BECOMING FILIPINO IN HAWAI‘I:
REJECTION, REFRAMING, AND ACCEPTANCE OF A STIGMATIZED IDENTITY

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE DIVISION OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF HAWAI‘I AT MĀNOA IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE
REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

IN

SOCIOLOGY

AUGUST 2011

By

Daniel B. Eisen

Dissertation Committee:

Donald William Wood, Chairperson
Valli Kalei Kanuha
Wei Zhang
Roderick Labrador
Amefil Agbayani
Andrew Grandinetti

Keywords: Colonial Mentality, Community Cultural Wealth, Defensive Othering, Ethnic
Identity, Filipino, Stigma
ABSTRACT

It is an unfortunate occurrence in Hawai‘i that many locally raised Filipino individuals grow up viewing their ethnicity as a stigma. This leads many of these individuals to develop a sense of shame about their ethnic background and they often reject a Filipino identity. While these individuals reject their Filipino identity they attempt to pass as another ethnicity or simply claim local in an attempt to shed any ethnic ties they have to the Filipino community. Although these individuals reject their Filipino background growing up, many of these individuals reconnect and “rediscover” their Filipino identity between the ages of 18 and 23, often in a college setting where they have access to learn about their Filipino heritage (Strobel 1996). Learning about the Filipino culture allows these individuals to discover the various forms of capital, known as community cultural wealth (Yosso 2005), that exist within the Filipino culture and develop a sense of pride in their Filipino background.

This study focuses on the experiences of twelve individuals, who have undergone this process of shifting from rejecting a Filipino ethnic identity to embracing and accepting a Filipino ethnic identity. Through semi-structured interviews with these individuals, who were raised in Hawai‘i, the processes of rejection and acceptance were examined. The research examines how and why these individuals internalized the negative stereotypes about Filipinos, such as “Filipinos are uneducated,” “Filipinos are simple wage workers,” and “Filipinos are rude.” The research further examines how these individuals coped with these internalized stereotypes by (a) claiming another ethnicity, (b) claiming to be local Filipino or just local, and (c) being ambivalent about their ethnicity. Finally, this study examines the processes that allowed these individuals to begin to accept a Filipino ethnic identity and examines the importance of (a) becoming a role model, (b) breaking the stereotypes about
being Filipino, and (c) reframing the idea of Filipino in a positive fashion.

Overall, this study sheds light on the impact that stereotypes and a colonial mentality have on the development of a Filipino ethnic identity in Hawai‘i, which raises important theoretical questions about identity formation in marginalized groups, such as Filipino in Hawai‘i.
RESEARCHER’S REFLEXIVE STATEMENT

Why did I choose to embark on this journey of conducting research about Filipino ethnic identity in Hawai‘i? My interest in this topic arose out of my own personal experiences with being Filipino in Hawai‘i and an interest in attempting to make sense of these past experiences. I thought that by conducting this research I would begin to understand my own experience of coming to terms with being Filipino, as I would be able to academically examine the experiences of others that have also come to terms with being Filipino, who I thought would have had experiences very similar to my own experiences.

Growing up I always knew I was Filipino, but as I got older I developed a sense of shame and embarrassment about my ethnicity and attempted to hide it from others. Like many individuals raised in Hawai‘i, I was exposed to the negative stereotypes about Filipinos at a young age through ethnic humor. I learned that Filipinos spoke with a funny accent, ate black dogs, were overly religious, carried knives, were janitors or hotel workers, and were often uneducated. I was exposed to these jokes through comedians like Frank DeLima and through my friendship network, as we would often exchange ethnic jokes while we were hanging out. For me this was just a normal practice in Hawai‘i and at the time I did not realize that I internalized these jokes and stereotypes and used them to define what I thought it meant to be Filipino. Looking back, I realize that these became deeply engrained within me, as I ignored the fact that my family members who are Filipino did not speak with an accent, did not eat black dogs, were not violent or carry knives everywhere they went, and were, in fact, college educated and employed as doctors, architects, and teachers. Instead of using these individuals as my reference for understanding what it meant to be Filipino, I bought into the stereotypes and generalized them to all Filipinos.
When I engaged in this behavior, I decided that I did not want to be Filipino. I did not want to be associated with such a low social status. I attempted to claim anything other than Filipino. When I was asked, “what are you?” I would always respond by saying that I was Scottish, Swedish, Jewish, German, and Filipino. I would always say Filipino softly and hope that the individual I was talking to would focus on the first ethnicities that I claimed rather than the fact that I was Filipino. I felt that the other ethnicities were more respected and would allow me to be more successful in life. For me, being Filipino was just a hindrance.

When individuals did not allow me to focus my claims of ethnicity on my white background and wanted to focus on the fact that I was Filipino, I always attempted to make sure that they knew I was a local Filipino and not an immigrant Filipino. In high school I attempted to drop the label of Filipino completely, as I would just tell people I was local rather than local Filipino. This change occurred because I became disenfranchised with what I perceived as elitism (yes, I was probably guilty of this too) that the local Filipinos directed towards the immigrant Filipinos. In my high school there was a single building that all the Filipinos congregated around during lunch, recess, and other free periods. The immigrant Filipinos gathered in the building and the local Filipinos gathered outside the building, which minimized the interaction between the two groups and also created tension between the two groups. I grew tired of the feud between these two groups and just tried to be local, which usually did not work; people accepted my claim of being local, but always wanted to know about my specific ethnic background.

After high school I travelled to Oregon to attend college and was often mistaken for being Mexican. I found that the stereotypes that existed in Hawai‘i for Filipinos were the
same stereotypes that existed for Mexicans in Oregon. I grew tired of being spoken to in Spanish, followed around stores, and stigmatized for being a Mexican. It was at this point that I finally decided to stress to people that I was Filipino. Therefore, I asserted my Filipino ethnicity to deflect another stigma. This was an interesting experience for me, as when I told others I was Filipino they looked at me blankly, as they did not know what it meant to be Filipino. They were not judging me for being Filipino. Instead they asked me what a Filipino was. This was a welcomed change, as I was able to create my own definition of Filipino.

I still, however, had to answer the question of what is a Filipino. So, I became interested in my ethnicity and began reading about Filipino culture and the history of the Philippines. Since I was a member of an academic institution, I had broad access to online databases, journals, and books, which allowed me to explore my Filipino identity. I began to see the Filipino culture in a different light. My opinions changed; Filipinos were no longer uneducated service workers, who spoke with funny accents, were violent, overly religious, and ate black dogs. I slowly became more interested in what it meant to be Filipino, more comfortable in claiming Filipino, and more committed to combating the stereotypes about Filipinos in Hawai‘i.

This was the process that I had to go through to become comfortable with telling others that I am Filipino and this is process that I thought I could make more sense of by embarking on this research project. While my journey to “becoming” Filipino shares some characteristics with this journeys of the participants in this study, they experienced a quite different process, one that involved becoming a role model for others, to become comfortable with being Filipino. Therefore, this research has allowed me to partially make sense of my own experiences, but more importantly, the different experience of the participants in this study.
research from my own shows that there are multiple ways that an individual can come to terms with a stigmatized identity. This further increases my interest in Filipino ethnic identity in Hawai‘i to examine the different routes that individuals take to accept being Filipino and how various sociodemographic variables lead individuals towards the various paths of accepting a stigmatized ethnic identity.
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INTRODUCTION

A group of seven second generation Filipino-Americans living in Hawai‘i were asked a simple question: "What is positive about being Filipino?" Silence fell over the room and the individuals in the group appeared to be thinking very hard about an answer to this question. A minute passed and this rather talkative focus group had not produced an answer, so the group's facilitator rephrased the question, "Are there any benefits to being Filipino?" Again silence filled the room until one individual spoke up and said, "nothing--there's nothing positive about being Filipino." A few minutes later another individual shared a story about how he hid his ethnicity from others, such as his coworkers. He told about his conscious decision to not speak Tagalog in public, not bring Filipino foods to work, and always make sure he was fashionable, so others would not know he was Filipino. He then shared a story of how his coworkers discovered that he was Filipino. He said that one day at work he made a mistake by laughing at a joke that was told in Ilocano by one of the janitorial staff. He was exposed as a Filipino and recounted that he felt ashamed, embarrassed, and scared of what his coworkers would think about him now that they knew he was Filipino.

The description of the focus group above raises important questions about Filipino ethnic identity in Hawai‘i. First, one must wonder why this focus group could not answer the simple question of "what is positive about being Filipino." Is there really nothing positive about being Filipino in Hawai‘i? In fact, if one were to review the entire transcript of this two-hour focus group, they would find that a majority of the discussion centered around the negative aspects of being Filipino. When a positive aspect was presented the discussions were not very lively and quickly returned to the negative aspects of being Filipino. Therefore, one must wonder how common these sentiments are and if there really is "nothing positive" about being Filipino in Hawai‘i.

Unfortunately, the focus group discussed above may not be a unique case, as many individuals with a Filipino ethnic background develop a sense of embarrassment and shame about their ethnicity (David 2011; David and Okazaki 2006; Labrador 2004; Okada 2007; Okamura 2008; Revilla 1998). David (2011) and David and Okazaki (2006) argued that this sense of embarrassment and shame is a result of the Filipino colonial mentality, which leads Filipinos to devalue values, attitudes, or customs that are associated with being Filipino. In a
way, they lose a sense of their culture and become indoctrinated into the belief that things that are European or American are inherently better than things that are Filipino and if adopted will lead to more success in life.

David (2011) and Strobel (1996) argued that the Filipino colonial mentality can be countered with education, which helps the colonized individual shed many of the misperceptions that they hold about the Filipino culture. Strobel (1996) argued that this is mostly likely to happen in college, where individuals have access to college courses about Filipino culture and the Philippines. Basically what this opportunity does is allow the individual to reframe and reconstruct what it means to be Filipino, so they can provide an answer to the question of "what is positive about being Filipino."

PURPOSE AND SIGNIFICANCE OF THIS STUDY

This dissertation provides a sociological examination of the identity formation processes that Filipinos raised in Hawai‘i undergo to research a point where they can comfortably tell others that they are Filipino. This research attempts to answer some of the questions raised above, as it examines the reasons why Filipino individuals raised in Hawai‘i reject their ethnic identity, how they attempt to distance themselves from being Filipino, and what allows these individuals to eventually accept and assert a Filipino identity. The examination of this process of ethnic identity formation provides insights and raises questions about the societal image of Filipinos in Hawai‘i, the colonial mentality of Filipinos in Hawai‘i, the racial and ethnic hierarchy in Hawai‘i, and the process that these individuals engage in to reframe and, perhaps, reclaim a stigmatized identity.

One may wonder why a study such as this is needed; after all, there are numerous studies about ethnic identity formation in Asdeian American communities that include
Filipinos in the sample (Kim 1981; Kitano 1982; Phinney and Ong 1992; Sue and Sue 1971; Suinn, Ahuna, and Khoo 1992). As with these studies, Filipinos are often hidden within the larger classificatory scheme of "Asian American," but it is arguable that research that focuses solely on the Filipino experience needs to be conducted. Filipinos are the second largest Asian group in the United States and their immigration rates continue to rise rapidly (David 2011). In 2000, 1.9 million people identified themselves as Filipino alone and an additional 0.5 million people identified themselves as Filipino in combination with another race (U.S. Census Bureau 2000). While the Filipino population is spread throughout the United States there are large concentrated population in California and Hawai‘i. In 2000, Filipinos constituted 22.8% of the Hawai‘i population (U.S. Census Bureau 2000). Although Filipinos constitute a large population in the United States, there is little known about their unique experiences because they are often overlooked as a unique ethnic group worthy of study (Tuason, Taylor, Rollings, and Harris 2007). Some have argued that this occurs because Filipinos tend to adjust to life in the United States better than other Asian groups (Tuason et al. 2007) and have higher rates of intermarriage (Zhenchao, Blair, and Ruf 2001).

While Filipinos tend to be overlooked as a unique ethnic group, there are many cultural and historical reasons to differentiate Filipinos as a unique group from other Asian American groups. While it is important to note differences such as the Filipinos' relative ease with English (Kitano and Daniels 1995), the high rates of interracial marriages for Filipinos (Zhenchao, Blair, and Ruf 2001), and the strong Catholic presence in Filipino culture (Agbayani-Stewart and Revilla 1995), it is more important to note that these differences arise out of the history of colonization of the Philippines (David 2011, David and Okazaki 2006; Nadal 2004; Takaki 1998; Tuason et al. 2007). The colonization of the
Philippines and the exploitation of Filipinos began in 1521 when Ferdinand Magellan "discovered" the Philippines and claimed it in the name of Spain (Agoncillo 1974, David 2011; Halili 2004). For the next 50 years Spanish voyages were met with resistances by the indigenous peoples of the Philippines, but in 1971 the Spanish were successful in erecting the Spanish city of Manila and subduing much of the resistance (David 2011; Halili 2004). As with many processes of colonization the Spanish colonizers attempted to "civilize" the indigenous peoples of the Philippines by imposing their cultural, social, and economic systems upon the island nation. The use of the Catholic religion was one of the strongest tools for subduing resistance and changing the culture of the indigenous inhabitants (David 2011; Rimonte 1997).

This colonization of the Philippines by the Spanish began the development of a Filipino colonial mentality (David 2011; David and Okazaki 2006). David (2011) argued that the results of colonialism can manifest themselves in society, where the oppressed (a) accept the ideology of themselves as inferior and the colonizers as superior, (b) attempt to distance themselves from their inferior status and emulate the colonizer, and (c) believe that colonization was necessary for growth, civilization, and progress. Thus, the Filipino colonial mentality is characterized by an affinity for anything that is European or American and a dislike for anything that is Filipino.

The colonization of the Philippines and the development of the colonial mentality under Spanish rule continued for 300 years and further continued when the United States "acquired" the Philippines at the conclusion of the Spanish-American War with the signing of the Treaty of Paris in 1898 (David 2011). Although Philippine sovereignty had been claimed prior to 1898, the transference of the Philippines from Spain to the United States still
occurred, leading to the Philippine-American War. The war lasted from 1899 to 1902, when the United States declared victory, although strong resistance continued until 1913 (Agoncillo 1974; David 2011). While the Spanish used the Catholic religion to subvert the indigenous culture, the Americans used the education system to subvert the culture and attempt to "civilize" or Americanize the Filipinos. In order to accomplish this the United States established a national education system, in which the teachers "taught Filipinos the English language, inculcated Filipinos with American culture and values, and replaced Filipino worldview with American political ideals (Constantino, 1982; Pido, 1997)" (David 2011:55). Takaki (1998) writes that Filipinos in the Philippines were schooled in American schools where they learned American history, American values, and engaged in American rituals like saying the pledge of allegiance. By doing this, the United States was able to further colonize the Filipino mind by defining American culture as superior to Filipino culture.

This 350 year history of colonization of the Philippines, first by Spain and than by the United States, makes Filipinos a unique ethnic group to study because no other Asian nation has been directly colonized by these two nations. This history of colonization makes research on Filipino-Americans even more unique from other Asian-American groups and an important topic of research. It is further important to note that research on Filipino-Americans in Hawai‘i is further unique and important to study, as the Filipino community in Hawai‘i tends to be one characterized by continued oppression and lower social status.

Beginning in 1778, western foreigners and Caucasian immigrants acquired large plots of Hawaiian land that, in 1840, became the land used for the Hawai‘i sugar plantations (Okada 2007). These sugar plantations produced the need for Hawai‘i sugar plantation
owners to import more laborers to work on the plantations. The plantation owners began to recruit immigrant workers from China, Korea, Japan, Puerto Rico, and the Philippines (Okada 2007; Takaki 1998).

Upon arriving in Hawai‘i, each ethnic group was separated from one another and was housed in different ethnic plantation sub-camps, which were often closely related to social status. An examination of the camps suggests that the Filipinos experienced some of the harshest living conditions and were often considered the lowest in social status. This claim is further supported by the stigma that plantation owners assigned to Filipinos to justify their preference for hiring Filipinos over other ethnic groups. Filipinos were often viewed as “stoop workers,” whose short stature made it “easy” for Filipinos to complete the grueling labor of the Hawai‘i plantation (Takaki 1998). Therefore, while Filipinos were admired for their plantation work, they were admired, partially, because a stereotype existed about Filipinos that suggested the work, which was difficult for Filipinos, was easier for Filipinos due to their biological characteristics.

Filipinos were not only stereotyped as “stoop workers,” which may have helped plantation owners justify the harsh working environments that Filipinos endured, but they were also demonized as “primitive,” “violent,” “sex-hungry,” “ignorant,” and “flashy” (Okamura 2008). These negative stereotypes that surrounded Filipinos had a direct effect on their treatment in Hawai‘i. Porteus and Babcock (1926) analyzed court convictions in Hawai‘i and found that Filipinos had committed “52 percent of murders, 43 percent of sex offenses, 36 percent of gambling offenses, and 28 percent of burglaries,” while Filipinos only constituted nine percent of the total population (Okamura 2008:157). Okamura (2008) further argues that high percentage of murder convictions among Filipinos is a direct effect
of the stereotypes that surrounded Filipinos, as unlike other ethnic groups, Filipinos were more likely to be charged with murder, rather than manslaughter. Porteus and Babcock’s (1926) report further supports the ideology that Filipinos were primitive, violent, sex-hungry, and hot-tempered, as they do not attribute the high crime rate among Filipinos to the sociological factors surrounding the Filipino community, but instead attribute and blame the high crime rate to the violent, primitive, and sex-hungry psychology of the Filipino. The newspapers further supported and maintained these stereotypes about Filipinos, as they would print headlines that displayed a Filipino’s ethnicity when (s)he was convicted or executed for a crime. According to Okamura (2008) this practice was almost nonexistent for other ethnic groups in Hawai‘i.

These stereotypes about Filipinos were deeply embedded in Hawai‘i’s culture and can be evidenced by a survey conducted by Felix Keesing with sixty-three students at the University of Hawai‘i in 1934 (Cariaga 1974; Okamura 2008). Keesing asked his students to list the characteristics that they believed applied to Filipinos. “Those that had ten or more responses in descending order were: “hardworking,” “emotional/excitable/temperamental,” musical,” “thrifty,” “low standard of living/poor food,” “neatly dressed,” “eager to learn,” “love bright colors,” “sociable and cooperative,” “primitive/simple-minded/child-like,” and “flashy/over-dressed”” (Okamura 2008:158). As one can see these stereotypes are mostly negative, and most of those that are positive can be attributed to the general, overarching stereotype that Filipinos are simple and childlike. Therefore, general members of society, the elite plantation owners, the newspapers, and the criminal justice system perpetuated these stereotypes about Filipinos in Hawai‘i.
The stereotypes and low social status of Filipinos does not seem to improve much with the end of the Hawai‘i plantation era. As the production on the plantations began to slow and the plantations gradually began to close, the Filipino laborers were no longer needed. Therefore, the Hawaiian Sugar Planter’s Association repatriated more than nine thousand unemployed Filipino individuals, which was a way to rid society of these individuals who were stigmatized as undesirable citizens (Alcantara 1972; Okamura 2008). A large percentage of Filipinos, who were displaced from work after the closure of the plantations, were hired into the rapidly growing tourism and service industries. By accepting jobs in these two industries, Filipinos maintained their community’s lower social status, as they accepted low-wage jobs with low chances of promotion (Okada 2007).

While many might argue that the current situation of Filipinos in Hawai‘i is far from their history of underprivileged plantation workers, as Hawai‘i has evolved into an ethnic melting pot of equal opportunities for all race and ethnic groups, Filipinos continue to be underprivileged and continue to hold lower social statuses than other ethnic groups (Okada 2007; Okamura 1990, 1998). Data from the US Census Bureau show that from 1970 to 2000 Filipinos were overrepresented in the service sector, as 31.4% of Filipino males and 30.3% of Filipino females were employed in service oriented occupations (Okamura 1990, 1998, 2008). On the other end of the spectrum, Filipinos tend to be underrepresented in professional and management positions. While some of this overrepresentation can be attributed to the large number of post 1965 immigrants that have taken jobs in the service industry, it is important to note that the underrepresentation of Filipinos in professional and management jobs, along with the overrepresentation of Filipinos in service sector jobs perpetuates many of the stereotypes about Filipinos in Hawai‘i.
In fact, Filipinos continue to be looked down upon as simple uneducated service workers and are often one of the ethnic groups that are constantly the subject of ethnic humor in Hawai‘i (Labrador 2004; Okada 2007; Okamura 2008). The ethnic humor in Hawai‘i tends to be more harmful and degrading to Filipinos than other ethnic groups. These jokes continue to perpetuate the earlier stereotypes about Filipinos being violent, using knives, being hypersexual, and being uneducated (Okamura 2008). This form of humor has also identified other stereotypes about Filipinos and has allowed them to persist in Hawai‘i. These stereotypes suggest that Filipinos are excessively religious, consume weird food, in particular black dog, and are incapable of speaking English without an accent (Okada 2007; Okamura 1998). Since Filipinos are often the topic of Hawai‘i’s ethnic humor, Filipinos often experience lower levels of self-confidence, as the jokes reinforce the stereotypes about Filipinos being uneducated service workers.

Revilla (1996) further suggested that the negative stereotypes and jokes that are constantly circulated about Filipinos have created a generation of Filipinos that are ashamed of being Filipino, after all, “who wants to be identified with a group that others make fun of?” (9). Not only have individuals become ashamed of being Filipino, this sense of shame and embarrassment has created a rift in the Filipino community, creating distance between “local Filipinos” and “immigrant Filipinos.” Bumanglag (1996) quotes a local Filipino student, who claimed that in high school the immigrant Filipinos were always being teased for the food they ate, the way they spoke, and the clothes that they wore. Overall, these immigrant Filipinos were viewed as one of the strangest groups in the school. Therefore, local Filipinos engage in a process of “defensive othering,” where they attempt to receive recognition and acceptance into the dominant group by asserting that the stereotypes about
Filipinos are, in fact true, but only apply to immigrant Filipinos, not local Filipinos. While some individuals attempt to assert their identity as local Filipino, many others simply claim themselves to be local or Hawaiian (Okamura 2008). What is intriguing about this group, however, is that later in life, often while in college, these individual overcome their sense of embarrassment and shame to develop a sense of pride and acceptance of being Filipino (Okamura 2008; Strobel 1996).

Therefore, the Filipino colonial mentality (David 2011) is something that is important to examine in the Filipino community in Hawai‘i, as the history of colonization and neocolonialism appears to continue to the present day, as Filipinos in Hawai‘i are constantly bombarded with popular culture messages that attempt to reinforce the ideology of American superiority and Filipino inferiority. This research adopts a critical race perspective to examine the processes of ethnic identity that occur within the Filipino community to either allow an individual to suppress his or her association with the Filipino community or align his or herself with the community. Overall, this study examines how Filipino individuals raised in Hawai‘i negotiate the racist and oppressive structures that lead many of these individuals to feel ashamed and embarrassed about their ethnicity.

ORGANIZATION OF THE DISSERTATION

The second chapter of this dissertation reviews the literature that is relevant to this study. Specifically, it reviews Bourdieu’s work on capital, the tenets of critical race theory and how they have lead to a revision of Bourdieu’s notion of capital into the concept of community cultural wealth. These bodies of literature are reviewed because the way that an individual views his or her ethnicity, either through a deficit perspective or a strength
based perspective, can influence an individual’s willingness to assert a certain identity. Furthermore, this chapter examines foundational work on the formation of an identity, previous research on the formation of an ethnic identity, and Goffman’s works on stigma and identity management. These bodies of literature are reviewed, as they provide insights about the processes that individuals engage in to develop a strong sense of their identity and how they may behave in order to distance themselves from other identities.

Chapter three discusses the methodological component of this research. The chapter contains discussions about why qualitative research methods and grounded theory methods of analysis were employed in this study, the sampling processes used in this study and a description of the sample that was recruited as a result of these techniques, and the interview procedures that were used in this study. This chapter closes with a discussion of the advantages and disadvantages of insider research and how such issues were addressed within the context of this research project.

The analysis of the data collected in this study begins to be presented in chapter four, which provides insights into why some Filipino individuals in Hawai‘i feel ashamed and embarrassed about their Filipino ethnicity. The chapter opens with a discussion of three of the stereotypes about Filipinos that affected the participants in this study the most. This chapter also examines the colonial mentality of these individuals, as they internalized the stereotypes of Filipinos being rude, uneducated, racist service workers and laborers. Finally, this chapter closes with an examination of the differential effect that these stereotypes had on the males and females in this study and provides some insights into why the participants in this study accepted and internalized the stereotypes about Filipinos.
Chapter five examines the various processes that the participants in this study engaged in to distance themselves from what they viewed as a stigma—being Filipino. It examines how the individuals in this study attempted to negotiate their ethnic identity with others, as they assert ethnic identities that were not Filipino. This chapter also explores the practice of asserting a local Filipino identity, which allowed the participants in this study to draw a sharp distinction between immigrant Filipinos, who they called FOBs, and themselves. Overall, this chapter examines the various techniques that the individuals in this study used to gain status for themselves while they were ashamed or embarrassed about being Filipino.

Chapter six examines the participants’ return to their Filipino ethnicity. First, this chapter examines why the participants began to rethink their ethnic identity and develop the ability to assert their Filipino ethnicity. Here the importance of perceiving the self as a role model is explored, as this appeared to be the main reason why many of the participants began to accept their ethnicity. Since these individuals did not explore or commit to their ethnicity before asserting a Filipino identity, they had to find ways to feel comfortable with what they were doing. The chapter closes with an examination of these processes, as the way that the individuals reframed the stereotypes about Filipinos and how they found strength within the Filipino family structure are discussed.

Chapter seven concludes the dissertation with a recap of the major findings in this dissertation, which sheds light on the process of Filipino identity formation in Hawai‘i and the role that negative stereotypes have in that process. This chapter also presents some suggestions for future research projects on this topic of Filipino identity formation in Hawai‘i, as they are greatly needed to understand why many young Filipinos born in Hawai‘i
are turning away from their Filipino ethnicity. Finally, this chapter closes with a reflection on what could be done to help remedy this problem of Filipino youth experiencing embarrassment and shame about their ethnic background.
LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter examines the various bodies of literature that contribute to a better understanding of how Filipinos in Hawai‘i develop a sense of pride in their Filipino ethnic identity, as well as the barriers that may prevent an individual from adopting a Filipino ethnic identity. The review begins with an examination of Bourdieu's (1977, 1984, 1986, 1993) theory of capital, which provides a backdrop for how we often think about capital and marginalized groups in society. The chapter continues with an examination of the tenets of critical race theory and how these principles inform Yosso (2005) and Yosso and Garcia's (2007) conceptualization of community cultural wealth. These discussions compliment each other as a review of Bourdieu's theory provides a framework for understanding how legitimate culture is formed, a concept, which Yosso (2005) argued is employed by many researchers to examine minority cultures, leading to "deficit thinking." Yosso's (2005) work extends Bourdieu's theoretical framework, providing an alternative way of examine the culture of oppressed groups, one that examines the strengths of the community, rather than examines how the community lacks the values, norms, and motivations to engage in legitimate culture. Therefore, conceptualizing an ethnic group through a community cultural wealth perspective discovers new forms of capital and empowers groups to see the strengths that their communities possess.

This chapter continues with an examination of the literature on the development of a self-concept and an ethnic identity, a process that allows an individual to become a participating member of their ethnic community (Bankston and Zhou 1995; Imbens-Bailey 1996; Phinney and Ong 2001). This discussion links the ethnic identity literature to the previously discussed literature, as it suggests that the development of an ethnic identity, not
only allows an individual to become a participating member in his or her ethnic community, but also allows the individual to activate the community cultural wealth that is available through that community.

