

**INTEGRATION OF  
IMMIGRANTS  
PROGRAMME**



**POLYCULTURAL CAPITAL AND THE  
PASIFIKA SECOND GENERATION:  
NEGOTIATING IDENTITIES**

**Karlo Mila-Schaaf**

**Working Paper, Number 3**

**Integration of Immigrants Programme**

**Massey University**

**Albany**

**November 2011**



Copyright. © 2011 Integration of Immigrants Programme

- No part of the report may be reproduced in any form without written permission.

- Published by:

Integration of Immigrants Programme  
College of Humanities and Social Sciences  
Massey University  
Private Bag 102 904  
North Shore City  
New Zealand

ISBN: 978-0-9582971-7-2

ISSN: 1174-7625 (Print)

ISSN: 1174-7633 (Online)

- See our website at: <http://integrationofimmigrants.massey.ac.nz>

Working Papers are the work of staff members as well as visitors to the Programme's events. The analyses and opinions presented in the papers do not reflect those of the Programme but are those of the author alone.

# CONTENTS

Foreword .....	3
Introduction.....	5
Pasifika: New Zealand-born or Second Generation?.....	6
Methodology.....	9
Negotiating Identities: Second Generation Identity Stories .....	11
The Relational Context .....	12
Identity Stories.....	13
The Contested Terrain of Fa'aSamoa.....	16
Negotiating Voice without Language.....	25
Symbolic Struggle .....	29
Negotiating Belonging and Recognition from Beyond the Limits.....	35
Conclusion .....	42
References .....	45



## FOREWORD

We are pleased to publish part of Karlo Mila-Schaaf's PhD thesis as a working paper in the Integration of Immigrants publication series. It is only a small part of Karlo's thesis (readers might want to look at a copy; see Mila-Schaaf, 2010). But it deals with the narratives of identity of second generation Pasifika. This is of growing interest as these descent populations redefine identity for ethnic and immigrant communities. As the communities from various parts of the Pacific, now resident in New Zealand, changed from being "immigrant" communities – those dominated by members who were born elsewhere and whose homeland values and practices dominated in New Zealand – to communities that, after 1990, were populated (if not dominated) by the New Zealand-born. As the first significant (in size and increasingly influence) non-European migration to New Zealand, the experience of Pasifika communities provides an indication as to what might happen to other, non-European immigrant and descent communities.

Karlo provides both a sophisticated conceptual framework and some rich stories about identity for these second-generation representatives of Pacific communities. Other chapters in the thesis discuss identity in relation to significant "others", including Palangi<sup>1</sup>, Maori and to the initial generation of immigrants from Pacific states. She adopts a strengths-based approach in contrast to many policy and research narratives which – for a variety of reasons – focus on the negative outcomes and dynamics of Pasifika. And she provides new insights and theoretical understandings of this transition (or break-through) generation.

The Integration of Immigrants Programme is pleased to publish this report. While Pasifika are not a major focus for the IIP, these communities are an important part of New Zealand's immigrant history and a critical component in the current policy/political/demographic mix. Moreover, their experiences of settlement and the re-negotiation of identity are 2-3 decades ahead of the more recent immigrants from Asia and elsewhere. This report is an important contribution to the research literature on settlement outcomes and the transition from immigrant to resident, with all the challenges both entail.

Paul Spoonley  
Programme Leader  
Integration of Immigrants Programme

---

<sup>1</sup> In this working paper Palangi is spelt according to Tongan usage and therefore appears with an "n". However, where a Samoan is being quoted it may appear in the Samoan form ie without the "n".



## INTRODUCTION

As part of my PhD (Mila-Schaaf, 2010) the first research question I asked was “How are second generation Pacific peoples operating culturally?” This was investigator-initiated. The research project was located within the discipline of sociology, supervised by Paul Spoonley and Cluny Macpherson at Massey University, with help from Suzanne Phibbs. In many ways, the second question – “Under what sort of conditions are the second generation operating culturally and constructing identities?” – reflected a sociological approach to the subject at hand.

