Mahina (2004) argues that art is considered the process of rearranging space to create harmony and beauty, transforming chaos into patterned and aligned therapeutic abstractions. This included organising contradictory elements in symmetrical arrangements invoking both union and separation. Ka'ili (2008, p. 47) writes that, "In the fine art of ngatu (tapa) making, geometrical patterns are called kupesi, and in the performing of tauhi v□, beautiful social patterns are known as s□pinga or kupesi. Therefore, "tauhi v□ creates specific forms of kupesi" (beautiful patterns) and that the appreciation of beautiful patterns give rise to certain kinds of m□lie (harmonious beauty)" (Ka'ili 2008 p.217-218). The focus on manulua is not meant to create another binary between harmony and disharmony, beauty and chaos. This would fall into a trap which associates liminality and lack of structure with negativity. Rather manulua emphasises the many ways that in between spaces (relational, intertextual) can be patterned, connecting through difference and same, union and separation, many different resolutions are engendered. Both disharmony and harmony are required to provide a creative dialectic tension of movement and motion which is temporal rather than teleological. It is asymmetry, contradiction and disjuncture that stimulate an ever-changing arrangement of resolutions – a makeshift equilibrium that will be then be tipped and rearranged by the arrival of new factors, circumstances and conditions.

Mālie, which is described as harmonious beauty by Ka'ili (2008) has been written about at length by Manu'atu (2000). It is at the moment of creating mālie and engendering appreciation and a warm hearted response to this arrangement, this aesthetic, that *recognition* is stimulated. If identity as performance is taken to the end of its potential as an extended metaphor, then creating mālie in an audience indicates warm recognition. In Tonga, during dance performances or while watching a singer or performer of beauty, the audience members will shout out "mālie, mālie" and sometimes put money on the dancer or performer to show appreciation.

Despite the second generation troubling boundaries, breaking rules, and exceeding limits, they also stimulated recognition and feelings of mālie from their discrepant audiences. The second-gen participants were constantly in the act of facilitating noa (a temporal equilibrium between often opposing forces), balancing and negotiating culturally distinctive ideas and discourses. Manulua is the term I deploy to describe the aesthetic of those many resolutions. Manulua does not represent a duality, or the coming together of two distinctive cultures, but rather it represents the aesthetic process of finding a connection through difference. I believe that the cultural aesthetic of the second generation was generally considered attractive and beautiful enough to be (sometimes begrudgingly) symbolically recognised by their many others. And in the act of being claimed, owned, accepted, recognised and included as "Pasifika" or as "New Zealanders" the cultural boundaries and cultural signifiers of what constituted the Pasifika imaginary, as well as the New Zealand national imaginary, opened to become more inclusive.

As Lola explained:

I mean one of the realities is the more visibly successful I've become in terms of Board appointments and the kind of law I do, the more Samoans are saying I'm Samoan. There was less tolerance of my differences people twenty years ago when I was wearing Dr Martins and clubbing, and being a different person to what I am now you know. It's just interesting...

What I've really noticed is that once there was no one really like me around. Because all the Samoans were that I knew, even if they were NZ-born and had that whole fa'aSamoa up-bringing. And then all the Palagi's were - you know - assumed I was Samoan, and different, and really didn't engage in that. And one of the things that has really changed in the last generation is that there are so many people, more people that have had that kind of experience...

I think acceptance, feeling accepted as opposed to feeling isolated is a really important thing for everybody.

When I asked Alipate if he felt accepted, he replied that not only does he feel accepted, but he feels “in demand”. When I asked him to explain further, he said:

Well, I think that people want time of successful people... People want us to do things and want us to be around. We are doing good things, we operate at a high level and perhaps, maybe, perhaps we can walk in both worlds and talk and see things in two perspectives.

This is echoed by Isabella who says:

Yeah, yeah I am proud. And what I think is Pacific has also changed. What I think is exciting is we can call it, *we are New Zealand-born*, but in terms of what it is to be Pacific in New Zealand, well, that's *us* you know. Like if you're going to go looking for what it is to be Pacific in New Zealand, well it's *me*.

My final argument is that while recognising acceptance and recognition was very difficult and complex to negotiate, the second-gen Pasifika people I interviewed did illustrate that people were drawn to the way they “performed life”. While they broke discursive rules, troubled binaries and engaged in symbolic struggle, there was also evidence of a cultural aesthetic which was appreciated and recognised by others, even if it challenged or changed their stories.

Conclusion

In this chapter, I have advocated the idea of multiple relational spaces, in which the va between self and other is negotiated and re-negotiated. These are spaces of symbolic interaction and knowledge production and co-construction. The relational space is mutual terrain, where we are called into relation, where many ways of relating are possible. These are spaces where we perform identities, met with recognition or misrecognition. There has been an emphasis in this chapter on multiplicity. Therefore singular, linear identity stories were not told, rather they were multidimensional, characterised by heteroglossia. Instead of one subject position, there were shifting subject positions, many locations-in-relation resulting in complex negotiations of sameness and difference.

This resulted in a fluidity, but I agree with Alcoff (2006, p. 277) that a free floating simplistic promotion of fluidity is inadequate. Rather, in alignment with Bourdieu, I consider that this movement was “paid for in work, in efforts and above all in time

(moving up means raising oneself, climbing, and acquiring the marks, the stigmata, of this effort)" (Bourdieu, 1985, pp 725-726).

Polycultural capital is associated with the ability to both negotiate between multiple discourses and strategically perform identities in particular contexts in relation to specific others. Many patterns of possibility across relational spaces have been identified: dialogic distance, bridging, negotiating turf, strategic ignorance, strategic hybridity among others.

Complex negotiations and strategic appropriations from an array of symbolic resources were evident. These were not already hybridized, but involved an accumulation of cross-cultural resources, pregnant with potential for multiple options and outcomes. Negotiation about which discourses, ideas and beliefs would have practical adequacy and guide behaviour occurred in a context of many options and multiple accountabilities. It is argued here that having many cross-cultural resources, and strategically deploying different symbols and discourses in relational spaces of encounter, resulted in a cultural aesthetic of *manulua* characterised by balance and *noa*. Importantly, this is not just one resolution of balance, but many different and constantly shifting and adjusting resolutions. *Manulua* represents a recurring process of ever reconfiguring patterns of connection and difference, union and separation, attraction and repulsion, bridging and distancing, balancing and disrupting within the many spaces in between.

CHAPTER 10:

Reflections, Limitations, Recommendations

for the first time
someone
translated
my inheritance

unlocked the songs
under my skin

it was a chant
naming
all my father
taught me
without telling

words
indelibly
marked
on the map
that is my body

(Mila, 2008, p. 44)

Negotiating Spaces Between

Everything that I have listened to, read, written about, theorised and developed during this thesis journey has pulled me towards the *spaces between*. The importance of the *inter-* has been signalled repeatedly. The space between individuals, the space of interpersonal encounter and the way this is negotiated. The space between the open meaning of the present and the cultural texts and discourses which seek to name, language, know, define and produce social meaning. The space between different cultural texts and the intertextual skills required to negotiate between them.

The space in between, the *va*, is the infinite space of potential. It cannot always be bridged. Such spaces have been presented as sites of symbolic interaction and symbolic struggle; as sites of negotiation, as sites of knowledge production and co-construction. From researching this thesis, I have gained much respect for the stakes of representation, the contested nature of the production of social meaning and the politics of cultural reproduction. These are the high stakes of how we imagine

ourselves, how we imagine ourselves as different from others, and how they imagine us. Across many relational spaces, we negotiate our sense of sameness and difference. Some cultural resources and texts are shared, others are not. In each encounter participants made decisions about which symbols, cultural resources and discourses they would identify through. They would make decisions about how to perform identity in relation to the other in each particular context. What would be recognised?

Often within these relational spaces, participants sought the symbolic power to voice alternative stories about themselves, rupture existing narratives and trouble the binaries that constructed them as a particular form of different. A considerable amount of counter-performance and counter-narrative was evident, in which they reacted strategically against enduring social narratives that racialised and constructed them in a limited number of ways.

Wherever this generation encountered invocations about Pasifika ethnic imaginaries and identities being logically consistent, highly integrated, consensual, authentic, bounded, and pure, there was inevitably going to be identity trouble. In many ways, in many different relational spaces, others tried to force or fix a particular identity, an identity which had symbolic authority according to their preferred social narrative. There was the expectation of out-of-date performances. The second generation participants encountered others energising old and enduring social narratives about “us” and “them”, rehearsing an inflexible rhetoric of difference.

From beyond the limits of what was constituted as authentically Pasifika, the second generation participants had to negotiate acceptance and belonging. This was often partial, both less-than and more-than, they were supposed to be. For example, to “be Tongan but not *a* Tongan”, to mimic Alipate’s tricky discursive slip in the story “More Tongan than I thought” outlined in Chapter Eight. Participants repeatedly made it clear that they were both Kiwis (New Zealanders) and Pasifika (Samoan, Niuean, Cook Islands or Tongan). To be both, meant being beyond the limits of what was centred, privileged and represented as “pure” and authenticated in either imaginary. In a context of many relationships, there were multi-dimensional (as opposed to singular or linear) constructions of self. This multiplicity added complexity to the challenge of meeting social demands for coherence and cultural legibility.

Transnational spaces and hierarchies tended to privilege Pasifika homeland identities and culture as most real, and the cultures and identities of diasporic Pasifika people

were monitored and regulated against these ideals. Appeals to purity, or strategic essentialism, were too powerful, and associated with too much profit, for it to be in the second-generation's interests to be able to perform only hybridity. To perform culture in strategically essentialist ways was often met with recognition, appreciation and inclusion, particular from migrant generations. As the participant Lola asks in the previous chapter: "What's going to suit my purpose in this particular context?" What will be validated and legitimated? Different choices and combinations of symbolic resources were deployed and different identity performances were mobilised, not just to establish connections and to stimulate recognition, but also to counter-perform and rehearse difference. Strategic ignorance, strategic essentialism, strategic hybridity were just some of the ways participants mobilised culturally in and across different relational spaces.

Polycultural Capital

I have argued that an analysis of power in relation to second generation identities is necessary. One of the major ideas developed in this thesis is polycultural capital, which is associated with profit and power across culturally distinctive spaces. Polycultural capital refers to an accumulation of distinctive cultural resources; intertextual skills (a sense of how these cultural texts relate to another), the power to negotiate between them and the ability to deploy these symbolic resources strategically in different contexts.

Having polycultural capital means having the multiple tongues of heteroglossia, the ability to speak with many others in many ways. It means having the stereoscopic vision which provides the opportunity to look at situations with many eyes. It means being able to approach a situation and ask: which cultural text do I read from to interpret this dynamic? Or do I need to create some kind of compromise and negotiate a resolution that draws cross-culturally, balancing competing ideas? Polycultural capital is celebrated here as a position of power, but it is recognised that many participants had to operate cross-culturally lacking or low in important forms of capital, particularly Pasifika languages, status associated with age or bloodlines, or traditional knowledge. They did the best with what they had, negotiating constantly, as well as suffering penalties and misrecognition due to their lack of capital.

While second generation participants may have felt the alienation of existing beyond the limits of cultural boundaries, their reward was the return tickets they had earned

that allowed them to move with relative ease in between spaces. This often came with a sense of responsibility for translating, connecting, explaining, educating, communicating across and bridging intercultural spaces, as many of the stories show.

Accumulating diverse symbolic resources, cultural texts and forms of capital led to a way of operating culturally that was characterised by negotiating many balances and compromises. These were temporal, local, multidimensional resolutions dependent on position, location, and relational context. Manulua is the term deployed to describe the aesthetic of constantly negotiated resolutions, a pattern signalling a series of processes, rather than one unified hybrid outcome.

Cultural Cartography

I have found the viscosity of spatiality, va and manulua to be a useful way of “representing social complexity” (Lopez, 2001, p. 93). Wendt (1991, p. 181) says:

The Pacific has many maps. Not just geographical / political ones, but maps of the moa (centre), the heart, imagination, agaga; cultural, artistic, literary / language, spiritual, philosophical, cinematic, mythological, dream, emotional maps; maps emerging out of the Pacific, maps brought in and imposed, maps combining the two, maps which are deliberate erasures and replacements; maps which reveal the rivers, mountains and geography of a people’s agaga/ psyche; maps used to perpetuate fictions/myths about ourselves; new maps, new fusions and interweavings.

A few weeks before this thesis was completed, I attended a forum on Pasifika arts. I listened to Albert Wendt deliver the keynote at this occasion. He acknowledged and made a tribute to the work of younger Pasifika writers, including my own writing. He said,

Our art is our attempt to understand who and what we are, and the marvelous cultures, histories, and situations we have come out of. Our art is the search for that and to map and shape the present... (Wendt, 2010, p. 2)

In this case, it is not only my art, but also my academic writing which seeks to map and shape the present. With some caveats (and nervousness), in the theoretical chapter I described this thesis as a project of cultural cartography. The conceptual narrative that I have developed theorises, imagines and reconstructs using metaphors and techniques invoking viscosity and spatiality, the social conditions and power relationships in which Pasifika second generation are constructing identities and operating culturally.

This map, like all maps, is not the territory itself, rather a particular representation. It cannot answer adequately the second-generation question of “who we are”. What it can show you is where I have been during five years of thinking through the question. This particular representation frees those who embrace it from the deficit model which rendered them inauthentic, incomplete people. It affords them more space than the confines of the “caught between”, and represents them as strategic actors with multiple forms of capital, using it strategically to navigate relational spaces in the same ways as skilled orators take pieces of scarce knowledge to create and use power.

Research limitations and recommendations

The final section of the thesis acknowledges the limitations of the project, and makes recommendations for future research. First there were limits and problems with the Youth2000 Survey. By the time I came to analyse and publish work associated with this dataset it was already dated. However there was no comparable dataset available in New Zealand. It was unanalysed and would possibly have remained so had I not made an approach. The Youth2000 data can also be criticised for being based on self-reporting which is not always considered reliable. The odds ratio tests compare self-reported variables with self-reported variables. These associations, taken from one cross-sectional study, cannot be determined as causal, just significantly associated with one another. The awareness of these shortcomings led me to use the data only to frame issues and formulate particular qualitative research questions, as opposed to others.

The difficulty of generalising data collected from Pasifika high school students (regardless of where they were born) with qualitative interviews with second generation Pasifika professionals, mostly in their mid-thirties, is a clear weakness of the study. In the end only very broad themes (of culture, identity, acceptance, belonging,) were carried over. The quantitative component added less to the core of the thesis than I had anticipated. Given the amount of time spent gaining access to the dataset and learning quantitative skills, I am unsure of the value of this line of enquiry for future research. The difficulties of being stuck within post-positivist parameters and the way this rubbed with qualitative paradigms was particularly problematic. The disjuncture has led to some critics suggesting that mixed-methods research is fatally flawed, although Teddlie and Tashakkori (2003, p. 22) argue that: “Multiple diverse perspectives are important because they are required to explain the complexity of an increasingly pluralistic society”. Their argument is that we must consider opposing viewpoints and interact with the tensions caused by their juxtaposition (Teddlie and

Tashakkori, 2003, p. 22). This is not unlike the argument advanced by Southwick (2001, p. 48), who writes that the important thing is always the opening which deconstructive tension creates, not the resolutions.

This focus on the spaces between has been pervasive throughout the thesis, both methodologically and theoretically. It is hard to know the extent to which my own personal “half-ness” or “doubleness” privileged the relational space in-between. I do know that this intercultural space was articulated by all my participants, as meaningful and applicable to their own lived diasporic experiences. The determination to have a strengths-based focus also influenced the development of certain ideas and shut down others. I was determined, for example, that liminality would not be cast as only disorder, but seen perhaps as the ambivalent tension required to lubricate fluidity across subject positions, identifications, relational locations and move in in-between spaces.

It is with hindsight that I can see how I have erased or avoided differentiations between the experiences of those with parents from more than one ethnic group, and those with sole ethnicity. Future research may seek to generate clearer understandings of the differences between people of “mixed descent”, rather than emphasise common generational ground as I have. In particular, research focusing on polycultural capital for people with parents from different ethnic backgrounds would be an interesting area for further research.

Gender differences have not been emphasised, much of the analysis in this thesis being generalised across genders. This is a limitation of my approach, as well as productive area for future research. I was aware from my interviews that there were gendered experiences and that negotiating dissonance and disjuncture between culturally validated versions of gender roles emerged as an important issue. I would see further analysis of gender roles that are privileged and accorded most symbolic recognition across and between spaces to be an area ripe for analysis. A few stories touch on this, such as Leilani’s experiences in Apia. Further transnational research on gender, what is authenticated, the intertextual relationships between different cultural discourses on gender, and how Pasifika women in particular navigate and negotiate this would be valuable.