Finally, this chapter examines the primordialist approach to ethnicity, which argues that ethnicity and ethnic identity are not things that an individual can rationally choose as they are a result of natural and biological conditions that exist for an individual (Gil-White 1999). This discussion leads to an examination of Goffman's (1959, 1963) theory of stigma, impression management, and the presentation of the self. If an individual's ethnic group is devalued in society it is arguable that the individual's ethnicity and ethnic identity can function as a stigma for the individual. In this case it is essential to examine Goffman's theory, as it is the presentation of the self and the impression that an individual creates for others that may allow the individual to manage the relationship between his or her ethnicity and a social stigma. Furthermore, this discussion is important within the context of the other areas of the literature reviewed in this chapter, as presenting the self in a fashion that rejects an individual's ethnic community may not only be detrimental to his or her development of an ethnic identity, but may also limit the individual's ability to view his or her ethnic community in a positive, asset based manner and, ultimately, may restrict the individual from activating the community cultural wealth that may be available through active association and participation with the individual's ethnic group.

BOURDIEU’S THEORY OF CAPITAL

Pierre Bourdieu’s (1984, 1986) theoretical framework of capital and practice have become popular in sociological analyses of the culture of oppressed groups and social stratification (Sallaz and Zavisca 2007), which has often led researchers to conclude that
minority groups fail to succeed and become equals with the majority group because they do not possess the values, norms, and motivations to engage in legitimate culture (Yosso 2005). Before this critique of Bourdieu’s theory can be explored, one must gain an understanding of the theory of capital presented by Pierre Bourdieu. Bourdieu (1986) argued that for the social scientist to truly understand social stratification, “one [must] reintroduce capital in all its forms and not solely in the one form recognized by economic theory” (242). While all forms of capital must be introduced into an analysis of social stratification, Bourdieu’s writings tend to suggest that a hierarchy of culture exists, allowing various forms of cultural values and practices to afford an individual more capital that other cultural values and practices (Bourdieu 1984, 1986; Yosso 2005). While Bourdieu (1977, 1986, 1998) discussed many forms of capital in his work, his work centered on four interrelated forms of capital: economic capital, cultural capital, social capital, and symbolic capital.

Bourdieu (1986) rejected the notion that income and monetary holdings constitute an individual’s economic capital and defined economic capital as “that which is immediately and directly convertible into money and may be institutionalized in the form of property rights” (243). Bourdieu (1986) extended his definition of economic capital to include property rights because he argued that an individual’s property is fundamentally money transformed into an object, which is institutionally recognized as belonging to the individual who purchased the item. Furthermore, this institutional recognition of ownership allows an individual to reconvert his or her belonging into the form of money through the process of selling the item. When an individual sells his or her property, the individual is exchanging the object into money that he or she initially invested in the object. This transformation from object to money provides the individual with an economic resource that is readily available
for use by the individual, thus explaining why property holdings are simply the institutional recognition of money and, therefore, should be considered as part of an individual’s economic capital.

Bourdieu (1986) suggested that economic capital is the one form of capital that many social scientists acknowledge and incorporate into their analyses of society and, therefore, did not focus much of his own work on this form of capital. He does make an important note, however, that economic capital is, perhaps, the most important form of capital that an individual can possess. Economic capital is the most important form of capital, Bourdieu (1986) argued, because it is often used to develop the other forms of capital. For example, it is through the utilization of economic capital that many individuals are able to gain acceptance into various social clubs, a form of social capital, and complete various levels of education, a form of cultural capital. Furthermore, this investment of economic capital and its transformation into cultural and social capital, often has a return effect which further increases an individual’s economic capital, as shown in the example of an individual who completes an advanced educational degree, which leads to an occupation with a higher salary (Bourdieu 1986).

A large portion of Bourdieu’s (1986, 1993) work focuses on his second form of capital--cultural capital. In short, cultural capital refers to an individual’s accumulation of cultural knowledge, skills, and abilities. According to Bourdieu (1984), the knowledge, skills, and abilities that an individual accumulates must be aligned with legitimate culture, which in the United States is often viewed as the culture of the upper class, as it is this form of capital that is recognized by the members of a society as a privileged form of capital. Therefore, legitimate culture is a social construct that can change over time and it often does
to protect the prestige of those in power. Bourdieu (1986, 1993) elaborated on the concept of cultural capital by identifying three different forms of cultural capital, which when combined constitute an individual’s overall level of cultural capital. These three forms of cultural capital have been identified as (a) cultural capital in the embodied state, (b) cultural capital in the objectified state, and (c) cultural capital in the institutionalized state.

Cultural capital in the first form, the embodied state, is an individual’s “dispositions of the mind and body,” or, in other words, an individual’s internalization of values, beliefs, attitudes, and behaviors (Bourdieu 1986:244). This internalization of culture is what Bourdieu (1986) argued was the premise for his well known concept of *habitus*, which is “external wealth converted into an integral part of the person...[which] cannot be transmitted instantaneously” by any means (244). Therefore, an individual’s *habitus* is basically the social norms, values, and attitudes of an individual’s social structure and social location internalized into the individual’s disposition. Since the *habitus*, is basically built into an individual’s disposition, it becomes the “structuring structure,” which allows individual’s to make sense of their social worlds (Bourdieu 1986:244). The *habitus*, or the individual’s disposition, is inculcated through the institution of the family and is often further developed through the education system. While an individual’s *habitus* is often created in the institutions of the family and education, it can be further developed and changed through an individual’s personal investment in developing particular *habitus* (Gorder 1980; Harker 1990; Webb, Schirato, and Danaher 2002). These investments in developing the *habitus*, through the various social institutions and the individual, ultimately become internalized within the individual and shapes an individual’s tastes and practices (Bourdieu 1984).
Bourdieu (1984) argued that the *habitus* distinguishes different classes of individuals from one another, as the *habitus* greatly influences the practices that each class of people engages in. This argument can be illustrated through an examination of various eating habits in society. Bourdieu (1986) examined the eating habits of the various social classes in relation to poverty, which Bourdieu called necessity. He argued that individuals that are closer to necessity, those in the working class, are influenced by their *habitus* to consume heavy foods, such as starches. These practices arise from the fact that foods, such as starches, are relatively inexpensive and can often satiate an individual with smaller quantities. It is important to note here, however, that while this class of individuals may have initially chosen to consume heavy foods, such as starches, due to financial constraints, these individual grow fond of and develop a preference for these foods over lighter, more artistic foods. At the other end of the spectrum, those furthest from necessity, the upper middle and upper classes, are more likely to enjoy foods that are light, artistic, and more appealing to the palette and eye. While the working class is constrained by their economic capital, the upper middle class and the upper class are liberated by their economic capital, which allows them to consume food that is more artistic in nature, rather than food that is inexpensive and can satiate an appetite. Again, however, it is important to note, that it is the economic freedom that allows this class of individuals to appreciate and develop a preference for light, artistic foods.

In addition to understanding how preferences for various foods develop, the above example also provides insights into how various forms of cultural practices, such as food consumption, provide various classes of individuals with more power and prestige. When considering food consumption practices, it becomes apparent that consuming lighter foods
that are prepared more artistically is considered more prestigious than consuming heavier foods, whose main purpose is to satiate an individual’s hunger (Bourdieu 1986). As stated above, these two food consumption patterns are practiced by two very different classes of individuals—thus affording the upper classes, those who consume more artistic food, more prestige and power in society, than those in the working class who do not engage in these consumption patterns. Ultimately, the upper class food consumption patterns become privileged and viewed as legitimate culture. Bourdieu (1986) argued that this assignment of prestige to various forms of practices exists for all practices and, thus, socially creates legitimate culture, which if practiced, can afford an individual more power and prestige. It is important to note, however, that Bourdieu (1986, 1993) argued that an individual’s *habitus*, not a conscious decision to engage in various practices, is what drives an individual to engage in more prestigious activities. Therefore, it is through the examination of cultural practices that an individual engages in that a social scientist can ascertain the level of cultural capital in the embodied state that an individual possesses.

Intertwined in the first form of cultural capital is the second form of cultural capital—cultural capital in the objectified state. Cultural capital in the objectified state takes the forms of an individual’s ownership of cultural goods (Bourdieu 1986:243). Therefore, all of the cultural items, such as televisions, books, paintings, instruments, etc., that an individual possesses constitutes his or her cultural capital in the objectified state. However, Bourdieu’s concept of cultural capital is more intricate than Veblen’s (1899) theory of conspicuous consumption, which suggests that individuals simply accumulate cultural goods to display their economic wealth and gain prestige from others, who afford them a higher status, simply for the goods that they possess. Bourdieu’s (1986) argument differs from Veblen’s theory, as
Bourdieu argued that it was insufficient for an individual to simply own a plethora of cultural goods. Instead, the individual must not only own the cultural goods, but must also know how to appropriate the goods. For example, an individual may possess the economic capital to purchase a grand piano, a country club membership, or a French chateau, but the act of purchasing the goods would not afford the individual the cultural capital he or she is seeking, as the individual must understand how to play the grand piano, how to “properly” interact with other country club members, or how to “properly” live in the French chateau (Bourdieu 1986). Therefore, according to Bourdieu’s theory of cultural capital, an individual will only be afforded a higher level of cultural capital, if he or she is able to obtain and appropriate legitimate cultural goods.

The final form of cultural capital, one that has received much attention in the past, but has not been called cultural capital, is cultural capital in the institutionalized state. In this form, cultural capital presents itself as educational achievements (Bourdieu 1986). Bourdieu (1986) wrote that academic qualifications are “a certificate of cultural competence which confers on its holder a conventional, constant, legally guaranteed value with respect to culture, social alchemy produces a form of cultural capital which has a relative autonomy vis-à-vis its bearer and even vis-à-vis the cultural capital he effectively possesses at a given moment in time” (248). Therefore, academic credentials are a stable form of cultural capital, legitimized by the state, which ascertain that an individual possesses a certain level of cultural knowledge. In short, the more legitimate education, education recognized and granted privilege by the broader society, that an individual completes, the more cultural capital in the institutionalized form, as well as cultural capital in general, an individual possesses.
The third form of capital discussed by Bourdieu (1986) is social capital, where “the volume of social capital possessed by a given agent thus depends on the size of the network of connections that he can effectively mobilize and on the volume of the capital (economic, cultural, symbolic) possessed in his own right by each of those to whom he is connect” (249). Therefore, there are two main aspects that are essential to understanding social capital—the number of connections an individual can mobilize and the amount of capital that each connection possesses. The first aspect of social capital assesses the number of social connections that an individual can mobilize to come to his or her aid. This aspect is vital to understanding social capital, as the social connections that an individual possesses, but cannot mobilize, do not increase an individual’s social capital. Therefore, similar to cultural capital in the objectified state, it is not enough for an individual to simply have many social connections, as it is vital that these connections will answer his or her call for help.

Furthermore, social capital is not solely about the number of social connections an individual can mobilize, but about the strength, measured in the amount of capital that each connection possesses. Therefore, each connection can be ranked based on the amount of economic, cultural, social, and symbolic capital that the individual, who has been mobilized possesses. Since social capital is not simply about the size of an individual’s social network, but also about the strength of each connection, it can be concluded that an individual who possesses a social network of 50 individuals with high levels of the various forms of capital, possesses more social capital than an individual who possesses a social network of 50 individuals with low levels of the various capital.

The final form of capital that Bourdieu (1984, 1986) discussed was symbolic capital, which is similar to Weber’s (1948) concept of status. Weber argued that status is
“determined by a specific, positive or negative, social estimation of honor...[and] status honor need not necessarily be linked with class situation” (Gerth and Mills 1967:187). As with Weber’s description, Bourdieu (1986, 1989) argued that an individual’s symbolic capital is afforded to the individual through the social recognition of other forms of capital. In other words, an individual only possesses symbolic capital if other individuals empower him or her with symbolic capital, as if the other individuals in society fail to recognize the other forms of capital that an individual possesses, the individual loses the symbolic capital he or she was once afforded. As with the other forms of capital, this type of capital is deeply intertwined with the other forms of capital, as it is an individual’s economic, cultural, and social capital that influence an individual’s level of symbolic capital. This process of assigning symbolic capital to an individual is not done on an individual basis, but on a much broader structural level, as societies symbolically assign privilege to various forms of capital, attitudes, practices, and tastes (Bourdieu 1986). This makes it possible for individuals to quickly assign symbolic capital to an individual based on minimal amounts of information. For example, discovering that an individual is employed as a doctor, affords the individual a high level of symbolic capital, as it is assumed, based on societal perceptions, that doctors have high levels of economic, cultural, and social capital and inhabit the upper class. Therefore, the individuals that possess these various forms of capital, attitudes, practices, and tastes are afforded a certain level of prestige, power, and symbolic capital, which stems from the societal categories that are created and the practices that are associated with each group. Overall, it is symbolic capital, the social estimation of honor, that regulates what a society deems as legitimate culture.
CRITICAL RACE THEORY: TRANSFORMING CAPITAL INTO COMMUNITY CULTURAL WEALTH

The development of critical race theory has provided a framework for scholars to critique and attempt to revise Bourdieu’s notion of capital. These revisions attempt to decenter the discussions of capital, allowing scholars to address the value of alternative forms of values that may exist, especially within oppressed communities. This decentering of capital, the ability to move away from seeing upper middle class and upper class as the only form of legitimate culture that grants individuals power and prestige, encourages scholars to look within the minority and oppressed community to find sources of strength and capital, which may improve the social condition of its constituents. The following section briefly explores the theoretical underpinnings of critical race theory and how these theoretical tenets have been applied to extend Bourdieu’s notion of capital into the broader concept of community cultural wealth.

While many may argue that there are no central tenets that all critical race theorists agree upon, there are three main tenets of critical race theory. These main tenets are: (a) racism is a normal occurrence in American society, (b) reality is socially constructed and alternative realities can be constructed through the practice of storytelling, and (c) a commitment to social justice and challenging the dominant ideology (Delgado and Stefancic 2000, 2001; Solorzano and Yosso 2002; Yosso 2005).

The first tenet of critical race theory, the idea that racism is a normal, everyday occurrence in American society, has led many to critique the critical race movement as too pessimistic (Delgado and Stefancic 2000; Delgado and Stefancic 2001; Solorzano and Yosso 2002; Yosso 2005). Critical race theory argues that racism is normal, ordinary, ingrained in all interaction, and experienced on a daily basis by people of color, and, therefore, “formal
conceptions of equality, expressed in rules that insist only on treatment that is the same across the board, can thus remedy only the most blatant forms of discrimination, such as mortgage redlining or the refusal to hire a black PhD rather than a white high school dropout” (Delgado and Stefancic 2001:7). Therefore, the traditional civil rights movement, which aimed to force equality through the creation of laws that ensure equal opportunities, according to critical race theorists, is inadequate because it cannot fully address the everyday lived experiences of racism.

Critical race theorists have coined the term microaggressions to refer to these, often unconscious activities that preserve and perpetuate racism and, ultimately, define the everyday lived experience of racism (Davis 1989; Delgado 1987; Sue, Bucceri, Lin, Nadal, and Torino 2009). The early work on microaggressions focused on the legal structure, as critical race theory developed out of critical legal studies, and examined the unconscious racism that existed in the courtroom. Davis (1989) argued that every individual, including the attorneys, live in a society, where Blacks are constantly regarded as incompetent, which greatly affect the perception of Blacks within the legal system. For example, if an attorney was raised in the United States, he or she was most likely exposed to the prevalent negative stereotypes about Blacks from a very young age and would have assimilated these stereotypes into their worldview. Davis (1989) argued that these stereotypes, regardless of whether or not the attorney consciously recognizes racism as morally wrong, will guide the attorney’s decisions, body language, and subconscious. Ultimately, these internalized stereotypes will lead an attorney to represent a Black defendant in a different fashion that he or she would represent a White defendant.
Furthermore, Davis (1989) argued that Black jurists experience two levels of microaggressions during jury deliberations. First, they experience a sense of injustice and inferiority during the deliberations, as their views on the case are often disregarded and ignored. She argued that the common practice of ignoring or disregarding the input of Black individuals stems from the negative stereotypes that exist about Blacks in the broader society. Secondly, the rejection of their views as legitimate jury members translates into a broader message of inferiority in society, as these Black jurors conclude that the law, which they believed to be unbiased and neutral, is deeply influenced by racial stereotypes and racist behaviors. Therefore, it is argued that Blacks tend to be disenfranchised with the legal system, as they recognize that what they once believe to be an objective structure, is actually quite subjective in nature.

Current work on microaggressions has expanded to incorporate work in the fields of education, psychology, and sociology. In a recently published study, Sue et al. (2009) examined the microaggressions that Asian Americans experience on an everyday basis, which reaffirm the inferiority of Asian Americans in American society. The researchers concluded that Asian Americans often experience microaggressions that question their nativity to the United States, deny them a racial experience, and ascribe traits of intelligence and exoticism to individuals. These microaggressions take the form of statements or actions, which are often done without negative intentions, such as attempting to speak to an Asian American in an ethnic Asian language or making a comment such as “you speak very good English.” Other examples of Asian American racial microaggressions take the form of individuals suggesting that “all Asians look alike” or making a statement such as, “my
neighbor was Chinese, or was she Japanese, I’m not sure,” which, in both cases deny the racial differences that exist between various Asian American ethnic groups.

Furthermore, critical race theorists argue that racism in society is normal and common “because racism advances the interests of both White elites (materially) and working-class people (psychically)” (Delgado and Stefancic 2001:7). Therefore, racism is perpetuated and continues to exist in society because it advances the interest of a large segment of society, and a remedy for racist actions will only be instituted when the societal advance that improves the life conditions for an oppressed group also advance the interests of the White majority (Bell 1980; Delgado and Stefancic 2000; Delgado and Stefancic 2001; Dudziak 1988). This concept, to the critical race theorists, is known as interest convergence and the popular desegregation case *Brown Vs The Board of Education* has been a popular case for analysis and application of the interest convergence concept. Dudziak (1988) employed a historical approach to examine the *Brown Vs The Board of Education* ruling, which desegregated American schools, and argued that desegregation only occurred because it was proposed during a Cold War American culture. Since the United States was fighting against the rising popularity of communism, American foreign policy greatly shaped the *Brown* decision, as the United States attempted to prove to the world that it was the most civilized and secure form of government by granting “equal” rights to all of its citizens. Therefore, while desegregation was a social change that improved the social position of Blacks, it also furthered the foreign policy interests of Whites by allowing the ruling to “deliver a blow to communism and [vindicate] American democratic principles” (Dudziak 1988 in Delgado and Stefancic 2000:107).
Therefore, to fully understand the first tenet that racism is normal in American society, one must first understand the concept of microaggressions, as this concept reveals how racism is alive and well in everyday life and is often committed without cruel intentions. It is through the study and understanding of microaggressions that one can understand why critical race theorists consider racism to be a daily lived experience by people of color.

Secondly, it is important to understand the concept of interest convergence, as it sheds lights on why racism continues to exist in American society and why many attempts to gain rights and equality for people of color are often unsuccessful.

The second tenet of critical race theory is that reality is socially constructed and that alternative realities can be created through the process of storytelling (Buenavista, Jayakumar, and Misa-Escalante 2009; Delgado and Stefancic 2000; Delgado and Stefancic 2001; Solorzano and Yosso 2002). More specifically, and more importantly, critical race theorists argue that race is not an objective and stable concept, but, instead, it is a social construction, which varies with time and space (Lopez 1994; Omi and Winant 1994; Torres and Milun 1990). Lopez (1994) argued that the creation of race is an ongoing process that is influenced by the broader social and political forces, which define a collectivity of human beings as having the same racial ancestry. This definition of race suggests that there is no direct gene or cluster of genes that define any group of people, as biologically distinct from other groups of people. Instead, the human race is vastly differentiated and the objective creation of distinct racial groups based on biology is impossible.

Furthermore, Lopez (1994) argued that (a) race is the result of human interaction, rather than abstract forces, (b) races are created and ordered in relation to other races, and (c) the ideas about race can change quite rapidly. Take for example, the case of the Mashpee
Indians in the land claim suit *Mashpee Tribe v. Town of Mashpee*. In this land claim suit, the Mashpee Indian Tribe sought control of the land that belonged to the tribe, and in order to win the legal suit the Mashpee needed to prove they qualified as a tribe. Therefore, according to the legal doctrine at the time, the Mashpee needed to prove racial purity, authoritarian leadership, and consistent territorial occupancy (Torres and Milun 1990). Overall, the Mashpee needed to prove that they were a legitimate race, which they failed to do and lost the land dispute. This case demonstrates the fluidity of race, as since the Mashpee were unable to meet the legal requirements, which were socially constructed to maintain society, to prove they were a tribe, their race became delegitimized. Therefore, by constructing race as a social construction, rather than an objective truth, critical race theorists argue that race is a dynamic concept that must constantly be maintained and recreated.

Also related to the idea of social constructionism, is critical race theory’s commitment to challenge the dominant ideology (Delgado and Stefancic 2000; Delgado and Stefancic 2001; Solorzano and Yosso 2002). Since race is simply a social construction and is malleable, the notions of race, and the stereotypes associated with each created race, can be changed or at least challenged through the use of storytelling (Bell 1988; Delgado 1989; Ross 1989; Torres and Milun 1990). Storytelling makes it apparent that one’s reality can be seen in many different ways, as a single object, event, or idea can be understood in a multiplicity of ways by different individuals. Take for example “a rectangular red object on my living room floor [it] may be a nuisance if I stub my toe on it in the dark, a doorstop if I use it for that purpose, further evidence of my lackadaisical housekeeping to my visiting mother, a toy to my young daughter, or simply a brick left over from my patio restoration project” (Delgado 1989 in Delgado and Stefancic 2000:61). According to critical race theorists, the
simple act of describing an object or event places the actor in a position of creating a reality. Stories that are commonly told can become adopted as the popular discourse and are often used as the measuring stick against which future events or actions are assessed by. In the United States these stories include the American Dream, meritocracy, colorblindness, and other stories that promote a neutral, unbiased approach to assessing various objects, events, or individuals.

Critical race theory proposes that we should not take these stories for granted and should challenge the dominant discourse, which can effectively be done by listening to the “voices at the bottom” and constructing counterstories (Buena Vista et al. 2009; Delgado 1989; Matsuda 1987; Solorzano and Yosso 2002). By listening to the “voices at the bottom” critical race theory acknowledges that the experiences and created realities of the oppressed are legitimate constructions of the world, which can be employed to debunk many of the myths created by the dominant societal discourse. In its infancy the concept of storytelling was grounded in legal studies and used to challenge the dominant legal discourse, as represented in the previously discussed examples of Brown (Dudziak 1998) and Mashpee (Torres and Milun 1990). Currently, the process of creating a counterstory has been expanded in to fields such as sociology and education, which have helped create a methodology for creating counterstories. While these fields recognize the strength and existence of personal narratives as counterstories, they call for the creation of composite stories or narratives (Solorzano and Yosso 2002). Composite counterstories are created from “(a) the data gathered from the research process itself, (b) the existing literature on the topics, (c) our own professional experiences, and (d) our own personal experience” (Solorzano and Yosso 2002:34). Therefore, the first step to creating a counterstory is to sift through the data
collected and identify themes and concepts that are present in the data. Next, the researcher compares these identified themes and concepts to the existing literature on the identified topics, and finally uses his or her personal and professional experiences to add to the developed themes and concepts. These processes, which are congruent with grounded theory principles, are the basis for the composite counterstories (Charmaz 2006). Based on this information the researcher creates a counterstory, by creating composite characters, situations, and plots, to shed light on the experiences of the oppressed and to challenge the dominant ideology.

Critical race theory’s dedication to understanding race as a socially constructed everyday experience and to valuing the experiential knowledge of the oppressed, leads to the final tenet of critical race theory, a commitment to social justice (Delgado and Stefancic 2000; Delgado and Stefancic 2001; Solorzano and Yosso 2002). This commitment to social justice requires critical race scholars to value the voices of the oppressed and to recognize and advocate against the numerous forms of oppression that exist in our society. A crucial aspect of being able to advocate against the types of oppressions present in society is being able to identify what these oppressions are and how they intersect with one another. This principle of intersectionality suggests that scholars should not privilege or rank any single form of oppression, but should attempt to understand how these oppressions are interlocked with one another creating a numerous different forms of oppression (Caldwell 1991; Crenshaw, Gotanda, Peller, and Thomas 1995; Delgado 1993; Hill Collins 1998). Therefore, a Black male and Black female, although they both will experience oppression in the form of racism, will have quite different experiences with oppression. Here the Black female experiences oppression at the crossroads of racism and sexism, while the Black male only
experiences racism. It is, of course, important to note that this is a rather simplistic example as numerous other forms of oppressions (e.g. classism, heterosexism, etc.) exist in society and can intersect with each other in countless ways. Therefore, critical race scholars tend to adopt anti-essentialist arguments, arguing that scholars need to recognize that there are varying experiences of oppression among minority and oppressed groups (Ikemoto 1993; Hill Collins 1998; Kennedy 1989).

These beliefs in intersectionality and anti-essentialism have lead many critical race scholars to adopt the aforementioned storytelling techniques. In critical race theory’s infancy these tactics were used to win legal cases, as the narrative of the oppressed was presented in a court of law to persuade the jury to find in favor of the oppressed individual. A recent example of how this commitment to social justice is demonstrated through these beliefs of intersectionality and anti-essentialism comes from the field of education. Buenavista, Jayakumar, and Misa-Escalante (2009) examine the experiences of Filipino college students in the United States. The researchers employed a critical race framework because they argue that the experiences of Filipinos in the United States have largely been ignored. This failure to recognize the experiences of Filipinos is usually a result of the common categorization of Filipinos as Asian Americans. It is through this categorization that the plight of Filipinos tends to go unnoticed or delegitimized, as Filipinos are believed to be part of the “model minority.” Due to this common misperception and belief that Asian Americans have a common experience in American universities, Buenavista et al. (2009) argued that Filipino students tend to be invisible as an underprivileged group and lack the institutional support that the “visible” underprivileged groups have access to, making the Filipino experience very different, and worthy of investigation, from that of other underprivileged groups. At a broad
level, Sue et al. (2009) argued that these essentialist beliefs held about people of color have allowed numerous injustices to occur to the broad Asian American community, as the plight of each individual Asian ethnic group is ignored and rendered invisible by the broad grouping Asian American.

Therefore, critical race theory, by accepting an anti-essentialist position and recognizing the intersectionality of types of oppression, forces critical race scholars to provide a voice for groups that are oppressed (Solorzano and Yosso 2002). By listening to the “voices of at bottom” and creating counternarratives from these data, critical race scholars are devoted to providing resources to oppressed groups, which allow the groups to recognize and legitimize the existence of alternate realities. The ability of the marginalized groups to accept, legitimize, and share the existence of their alternate realities with the broader public, allow these groups to gain more power in society. Critical race theory’s commitment to social justice takes an active role in this process, as many critical race scholars focus on how we, as a society, can move towards the elimination of the various forms of oppression (Solorzano and Yosso 2002).