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

This project ultimately moved across and drew from many disciplines (sociology, social anthropology, epidemiology, post-colonial studies, English literature, cross-cultural psychology, cultural studies, public health,) and it shifted between quantitative and qualitative modes of inquiry. To have difference components of the research “rooted in distinct paradigms... mixed throughout a single research project” is a classic challenge of mixed methods research (Tashakkori and Teddlie, 2003, p. 11).

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

## PASIFIKA: NEW ZEALAND-BORN OR SECOND GENERATION?

It is important to acknowledge the fact that the Pasifika population in New Zealand is not a singular, homogenous entity but contains much diversity (see Macpherson, 1996; Anae et al., 2001; Health Research Council of New Zealand, 2004). As Anae et al., (2001, p. 7) argue:

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

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

The term 'second generation' is deployed in the international literature to refer to the children of migrants<sup>2</sup> (Portes and Rumbaut, 2001; Waldinger et al., 2007). However, this term is rarely used in the context of Aotearoa and the designation New Zealand-born (hereafter, NZ-born) is commonly used. Such a term, Macpherson (2001, p. 75) argues, recognises:

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

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

---

<sup>2</sup> This term tends to be inclusive of native-born children of foreign migrants, as well as foreign-born children of migrants who were very young (e.g., pre-adolescent) at time of migration (Portes and Rumbaut 2001, p.23).

In addition, the participants interviewed were second generation, not third or fourth. Finally, the term “second generation” is used widely in the international literature. The shift of emphasis from the NZ-born Pasifika as an ethnic minority within Aotearoa, to a second-gen Pasifika population (and cultural imaginary) explicitly open up a realm of international second generation peers. And it potentially heightens the sense that this is a diasporic population connected to the experiences of other “second generation” Pacific populations and migrant populations located elsewhere in the world.

By focusing on this population as a generational group, it enabled an exploration of the relationship between the second generation and the first (migrating) generation, as well as significant “others” whom they defined themselves in relation to: people living in Pacific homelands, the indigenous Maori of New Zealand and Pakeha New Zealanders. Participants identified with many others across many relational spaces, negotiating both sameness and difference. Identifications were burdened with the pressures of being cross-culturally coherent and legible, and were subject to changing politics of recognition.

It is argued that the more cross-cultural knowledge and capital the second generation acquired, the stronger and more powerful their resource base and negotiating position, the less likely they would be forced to make default choices (Swinburn et al., 2003) and the more likely they would deploy identity strategies (Butcher, 2004) which suited their purposes.

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

It is argued that capital is variously configured and that the ways in which it is symbolically recognised and validated are culturally determined. What is rewarded and privileged in one space, is rejected as inferior or inauthentic in another. These spaces (and second-generation identities within them) were often already over-narrated, over-inscribed with enduring social

narratives about Pasifika peoples and “who they were supposed to be”. The identity stories shared by participants referenced symbolic struggle: trying to change the story, challenge stereotypes and exceed the limits of ethnic roles and identities they’d been ascribed. They sought to be symbolically recognised even if their cultural representations were beyond the limits of what was currently constituted and authenticated as truly Pasifika

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

Manulua<sup>3</sup> is the term deployed to describe the aesthetic of constantly (re)negotiated resolutions across relational spaces. This is a pattern signalling a process of re-arranging cultural connections and difference across spaces. It is argued that cultural complexity was never solved or completely resolved but constantly negotiated in temporal, time- context- and purpose-specific ways. Manulua or two birds is a stylised motif or kupesi (pattern) which can be traced to the Lapita culture (Stevenson, 2008) and is sometimes referred to as a vane swastika. Manulua represents endless patterns and arrangements of connection and difference across multiple spaces. It represents the ambivalent tension between sameness and difference, connection and distance, union and separation, occurring across many spaces and many different modalities of power and the many different ways this is resolved. In the full thesis, the relationships between the second generation and multiple significant others are explored. This report focuses exclusively on the relationship between first generation migrants and second generation and the impact this relational dynamic has on identity.

---

<sup>3</sup> Manulua is a Polynesian design traced back to the Lapita people. The design is shown on the cover of this paper.