A pan-Pasifika approach was taken in this thesis. It is acknowledged that an ethnic-specific emphasis would probably have provided a clearer sense of cultural continuity

and a tidier focus on the politics of transnational relationships. An ethnic-specific focus would have generated sharper findings, grounded in locale, a specific language, culture, social conditions and historical experiences. An ethnic-specific focus would also have avoided the sometimes disjunctive leaps from Pasifika imaginaries to ethnic specific examples. It is acknowledged that most of these ethnic-specific examples were Tongan, given my own ethnic background, and while it is implicitly glossed that these examples may be generalisable across all Pasifika cultures, this is not a given and is another weakness of the research.

In this research the sample of participants consisted of Pasifika professionals who were not selected to be representative of the entire population. Rather they represented a small group, who met predominantly Western criteria of capital and success: upward social mobility, educational or professional success, and status. Yet they also continued to participate in Pasifika networks and engage in Pasifika communities and were thus readily identifiable by the Ministry of Pacific Island Affairs or my own networks; many were identified through the emerging Pacific leader's network.

This is a particular experience, and it ignores those who might have considerable professional and educational capital but who do not choose to associate or participate in Pasifika community networks and are thus not readily identifiable by the Ministry of Pacific Island Affairs, or by myself or through the emerging Pacific leaders network. The experiences of those who opt out and distance themselves from Pasifika networks would also be an interesting area of study. Similarly, those people who have maintained Pasifika languages, knowledge and cultures, but who have not attained institutionalised educational or professional status, have not been represented in this study. My own value judgments, biases and assumptions about what is successful are exposed here. The positive deviance agenda, to focus the research on those whose lives are not characterised by disadvantage, criminality, ill health, unemployment and so on, led to a search for those who represent another experience. As someone involved in the Pasifika community, I chose people whom I respected and knew about, who "performed life" and had achieved things that I admired. The Ministry of Pacific Island Affairs identified others. Value judgments were made. After conducting the research, I conclude that a focus on culture and identity, belonging and acceptance, from Pasifika peoples whose experiences are not represented here would be an extremely productive area of study, particularly, because of the way that acceptance emerged as such a salient theme. Negotiating inclusion, recognition, acceptance and

belonging, was strongly associated with wellbeing. If the second-generation participants I interviewed found this difficult with all of their capital, how would those with less capital manage these same issues?

Finally, this thesis did not consider the third and subsequent generations who have had an opportunity in Aotearoa to watch the second-generation negotiate before them. The cultural experiences of the second-generation have been coloured by predictions of cultural loss and deficit, and although I have no desire to make predictions about the experience of subsequent generations, I will watch for research in this area with great interest. As Tama said to me about the next generation, "I think, '*Man*, you're going to be *something different*'. And that is exciting."

It has been acknowledged many times in this thesis that I have written about experiences which are similar to my own. The knowledge produced here has been co-constructed with the participants, and another researcher would have listened for different stories, picked up on different threads and noticed different patterns. This is the kupesi I offer; it interweaves many elements which might not be reproduced in identical form by another researcher. I hope, however, that the ways I have approached understanding the culture and identities of second generational Pasifika peoples will add to the body of knowledge already generated. I hope also that it will have useful implications for other identity-based research.

I wish to close this thesis by offering thanks to those who took part in the interviews, patterning the va between us. This space was for you. This space was for us.

References

- Adams, M. (2006). Hybridizing Habitus and Reflexivity: Towards an Understanding of Contemporary Identity? *Sociology*, 40(3), 511-552.
- Adams, G., & Markus, H.R. (2004). Towards a conception of culture suitable for a social psychology of culture. In M. Shaller & S. Christian (Eds.), *The psychological foundations of culture* (pp. 335-360). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Adolescent Health Research Group, (2003). *New Zealand Youth: A Profile of Their Health and Wellbeing*. Auckland, NZ: University of Auckland.
- Alba, R. & Nee, V. (2003). *Remaking the American Mainstream: Assimilation and Contemporary Immigration*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Alcoff, L.M. (1991). The Problem of Speaking for Others. *Cultural Critique*, 20, 5-32.
- Alcoff, L.M. (2006). *Visible Identities: Race, Gender, and the Self*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Allen, G. (2000). *Intertextuality. (The New Critical Idiom)*. London: Routledge.
- Anae, M. (1998). *Fofoa-i-vao-'ese: the identity journeys of NZ-born Samoans*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Auckland, Auckland, New Zealand.
- Anae, M. (2001). The New Vikings of the Sunrise: New Zealand-borns in the Information Age. In P. Spoonley, C. Macpherson, & M. Anae (Eds.), *Tagata o te Moana Nui: The Evolving Identities of Pacific peoples in Aotearoa, New Zealand* (pp. 101-121). Palmerston North, NZ: Dunmore Press.
- Anae, M. (2003). A A'u/I – My Identity Journey. In: P. Fairbairn-Dunlop & G. Makisi (Eds.), *Making our Place: Growing up PI in New Zealand* (pp. 89-101). Palmerston North, NZ: Dunmore Press.
- Anae, M. (2007, November, 1-2). *Is your research making a difference to Pasifika Education?* Paper presented at the Translating Pasifika Research into Policy Symposium, New Zealand Council of Education Research, Wellington, New Zealand.

- Anae, Melani., Coxon, Eve., Mara, Diane., Wendt-Samu, Tanya., & Finau, Christine. (2001) "Pasifika Education Research Guidelines". Auckland, NZ: UniServices.
- Anae, M., Moewaka-Barnes, H., McCreanor, T., & Watson, P. (2002). Towards promoting youth mental health in Aotearoa/New Zealand: Holistic 'houses' of health. *International Journal of Mental Health Promotion*, 4, 5-14.
- Anderson, B. (1991). *Imagined Communities: reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism*. London, New York: Verso.
- Ang, I. (2001). *On Not Speaking Chinese: Living Between Asia and the West*. London: Routledge.
- Anthias, F. (1998). Evaluating Diaspora: Beyond Ethnicity. *Sociology*, 32(3), 557-580
- Anzaldúa, G. (2006). Towards a new consciousness. In B. Ashcroft, G. Griffiths, & H. Tiffin (Eds.), *The Post Colonial Studies Reader* (2nd edit., pp. 208-210). London: Routledge.
- Appadurai, A. (1991). Global Ethnoscapes: Notes and Queries for a Transnational Anthropology. In R.G. Fox (Ed.), *Recapturing Anthropology: Working in the Present* (pp. 191-210). Santa Fe, New Mexico: School of American Research Press.
- Appadurai, A. (1996). *Modernity at large: Cultural dimensions of globalization*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Archibald, R. (2002). A Personal History of Memory. In J. Climo and M. Cattell. (Eds.), *Social Memory and History: Anthropological Perspectives*. New York: AltaMira Press.
- Armitage, A. (2005). *Comparing the Policy of Aboriginal Assimilation: Australia, Canada and New Zealand*. Vancouver, Canada: UBC.
- Ashcroft, B., Griffiths, G., & Tiffin, H. (2006). The Body and Performance. In B. Ashcroft, G. Griffiths & H. Tiffin, (Eds.), *The Post Colonial Studies Reader* (2nd ed., pp. 289-290). London: Routledge.
- Bakhtin, M. (1981). Discourse in the Novel. In M. Holquist (Ed.), *The Dialogic Imagination* (C. Emerson & M. Holquist, Trans.) (pp. 259–422). Austin: University of Texas Press.

- Ballara, A. (1986). *Proud to be White? A Survey of Pakeha prejudice in New Zealand*. Auckland, NZ: Heinemann.
- Bedford, R.D. (1994). Pacific Islanders in New Zealand. *Espaces Populations Societes*, 2, 187-200.
- Bedford, R.D. (2007, August 30-31). Pasifika Mobility: Pathways, Circuits and Challenges in the 21st Century. Paper presented at Thought Leaders Dialogue. Hamilton, NZ: University of Waikato.
- Belich, J. (2007). *Making Peoples: The Story of the New Zealanders*. Auckland, NZ: Penguin (Original work published 1996).
- Benet-Martinez, V., Lee, F., & Leu, J. (2006). Biculturalism and cognitive complexity: Expertise in cultural representations. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 37(4), 386-407.
- Benet-Martinez, V., Leu, J., Lee, F., & Morris, M. W. (2002). Negotiating biculturalism - Cultural frame switching in biculturals with oppositional versus compatible cultural identities. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 33(5), 492-516.
- Berggren, W.L., & Wray, J.D. (2002). Positive deviant behavior and nutrition education. *Food Nutrition Bulletin*, 23(4), 9-10.
- Berry, J.W. (1980). Acculturation as varieties of adaptation. In A. Padilla (Ed.), *Acculturation: Theories, Models and Some New Findings* (pp. 9-25). Boulder, CO: Westview.
- Berry, J.W. (2001). A psychology of immigration. *Journal of Social Issues*, 57, 615-31.
- Berry, J.W. (2002). Conceptual Approaches to Acculturation. In K. Chum, P. Balls Organista & G. Marin (Eds.), *Acculturation: Advances in Theory, Measurement and Applied Research* (pp. 17-38). Washington DC: American Psychological Association.
- Berry, J.W., Phinney, J., Sam, D., & Vedder, P. (2006). *Immigrant Youth in Cultural Transition: Acculturation, Identity, and Adaptation Across National Contexts*. New Jersey: Mahwah.
- Berry, J.W., Poortinga, Y., Segall, M., & Dasen, P. (2002). *Cross-Cultural Psychology: Research and Implications*. (2nd Edit). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Bhabha, H. (1990). The Third Space: Interview with Homi Bhabha. In J. Rutherford (Ed.), *Identity, Community, Culture, Difference* (pp. 207-221). London: Lawrence and Wishart.
- Bhabha, H. (1994). *The Location of Culture*. London: Routledge.
- Bhabha, H. (1993). Culture's in between. *Artforum International*, 32(1), 167-171.
- Bhabha, H. (1995). Black and white and read all over. *Artforum International* 34(2), 16-18.
- Bhabha, H. (1996). Culture's in between. In Stuart Hall & Paul Du Gay (Eds.), *Questions of Cultural Identity*, (pp. 53-60). California: Sage.
- Blakely, T., Tobias, M., Robson, B., Ajwani, S., Bonne, M., & Woodward, A. (2005). Widening ethnic mortality disparities in New Zealand 1981 to 1999. *Social Science and Medicine*, 61(10), 2233-2251.
- Bolatagici, T. (2004). Claiming the (n)either/(n)or of 'third space': (re)presenting hybrid identity and the embodiment of mixed race. *Journal of Intercultural Studies*, 25,(1) 75-85.
- Borell, B. (2005). Living in the city ain't so bad: cultural identity for young Maori in South Auckland. In: J. Liu, T. McCreanor, T. McIntosh, & T. Teaiwa (Eds.), *New Zealand Identities: Departures and Destinations* (pp. 191-206). Wellington, NZ: Victoria University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1977). *Outline of a Theory of Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. (Original work published, 1972)
- Bourdieu, P. (1985a). The forms of capital. In: J.G. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education* (pp. 241-258). New York: Greenwood.
- Bourdieu, P. (1985b). The Social Space and the Genesis of Groups. *Theory and Society*, 14(6), 723-744.
- Bourdieu, P. (1989). Social Space and Symbolic Power. *Sociological Theory*, 7(1), 14-25.
- Bourdieu, P. (1992). *In other words: essays towards a reflexive sociology* (M. Adamson Trans.). Cambridge: Polity.
- Bourdieu, P. (1990). *The Logic of Practice* (R. Nice Trans.). Cambridge: Polity.

- Bourdieu, P. (1993). *Sociology in Question* (R. Nice Trans.). London; California; New Delhi: Sage.
- Bourdieu, P. (2007). The Forms of Capital. In A. R. Sadonik (Ed.), *Sociology of Education* (pp. 83-95). New York: Routledge.
- Bourdieu, P. (2008). Outline of a Theory of Practice. In S. Seidman & J.C. Alexander (Eds.), *The New Social Theory Reader* (2nd Edit., pp. 80-87). London, New York: Routledge.
- Bourdieu, P., & Wacquant, L. (1992). *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Boyce Davies, C. (1994). *Black Women, Writing and Identity: Migrations of the subject*. London, New York: Routledge.
- Boyzatis, R. (1998). *Transforming qualitative information: Thematic analysis and code development*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Brah, A. (2006). Thinking through the concept of Diaspora. In B. Ashcroft, G. Griffiths & H. Tiffin (Eds.), *The Post Colonial Studies Reader* (2nd edit., pp. 443-446). London: Routledge.
- Brown Pulu, T. (2007) *Kakai Tonga 'i 'Okalani, Nu'u Sila: Tongan generations in Auckland, New Zealand*. Unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Waikato, Hamilton, New Zealand.
- Bush, A., Collings, S., Tamasese, K., & Waldegrave C. (2005). Samoan and Psychiatrists' perspectives on self: qualitative comparison. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Psychiatry*, 39: 621-626.
- Butcher, M. (2004). Universal Processes of Cultural Change: reflections on the identity strategies of Indian and Australian youth. *Journal of Intercultural Studies*, 25(3), 215- 231.
- Butler, J. (1988). Performative Acts and Gender Constitution: An Essay in Phenomenology and Feminist Theory. *Theatre Journal*, 40(4), 519-531.
- Butler, J. (1995). Collected and Fractured: Response to Identities. In: K.A. Appiah & H.L. Gates (Eds.), *Identities* (pp. 439-449). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

- Butler, J. (1999). *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. London, New York: Routledge.
- Campbell, B. (2005). *Negotiating Biculturalism: deconstructing Pakeha subjectivity*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Massey University: Palmerston North, New Zealand.
- Campbell, I. (2001). *Island Kingdom: Tonga Ancient and Modern*. Christchurch, NZ: Canterbury University Press.
- Casswell, S., Pledger, M., & Hooper, R. (2003). Socioeconomic status and drinking patterns in young adults. *Addiction*, 98(5), 601-610.
- Castellano, M. B. (2004). Ethics of Aboriginal Research. *Journal of Aboriginal Knowledge*, 98-114.
- Castles, S., & Miller, M.J. (2009). *The age of migration: international population movements in the world* (4th ed.) Basingstoke, England, New York: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Cheng, C., Sanders, M., Sanchez-Burks, J., Molina, K., Lee, F., Darling, E., & Zhao, Y. (2008). Reaping the Rewards of Diversity: The Role of Identity Integration. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass* 2(3), 1182-1198.
- Clifford, J. (1997). *Routes: Travel and Translation in the Late Twentieth Century*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Clifford, J. (2006). Diasporas. In B. Ashcroft, G. Griffiths & H. Tiffin, (Eds.), *The Post Colonial Studies Reader* (2nd ed., pp. 451-454). London: Routledge.
- Clifford, J. (2008). On Ethnographic Allegory. In S. Seidman & J.C. Alexander (Eds.), *The New Social Theory Reader*. (2nd ed., pp. 60-71). London, New York: Routledge.
- Cohen, R. (1997). *Global Diasporas: An Introduction*. London: UCL.
- Connell, J. (2006). Migration, Dependency and Inequality in the Pacific: Old Wine in Bigger Bottles? (Part 1) In Stewart Firth (Ed.), *Globalisation and governance in the Pacific Islands* (pp. 59-80). Canberra, Australia: ANU E-Press.
- Culbertson, P., & Agee, M. (2007). What's so 'identity' about that word?: Pasifika men's experience of being 'Afakasi. *New Zealand Journal of Counselling*, 27(2), 77-95.

- Craig, E., Taufa, S., Jackson C., & Yeo-Han, D. (2008) *The Health of Pacific Children and Young People in New Zealand*. Auckland, NZ: Department of Paediatrics, School of Population Health.
- Craig, R. (2004). *Handbook of Polynesian Mythology*. California: ABC-CLIO.
- Creswell, J. (2003). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches* (2nd ed.) Thousand Oaks, California: Sage.
- Darity, W., & Nembhard, J. (2000). Racial and ethnic economic inequality: the international record. *American Economic Review*, 90(2), 308-311.
- Darling, H., Reeder, A., McGee, R. & Williams, S. (2006). Brief report: Disposable income, and spending on fast food, alcohol, cigarettes, and gambling by New Zealand secondary school students. *Journal of Adolescence*, 29(5), 837-843
- De Andrade, L. (2000). Negotiating from the Inside: Constructing Racial and Ethnic Identity in Qualitative Research. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, 29, 268-290.
- Denzin, N., & Lincoln, Y. (1994). *Handbook of Qualitative Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Denzin, N. (1997). *Interpretive ethnography: Ethnographic practices for the 21st century*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- de Raad, J. & Walton, M. (2007, August 30-31). *Pacific People in the New Zealand Economy: Understanding Trends and Linkages*. Paper presented at Thought Leaders Dialogue. Wellington, New Zealand: NZIER.
- Dhooleka, R. (2002). *Where are you from? Middle-class migrants in the modern world*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Diaz, V.M. & Kauanui, J.K. (2001). Native Pacific Cultural Studies on the Edge. *The Contemporary Pacific*, 13(2), 315-341.
- Duarte, F. (2005). Living in 'the Betweens': Diaspora Consciousness Formation and Identity among Brazilians in Australia. *Journal of Intercultural Studies*, 26(4) 315-335.
- Durie, M. (2005). *Nga Tai Matatu: Tides of Maori Endurance*. Victoria, Australia: Oxford University Press.