Using the critical race framework discussed above Tara Yosso (2005) has raised concerns about the way Bourdieu’s theory of capital has been employed in the analyses of oppressed groups. As stated earlier, Bourdieu’s theory of capital suggests that various practices, those that are considered legitimate culture, are more prestigious and, thus award a differential amount of capital to individuals who engage in these various cultural activities. Therefore, when applying this theory to minority or oppressed groups, the theory suggests that “some communities are culturally wealthy while other are culturally poor...[thus suggesting that] cultural capital is not just inherited or possessed by the middle class, but
rather it refers to an accumulation of specific forms of knowledge, skills, and abilities that are valued by privileged groups in society” (Yosso 2005:76). Yosso (2005) argued that this application of Bourdieu’s theory represents “deficit theorizing,” as it centers the norm of cultural knowledge in the realm of the white middle class and suggests that minority groups must find a way to acquire this specific form of cultural knowledge to improve their social position. Therefore, this suggests that minority groups are born into a disadvantaged class as they lack immediate access to the appropriate forms of capital.

In line with critical race theory’s commitment to social justice, and imperatives to listen to the “voices at the bottom” and realize that dominant ideas are influenced by and often maintain racist ideologies, Yosso (2005) and Yosso and Garcia (2007) employ a decentered approach to capital in minority communities. This is accomplished by employing the concept of community cultural wealth, which refers to “an array of knowledges, skills, abilities, and contacts possessed and utilized by Communities of Color to survive and resist macro and micro-forms of oppression” (Yosso 2005:77). As depicted in the diagram below, Yosso (2005) and Yosso and Garcia (2007) define six different forms of capital that constitute community cultural wealth. These ‘alternative’ forms of capital are aspirational capital, familial capital, social capital, linguistic capital, resistant capital, and navigational capital. As with Bourdieu’s theory each form of capital is deeply interrelated, as one form of capital can be employed to increase the level of another form of capital that an individual possesses.

Figure 1: Community Cultural Wealth. Adapted from: Yosso, 2005
The concept of aspirational capital draws from the work of scholars who have found that Chicanos/as experience the lowest educational rates compared to all other minority groups in the United States, but still continue to have high educational aspirations for their children (Delgado-Gaitan; Gandara 1982; Solorzano 1992). Therefore, aspirational capital refers a community’s ability to foster a sense of hope among its members to hold dreams that their present situation does not have the means to obtain. An example of this form of capital would be a working class family that struggles to pay their rent and provide food for the members of the family, but encourage their children to hold on to their dreams about attending medical school and becoming a doctor. In this case, the family does not have the financial ability to send their children to medical school, but still continues to foster a sense of hope in the child that one day their dream may become a reality. Gandara (1995) argued that this form of capital creates a culture of possibility, a belief in a fluid social structure, where one’s aspirations and dreams do not have to be limited by one’s parent’s current social position.

Drawing on research on bilingual education, Yosso (2005) identified linguistic capital as another form of capital that contributes to community cultural wealth of a minority
community. Linguistic capital refers to set of communication skills and abilities that individuals develop by speaking more than one language. It has been found that children who are bilingual often are asked to be translators for their parents or other adults, which provides these children with skills in audience awareness, literacy skills, enhanced vocabulary, teaching skills, family responsibility, and higher maturity levels (Orellana 2003 as cited in Yosso 2005). Furthermore, Yosso (2005) argued that these individuals are often raised in a storytelling culture, which helps individuals develop skills with memorization, facial affect, comedic timing, attention to details, and ability to communicate using visual art, poetry, and music, which also constitutes linguistic capital.

The third form of capital the Yosso (2005) identified as constituting community cultural wealth is familial capital, which refers to “cultural knowledges that are nurtured among familia (kin) [and] carry a sense of community history, memory, and cultural intuition” (79). These cultural knowledges tend to shift the focus of the family from the nuclear family to the extended family (Foley 1997; Morris 1999; Velez-Ibanez and Greenberg 1992). Here the term of extended family is used quite liberally, though, as the term refers to friends that individuals may consider family in addition to those acknowledged by the traditional use of the phrase, such as aunts, uncles, grandparents, and cousins. Yosso (2005) and Yosso and Garcia (2007) argued that this form of capital creates a community, in which its members are well connected to one another, as isolation is minimized. This form of community helps to develop strength in the community, as community members recognize that they are not alone in their trials and tribulations and have a strong support system to fall back upon. This communal nature, created by familial capital, often socializes individuals to be caring, nurturing, and teaches individuals how to be providers for others.
The fourth form of capital identified by Yosso (2005) is social capital, which are simply the networks of people and community resources that are available to an individual. It is noted that social capital can function on two different levels. First, it can provide emotional support for an individual. Social capital in this form is closely related the familial capital, as this type of social capital allows an individual to understand that he or she is not alone in whatever process (s)he may be pursuing. For example, social capital may present itself in the form of a minority individual recognizing that (s)he is not the only individual from the minority community that is pursuing or has pursued higher education. This functions to reduce the anxiety that is associated with “acting white,” which may prevent some individuals from pursuing higher education (Jencks and Phillips 1998). As one can see, this type of social capital is closely interrelated with familial capital, as it provides a sense of community and belonging for the individual.

The second form of social capital that Yosso (2005) identified is similar to Bourdieu’s (1984, 1986) concept of social capital, but is grounded in the social networks of the minority community. Yosso terms this instrumental social capital, which refers to actual aid and resources that social connections may bring to an individual. Therefore, this form of social capital may present itself as a community member helping a high school student complete college or scholarship applications, or as local business owners who offer scholarships or internships to their fellow community members. Therefore, this form of social capital can be recognized by the actual help and resources that become available to the individual through his or her social connections.

The fifth form of capital that Yosso (2005) identified, which is closely related to social capital, is navigational capital. This form of capital refers to the skills that an individual
acquires to navigate his/her way through social institutions. Drawing on the critical race
tenet that racism is normal and permeates American society (Delgado and Stefancic 2000;
Delgado and Stefancic 2001; Solorzano and Yosso 2002; Yosso 2005), Yosso (2005) argues
that social institutions are not created with communities of color in mind, and, therefore,
minority individuals need to develop ways to successfully navigate a social structure that
only privileges certain groups of people. Therefore, this type of capital could take the form
of the advice from a fellow community member about what doctors to go to, which classes to
take at a university, or which professors are more likely to give aid to minority students.
However, navigational capital differs from social capital because it can be obtained simply
through the individual, as the individual may learn from his or her past experiences and
develop his or her own strategies for navigating through social structures. Overall, this form
of capital helps to allow the individual to become more resilient to oppression, as they will be
able to survive, recover, and/or thrive after stressful events they encounter in various social
structures (Stanton-Salazar and Spina 2000; Yosso 2005, Yosso and Garcia 2007).

The final form of capital that constitutes community cultural wealth is resistant capital,
which is the “knowledges and skills fostered through oppositional behavior that challenges
inequality” (Yosso 2005:80). Since resistant capital refers to skills and knowledges that
challenge inequality, a major component of resistant capital is cultural knowledge that racism
exists and a rationale for transforming the racist structure (Pizarro 1998; Yosso 2005). By
recognizing that racial inequality exists within communities, individuals are able to develop
strategies and skills to resist forms of inequality, increasing their ability to be resilient in
oppressive structures. For example, studies conducted with African American and Latino
communities have found that parents, who recognize the disadvantages they face due to their
race and ethnicity, attempt to socialize their daughters to be oppositional with their bodies and minds despite constantly being faced with issues of racism, sexism, and class inequalities that attempt to maintain the status quo (Villenas and Morena 2001; Ward 1996; Yosso 2005). Thus, these young females are taught about the inequalities that they will experience throughout society, as well as strategies to overcome these inequalities.

A final component of resistant capital and an important component of community cultural wealth is the reciprocal nature of the community cultural wealth. Community cultural wealth functions as a pool of resources that community members can draw upon when needed and individuals who gain capital as a result of the aid rendered are encouraged to help maintain and pass on the numerous forms of capital that constitute community cultural wealth (Yosso 2005). This “requirement” of reinvesting in the community cultural wealth of one’s community is what allows minority communities to build their strength, increase the strength of their social networks, and increase the set of resources, skills, and knowledge that individuals can learn from a community’s community cultural wealth.

It is important to note that the forms of capital addressed above are simply suggestions for forms of capital that may exist in various minority and oppressed communities. The work done by Yosso (2005) and Yosso and Garcia (2007) has focused on Latina/o communities and has found that these are some of the forms of capital that exist within these communities. However, to simply apply these forms of capital to a community of color would be to simply commit the same fallacy Yosso (2005) describes with the use of Bourdieu’s theory. Researchers can use these forms of capital as a starting point to uncover often ignored or unprivileged forms of capital that may exist within these various minority communities. Therefore, it is suggested that researchers should decenter their approach to capital in the
various communities and seek to uncover the forms of capital that are available for community members to access, which are often not considered legitimate capital.

DEVELOPING A SENSE OF THE SELF AND AN IDENTITY

Prior to delving into the research that has been done on ethnic identity and its relationship to the various forms of capital, it is important to briefly examine the literature on the creation of a self and formation of an identity, as an individual can only develop an identity when once they have developed a self. Mead (1934), who has been cited by many symbolic interactionists, takes a dualistic approach to the body and the self, as he sees the two separate things that are interrelated. Mead (1934) clearly makes this distinction, as he writes:

We can distinguish very differently between the self and the body. The body can be there and can operate in a very intelligent fashion without there being a self involved in the experience. The self has the characteristic that it is an object to itself and that characteristic distinguishes it from other objects and from the body...The parts of the body are quite distinguishable from the self. We can lose parts of the body without any serious invasion of the self. (136)

In the above passage, it becomes clear that while an individual is born with a body, an individual is not necessarily born with a self, as a self is not a requirement for the body to function. Instead, this suggests that the self is something that must be developed through the ability to take the self as an object, to be able to objectively see oneself as an object that is not only separate from other objects in the environment, but also from one’s body. This dualistic approach to the body and self, creates a basis for Mead’s (1934) argument that the self “is something which has a development; it is not initially there at birth, but arises in the process of social experience and activity” (135). Therefore, the self, and the creation of the self, is inherently a social process and a social construction.
If one accepts Mead’s (1934) argument about the duality that exists between the body and the self, with the self being, essentially, the culmination of a social process, as “it is impossible to conceive of a self arising outside of social experience,” it becomes extremely important to examine how this is a social process and how this process can enable or constrain the development of an identity (140). Mead suggests that the creation of a self is inherently social because the self is created through the process of taking oneself as an object. The ability to take oneself as an object only arises from the individual’s ability to “take the attitude of other individuals towards himself within a social environment or context of experience and behavior in which both he and they are involved” (138). Therefore, for an individual to establish and develop as self, he or she must be able to take the position of another individual and conceptualize what that other individual thinks about him or her. In other words, the individual must view his or herself from the perspective of another individual, which makes the development of a self an inherently social process.

This ability to view the self as an object seen through the lens of another individual is not only the basis for a creation of the self, but is also the basis for the creation of an identity. Appiah (2005) writes that, like the self, and identity begins in infancy and “is a dialogue with other people’s understandings of who I am that [helps to] develop a conception of [one’s] own identity” (20). Again, there is this connection that exists between the social environment and the individual, which suggests that the individual’s concept of his or herself is actually formulated through the interpretation of ideas and concepts that are generated from society and not the individual. In fact, the ideas and concepts that an individual uses to understand himself or herself are often generated through social institutions, such as religion, education, politics, and can be mediated through social relationships with family, friends, and
acquaintances (Appiah, 2005). Therefore, our identities, while formulated and viewed as an individual development, are in actuality collective identities. Appiah (2005) argues that:

To say that collective identities--that is, the collective dimension of our individual identities--are responses to something outside our selves is to say that they are the products of histories, and our engagement with them invokes capacities that are not under our control. Yet they are social not just because they involves others, but because they are constituted in part by socially transmitted conceptions of how a person of that identity properly behaves. (21)

Therefore, it can be concluded that identities are not stable and will vary with location and time. Thus, Appiah (2005) invokes the concept of the sociological imagination, when discussing his theory of identity formation. C. Wright Mills (1959) coined the concept of the sociological imagination and suggested that it is vital for any social scientist to understand, not only the biography of an individual, but also the history of the society that the individual exists within, along with the intersections between the biography and history. This concept becomes extremely important in understanding collective identities, as these identities that individuals can adopt are created by the historical, social environment that an individual finds his or herself in.

Therefore, in order to form an identity, an individual must draw on the “kinds of persons” that are available in one’s society (Appiah, 2005; Hacking 2007). According to Hacking (2007) a typology of people is created by society, which often leads to a classificatory scheme to determine who belongs to what group. These typologies, however, are constantly changing and being contested. Omi and Winant (1986) provide an example of this change, as they discuss the historical changes that have occurred in the United States to classify who is Black. Although, the current culture in the United States may not classify someone who only has a very distant ancestor who was Black, as Black, according to the one drop rule, which has historically used, someone who only had “one drop of Black blood”
would be considered and classified as Black. As one can see from this example, the typology of “kinds of people” is not static and can be changed, thus making it essential to understand the personal choices for adopting an identity, as well as the historical trends and circumstances that create the identification categories that individuals can choose to adopt.

Hacking (2007) further argued that once the typology of “kinds of people” is created, different attributes, or stereotypes concerning behavior, values, and attitudes are assigned to each group. Through the process of depersonalization in the way that we speak about the different “kinds of people” these stereotypes become salient, as in the case of “the autistic child,” rather than “the child with autism” (Hacking 2007:312-313). Here, language allows for the depersonalization of an individual with a certain characteristic, which allows the individual to be placed in a broad, generalized category. This does not mean that every individual in the group is identical, however, it does suggest that a collective representation of a group is formed and is often used to prejudge individuals that are part of, or identify with, a particular group of people. Appiah (2005) further supports these arguments and suggests, “once labels are applied to people, ideas about who fit the label come to have social and psychological effects. In particular, these ideas shape the ways people conceive of themselves and their projects. So, the labels operate to mold what we may call identification” (66). Here, one can see that the label is not simply used to categorize an individual, but to suggest some set of predefined characteristics that apply to the individual, a process, which can have profound effects on an individual’s sense of self.

Returning to Mead (1934) one can examine how an individual may manage the different labels that are assigned to them. Mead (1934) writes “of course, a good deal of the self does not need to get expression. We carry on a whole series of different relationships to
different people. We are one thing to one man and another thing to another. There are parts of the self, which exist only for the self in relationship to itself. We divide ourselves up in all sorts of different selves with reference to our acquaintances” (142). In other words, there are different categories that an individual can be placed in, each having varying degrees of saliency. Therefore, the individual can change his or her behavior to highlight various segments of the self, while making other aspects of the self less conspicuous (Appiah 2005; Cooley 1902; Mead 1934; Goffman 1959; Goffman 1963). Appiah (2005) suggests that “you can choose whether or not to play a certain conventional role, and, if all there is to an identity is a conventional set of behaviors, and you are capable of them, then you can choose whether to adopt the identity” (69-70). Therefore, while social categories, or kinds of people, are created and applied to an individual, the individual, in many cases, has the option to either engage in the criteria that define the category or refuse to display any behaviors that are assigned to a category, allowing the individual to ultimately choose and develop his or her identity.

In conclusion, it is clear that the creation of the self and the development of an identity is neither purely a personal endeavor or imposed upon an individual by the individual’s social environment. Instead, as Mills (1959) suggests the is a clear blending of history and biography, as the history and social environment presents an individual with a number of socially agreed upon categories that can be employed to create a self concept and an identity. However, it is, in most cases, the individual’s choice, as to which category the individual will adopt and adjust his or her behavior to, in order to identify with the category created by the social environment.
ETHNIC IDENTITY, CAPITAL, AND THE CIRCUMSTANTIALIST APPROACH TO ETHNICITY

The above discussion brings one to the question of “why would someone identify with a social category.” One plausible explanation for this gravitation towards a particular social category is that the individual views the types and amount of capital that a social category can afford them in a favorable fashion. While it is important, as Bourdieu (1984) suggested to “reintroduce capital in all its forms,” it is also necessary to examine the processes that occur and allow individuals to activate that capital they can potentially activate. One strand of empirical research suggests that an individual’s ethnic identity can provide an individual with access to these forms of capital, as an individual’s ethnic identity provides the individual with the ability and pride to participate in their ethnic communities (Bankston and Zhou 1995; Imbens-Bailey 1996; Phinney and Ong 2001). The following discussion will explore the theoretical concept of ethnic identity and examine how the development of a strong, positive ethnic identity may lead an individual to activate various forms of capital to which (s)he may have access.

For the purposes of this research, ethnic identity will be defined as an individual’s subjective sense of belonging to an ethnic group, which is usually supported by the individual’s exploration of what it means to be part of their ethnic group. While ethnic identity may be simply defined, as above, the concept of ethnic identity is quite complex. An examination of the literature on ethnic identity yields eight different aspects of ethnic identity (Ashmore, Deaux, and McLaughlin-Volpe 2004; Cokley 2007; Phinney 1996; Phinney 2000; Phinney and Ong 2007). These aspects are (a) self categorization, (b) commitment and attachment, (c) exploration, (d) behavioral involvement, (e) in-group attitudes, (f) ethnic values and beliefs, (g) importance of group membership, and (h) importance of ethnic
identity in relationship to national identity. While scholars have identified all of these aspects of ethnic identity, it is generally agreed that the two most important components of ethnic identity are commitment or self-categorization and exploration (Phinney, Romero, Nava, and Huang 2001).

Commitment and exploration are the two crucial aspects of Erikson’s (1968) ego identity formation theory that was later applied by Marcia (1980) to explain the development of an ethnic identity. Commitment refers to an individual’s attachment and personal investment in an ethnic group, while exploration refers to an individual seeking information and experiences that are related to his or her claimed ethnicity. This theoretical framework identifies four different types of identities as demonstrated in the table below.

Table 1: Types/Stages of Ethnic Identity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No Commitment</th>
<th>Commitment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Exploration</td>
<td>Diffuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exploration</td>
<td>Moratorium</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An individual with a diffuse ethnic identity does not have a commitment to an ethnic group and does not attempt to explore an ethnic group. Often those in the majority group have a diffuse ethnic identity, as they claim to not have a vested interest in ethnicity, which may be a result of the fact that they are unable to see how ethnicity affects their everyday life. An individual who does not explore his or her ethnic group, but has made a commitment to an ethnic group has developed a foreclosed identity. This is a common occurrence among children and adolescents, who often are socialized to have positive attitudes about their ethnic group, but have not had the opportunity to independently explore their ethnicity. An exploration of one’s ethnicity, is often triggered by an event that forces an
individual to become aware of his or her ethnicity (Cross 1978; Kim 1981; Nadal 2004; Phinney and Ong 2007). This event usually leads an individual to become interested in his or her ethnicity and to develop a moratorium identity. Once the individual actively explores his or her ethnicity and makes a conscious choice to be committed to that ethnicity, he or she is thought to have developed an achieved ethnic identity.

Umama-Taylor, Yazedjian, and Bamaca-Gomez (2004) build upon this two by two matrix and introduce a third variable that is critical to understanding ethnic identity--affirmation. Affirmation refers to an individual’s positive or negative feelings about his or her ethnicity. The researchers offered an example of two Filipino women to illustrate their argument for the inclusion of the affirmation variable:

Take, for example, two Filipino women. They have both explored their ethnicity by attending cultural events, reading books about the history of the Philippines, and talking to their families about Filipino culture (i.e. exploration). In addition, they both feel confident about what being Filipino means to them (i.e. resolution [the variable is called commitment in the previous chart]). However, one of the women feels very positively about her Filipino background, while the other woman feels negatively because of the history of colonization of the Philippines by multiple countries, which she feels has resulted in a lack of Filipino culture (i.e. affirmation). (Umana-Taylor et al. 2004: 14)

Applying this Marcia’s (1980) framework to this example would yield a result where both women have a similar ethnic identity. In this case, both women have explored and committed themselves to an ethnicity, thus suggesting that they both have an achieved ethnic identity. However, when the third variable, affirmation, is introduced these two women will be found to have very different forms of ethnic identity, as one has pride in being Filipino, while the other does not. Therefore, it is arguable that there are three main components to ethnic identity--commitment, exploration, and affirmation.
It was contradictions such as that presented above and the unique historical and sociocultural factors presented to Filipinos that led (2004) to develop a six stage nonlinear Pilipino Identity Development model. He identified the following six stages in his model: (a) ethnic awareness, (b) assimilation to the dominant culture, (c) awakening to social political consciousness, (d) panethnic Asian American consciousness, (e) ethnocentric consciousness, and (f) incorporation. While Nadal (2004) wrote about these stages as a progression of development, he cautions social scientists from treating the model as a linear model, suggesting that Filipino individuals may pass through each stage numerous times, may skip some stages all together, or may never emerge from one phase into another.

Nadal (2004) argued that the ethnic awareness stage usually begins at the early ages of two to five years old, when parents “attempt to teach [their] children of the importance of F/Pilipino culture--through food, dance, dress, music, or attempts to teach his or her native language” (53). This stage is similar to the aforementioned foreclosed stage, as the child basically has strong, positive feelings about being Filipino because that is all the child knows. The individual has not attended school at this point and, therefore, may not be aware of the cultural diversity that exists in the broader society. Nadal (2004) argued that Filipinos in this stage have positive feelings about themselves, other Filipinos, and the dominant group in society. Since the individual has been socialized to be proud of his or her ethnicity, the individual has pride in his or herself and maintains pride in other Filipinos, as he or she was taught to view all other Filipinos as extended family.

The second stage identified by Nadal (2004) is the assimilation to the dominant culture, which can begin as early as five years old and, for some, may last for a person’s entire adult life. This stage is similar to a stage in Sue and Sue’s (1998) Asian American
Identity Development Model, where “lifestyles, value systems, and cultural/physical characteristics most like White society are highly valued while those most like their own minority group’s are viewed with disdain or are repressed” (129). This is intensified in the case of the Filipino, as being light-skinned is considered honorable in the Philippines (Nadal 2004; Root 1997; Takaki 1998). In this stage the pride that an individual once held for his or her Filipino ethnicity transforms into disdain, as the individual tends to hold negative attitudes about themselves, other Filipinos, other Asian Americans, and other minority groups. Therefore, the only group that the individual in this stage hold positive attitudes towards is the dominant group and will attempt to hide any characteristics that may identify the individual as being Filipino.

Nadal’s (2004) third stage draws on the work of Kim (1981) and suggests that in this stage, the Filipino individual becomes aware of the social and racial injustices that occur in the broader society. Congruent with previous research, it is suggested that the beginning of this stage can be triggered by an experience of discrimination or inequality, such as being denied service, being passed over for a promotion, or being followed around a store (Cross 1978; Nadal 2004; Phinney and Ong 2007). Furthermore, this awakening could be triggered by an individual becoming aware of the numerous microaggressions that Filipinos and other Asian Americans encounter throughout society (Buenavista et al. 2009; Sue et al. 2009). Finally, this stage may be triggered by an academic venture that exposed the injustices faced by Filipinos in the world, such as enrolling in a Filipino history or culture course, often at a university (Nadal 2004; Strobel 1996). In this stage the individual will develop positive feelings for themselves, as well as all minority groups, while possessing a negative or hostile
attitude towards the dominant group. The Filipino in this stage will also attempt to encourage other Filipino individuals to take pride in their ethnicity.

It is the fourth stage of the identity model that Nadal (2004) argued is unique to Filipinos and which may make the Filipino ethnic identity development process different from other models of ethnic identity development. Usually in areas with small Filipino populations, but this can happen in areas with substantial Filipino populations as well, Filipinos are socialized to accept their role as an Asian American. Therefore, Filipinos in the Panethnic Asian American Consciousness stage, will seek coalitions and a sense of belonging with other Asian Americans. At this stage, the Filipino individual will identify as Asian, rather than Filipino, as a way to feel attached to a broader community that is not specifically Filipino. During this phase the individual usually has positive feelings and attitudes towards minority groups, but continues to hold negative attitudes about the dominant group in society.

The fifth stage, ethnocentric realization, is also unique to the Filipino American experience (Nadal 2004). It is in this stage that the individual realizes that he or she has been incorrectly labeled and adopted an Asian American identity. As with the previous realization that the individual is not part of the dominant group, a positive event (e.g. taking a course on Filipino history) or a negative event (e.g. discrimination against the Filipino individual by an Asian American) may trigger the individual to realize that Filipinos are unique and do not fit under the broader term of Asian American. This form of realization was accomplished in California where Filipinos sought to allow Filipino to be recognized as a distinct ethnic group, as they believe that their needs and opinions were being marginalized by the broader Asian American movement (Nadal 2004). Therefore, in this stage the Filipino individual
may hold positive attitudes toward himself, other Filipinos, and other minority groups. At this point the individual will also hold negative attitudes towards Asian Americans and the dominant group, the two groups that the Filipino once attempted to associate with, but ended with feelings of neglect or marginalization.

In the final stage of ethnic identity development, incorporation, the Filipino individual will develop positive and confident attitudes about being Filipino, while being able to accept, acknowledge, and appreciate other ethnic cultures (Nadal 2004). Therefore, this stage is characterized by pride in being Filipino, as well as an understanding and appreciation for others that are proud of their ethnicity. In this stage, the individual will also become comfortable with his or her place in the broader Asian American community, realizing that it is a community that he or she can turn to for various coalitions, but will remember to advocate for his or her ethnic community’s specific needs. Finally, it is in this stage that the individual slowly becomes able to regain trust and faith in the various communities in which he or she once felt marginalized.

While it is important to examine the various theories of how an individual develops an ethnic identity, it is also important to examine the reasons an individual may choose to associate his or herself with a certain ethnic group. To examine the reasons an individual may develop an ethnic identity has its theoretical grounding in the circumstantialist argument of ethnic identity, as it assumes that ethnicities, and thus ethnic identities, are constructed by “rational actors who calculate their objective interests and then make decisions concerning association and political mobilization with others” (Gil-White 1999:790). Therefore, the individual can weigh the pros and cons of identifying with the various ethnic groups and will
choose to identify ethnically with the group that grants him or her access to the highest status.

Gilliland (2006) conducted research about the small town of Brod in Croatia during 1982. At that time Croatia was part of the larger entity known as the Democratic Federal Yugoslavia. Since Croatia was encompassed by this larger government entity, the social structure at the time privileged those that identified ethnically as Yugoslavs. Therefore, many individual saw “no obvious advantage to being Croat or Serb...[and therefore when asked to identify themselves ethnically, they] were Yugoslavs” (Gilliland 2006:85). This exemplifies the circumstantialist argument of ethnic identity, as individuals in this town were making a rational choice, as they saw more benefit associated with identifying as a Yugoslav, about which group to ethnically identify.

ETHNICITY AS STIGMA AND ETHNIC IDENTITY AS PRESENTATION OF SELF

While the above discussion suggests that individuals can rationally choose to associate with an ethnic group, it is important to note that the arguments presented by the primordialist approach to ethnicity are also valid. The primordialist approach to ethnicity suggests that an individual does not have a free choice about the ethnic group to which s/he can associate. Instead, an individual is bound by his biological makeup and is, thus, only has a limited choice about which ethnic groups (s)he can associate him or herself with (Gil-White 1999). Take, for example, the following conversation with a Los Angeles taxi driver:

Another day I asked an Ethiopian taxi-driver in Los Angeles, ‘If a child was born of Tigre parents, but was immediately adopted by an Oromo couple, subsequently grew up among Oromo, and was in every respect like an Oromo, would he be thought of as an Oromo?’ ‘No,’ he replied, ‘he would be accepted by the Oromo community, but the parents would think “This is our Tigre child.” He would still be Tigre.” (Gil-White 1999:789-790)
In the above example, it does not matter what community an individual is socialized into, since what is truly important in determining an individual's ethnic identity is his or her ancestry. In this case the child was born to Tigre parents, and therefore, can only be considered a Tigre.