## METHODOLOGY

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

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

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

Therefore, in a diasporic context in Aotearoa, it is argued that Pasifika second generation identity stories, as “stories of our lives”, take on a multidimensional, polyglot quality of heteroglossia (Allen, 2000) as they are performed for multiple audiences. The local, cross-cultural, national and transnational relational spaces possible via migration, diaspora and relocation, makes the process of identification and recognition a much more complex experience of symbolic interactions. The concept of *va* – the space of relating – has been useful for thinking about how these relationships are not only characterised by absorption or resistance to the other. It is described by Refiti (2010, p. 1) in the following way:

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

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

Individual narrative interviews with fourteen second-gen professionals were used for the qualitative component of the thesis.

I interviewed a sample of successful, second-generation Pasifika professionals about their identities and cultural orientations. The participants were selected using the networks of the Ministry of Pacific Island Affairs and my own community networks. Of the fourteen New Zealand-born Pacific participants, eight were female and six were male. The majority were of Samoan descent but there were also participants from Tonga, the Cook Islands, and Niue. Some participants carried more than one Pacific ethnicity, for example, Samoan and Tongan. Half of the sample had one non-Pacific parent. All were in the workforce and at a stage of early- to mid-career. They worked in the public and private sectors and the sample included lawyers, accountants, social workers, journalists, academics, lecturers and other professionals. The vast majority were university educated.

Information about the individual participants is deliberately withheld so as to protect confidentiality. It is a small community and these people are potentially identifiable. Pseudonyms are used. The female participants are: Simone, Leilani, Isabella, Lola, Margaret, Tiare, Sina and Salote. The male participants are: Alipate, Tama, Pita, Bill, Dylan and Leo.

These individual interviews were conducted in a manner consistent with a *talanoa* approach: “A *talanoa* approach is a traditional Pacific reciprocating interaction, which is driven by common interest, regard for respectfulness and are conducted mainly face to face” (Morrison and Vaioleti, 2008, p. 11). One of the first questions was: “Can you tell me a little bit about your story?” It has been argued that research which enables and allows narratives to be spoken is particularly effective with Pasifika peoples (Williams et al., 2003). The process of storytelling is believed to be appropriate because of a long history of storytelling within an aural and oral culture (Williams et al., 2003). Eastmond (2007, p. 261) argues that, “Such stories, properly situated, can rather bring out more clearly the ways in which experience and agency are socially and culturally mediated phenomena”. I have framed the stories relayed to me in the interviews as “identity stories” (Plummer, 1995).

# NEGOTIATING IDENTITIES: SECOND GENERATION IDENTITY STORIES

## **Where you from?**

Where you from?  
the Tongan lady asks, her hair  
austere, eyebrows high  
like question-marks

“Kolofo’ou” I reply,  
“My mother is a Palangi.”  
(She can tell where I come from  
vowels tight  
like they could fit  
square  
on any sans-serif font.)

“Are you a Tongan?”  
she asks.

I am not sure  
if this is a question.

(Mila, 2008, p. 12)

This report focuses on identity stories told by the second-gen Pasifika participants about being “NZ-born” and constructing identities in relation to Island-born others within Aotearoa. This was a relational dynamic characterised by intergenerational politics and symbolic struggle over how Pasifika culture is imagined and reproduced in an Aotearoa context. This struggle often occurred at an ethnic-specific level, where representations of fa’aSamoa or fakatonga were contested.

A key theme running through these stories are claims to authenticity and the tension between the construction of Pasifika cultures as logically consistent, highly integrated and resistant to change. The second-gen participants had to negotiate identities in relation to what was authenticated as traditional and were often misrecognised for not performing these identities. This report begins with a brief discussion of the relational context between diasporic Pasifika generations.

## *THE RELATIONAL CONTEXT*

Analyses of Pacific migration shows some consistency in the findings that most Pasifika peoples migrated with the ultimate goal of becoming better positioned within the locus of their own cultural frameworks (see Evans 2001, Small 1997). Evans (2001, p. 15) points to earlier research by Lockwood arguing that the “real incentive” of Samoan migration “is effective participation in fa’aSamoa or the Samoan way of life”. Small (1997, p. 186) explains this somewhat contradictory position:

From the vantage point of a village in Tonga, Tongans left Tonga to be better Tongans – to develop themselves and their families and to improve their lot and status among other Tongans.