- Durie, M. (2002). Is there a distinctive Maori psychology?" In Nikora, L., Levy, M., Masters, B., Waitoki, M., Te Awekotuku, N. & R. Etheredge (Eds.), *The Proceedings of the National Maori Graduates of Psychology Symposium*. Hamilton: University of Waikato. pp. 19-25.
- Eastmond, M. (2007). Stories as Lived Experience: Narratives in Forced Migration Work. *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 20(2), 248-264.
- Escobar, A., & Harcourt, W. (2005). Introducing Practices of Difference: Introducing Women and the Politics of the Place. In W. Harcourt & A. Escobar (Eds.), *Women and the Politics of Place* (pp. 1-17). Bloomfield, CT: Kumarian Press.
- Escobar, J.I. (1998). Immigration and mental health: Why are immigrants better off? *Archives of General Psychiatry*, 55, 781-782.
- Escobar, J., & Vega, W. (2000). Mental Health and Immigration's AAAs: Where Are We and Where Do We Go from Here? *Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease*, 188(11), 736-740.
- Ewing, K. (1990). The Illusion of Wholeness: Culture, Self, and the Experience of Inconsistency. *Ethos* 18 (3): 251-278.
- Evans, M. (2001). *Persistence of the Gift: Tongan Tradition in Transnational Context*. Ontario: Wilfred Laurier University Press.
- Fairbairn-Dunlop, P. (2003). Some Markers on the Journey. In P. Fairbairn-Dunlop & G. Makisi (Eds.), *Making our Place: Growing up PI in New Zealand* (pp. 19-44). Palmerston North, New Zealand: Dunmore Press.
- Fairbairn-Dunlop, P., & Makisi G. (2003) *Making our Place: Growing up PI in New Zealand*. Palmerston North, NZ: Dunmore Press.
- Fanon, Frantz. (1992). The Fact of Blackness. In: J. Donald & A. Rattansi (Eds.), *'Race', Culture & Difference* (pp. 220-242). London: Sage.
- Fanon, Frantz, (2006). The Fact of Blackness. In B. Ashcroft, G. Griffiths, H. Tiffin, (Eds.), *The Post Colonial Studies Reader* (2nd ed., pp. 291-294). London: Routledge.
- Fiegal, S. (1994). *Where we once belonged*. Auckland, NZ: Pasifika Press.

- Flores, J. (2003). The Latino Imaginary: Meanings of Community and Identity. In K.A. Appiah & H.L. Gates, *Identities* (pp. 96-104). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Foliaki, S.A. (1999). Mental health among Tongan migrants. *Pacific Health Dialog*, 6(2), 288-294.
- Foliaki, S.A. Kokaua, J. Schaaf, D. & Tukuitonga, C. (2006). Pacific People. In M.A. Oakley-Browne, J.E. Wells, K.M. Scott, (Eds.), *Te Rau Hinengaro: The New Zealand Mental Health Survey* (pp. 178-208). Wellington, New Zealand: Ministry of Health.
- Foliaki, S., & Pearce, N. (2003). Prevention and control of diabetes in Pacific people. *British Medical Journal* 327, 437-439.
- Foucault, M. (1989). *The Archaeology of Knowledge* (A. M. Sheridan Smith, Trans.). London; New York: Routledge. (Original work published 1972)
- Foucault, M. (1991). *The Foucault Reader: An Introduction to Foucault's Thought*, (Ed.,) P. Rabinow. London: Penguin Books, reprinted.
- Foucault, M. (2001). *The Order of Things*. London: Routledge. (Original work published 1970).
- Foucault, M. (2008). Power/Knowledge. In: S. Seidman & J.C. Alexander (Eds.), *The New Social Theory Reader*. (2nd ed., pp. 74-79). London; New York: Routledge.
- Fowers, B., & Richardson, F.C. (1996). Why is Multiculturalism Good? *American Psychologist*, 51(6) 609-621.
- Frank, Arthur W. (1995). *The Wounded Storyteller: Body, Illness, and Ethics*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Fraser, J. (1892). The Samoan Story of Creation: A Tala. *Journal of the Polynesian Society*, i,164-189.
- Furedi, F. (2001). How Sociology Imagined "Mixed Race". In D. Parker & M. Song (Eds.), *Rethinking "Mixed Race"* (pp. 23-41). London: Pluto Press.
- Fuss, D. (1989). *Essentially Speaking: Feminism, Nature and Difference*. London, New York: Routledge.
- Gans, H.J. (1992). Second Generation Decline: Scenarios for the Economic and Ethnic Futures of the Post-1965 American Immigrants. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 15(2), 173-192.

- Gans, H. (1997). Toward a Reconciliation of "Assimilation" and "Pluralism": The Interplay of Acculturation and Ethnic Retention. *International Migration Review*, 31(4), 875-892.
- Gates, H.L. (2003). The Close Reader; Both Sides Now. *New York Times Online*. Retrieved Jan 27, 2008, from: <http://query.nytimes.com/gst/fullpage.html?res=9C0DEEDF163DF937A35756C0A9659C8B63&sec=&spon=&pagewanted=2>
- Gegeo, D. (2001). Culture, Rupture and Indigeneity: The Challenge of (Re)visioning "Place" in the Pacific. *The Contemporary Pacific*, 13(2), 491.
- Gershon, I. (2000). How to Know When Not to Know: Strategic Ignorance When Eliciting for Samoan Migrant Exchanges. *Social Analysis* 44, 84-105.
- Gershon, I. (2007). Viewing Diasporas from the Pacific: What Pacific Ethnographies Offer Pacific Diaspora Studies. *The Contemporary Pacific*, 19 (2), 474-502.
- Gilroy, P. (1993). *The Black Atlantic: Modernity and Double Consciousness*. Harvard University Press: Cambridge
- Gilroy, P. (1997). Diaspora and the Detours of Identity. In K. Gifford (Ed.), *Identity and Difference*, (pp. 301-340). London: Sage Publications.
- Gray, J., & Nosa, V. (2009). Tau Fifine Fiafia: The Binge Drinking Behaviours of Nine New Zealand Born Niuean women living in Auckland. *Pacific Health Dialog*, 15(1), 104-111.
- Greene, J. & Caracelli, V. (2003). Making Paradigmatic Sense of Mixed Methods Practice. In: A. Tashakkori & C. Teddlie (Eds.), *Handbook of Mixed Methods in Social and Behavioural Research*. (pp. 91-110) Thousand Oaks, London, New Delhi: Sage.
- Gubrium, J., & Holstein, J. (2003). *Postmodern Interviewing*. Thousand Oaks, London, New Dehli: Sage.
- Gupta, A. and Ferguson, J. (1992). Beyond Culture: Space, Identity and the Politics of Difference. *Cultural Anthropology* 7(1), 6-23.
- Gupta, A. & Ferguson, J. (1997). Beyond "Culture". In A. Gupta & J. Ferguson (Eds.), *Culture, Power, Place: Explorations in Critical Anthropology*, (pp. 33-51). Durham, London: Duke University Press.

- Gurevitch, V.D. (1989). The Power of Not-Understanding: The Meeting of Conflicting Identities. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 25, 161-173.
- Gurevitch, V.D. (1990). The Dialogic Connection and the Ethics of dialogue. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 41(2), 181-196.
- Hall, S. (1990). Cultural identity and diaspora. In J. Rutherford (Ed.), *Identity, Community, Culture, Difference*. (pp. 222-237). London: Lawrence and Wishart.
- Hall, S. (1992). New Ethnicities. In J. Donald & A. Rattansi (Eds.), *'Race', Culture & Difference* (pp. 252-259). London: Sage.
- Hall, S. (1996). Introduction: Who needs 'Identity?' In S. Hall & P. du Gay (Eds.), *Questions of Cultural Identity* (pp. 1-17). London: Sage.
- Hall, S. (2006). New Ethnicities. In B. Ashcroft, G. Griffiths & H. Tiffin, (Eds.), *The Post Colonial Studies Reader* (2nd ed., pp199-202). London: Routledge.
- Hanson, A. (1983). Art and the Maori Construction of Reality. In S. Mead & B. Kernot (Eds.), *Art and Artists of Oceania* (pp. 210-225). Palmerston North, NZ: Dunmore Press.
- Harcourt, W., & Escobar, A. (2002). Women and the Politics of Place. *development*, 45(1), 7-14.
- Hau'ofa, E. (1998). The ocean in us. (Pacific Ocean). *The Contemporary Pacific*, 10(2), 391-411.
- Hau'ofa, E. (2008). *We are the Ocean: Selected Works*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Health Research Council of New Zealand. (2004). *Guidelines on Pacific Health Research*. Auckland, New Zealand: Author.
- Health Research Council of New Zealand. (2006). *HRC Strategic Plan for Pacific Health Research*. Auckland, New Zealand: Author.
- Health Research Council of New Zealand. (2006). *HRC Strategic Plan 2008-2010*. Auckland, New Zealand: Author.
- Hekman, S. (1991). Reconstituting the Subject: Feminism, Modernism, and Postmodernism. *Hypatia* 6(2), 44-63.

- Helu, I.F. (1999). *Critical Essays: Cultural Perspectives from the South Seas*. Canberra, Australia: ANU.
- Hereniko, V. (1995). *Woven Gods: Female Clowns and Power in Rotuma*. Institute of Pacific Studies, University of the South Pacific in association with Centre for Pacific Island Studies, School of Hawaiian, Asian and Pacific Studies, University of Hawaii, Suva and Honolulu.
- Hereniko, V. (1999). Representations of Cultural Identities. In V. Hereniko & R. Wilson (Eds.), *Inside Out: Literature, Cultural Politics, and Identity in the New Pacific*. (pp. 137-166). Maryland, Oxford: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Hermans, H.J.M., Kempen, H.J.G. (1998). Moving cultures: the perilous problems of cultural dichotomies in a globalizing society, *American Psychologist*, 53, 1111-20.
- Higgins, K. & Leleisi'uao, A. (2009). Kamoan Mine. In A.M. Tamaira (Ed.), *In The Space Between: Negotiating Culture, Place, and Identity in the Pacific*, Occasional Paper Series 44 (pp. 37-54). Honolulu, Hawai'i: Center for Pacific Islands Studies, School of Pacific and Asian Studies, University of Hawai'i at Mānoa.
- Hokowhitu, B. (2008). The Death of Koro Paka: "Traditional" Maori Patriarchy in *The Contemporary Pacific*, 20(1), 1-24.
- Holland, D., Skinner, D., Lachiotte, Jr. W., & Cain, C. (1998). *Identity and agency in cultural worlds*. London: Harvard University Press.
- Holt, A. (1999). *Culture, ethnicity & identity: a look at first generation children from immigrant Samoan families*. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Auckland, Auckland, New Zealand.
- Hong, Y., Morris, M. W., Chiu, C., & Benet-Martinez, V. (2000). Multicultural minds – A dynamic constructivist approach to culture and cognition. *American Psychologist*, 55(7), 709-720.
- Hong, Y., Wan, C., No, S., Chiu, C. (2007). Multicultural Identities. In S. Kitiyama & D. Cohen (Eds.) *Handbook of Cultural Psychology*, (pp. 323-345). New York: Guilford Press.
- Howard, A. (1990). Cultural Paradigms, History, and the Search for Identity in Oceania. In J. Linnekin & L. Poyer (Eds.), *Cultural Identity and Ethnicity in the Pacific*. (pp. 259-280) Honolulu: University of Hawaii.

Howard, J. (2000). Social Psychology of Identities. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 26, 367-393.

Hunkin-Tuiletufuga, G. (2001). Pasefika Languages and Pasefika Identities: Contemporary and Future Challenges. In C. Macpherson, P. Spoonley & M. Anae, (Eds.), *Tangata O Te Moana Nui: The Evolving Identities of Pacific Peoples in Aotearoa / New Zealand* (pp. 196-211). Palmerston North, NZ: Dunmore Press.

Hudson, M. (2008, October 29-31). *Negotiating Space: Creating Environments to Realise Vision Matauranga*. Poster presented at Running-Hot conference, Wellington, New Zealand.

Hudson, M., Hemi, M., Smith, L., Tiakiwai, S., Joseph, R., Barrett, A, & Dunn, M. (2008). *Te Ira: Indigenous Reference Analysis*. Unpublished paper, Te Hau Mihi Ata: Matauranga Maori, Science and Biotechnology.

Ifekwunigwe J.O. (1999). *Scattered Belongings: Cultural Paradoxes of 'Race', Nation and Gender*. London: Routledge.

Ifekwunigwe, J. O. (2001). Re-membering 'Race': On Gender, 'Mixed Race' and Family in the English, African Diaspora. In D. Parker & M. Song (Eds.), *Rethinking "Mixed Race"* (pp. 42-64). London: Pluto Press.

Irwin, G. (2008). *Pacific migrations*. Retrieved December, 28, 2009, from Te Ara - the Encyclopedia of New Zealand web site:
<http://www.TeAra.govt.nz/NewZealanders/MaoriNewZealanders/PacificMigrations/en>

Irwin, G. (2006). Voyaging and Settlement. In K. Howe (Ed.), *Vaka Moana: Voyages of the Ancestors* (pp. 54-99). Auckland, NZ: David Bateman.

Irwin, S. (2008). Data Analysis and Interpretation: Emergent Issues in Linking Qualitative and Quantitative Evidence. In: Sharlene Nagy Hesse-Biber & Patricia Leavy (Eds.), *Handbook of Emergent Methods* (pp. 415-435). New York, London: The Guilford Press.

Johnstone, B. (2008). *Discourse Analysis*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Jolly, M. (2007). Imagining Oceania: Indigenous and Foreign Representations of a Sea of Islands. *The Contemporary Pacific*, 19(2), 508-545.

- Jones, A., & Jenkins, K. (2008). Working the Indigene-Colonizer Hyphen. In N. Denzin, Y. Lincoln & L.T. Smith (Eds.), *Handbook of Critical and Indigenous Methodologies* (pp.471-486). New York: Sage.
- Kachru, B. (1995). The Alchemy of English. In B. Ashcroft, G. Griffiths, H. Tiffin (Eds.), *The Post Colonial Studies Reader* (2nd ed., pp. 291-295). London: Routledge.
- Keddell, E., (2006). Pavlova and pineapple pie: selected identity influences on Samoan-Pakeha people in Aotearoa/New Zealand. *Kōtuitui: New Zealand Journal of Social Sciences Online*, 1 45–63.
- Kaeppler, A. (1971). Rank in Tonga. *Ethnology* 10(2), 174-93.
- Kaeppler, A. (1985). Hawaiian Art and Society: traditions and transformations. In: A. Hooper & J. Huntsman (Eds.), *Transformations of Polynesian Culture* (pp. 105-132). Auckland: The Polynesian Society.
- Kaeppler, A. (1989). Art and Aesthetics. In: A. Howard & R. Borofsky (Eds.), *Developments in Polynesian Ethnography* (pp. 211-240). Hawaii: Honolulu.
- Kaeppler, A. (2002). The Structure of Tongan Barkcloth design: Imagery, Metaphor and Allusion. In A. Herle, N. Stanley, K. Stevenson & R. Welsch. (Eds.), *Pacific Art: Persistence, Change and Meaning* (pp. 291-308). Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Ka'ili, T. (1997). Ala 'I Sia, Ala 'I Kolonga: Skillful at Sia, Skillful at Kolonga: An Indigenous Tongan Proverb for Contemporary Pacific Islanders. *Moana Publication*. 1(1). Retrieved November, 14, 2008, from: http://www.tongatapu.net.to/tonga/lang/article_alaisia.html
- Ka'ili, T. (2005). Tauhi va: nurturing Tongan sociospatial ties in Maui and beyond. *The Contemporary Pacific*. 17(1), 83-115.
- Ka'ili, T. (2008). *Tauhi Va: Creating Beauty through the art of Socio-spatial Relations*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Washington, Washington, DC.
- Kavaliku, S.L. (1966). *Educational Reorganisation for National Development in Tonga*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Victoria University of Wellington, Wellington, New Zealand.