Another example of how this primordialist approach to ethnicity and ethnic identity presents itself in society was the one-drop rule that was used to determine who was Black and who was White (Omi and Winant 1994). In this example, any individual who had a “single drop” of blood that could be traced back to a Black ancestor would be considered Black. Even, if the individual was of 99% European descent, the fact that the individual had a single Black ancestor dictated that the individual had to claim a Black ethnicity. Therefore, in both of the above cases, it is not an actor’s rational choice to associate with an ethnic group, but the individual’s biology that determined the ethnic group that an individual is “required” to associate.

Furthermore, drawing on the critical race research on microaggressions it can be concluded that individuals still employ a primordialist approach to ethnicity and ethnic identity when interacting with others (Delgado and Stefancic 2000; Delgado and Stefancic 2001; Solorzano and Yosso 2002; Yosso 2005). This occurs because microaggressions tend to be committed based on biological features, which tend to confine individuals to their biological ethnic groups. For example, an individual with Asian American physical characteristics could choose to identify as an American, an Asian American, or, their specific Asian ethnic group (e.g. Japanese). Regardless, of how this individual chooses to identify, (s)he will still experience microaggressions aimed at Asians. For example, the individual might be told “I’m impressed you speak really good English,” or the individual may be
approached by another person who attempt to speak to the individual in an Asian language (Sue et al. 2009). Therefore, an individual’s phenotype may lead him or her to experience racialized microaggressions, which can affect his or her options and choices for an ethnic identity (Kiang and Takeuchi 2009).

The work on microaggressions and racism leads one to Erving Goffman’s (1963) work on stigma and identity management. Goffman (1963) argued that the three different types of stigma were abominations of the body (e.g. physical deformities), blemishes of individual character (e.g. dishonesty, addiction, unemployment, etc.), and tribal stigma of race, nation, and religion (4). The stigma that is of concern to the proposed research is tribal stigma, which may lead an individual to experience discrimination and racism in society, as tribal stigma are “transmitted through lineages and equally contaminate all members of a family.” (Goffman 1963:4). In this instance, ethnicity can serve as a stigma, a marking or physical characteristic that designates disgrace for an individual, and may lead an individual to experience microaggressions.

A stigma, however, causes the individual to be separated from others, as the individual will not be considered a “normal.” In the case of ethnicity, a “normal” would be an individual of the dominant ethnic group in society. The stigma, according to Goffman (1963), can lead normals to “exercise varieties of discrimination, through which we effectively, if often unthinkingly, reduce his life chances” (5). This experience with various forms of discrimination may lead an individual to attempt to hide his or her stigma to avoid experiencing discrimination. At this point, Goffman’s (1963) work can be seen as blending the circumstantialist and primordialist approach to ethnicity, as the stigma stems from the
primordialist approach and the attempt to hide the stigma stems from the circumstantialist approach to ethnicity.

While an individual’s ethnicity may have been easily inferred by biological characteristics in the past, the rise of biracial and multiracial individuals in society has made successfully determining an individual’s ethnicity, simply based on biological characteristics, more ambiguous. Therefore, it is arguable that an individual, whose ethnicity serves as a stigma, is no longer a discredited individual, but instead is a discreditable individual. Goffman (1963) argued that a discredited individual is an individual whose stigma is readily and easily known to others in interaction (e.g. a physical disability), while a discreditable individual is an individual whose stigma is not readily noticed and with some work, or identity management, can be hidden from other individuals. Considering that ethnicity may have shifted from stigma that makes an individual a discredited individual to a stigma that makes an individual a discreditable individual, it is important to explore Goffman’s works (1959, 1963) on passing and identity management.

Individuals interact with each other through the use of numerous symbols, in which an individual with a stigma may attempt to employ disidentifiers to conceal his or her stigma. Goffman (1963) defined a disidentifier as “a sign that tends--in fact or hope--to break up an otherwise coherent picture but in this case in a positive direction by the actor, not so much establishing a new claim as throwing severe doubt on the validity of the virtual one” (44). This can take the form of the immigrant individual who learns to speak English exceptionally well or the Filipino individual who attempts to lighten his or her skin color by using skin lightening lotions (Goffman 1963; Nadal 2004). These tactics are often used to allow an
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individual to appear “normal,” as when the individual’s stigma is successfully hidden from those with whom he or she interacts.

Since tribal stigma contaminates all members of a family, or in this case an ethnicity, employing these tactics attempts to differentiate the individual from the rest of his or her ethnic group. Often this results in what Schwalbe et al. (2000) call defensive othering. Defensive othering occurs when members of a stigmatized group behave in a way that says “there are indeed others to whom this applies, but it does not apply to me” (Schwalbe et al. 2000:422). This preserves the tribal stigma, as the individual is suggesting that he or she is different from the average individual in his or her stigmatized group. Take, for example, women who in an attempt to “fit in” with the men in the workplace engage in behaviors that degrade other women, or the homeless individual who claims that while he or she works hard to overcome homelessness, many others are simply “lazy bums,” or the second generation Filipino who disparages his or her parents for speaking with an accent and following Filipino customs (Andaya 1996; Padavic 1991; Shwalbe et al. 2000; Snow and Anderson 1987). These actions function as identity work, allowing the individual to deflect his or her stigma and attempt to fit in with the dominant group in society.

Ultimately, what an individual is doing when interacting with others is attempting to create a virtual self (Schwalbe et al. 2000), a desirable image of him or herself, through the use of a carefully thought out and crafted performance (Goffman 1959). According to Goffman’s (1959) dramaturgical framework, an individual is constantly engaging in an act of performance, with the ultimate goal of creating “coherence among setting, appearance, and manner...[which] represents an ideal type that provides us with a means of stimulating our attention to and interest in expectations.” This framework of interaction considers the
setting as the expressive equipment that is external to the individual actor, often the location in which the performance is taking place. The concepts of appearance and manner are associated with the individual actor, rather than the external setting, as they refer to stimuli that express an individual’s social statuses and the roles that an actor expects to play, respectively. Therefore, an individual’s front stage, the arena that is exposed to other actors that the individual interacts with, is a meticulous performance that strives to live up to an ideal standard.

For the minority individual attempting to pass or perform as a dominant group member, this may include, but is not limited to, changing his or her style of dress, speech patterns, and voicing approval and disapproval for activities and cultural norms that the individual may hold opposing feelings and attitudes about. These tactics of identity maintenance are often performed and concealed in what Goffman (1959) considered the back stage, the arena where the individual is not interacting with others and can carefully plan his or her performance in the front stage.

Overall, Goffman’s (1959, 1963) work on stigma, passing, and identity maintenance is of interest to the scholar examining ethnic identity as it serves as a link between the primordialist and circumstantialist approach to ethnicity. This link is presented because Goffman’s work on stigma (1963) suggests that an individual’s stigma can be determined by his or her biological traits, but the individual also has some agency to make a rational decision to attempt to hide his or her stigma through a process of performance, known as passing (Goffman 1959). Applying these concepts to ethnic identity and ethnicity, one can assume that an individual whose biological features and ethnicity may create a stigma for the
individual will make every attempt to reject association with his or her ethnic group and appear as a “normal,” dominant member of society.

**CONTRIBUTIONS OF THE RESEARCH**

This research contributes to the above literature, as it weaves together components of Bourdieu’s (1984, 1986, 1993) theory of capital, critical race theory, theories of ethnic identity, and Goffman’s (1959, 1963) theories of stigma, passing, and identity management to the ethnic identity processes of Filipino individuals raised in Hawai‘i. The research employs a decentered critical race approach to capital in the Filipino community in Hawai‘i in an attempt to uncover what Filipinos in Hawai‘i consider community cultural wealth of a community that is often viewed as a culturally poor community. It was hypothesized that recognizing the various forms of community cultural wealth in the Filipino community and realizing that the Filipino community is culturally rich is vital for individuals to begin to feel comfortable embracing a Filipino ethnic identity. Therefore, this research will examine the various frames that the members of the Filipino community, who at one point in their life rejected being Filipino, have used throughout their life to understand the Filipino community and how these frames affect their choices about employing various techniques of identity management.

Furthermore this research examines the tactics that these individuals use to manage their stigmatized Filipino identity to suppress their association with the Filipino community. This research was conducted with individuals that have undergone the transformation from rejecting their Filipino ethnic identity to embracing their Filipino ethnic identity, which also allows for an examination of the identity management techniques that individuals use to reassociate themselves with the Filipino community. It is believed that by reconnecting with
the Filipino community, these individuals are able to activate the various forms of community cultural wealth that are available to them through the Filipino community.

While this research examined the reasons that an individual rejected his or her Filipino ethnic identity, the research also focused on the individuals’ abilities to redefine the Filipino community as culturally rich and embrace their Filipino ethnic identity. Therefore, this research is one of the few research projects that examines the Filipino community in Hawai‘i from a decentered position, as much of the current research on this community employs a deficit thinking model, which focuses on the failures and shortcomings of the Filipino community in Hawai‘i.

By focusing on these processes of identity management, redefining of the Filipino community in Hawai‘i, and the transformation of ethnic identity among members of the Filipino community in Hawai‘i, the following research questions will be addressed:

1. Why do Filipinos raised in Hawai‘i reject their Filipino ethnicity?

2. What identity processes do Filipinos engage in as they transition from rejecting and being ashamed of being Filipino to developing positive feelings and perhaps a sense of pride in being Filipino?

3. Do Filipinos in Hawai‘i attempt to reframe the Filipino culture from a perspective other than a deficit perspective? If they do, what constitutes community cultural wealth in the Filipino community in Hawai‘i?

It is believed that this research project has addressed the above questions. This contributes to the theoretical discussions on community cultural wealth, ethnic identity formation, and identity management, and also encourages a much needed discussion in the Filipino community about its strengths and ability to instill a sense of pride in subsequent generations of Filipino individuals. The research, although exploratory, sheds light on the strengths of
the Filipino community that individuals have “discovered,” that have helped them embrace their Filipino ethnic identity.
METHODOLOGY

Qualitative research methods were employed in this study to examine (a) the reasons why some Filipinos raised in Hawai‘i reject their Filipino ethnicity, (b) what processes Filipinos in Hawai‘i engage in as they transition from rejecting their ethnic identity to accepting their ethnic identity, and (c) how Filipinos attempt to reframe the Filipino culture to develop a sense of pride in being Filipino. My interest in critical race theory and its dedication to "challenging the traditional research paradigm, text, and theories used to explains the experiences of [people] of color" and focusing on the stories of race and racism as told by those at the margins of society (Delgado and Stefancic 2000, 2001; Matsuda 1987; Solorzano and Yosso 2002) led me to select semi-structured interviews, which all for a thorough examination of everyday behavior and live histories (Silverman and Marvasti 2008), as the most appropriate method of inquiry. The use of semi-structured interviews allows participants to reflect upon and explore their own life histories around the complex issues of ethnic identity formation while guided by the research in the process of knowledge construction (Kvale and Brinkmann 2009).

Furthermore, although scales and measures have been created to measure an individual's ethnic identity (Alvarez and Helms 2001; Kwan 2000; Lew and Vigil 1987; Phinney 1992; Phinney and Ong 2002), these scales tend to be static, measuring an individual's ethnic identity at a given point in time and cannot capture the subtleties and complexities of ethnic identity development. Since this research focused on the processes that individuals engage in to develop their ethnic identities, interviews were deemed more appropriate because they allow a research to encourage participants to elaborate on their responses and to probe for explicit details about various topics (Charmaz 2006; Kvale and
Brinkmann 2009). Therefore, in my study interviews allowed for a more thorough examination of the detailed nuances of ethnic identity development. Also, since the transformation from rejecting an ethnic identity to accepting an ethnic identity can be an emotional process (Nadal 2004), interviews provided additional insights into the process of identity formation, as the emotions that an individual attaches to the transformation process can be observed by the researcher as the participant recounts his or her experiences.

SAMPLING

Individuals who participated in this study were required to meet three main criteria. First, at the time of the interview they had to accept their Filipino identity and at an earlier point in their life were ashamed of or rejected their Filipino ethnic identity. Therefore, at the time of the interview the individuals had to actively claim and admit to others that they were Filipino, while at an earlier point in their life they were ashamed of being Filipino and attempted to hide their Filipino heritage from others. These individuals were recruited for this study because they could reflect upon the process that they underwent from rejecting their ethnic identity to accepting their ethnic identity. Therefore, these individuals were recruited for this study so they could retrospectively discuss the ethnic identity transformation that they experienced.

In addition to experiencing the transformation from rejection to acceptance, the participants in this study were required to be between the ages of eighteen and twenty-five because the previous research suggests that this transformation usually occurs in college-aged individuals. Strobel (1996) described these individuals as "born again Filipinos" and suggested that the transformation from rejecting to accepting a Filipino ethnic identity occurs
within this age range because these individuals are most likely to be college students, who have access to college courses that discuss Filipino culture, history, values, and customs. It is through these college courses that Strobel (1996) argued that these individuals are able to reframe their perceptions of the Filipino community and culture, which allows them to take pride in their ethnicity and develop a positive Filipino ethnic identity. This experience often provides the encouragement and support that an individual needs to move into what Nadal (2004) identified as the "awakening to social political consciousness" or "incorporation" stage of Filipino ethnic identity development, where an individual begins to actively assert a Filipino identity.

Finally the sample was limited to individuals who were raised for the majority of their childhood (0-18) in the state of Hawai‘i. There were two rationales for these selection criteria. Because the study was conducted in Hawai‘i as a key setting for the process of Filipino identity development, this was an important criteria. Although Filipinos constitute more than 15% of Hawai‘i's population they are overrepresented in the service sector (Okamura 2008), which in part explains the negative stereotypes that continue to exist about Filipinos in Hawai‘i. Okada (2007) and Labrador (2004) suggest that ethnic humor in Hawai‘i is disproportionately directed towards Filipinos because of the common notion that Filipinos are uneducated laborers. These stereotypes lead many local Filipinos to have feelings of self-doubt and shame about their ethnic identity in the Hawai‘i context (Okada 2007).

The sample was recruited using snowball sampling, a method that allows the researcher access to hidden or stigmatized populations through informal social networks and referrals (Beirnacki and Waldorf 1981; Nowy 2007). Recruitment began with my personal
contacts, starting with a personal friend, a professional contact, and a student in one of my sociology classes at a local community college. After briefly discussing my research interests these individuals reported rejecting then accepting their Filipino identities. These individuals were asked if they were interested in participating in my research project, and consented.

After these individuals completed the interview process (described below), I fully explained the research project and participation requirements to them and asked if they knew others who met the criteria for the study. They each named two or more people with whom they volunteered to describe the study, after which they would contact me via a phone number or email address I provided. Once this next set of informants contacted me, I sent them the consent forms (see Appendix A) and the initial screening survey (see Appendix B) via email. Once those forms were returned and the participants met the screening criteria interviews were scheduled with them. Snowballing sampling proceeding in this manner until the twelve final study participants were interviewed. Of the twelve participants in this study, three were personal friends of mine and two additional were acquaintances that I knew through extended network connections.

Five individuals who initially contacted me did not complete the initial screening survey or respond to subsequent emails, and two individuals who completed the interview process were excluded from the final data analysis because they reported unwillingness to discuss their shameful feelings about their Filipino ethnic identity and did not want to say anything negative about Filipinos. While the data from these two interviews are very interesting they were excluded from the data analysis because the participants did not provide an account of their process of ethnic identity transformation, which is the focus of this study.
Therefore, a total of 14 interviews were completed, but only 12 were included in the final data analysis upon which this dissertation is based.

There were three main reasons that data collection was ended after 12 interviews. First, since this was considered an exploratory study, which will lead to more elaborate research projects in the future a smaller sample size was considered adequate. While there have been numerous studies on Filipinos in Hawai‘i, there are few studies that examine the ethnic identity transformation process of Filipinos within the Hawai‘i context. Therefore, this study was designed to "test the waters" and discover avenues for future research endeavors. Secondly, it was believed that trends of "theoretical saturation" were developing. Theoretical saturation occurs, not when all data sources are exhausted, but when the theoretical categories that emerge out of the data are fully developed (Charmaz 2006; Glaser and Strauss 1967). Therefore, the trends in the newly collected data begin to mirror the theoretical categories that were created through the various coding techniques used in this study. In this study trends of theoretical saturation began to develop at about the tenth interview. Finally, time constraints enforced by my personal and professional life influenced my final decision to end data collection to complete the written dissertation.

DATA COLLECTION

Once potential participants for this study conducted me about participating in the study, I emailed them a copy of the informed consent form and the initial screening survey. Participants were instructed to read through the informed consent and email or call me with any questions. They were further asked to sign the consent form and complete the screening survey to be reviewed prior to scheduling an interview. There was one participant who did
not have access to a scanner and therefore could not return the forms electronically; that individual was scheduled for an interview with the understanding that the screening survey would be reviewed prior to begging to assure they met the study criteria, which he did.

The Initial Screening Survey

The initial screening survey consisted of 20 demographic questions, seven of which covered demographic data including gender, age, education, parents' education, and parents' occupations. Questions eight through fourteen on the initial screening survey were designed to measure the process of change in participants' ethnic identification as a Filipino. This section began with, "Are you Filipino?" and which ethnicity they felt was the most important to their identity. Questions 10-11 assessed whether individuals had experienced a process of rejecting their Filipino ethnic identity at any point in their lives. To assess this, respondents were asked if they had ever claimed anything other than "Filipino." This question was followed by open-ended questions, allowing the individual to briefly elaborate on other ethnicities they had claimed in the past and why. Questions 12-15 asked about ethnicity, birthplace, and immigration status of informants' parents. These questions also shed some light on why an individual may claim an ethnicity other than Filipino, as many individuals came from interracial marriages. The final four questions were included to ensure that study participants were raised in Hawai‘i. Informants were asked where they lived during early childhood and where they attended school, by region, (a) Hawai‘i, (b) Other U.S. State, and (c) Other Country.
The Multi-Group Ethnic Identity Measure (MEIM)

The final portion of the screening tool was a commonly used ethnic identity measure, known as the Multi-Group Ethnic Identity Measure (MEIM), which was used to provide an initial measure of an individual's commitment and exploration of a Filipino identity (Phinney 1992; Phinney and Ong 2002). While some early measures of ethnic identity were created for use with specific ethnic groups, Phinney (1992) created the MEIM to enable scholars to make comparisons across groups. The original MEIM consisted of fourteen questions, which were originally thought to constitute a single factor of ethnic identity—attachment or belonging (Phinney 1992). However, a large-scale study conducted with 5,423 adolescents in the southwestern United States suggest that the scale consisted of two factors of ethnic identity—exploration and commitment (Roberts, Phinney, Masse, Chen, Roberts, and Romero 1999), which was subsequently supported by Spencer, Icard, Harachi, Catalani and Oxford (2003) and Yancey, Aneshensel and Driscoll (2003).

After years of research, Phinney and Ong (2002) decided to reassess MEIM, arguing that all fourteen questions were not necessary to accurately measure ethnic identity. Instead they found that the following six questions were adequate measures for ethnic identity across ethnic populations:

1. I have spent time trying to find out about my ethnic group, such as its history, traditions, and customs.

2. I have a strong sense of belonging to my ethnic group.

3. I understand pretty well what my ethnic group membership means to me.

4. I have often done things that will help me understand my ethnic background better.
5. I have often talked to other people to learn more about my ethnic group.

6. I feel a strong attachment toward my own ethnic group.

Phinney and Ong (2002) found that the correlation between the exploration score (the sum of respondent's answers to questions one, four, and five) and the commitment score (the sum of the respondents' answers to questions two, three, and six) was .74, suggesting that the two are strongly correlated, as those who explore the culture associated with their ethnic identity tend to have a stronger commitment to those ethnic identities. The authors also reported that each subscale had good reliability statistics, with Cronbach's alpha for the exploration subscale of .76 and .78 for the commitment subscale. The entire six-item scale has a Cronbach's alpha of .81.

Since this study focused on individuals who currently claimed a Filipino ethnic identity, the MEIM was used as a screening measure, ensuring that participants had some form of commitment to or exploration of their ethnic identity. It was important to use a standardized measure for these screening purposes because the measure has already been tested for reliability and validity with diverse populations (Phinney and Ong 2002; Resse, Vera and Paikoff 1998; Roberts et al. 1999; Spencer, Icard, Harachi, Catalano and Oxford 2000; Worrell 2000; Yip and Fuligini 2002). Furthermore, the MEIM had been employed by many researcher studying Filipinos and has been demonstrated to be reliable and valid for assessing Filipino ethnic identity (David 2008; Kiang 2009; Massakowski 2003; Umana-Taylor, Bhanot, and Shin 2006). Furthermore, while there are other scales that been used with Asian American populations (Alvarex and Helms 2001; Kwan 2000; Suinn, Rickark-Figueroa, Lew, and Vigil 1987; Tsai, Ying, and Lee 2000), these scales are often created for a specific ethnic group and contain items that are very specific to a certain culture.
Therefore, the MEIM was chosen over these more specific scales, as the MEIM addresses the general components of ethnic identity, which was useful in studying a group like Filipinos in Hawai‘i, who ethnic identity scales have rarely been used with.

The Interviews

As stated earlier, once the initial screening survey was reviewed and the individuals met the criteria for participation they were contacted to schedule an interview. I tried to be as flexible as possible when scheduling interviews with participants, allowing them to select a date, time, and location that was convenient for them. Most of the interviews were conducted in the late afternoon after the participants finished work and were held at Starbuck's locations in Ewa Beach, Pearl City, and Manoa. Two of the interviews were conducted in my office at Honolulu Community College, as the participants said that would be a convenient location for them to complete the interview process.

Once I met with the participants at the agreed upon place, date, and time, I thanked the individual for participating in the study and offered to buy the participants something from Starbuck's or the Honolulu Community College cafe. Other than this offer the participants were not offered any type of incentive for participating in the study.

The interview process began with a review of the procedures of that study as covered in the consent form. Participants were further reminded that the interview would be audio recorded and that any information that allowed the individual to be identified would be redacted from the transcripts to ensure the confidentiality of the data. Upon reviewing this information with the participant, the participant was asked if he or she had any questions about the research before beginning.
The average length of the interviews was 70 minutes. The interviews addressed the following broad topics: (a) the complexities of Filipino ethnic identity in Hawai‘i, (b) the way the individual managed and created meaning for a Filipino ethnic identity, (c) the positive and negative consequences of being Filipino in Hawai‘i, and (d) the strengths and weaknesses of the Filipino community in Hawai‘i (See Appendix C). Each interview was conducted in a semi-structured manner, allowing for a thorough examination of participant experiences as a Filipino in Hawai‘i.

The first five interviews were conducted with very broad questions; however, more specific questions that were developed around the general themes from the first five interviews were added to the interview protocol focusing on (a) stereotypes about Filipinos in Hawai‘i, (b) techniques for hiding one's Filipino identity, (c) experiences of becoming a role model for younger Filipinos, (d) reframing stereotypes about Filipinos, and (e) finding positive aspects about being Filipino in Hawai‘i.

DESCRIPTION OF THE SAMPLE

The participants in the study consisted of seven females and five males, from 19-26 years old, with the average age of 24 years old. Although the individual who was twenty-six was just beyond the desired age range for the study, she was allowed to participate in the study because she was currently enrolled in college and had recently experienced the transition from rejecting to accepting her ethnic identity. Furthermore, she had just recently had her 26th birthday, and therefore, was not that far out of the desired age range for participants.
All of the participants in the study were either currently enrolled in college or reported recently completing a college degree. Ten of the twelve participants reported that they were either currently working towards earning or recently earned their Bachelor's degree, while two participants reported currently completing their Master's degree. Most of the participants reported that their parents had only completed high school or an associate's degree. Three stated that their parents had not finished high school and one participant reported that her mother only completed "some elementary school." Therefore, the sample consisted of individuals who were experiencing upward intergenerational social mobility, as they reported coming from a working class or lower middle class background and were often the first member of their immediate family to attend college.

In regards to the Multi-Group Ethnic Identity Measure (MEIM) the participants in the study scored within the midrange of the MEIM, with scores ranging from 6 to 23. The average score of the participants in this study was 17.125, which represents slightly over half of the total possible score on the MEIM. If the outlier, who scored a total of 6 on the MEIM, is removed from the calculations, the average score on the MEIM rises to 18.714. This represents a stronger connection to a Filipino ethnic identity, but still only represents a moderate strength in ethnic identity. It is interesting to note that males in the sample scored lower in the MEIM, with an average score of 16. The females scored higher on the MEIM with an average score of 19, which suggests that they explored and were more committed to their ethnic identity than that males in the study. In other words, a Filipino ethnic identity was more salient to the females than the males in this study. Overall, the participants in this study had a moderate score on the MEIM, suggesting that the participants, while comfortable claiming a Filipino identity, are not quite confident with their ethnicity.
DATA ANALYSIS

Grounded theory procedures were used to code and analyze the data collected in this study. Glaser and Strauss (1967) first formulated the grounded theory approach, which functions as a method of discovery and allows theoretical categories to emerge from the data (Charmaz 2006). Strauss and Corbin (1998) reformulated the practice of grounded theory to refute the original grounded theory tenets of embarking on the research project without any preconceived notions about the data, which can be developed by having a certain theoretical orientation or by conducting a literature review prior to evaluating the data (Glaser and Strauss 1967). The version of grounded theory presented by Strauss and Corbin (1998) suggests that entering the research project with a theoretical orientation and reviewing the existing data prior to data analysis is a positive practice with can help the researcher identify relevant concepts and processes that exist within the data. The grounded theory procedures used in this study align more closely to Strauss and Corbin’s (1998) reformulation of grounded theory practices.

All of the interviews were digitally recorded and transcribed. Once any identifying data was removed from the transcript, the transcripts were coded and analyzed. As suggested by Charmaz (2006), coding was conducted in two phases: initial coding and focused coding. The initial coding phase was completed through line-by-line coding techniques. Due to my “native” researcher status, I felt that this would be the most effective way of coding, as it forces the researcher to focus on small bits of data, which often are not complete thoughts, as complete thoughts usually span numerous lines (Strauss and Corbin 1998).
In the second stage, focused coding I revisited the initial codes in an attempt to make decisions about which codes best helped to describe the process that individuals engaged in while transitioning from rejecting to accepting their Filipino ethnic identity (Charmaz 2006). Once these themes were constructed they were compared to each individual transcript to ensure that the themes were theoretically sound. This process further identified statements made by the participants that helped to exemplify the identified themes. Therefore, this process of inductive data analysis, situated in grounded theory practices, allowed the analysis and findings to emerge from the actual statements made by participants in this study.

CONDUCTING INSIDER RESEARCH

There has been much discussion (Acker 2000; Asselin 2003; Brannick and Coghlan 2007; Dwyer and Buckle 2009; Kanuha 2000) about the issues that surround research conducted by academics on groups in which they are a member. Many of the issues that surround what is known as "insider research" center around issues of validity, as the researcher's ability to remain objective is often called into question. Some researchers suggest that insider research should be conducted such that the research makes few assumptions about what is being studied (Asselin 2003). Others recognize what Weber (1958) suggested that no research can be devoid of values. Instead, no researcher can fully set aside their values and be completely objective, but can reflexively identity and be aware of the biases they may have in regards to the research project (Rose 1985).

Kanuha (2000) makes the distinction between "going native" and "being native" and discusses the tensions that exist for the native researcher, as he or she may know too much about the topic being researched, be too close to the project, or be too similar to those being
studied. Adler and Adler (1987) identified the role of the native researcher as the "complete member researcher," who is already a member of the group being studied. While this status as "native researcher" or "complete member researcher" provides the researcher with a privileged position, the position the researcher exists within is also a stigmatized position. On one hand the researcher, who is close to the group being studied is provided with access to the group and the group's culture that a "peripheral member researcher" or "outsider researcher" would not be privy to (Adler and Adler 1987). Therefore, participants may become less hesitant to share sensitive information with the researcher since they both share common group membership.