The politics of cultural continuity and what is considered acceptable ways to change are played out in the identity stories reproduced here. Macpherson and Macpherson (1999, p. 285) write of Samoan migration:

It is difficult to imagine a set of circumstances more likely to deal a fatal blow to a system of extended kinship based on common ownership of resources and which had evolved in a small, rural village-based society.

Yet, Macpherson and Macpherson (1999) are able to cite several studies which show that extended kinship remained a central feature of migrant community organisation. They argue persuasively that the circumstances of chain migration, the resulting concentration in the same industries and neighbourhoods, widespread involvement in church congregations and the enduring extended kinship structure, facilitated “critical masses” of migrants forming enclaves in which they reproduced social organisation patterns from the homelands.

Appadurai (1991, p.191) writes, “As groups migrate, regroup in new locations, reconstruct their histories, and reconfigure their ethnic ‘projects’, the ethno in ethnography takes on a slippery, non-localised quality”. It is argued that in Aotearoa, Pasifika social spaces are renegotiated and re-territorialised as spaces where “worlds of meaning somehow hang together” (Sewell, 2005, p. 93). This emphasises a focus not only on the “people, goods, objects, messages” but also on the “flows of ideas and practices” (Werbner, 2004, p. 896).

The identity stories told in this report talk of the symbolic struggle over the way these “worlds of meaning” do “hang together” in Aotearoa and the politics of cultural reproduction. The configurations of capital and “the form in which the different forms of capital are perceived and recognized as legitimate” appear to be strongly culturally contextual (Bourdieu, 1985, p.724). For example, describing the Samoan diaspora in Australia, Va’a (2001, p. 253) writes that, “Ironically, it seems that the goal of the average Samoan migrant is not wealth in itself but esteem”. This observation is consistent with traditional Pasifika approaches to capital whereby wealth can add to mana or esteem, but mana is more valuable than wealth (see Evans, 2001).

The participants’ lack of Pasifika cultural capital, the regulation of authenticated ways of performing Pasifika identities and the penalties for operating outside these limits emerge as commonly shared second-generation stories. These are stories about the rhetoric of difference, trying to have a voice without access to language, rehearsing division and negotiating belonging and acceptance.

## *IDENTITY STORIES*

### *Story: Simone and “I Can’t Change the Fact that I was Born Here”*

I can’t change the fact that I was born here in New Zealand. I suppose I fall into that *typical stereotype* or label that we’re not fluent and we don’t have any access to our P.I.<sup>4</sup> language, even though I was fluent when I was a child and I can understand it, I just can’t confidently speak Samoan. I have no fluency in Tongan language whatsoever. I’d be totally lost if I had to go to Tonga and try and get around the Islands. No problem reading Samoan and speaking it if I had to read it and I could conduct a conversation but I would not be confident to get up there and speak in a formal context without knowing I’d be ridiculed or mocked.

Being NZ-born I suppose is a journey of something that is always evolving, who I am... Because people ask you who you are and the context in which you go is always changing. People, I think, often use that label NZ-born and Island-born to create or divide. Or perhaps keep that divide between us going.

---

<sup>4</sup> P.I. stands for Pacific Islander and is often used colloquially to describe “Pacific Islanders”. It is used as a term of preference by Fairbairn-Dunlop and Makisi (2003).

And you know we're just as bad as Island-born: you know they see us as being Palagi and we see them as being "fresh" or from "the bush".

I really think it really depends on your relationship and what type of relationship you have with your extended family too, back in the islands and how you perceive each other. I remember when my grandmother was still alive and some of my cousins go, "oh you're fia Palagi<sup>5</sup>, you're from this, and you're from that." And I remember my grandmother goes, "It doesn't matter what you say about her being fia Palagi. You can't change the colour of her skin. And you can't change the fact that her heart is Samoan and her ways and her mannerisms."