- Kelley, R. (2003, July). People In Me. *Zspace*. Retrieved August 1 2008 from: www.zmag.org/zspace/robinkelley
- Kenney, C. M. (2009). *Me aro hi te ha o hineahuone. Women, Miscarriage Stories, and Midwifery: Towards a Contextually Relevant Research Methodology*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Massey University, Palmerston North.
- Kokaua, J., Schaaf, D., Wells, J.E., & Foliaki, S.A. (2009). Twelve-month prevalence, severity, and treatment contact of mental disorders in New Zealand born and migrant Pacific participants in Te Rau Hinengaro: The New Zealand Mental Health Survey. *Pacific Health Dialog*, 15(1), 9-1.
- Koloto, A. (2003). *The Needs of Pacific Peoples when they are Victims of Crime*. Wellington: Ministry of Justice.
- Kvale, S. (2007). Dominance through interviews and dialogue. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 12(3), 480-500.
- Lapsley, H., Nikora, L.W., & Black, R. (2002). *Kia Mauri Tau!: narratives of recovery from disabling mental health problems*. Wellington, NZ: Mental Health Commission.
- Latour, B. (1999). *Pandora's Hope: Essays on the Reality of Science Studies*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Latour, B. (2005). *Reassembling the Social: An Introduction to Actor-Network-Theory*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Lavis, J., Pasada, F., Haines, A., Osei, E., (2004) Use of Research to Inform Public Policy Making. *Lancet*, 364, 1615-21.
- Lay, G. (1996). *Pacific New Zealand*. Auckland, NZ: D. Ling Pub.
- Lee, D. (1995). Writing in Colonial Space. In B. Ashcroft, G. Griffiths & H. Tiffin (Eds.), *The Post-colonial studies reader* (pp. 397-401). London: Routledge.
- Lee, H.M. (1998). Creating their own culture: diasporic Tongans. *The Contemporary Pacific*, 10(1), 1-30.
- Lee, H.M. (2003). *Tongans Overseas: Between two shores*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

- Lee, H. (2004). 'All Tongans Are Connected: Tongan Transnationalism.' In V. Lockwood (Ed.), *Globalization and Culture Change in the Pacific Islands*, (pp. 133-148). New Jersey: Pearson.
- Lee, H. (2006). 'Tonga Only Wants Our Money': The children of Tongan migrants. In Stewart Firth (Ed.), *Globalisation and governance in the Pacific Islands* (pp. 121-135). Canberra, Australia: ANU E-Press.
- Lemke, S. (2000). Berlin and Boundaries: sollen versus geschehen. *boundary 2*. 27(3), 45-78.
- Leung, A.K., Maddux, W., Galinsky, A., Chiu, C. (2008). Multicultural Experiences Enhances Creativity: The When and How. *American Psychologist*, 43(3), 169-181.
- Lilomaiva-Doktor, S. (2004). *Fa'a-samoa and Population Movement From the Inside Out: The Case of Salelologa, Savai'i*. Unpublished PhD Dissertation, University of Hawaii, Honolulu, Hawai'i.
- Lilomaiva-Doktor, S. (2009). Beyond "Migration": Samoan Population Movement (Malaga) and the Geography of Social Space (Vä). *The Contemporary Pacific*, 21(1), 1-32
- Lima, I. (2004). Tafesilafa'i: exploring Samoan alcohol use and health within the framework of fa'asamoa. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Auckland: Auckland.
- Linde, C. (1993). *Life Stories: The Creation of Coherence*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Linnekin, J. (1992). On the theory and politics of cultural construction in the Pacific. *Oceania*, 62(4), 249-63
- Loomis, T. (1990). *Pacific Migrant Labour, Class and Racism in New Zealand: Fresh off the boat*. Aldershot, England: Avebury.
- Lopez, J. (2001). Metaphors of Social Complexity. In: J. Lopez, G. Potter (Eds.), *After Postmodernism: An Introduction to Critical Realism* (pp. 86-96). London, New York: The Athlone Press.
- Lopez, M.E. (1999). *When Discourses Collide: An Ethnography of Migrant Children at Home and in School*. New York: Peter Lang.

Lorde, A. (1984). *Sister Outsider: Essays and Speeches by Audre Lorde*. New York: The Crossing Press.

Lye, J. (1998). *Some Issues in Postcolonial Theory*. Retrieved December 29, 2008, from <http://www.brocku.ca/english/courses/4F70/postcol.php>

Macpherson, C. (1984). On the Future of Samoan Ethnicity in New Zealand. In P. Spoonley, C. Macpherson, D. Pearson & C. Sedgewick (Eds.), *Tauitiwi: Racism and Ethnicity in New Zealand* (pp. 107-127). Palmerston North, NZ: Dunmore Press.

Macpherson, C. (1996). Pacific Islands identity and community. In P. Spoonley, D. Pearson and C. Macpherson (Eds.), *Nga Patai: Racism and ethnic relations in Aotearoa/New Zealand* (pp. 124-143). Palmerston North, NZ: Dunmore Press.

Macpherson, C. (1997). The Polynesia diaspora: new communities and new questions. In K. Sudo and S. Yoshida (Eds.), *Contemporary migration in Oceania: diaspora and networks* (pp. 77-100). (JCAS Symposium Series No. 3). Osaka, Japan: The Japan Center for Area Studies.

Macpherson, C. (1998, April). *Would the real Samoans please stand up? Issues in Diasporic Samoan Identity*. Paper presented at Building Blocks of National Identity: Populations in National Identity Seminar, University of Waikato, Hamilton, New Zealand.

Macpherson, C. (2001). One Trunk Sends out many Branches: Pacific Cultures and Cultural Identity. In: C. Macpherson, P. Spoonley & M. Anae, (Eds.), *Tangata O Te Moana Nui: The Evolving Identities of Pacific Peoples in Aotearoa / New Zealand* (pp. 66-80) Palmerston North, NZ: Dunmore Press.

Macpherson, C. (2002). From Moral Community to Moral Communities: the Foundations of Migrant Social Solidarity among Samoans in Aotearoa New Zealand. *Pacific Studies*, 25(1,2), 71-93.

Macpherson C. (2004a). From Pacific Islanders to Pacific People: The Past, Present and Future of the Pacific Population in Aotearoa. In: P. Spoonley, C. Macpherson & Pearson, D. (Eds.) *Tangata, Tangata: The Changing Contours of Ethnicity in Aotearoa New Zealand*. (pp. 135-156). Palmerston North, NZ: Dunmore Press.

Macpherson, C. (2004b). Tongans Overseas: Between Two Shores. (Book Review) *The Contemporary Pacific*, 16(2), 455-459.

- Macpherson, C., Bedford, R., & Spoonley, P. (2000). Fact or Fable? The Consequences of Migration for Educational Achievement and Labor Market Participation. *The Contemporary Pacific*, 12(1), 57-82.
- Macpherson, C., & Macpherson, L. (2001). Evangelical Religion Among Pacific Island Migrants: New Faiths or Brief Diversions? *Journal of Ritual Studies*, 15(2), 27-37.
- Macpherson, C. & Macpherson, L. (1999). Changing Contours of Migrant Samoan Kinship. In R. King and J. Connell, (Eds.), *Small Worlds Global Lives: Islands and Migration* (pp. 277-295). London: Cassell.
- Maielua, B.P.L. (2009). Moanaakea. In A.M. Tamaira (Ed.), *In The Space Between: Negotiating Culture, Place, and Identity in the Pacific*, Occasional Paper Series 44 (pp. 141-150). Honolulu, Hawai'i: Center for Pacific Islands Studies, School of Pacific and Asian Studies, University of Hawai'i at Mānoa.
- Mafile'o, T.A. (2005). *Tongan Metaphors of Social Work Practice: Hange ha Pa kuo Fa'u*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Massey University, Palmerston North, New Zealand.
- Mahina, O. (1992). *The Tongan Traditional History Tala-ʻi-Fonua: A Vernacular Ecology-Centred Historico-Cultural Concept*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Australian National University, Australia.
- Mahina, O. (2004a). Art as ta-va "time-space" transformation. In T. Baba, O. Mahina, N. Williams, U. Nabobo-Baba (Eds.), *Researching the Pacific and Indigenous Peoples: Issues and Perspectives* (pp. 86-93). Auckland, NZ: Centre for Pacific Studies.
- Mahina, O. (2004b). *Reed Book of Tongan Proverbs: Ko e Tohi 'a e Reed ki he Lea Tonga Heliaki*. Auckland, NZ: Reed.
- Mailei, F.D.T. (2003). E Lele A Le Toloa a e maau lava i le va. In: Peggy Fairbairn-Dunlop & Gabrielle Makisis (Eds.), *Making our Place: Growing up PI in New Zealand* (pp. 222-231). Palmerston North, NZ: Dunmore Press.
- Makasiale, C.A. (2007). Making Culture "God" is Driving our people crazy. In: P. Culbertson, M.N. Agee & C.A. Makasiale (Eds.), *Penina Uliuli: Contemporary Challenges in Mental Health for Pacific Peoples* (pp. 77-86). Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

- Mallon, S. & Pereira, P. (2002). Introduction. In S. Mallon & P. Pereira, (Eds.), *Pacific Art Niu Sila: the Pacific dimension of contemporary New Zealand's arts*, (pp. 7-21). Wellington: Te Papa Press.
- Mani, L. (1990). Multiple Mediations: Feminist Scholarship in the Age of Multinational Reception. *Feminist Review*, 35, 24-41.
- Manu'atu, L. (2000). Pedagogical possibilities for Tongan students in New Zealand secondary schooling: Tuli ke ma'u hono ngaahi malie. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Auckland: Auckland.
- Markus, H. & Hamedani, M. (2007). Sociocultural Psychology: The Dynamic Interdependence among Self Systems and Social Systems. In S. Kitiyama & D. Cohen (Eds.), *Handbook of Cultural Psychology*, (pp. 3-39). New York: Guilford Press
- Markus, H.R. & Kitiyama, S. (1991). Culture and the self: Implications for cognition, emotion, and motivation. *Psychological Review*, 98, 224-53.
- Marsden, M., & Henare, T.A. (1992). *Kaitiakitanga: a Definitive Introduction to the Holistic World View of the Maori*. Unpublished manuscript.
- Marsh, D., Schroeder, D., Dearden, K., Sternin, J., & Sternin, M. (2004). The power of positive deviance. *British Medical Journal*, 329, 1177-1179.
- Massey, D.B. (1992). Politics and Space/Time. *New Left Review*, 196, 65-84.
- Massey, D.B. (2005). *For Space*. London: Sage.
- McDougall, R. (2006). The Body as Cultural Signifier. In: B. Ashcroft, G. Griffiths, H. Tiffin (Eds.), *The Post Colonial Studies Reader* (2nd ed., pp. 298-301). London: Routledge.
- McIntosh, M. (2005). Maori Identities: Fixed, Fluid, Forced. In: J. Liu, T. McCreanor, T. McIntosh, & T. Teaiwa (Eds.), *New Zealand Identities: Departures and Destinations* (pp. 38-51). Wellington, NZ: Victoria University Press.
- McNay, L. (1991). Gender, Habitus and the Field: Pierre Bourdieu and the Limits of Reflexivity. *Theory Culture Society*, 16(1), 95-117.
- Mendieta, E. (2003). Afterword, Identities: Postcolonial and Global. In K.A. Appiah & H.L. Gates, *Identities* (pp. 407-416). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

- Meredith, P. (1998). *Hybridity in the Third Space: Rethinking Bi-cultural Politics in Aotearoa/ New Zealand*. Unpublished Paper Presented to Te Oru Rangahau Maori Research and Development Conference 7-9 July 1998 Massey University. Retrieved, December 29, from, <http://lianz.waikato.ac.nz/PAPERS/paul/hybridity.pdf>
- Mila, K. (2001). Flying foxes don't fit into pigeon holes: Working as "Pacific Island" social workers: Questions of Identity. *Social Work Review/ TuMau*, 13(3), 23-24.
- Mila, K. (2004). *Dream Fish Floating*. Wellington, NZ: Huia.
- Mila, K. (2008). *A Well Written Body*. Wellington, NZ: Huia.
- Mila-Schaaf, K. (2006). Va-centred Social Work: Possibilities for a Pacific Approach to Social Work Practice. *Social Work Review (Tu Mau II)*, 18(1), 8-13.
- Mila-Schaaf, K. (2008). *Regional Pacific Ethics of Knowledge Production Workshop Report*. Wellington, NZ: UNESCO.
- Mila-Schaaf, K., Robinson, E., Schaaf, D., Denny, S., & Watson, P. (2008). *A Health Profile of Pacific Youth: Findings of Youth2000. A National Secondary School Youth Health Survey*. Auckland, NZ: The University of Auckland.
- Mila-Schaaf, K., & Hudson, M. (2009a). *Negotiating Space for Indigenous Theorising in Pacific Mental Health and Addictions*. Auckland, NZ: Le Va Pasifika in Te Pou.
- Mila-Schaaf, K., & Hudson, M. (2009b). The interface between cultural understandings: Negotiating new spaces for Pacific mental health. *Pacific Health Dialog* 15(1), 113-119.
- Mila-Schaaf, K. (2010). Pacific Health Research Guidelines: The Cartography of an Ethical Relationship. *International Social Science Journal*, 60(195), 135-143.
- Mila-Schaaf, K. & Robinson, E. (2010). 'Polycultural' capital and educational achievement among NZ-born Pacific peoples. *Mai Review*, (Pacific Research in Education, New Directions) 1, 1-18
- Miles, R. (1984). Summoned by Capital. In: P. Spoonley, C. Macpherson, D. Pearson, & C. Sedgewick (Eds.), *Tauiwai: Racism and Ethnicity in New Zealand* (pp. 223-243). Palmerston North, NZ: Dunmore Press.

Miles, R. (1989). *Racism*. London: Routledge.

Ministry of Education. (2007). *Pasifika Peoples: A note on terminology*. Hand-out at Pasifika Education Research Symposium: 2 November 2007, Wellington.

Ministry of Health. (1997). *Making a Pacific Difference: Strategic initiatives for the Health of Pacific Peoples*. Wellington, NZ: Author.

Ministry of Health. (1999). *Taking the Pulse: The 1996/1997 New Zealand Health Survey*. Wellington, NZ: Author.

Ministry of Health. (2002) *Youth Health: A Guide to Action*. Wellington, New Zealand: Author.

Ministry of Health, (2004). *Tupu Ola Moui: Pacific Health Chart Book*. Wellington, New Zealand: Author.

Ministry of Health. (2005). *Te Orau Ora: Pacific Mental Health Profile*. Wellington, New Zealand: Author.

Ministry of Health. (2006). *Te Kokiri: The Mental Health and Addiction Action Plan*. Wellington, NZ: Author

Ministry of Health. (2008a). *Pacific Peoples and Mental Health: A paper for the Pacific Health and Disability Action Plan Review*. Wellington, NZ: Author.

Ministry of Health, (2008b). *Pacific Youth Health: A Paper for the Pacific Health and Disability Action Plan Review*. Wellington, NZ: Author.

Ministry of Pacific Island Affairs, (1999). *Pacific Directions report*. Wellington, NZ: Author.

Ministry of Pacific Island Affairs (2003). *Ala Fou: New Pathways: Strategic directions for Pacific Youth in New Zealand*. Wellington, NZ: Author.

Ministry of Pacific Island Affairs. (2006). [Pacific analysis framework 2006 with Pacific consultation guidelines: analysing public policy through Pacific lenses](#). Wellington, NZ: Author.

Ministry of Social Development, (2005). *Pacific Youth Development Strategy: Deliver positive life-change and affirmation for all Pacific youth in Auckland*. Auckland, NZ: Author.

Ministry of Youth Development, (2002). *Youth Development Strategy Aotearoa: Action for Child and Youth Development*. Wellington, NZ: Author.

Mitias, M., & Al-Jasmi, A. (2004) Intercultural Dialogue. *Dialogue and Universalism* 3(4), 143-161.

Mohanty, S. P. (2003). The Epistemic Status of Cultural Identity. In L.M. Alcoff & E. Mendieta (Eds.), *Identities: Race, Class, Gender, and Nationality* (pp. 392-406). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Mok, T. (2000). *In the Name of the Pacific: theorising Pan-Pacific identities in New Zealand*. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Auckland, Auckland, New Zealand.

Morgan, D., Fellows, C, & Guevara, H. (2008). Emergent Approaches to Focus Group Research. In: S. N. Hesse-Biber & P. Leavy (Eds.), *Handbook of Emergent Methods* (pp 189- 205). New York, London: The Guilford Press.

Morrison, S. & Vaiioleti, T. (2008). *Ko te Tangata: An analysis of key government policy documents and strategies to identify trends that will influence Māori and Pacific progress within the Adult and Community Education (ACE) sector and professional development (PD) opportunities within ACE*. Retrieved March 15, 2009, from Tertiary Education Commission Web Site:

<http://www.tec.govt.nz/upload/downloads/ace-pd-ko-te-tangata.pdf>

Nabobo-Baba, U. (2006). *Knowing and Learning: An Indigenous Fijian Approach*. Fiji: Institute of Pacific Studies, University of the South Pacific.

National Health Committee, (1998). *The Social, Cultural and Economic Determinants of Health in New Zealand: Action to Improve Health*. Wellington, NZ: Author.

Neitch, R. (1983). The Veil of Orthodoxy. In: S. Mead & B. Kernot (Eds.), *Art and Artists of Oceania*. (pp245-265). Palmerston North, NZ: Dunmore Press.