On the other hand, however, the insider researcher or native researcher position is a stigmatized position, since the native researcher's objectivity and authenticity is often called into question (Adler and Adler 1987; Dwyer and Buckle 2009; Kanuha 2000). The objectivity of the researcher, and thus the validity of the study, is often questioned because as an insider researcher the researcher may experience role conflict of role confusion. This is quite common as the researcher responds and interacts with the participant as an inside member of the group rather than a researcher. While the insider posit may allow a participant to share information that he or she would not share with an outsider, the relationship between the insider researcher and participant creates an environment where an assumption of understanding, whereby the researcher may draw conclusions that are not present in the data, but are simply assumptions (Dwyer and Buckle 2009).

Therefore, it is important to make it clear that I, the researcher, would be considered a "native researcher" or "complete member researcher" in this research. My interest in this project originally stemmed from my own experiences as a Filipino individual born and raised
in Hawai‘i, who struggled with accepting his ethnic identity. I was able to come to terms with my Filipino ethnicity when I left Hawai‘i and lived in Oregon for four years while I earned my BA from Pacific University. Upon returning to Hawai‘i as a "born again Filipino" I wondered how many other local Filipinos went through the struggles that I did in regards to their ethnic identity and decided to pursue this doctoral research, not only because it fills a gap in the sociological literature, but because it also satisfied a personal interest of mine.

Throughout the research I had to constantly be aware of my role and status as both member of the group being studied and as an academic researcher. I found that I had to remind myself of this study's research questions so that the interviews remained focused and not veer off topic to satisfy a personal interest of mine. While conducting interviews, as the literature suggests, I had to be very conscious of my responses to the participants to make sure I was not simply making assumptions about what they were saying. While I believe I was quite successful at this, there were instances that I found in the transcripts where participants simply said, "you know what I mean" and I accepted their comment with a simple "yes I do."

At the same time, however, this consciousness of my role as researcher also created some tension in the interview process. This difficulty arose because the participants began the interview knowing that I was an insider researcher, however, when they would make comments such as "You know what I mean" I would often ask them elaborate, which reinforced my position as researcher. This reminded both the participant and myself that we were not simply friends talking about similar experiences.

Finally, the grounded theory practices employed for the data analysis and data collection processes allowed me to better negotiate my role as researcher and inside member.
Since grounded theory practices encourage the use of line-by-line coding and conducting data analysis that remain close to the actual data, it allowed the data to speak for itself. This process allowed me to see recurring themes throughout the interviews and objectively organize the data into generalized categories. The results of this negotiation between group member and research are presented in the following chapters.
IDENTITY DEVELOPMENT AND THE DISTORTED LOOKING GLASS

Growing up I always knew that I was Filipino, but would rarely admit that I was, as I preferred to identify as anything other than Filipino. Like many, who have grown up in Hawai‘i, I did not believe that ethnicity was an important factor in my life until I entered intermediate school. The importance of ethnicity in my life grew substantially when I entered high school. Throughout these years, I was introduced to numerous stereotypes about individuals who are Filipino. I was told that Filipinos could not match their clothes, liked bright colors, were obnoxious, as they frequently enjoyed dancing and karaoke, were uneducated, were simple laborers, and, ultimately, were not leaders in our society. Unfortunately, I was blind to all of the successful Filipinos that were in my family and that were around me in society, and I simply saw the Filipinos that lived up to the stereotype that was contained in the jokes and put downs that were shared among my peers. My attention became focused on the fact that almost none of the teachers, counselors, or members of the school administration were Filipino, while almost all of the janitors and secretaries were Filipino. I slowly began to believe in the stereotypes and attempt to dissociate myself with my Filipino identity.

Cooley (1902) coined the phrase “the looking glass self” to describe how an individual develops his or her self concept. The metaphor of the looking glass is employed because Cooley argued that individuals develop their self concept by viewing themselves through the perspective of other individuals, thus using these individuals as a mirror through which they can see themselves. Therefore the individual is able to take his or herself as an object and judge him or herself based on how it is perceived that others see the individual (Mead 1934). Hacking (2007) argued that identities are social constructs that create “types of people.” These categories, which define various types of people, can be adopted by individuals to develop their self concept. It is important to note that those in power often have the ability to influence what is known as the “truth” and, therefore, not all types of people are defined in a positive light (Foucault 1977). Thus, it is possible for an individual to gaze into the looking glass and see a degrading and denigrated image of his or her type of person, which can lead to a negative or self-depreciating self concept (Ford 2008).
This phenomenon of seeing oneself through a distorted looking glass and viewing oneself through what critical race theorists have called a deficit perspective (Yosso 2005) was a common experience for the participants in this study. As Okamura (2008) argued, the participants in this study did not create a Filipino identity for themselves, but instead simply adopted and internalized the negative construction of Filipinos in Hawai‘i. This internalization of a negative imagery of Filipinos created a sense of shame and embarrassment for the participants in this study around their Filipino ethnic background and encouraged all the participants to attempt to disassociate with their Filipino identity. After all, as Revilla (1996) argued “who would want to be part of a group that is constantly teased, put down, and viewed as inferior.”

THE DISTORTED LOOKING GLASS

According to all of the participants in this study they were exposed to the stereotypes about Filipinos at a very young age and the negativity of these stereotypes led them to be ashamed of being Filipino. This negativity and feelings of embarrassment and shame about being Filipino led all the participants in this study to disassociate with the Filipino culture and Filipino community at one point in their life. Overall, the constant exposure to these negative stereotypes about Filipinos from family, friends, and the general society led these individuals to lack pride and enthusiasm for the Filipino culture. Roxanne¹ stated in her interview that the one thing she regrets about her past is that she never developed an interest in the Filipino culture, even though she was deeply interested in numerous other cultures, such as Japanese, Chinese, European, and Indian culture. Despite her interest in the many cultures of the world, her lack of enthusiasm and embarrassment about being Filipino did not

¹ All names used are pseudonyms to maintain the confidentiality of the participants’ identities.
allow her to develop an interest in learning about the Filipino culture. Many other participants in this study had a similar experience with the Filipino culture and therefore it is important to examine the deficit lens through which they viewed themselves.

The deficit lens that the participants in this study viewed themselves had a profound effect on their ethnic identity development and was characterized by three main stereotypes about Filipinos. The three main stereotypes about Filipinos, which were internalized by the participants in this study were: (a) Filipinos are uneducated laborers and wage workers, (b) Filipinos are rude and lack social skills, and (c) Filipinos are racist. While there were other stereotypes that the participants discussed, such as Filipinos eat dog, Filipinos like bright colors, and Filipino can not match their clothes, these three stereotypes had the strongest effect on the participants ethnic identity development and were the stereotypes that preoccupied their notions of what it meant to be Filipino.

The Ethnic Glass Ceiling: Filipinos as Uneducated Laborers and Wage Workers

All of the participants in this study recited one of the most commonly shared stereotypes about Filipinos in Hawai‘i, as they stated that they believed that Filipinos were mostly uneducated laborers or wage workers and do not hold professional careers. While this is simply a stereotype and not all Filipinos are destined to become laborers or wage workers, it is important to note that it is hard for young Filipinos to find examples of other Filipinos who do not fit this stereotypes, as the structure of the labor force reinforces this common perception. Okamura (1990, 1998, 2008) made the observation that although Filipinos constitute over 15% of the population in Hawai‘i, they are overrepresented in the service sector and underrepresented in professional or managerial professions. According the 2000 United States Census, only 32.2% of those who claimed Filipino as their only ethnicity
were employed in “management, professional, and related occupations,” while 20.9% of those individuals were employed in “service occupations,” 28.1% of the population was employed in “sales and office occupations,” and 8.6% were employed in construction or maintenance occupations. Furthermore, 10.7% of those who claim Filipino as their only ethnicity in Hawai‘i are living below the poverty line. Therefore, the structure of the labor force and the distribution of wealth in Hawai‘i appears to support this stereotype, making it difficult for young Filipinos to question this common perception of Filipinos.

Allison, a female of mixed Japanese and Filipino heritage, stated that one of the reasons why she attempted to disassociate herself with being Filipino was because she did not see Filipinos as successful individuals. Being of mixed ancestry she would often compare the Japanese side of her family with the Filipino side of her family and stated,

When I think of Filipinos I just think of lower end jobs. I guess that’s kind of how it is with [my Filipino] side. My mom’s a secretary, my aunty, I don’t even know what she does, my Uncle [is] a nurse’s aide, like the people who clean up and stuff. So, [it’s basically] the lower end jobs...When I think of my Japanese [side of the family], I think of my dad, who’s an electrician and my uncles who’s an engineer. They just have higher jobs. (Allison, July 2, 2010)

The comparison of her Japanese side of the family and her Filipino side of the family supported what she saw in society where she encountered Filipinos as janitors and service sector individuals, while Japanese individuals were teachers, counselors, and other professionals she encountered. In fact, when asked what the first thing that came to mind when hearing the word Filipino, she responded that she “thinks of the big hats working out in the field” (Allison, July 2, 2010).

This stereotype and the inability to find Filipinos in high status positions was especially relevant in Rhonda’s, a female who was only of Filipino ancestry, life, as her
mother was employed as a cashier at a retail store and her father was a dishwasher at a bakery. She stated that she “didn’t talk about what [her] parents did because [she] was ashamed of what [her] parents did because they had that I felt were not good enough...especially because they were Filipino” (Rhonda, September 28, 2010). It is important to note that she stressed the fact that her parents’ jobs were embarrassing for her because her parents were Filipino, which meant that they fulfilled the stereotypes about Filipinos being wage workers and laborers. Therefore, for Rhonda, her parents’ ethnicity made their jobs more salient to their identities, which contributed to her embarrassment about being Filipino. In fact, this stereotype became her reality, as she believed that her Filipino ethnicity created a barrier that would prevent her from doing anything great in life—a reality that she embraced until her sophomore year in high school.

These beliefs that Filipinos are laborers and wage workers was further exacerbated by the fact that many of the participants “blamed the victim” for their low status jobs. Therefore they did not attribute the fact that barriers exist within the social structure and labor force which concentrate Filipinos in service sector and low status jobs, but instead blamed Filipinos for being uneducated, lazy, and unmotivated to obtain professional, high status careers (Jordan, September 23, 2010; Michael, July 14, 2010; Roxanne, July 23, 2010). Roxanne, an individual of mixed Japanese and Filipino ethnicity, was the most adamant about this point and expressed her anger and frustration with Filipinos who refuse to use their talents and simply settle for any job they can get. She argued,

They work hard, but they don’t have any bigger goals than that. They just stick to what they know they are good at, they don’t push themselves to achieve anything more...they just stick to what is comfortable (Roxanne, July 23, 2010)
While she is blaming the victim in this statement, it is important to note that she does not believe that Filipinos do not have talents, but believes that they refuse to fully utilize the talents that they have. David, a male of mixed ancestry, further supported this idea as he claimed “they [Filipinos] could do so much more with their lives, but they just seem content living pay check to pay check” (November 20, 2010). Allison also believed that Filipinos fail to dream big and set high expectations for themselves and used her grandfather as “proof” that this belief was justified. She stated that her discussions about graduate school with her Filipino grandfather encouraged her to believe that Filipinos limited themselves, as they were not supportive of her continuing her education. She described these interactions as follows:

My grandpa would always say you shouldn’t be going to school. You should just be working, you know. [I think it’s because] he worked on the plantation at a young age and he thought I should be like that too. I don’t know, I didn’t really understand so I would just ignore him and stop talking to him. (Allison, July 2, 2010)

These constructions of Filipinos as unmotivated and unwilling to set high goals and expectations for themselves simply strengthened the saliency of the stereotypes of Filipinos as laborers and wage workers for the participants in this study, as they allowed the participants to blame Filipinos for failing to obtain prestigious social positions.

It is further important to note that most of the participants in this study discussed this stereotype within the context of those that they considered “fresh off the boat,” or FOB. In accordance with the previous discussion, the participants in this study saw the immigrant Filipinos, those that are FOB, as not having any goals beyond coming to the United States. Roxanne stated that “they don’t have bigger goals than just that...coming to the United States and finding a job...they never really assimilate to the culture” (July 23, 2010). David stated that perhaps immigrant Filipinos are content with their low prestige jobs because they “are
simply happy that they are in the United States and are having a better life than they would in the Philippines” (November 20, 2010). Therefore, the participants in this study seemed to have a negative imagery of the Philippines, often considering it a third world or developing country, which allowed them to juxtapose this image of the Philippines against the imagery of the United States as a place of opportunity and a locale where life is better even if one is employed in low status positions (Alan, August 10, 2010).

Filipinos are Rude and Lack Social Skills

The second stereotype about Filipinos that distorted the lens through which the participants viewed themselves was that Filipinos are rude and lack appropriate social skills. As with the previous stereotype many of the participants in this study mentioned that they internalized and believed in this stereotype because they had personal experiences, often with family, which they believed confirmed the stereotype. Many of the participants who mentioned this stereotype discussed it within the context of family parties or events, as this was one of the few times that the participants saw a large group of Filipinos gather in a single place and interact with one another.

When asked about stereotypes that apply to Filipinos Allison became agitated and complained about her family members’ behaviors at her graduation party. She recounted the following,

I remember too for my grad party--I remember my Filipino family they brought like all of my uncle’s wife’s family. So my Auntie’s family. They brought everybody to my grad party and they weren’t really invited. And also the fact that brought all of those people and only gave the same amount of money they would [if they had come alone]. I mean it’s just HELLO! And it’s like I’ve never met them before but they were all there at my party. So I don’t know how I would describe that, like no class. (Allison, July 2, 2010)
David and Rachel recounted similar stories as they described the difficulties that each of their families had when trying to plan for the Filipino family parties. David questioned “why spend time inviting people, when everyone’s just going to show up anywhere, whether they’re invited or not” (November 20, 2010). Rachel stated that at parties they always had “LOTS of food left over,” which she stated stemmed from the fact in Filipino culture it is embarrassing to run out of food at a party and “you never know who is going to show up so you always have to cook so much extra food just to make sure you don’t run out” (December 1, 2010). Therefore, the participants framed this behavior of showing up at parties or family events as rude and unacceptable, often because it placed a hardship on the family that was planning the event, as all Filipino parties seemed to have an atmosphere of uncertainty around them in regards to how many people would show up for the event or party.

While some participants focused on Filipinos willingness to rudely invite others or themselves to events or parties, other participants focused on Filipinos’ behaviors at these parties. Roxanne compared her Japanese family’s parties and her Filipino family’s parties. She stated that at her Japanese family parties everyone is mild mannered, polite and respectful. Her Filipino relatives, however, were painted in a different light, as rude and obnoxious. She stated that she disliked attending Filipino parties because everyone there was always “singing Karaoke, people are pushing other people, people are taking home food before everyone’s eaten...people are just yelling and crazy” (Roxanne, July 23, 2010). Jordan concurred with this assessment as he described Filipinos as rude, obnoxious, and “loud people who don’t know how to act in public” (September 23, 2010).

Interestingly, while many participants described Filipinos as loud, one participant described Filipino as quiet. In fact, they were too quiet for her liking and she interpreted
their behavior as being anti-social and rude. Genevieve presented this dissatisfaction with Filipino within the context of her aunties and cousins that immigrated from the Philippines. She states,

> They’re [my relatives] are immigrating to the US now. They don’t talk to you. It’s like they are afraid of me because I speak “too” much. You know, I tell them hi and they look at me and don’t say anything. They don’t have any social interaction with people. It’s like you have to be shame...and you have to be quiet. I hate that. My cousins have been here for like 10 years, I keep telling them to TALK! (Genevieve, September 23, 2010)

She continued her story by saying that she could justify their behavior and understand their actions if they did not know how to speak English. However, she stated that they all know how to speak English and simply refuse to speak to her, which she finds frustrating. Unfortunately, rather than attribute these behaviors to these few individuals that engage in these behaviors, she attributes their behavior to a what she considers a Filipino cultural imperative to be “shame,” and, therefore, sees their actions as a function of being Filipino.

While no other participant recounted stories of cousins or relatives from the Philippines refusing to talk to them, they did recount stories of immigrant Filipinos attempting to seclude themselves from others. Allison and Roxanne, who attended the same high school, both stated that the immigrant “Filipinos just stuck to Filipinos” (Allison, July 2, 2010) and that Filipinos needed to “learn how to be more social outside of people that are just Filipino” (Roxanne, September 23, 2010). Michelle has a similar experience at her high school and believed that these actions of sticking together was quite detrimental for these individuals as it leads them to be close minded. She stated,

> I think if they are from the Philippines and they stick together it is because they do not want to let anyone else in. But, I think its good to mingle with other people. Cause I think when you are close minded that’s when you start to make stereotypes about other people. (Michelle, September 9, 2010)
Overall, it was quite a commonly belief among participants in this study that the immigrant Filipinos did not attempt to assimilate into “American culture,” which in turn made them rude, as they did not abide by the same social norms that participants in this study abided by.

It was also common for participants in this study to consider Filipinos to be flashy (Jordan, September 23, 2010; Michael, July 14, 2010; Michelle, September 9, 2010; Rachel December 1, 2010), a trait that was interpreted by many of the participants as rude. Therefore, since Filipinos were not humble with their belongings and appearance, the participants in this study considered them rude and obnoxious. Michelle stated that Filipinos are very flashy and always want to show off their things, especially when you visit their home. She says that when you visit a Filipino home they are very quick to show off their newest and biggest purchases. She states, “a lot of them show off cause they are like look at this new thing I have. It cost me 500 dollars, or did you see my new this or that!” (Michelle, September 9, 2010). While Michelle generalized this trait to all Filipinos she particularly recounted examples of her father engaging in this behavior, as he always kept up with the trends and was always quick to show his guests his new paddleboard, surfboard, stereo system, or newest pair of shoes that he added to his shoe collection. Therefore, this perceived failure of Filipinos being humble allowed some participants to interpret their behavior as rude, obnoxious, and uncalled for.

*Filipinos are Racist: The Quest for a Lighter and “More Beautiful” Complexion*

The third stereotype that contributed to the distortion of the looking glass that the participants in this study saw themselves through is the idea that Filipinos are racist. For the most part, this construction of Filipino as racist centered around the issues of skin color. Participants in this study were encouraged to stay out of the sun, use an umbrella when they
had to walk in the sun, and use skin lightening soaps and chemicals (Allison, July 3, 2010; Michelle, September 9, 2010; Rachel, December 1, 2010). Rachel felt that these beliefs about skin lightening were ridiculous, especially since they lived in Hawai‘i, and felt that her mother would “believe any new trend about how to lighten your skin” (December 1, 2010). She stated that this pressure still continues into her adulthood and stated that just recently her mother encouraged her to take a shower with milk, rather than water, to help lighten her skin. The participants that did not follow the advice from their friends and family about lightening their skin were often subject to ridicule, which further allowed the participants to believe that Filipinos are racist. Allison stated that her cousins would always tease her about her skin color because she was the darkest in the family and that “they still tease [her] about the color of [her] skin all the time” (July 3, 2010). Michelle stated that she always had mixed emotions when visiting her grandmother in California. As an individual who loved to go to the beach, she would always be darker than her family members that avoiding sun exposure to maintain their light complexion. She stated that every time she visited her grandmother her skin color was always a topic of discussion, as her grandmother would always tell her to stay out of the sun because she was “SO dark!” (Michelle, September 9, 2010).

This was a common trend with many of the participants in this study, as they argued that their parents often told them that having light colored skin was associated with success, social status, and most importantly, beauty. Alan, who recently completed a course in Philippines history at Leeward Community College, suggested that this belief of whiteness as beautiful and successful was a product of the colonization of the Philippines, first by Spain and than by the United States. He argued that Filipinos, even those in the Philippines, seem to idolize White Americans and strive to be like them, even in terms of skin color (Alan,
August 10, 2010). Michelle, David, and Rachel all said that this obsession with whiteness and the racist attitude that Filipinos hold towards those with darker skin is further supported by the media images that are presented in Filipino media, such as The Filipino Channel. All of these participants described the images that Filipinos who subscribe to this cable channel are presented with, but Rachel summed it up most concisely when she stated that when you watch the channel “you never see a dark Filipino, they all look like they are White or mixed ethnicity...you wouldn’t be able to tell they are Filipino” (December 1, 2010). Therefore, the media images may contribute to the beauty myth that attractiveness is associated with lighter skin. This beauty myth was pushed on these participants in this study as many of the females were told, while they were single, that they should not go to the beach or get dark because “the good guys wouldn’t be attracted” to them because they were too dark (Rachel, December 1, 2010).

This idea of the “good guys” was also related to skin color, as the females were told only dark guys would be attracted to them if they got too dark. The females and males in this study were told that skin color was often associated with social class, as those who were darker were members of the working or lower class. This connection between social class and skin color was constructed around the idea that members of the working class are required to work outdoors in the sun, while those of the middle or upper class were able to get job where they could work inside buildings and not out in the sun (Alan, August 10, 2010; David, November 20, 2010). Therefore, using this logic those of the lower class would be considerably darker than those who were members of the middle or upper class. This belief ties into the beauty myth that was forced upon the females in this study, as they were
told that “the good guys,” those with lighter skin, and, therefore, middle or upper class individuals would not be attracted to them if they got too dark.

Genevieve’s story of her experiences with her “racist parents” help to elucidate how skin color, social class, and beauty are important to Filipinos. Genevieve stated that in high school she began to take an interest in “Black guys” and began to dread letting them come over to her house, where they would meet her parents. She said that while her parents did not like the fact that she was dating “Black guys” they would always be nice to her boyfriends when they were at her house. However, when her boyfriend was not present they would always ask why she “was dating a Black guy...and that [she] should date a Filipino [or better yet] an Asian or a White guy” (Genevieve, September 7, 2010). The goal of this type of encouragement stemmed from the fact, the participant argued, that her parents wanted to make sure that she would marry someone that would ensure that her children would be “not too dark,” “attractive,” and not a laborer.

Due to these experiences the participants in this study began to believe that Filipinos were racist, especially against those with darker skin colors. Throughout the participants’ childhood socialization they were encouraged to adopt a belief that equated darkness with images of being unattractive and a laborer, while whiteness was considered beautiful and successful. While Genevieve’s story shows the Filipinos may discriminate against Blacks, the participants in the study shared stories that suggested that they believe Filipinos were the most discriminatory and prejudice against Filipinos with dark skin, as it was believed that these individual had a choice and could take measures to lighten their skin and fix the problem of being “too dark.”
THE DIFFERENTIAL EFFECTS OF THE DISTORTED LOOKING GLASS

All of the participants in this study were exposed to the stereotypes that are presented above and often internalized the stereotypes. These internalized stereotypes helped create what Hacking (2007) considered a “type of person,” in this case a Filipino. Therefore, the stereotypes were juxtaposed against each other to create a generalized picture of what a Filipino is, which created a category that all of the participants in this study did not want to associate themselves with at one point in their life. Since the overall image of Filipino held a negative connotation for the participants in this study they believed that they had to engage in various processes to disengage and distances themselves from being Filipino.

Before delving into the processes and strategies these individuals used to distance themselves from being Filipino, it is important to note that while the participants in this study viewed themselves through a similar distorted looking glass, the deficit perspective of themselves had a differential effect on males and females. In fact, these stereotypes seemed to have a more detrimental effect on the ethnic identity construction of the females in this study than they did on the ethnic identity construction of the males in this study.

The starkest contrast between the males and females in this study centers on the stereotype of Filipinos as racist and the imperative of Whiteness and light skin color. All of the females in this study discussed the pressure that was placed upon them to achieve a light skin complexion, as they were told that being too dark would make them unattractive and lower their chances of attracting a “good guy.” While the females in this study developed an irritation with the fact that their family and friends seemed to be preoccupied with the color of their skin, they still internalized the ideology, as many of them stated that they are still self-conscious about being in the sun and getting dark. Michelle stated she no longer uses
skin lighteners, but also stated that if she “goes to the beach or if [she goes] somewhere where [she’ll] be in the sun, she wears a long sleeve [shirt]” (September 9, 2010). Therefore, this practice of maintaining whiteness has stuck with her, and many of the female participants, as they continue to avoid the sun and often activities they enjoy, such as surfing, to maintain their attractiveness as light skinned individuals. It is also important to note that the females in this study argued that this lightness imperative was not just enforced by their families, but was also reinforced by their friends and acquaintances, which made this beauty myth of whiteness much more salient in their life.

On the other hand, the males in this study knew about the beauty myth that existed around whiteness, and although whiteness was often also associated with social class, viewed this cultural imperative and practice as a female phenomenon. In fact when the males discussed this stereotype, which allowed them to come to the conclusion that Filipinos are racist, they did so in the context of someone else, often a female, such as their mother, sister, aunty, or girlfriend. Therefore, this need to be light skinned was something that the males in this study were very aware of, but did not perceive a great amount of pressure being placed upon them to achieve. The males in this study often talked about “how silly” or “how strange” it was that Filipino girls did not like to go out in the sun and were so obsessed with having a light skin complexion. Therefore, since the males were aware of the obsession with whiteness, but did not perceive pressure for conforming to this idea of beauty, they were able to view this ideology as a silly obsession and label it as a female phenomenon, which they could ignore and not be bothered by. It is important to note, however, that while the males did not seem to be bothered by this beauty myth of whiteness, as they continued to enjoy going to the beach and not worrying about how dark they became, they also contributed to
the maintenance of the beauty myth, as they often suggested that “Filipino girls with lighter skin are more attractive” (David, November 20, 2010).

While males and females both believed that Filipinos were rude and obnoxious, females, again, seemed to be more affected by this stereotype when developing their self-image, as they took more precautions to avoid “being the typical Filipino” (Kimberly, September 24, 2010). Therefore, the females often became hyperconscious about their behaviors and made sure that they weren’t “hogging the karaoke mic,” being too loud, or being rude (Roxanne, July 23, 2010) when in the presence of others. Perhaps this differential effect of this stereotype on the development of a self-concept stems from the way that society constructs the concept of masculinity, especially as it applies to younger males, which is when most participants rejected their Filipino ethnic identity. In fact the cultural phrase of “boys will be boys” may have excused the males in this study from being labeled as your “typical Filipino” when they were too loud or too rude. Again, while the males recognized that this stereotype about Filipinos existed they did not feel many repercussions of the stereotype when they acted in accordance with the stereotype. Perhaps this phenomenon occurred because in these instances the males’ status as a male was more salient than their ethnic identity and they were excused for their loud or rude behavior simply because they were males.

Finally and perhaps most importantly the males in this study reacted to the distorted looking glass in a very different manner than the females in this study. While this deficit perspective of the self led females to hate being Filipino, embarrassed to claim Filipino, or ashamed to be Filipino, this deficit lens simply led the males in study to be nonchalant about their ethnic identity. All the males in this study claimed that they engaged in processes to
hide that they were Filipino, as did the females, but they all claimed that they were never really embarrassed to be Filipino. Instead, they simply stated that they minimized the importance of ethnicity in their life, simply saying that being Filipino was not important and preferred to be defined by their gender, their educational credentials, or their job. Therefore, seeing Filipinos, and therefore themselves, through a deficit lens created by the popular stereotypes about Filipinos simply encouraged the males in this study to minimize the importance of ethnicity in their life. In contrast to this, the females tended appropriate the stereotypes into their self concept and attempted to be aware of their actions to ensure that they did not live up to the stereotypes that they internalized as defining a Filipino. Therefore, for the females in this study their ethnicity became more salient in their life as they attempted to distance themselves from being Filipino and monitor their behavior so as not be labeled as a typical Filipino.