Neylan, J. (2008). Social Policy and the Authority of Evidence. *The Australian Journal of Public Administration* 67(1), 12-19.

Nicole, R. (1999). Resisting Orientalism: Pacific Literature in French. In: V. Hereniko & R. Wilson (Eds.), *Inside Out: Literature, Cultural Politics, and Identity in the New Pacific*. (pp. 265-290). Maryland & Oxford: Rowman and Littlefield.

- Noble, G. (2007). Respect and Respectability amongst Second-Generation Arab and Muslim Australian Men. *Journal of Intercultural Studies*, 28 (3), 331-344.
- Noble, G., Poynting, S. & Tabar, P. (1999). 'Youth, Ethnicity and the Mapping of Identities: Strategic Essentialism and Strategic Hybridity among Male Arabic-speaking Youth in South-western Sydney'. *Communal/Plural* 7(1) 29-44.
- Nosa, V.H. (2005). The perceptions and use of alcohol among Niuean men living in Auckland. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Auckland.
- Okere, T., Njoku, C., Devish, R. (2005). All Knowledge is First of all Local Knowledge: An Introduction. *Africa Development*, XXX(3), 1-19.
- Ongley, P. (1996). Immigration, employment and ethnic relations. In P. Spoonley, C. Macpherson and D. Pearson (Eds.), *Nga Patai: Racism and Ethnic Relations in Aotearoa/New Zealand* (pp. 17-36). Palmerston North, New Zealand: Dunmore Press.
- Ongley, P. (2004). Ethnicity, Migration and the Labour Market. In P. Spoonley, C. Macpherson and D. Pearson (Eds.), *Tangata Tangata: The Changing Ethnic Contours of New Zealand* (pp. 199-220). Southbank Victoria: Thomson /Dunmore Press.
- Onwuegbuzie, A.J., & Teddlie, C. (2003). A Framework for Analyzing Data in Mixed Methods Research (pp. 351-384). In A. Tashakkori & C. Teddlie (Eds.), *Handbook of Mixed Methods in Social and Behavioural Research* (pp. 351-384). Sage: Thousand Oaks, London, New Delhi.
- Orange, C. (1987) *The Treaty of Waitangi*. Wellington, NZ: Allen & Unwin & Port Nicholson Press.
- Organista, P.B., Organista K., & Kurasaki, K. (2002). The relationship between acculturation and ethnic minority mental health. In K. Chum, P. Balls Organista and G. Marin. (Eds.), *Acculturation: Advances in Theory, Measurement and Applied Research* (pp. 17-38). Washington DC: American Psychological Association.
- Orr, M. (2003). *Intertextuality: Debates and Contexts*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Ortega, A., Rosenheck, R., Alegria, M., & Desai, R. (2000). Acculturation and the lifetime risk of psychiatric and substance use disorders among Hispanics. *Journal of Nervous Mental Disorders* 188, 728-735.

- Osorio, J.K. (2001). "What Kine Hawaiian Are You?" A Mo'olelo about Nationhood, Race, History, and the Contemporary Sovereignty Movement in Hawai'i. *The Contemporary Pacific*, 13(2) 359-379.
- Oxman, A., Lavis, J., & Fretheim, A. (2007). Use of Evidence in WHO Recommendations. *Lancet*, 369, 1883-89.
- Papastergiadis, N. (1997). Tracing Hybridity in Theory. In P. Werbner & T. Modood (Eds.), *Debating Cultural Hybridity: Multi-Cultural Identities and the Politics of Anti-Racism* (pp. 257-281). London: Zed Books.
- Park, R.E. (1928). Human Migration and the Marginal Man. *American Journal of Sociology* 33, 881-893.
- Parker, J. (2001). Social Movements and Science: The question of plural knowledge systems. In: J. Lopez, G. Potter (Eds.), *After Postmodernism: An Introduction to Critical Realism*, (pp. 251-259). London, New York: The Athlone Press.
- Paterson, J., Feehan, M., Butler, S., Williams, M., Cowley-Malcolm, E. (2007) Intimate partner violence within a cohort of Pacific mothers living in New Zealand. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 22, 698-721.
- Perlmann, J., & Waldinger, R. (1996). Second Generation Decline? Children of Immigrants, Past and Present - A reconsideration. *International Migration Review*, 31(4), 893-922.
- Phibbs, S. (2008). Four dimensions of narrativity: Towards a narrative analysis of gender identity that is simultaneously personal, local and global. *New Zealand Sociology*, 23(2), 47-20.
- Phinney, J., Devich-Navarro, M. (1997). Variations in Bicultural Identification Among African American and Mexican American Adolescents. *Journal of Research on Adolescence* 7(1), 3-32.
- Phinney, J., Berry, J.W., Sam, D., & Vedder, P. (2006). Understanding Immigrant Youth: Conclusions and Implications. In J.W. Berry, J. Phinney, D. Sam & P. Vedder (Eds.), *Immigrant Youth in Cultural Transition: Acculturation, Identity, and Adaptation Across National Contexts*(pp. 211-234). New Jersey: Mahwah.

Plummer, K. (1995). *Telling Sexual Stories: Power, Change and Social Worlds*. London, New York: Routledge.

Pieterse, J.N. (2007). Hybridity, So What?: The Anti-Hybridity Backlash and the Riddles of Recognition. *Theory, Culture, Society*, 18(2-3), 219-243.

Polamalu, T. (2009). Diasporic Deam: Letter to Grandfather. In: A.M. Tamaira (Ed.), *In The Space Between: Negotiating Culture, Place, and Identity in the Pacific*, Occasional Paper Series 44 (pp. 62-63). Honolulu, Hawai'i: Center for Pacific Islands Studies, School of Pacific and Asian Studies, University of Hawai'i at Mānoa.

Poltorak, M. (2007). Nemesis, Speaking, and Tauhi Vaha'a: Interdisciplinarity and the Truth of "Mental Illness" in Vava'u, Tonga. *The Contemporary Pacific* 19(1), 1-35.

Poignant, R. (1967). *Oceanic Mythology*. London: Paul Hamlyn.

Portes, A., Rumbaut R.G. (2001). *Legacies: The Story of the Immigrant Second Generation*. Berkley: University of California Press.

Portes, A., & Zhou, M. (1993). The new second generation: segmented assimilation and its variants. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences*, 530, 74-96.

Potter, J., & Wetherell, M. (1987). *Discourse and Social Psychology: Beyond Attitudes and Behaviour*. London: Sage.

Poutasi, C. M. (1999). *How does the ability/inability to speak the Samoan language impact upon New Zealand raised Samoan women and their identity as a Samoan?* Unpublished manuscript.

Redfield R., Linton R., & Herskovits M.T. (1936). Memorandum for the Study of Acculturation. *American Anthropologist* 38, 149-152.

Refiti, A. (2010) Reanimation, upgrades, and ancestors in the work of Rosanna Raymond. Retrieved June 20, 2010, from Borderzones.ca : The Ideas Behind the Exhibit web site:

http://www.borderzones.ca/features_rr.html

Refiti, A. (2002). Making Space: Polynesian Architecture in Aotearoa/ New Zealand. In S. Mallon and F.F. Pereira (Eds.), *Pacific Art Niu Sila: The Pacific Dimension of Contemporary New Zealand Art* (pp. 209-225). Wellington, New Zealand: Te Papa Press.

- Reynolds, T. (2010). Editorial introduction: young people, social capital and ethnic identity. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 33(5), 749-760.
- Rilke, R.M. (1984). *Letters to a Young Poet*. (trans. Stephen Mitchell). New York: Random House.
- Rocco, T., Bliss, L., Gallagher, S., Perez-Prado, A., Alacaci, C., Dwyere, E., Fine, J. & Pappamihel, N.E. (2003). The Pragmatic and Dialectical Lenses: Two Views of Mixed Methods Use in Education. In A. Tashakkori & C. Teddlie (Eds.), *Handbook of Mixed Methods in Social and Behavioural Research* (pp. 595-615). Thousand Oaks, London, New Dehli: Sage.
- Romero, A. & Roberts, R. (2003). Stress within a Bicultural Context for Adolescents of Mexican Descent. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology* 9(2), 171-184.
- Rudman, F. (2008a). Book Review: Immigrant Youth in Cultural Transition: Acculturation, Identity, and Adaptation Across National Contexts. *Journal of Cross Cultural Psychology* 39(2), 230-233.
- Rudman, F. (2008b). ICSEY Data Deserve New Analysis: Reply to Berry, Phinney, Sam, and Vedder. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 39(4), 521.
- Rumbaut, R. (1997). Assimilation and Its Discontents: Between Rhetoric and Reality. *International Migration Review*, 31(4), 923-960.
- Rushdie, S. (2006). Imaginary Homelands. In B. Ashcroft, G. Griffiths, H. Tiffin, (Eds.), *The Post Colonial Studies Reader* (2nd ed., pp. 428-434). London: Routledge.
- Sahlins, M. (1958) *Social Stratification in Polynesia*. Seattle: University of Washington Press.
- Sahlins, M. (1985). Hierarchy and Humanity in Polynesia. In A. Hooper & J. Huntsman (Eds.), *Transformations of Polynesian Culture* (pp. 195-219). Auckland, NZ: The Polynesian Society.
- Sahlins, M. (2000). *Culture in Practice: Selected Essays*. New York: Zone Books.
- Sahlins, M. (2008). Historical Metaphors and Mythical Realities. In S. Seidman & J.C. Alexander (Eds.), *The New Social Theory Reader* (2nd ed., pp. 51- 59). London and New York: Routledge.

- Siataga, P. (2010). *I Am: A guide for nurturing hope, resilience, happiness, Pasifika style*. Auckland: Le Va, Pasifika within Te Pou.
- Sinavaiana-Gabbard, C. (2001). Modeling Community: A Response to "The Oceanic Imaginary" *The Contermprorary Pacific*. 13(1), 169-177.
- Somers, M. (1994). The narrative constitution of identity: A relational and network approach. *Theory and Society*, 23, 605-649.
- Southwick, M. (2001). *Pacific Women's Stories of Becoming a Nurse in New Zealand: A Radical Hermeneutic Reconstruction of Marginality*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Victoria University of Wellington: Wellington, New Zealand.
- Said, E. (1978). *Orientalism*. London: Penguin.
- Said, Edward. (2001). *Power, Politics and Culture: Interviews with Edward W. Said*. Edited and with an Introduction by Gauri Viswanathan. New York: Pantheon Books
- Samu, K.S. (2003). *Social correlates of suicide among Samoan youth*. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Auckland, Auckland, New Zealand.
- Samu, T. Wendt. (2007). Revisiting the 'Pasifika Way' for a new School of Pasifika Education. In K. Teaiwa (Ed.), *Indigenous Encounters*, Center for Pacific Islands Studies Occasional Paper Series, University of Hawaii-Manoa.
- Scott, M. (1990). Whitewash: The Acceptable Image in Television Advertising. In P. Spoonley & W. Hirsch (Eds.), *Between the Lines, Racism and the New Zealand Media* (pp. 84-89). Palmerston North, NZ: Dunmore Press.
- Secretariat of the Pacific Community, (2006). *Pacific Youth Strategy 2010: Youth Empowerment for a secure, prosperous and sustainable future*. Oceania: Author.
- Segall, M., Lonner, W.J., & Berry, J.W. (1998). Cross-cultural psychology as a scholarly discipline: On the flowering of culture in behavioural research. *American Psychologist*, 53, 1101-1110.
- Sewell, W. H. (2005a). A theory of structure: Duality, agency and transformation. In G.M. Spiegel, (Ed.), *Practicing History: New Directions in Historical Writing after the Linguistic Turn*. (pp. 143-165) New York: Routledge.

- Sewell, W. H. (2005b). The Concept(s) of Culture. In G.M. Spiegel, (Ed.), *Practicing History: New Directions in Historical Writing after the Linguistic Turn*. (pp. 76-96) New York: Routledge.
- Skrbis, Z., Baldassar, L., & Poynting, S. (2007). Introduction: Negotiating Belonging: Migrations and Generations. *Journal of Intercultural Studies*, 28(3), 261-269.
- Small, C. (1997). *Voyages from Tongan villages to American suburbs*. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press.
- Smart, J. & Smart, D. (1995). Acculturative Stress of Hispanics: Loss and Change. *Journal of Counselling and Development*, 73, 390-396.
- Smith, L.T. (1999). *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*. London: Zed Books.
- Smith, L.T., Hudson, M., Hemi, M., Tiakiwai, S., Joseph, R., Barrett, A., & Dunn, M. (2008). *The Negotiated Space*. Unpublished paper Te Hau Mihi Ata: Mātauranga Māori, Science and Biotechnology.
- Spickard, P. & Burroughs, W.J. (2000). We are a People. In P. Spickard & W.J. Burroughs (Eds.), *We are a People: Narrative and Multiplicity in Constructing Ethnic Identity* (pp. 1-22). Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Song, M. (2003). *Choosing Ethnic Identity*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Spencer, S. (2006). *Race and Ethnicity: Culture, Identity and Representation*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Spivak, G. (1988). Subaltern Studies: Deconstructing Historiography. In: R. Guha and G. C. Spivak (Eds.), *Selected Subaltern Studies* (pp. 3-32). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Spivak, G. (1990). *Post-colonial Critic*. London: Routledge.
- Spoonley, P. (2001). Transnational Pacific Communities: Transforming the Politics of Place and Identity. In C. Macpherson, P. Spoonley & M. Anae, (Eds.), *Tangata O Te Moana Nui: The Evolving Identities of Pacific Peoples in Aotearoa / New Zealand* (pp. 81-96) Palmerston North, NZ: Dunmore Press.

- Spoonley, P. (1996). Mahi Awatea? The Racialisation of Work in Aotearoa New Zealand. In P. Spoonley, D. Pearson & C. Macpherson (Eds.), *Nga Patai: Racism and Ethnic Relations In Aotearoa/New Zealand*, (pp. 35-77). Palmerston North, NZ: Dunmore Press.
- Spoonley, P., & Fleras, A. (1999). *Reclaiming Aotearoa: Indigenous Politics and Ethnic Relations in New Zealand*. Auckland: Oxford University Press.
- Spoonley, P., & Hirsch, W. (1990). *Between the Lines, Racism and the New Zealand Media*. Palmerston North, New Zealand: Dunmore Press.
- Statistics New Zealand, (2002). *Pacific Progress: A Report on the Economic Status of Pacific peoples*. Wellington, New Zealand: Author.
- Statistics New Zealand, (2007). QuickStats about Maori. Retrieved June 6, 2010, from Statistics New Zealand web site:
- <http://www.stats.govt.nz/Census/2006CensusHomePage/QuickStats/quickstats-about-a-subject/maori.aspx>
- Statistics New Zealand, (2008). *QuickStats about Pacific Peoples*. Retrieved December 15, 2008, from Statistics New Zealand web site:
- <http://www.stats.govt.nz/NR/rdonlyres/45BED0E7-E709-4DCE-9B01-0C715EC050AE/0/quickstatsaboutpacificpeoples.pdf>
- Steinberg, S. (2000). The cultural fallacy in studies of racial and ethnic mobility. In H. Vermeulan & J. Perlmann (Eds.), *Immigrants, Schooling and Social Mobility: Does Culture Make a Difference?* (pp 61-71). Houndmills: MacMillan Press
- Stevenson, K. (2008). *The frangipani is dead: contemporary Pacific art in New Zealand, 1985-2000*. Wellington, New Zealand: Huia.
- Stevenson, K. (2004). Re-fashioning the label: Reconstructing the Cliché: a Decade of Contemporary Pacific Art 1990-2000. In *Paradise Now? Contemporary Art from the Pacific* (pp. 20-33). New York: Asia Society.
- Sua'alí'i-Sauni, T. (2006). *Le Matuamoepo: competing 'spirits of governing' and the management of New Zealand-based Samoan youth offender cases*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Auckland: Auckland.

- Suarez-Orozco, M. (2001). Everything you wanted to know about assimilation but were afraid to ask. In R. Schweder, M. Minow, & H. Markus (Eds.), *The free exercise of culture* (pp.1-30). New York: Russell Sage.
- Subramani, (2001). The Oceanic Imaginary. *The Contemporary Pacific*, 13(1), 149-162.
- Subramani, (2003). *Emerging Epistemologies*. Unpublished Paper Presented to South Pacific Literatures, Emerging Literatures, Local Interest and Global Significant, Theory, Politics, Society. 20-24 October 2003, Noumea, New Caledonia.
- Swinburn, B., I. Caterson, et al. (2003). Diet, nutrition and the prevention of excess weight gain and obesity. *Public Health Nutrition* 7(1A): 123-146.
- Tadmor, C.T., Tetlock, P.E., & Peng, K. (2009). Acculturation Strategies and Integrative Complexity: The Cognitive Implications of Biculturalism. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 40(1), 105-139.
- Tamaira, A.M. (2009). Preface. In A.M. Tamaira (Ed.), *In The Space Between: Negotiating Culture, Place, and Identity in the Pacific*, Occasional Paper Series 44 (pp. 1-4). Honolulu, Hawai'i: Center for Pacific Islands Studies, School of Pacific and Asian Studies, University of Hawai'i at Mānoa.
- Tamasese K., Peteru C., & Waldegrave C. (1997). *Ole Taea Afua - a qualitative investigation into Samoan perspectives on mental health and culturally appropriate services*. Unpublished manuscript.
- Tashakkori, A., & Teddlie, C., (1998). *Mixed Methodology: Combining qualitative and quantitative approaches*: Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Tashakkori, A., & Teddlie, C., (2003). The Past and Future of Mixed Methods Research: From Data Triangulation to Mixed Model Designs. In A. Tashakkori & C. Teddlie (Eds.), *Handbook of Mixed Methods in Social and Behavioural Research*. (pp. 671-702) Thousand Oaks, London, New Delhi: Sage.
- Taouma, L. (2002). Getting Jiggy With It: The Evolving of Pasifika Dance in New Zealand. In S. Mallon and P. F. Pereira (Eds.), *Pacific Art Niu Sila: The Pacific Dimension of Contemporary New Zealand Art* (pp. 133-146). Te Papa Press: Wellington.

- Tau'akipulu, L.B.J. (2000). *Individualism and community : a case study of Tongan identity in Aotearoa New Zealand and its social and political implications*. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Auckland, Auckland, New Zealand.
- Taufe'ulungaki, A. (2004, Dec 1-2). "Fonua": Reclaiming Pacific Communities in Aotearoa. Paper presented at LotuMoui Pacific Health Symposium. Auckland: Counties Manukau District Health Board.
- Teaiwa, T. (2001). L(o)osing the Edge. *The Contemporary Pacific* 13 (2), 343-357.
- Teaiwa, T.K. (2006). On analogies: Rethinking the Pacific in a Global Context. *The Contemporary Pacific*, 18(1), 71-88.
- Teaiwa, T.K. & Mallon, S. (2005). Ambivalent Kinships? Pacific People in New Zealand. In J. Liu, T. McCreanor, T. McIntosh, & T. Teaiwa (Eds.), *New Zealand Identities: Departures and Destinations* (pp. 207-229). Wellington, NZ: Victoria University Press.
- Teddlie, C. & Tashakkori, A. (2003). Major Issues and Controversies in the Use of Mixed Methods in the Social and Behavioural Sciences. In A. Tashakkori & C. Teddlie (Eds.), *Handbook of Mixed Methods in Social and Behavioural Research* (pp. 3-50). Thousand Oaks, London, New Delhi: Sage.
- Teddlie, C., Tashakkori, A., & Johnson, B. (2008). Emergent Techniques in the Gathering and Analysis of Mixed Methods Data. In S. Nagy Hesse-Biber & P. Leavy (Eds.), *Handbook of Emergent Methods* (pp. 389-413). New York, London: The Guilford Press.
- Thaman, K.H. (2002). Re-presenting and re-searching Oceania: a suggestion for synthesis. *Pacificentric Health Research Methods*, Anthology Series No. 1, Fiji: Pacific Health Research Council.
- Thaman, K.H. (2003). Decolonizing Pacific Studies: Indigenous Perspectives, Knowledge, and Wisdom in Higher Education. *The Contemporary Pacific*. 15(1), 1-17.
- Thaman, K. H. (2004). Tauhi V□ ha'a: A Possible Foundation for Peace and Inter-Cultural Understanding. *Intercultural Education* (Summer) 32-36.
- Tiatia, J. (1998). *Caught Between Cultures: a New Zealand-born Pacific Island perspective*. Auckland: Christian Research Association.

- Tiatia, J. (2003). *Reasons to live: N.Z. born Samoan young people's responses to suicidal behaviours*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Auckland: Auckland.
- Ting-Toomey, S. (1988). Intercultural conflict styles: A face-negotiation theory. In Y. Kim & W. Gudykunst (Eds.), *Theories in intercultural communication* (pp. 213-235). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Tonga, N. (2007). *The shock of the Niu: generational perspectives on migration in the work of Andy Leleisi'uao*. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Auckland, Auckland, New Zealand.
- Triandis, H. (1995). *Individualism and collectivism*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Trimble, J.E. (1995). Toward an understanding of ethnicity and ethnic identity, and their relationship with drug use research. In: Botvin GJ, Schinke S & Orlandi MA, Eds. *Drug Abuse Prevention with Multiethnic Youth*. California: Thousand Oaks, Sage.
- Trlin, A. D. (1987). New Zealand's admission of Asians and Pacific Islanders. In J. T. Fawcett & B. V. Carino (Eds.), *Pacific bridges: The new migration from Asia and the Pacific Islands* (pp. 199-227). New York: Center for Migration Studies.
- Trouillot, M.R. (2002). The Otherwise Modern: Caribbean Lessons from the Savage Slot. In B. Knaft (Ed.), *Critically Modern: Alternate, Alterities, Anthropologies* (pp. 220-240). Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Tui Atua Tupua Tamasese Efi. (2002, September 23). *In Search of Meaning and Nuance and Metaphor in Cultural Competencies*. A paper presented at the Waitemata District Health Board Pacific Mental Health Competency Training Programme, Auckland.
- Tui Atua Tupua Tamasese Efi. (2007, Nov 13-15). Keynote Address: Bio-Ethics and the Samoan Indigenous Reference. In K. Mila-Schaaf (2008), *Workshop Report. Regional Pacific Ethics of Knowledge Production Workshop* (pp. 79-89). Wellington, New Zealand: UNESCO.
- Tupuola, A. (1998). *'Adolescence': myth or reality for 'Samoan' women? : Beyond the stage-like toward shifting boundaries and identities*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Auckland; Auckland, New Zealand.
- Tupuola, A. (2004a) Editorial: Cultural ways of knowing within global contexts. *Journal of Intercultural Studies*, 25, (1) 3-6.

- Tupuola, A. (2004b). Pasifika edgewalkers: complicating the achieved identity status in youth research. *Journal of Intercultural Studies*, 25, (1) 87-100.
- Underhill-Sem, Y. (2003). Marked Bodies in Marginalised Places: Understanding Rationalities in Global Discourses. *development*, 46(2); 13-17.
- Underhill-Sem, Y. (2005). Bodies in Places, Places in Bodies. In W. Harcourt & A. Escobar (Eds.), *Women and the Politics of Place* (pp. 20-31). Bloomfield, CT: Kumarian Press.
- Ungar, M. (2006). Nurturing hidden resilience in at-risk youth across cultures. *Journal of the Canadian Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*, 15(2), 53-58.
- Ungar, M. (2008). Resilience across cultures. *British Journal of Social Work*, 38(2), 218-235.
- Va'a, L.F. (2001). *Saili Matagi: Samoan Migrants in Australia*. Fiji: Institute of Pacific Studies and National University of Samoa.
- Va'ai, S. (1999). *Literary Representations in Western Polynesia: Colonialism and Indigeneity*. Samoa: National University of Samoa.
- Vargas Reighley, R.V. (2005). *Bi-cultural competence and Academic Resilience Among Immigrants*. LFB Scholarly Series, New York: LFB.
- Vaoiva, R. (1999). New Zealand born Pacific Island youth: identity, place and Americanisation. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Auckland, Auckland, New Zealand.
- Vega, W., Kolody, B., Aguilar-Gaxiola, S., Alderete, E., Catalano, R., & Caraveo Anduaga J. (1998). Lifetime prevalence of DSM-III-R psychiatric disorders among urban and rural Mexican-Americans in California. *Archive of General Psychiatry* 5, 771-778.
- Vertovec, S. (2001). Transnationalism and identity. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 27(4) 573-582.
- Vertovec, S. (2007). Introduction: New directions in the anthropology of migration and multiculturalism. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 30(6), 961-978.

- Wacquant, L. (1992). Towards a Social Praxeology: The Structure and Logic of Bourdieu's Sociology. In: P. Bourdieu & L. Wacquant (Eds.) *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology* (pp. 1-47). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Wacquant, L. (2008). Pierre Bourdieu. In R. Stones (Ed.), *Key Sociological Thinkers* (2nd ed., pp. 261-277). Houndmills, Basingstoke Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Waldinger, R., Lim, N., & Cort, D. (2007). Bad Jobs, Good Jobs, No Jobs? The Employment Experience of the Mexican American Second Generation. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 33(1), 1- 35.
- Waldram, J. (2004). *Revenge of the Windigo: The construction of the mind and mental health of North American Aboriginal Peoples*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Walker L., Merry S., Watson P. D., Robinson E., Crengle S. and Schaaf D. (2005). The Reynolds Adolescent Depression Scale in New Zealand Adolescents. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Psychiatry*, 39, 136-140.
- Ward, C., Bochner, S., & Furnham, A. (2001). *The Psychology of Culture Shock*. East Sussex: Routledge.
- Waters, M., Tran, V., Kasinitz, P., & Mollenkopf, J. (2010). Segmented assimilation revisited: types of acculturation and socioeconomic mobility in young adulthood. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 33(7), 1168-1193.
- Webb-Binder, B. (2009). Pacific Identity through Space and Time in Lily Laita's Va I Ta. In: A.M. Tamaira (Ed.), *In The Space Between: Negotiating Culture, Place, and Identity in the Pacific*, Occasional Paper Series 44 (pp. 25-36). Honolulu, Hawai'i: Center for Pacific Islands Studies, School of Pacific and Asian Studies, University of Hawai'i at Mānoa.
- Webber, M. (2008). *Walking the Space Between :Identity and Maori/Pakeha*. Wellington: New Zealand Council for Educational Research.
- Weeks, J. (1990). The Value of Difference. In J. Rutherford (Ed.), *Identity, Community, Culture, Difference* (pp. 88-100). London: Lawrence and Wishart.
- Wendt, A. (1983). Contemporary Arts in Oceania: Trying to Stay Alive in Paradise as an Artist. In S. Mead & B. Kernot (Eds.), *Art and Artists of Oceania*. (pp. 198-209). Palmerston North, NZ: Dunmore Press.

- Wendt, A. (1991). Pacific Maps and Fiction(s): A Personal Journey. In: E. Thumbo (Ed.), *Perceiving Other Worlds*, (pp. 179-210). Singapore: Times Academic Press.
- Wendt, A. (1999). Afterword : Tatauing the Post-Colonial Body. In V. Hereniko & R. Wilson (Eds.), *Inside Out: Literature, Cultural Politics, and Identity in the New Pacific* (pp. 399-412). Maryland: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Wendt, A. (2010). *ArtSpeak Pasifika*. Unpublished Paper Presented to ArtSpeak Pasifika Forum, 25-26 June 2010, Auckland Town Hall, Auckland.
- Werbner, P. (2004) Theorising Complex Diasporas: Purity and Hybridity in the South Asian Public Sphere. *Britain Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 30(5), 895-911.
- Wessendorf, S. (2007). Sushi-Eating Secondos and Casual Latins: Political Movements and the Emergence of a Latino Counter-culture among Second-Generation Italians in Switzerland. *Journal of Intercultural Studies*, 28(3), 345-360
- Whimp, G. (2009). Working in the Space Between: Pacific Artists in Aotearoa / New Zealand. In A.M. Tamaira (Ed.), *In The Space Between: Negotiating Culture, Place, and Identity in the Pacific*, Occasional Paper Series 44 (pp. 9-24). Honolulu, Hawai'i: Center for Pacific Islands Studies, School of Pacific and Asian Studies, University of Hawai'i at Mānoa.
- Williams, L., Labonte, R., & O'Brien, M. (2003). Empowering social action through narratives of identity and culture. *Health Promotion International* 18(1), 33-40.
- Winduo, S. (2000). Unwriting Oceania: The Repositioning of Pacific Writer Scholars Within a Folk Narrative Space, *New Literary History*, 31(3), 599-613.
- Wood, S. (2003). Cultural Studies for Oceania. *The Contemporary Pacific*, 15(2), 340-374.
- Wood-Ellem, E. (1999). Queen Sālote of Tonga: the story of an era, 1900-1965. Auckland, NZ: Auckland University Press.
- Wolfgramm, P. (2007). What about Zebras who climb trees? *SPACIFIK Magazine* May/June 2007, 20, 12.
- Young, R. (1995). *Colonial desire: hybridity in theory, culture, and race*. London; New York: Routledge.

Zhou, M. (1997). Segmented Assimilation: Issues, Controversies, and Recent Research on the New Second Generation. *International Migration Review*, 31(4), 975-1008.

Zuckerman, P. (2004). *The Social Theory of W.E.B. Du Bois*. Thousand Oaks CA: Pine Forge Sage.

Glossary

Note: This is a list of Pacific words used in the thesis. The translations are the author's own except where an expert definition is cited. The glossary is not intended to be definitive but a reference to assist the reader in the context of this thesis.

Aiga - family - see detailed definition of kainga (Samoa)

Ala 'I Sia, Ala 'I Kolonga - Tongan proverb "skilled on the mound; skilled in the hut" (Māhina, 2004, p 177)

Anga-fakatonga- a Tongan way of doing something (Tonga)

Ariki - chief (Cook Islands)

'Eiki (hou'eiki) -chief (Tonga)

Fa'alavelave - obligation, donation or gift usually to family, church (Samoa)

Fa'aSamoa - Samoan cultural way of doing things (Samoa)

Fahu - the brother/sister (fahu) ranking principle (which places sister higher than brother). An elder sister or those descended from an elder sister are referred to as 'fahu' to acknowledge their rank.

Faifeau - Church Minister, Priest or Reverend (Samoa)

Faka'apa'apa - respect (also delineates the proper behaviour in particular relational contexts) (Tonga)

Fakatonga - Tongan cultural way of doing things (Tonga)

Fatongia - specific duties and obligations i.e., to pay certain quantities of produce to his chief, distinguished from kavenga which is voluntary as opposed to enforced or expected. (Tonga)

Fie-Palagi - term used to criticise someone emulating or imitating European people or ways of doing things (wanting to be 'white') (Samoa)

Fie-Palangi - term used to criticise someone emulating or imitating European people or ways of doing things (wanting to be 'white') (Tonga)

Fie poto – Tongan word used to criticise someone trying to be more knowledgeable than they really are (wanting to be smart, clever)

Fonua – directly translates as land but encompasses a philosophical approach to life which recognises “inter-woven interdependent and reciprocal relationships. The concept of ‘fonua’, ‘vanua’ and ‘whenua’ sums up these relationships.” (Taufe’ulungaki, 2004, p. 6) (see vanua) (Tonga)

Kainga – family, Kavaliku described the kainga as a “loose and amorphous group” with whom one can “trace cognatic kinship” (1966, p. 70). He writes:

“In practice the group or category is limited to those with whom one retains some sort of contact, which depends on considerations as the closeness of the relationships, residence, economic interest and rank... People within this group borrow from one another freely; they take food from one another’s farms; they make copra from one another’s coconuts; and they appeal when necessary for financial help from one another. Each member has rights and duties to each and every other member of his kainga. When help is needed by a member of the kainga, the spatially and geographically close members of the kainga come to help without being asked. On important occasions, members from all over Tonga are present to help. In many ways, the kainga serves as a social security system within Tongan society. As long as a person has a kainga he is sure to be able to get food, clothing and a place to sleep no matter how poor he may be” (Kavaliku, 1966, p. 70). (Tonga)

Kakala – garland made of flowers (Tonga). This is also used as a metaphor for research (see Konai Helu-Thaman, 2003).

Kato ‘ilo – basket of knowledge (Tonga)

Kau'a - social boundaries (Tonga)

Kava circle (kava bowls) – a social occasion where men come together, sit with one another in a circle around a kava bowl and drink kava together (can be extremely formal and ritualistic or informal) (Tonga)

Kavenga – voluntary donations, gifts, obligations (“the labour that commoners do for their chiefs out of love, not because they are forced as was the case with fatongia” Wood-Ellem, 1999, p. 99).

Kete – basket, bag, container (Cook Islands)

Kohanga Reo - Early childhood centres of learning where the philosophy and practice reflect Māori cultural values and Maori language and knowledge are central (Maori).

Kole - “Requesting things from relatives, neighbours or anyone who has what one needs – is a social custom. It is based not on the ethic of economic exchange but on the social principle of generalised reciprocity” (Helu, 1999, p. 167).

Kupesi - patterns; Ka’ili (2008) writes that, “In the fine art of ngatu (tapa) making, geometrical patterns are called kupesi, and in the performing of tauhi vā, beautiful social patterns are known as sūpinga or kupesi” (p. 47).

Kupesi fo’ou – new patterns, see above (Tonga)

Kura Kaupapa: schools where the philosophy and practice reflect Māori cultural values and Maori language and knowledge are central (Maori).