“‘I’M NOT REALLY WITH THE CULTURE:’ WHY THE DISTORTED LOOKING GLASS DOESN’T SHATTER

One might wonder why the stereotypes that exist about a group, such as Filipinos in Hawai‘i, can be so powerful that they shape the way members of the group view themselves and led those individual to develop a disparaging or denigrated self concept. A common theme that exists through the interviews in this study is that many of the participants felt disconnected from the Filipino culture and therefore, they were “not really with the culture” (Rhonda, September 28, 2010). This disconnection from the culture stemmed from what the participants in this study viewed as limited access to the Filipino culture within the broader society and the lack of education about the Filipino culture that they obtained from their family.
Rhonda claimed that she was not exposed to Filipino culture in the broader society. She stated that she readily had access to Japanese culture through the popular media and throughout her educational career, even though she attended school in a predominately Filipino neighborhood (September 28, 2010). Allison stated that she was unaware of any Filipino cultural events, but was very aware of Japanese and Chinese cultural events that occurred in Hawai‘i because they were very well organized and publicized (July 3, 2010). This sentiment was supported by many of the participants in this study as they claimed that they always knew when Chinese New Year celebrations occurred, when Bon Dances were held, and celebrated events like Chinese New Year, Boy’s Day, and Girl’s Day in their schools. Therefore, the participants in this study felt that they were always exposed to Asian culture and often celebrated Chinese and Japanese culture, while feeling completely disconnected from the Filipino culture in the broader society. Therefore the participants in this study were unaware of the Filipino community publications, events like the Filipino Fiesta, and Filipino community celebrations. It is important to note that all the participants in this study mentioned that they were aware that the Filipino Community Center existed, but did not know what the role of the center in promoting Filipino culture. David stated “I know the FilCom center exists, but I don’t know what it does. I guess it’s a start for community building, but I don’t know how successful it is...I haven’t heard anything about it” (November 20, 2010). Therefore, the participants in this study felt that they could not learn about the Filipino culture through the broader society or Filipino community because it was not celebrated in the general society and therefore, there was not a lot of awareness about the Filipino culture.
This disconnect from the Filipino culture and community was further exacerbated by the fact that many of the participants in this study did not learn about the Filipino culture from his or her family. In fact, many of the participants in this study felt that their families hid the culture from them and refused to teach them about the positive attributes of the Filipino culture or community. In fact, many participants felt that their parents and family members downplayed or degraded the importance of the Filipino culture, often suggesting that it was more important for the participants to learn “American culture” and be “American” rather than “Filipino” (Jeremy, October 1, 2010). Jeremy stated that when his grandfather immigrated to Hawai‘i from the Philippines he left the Filipino culture behind, refusing to participate in Filipino cultural practices or speak Tagalog. He stated “he came to America, he wanted to be American, that was his reason for coming down to America...he just wanted his kids to speak English” (October 1, 2010). Therefore, for many of these participants the Filipino culture was lost with their parents’ generation, as they refuse to perpetuate the culture in an attempt to make a better life for their children. Alan stated, “my mom told me that she didn’t see any use in teaching me [the Filipino culture or language] because she didn’t think we would go back [to the Philippines] because of all the opportunities that we have here...so I would never need it (August 10, 2010). Therefore, this lack of education about the Filipino culture from the broader society and the participant’s family lead the participants to feel like they “knew I was Filipino...but culture-wise, yeah, I don’t know any Filipino culture, just a few things I picked up from friends...but nothing from family” and were therefore disconnected and uninterested in the Filipino culture.

This ignorance about the Filipino culture and any positive attributes that are associated with either the culture or the Filipino community left the participants in this study
with a lack of information to contradict the stereotypes that informed their view of what a Filipino is. In a sense, they were forced to accept the ethnic category as their ethnic identity (Cornell and Hartmann, 2007). Therefore, they were unable to deviate from the popular discourse of what a Filipino is and if therefore, viewed their Filipino self through a deficit perspective. While the story could end here, it does not, as the participants in this study attempted to preserve their ego and self-esteem by disassociated themselves with being Filipino. They did this because they believed that by engaging in various strategies and processes, discussed in the next chapter, that distanced themselves from being Filipino, they would not be viewed as a Filipino and, therefore, not judged through the deficit lens discussed throughout this chapter.
DISASSOCIATING WITH THE DISTORTED LOOKING GLASS

In intermediate school, I attempted to reject my Filipino identity by stressing that I wasn’t just “Filipino,” I was a “local Filipino.” I did this because I strongly believed that by stressing the fact that I was born and raised in Hawai‘i, I was telling others that I really wasn’t Filipino. I felt as if I was telling people that I was only Filipino because I had Filipino ancestry, but other than that I had no other connection to the Filipino culture or community. During this time, I began to feel better about myself because being a local Filipino helped shield me from the stereotypes and jokes about Filipinos, which I rationalized as only applying to immigrant Filipinos. I believed that I wouldn’t be held back by my Filipino ancestry and be forced to live a life as a janitor or service worker.

In high school, the division between local Filipinos and immigrant Filipinos became more defined and played a major role in the group formations within the school. In fact, there was one building at my high school where most of the Filipinos in the school would hang out during recesses and lunch. What was interesting was that there seemed to be an invisible barrier, which prevented the local Filipinos from mingling with the immigrant Filipinos, as the local Filipinos would all gather on one side of the building, while the immigrant Filipinos would gather on the opposite side of the building. In my opinion, the local Filipinos were not much better than the immigrant Filipinos, and in fact seemed to be very materialistic, cliquish, and judgmental. Therefore, I was again faced with an identity crisis, as I did not want to associate myself with this group of “local Filipinos.” Therefore, I further disassociated with my Filipino identity and pretended that my Filipino identity did not matter in my life at all. When I was asked about my ethnicity, I would say, “I’m Scottish, Swedish, Jewish, German, and (pause) Filipino.” Filipino was always stated in a softer voice and as if it was a simple afterthought that really didn’t matter. I felt that by identifying this way I was able to stress my Caucasian ethnic background and, hopefully, hide my Filipino identity from others. Ultimately, I believed in the stereotypes about Filipinos and attempted to pass as anything other than just Filipino.

Okamura (2008) differentiated the Filipino ethnic identity in Hawai‘i from other ethnic group identification in Hawai‘i because he argued that the Filipino identity is one that is defined by others and assigned to members of the Filipino community rather than one that is created by Filipino individuals in Hawai‘i. As discussed in the previous chapter, this characterization of the Filipino identity is quite accurate, as all of the participants in the study developed their sense of self and beliefs about their ethnicity from the stereotypes that are commonly employed when talking about Filipinos. In short, the individuals in this study saw themselves, as they believe others saw them, which was through a lens that suggests that the
Filipino culture and community is culturally deficient. This negative view of the self led many participants to develop negative feelings about being Filipino, which lead them to feel embarrassed and ashamed of who they were and in some cases led participants to hate being Filipino. Due to these negative images and belief about the self, all of the participants in this study rejected their Filipino ethnic identity and disassociated themselves from anything that was Filipino, which allowed the participants to improve their sense of self. After all, as Revilla (1996) argued who wants to be part of a group that is constantly teased, put down, and viewed as inferior.

Overall, the Filipino identity became viewed as a stigma, a marker that can spoil one’s identity. Interestingly enough, all of the participants in this study, even those that believed they had distinct Filipino features, believed that Filipino was a discreditable stigma rather than a discredited stigma. Goffman (1959) distinguished between the two types of stigma by suggesting that a discredited stigma is one that an individual can not hide from others and is often immediately noticeable to others, while a discreditable stigma is one that is not obvious to others and, therefore, allows an individual to perform identity work to attempt to hide the stigma from others. David stated, “it’s [ethnicity] so mixed here that you can’t always tell what someone is by looking at them” (November 20, 2010). It was beliefs like this that allowed the participants in the study, who had what they considered distinguishable Filipino features to believe that they could attempt to be something other than Filipino. Therefore, the participants in this study had to put on performances that gave “expression to ideal standards...[and] forgo or conceal action which is inconsistent with these standards” (Goffman 1959:41). Engaging in these behaviors required the individuals to be
very cautious with their actions, as errors in their performance would reveal that they
possessed the stigma of being Filipino.

Basically, the participants in this study engaged in three different processes to
disassociate themselves with the stigma of Filipino: (a) being ambivalent about their ethnic
identity, (b) claiming a different ethnic identity, and (c) claiming to be local or a local
Filipino as opposed to an immigrant Filipino. These practices allowed the individuals to
improve their self-concept by allowing them to gain status, even if just temporarily, by
aligning themselves with a more prestigious ethnic group. The first two practices listed
above allowed the participants in this study to seek out privileged ethnicities and attempt to
claim them for their own, while the third practice allowed participants to create an other,
Fresh of the Boat Filipinos (FOB) and attain status through defensive othering, as they
clearly defined FOBs and being of a lower status than local or local Filipino.

“WHAT DO YOU THINK I AM?”: ETHNIC IDENTITY AMBIVALENCE AND
DISCOVERING AN ACCEPTED ETHNICITY

While sociologists (Cornell and Hartmann 2007; Giddens, Appelbaum, and Carr
2009; Henslin 2009) differentiate between race and ethnicity, it is important to note that most
people tend to conflate race with ethnicity. Since the distinction between race and ethnicity
is not clearly drawn in real life interactions, the “type of person” (Hacking 2007) that defines
a Filipino consists of phenotypical and cultural descriptions. Therefore, while the individuals
in this study may not have exhibited the cultural components of a “Filipino,” many of the
participants had what they considered “Filipino physical features.” Therefore, to some
extent the individuals in this study felt that their free will to associate with an ethnicity was
limited by their phenotypical characteristics. However, at the same time, due to the Hawai‘i
context, the participants also felt that it is often hard for others to tell what race or ethnicity someone is simply by looking at them because “everyone is mixed.” Therefore, participants in this study utilized what may have been one of their most powerful techniques for negotiating their identity--they asked others the simple question, “what do you think I am?”

By responding to the question of “what are you” with the question “what do you think I am,” the participants in this study became ambivalent about their ethnicity. This ambivalence allowed the participants in this study to basically ask others “what ethnicity would you believe I am,” which then gave the participants the option to either accept or deny the label that the other person was trying to assign to him or her. This technique of being ambivalent about their ethnicity was especially powerful for the participants who were “full Filipino,” as it allowed them to see what was “believable,” so they would not get caught in a lie.

Rachel recounted that she would always ask others “what do you think I am,” and they would often respond by saying that she was probably Hawaiian (December 1, 2010). Although she was not Hawaiian, as she identified as full Filipino, she would usually simply agree that she was Hawaiian and move forward with the conversation. Furthermore, it was easy for her to pass as Hawaiian because she could continue to engage in conversations about things that others thought were Hawaiian. She was involved in and enjoyed hula, the Hawaiian music scene, and local/Hawaiian foods. When asked why she did not correct people and tell them that she was not Hawaiian, but was Filipino, she stated that she “was happy when they thought I was Hawaiian. I always wanted to be White or Hawaiian. I always thought those ethnicities were so much more interesting” (Rachel, December 1, 2010). In fact, she enjoyed being Hawaiian so much that she would continue to be Hawaiian
and forget to correct people once they became her friends, which often created discomfort for her when she was found out to be a Filipino. This discovery of her “true ethnicity” often occurred with her college friends from Kamehameha Schools, who would ask her if she completed the forms and service hours to maintain her Kamehameha Schools college scholarship. It was only at that this point that she finally had to admit that she was not Hawaiian. What is interesting, though, is that while she was embarrassed about lying she was also happy that she was able to pass as Hawaiian for so long because her friends did not have a chance to apply the negative stereotypes about Filipinos to her, which allowed them to “really get to know her” before judging her (December 1, 2010).

This story exemplifies a common process for many of the participants in this study, as they simply accepted the label that they were given when they were satisfied with it. A male who had a “Japanese last name” and had “Japanese features” was usually assumed to be Japanese and during high school he did not correct those that made this assumption (Michael, July 14, 2010). Michael claimed that he was never really interested in Filipino culture, as most his family’s cultural practices were Japanese and, therefore, did not see any reason to correct people by telling them he was Filipino. He did, however, have to admit to being Filipino when he wanted to take advantage of opportunities such as scholarships that were designated for Filipinos. He recounted a story of a teacher asking him if he was Filipino and he only admitted that he was Filipino when she said that she knew of a scholarship opportunity that he could apply for if he was Filipino. He also had to admit to some of his friends that he was Filipino when they found out that he applied for the scholarship and again when he was awarded the scholarship. Alan had a similar experience as he liked when people considered him local or Hawaiian because he did not feel like there were many
negative stereotypes about these groups. Therefore, like Rachel, he believed that others could really “get to know him” when they did not know he was Filipino.

While these participants attempted to pass as another assigned ethnicity for an extended period of time, some participants were ambivalent about their ethnicity but did not maintain the facade of being another ethnicity for very long. Although some participants “came clean” (Rhonda, September 28, 2010) after being told that they were another ethnicity, they still believed they got the same benefit of asking the question “what do you think I am.” Basically, these individuals were able to discover that others did not view them as Filipino, and therefore, felt that they were not being judged based on this identity category. Michelle, who believed that she did not have typical Filipino physical features, enjoyed asking others what they thought her ethnicity was. Although she would eventually admit to being Filipino, she always felt “happy about it, when they would guess that I’m mixed [because I’m full Filipino]” (September 9, 2010). She said she was constantly mistaken as Japanese-Filipino, which she enjoyed because she believed that “mixed individuals” were more attractive and because she attributed success to the Japanese ethnicity. Therefore, she felt that when others saw her they saw an individual who was Japanese-Filipino, which meant she was not being held to the stereotypes about Filipinos.

Overall the participants who employed this technique of being ambivalent about their ethnicity sought to negotiate the boundaries of their ethnicity. By asking others “what do you think I am” they were able to see what they could reasonably be considered. Therefore, by asking this question they increased their chance of convincing others that they were not Filipino, as they could simply agree with the inaccurate assumptions that other people made about them. Often the participants in this study were assumed to be of another ethnicity (e.g.
Japanese) or to have a mixed ethnic background, both of which the participants believed afforded them higher status than just being Filipino.

SEEKING STATUS THROUGH “INTERESTING” OR PRESTIGIOUS ETHNICITIES

While some participants were ambivalent about their ethnicity, other participants simply attempted to claim a different ethnicity without asking the question “what do you think I am.” As with the previous discussion, this practice of claiming an ethnicity other than Filipino was an attempt to gain more status for the individual. It is important to note that status is simply a “social estimation of honor” which is bestowed upon another person by those with whom an individual interacts (Weber 1948 in Gerth and Mills 1967). Therefore, status can be attached to various groups of individuals and in Hawai‘i status is often assigned based on the social categorization of ethnicity (Labrador 2004; Okada 2007; Okamura 1998, 2008). This assigning of status can be observed and is often reflected in the structure of labor market, the prison and homeless populations, the structure and content of ethnic humor, and the celebration of various cultures in public institutions, such as the education system. As discussed in the previous chapter these socially created images of the various ethnic groups is internalized by those raised in Hawai‘i, which is reflected in the ethnicities that the individuals in this study attempted to claim in order to afford themselves more status.

Eight out of the twelve participants in this study attempted to gain more status by claiming a different ethnic identity at one point in their life, usually during their intermediate of high school careers. For some of the participants, claiming a different ethnicity was quite easy, as they were of mixed ethnic heritage. Therefore, they would simply stress their other ethnicity and hide or minimize the importance their Filipino ethnicity had in their life. This was especially easy for the individuals who were of both Filipino and Japanese ethnicity, as
Okamura’s (2008) work suggests that this perception of Japanese is not inaccurate as Japanese individuals are over-represented in professional jobs, while under-represented in service sector jobs. Therefore, the societal image of Japanese allowed the participants to equate Japanese with success and, thus, abandon their association with the Filipino ethnicity, as Filipino was associated with barriers, hardships, and failure.

Allison said that she would not always deny her Filipino ethnicity, but would always minimize the importance of her Filipino ethnicity and stress the importance of her Japanese ethnicity in her life. She stated,

I identified more with my Japanese side...I wouldn’t say Filipino, I would try to keep that quiet as long as possible. [When people asked me if I was Filipino] I’d correct them and say no, I’m not just Filipino, I’m something more than Filipino. I’m Japanese (July 2, 2010).

Roxanne recounted stories in which she attempted to do a similar thing, as she wanted to be Japanese, which she associated with success, and not Filipino, which she associated with having very limited talents. While there is a lot of diversity within each group she believed that Japanese individuals are quieter, more polite, and more intelligent than Filipinos (July 23, 2010). It is important to note that this participant, after describing the differences between Filipinos and Japanese for a couple of minutes, stopped and said that while she believed everything she said, when she really stops and thinks about it there are not many differences between the two groups. Therefore, one can see how the individual has internalized the stereotypes about the various ethnic groups in Hawai‘i and allowed them to shape her reality more than what she actually observed. These internalized stereotypes, in both of the above cases, were so important that the individuals stressed the importance of their Japanese identity, while minimizing the importance of their Filipino identity.
Participants who claimed to look more Asian than Filipino and have “Japanese last names” stated that stressing the importance of their Japanese identity over their Filipino ethnicity was quite easy. These individuals claimed that it helped that they did not look like a Filipino as they had lighter skin, a nose that was not flat, and lighter colored hair (Alan, August 10, 2010; Kimberly, September 24, 2010; Michael, July 14, 2010; Michelle, September 9, 2010; Roxanne, July 23, 2010). Furthermore, these individuals’ last names helped them put forth an impression that they were Japanese, rather than Filipino. Kimberly stated that people automatically believed that I was Japanese because of my last name. What is interesting, though, is that my name was spelled wrong on my birth certificate and was never changed. It was supposed to be a Filipino name, but the mistake makes it sound like a Japanese name (September 24, 2010).

Therefore, since many individuals in society continue to adopt a primordialist approach to ethnicity (Gil-White 1999) the participants’ last names were an important asset in their ability to perform an ethnicity other than Filipino.

Other individuals claimed that they struggled to claim an ethnicity other than Filipino because they “looked Filipino.” Rhonda said she would tell people she was Japanese, but others would not believe her. After telling others that she was Japanese, they would ask her what she really was, which would force her to admit that she was Filipino. When asked why others would not believe her, she stated, “it was because I didn’t look Japanese. I think it was the color of my skin, or my nose...and my eyes, they are not as slanted...and my last name didn’t help” (Rhonda, September 28, 2010). Another participant claimed that her nose told others that she was Filipino, as she “had the small, flat, Filipino nose” (Michelle, September 9, 2010). While physical appearance restricted the ethnicity that an individual of
mixed ethnic heritage could claim, it made it very hard for individuals who were not of mixed heritage to claim something other than Filipino.

While these participants’ physical appearances limited their options of acceptable ethnicities to claim, it did not prevent them from trying to claim an ethnicity other than Filipino. Jordan claimed that he tried to convince others that he was African American, rather than Filipino. This participant grew up around Filipinos and, like the other participants in the study, believed the stereotypes about Filipinos and did not view them as interesting people. However, he met an African American female in his freshman year of high school and became fascinated with her. Her culture fascinated him and he subsequently tried to claim African American as his own ethnicity (Jordan, September 23, 2010). It is important to note that this participant discussed African American culture as presented through the lens of the mainstream media. Although this may not be an accurate portrayal of African American culture, he was fascinated by the music, the way they spoke, and the way they dressed. His fascination with these things encouraged him to change his behavior. He began to listen to rap music, change his speech patterns, and dress with loose fitting clothing. While he completely embraced this image of African Americans and adapted his behavior to fit this image, he was never truly accepted as an African American. Others simply understood that he liked “African American culture” and that he was immersed in it, but when they looked at him they simply saw a Filipino. Therefore, while he wanted to simply be known as African American, other saw him as a Filipino who liked African American culture or as a Filipino who was pretending to be African American.

Often this fascination with another ethnic group stemmed from a lack of exposure to the Filipino culture. One participant who loves to travel, expressed her frustration with
herself in the past, as she found herself being interested in traveling throughout the world, but has “never been interested in visiting the Philippines...and I feel ashamed that I don’t know anything about it” (Roxanne, July 23, 2010). Another participant expressed a similar feeling and stated that she became fascinated with another ethnic group because she “was unfamiliar with [Filipino culture]...I was born in Hawai‘i and I don’t speak Ilocano. It makes me feel disconnected because I don’t know the language and I’m not really with the culture” (Rhonda, September 28, 2010). This participant became fascinated with Japanese culture and gravitated towards Japanese culture in intermediate and high school. She recounts her experience with Japanese culture as:

I think I was more drawn to the anime and maybe like the languages. It was very interesting for some reason. And the writing of hiragana and the kanji. I found it be very artistic (Rhonda, September 28, 2010).

She also stated that Japanese culture was readily available for her to explore, as it was presented to her in the school system and through television media. This was a common sentiment shared by a majority of the participants in this study, as they claimed that Japanese culture was celebrated in the Hawai‘i public school system, but there was little or no exposure to the Filipino culture in the school system. While this participant attempted to become Japanese, it did not work, as her physical features told others that she was Filipino. Therefore, like the previously discussed participant, she was not viewed as Japanese; instead she was viewed as a Filipino who liked Japanese culture or a Filipino who was pretending to be Filipino. She reported that others would not believe her when she said she was Japanese and she felt disappointed and thought “aw shucks, maybe I should just tell them straight up that I’m Filipino” (Rhonda, September 28, 2010).
Overall, what all the participants have done in the previous discussion is attempt to claim some status for themselves by aligning themselves with groups that they considered to be privileged in Hawai‘i. The ethnicities that they chose to associate themselves with were those that are were often presented in a positive manner, celebrated in the public sphere, or those that the participants simply viewed as interesting. Thus it is clear that the participants in this study viewed the Filipino ethnicity as one that lacked status, as it was often viewed as uninteresting, lacking in cultural values and practices, and simply associated with being a member of the working class. Therefore, these beliefs encouraged the participants in this study to attempt to claim to be of an ethnicity other than Filipino.

“I’M NOT A FOB:” STATUS ATTAINMENT THROUGH DEFENSIVE OTHERING

Often the participants in this study struggled with their attempts to claim an ethnicity other than Filipino and this frustration led these individuals to engage in a process known as defensive othering. Schwalbe et al. (2000) define defensive othering as identity work done by members of an oppressed group against other members of the oppressed group in an attempt to align themselves with a dominant, more powerful group. Often this form of identity work reaffirms the stereotypes about a group, as the members engaging in defensive othering assert claims that suggest that while they, as an individual, should be viewed differently from other members of the group the negative perceptions about the rest of the members of the oppressed group are mostly true. Labrador (2002, 2004) affirms that this process of defensive othering exists in Hawai‘i and is often maintained through ethnic humor, as Hawai‘i’s ethnic humor “construct[s] discourses that place immigrant Filipinos as cultural and linguistic Others, signifying their subordinate position in the social hierarchy and order” (290). Labrador further argued that this distinguishing between Locals and immigrant
Filipinos centers around two main issues: English speaking ability and culinary tastes. Okada (2007) argued that ethnic humor allows racist ideas to be perpetuated, as they become shared in the form of jokes, which people view innocuous, unlike overt racist dialogue. This process of defensive othering was clearly engaged in by the participants in this study, as ten out of the twelve participants stated that there is a distinct difference between Filipinos from the Philippines and local Filipinos.

After discussing stereotypes that existed about Filipinos in Hawai‘i, the participants were asked if they believed the stereotypes were true. While many of the participants claimed that they actively resisted the stereotypes when they were confronted with the stereotypes as others tried to define who they were, they believed that the stereotypes about Filipinos could be applied to one group--immigrant Filipinos. This belief that the stereotypes only applied to immigrant Filipinos, led many of the participants to assert a “local Filipino” identity, rather than a “Filipino” identity.

Many of the participants claimed that while they were growing up they did not do “Filipino things,” instead they did “local things, like going to the beach and cruising. I mean what things are local? The beach! We went to the beach and parties” (Genevieve, September 7, 2010). Jeremy echoed a similar belief as he stated,

I grew up more local than Filipino...I like the ocean, I like ocean sports...I like the music. I grew up listening to Hawaiian music and eating Hawaiian food and it wasn’t until I moved to Kapolei...that I experience a lot of Filipino people and [the Filipino culture] (October 1, 2010)

Rachel and Kimberly stated that they claimed to be local because they believed that they were Hawaiian, as they were not exposed to Filipino culture, but their parents enrolled them in activities like hula, which reinforced their belief that they were in fact Hawaiian.

Kimberly stated “I danced hula and sang Hawaiian songs...I thought I was Hawaiian...but
than I found out later that we don’t even have Hawaiian in our blood” (September 24, 2010).

Therefore, the participants in this study associated things like hula, local “Hawaiian” food, local Hawaiian music, and ocean sports with being local, but not with being Filipino. This belief allowed the participants in this study to reaffirm the line that they created between themselves and immigrant Filipinos, positioning themselves in a more prestigious position than immigrant Filipinos.

By drawing a line between themselves, as local Filipinos, and immigrant Filipinos, the participants in this study allowed themselves to adopt prejudiced attitudes and beliefs about immigrant Filipinos and at times even engage in discriminatory actions. Jeremy recounted an experience he had with “immigrant Filipinos” in which he remembers thinking that they were weird,

We had Filipino neighbors on both sides in Kapolei...I saw them slaughter a goat, you know. I actually saw the dogs that they ate at their party. That was a shock for me...I saw them burning the goat with the torch. We saw it tied up in the garage, we all went out to play, came back, and smell the burnt hair and saw the goat getting the shave and the torch. All that to me was shocking (October 1, 2010)

While most participants did not have vivid stories of watching an animal being slaughtered, most of the participants differentiated local culinary tastes from immigrant Filipino culinary tastes. Usually this was done by denigrating the culinary choices of the immigrant Filipinos as “weird” (David, November 20, 2010; Jeremy October 1, 2010; Rachel, December 1, 2010), too ethnic (Allison, July 3, 2010), or disgusting (Jordan, September 23, 2010). Basically the participants did not enjoy “Filipino” food and thought that clinging to the “too ethnic” types of foods was a clear distinguishing marker of those they call FOBs, which stands for fresh-off-the-boat and was used to refer to immigrant Filipinos.
Besides the culinary choices of immigrant Filipinos, the participants in this study believed that an immigrant Filipino could be identified by the way they spoke. Not only could the immigrant Filipinos be identified by their linguistic patterns, their speech patterns were often viewed as inferior to a local accent or what the participants considered proper English. One participant questioned why anyone would want to speak Filipino in public, as it was a clear marker of being a FOB (Genevieve, September 7, 2010). This disdain for the Filipino language and of being a FOB led many of the participants in this study to tease the “Filipino accent” as they found it “funny the way they talk...their accents and the way they pronounce things. I’d say it is pretty funny, how [they pronounce] the p’s and f’s” (Kimberly, September 24, 2010). Alan recounted how he would tease others that had a Filipino accent, “even my friends from the Philippines, I would tease them too” (August 10, 2010). Other participants would not only tease their friends, but would also tease their family members. Rachel and Allison both stated that they would tease their mom for speaking with a Filipino accent, often mocking their mothers’ speech patterns, and trying to tell their mom how to speak “correctly.” By teasing and mocking immigrant Filipinos about their accents the participants in this study were able to further disassociate themselves with the Filipino identity, as they did not have an accent and, thus, were not that kind of Filipino.