Lavalava – a wrap-around garment worn by both men and women of Samoa (Sarong). (Samoa)

Noa - zero-point, harmony or balance, where two sets of equal and opposite forces are mediated to a state of equilibrium. (Mahina, 2009, personal communication) (Tonga)

‘Ofa – akin to love (Tonga)

'Oua 'e hikihihi kau'a - Do not overstep your bounds, (Tongan proverb)

Pakeha - refers to people of European descent or things ‘Western’, specifically the white settler society in New Zealand. (Maori)

Palagi - refers to people of European descent or things Western. It translates as ‘sky breakers’ (those that broke the sky with their boats, referencing the first explorers to arrive in the Pacific and be seen on the horizon). (Samoa)

Palangi - refers to people of European descent or things ‘Western’. It translates as ‘sky breakers’ (those that broke the sky with their boats, referencing the first explorers to arrive in the Pacific and be seen on the horizon). (Tonga)

Palangi Loi - Loi means ‘falsehood’ or ‘lie’ so this refers to being a fraudulent or fake white person, usually spoken in jest or in the context of teasing. (Tonga)

Papa’a – refers to person of European descent or things ‘Western’ (Cook Islands)

Pasifika - A popular transliteration of 'Pacific' that is widely used as a pan-ethnic label in New Zealand

Poto - intelligent, clever, smart (Tonga)

Siva - traditional Samoan female dance (Samoa)

Tangata poto - An educated person which according to Kavaliku, "has become an ideal, a thing of value in Tongan society" (1966 p. 75). (Tonga)

Takitaha tauhi hano hula - Each one keeps to its orbital route (Tongan proverb)

Talanoa - defined as "frank expression without concealment in face-to-face storytelling" (Halapua, cited in Ka'ili, 2005). Tala means talking or telling stories. I draw on Mahina's translation of noa which refers to 'balance' rather than the 'nothingness' (or without concealment) which zero or noa can imply. Talanoa has been employed as a research methodology and conflict mediation tool. Morrison and Vaiotele write: "A talanoa approach is a traditional Pacific reciprocating interaction which is driven by common interest, regard for respectfulness and are conducted mainly face to face" (2008, p. 11). (Tonga)

Ta'olunga - traditional Tongan female solo dance (Tonga)

Tauhi va - "the art of caring for sociospatial relations" (Ka'ili, 2005, p. 84) (Tonga)

Tautua - service (Samoa)

Te korekore - described by Marsden as "the realm between non-being and being: that is, the realm of potential being. This is the realm of primal, elemental energy or latent being. It is here that the seed-stuff of the universe and all created things gestate." (Marsden, 2003, p. 20). (Maori)

Te reo - the language, in this case, the Cook Islands language (Cook Islands)

Tu'i Tonga - the oldest most aristocratic and prestigious chiefly line in Tonga (Tu'i translates to King) (Tonga)

'Ulumotu'a - head of family (Tonga)

Va - relational (social) space, "Va is the space between, the between-ness, not empty space, not space that separates but space that relates, that holds separate entities and

things together in the unity-in-all, the space that is context, giving meaning to things” (Wendt cited Refiti 2002, p. 185). (Samoa / Tonga)

Vaha / Vaha’a - “Vaha is the open sea space between two islands, and vaha'a is the intervening space between two things/persons. Vaha indicates the relational space between the two islands, and vaha'a signifies the relations between things/persons” (Ka’ili, 2008, p. 16). (Tonga)

Vaka - boat, canoe, vessel (Samoa, Tonga)

Vanua - a philosophical approach that recognises all life is sacred and interrelated. Nabobo-Baba (2006) refers to the ‘vanua’ as it applies to the Vugalei of Fiji, writing: “Life is complete and wholesome when all elements – air, wind, seas, rivers, plants, animals, fishes, people, the dead – are ‘synchronised’. (p.42) (Fiji)

Appendix One:

Interview Schedule

Preamble:

You've been chosen to be part of this interview because of your achievements as a (relatively) young Pacific person who has been raised here in New Zealand. I'm interested in how you've come to be so successful, especially given the statistics associated with young Pacific people in New Zealand, which we have in part explored in the previous focus groups.

Firstly, how would you define success – what is your idea of a successful person?

I was wondering if you could tell me a bit about your story. Where you come from, how you grew up, how you got to be where you are today?

Prompts: Who are your parents? Where were they born? Where were you born? What is your educational background?

When you were growing up how would you describe your family's financial situation? Do you think this had an impact on any of the issues I am looking at or where you are today?

How would you describe the cultural orientation of your family, for example, strongly aligned to Pacific culture and ways of doing things, or perhaps relatively Palangi?

Can you tell me a bit about your professional journey?

Has churchgoing been a big part of your life? If yes or no, what impact has that had at various times in your life?

How about spirituality? Would you say that your spiritual beliefs have been important to you in your journey?

What kind of impact do you see this having – is it different in your mind to the influence of churchgoing?

Which ethnic group do you identify with primarily and why? How has this come about?

Which other ethnic groups do you belong to?

If you are of [sole Pacific ethnicity] or of [multiple ethnic backgrounds] what has this meant for you and to what extent has this influenced your experiences?

Are you NZ-born or Island-born? What does this mean to you? To what extent has this influenced your journey?

As a Pacific (male/female) to what extent do you think your gender has played a role in where you are today?

Would you say Pacific values are important to you? Can you tell me which kinds of Pacific values are important to you? Are there other Pacific values that may not be so important to you?

Are you proud to be Pacific? Do you think that the way you feel about your cultural heritage has influenced things in your life / made a difference?

Do you speak a Pacific language (at an average or better level)? What advantages or disadvantages do you see associated with this over your lifetime?

Do you feel accepted by other Pacific people? What kind of impact has this had on you? Do you feel accepted more by some Pacific people and not others?

Do you feel accepted by others (generally)? What kind of a difference has this made in your life? How has it affected your outlook and experiences? If you [do] or [don't] feel accepted by others, why / why not? Are there some people you feel more accepted by than others?

Do you feel accepted in both worlds? Is this important? Does it make a difference?

It has been said that many NZ-born or second generation Pacific peoples who grow up in New Zealand experience culture and identity conflicts? Do you believe this is true of all NZ-born Pacific people, most, some or only a few?

What sorts of issues provoke these sorts of conflicts in your view?

The other side of the coin is the idea that this second generation has access to the best of both worlds? Does this resonate with you? Do you think it is true for all, most, some or only a few Pacific people? What seems to make the difference in your view?

To what extent do you see yourself as negotiating between two cultures / two ways of seeing and being in the world?

Can you describe the sorts of issues that might be negotiated? Or describe situations where negotiations might happen?

What do you see as the biggest challenges facing the 'second generation' of Pacific peoples in New Zealand?

What would be your advice to younger Pacific peoples, what are the keys to being resilient and successful in your view?

Given that many young Pacific people in New Zealand are struggling, why do you think your experiences have been different? I want you to think back to high school and think about why you may or may not have been resilient? (By resilient I mean able to cope with stress, challenges and possibly high risk situations and deal with them and move on to be successful). What is it about your experiences or personality or background or beliefs that have helped you be resilient?

Finally, when you look back at your own journey, what have been some of the most important influences on your life? What really made a difference?

(prompts):

Moments or experiences that made a difference?

People that made a difference?

Family values or practices that made a difference?

Experiences at school or university?

Appendix Two:

Further Quantitative Information and Tables

Further information about median variables selected from the Youth2000 Survey

These are the questions taken from the Youth2000 Survey which were analysed as median variables and their possible answers. The italicised answers are those positive answers which were employed in the odds ratio testing.

- Do you feel accepted by other Samoan / Tongan / Cook Islands / Niuean people?

Possible answers: not at all, *some, quite a bit, a lot*, don't know

- Are you proud of being Samoan / Tongan / Cook Islands / Niuean?

Possible answers: I'm not at all proud, *I'm somewhat proud, I'm very proud*, I'm not sure, I'm not Samoan / Tongan / Cook Islands / Niuean

Are Samoan / Tongan / Cook Islands / Niuean values important to you?

Possible answers: not at all important / *somewhat important / very important*

- Which of the following statement best describes your ability in speaking Samoan / Tongan / Cook Islands / Niuean?

Possible answers: speak no Samoan / Tongan / Cook Islands / Niuean at all; speak only a few words of Samoan / Tongan / Cook Islands / Niuean and basic greetings; *speak an average amount of Samoan / Tongan / Cook Islands / Niuean; can easily have a conversation in Samoan / Tongan / Cook Islands / Niuean; Fluent speaker of Samoan / Tongan / Cook Islands / Niuean*

Socio-economic status required four prosperous answers to the following questions:

- Do your parents or family ever worry about not having enough money to buy food?

Never, occasionally, sometimes, often, all the time, don't know

(AND)

- In your home are there any of the following? (you can answer as many or few as apply to you)

a car that is working

(AND)

a telephone that is connected

(AND)

- Does your dad (or someone who acts as your dad) have a paid job outside the home or work at home earning money?

Yes, no, sometimes, not sure

(OR)

- Does your mum (or someone who acts as your mum) have a paid job or work at home earning money?

Yes, no, sometimes, not sure

Further information about outcome variables selected from the Youth2000 Survey

Mental Health and Wellbeing Variables

In the Youth2000 Survey the Reynolds Adolescent Depression Scale (RADs) found to have reliability and validity across all New Zealand major ethnic groups (Walker et al., 2005). This was used to identify depressive symptoms. A number of questions about symptoms were asked and participants were allowed to choose from three responses to each question: hardly ever, sometimes or most of the time. These responses are used to calculate a RADs score indicating whether the young person is likely to have a clinically significant level of depressive symptoms.

The two other mental wellbeing questions were about suicide.

- In the last 12 months have you thought about killing yourself (attempting suicide)?

Possible answers included: not at all, not in the last 12 months, *once or twice, three or more times*.

- During the past 12 months, have you ever tried to kill yourself (attempt suicide)?

Possible answers included: not at all, not in the last 12 months, *yes - once*, *yes - two or more times*.

Education Variables

The three education questions selected included were:

- Do you try as hard as you can to do your best at school?

Possible answers included: *usually*, sometimes, hardly ever.

- Compared with other students in your class how well do you do at school?

Possible answers included: *about the middle*, below the middle, *above the middle*.

What do you plan to do when you leave secondary school?

Possible answers included: *get more training or education*, *start work or look for a job*, start a family, do nothing, or I don't know / I have no plans.

Substance Use Variables

Three different kinds of substance use were examined: tobacco smoking, alcohol consumption and marijuana use. There was a slightly different focus with each different substance. The focus with tobacco smoking was those who smoked daily or more than daily. The focus on alcohol use was those who reported binge drinking in the previous four weeks and the focus on marijuana was those who had ever tried marijuana. The questions were as follows:

- About how often do you smoke cigarettes now?

Possible answers were: never - I don't smoke, occasionally, once or twice or a month, once or twice a week, several times a week, *most days*.

- Thinking back over the past four weeks, how many times did you have 5 or more alcoholic drinks in one session - within 4 hours?

Possible answers were: not at all, *several times a week*, *weekly*, *about monthly*, *two or three times*, *only the once*.

- We would now like to ask some questions about marijuana. By this we mean pot, grass, hash etc. You don't have to answer if you really don't want to.

Remember there is no way to identify you from your answers. Have you ever smoked marijuana?

Possible answers included: *yes*, no, I don't want to answer any further questions about marijuana.

Summary of Pacific and NZ European comparisons across nine outcome variables

Table 2: Youth2000 Results: Summary of Pacific and NZ European Comparisons, Across Nine Outcome Variables

	Pacific (unadjusted)	NZ E (unadjusted)	Odds ratio (controlling for age, sex and socio-economic variables) followed by Confidence Interval (CI) and p-value
Usually try hard at school	45.4%	55.5%	Pacific less likely [OR 0.62 95% CI (0.53-0.73) p<0.0001].
Achieve around the middle / above the middle at school	86%	91%	Pacific less likely [OR 0.61 95% CI (0.47- 0.78) p<0.0001].
Have plans for further study / finding job after school	60%	72%	Pacific less likely [OR 0.66 95% CI (0.52-0.85) p=0.001]
Meets RADS criteria depressive symptoms	18%	12%	Pacific more likely [OR 1.32 95% CI (1.05-1.66), p=0.019].
Suicidal thoughts in previous year	27%	22%	No significant difference
Suicide attempt in previous year	13%	6%	Pacific more likely [OR 1.75 95% CI (1.33-2.31), p<0.0001].

Smokes daily	12.5%	7%	Gender association: Among Pacific students, twice as many females (17%) as males (8%) reported smoking cigarettes daily (or more often) [OR 2.38 95% CI (1.43-3.95) p=0.0008].
Binge drank in previous month	33%	41%	No significant difference
Ever tried marijuana	44%	35%	Pacific more likely [OR 1.54 95% CI (1.22-1.94) p=0.0003]

Summary of Relationships between Demographic Variables and Median Variables for Pacific students

Table 3: Pacific Youth2000 Participants, Relationship between demographic variables and speaking your own Pacific language

	• Speak language (percentage)	• Confidence Intervals
• Born in nz	• 42%	• (37.8-46.9)
• Born overseas	• 59.8%	• (53.5-66.1)
• Born overseas 8yrs plus in country	• 55.6%	• (47.7-63.4)
• Less than 8 yrs in country	• 62.2%	• (51.5-73.0)
• Single ethnicity	• 74%	• (68.1-80.0)
• Multiple ethnicity	• 34.3%	• (29.8-38.9)
• Female	• 52.2%	• (46.6-57.8)

- Male
- 40.9%
- (53.5-64.6)

Table 4: Pacific Youth2000 Participants, Relationship between Demographic Variables and proud to be Pacific/ Pacific values important

	Proud / Cult values (Percentage)	Confidence intervals
Born in nz	73.6	(68.8-78.4)
Born overseas	71.6	(65.0-78.2)
Born overseas 8yrs plus in country	80.0	(72.3-87.8)
Less than 8 yrs in country	64.2	(55.0-73.4)
Single ethnicit y	94.4	(92.6-96.3)
Multiple ethnicit y	61.5	(56.6-67.2)
Female	77.0	(72.3-81.9)
Male	68.1	(61.7-74.4)

Table 5: Pacific Youth2000 Participants, Relationship between demographic variables and churchgoing and spirituality, percentages and confidence intervals

	• Spirit+Church	• Church only	• Spirit only	• Neither
• Born in nz	• 30.6 • (24.7-36.4)	• 6.8 • (5.1-8.7)	• 26.9 • (22.8-30.9)	• 35.7 • (29.5-41.7)
• Born overseas	• 42.9 • (35.3-50.5)	• 7 • (3.9-10.0)	• 24.6 • (17.6-31.7)	• 25.5 • (19.7-31.3)
• Born overseas 8yrs plus in country	• 37.4 • (24.4-50.3)	• 5.4 • (2.1-8.7)	• 26.2 • (16.3-36)	• 31 • (22.2-39.8) •
• Less than 8 yrs in country	• 48.5 • (38.4-58.5)	• 7.9 • (3.3-12.4)	• 24.1 • (15.4-32.7)	• 19.5 • (12.0-27.1)
• Single ethnicity	• 53.5 • (48.1-58.9)	• 7.8 • (4.0-11.5)	• 23.3 • (17.5-29.2)	• 15.3 • (10.5-20.3)
• Multiple ethnicity	• 25.1 • (20.0-30.2)	• 6.5 • (4.5-8.5)	• 27.6 • (23-31.8)	• 40.8 • (34.7-46.9)
• Female	• 37.9 • (31.5-44.2)	• 8.2 • (6.4-10.0)	• 26.5 • (22.4-30.7)	• 27.3 • (21.9-32.7)

• Male	• 28.9	• 5.2	• 25.9	• 40.0
	• (22.6-35.1)	• (3.0-7.3)	• (20.6-31.3)	• (32.0-44.2)

Table 6: Pacific Youth2000 Participants, Relationship between demographic variables and feeling accepted by own ethnic group and others, percentages and confidence intervals

	• Neither	• Both	• Not own ethnic	• Own, not generally ethnic
• Born in nz	• 7.4 (5.1- 9.8)	• 47.9 (43.4- 52.4)	• 8.8 (6.4- 11.1)	• 35.8 (31.6- 39.9)
• Born overseas	• 9.4 (5.6- 13.2)	• 38.8 (32.5- 45.2)	• 6.8 (4.3- 9.3)	• 44.9 (40.3- 49.4)
• Born overseas 8yrs plus in country	• 8.2 (2.7- 13.7)	• 46.2 (38.0- 54.4)	• 5.4 (1.2- 9.6)	• 40.1 (33.8- 46.5)
• Less than 8 yrs in country	• 10.9 (4.8- 17.15)	• 32.0 (24.9- 39.1)	• 7.9 (4.6- 11.2)	• 49.1 (42.4- 55.8)
• Single ethnicit y	• 2.2 (0.77- 3.6)	• 51.1 (44.8- 57.4)	• 2.3 (0.77- 3.9)	• 44.4 (38.3- 50.4)
• Multiple ethnicit y	• 11.2 (8.6- 13.8)	• 42.2 (37.1- 47.3)	• 11.5 (8.5- 14.5)	• 35.0 (30.5- 39.4)
• Female	• 8.0 (5.7- 10.3)	• 44.2 (38.4- 50)	• 7.5 (4.9- 10.1)	• 40.3 (35.8 - 44.8)
• Male	• 8.0	• 47.0	• 9.2	• 35.7 (30.1-

(5.4- 10.8)	(41.2- 52.7)	(6.4- 12.1)	41.3)
----------------	-----------------	----------------	-------

Summary of Significant Median Associations (Odds ratio testing results)

Table 7: Odds ratio tests: “Relatively Prosperous” for Pacific Youth2000 Participants (significant findings only)

• Outcome variable	• Odds ratio (Confidence interval) for “relatively prosperous”	• p-value for “relatively prosperous”	• Other significant associations, odds ratio, confidence interval and p-value
• Try hard	• 1.3 (1.01-1.67)	• (0.042)	• Sex: Female (OR 1.65, 95 % C.I. 1.27-2.13) (p=0.0002) and Age: (13) (OR 2.87, 95% CI 1.86-4.42) (p=0.0001)
• Doing ok	• 1.85 (1.12-3.07)	• (0.017)	•
• RADS	• 0.51 (.31-.84)	• (0.009)	• Sex: Female (OR 2.14, 95% CI 1.29-3.57) (p=0.034)
• Binge drinking	• 1.39 (1.10-1.75)	• p=0.005)	• Age: (13) (OR 0.26, 95% CI 0.15-0.47) Age: (14) (OR 0.65, 95% CI 0.43-0.99) (p<0.0001)

Table 8: Odds ratio tests: Proud and values for Pacific Youth2000 Participants (significant findings only)

•	• Odds ratio for proud and values and confidence intervals	• p-value for proud and values	• Other significant associations, odds ratio, confidence intervals and p-value
• Doing ok	• 2.01 (1.26-3.23)	• (0.0036)	•
• Future Plans	• 1.53 (1.06-2.20)	• (0.023)	•
• Suicide Acts	• 0.56 (0.33-0.93)	• (0.027)	• Sex: Female (OR 2.49, 95% CI 1.54-4.03) (p=0.0003)

Table 9: Odds ratio tests: Speak own Pacific language for Pacific Youth2000 Participants (significant findings only)

• Outcome variable	• Odds ratio for speak own language	• p-value for speak own language	• Other significant associations for odds ratio, confidence intervals and p-value
• Try hard	• 1.33 (1.04-1.71)	• (0.022)	• Sex: Female (OR 1.43, 95% CI 1.14-1.79) (p=0.0019) Age: 13 (OR 3.05, 95% CI 2.11-4.51) (p<0.0001)
• Binge drinking	• 0.63 (0.49-0.81)	• (0.0003)	• Age: 13 (OR 0.26, 95% CI 0.15-0.46) 14 (OR 0.65, 95% CI 0.43-0.98) (p<0.0001)
• Marijuana ever	• OR 0.58 (0.44-0.77)	• (0.0002)	•

Table 10: Odds ratio tests: Churchgoing and Spirituality for Pacific Youth2000 Participants (significant findings only)

• Outcome variable	• Odds ratio for Churchgoing and Spirituality, Confidence Intervals	• p value for Churchgoing and Spirituality	• Other significant associations, odds ratio, confidence interval, p-value
• Cigarette Daily	• 0.35 (0.21-0.61)	• (<0.0001)	• By Sex: Female (OR 2.93, 95% CI 1.82-4.74) (p<0.0001)
• Binge drinking	• 0.34 (0.24-0.49)	• (<0.0001)	• • Churchgoing only: (OR 0.49, 95% CI 0.27-0.93), • (p<0.0001). • By Age: 13 (OR 0.27, 95% CI 0.14-0.51) (p <0.0001)
• Marijuana ever	• 0.26 (0.15-0.43)	• (<0.0001)	• Churchgoing only: (OR 0.48, CI 95%, 0.24-0.98) (p<0.0001). • Spirituality only: (OR 0.55, 95% CI 0.36-86) (p<0.0001). • By Age: 13 (OR 0.23, 95% CI 0.11-

0.48) ($p < 0.0001$) 14
(OR 0.51, 95% CI
0.32-0.83)

•

Table 11: Odds ratio tests: Feeling accepted by own ethnic group and others for Pacific Youth2000 Participants (significant findings only)

• Outcome Variable	• Odds Ratio for feeling accepted and confidence intervals	• p-value for feeling accepted	• Other significant associations, odds ratio, confidence intervals, p-value
• Try hard	• 1.51 (1.028-2.239)	• (0.0514)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accepted by others only, (OR 1.64, 95% CI 1.20-2.61) (p=0.0514) • By age: 13 (OR 3.15, 95% CI 2.08-4.78) (p<0.0001) • 14 (OR 1.78, 95% CI 1.16-2.72) (p <0.0001)
• Doing ok	• 2.47 (1.21-5.044)	• (0.0005)	• Accepted by others only, (OR 1.12, 95% CI 0.57-2.20) (p=0.005)
• RADS	• 0.19 (0.107-0.323)	• (<0.0001)	• Sex: Female (OR 2.09, 95% CI 1.36-3.20) (p =0.0008)
• Suicidal thoughts	• 0.48 (0.28-0.83)	• (0.0028)	• Sex: Female (OR 2.03, 95% CI 1.38-3.00) (p = 0.0003)
• Suicidal Acts	• 0.30 (0.14-0.64)	• (<0.0001)	• Sex: Female (OR 2.20, 95% CI 1.43-

3.48) ($p = 0.0004$)

Appendix Three:

Ethics Information

Participant Information Sheet

Policy and Planning for the 'niu' generation of Pacific peoples raised in New Zealand

Principal Investigator: Karlo Mila-Schaaf
PhD Candidate
School of Social and Cultural Studies
Massey University

Malo e lelei, Talofa lava, Kia orana, Fakalofa lahi atu, Taloha ni, Nia sa bula vinaka,

You are invited to take part in a study about policy needs of the generation of Pacific peoples raised in New Zealand. Your participation is entirely voluntary (your choice). An immediate decision is not required. Please feel free to think it over and get back to me.

You have been identified as a participant because you have first-hand experience, as well as specialist knowledge, about issues relating to the 'second generation' of Pacific peoples (e.g. in the areas of culture, identity, youth, education, health, economic development etc).

A part of the research project also includes aiming to learn from successful young Pacific people who have been raised in New Zealand. You have been identified by the Principal Investigator and her Pacific cultural advisors, as having much to contribute to policy and knowledge development process.

What is the Study about?

The research project focuses on Pacific peoples whose primary cultural experiences are of being Pacific in New Zealand, as opposed to being migrants. The study aims to:

- identify key issues, characteristics and needs of the generation of Pacific peoples raised in New Zealand, relevant for planning and policy development;
- identify influential determinants of wellbeing, achievement and positive outcomes for the generation of Pacific peoples raised in New Zealand;
- generate a peer-reviewed and evidence-based set of recommendations for policy targeting this generation; and,
- be strengths-based.

The study has a quantitative and qualitative component and includes statistical analysis of the Youth2000 Survey, focus groups and individual interviews with 'second generation' Pacific peoples.

Who is undertaking the study?

The Principal Investigator is a 'second generation' NZ-born Tongan, Samoan and Palangi PhD student, Ms Karlo Mila-Schaaf. She is also a poet (Karlo Mila).

This research will inform her PhD thesis in Sociology in the School of Sociology, Social Work and Social Policy at Massey University, Albany. Her supervisors are: Professor Paul Spoonley and Professor Cluny Macpherson at Massey University.

This research is funded by the Health Research Council of New Zealand. The cost of the research is also partly sponsored by the Ministry of Pacific Island Affairs.

What is involved?

You are asked to participate in a focus group with other 'second generation' young Pacific people (maximum 15 people) from diverse backgrounds who are leaders in their fields.

The key findings of the most comprehensive-to-date Youth2000 Survey surveying over 1000 Pacific participants will be shared with this group. This will provide an opportunity to have an open discussion about the latest statistics and the implications for the next generation of young Pacific peoples.

Based on the discussions of the group, the researcher will develop a 'thought paper' summarising the ideas of the group and incorporating other relevant information and evidence. You are invited to meet again, in the same focus group setting, to discuss and feedback ideas about this 'thought paper' and discuss potential recommendations.

Finally, you are asked to take part in an individual interview. This would be conducted with you, about your own story as a young 'second generation' Pacific person. It would focus on your own journey, cultural background, influences and ideas about how to be successful in a contemporary New Zealand setting.

Where will the research take place?

The two focus groups will be held at the Auckland Regional Office of the Ministry of Pacific Island Affairs in Manukau City. It is proposed that the meetings will run from 3.30pm (beginning with afternoon tea) to 6.00pm followed by dinner.

One meeting will be held in late September and the other will be held in late October at a date (and time) that suits participants. Times and dates are flexible at this point, depending on what suits the majority of participants.

For the individual interviews, the Principal Investigator will come to you, at a venue that you feel is appropriate, or organise a venue that you are satisfied with. All measures will be taken to ensure that you are not inconvenienced and that the interview causes minimal disruption to your other commitments. The individual interviews will be held in the months of November and December, at a time that suits you and will not take longer than two hours.

Study Benefits

There is little evidence to inform policy development for the younger Pacific population who have been raised in New Zealand. This is confirmed by the Chief Executive of the Ministry of Pacific Island Affairs, Dr Colin Tukuitonga who has lent his support to this project by providing the venue and funding the focus groups.

Dr Tukuitonga is interested in the outcome of the 'thought paper' as this will improve evidence in this area. Your participation and contribution to knowledge development is greatly valued.

The costs of your travel will be met (including flights for those out of Auckland) and for those from Auckland, taxi chits or petrol vouchers to the value of \$40.00 for each meeting will be provided. Afternoon tea and dinner will be provided at both focus group meetings.

For the individual interviews, a mea'ofa (koha or gift) will be provided to thank you for your time and contribution. Participants may withdraw at anytime, irrespective of whether or not any payment has been received.

A summary of key findings will be distributed to all participants on completion of the research. More detailed information about research results will be disseminated on request.

Your rights

This study is for research purposes only. All interviews will be confidential to the research group. If the information you provide is reported or published, this will be done in a way that does not identify you as its source.

Recognising the small size of the Pacific community, great care will be taken to ensure that you are not identifiable in any publications. It is acknowledged that within a small community, confidentiality with respect to the participant's identity cannot be guaranteed, however, all reasonable and practical measures will be taken to protect identity.

If you require an interpreter, one will be provided. Otherwise all interviews will be conducted in English.

It is optional for interviews to be tape recorded and this will only happen with your consent. Even if you agree to being taped, you may choose to have the recorder turned off at any time. The Principal Investigator will have access to your interview tapes and transcripts. A confidentiality agreement will be signed if any transcription is involved.

Data will be stored securely by the School of Social and Cultural Studies in accordance with Massey University protocol for five years and will be destroyed thereafter.

Participants have the right to withdraw from the project at any time. Participants also have the right to withdraw their information/data up until April 2008.

Contacts

If you would like to know more about the study, or wish to ask any questions, Ms Karlo Mila-Schaaf can be contacted by phone on (09) 624 0130 or email: karlodavid@xtra.co.nz

Her Supervisors' contacts are:

- | | |
|--|--|
| • Professor Paul Spoonley | • Professor Cluny Macpherson |
| • School of Sociology, Social Work and Social Policy | • School of Sociology, Social Work and Social Policy |
| • Massey University | • Massey University |
| • p.spoonley@massey.ac.nz | • c.macpherson@massey.ac.nz |
| • PH: 414 0800 | • PH: 414 0800 |
| • | • |

If you have any concerns of an ethical nature you can contact the Chair of the Massey University Ethics Committee

Approved by the Massey University Human Participants Ethics Committee.

Participant Consent Form

Participant's name:.....

Address:.....

.....

Ph:.....

- | | | | |
|----------------|---|-------|---------|
| • English | • I wish to have an interpreter | • Yes | • No |
| • Samoan | • Oute mana'o e iai se fa'amatala upu | • Ioe | • Leai |
| • Tongan | • 'Oku ke fiema'u ha fakatonulea | • Io | • Ikai |
| • Cook Islands | • Ka inangaro au i tetai tangata uri reo | • Ae | • Kare |
| • Niuean | • Fia manako au ke fakaaoga e tagata fakahokohoko | • E | • Nakai |

Title of project: Policy and Planning for the 'niu' generation of Pacific peoples raised in New Zealand

Principal Investigator: Ms Karlo Mila-Schaaf

I have been given, and have read, a written explanation and understand what is asked of me.

I have had an opportunity to ask questions and have them answered.

I understand that I am free to withdraw from the research at anytime without giving a reason, irrespective of whether or not payment is involved and that, if so, I will not be affected in any way. I understand that I have up until March 2008 to withdraw my information/data.

I am aware that the costs of travel will be met (flights if out of Auckland, \$40 petrol voucher or taxi chits if in Auckland) and meals will be provided at the Focus Group. I know that a small mea'ofa (koha) of a book will be provided for my time for my individual interview.

I understand that only the Principal Investigator (Karlo Mila-Schaaf) has access to this data and a transcriber who will be bound by a confidentiality agreement.

I understand that although ALL practicable measures will be taken by the research to protect identity and confidentiality, because the Pacific community is small and because high profile members are identifiable and well known, confidentiality cannot be guaranteed.

I understand that consent forms and data gathered from this research project will be stored for five years, securely, at the School of Social and Cultural Studies and then will be destroyed.

I CONSENT TO TAKE PART IN THIS RESEARCH YES / NO

Signed: DATE:.....

Non Disclosure Agreement for Focus Group Participants

Title of project: Policy and Planning for the 'niu' generation of Pacific peoples raised in New Zealand

Principal Investigator: Ms Karlo Mila-Schaaf

I, _____ hereby agree to maintain the confidentiality of information disclosed during focus group or interview sessions ("Focus Group") observed live or recorded as follows:

For purposes hereof, "Confidential Information" shall mean information or material obtained or observed while attending a focus group for this research project.

Also included as confidential is any participant's "Personally Identifiable Information". "Personally Identifiable Information" shall mean a person's identity or information that might reasonably allow identification of the person.

All notes, reference materials, memoranda, documentation and records provided at the Focus Group shall remain confidential.

I shall at all times hold in trust, keep confidential and not disclose to any third party or make any use of the identity or Personally Identifiable Information of any person or persons involved in the Focus Group.

The undersigned agrees to the above terms of this agreement.

Signed_____ Date_____

Printed_____

Non Disclosure Agreement for Transcriber

Title of project: Policy and Planning for the 'niu' generation of Pacific peoples raised in New Zealand

Principal Investigator: Ms Karlo Mila-Schaaf

I, _____ hereby agree to maintain the confidentiality of information disclosed during focus group or interview sessions ("Focus Group") observed live or recorded as follows:

1. For purposes hereof, "Confidential Information" shall mean information or material obtained or observed while transcribing focus group or interviews for this research project.
2. Also included as confidential is any participant's "Personally Identifiable Information". "Personally Identifiable Information" shall mean a person's identity or information that might reasonably allow identification of the person.
3. All notes, reference materials, memoranda, documentation and records from Focus Groups or interviews shall remain confidential.
4. I shall at all times hold in trust, keep confidential and not disclose to any third party or make any use of the identity or Personally Identifiable Information of any person or persons involved in the Focus Groups or Interviews.

The undersigned agrees to the above terms of this agreement.

Signed_____ Date_____

Printed_____

Ethics Approval (MUHEC)



Massey University
AUCKLAND

OFFICE OF THE DEPUTY VICE-CHANCELLOR
(AUCKLAND & INTERNATIONAL)
Private Bag 102 904
North Shore 0745
Auckland
New Zealand
Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Auckland & International)
T 64 9 414 0800 extn 9517
Regional Registrar – Auckland
T 64 9 414 0800 extn 9516
Fax 64 9 414 0814
www.massey.ac.nz

4 September 2007

Karlo Mila-Schaaf
c/- Professor Paul Spoonley
College of Humanities and Social Sciences
Massey University
Albany

Dear Karlo

HUMAN ETHICS APPROVAL APPLICATION – MUHECN 07/053
“Policy and Planning for the ‘niu’ generation of Pacific Peoples in New Zealand”

Thank you for your application. It has been fully considered, and approved by the Massey University Human Ethics Committee: Northern.

Approval is for three years. If this project has not been completed within three years from the date of this letter, a reapproval must be requested.

If the nature, content, location, procedures or personnel of your approved application change, please advise the Secretary of the Committee.

Yours sincerely

Associate-Professor Ann Dupuis
Chair
Human Ethics Committee: Northern

cc: Professor Paul Spoonley, Professor C Macpherson
College of Humanities and Social Sciences