Overall, the participants in this study distanced themselves from the negative societal imagery of Filipinos by asserting that the stereotypes about Filipinos were true, but only when applied to the immigrant Filipinos. According to the participants in this study, it is the immigrant Filipinos who are rude, cannot speak English, are laborers, are uneducated, and often do not have bigger goals for their future. By doing this the participants were able to denigrate immigrant Filipinos, as their defined a new position for themselves--the privileged
position of local Filipino. This also led the participants in this study to hold very harsh opinions about immigrant Filipinos. One participant claimed that she wished the immigrant Filipinos did not live up to all the stereotypes because they were the reason that she was ashamed to be Filipino. She believed that the immigrant Filipinos could change, but simply refused to do so. Therefore, she was led to conclude that if the first and perhaps second generation of Filipinos simply disappeared, the Filipino community would have a much better reputation and start to move in the right direction. She stated that this was true because more Filipinos needed to be like her as she was “just trying to fit in” (Allison, July 3, 2010).

Therefore, most participants in this study viewed local Filipinos as attempting to assimilate to the dominant culture, which they viewed as successful and having more capital, than retaining the Filipino culture.

SUMMARY

Therefore, at one point in their life, all of the participants in this study viewed their ethnicity in a negative fashion. They often saw the Filipino ethnicity and culture through a deficit lens and did not see anything positive about being Filipino. Furthermore, they did not actively create an ethnic identity for themselves. Instead, they accepted the ethnic category that was already created as true and felt the need to deal with the negativity that surrounded Filipino. In other words, the participants in this study believed that the stereotypes about Filipinos defined the Filipino ethnicity and found a way to hide or disassociate themselves from being seen as Filipino.

The participants in this study disassociated themselves from being Filipino by claiming to be another ethnicity, often an ethnicity that they associated with success or one
that they found interesting. Often this ethnicity was Japanese, which was an ethnicity that
was often viewed by the participants as successful and celebrated in the school system.
Therefore, the participants in this study believed that they had more access to the Japanese
culture and therefore could associate themselves with the culture. While most participants
engaged in this practice, the individuals that did not have the physical characteristics that
were associated with being Filipino used it most successfully. In addition to simply choosing
another ethnicity to claim, the participants who did not want to be caught in an outright lie
would be ambivalent about their ethnicity, asking others “what do you think I am.” This
simple question allowed the participants to see what others believed they were and gave
themselves the option to simply accept the category that others assigned to them. For those
that could not escape the Filipino category, they clearly drew a line between immigrant
Filipino and local Filipino. They engaged in the process of defensive othering, telling others
that the stereotypes about Filipinos applied to the immigrant Filipinos, but not to local
Filipinos. This allowed the participants, not to accept their Filipino identity, but to create a
new category of Filipino, local Filipino, which distanced themselves from the popular notion
of Filipino.
QUESTIONING AND REBUILDING THE LOOKING GLASS

I attended a small liberal arts university in Oregon and, therefore, did not have access to a course about Filipinos in the United States or access to a large Filipino community. The lack of discourse about Filipinos and the relative absence of Filipinos in the broader community led many to label me as Mexican. Along with that label came the stereotypes about Mexicans, which are quite similar to the stereotypes about Filipinos in Hawai‘i. In an attempt to protect myself from the stereotypes and label of Mexican I began to actively claim my Filipino ethnicity. What was nice about this, however, is that no one really knew what a Filipino was and, therefore, it became an interesting ethnicity for one--one that I could define myself. I still knew very little about Filipino culture and was not a participant in a Filipino community, but would always assert my Filipino ethnic identity with others.

I truly began to question the stereotypes and reorganize my thinking about Filipinos as I was completing my senior thesis project, which looked at the differences between Filipinos in Oregon and Filipinos in Hawai‘i. As I attended meetings and talked to Filipinos in Oregon to complete my research, I found that Filipinos did not live up to the stereotypes that I was socialized with. In fact, most of the Filipinos that I met and talked with in Oregon were high-ranking businessmen and women. They held advanced degrees and were proud to be Filipino. The project helped push me to reject the stereotypes about Filipinos and develop pride in my ethnicity. Overcoming this aversion that I had to being Filipino allowed me to see the strengths of the Filipino community, especially the social and family capital that is built into the Filipino extended family. While I still have my moments of being ashamed of being Filipino, I am quite secure and proud of my ethnicity most of the time. In the recent past, I have even become the faculty advisor for a Filipino-American club that was started at one of the local universities.

Many scholars of ethnic identity argue that ethnic identity formation centers around two concepts: exploration and commitment (Cross 1978; Marcia 1980; Phinney 1996, 2000; Phinney, Romero, Nava, and Huang 2001; Umana-Taylor, Yazedjian, and Barmaca-Gomez 2004). Therefore, an individual usually develops their sense of an ethnic identity by exploring the culture and discovering what the culture means to them, which creates a sense of attachment to the culture for the individual. Furthermore, individuals often develop their ethnic identity when they have positive feelings about the ethnic group they are associated with, which can be developed by viewing the ethnic group as culturally rich or having some direct advantage for association (Gilliland 2006; White 1999; Yosso 2005). Therefore, when
an individual views their ethnicity in a positive light and believes their culture is rich in capital, they will explore their ethnicity and develop a commitment to that ethnicity.

While one of the male participants (Alan) described his journey of “becoming Filipino” in accordance with the process presented above, the other participants in this study did not develop their ethnic identity in that fashion. Instead the participants in this study discussed how they felt as they became role models for younger Filipinos and, therefore, felt an obligation to accept their Filipino ethnic identity. Due to the obligation that they felt to accept being Filipino, the participants in this study did not really explore their ethnicity and develop a commitment to being Filipino, as evidenced by their low to moderate scores on the Multi-group Ethnic Identity Measure (MEIM). Therefore, the participants in this study found themselves being Filipino and having to find a way to make themselves feel better about being Filipino, which often occurred through two processes: reframing the stereotypes about being Filipino and searching for capital in the Filipino community.

BEING THROWN INTO AN ETHNICITY: I HAVE TO BE A ROLE MODEL

For most of the participants in this study, one of the main reasons why they began to accept their Filipino ethnic identity was that they believed they became role models for younger Filipinos. For most of the participants this occurred when they took jobs in the Hawai‘i school system, as teachers, counselors, or tutors at schools with a predominately Filipino student body. The participants recounted that they often saw themselves in the students they worked work and, therefore, wanted to accept their Filipino ethnic identity so the students would feel it was okay to be Filipino. In a sense these individuals became Filipino overnight, as they did not explore their ethnicity or develop a commitment to being
Filipino before claiming a Filipino ethnic identity; essentially they were thrown into being Filipino and had to make the best of it because they felt they were role models.

Allison stated that she started to say she was Filipino rather than claiming that she was Japanese when she was employed at an elementary school in Kalihi. She stated,

When I was working in Kalihi that was one thing about being Filipino, like the kids faces would just light up when they found out I was Filipino because most of the teachers were all Japanese, so they could kind of identify with me...and it was really exciting...cause this was the first time that I worked most with Filipino kids...it was kind of different. But, I liked it, like I liked the fact that they kind of looked up to because I was the same ethnicity, you know? (July 3, 2010)

Here the participant describes how she began to feel a connection with the Filipino students at the elementary school, as she believed that they “looked up” to her. She stated that she did not want to let the students down and crush the excitement they demonstrated when they thought she was Filipino and therefore began telling others that she was Filipino.

Michelle and Rachel told similar stories as they were employed as a substitute teacher and counselor, respectively, in a predominately Filipino neighborhood. Michelle began to tell others openly that she was Filipino when she felt that the students in the classes in which she was a substitute teacher respected her more because they knew she was Filipino. She stated that by just looking at her it’s hard to tell that she is Filipino because she is taller than most Filipinos, has a lighter complexion, and doesn’t “have the flat Filipino nose” (Michelle, September 9, 2010). However, every once in a while when she was having difficulties with a student that she knew was Filipino she would speak to the student in Tagalog, which marked her as Filipino. She stated that in this context, however, it was not a negative experience as she believed that the students,

connect better to me [when they find out I’m Filipino]. I think they listen more and they don’t just think oh she’s a sub and we can do whatever. There are some, like some of the Filipino kids that can speak Filipino, you know if someone is being
Therefore, as with the previously discussed participant, Michelle felt that her ethnicity allowed her to connect with the students and, more importantly, she began to think that she became a Filipino role model for these children. Rachel tells a similar story as she stated that “this was the first time I worked with so many Filipino kids...I didn’t want them to be like me, I just wanted to help” (December 1, 2010).

Rhonda’s experience brings to light the importance of a Filipino role model in these young children’s lives, as well as a reason why some of the participants felt they needed to become a role model for young Filipinos. Rhonda believed in all the stereotypes about Filipinos because she felt that all the individuals who were “full Filipino” could accurately be described by the stereotypes. Therefore, she strongly believed that she was destined for a low wage job right after high school. However, during high school she was able to work with a young female tutor who was proud to be Filipino, which changed Rhonda’s life. She stated,

I think it had to do mostly with meeting up with college students who were Filipino and they demonstrated how proud they were to be Filipino, cause I had tutors. I met this one tutor...she was Filipino and she talked about how proud she was to be Filipino and what she did...she was the first successful Filipino I knew...she made me question the stereotypes (September 28, 2010)

This experience and connection with this tutor not only encouraged Rhonda to attend college, but also encouraged her to seek out a job as a tutor for young Filipino students. She stated “I wanted to help them see the truth about Filipino, like my tutor did for me.”

Rhonda’s story raises an important question about Filipino role models for young Filipino children. When the participants in this study were asked about Filipino role models in their life, the majority of the participants said that they did not exist while the were
They admitted that there were Filipinos that were successful, but these were Filipinos who were “mixed” and not “full Filipino” and often attributed their success to being local or being Japanese (David, November 20, 2010; Rachel, December 1, 2010; Allison, July 2, 2010). Therefore, these successful Filipinos were not viewed as Filipino role models, but were viewed as local role models or Japanese role models. Since the participants in this study did not view these individuals as Filipino role models, they believed that there were no Filipino role models for them to look up to.

When the participants in this study were pushed on this subject of role models, they said that things were changing and some role models may currently exist in the Filipino community. For example, Roxanne stated,

Yeah, I mean, I think there are some...there are some role models coming out...you know like Manny Pacquiao. People are proud of that. And that girl who can sing, Cherise, the one that can sing like Celion Dion (July 23, 2010)

All of the participants in this study mentioned these two individuals as icons in the Filipino community. However, most of the participants did not feel that they could use these individuals as role models because, although famous, they were recognized for their abilities such as singing or fighting and not because of education or “traditional career success.” Therefore, these celebrities were seen as individuals that the Filipino community could rally behind, but not as a role model for individuals.

Therefore, the participants in this study often believed that they became Filipino role models for the children that they worked with and, more importantly, believed that they could not reject this position as Filipino role model because they felt that the Filipino community was lacking good role models. David said, “I don’t know a lot about Filipino, but I claim it because it will help them (the younger Filipinos he works with)” (November...
Most participants held a similar belief, as they believed that by claiming Filipino they were helping the younger Filipinos see that it is not “bad to be Filipino.” Overall, the participants believed that by claiming Filipino they were guiding these younger Filipinos away from the path they had taken when they rejected their Filipino ethnic identity and felt ashamed of their ethnicity.

WHY AM I A ROLE MODEL: CONTINUED DEFENSIVE OTHERING

While the participants believed they were a role model for younger Filipinos and claimed to be Filipino they did not embrace the entire Filipino community as they continued to engage in practices of defensive othering and social distancing (Labrador 2002, 2004; Schwalbe et al. 2000). Essentially, the participants in this study believed that they became Filipino role models because of what they achieved, which made them different from the majority of other Filipinos. Many of the participants took pride in the fact that they could not be identified as “Filipino” and could “surprise” people by saying “I’m also Filipino” (Alan, August 10, 2010; David November 20, 2010; Kimberly September 24, 2010; Rachel December 1, 2010). Most of the participants believed they were a role model because they did not speak English with an accent and were not employed in the service sector, which they attributed to the fact that they went to college and were educated.

Many of the participants only became comfortable claiming that they were Filipino when they were not able to be associated with the stereotypes. One participant stated, “I liked telling people that I am Filipino because I don’t live up to their ideas about Filipino” (Rachel, December 1, 2010). This individual had completed her Bachelor’s degree and was currently working on her Master’s degree at the time of the interview. She stated that the more education that she obtained the more confident and comfortable she became with her
ethnicity. This was a common experience for many of the participants in this study. Another participant stated, “the more education I finish, I feel more confident that it doesn’t matter if I am Filipino, I can still be somebody” (Rhonda, September 28, 2010). Another participant argued that if she had not finished college and graduated with her Bachelor’s degree she would not want to claim to be Filipino, as she would simply fulfill society’s idea that Filipinos are uneducated (Roxanne, July 23, 2010). Many of the participants saw their completion of their education as a chance to “become somebody” and not be limited to the service sector. They used their completed education to say, I am Filipino, but I am different.

Therefore, while these participants felt they became Filipino role models they did not necessarily embrace the entire Filipino community and continued to define subsections of the Filipino community. In this case they distinguished between educated Filipinos, who were doing something with their life, and uneducated Filipinos, who are employed in the service sector. This dynamic and process is quite interesting and important to understanding how the individuals in this study began to reframe the idea about Filipino because it made them role models, which brought them closer to “being Filipino,” but also allowed the participants to distance themselves from “being Filipino.”

REPAIRING THE EGO: REFRAMING STEREOTYPES

Since the participants in this study were often thrown into their ethnicity and forced to accept being Filipino when they became role models for others they did not have the knowledge about being Filipino that some individuals who develop a Filipino ethnic identity have about the Filipino culture. Therefore, they were claiming Filipino but did not know very much about being Filipino and, therefore, had to begin to develop positive feelings about being Filipino to become more comfortable with their ethnic identity. Basically what
the participants in this study did was search for ways to make themselves feel better about being Filipino and they did so in a manner that often reinforced the stereotypes about Filipinos rather than question and disprove them. Therefore, while it may seem that this was a process of decolonizing the mind (Friere 1967; hooks 2010, 2003), it is more closely aligned with discussions of internalized racism (Bivens 1995; Jones 2000; Pyke 2011; Pyke and Dang 2003) as the participants simply reinforced the cultural stereotypes about Filipinos with their reframing of the stereotypes.

One of the most common ways that the participants in this study reframed the Filipino culture was that they shifted their view of Filipinos from Filipinos as simple laborers to Filipinos as hard workers. This reframing of Filipinos as hard workers, allowed the participants in this study to account for why Filipinos are overrepresented in the service sector. Michelle stated,

Filipinos are hard workers. They just work hard. When Filipinos come to America they know they’re going to have a better life, so even if they have the crappiest job they still do it and just work hard at it” (September 9, 2010)

Many other participants recounted stories about how they believed that Filipinos did not care about the jobs they took. What they were concerned about was that they did their job well and worked hard at what they did. Rachel expressed this sentiment when she talked about her parents. She stated that her parents did not hold professional jobs, but they worked hard in the positions that they had and were able to win numerous awards, such as employee of the month awards. She stated that this made her parents content and also allowed a sense of pride to develop, as she knew that her parents worked very hard to be “good at what they do” (Rachel, December 1, 2010). Therefore, many participants began to see past the job title that Filipinos had and attempted to look at how well they did their job. This reframing allowed
the participants in this study to develop a sense of pride in associating with people they once felt simply “limited themselves,” “did not live up to their potential,” and “had no bigger goals” (Roxanne, July 23, 2010).

This reframing of Filipinos as hard workers was also very closely linked to the idea of Filipinos as self-sacrificing individuals. This view of Filipinos also helped the participants in this study justify why Filipinos were overrepresented in the service sector. They argued that Filipinos do not care about what types of jobs they have, as long as they can work, because they are not concerned with prestige, but are concerned with helping their families. Alan stated that Filipinos take whatever jobs they can get and as many jobs as they can because they want to earn money to help their families have a better life (August 10, 2010). Another participant stated that Filipinos will often work hard and sacrifice their own advancement and well-being so that others can have a better life. A participant elaborated on this idea and stated,

I think sacrifice too and that ties into family. Like how much my mom sacrifices or like how I’ve seen my relatives sacrifice their money and their social status [to help others]. I have an Aunty, who constantly sends money back home to the point where she is renting a room from us and I used to think, why doesn’t she have her own place or want her own place...I’ve pondering these things, but now realize she is sacrificing for others...which is a good value to have (Roxanne, July 23, 2010)

Therefore, the participants in this study no longer saw Filipinos simply as laborers, but as individuals, who work very hard at what they do. The participants in this study saw this as a positive trait and argued that this has helped them establish a good work ethic. One participant stated that her mother and father worked extremely hard at their job and elaborated “they’re the type of people that won’t even use their sick leave unless its absolutely necessary...growing up around this I saw the importance of work...its important to
work hard at your job. It makes them happy at work” (Rachel, December 1, 2010). This participant further elaborated that she has “been given” some of this drive to work, as she finds herself not wanting to take sick leave or personal leave days from work, as she believes that others will see that she is not “working hard.”

What is interesting here is that despite the participants’ embarrassment that “Filipinos are laborers,” and despite the fact that many of the participants had completed a college degree, the participants did not reframe this stereotype as “Filipinos can do anything they want;” instead they acknowledged that Filipinos are laborers, but gave this stereotype a positive twist by arguing that they are good at what they do because they work hard. Therefore, it is arguable that the participants may still be ashamed of the low status of Filipinos in the workplace, but help to justify that status by saying that not everyone could do their jobs because they are not willing to work as hard as Filipinos. While this reframing does not necessarily refute the stereotype of Filipino as a laborer, it does put a positive spin on it and allows a form of capital to be presented.

Another way that participants attempted to reframe the stereotype of Filipino as laborer was to reframe the way that they thought about what Filipinos like to do and the human nature of Filipinos. To do this, the participants justified the overrepresentation of Filipinos in the service industry by stating that Filipinos are very hospitable people, who love to serve others. Alan stated that he learned about how eager Filipinos are to be of service to others in the Philippines:

You know what I learned in the Philippines is that people [Filipinos] love to serve other people...you can see Filipinos doing their job here [in Hawai‘i], but when you go to the Philippines it seems so genuine. That is just how they are, they are very hospitable. I see that with my family too...and other Filipinos as well...if I go over to [my friend’s] house they’re always like Oh
come and eat. They’re very hospitable and caring. They want you to come in and they want to serve you (August 10, 2010)

This rationale that it was part of the Filipino culture to be of service to others, helped the participants become a little less ashamed about being Filipino, as they no longer viewed Filipinos as experiencing barriers that made them take the jobs that they have, but rather viewed Filipinos as choosing and loving the service industry. This reframing was also related to the idea that Filipinos work hard, as the participants claimed that Filipinos can work hard at their jobs in the service sector because they love their jobs.

This idea was further supported by further reframing of the Filipino culture to find positive attributes of the culture. While the participants were once ashamed about the stereotype and status of Filipinos as janitors, some participants provided evidence for why Filipinos would become janitors or maids in the hotel industry. Michelle stated,

Filipinos like to clean. I would say that most of my family [members] have clean houses. My mom likes to clean. My aunts like to clean. Once I went to my mom’s house and it was super messy, so I ended up cleaning. I don’t live there but I cleaned. I was taught to love to clean, so I don’t mind doing it” (September 9, 2010)

Here the participant claims that Filipinos, like herself, are taught to love to clean. She further elaborates on this idea and says that she does not expect her husband to do any of the cleaning in the house. When asked why she does not expect any help from her husband, she stated that cleaning is something that she was taught to like and therefore, she enjoys cleaning the house by herself. Another participant had a similar experience with cleaning and recalled that her family would clean the house almost every weekend. She said that it was a family event that took place for almost half the day, in which they would thoroughly clean the house (Rachel, December 1, 2010). During these times, though, she began to
develop the value of keeping a clean house, which she began to see as “fun,” since it was a time that she could bond with her family.

It is important to note that although the way the participants in this study reframed the stereotypes about Filipinos often reinforced the stereotypes, the reframing provided a lot of support for the participants to assert their Filipino identity. Basically what the participants did was reframe negative stereotypes in a positive fashion, which allowed them to develop the positive feelings and sense of commitment that they would have obtained through exploring the Filipino culture prior to asserting a Filipino ethnic identity. Since the participants did not explore their ethnicity prior to asserting a Filipino ethnic identity, they had to rely on their own socialization and racial messages that society provides to make sense of the situation they were experiencing. As the critical race theorists (Delgado and Stefancic 2000, 2001; Matsuda 1987; Solorzano and Yosso 20002; Yosso 2005) point out, American society is often constructed around racist ideologies that standardize White culture as the norm and construct minority cultures as being lacking sufficient capital to make progress in American society. Therefore, since the participants in this study did not explore their ethnicity prior to adopting their Filipino ethnic identity they had to rely on this deficit lens to make sense of the Filipino community. This helps to explain why the participants simply justified the stereotypes with cultural explanations rather than radically reconstructing the notion of Filipino by simply saying Filipinos, like other ethnic groups, can do anything they strive for.

THE “FAMILY:” A SITE FOR DISCOVERING CAPITAL IN BEING FILIPINO

While many of the participants in this study were able to develop positive feelings about being Filipino, not by completely refuting the stereotypes about Filipinos, but by
finding positive justifications for why Filipinos may fit the stereotypes, many of the participants were able to find some capital in the Filipino community that was not just a justification of the stereotypes. For most of the participants they developed positive feelings about being Filipino because they were able to discover what Yosso (2005) defined as familial capital, which describes the sense of community that is establish not just between the nuclear family, but amongst an individual’s extended family. Therefore, the participants in this study were able to see their nuclear and extended family, not just as a source of embarrassment, but also as a source of strength and support.

Roxanne, who often viewed her Filipino side of the family as “loud, obnoxious, and rude,” said that she really developed a sense of pride in being Filipino when she saw the support network that formed during her father’s illness and continued after his death. She said that she was very touched and moved by how close and supportive her Filipino family was in comparison to her Japanese side (Interview, July 23, 2010). She recounted that her Filipino family was always there for her and would bring food over to her house, so her immediate family never had to worry about being lonely or about cooking. Everything was taken care of for them and they “even helped clean the house.” She compared this support system to her Japanese family, which she claimed was supportive, but in a more indirect way as they gave her immediate family a lot of money.

This experience with her father’s death and the perceived difference between her Filipino family and Japanese family helped this participant see what many of the other participants “discovered” about Filipinos--Filipinos are very family oriented and will do anything to help the family. The participant stated,

Just always being there for you. I feel like my Filipino aunties are always at my house, you know, they’re always eating together and they’re always
hanging out. It’s nice to have that you know, just the fellowship and...the camaraderie that my mom has with her cousins. It’s her cousin, but I call them my Aunties. (Interview, July 23, 2010)

Many of the participants held a similar feeling about Filipino families, as they believed that they were very supportive and cohesive. Jeremy recounted that Filipinos are “real big on family. Everything is family family family” (October 1, 2010). He further elaborated on the how these families stick together and strive to provide support for one another,

Filipinos are always trying to help their family, even those in the Philippines. They try to get them jobs here or if they’re not living here they send up clothes, they send up money, back to the Philippines. Like my fiancée’s mother, for example, is always donating stuff back to the Philippines [to help their family] (October 1, 2010)

Michelle discussed the sacrifices that Filipinos will make for their families. The participant argued that Filipinos will even travel to other countries to obtain work, so that they can support their families,

Filipinos know that America is a good place to live because you can make more money here and send it back [to the Philippines]. I have a cousin who lives in San Diego and his wife and son are in the Philippines and I always ask him, why don’t you just live there [in the Philippines]. And he says because he can’t work there...so he stays here to support, even if it means to be away from his family--to take care of them...and America’s not the only place, they’ll go to Dubai or Hong Kong, or Australia, anywhere [to find work] (Michelle, September 9, 2010).

Therefore, many of the participants began to see some form of capital in the Filipino community, specifically within their kinship networks, as they saw the value of a strong family unit being fostered among Filipinos.

Furthermore, the participants began to recognize this cohesion, support system, and most importantly sense of respect was not simply contained to those that they were biologically related to. Jordan stated that as he was growing up he found it irritating and annoying that everyone he met who was Filipino had to be called aunty or uncle, when they
were not really related to him. However, as he began to develop positive feelings about being Filipino and assert his Filipino ethnic identity, he started to feel that this was a real strength of the community (September 23, 2010). He realized that referring to others in this fashion actually brought people closer and they believed they were part of the same group. David expressed a similar belief as he stated, “it’s nice to know that even though these people aren’t related to you they still feel some connection to you and perhaps are willing to help you” (November 20, 2010). He made this comment while discussing how Filipinos often use labels for family members such as ading, ate, manong, or manang when referring to individual that they are not biologically related to. Overall, this closeness creates a sense of community and connection amongst Filipinos (Roxanne, July 23, 2010).

Michelle, who is employed as a substitute teacher in a predominately Filipino neighborhood, provided a clear example of how these connections beyond the kinship structures are fostered among Filipinos. She stated,

A lot of the kids don’t know [that I’m Filipino]...unless they hear me say something in Filipino. Then they start calling me “ate” which means older sister ad I guess they recognize that I am one of them and get more comfortable. It’s kind of cool some times cause I guess some of the kids...don’t feel like they’re a stranger anymore (September 9, 2010)

It is interesting that in this quote Michelle states that she thinks the students do not feel like strangers anymore, as her story and many of the other participants’ stories suggest that when they are presented with these “familial” connections beyond the actual kinship structures they feel very welcomed and supported. Therefore, many of the participants began to see the Filipino culture and community as a very welcoming and close-knit network of individuals who assert their Filipino identity. It is important to note that for most of the participants in this study they did not necessarily see this strength in the Filipino community while they
were rejecting their Filipino ethnic identity. It is not that the support system and community network were not available for the participants, but the participants in this study saw this network of Filipinos as Filipinos “only sticking together” (Roxanne, July 23, 2010), “being close minded” (Michelle, September 9, 2010), or “not trying to fit in” (Allison, July 3, 2010; Jordan, September 23, 2010). Therefore, while the participants rejected their Filipino ethnic identity they also rejected and isolated themselves from the supportive community of Filipinos in Hawai‘i.

What is interesting is that the participants, at the time of the interview, did not feel that the Filipino community would not accept them if they tried to become an active participant in the community. Jeremy stated “I don’t think they’d look down on me...I just haven’t tried...I’m more passive about it” (October 1, 2010). Here Jeremy believes that if he wanted to access the Filipino community he could, but just has not had a lot of enthusiasm to do so. Almost all the participants stated that they do not think the Filipino community, which they believed was constituted by the first and second generation Filipinos that they actively attempted to distance themselves from, would create barriers that prevent their participation in the community. Alan stated that despite the fact that he teased Filipinos and was ashamed of being Filipino growing up, the Filipino community would be “very welcoming...[as] they would just want to help me” (August 10, 2010).

Although many of the participants did not recognize this strength growing up, they believed that this was a vital part of their socialization and identity. Furthermore, they believed that this sense of family also created a sense of community amongst Filipinos in Hawai‘i. A participant stated “it’s nice to know that there is so much support from your extended family,” and continued to describe how she know that if she ever needs help, she
knows someone will be there to help her (Rachel, December 1, 2010). This is further supported by the participants’ belief that the Filipino family is so supportive, that no matter where you are, as long as you are near a family member’s house, you will always have a place to sleep and eat.

SUMMARY

Therefore, the participants in this study began to accept their Filipino ethnicity through one, or a combination of the four major processes discussed above. First, the participants developed a sense of confidence of being Filipino by becoming a role model for other individuals. When they were viewed as a role model, they felt a sense of guilt about being a role model and not being honest about their ethnicity. Therefore, they felt that they needed to tell others that they were Filipino, especially young Filipino children who the participants thought looked up to them. By doing this the participants believed that they were providing an example for the young children and showing them that they should not be ashamed of being Filipino, as the participants had once been.

While being a role model for children led many participants to become more comfortable with their Filipino ethnicity, they were more likely to claim Filipino when they did not live up to the stereotypes. This was often facilitated through obtaining college or advanced degrees and by pursuing professional careers. They believed that since they broke the stereotypes, they could claim to be Filipino, as they defied the commonly held beliefs about Filipinos. What is interesting in this process, however, is that they only felt positive about being Filipino when they felt distanced from other Filipinos. Therefore, being
different allowed the individuals to feel comfortable with being Filipino, but not really be associated with or thought of as Filipino.

Another process that helped the participants in this study develop the ability to comfortably claim to be Filipino was finding capital in the Filipino community. This was done through two different ways. First, the participants in this study reframed the stereotypes about Filipinos, but often did so in a way that did not refute the stereotypes, but instead justified the stereotypes. Instead they framed the stereotypes in a positive fashion, such as Filipinos love to serve, which allowed them to see the Filipino culture in a positive fashion, but, ultimately, made excuses for why Filipinos are overrepresented in low wage jobs in the service industry. Finally, the participants in this study found positive traits and capital in the Filipino community by seeing the strength of the Filipino family unit. Focusing on their immediate and extended family, the participants in this study reframed Filipinos as a strong, family oriented community that will support one another and will often sacrifice for other individuals.
DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

Through the application of qualitative research methods this study has approached the Filipino culture and ethnicity from a decentered critical race perspective to better understand the processes that some Filipino individuals, who were raised in Hawai‘i undergo as they develop a Filipino ethnic identity. This approach has produced results that suggest that the broader societal assumptions and stereotypes about Filipinos in Hawai‘i strong influence some locally raised Filipinos to be ashamed of their ethnic background, buts also suggest that these individuals are still agents capable of finding various ways to develop a sense of pride in being Filipino. Therefore, this study has provided some insights into how locally raised Filipinos have coped with a stigmatized identity and have transformed what was once perceived as a stigma into something they are proud of and able to assert as a positive aspect of their identity.

Unfortunately much of the literature that suggests that Filipino in Hawai‘i is viewed through a deficit perspective, which denigrates the Filipino culture and community continues to be accurate (Labrador 2004; Okada 2007; Okamura 1990, 1998, 2008). This was evidence through the participants' discussions of the stereotypes about Filipinos that exist in Hawai‘i. All of the participants stated that these stereotypes were part of their socialization, as they grew up being told that Filipinos were manual laborers, uneducated, rude, obnoxious, and destined to be part of the working class. This ideology about Filipinos had a profound effect on the participants in this study, as they internalized the stereotypes and accepted them as the truth. This acceptance of the stereotypes led all of the participants in this study to feel a sense of shame and embarrassment about being Filipino and attempt to hide their ethnic heritage from others.
Cornell and Hartmann (2007) define an ethnic category as a list of characteristics that are associated with a particular ethnic group, which are assigned to the ethnic group by groups other than the ethnic group itself. Okamura (2008) argued that the Filipino ethnic group is distinct from other ethnic groups in Hawai‘i because others tend to define what Filipino mean in Hawai‘i and Filipinos often do not have a say in the construction of what it means to be Filipino. Thus, Filipino becomes an ethnic category in Hawai‘i. While Cornell and Hartmann (2007) differentiate between an ethnic category and an ethnic identity they argue that it is possible for an ethnic group to adopt an ethnic category as their ethnic identity. This adoption of an ethnic category is supported in this study, as the participants at one point in their life simply accepted the societal perceptions of Filipinos, rather than construct a positive, asset-based perception of Filipinos. Therefore, since these individuals employed a negatively constructed ethnic category as their lens to understand what it meant to be Filipino, they viewed themselves through a deficit perspective and disassociated with being Filipino.

This study also provides evidence in support of Okada's (2007) argument on ethnic humor in Hawai‘i, which is disproportionately directed towards Filipinos, in which she argued that ethnic humor contributed to the maintenance of the deficit thinking about Filipinos. The participants in this study suggested that they were often exposed to the negative stereotypes about Filipinos through ethnic jokes that they heard on the radio, at comedy performances by local comedians such as Frank DeLima and Augie T, and from peers and family members. These jokes taught the individuals at a very young age what others think about Filipinos and reinforced ideas about Filipinos being laborers, unable to speak English, uneducated, and often unsuccessful. One participant recounted very vividly
her experience with ethnic humor, as she stated that every Christmas, she, along with her family members and friends, would openly sing the "Filipino Christmas Song" performed by local comedian Frank DeLima without thinking about what the words actually were. While rejecting her ethnic identity she did not see anything wrong with this song, but when she developed the ability to proudly claim to be Filipino she reexamined the lyrics to the song and found them extremely discriminatory and racist. Upon critically examining the song lyrics she wondering why Filipinos would openly support and share a song like this so freely, as she believed it taught others the negative stereotypes about Filipinos.

Furthermore, it is important to acknowledge that the ethnic hierarchy in Hawai‘i provides support for some of the stereotypes about Filipinos, thus providing more evidence for Filipino individual that the stereotypes are not simply negative constructions about Filipinos, but are the truth. For example one of the stereotypes that was salient in all of the participants' lives was the stereotype that Filipinos are laborers. This stereotype was especially hard for the participants in this study to combat because this is exactly what they saw in the society they lived. Okamura (1990, 1998, 2008) cited data from the United States Census Bureau, which shows that Filipinos are overrepresented in Hawai‘i's service sector, as 31.4% of Filipino males and 30.3% of Filipino females are employed in these types of jobs. For many of the participants in this study this trend was easily observed in the general population, especially in the school system, where they stated that their teachers and other school faculty members were usually Japanese or Caucasian, while the janitors and custodians at their schools were Filipino. The participants’ parents also supported this trend, as participants described their Filipino relatives as holding jobs as dishwashers, janitors, nurse's aides, hotel workers, and other positions within the service industry. Therefore, the
ethnic hierarchy in Hawai‘i, which places many Filipinos in lower status positions allowed the stereotypes to ring true for many of the participants, allowing them to make the generalization that Filipinos are lower status laborers.

The belief in these stereotypes and the ethnic hierarchy in Hawai‘i helped to create and maintain a form of the Filipino colonial mentality in the participants in this study. This was evidenced through their privileging of cultural practices that were American or local and the denigration of cultural practices that were considered Filipino. David (2011) and David and Okazaki (2006) argued that the colonial mentality can be exhibited in both overt and covert ways. Overt manifestations of the colonial mentality can take the form of refusing to speak a Filipino language, preferring English as the main language, preferring lighter colored skin, and discriminating against Filipinos who are too Filipino. Covert manifestations of the colonial mentality take the form of feeling a sense of shame and embarrassment about being Filipino. While there have been few studies that examine the prevalence of a colonial mentality in Filipinos in Hawai‘i, this study provides support that Filipinos in Hawai‘i have developed a colonial mentality. This colonial mentality, however, differs from David's (2011) conceptualization of the colonial mentality because the participants in this study did not necessarily privilege things that are European or American over Filipino things, they privileged local customs, values, and beliefs over Filipino customs, values, and beliefs. Therefore, this suggests the social setting of Hawai‘i, perhaps, further colonizes the Filipino sense of self further distancing Filipinos from accepting a Filipino identity.

Although this study attempted to examine the development of an ethnic identity from a constructionist perspective, which suggests that an individual can make an informed decision about whether or not to invoke a particular ethnicity, there is only partial support for
this approach. There is partial support for the constructionist approach because all of the participants attempted to disassociate themselves from their Filipino identity, which suggests that they assessed the costs and benefits of being Filipino and chose not to identity themselves as Filipino. However, there is only partial support for the constructionist approach to ethnicity because not all of the participants were able to fully deny their Filipino identity and claim another ethnicity as their own. Many of these participants struggled to claim something other than Filipino because they had physical features that identified them as Filipino. Therefore, there is also some support for the primordialist approach to ethnicity (Gil-White 1999), as the racial features of the participants categorized them as Filipino and reduced their ability to deny their Filipino ethnicity.

The inability to claim another ethnicity demonstrates the power of ethnic stigmas in Hawai‘i. Those that had "Filipino physical features" often felt like discredited individuals because they could not hide their ethnic background (Goffman 1963). They were automatically assigned a spoiled identity. This process of being assigned a spoiled identity and the inculcation of a colonial mentality led many of the participants to attempt to create a new ethnic category--local Filipino. This new ethnic category asserted that the members of this category were racially Filipino, but culturally they accepted local customs, values, and behaviors. Therefore, by claiming this as their ethnic identity, the participants in this study engaged in social distancing (Labrador 2004) or defensive othering (Schwalbe et al. 2000), which further denigrates those that are "full Filipino." Since a colonial mentality was a contributing factor to the creation of a local Filipino identity, the participants in this study often characterized Filipinos as being uneducated, as they could not speak proper English, rude, obnoxious, and lacking social status, as they were service sector laborers.
Those that did not have distinct Filipino physical features engaged in a different process to separate themselves from those that were "too Filipino." Since their physical features did not "give them away" they were able to be ambivalent about their ethnicity and see what others would accept them as. Therefore, the question of "what do you think I am" became a powerful tool for these individual to negotiate their ethnic identity with others, as they were able to see what others would accept as a believable answer. When these participants were able to do so, they often claimed to be Japanese, rather than Filipino because Japanese are often viewed as successful in Hawai‘i. This stereotype, like the negative stereotype about Filipinos, is also supported by the social structure in Hawai‘i, where Japanese are strongly represented in managerial and professional occupations.

Previous research suggests that although Filipinos tend to reject their ethnic identity, they often have an experience that allows them to reframe their ideas about being Filipino, which leads to the individual being able to positively assert a Filipino identity (David 2001; David and Okazaki 2006; Strobel 1996). While this is true of the participants in this study, the way that these individuals learned to accept their Filipino identity was different from the ways described in the literature. Most scholars report processes similar to Strobel's (1996) argument that exploration of the Filipino culture leads to a positive view of being Filipino. This argument is also congruent with the ethnic identity literature which suggests that in order to develop a positive ethnic identity an individual must explore their ethnicity, which helps the individual to develop a commitment to the ethnicity (Ashmore, Deaux, and McLaughlin-Volpe 2004; Marcia 1980; Phinney 1996, 2000; Phinney and Ong 2007). However, the experiences of this study's participants do not support these claims, as many of the participants in this study began to assert their Filipino ethnic identity without any
exploration of the Filipino ethnicity or culture. Instead, these participants began to accept and claim to be Filipino because they believed that they were breaking the stereotypes about Filipino and/or became role models for younger Filipinos. Often when participants broke the stereotypes about being Filipino they believed that they were Filipino role models and therefore needed to claim a Filipino identity so those that they were a role model for did not go through the same process that they did.

Since the participants in this study did not explore the Filipino ethnicity and culture prior to claiming a Filipino ethnicity they began to assert a Filipino ethnic identity, while they still possessed a strong Filipino colonial mentality. Since the participants were claiming a Filipino identity they needed to develop positive feelings about the identity that they were claiming and therefore attempted to discover positive aspect of being Filipino. Many of these positive aspects, however, were constructed through a colonial mentality perspective, as they began to describe Filipinos as being hard workers, being very hospitable, wanting to serve others, and having an affinity for cleaning. These "positive" reframings of the Filipino culture allowed the participants to believe that Filipino were overrepresented in the low status jobs because they chose those jobs rather than experienced institutionalized barriers that led to those jobs. In a sense, this allowed the participants to blame the victims for their social status. Overall, while this process allowed the participants to develop positive feelings about being Filipino, they provided cultural explanation for the social status of Filipinos in Hawai‘i, which actually helped to reinforce many of the stereotypes that the participants once believed.

While many of the explanations that the participants created were simple justifications of the stereotypes, there is some support for Yosso's (2005) argument about
community cultural wealth and the reconceptualization of a culture from a capital rich perspective to develop pride in a culture. The participants in this study discovered that the Filipino culture was not deficient of capital, as Filipinos have very strong values and attitudes about family ties. The participants found that their families were very strong support networks, as Filipinos provided both emotional and financial support for one another. In fact, it many believed that these familial ties allowed many Filipinos to sacrifice their own happiness to help a member of their family. This was supported by the participants’ observations of their family members who lived on a strict budget or in smaller homes so that they could send money to their families in the Philippines. The participants in the study also found that these familial ties reached far beyond the traditional family unit, as extended family and even friends that were Filipino were often included in these familial aid relationships. This value of the family and closeness of the extended Filipino family allowed the participants in this study to become proud about being Filipino, as it was a positive attribute that they could associate with being Filipino.

Finally, it is important to note, that while these individuals seem to have reached Nadal’s (2004) incorporation stage, in which they have positive feelings about being Filipino and have positive feelings about other ethnic groups, the interviews with these participants show that the ethnic identity development of the locally raised Filipinos is not as clear cut as transitioning through stages until they develop positive feelings about being Filipino. Instead, these individuals, who all claim to currently accept and claim to be Filipino, demonstrate that identity is quite fluid. This is demonstrated through the interviews, as no participant said that they fully rejected the stereotypes, but instead have learned to deal with them and are more apt to refute them than they once were. Therefore, it is important to
remember, that while an individual may develop positive feelings about a stigmatized ethnicity, they may still relapse into a position, where they feel embarrassed about their ethnicity. These individuals, however, are probably more like to return to a state when they have positive feelings about their ethnicity, than an individual who has not reframed and questioned the negative stereotypes that are attached to his or her stigmatized ethnicity.

STUDY LIMITATIONS AND DIRECTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

As with any study, there are several limitations of this study. First, while the study's results provide interesting insights into the issue of Filipino ethnic identity in Hawai‘i they are specific to a very select group of individuals and, therefore, can not be generalized to the general population of Filipinos in Hawai‘i. This study's sample was limited to individuals between the ages of 18 and 26, as Strobel (1996) suggested that this was the age range that many Filipino-Americans develop as sense of pride in their ethnicity, as they are enrolled in college courses that discuss the history and culture of the Philippines. Therefore, this study focused on this age range of individuals. By focusing on this age range and by using my personal contacts as a starting point for generating a sample, the sample has an educational level bias, as all but on participant reported completing some college education or higher. As stated earlier, two of the participants also reported completing a Master's level education. Therefore, this is a very unique sample of Filipinos in Hawai‘i and the results discussed in this dissertation can only be applied to the individuals who shared their stories as a part of this research.

Furthermore, since personal and professional time constraints required the data collection to be completed after only 12 interviews, complete theoretical saturation was not reached and therefore further research needs to be completed to further explore the
themes discussed in this dissertation. It is important to note, however, that trends of theoretical saturation began to develop, as the stories that the participants told followed a similar trend and pattern. Therefore, while the themes and trends need to be further explored, they should not be discounted, as they accurately represent what trends that presented themselves in the transcripts of the 12 interviews conducted.

While not generalizable to the population of Filipinos in Hawai‘i, this study provides some important insights into issues of stereotypes and ethnic identity in the Filipino community in Hawai‘i. This study suggests that the individuals in this study used the stereotypes that exist about Filipinos in Hawai‘i to define themselves. The practice of accepting these stereotypes as truth was further supported by the social structure that they observed, where Filipinos were mostly seen as low wage workers, and a sense of what David (2011) conceptualized as the Filipino colonial mentality. While this study along with other qualitative studies demonstrate that a form of the colonial mentality exists in local Filipinos, a larger quantitative study needs to be conducted to truly assess the extent to which a colonial mentality exists in members of the Filipino community in Hawai‘i. Due to the findings of this study and to fulfill this gap in the literature, I plan to conduct a large quantitative study of Filipinos in Hawai‘i. In order to due this I have contact David (2011) and received permission to use his Filipino Colonial Mentality Scale. Therefore, I plan to conduct a quantitative study of the Filipino community, which collects demographic data, educational data (especially examining if the individual has taken any courses on Filipino culture or history at a university), colonial mentality scores, depression scores, and a measure of social networks. This study would help to examine many of the themes found in the present study,
as it can quantitatively examine the effects of sociodemographic on a sense of the colonial mentality in Filipinos in Hawai‘i.

Upon completing this quantitative component, I believe it will be important to further examine any trends by found in the data by conducting follow up interviews. Therefore, I believe it is important for future studies to incorporate mixed methods to examine the issue of Filipino identity in Hawai‘i. More studies need to incorporate mixed methods, as this approach can provide a more complete examination of Filipino identity in Hawai‘i and can produce results that are generalizable to the broader Filipino population. This approach will also be beneficial as the follow up qualitative interviews can provide support and a deeper understanding of the processes discovered in the quantitative data collected.

I also plan to conduct a second wave of interviews to thoroughly examine the themes discussed in this dissertation. I believe that the second wave of interviews should focus on exploring the role that stereotypes play in the lives of local Filipinos. In this examination, I would like to thoroughly explore what stereotypes have the most effect on local Filipinos, why these individuals believe the stereotypes are true, the emotions that these individuals attach to these stereotypes, and why these individuals struggle to disregard these stereotypes when developing their identity. Furthermore, I believe that these interviews should also focus on the experience of becoming a role model for others. Specifically, I think these interviews should focus on why these individuals believe they are role models, how they negotiate their identity after becoming a role model, and especially how these individuals develop their identity if they are not exploring their ethnic identity.
I believe that the current study, along with these suggestions and plans for future research, will help to fill a gap in the literature about the experience of being Filipino in Hawai‘i. Filling this gap is crucial, as Filipinos have grown to be the second largest ethnic group in Hawai‘i (U.S. Census Bureau) and it is important to examine why an ethnic group that is near being the biggest ethnic group in Hawai‘i continues to be defined by negative stereotypes and is perhaps one of the most oppressed ethnic groups in Hawai‘i. Furthermore, it is important to gain insights into why a Filipino ethnicity often functions as a stigma for local individuals, who attempt to reject their ethnicity. It my hope that by filling this gap in the literature, we can gain a better understanding of Filipino ethnic identity in Hawai‘i, which can help community organizations and members of the community develop ways to create social change and instill pride around a Filipino identity.

Based on this study alone, which needs to be further substantiated with future studies, I believe that there are two important findings that provide some insight into how social change can begin. First, it is important that the Filipino community reach out to Filipino children to help develop a sense of pride in being Filipino. Helping Filipinos develop pride in their ethnic heritage can provide some support for these children and allow them to combat some of the negative stereotypes they encounter in life about Filipinos. Furthermore, the development of his sense of pride in young Filipinos may help them have more confidence and not limit themselves in their dreams and aspirations, as some of the participants in this study did.

Secondly, it is important to help Filipinos at all ages to "decolonize" their mind by providing access to credible information about the Filipino culture and history. It is also important to provide information to these individuals about the indigenous Filipino culture,
as many Filipinos believe that due the long history of colonization of the Philippines, Filipinos do not have a unique culture. By providing this type of information to individuals in the Filipino community, it may be possible to begin discussions about what it really means to be Filipino and break through many of the ideas that Filipinos hold about being Filipino, which simply support and reaffirm a colonial mentality. Perhaps as many scholars have suggested (David 2011; David and Okazaki 2006; Nadal 2004; Strobel 1996) this information can lead individuals to see the Filipino culture in Hawai‘i from a community cultural wealth/asset perspective rather than a deficit perspective, as it is currently seen through (Yosso 2005). Overall, it seems that the Filipino community needs to recognize its oppression and develop a successful identity movement in Hawai‘i, which can potentially bring a very large community, which has been oppressed and silenced, together to demand equality and respect in Hawai‘i.


(https://www.memphis.edu/crow/pdfs/Toward_a_New_Vision_-_Race__Class_and_Gender_.._.pdf)
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APPENDIX A: INFORMED CONSENT FORM

Agreement to Participate in Study
“Creating and Managing an Ethnic Identity: A Study of Filipinos in Hawai‘i”
Daniel B. Eisen, Primary Investigator
(808) 356-9515

The purpose of this research is to explore what it means to be a Filipino-American in the state of Hawai‘i. You are being asked to participate in this study because you have been identified as a Filipino-American between the ages of 18 and 25, who has spent a majority of their childhood (birth to age 18) in the state of Hawai‘i.

Participation in this project will consist of completing a two and a half hour interview. The questions asked in the interview will focus on (a) the complexities of a Filipino ethnic identity in Hawai‘i, (b) the way that Filipino individuals manage and create meanings for a Filipino ethnic identity, (c) the positive and negative consequences of being Filipino in Hawai‘i, and (d) the strengths and weaknesses of the Filipino community in Hawai‘i. No personal identifying information will be collected and/or included in any of the research results. With your consent the interview will be audio recorded. To ensure the confidentiality of your identity, any personal information that allows you to be identified will be deleted from any transcripts that are made from the recording.

The investigator believes there is little or no risk to participating in this research project. As a participant in this study you are not required to answer any questions that make you feel uncomfortable. While you are encouraged to share personal stories that are relevant to the discussion, it is important to remember that you are not obligated to share anything that you do not feel comfortable sharing with the investigator.

Participating in this research may be of no direct benefit to you. It is believed, however, the results from this project will help produce a better understanding of an important population in Hawai‘i--Filipino-Americans. While there is no compensation for participating in this study, your cooperation and active involvement in the study are greatly appreciated.

Research data will be confidential to the extent allowed by law. Agencies with research oversight, such as the UH Committee on Human Studies, have the authority to review research data. All research records will be stored in a locked filing cabinet in the primary investigators’ home. All audio files of interviews will be kept in a password protected file on the researchers’ password protected computer. Participation in this research project is completely voluntary. You are free to withdraw from participation at any time during the duration of the project with no penalty, or loss of benefit to which you would otherwise be entitled.

If you have any questions regarding this research project, please contact the researcher, Daniel B. Eisen, at (808) 356-9515. If you have any questions regarding your rights as a research participant, please contact the UH Committee on Human Studies at (808) 956-5007 or uhirb@Hawai‘i.edu.
Participant:
I have read and understand the above information, and agree to participate in this research project.

____________________________
Name (printed)

____________________________  _________________________
Signature                    Date

Please initial next to the following statement to indicate your consent to audio record the interview. If you do not wish to consent to this, do not initial next to the statement.

_____ I consent to allow the researcher to use equipment that will produce an audio recording of the interview.

*Please return this page to the research and keep the first page for your reference.*
APPENDIX B: INITIAL SCREENING SURVEY

Please read each question carefully and answer each question to the best of your ability. You are not required to answer every question. If you do not feel comfortable answering a question, you may skip the question and proceed to the next question.

1. Gender: ☐ Male    ☐ Female

2. Age:
☐ 18  ☐ 19  ☐ 20  ☐ 21  ☐ 22  ☐ 23  ☐ 24  ☐ 25  ☐ Other: ___

3. Highest Level of Education Completed:
   ☐ Some High School    ☐ High School Diploma    ☐ Some College
   ☐ Associate’s Degree   ☐ Bachelor’s Degree    ☐ Master’s Degree    ☐ Doctorate
   ☐ Vocational Training  ☐ Other: ______________________

4. Mother’s Highest Level of Education Completed:
   ☐ Some High School    ☐ High School Diploma    ☐ Some College
   ☐ Associate’s Degree   ☐ Bachelor’s Degree    ☐ Master’s Degree    ☐ Doctorate
   ☐ Vocational Training  ☐ Other: ______________________

5. Father’s Highest Level of Education Completed:
   ☐ Some High School    ☐ High School Diploma    ☐ Some College
   ☐ Associate’s Degree   ☐ Bachelor’s Degree    ☐ Master’s Degree    ☐ Doctorate
   ☐ Vocational Training  ☐ Other: ______________________

6. Mother’s Occupation: ______________________

7. Father’s Occupation: ______________________

8. Are you Filipino? ☐ Yes  ☐ No
9. What do you claim your ethnicity to be?  
________________________________________

10. Which ethnicity is the most important to your identity (list only 1)?  
_________________

11. In the past, when asked about your ethnicity, have you ever claimed to be something other than Filipino?  
☐ Yes (go to question 6a)  
☐ No (go to question 6c)

11a. If yes, what have you claimed to be?  
________________________________________

11b. If yes, why did you claim to be something other than Filipino?

11c. If no, why haven’t you claimed to be something other than Filipino?

12. What is your mother’s ethnicity?  
________________________________________

13. Where was your mother born?  
________________________________________

13a. If your mother was born outside the United States, in what year did she immigrate to the United States?  ___________

13b. If your mother was born outside the United States, has she become a U.S. Citizen?  
☐ Yes  ☐ No
14. What is your father’s ethnicity?
________________________________________________________

15. Where was your father born?
________________________________________________________

15a. If your father was born outside the United States, in what year did he immigrate to the United States? __________

15b. If your father was born outside the United States, has he become a U.S. citizen?

☐ Yes  ☐ No

16. Where you born?
________________________________________________________

17. Where did you live for the majority of you early childhood years (birth to 5 years old)?

☐ Hawai‘i  ☐ Other U.S. State: _________  ☐ Other Country: ________________

18. Where did you complete the majority of your elementary school education?

☐ Hawai‘i  ☐ Other U.S. State: _________  ☐ Other Country: ________________

19. Where did you complete the majority of your intermediate/middle school education?

☐ Hawai‘i  ☐ Other U.S. State: _________  ☐ Other Country: ________________

20. Where did you complete the majority of your high school education?

☐ Hawai‘i  ☐ Other U.S. State: ________________  ☐ Other Country: __________
Use the numbers below to indicate how much you agree or disagree with each statement.

(1) Strongly Disagree  (2) Disagree  (3) Neither Agree or Disagree  (4) Agree  (5) Strongly Agree

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I have spent time trying to find out more about my ethnic group, such as its history, traditions, and customs.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I have a strong sense of belonging to my ethnic group.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I understand pretty well what my ethnic group membership means to me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I have often talked to other people to learn more about my ethnic group.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I have often done things that will help me understand my ethnic background better</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I feel a strong attachment towards my own ethnic group.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C: INITIAL INTERVIEW GUIDE

Interview Guide for Initial Interview

1. What is your ethnicity?

2. Has there ever been a time when you would have answered that question differently?

3. How have you answered that question in the past? (Ask participant to detail the different answers that (s)he has given throughout his or her life)

4. Why did you choose to claim (answer from above) as your ethnicity?

5. When you were claiming to be something other than Filipino with everyone or just certain people in your life?

6. What allowed you to claim something other than Filipino?

7. What restricted you from claiming to be something other than Filipino?

8. Why do you currently choose to identify as Filipino?

9. What made it easier for you to feel comfortable about claiming Filipino as your ethnicity?

10. What made it difficult for you to feel comfortable about claiming Filipino as your ethnicity?

11. Did you have to change your behavior when you claimed to be something other than Filipino? How?

12. How did your behavior change as you became comfortable claiming to be Filipino?

13. What were your thoughts about/feeling towards the Filipino community in Hawai‘i when you were claiming to be something other than Filipino?

14. What were your thoughts about/feelings towards the Filipino community in Hawai‘i when you became comfortable claiming to be Filipino?

15. What are the positive consequences of being Filipino in Hawai‘i?

16. What are the strengths of the Filipino community in Hawai‘i?
17. What are the negative consequences of being Filipino in Hawai‘i?

18. What are the weaknesses of the Filipino community in Hawai‘i?

19. Has being Filipino had a positive or negative effect on your life in Hawai‘i?
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