So you might not have access to the language but the way that you conduct yourself and your role in how you participate in your immediate and extended family has a lot to do with who you are in terms of your identity and whether you *feel NZ-born*.

In this identity story, Simone identifies the way in which she is both recognised, as well excluded, as a NZ-born Samoan. She comes up against a form of social essentialism about what it means to be Pasifika with which she does not comply. In this story, she is accused of being fia palagi and deemed not to have the cultural capital or competence to claim or be recognised as Samoan. In this passage, Salote also talks about her Grandmother's defence of her as Samoan, in terms of her skin-colour, heart and mannerisms – which both make reference to an embodied Samoan-ness.

Yet, at the same time, there is a questioning of biological essentialism when second generation people are considered to not really be Pasifika, if they do not have the right cultural competencies and skills. Social constructions of identity that are symbolically privileged and socially essentialist sit alongside ideas (sometimes awkwardly) about skin and heart and mannerisms. This sentiment, of the importance of the heart, was shared by other participants. A number of people referred to a willing heart trumping inability to speak the language and lack of other skills sets and important forms of Pasifika cultural capital. As Sina said:

---

<sup>5</sup> Fia Palagi – wanting to be like a white person (disparaging term) (Samoan)

I initially did feel intimidated in Pacific forums not being able to speak or understand Samoan but a number of Samoan women elders, three of them, have all said to me at different times ‘if anybody says to you that you are not Samoan, tell them to come and see me’ because its not about the language, although they truly, I’m sure they do believe that you need to speak it. But it’s not about the language, it’s the *heart*.

Not having the necessary cultural capital to be recognised as “real” Samoans or Pasifika people, “feeling NZ-born” and all the “stereotypes” this engendered, and not speaking the language were recurring themes of second-gen narratives. Yet the participants I spoke to generally felt supported, accepted and defended by their own extended families. As Alipate said:

Once you relate to them genealogically, then they will really take ownership of you.

But many felt less secure moving outside of the family arena. The politics of recognition were much more fraught. Outside of the family realm, many had to negotiate their position and their ability to belong. Wacquant (2008, p. 265) writes that “recognition” represents a “thirst for dignity which society alone can quench”. This recognition and acceptance was not always easy to attain. As Simone explained:

I feel very much accepted by New Zealand-born, my generation, not so much perhaps from those that are first language speakers - unless they know me and they know my parents. Then I don’t have a problem. But if it’s in a context outside what I call my *safety zone* then it’s very different. They probably wouldn’t care two hoots who I am, and would probably just look down at me.

This sense of safety zone was also alluded to by Leilani:

Having a Palagi partner means that now I’m very much involved in a lot more Palagi things than I would have been if I had a Pacific partner. And you know I do feel comfortable in that. Whereas if I had a Pacific partner and had to go to Samoa a lot more often, or Tonga, I’d have totally no idea. All I know is just stay invisible or keep your head down, you know, you go back to the very raw Pacific concepts which are not based on anything but, (sorry, not based on

anything specific that I can name) but I know: keep your head down, stay invisible, don't step out of your circle of security.

The need to “keep your head down, stay invisible and don't step out of your circle of security” shows the way that the spaces outside familial safety zones were sometimes dangerous and highly contested grounds of representation and social meaning.

### *THE CONTESTED TERRAIN OF FA'ASAMOA*

Fa'aSamoa is one powerful ethnic specific transnational imaginary. In the following two stories, participants talk about their encounters and experiences with fa'aSamoa in an Aotearoa context.

#### *Story: Simone and the Cups of Tea*

Having been raised in white provincial New Zealand, the only time I got to be Samoan was in the church context. I suppose the lack of access to language and culture and one of the ways that my parents thought that they could bridge the gap was actually joining the Samoan community church. So this was sort of our link to normality and what we had known back in Auckland and in the Islands. And it was one of the few opportunities where they got to practise Samoan culture and speak Samoan language and actually practise the cultural rituals of fa'aSamoa as we know it today.

In a sense, when we weren't there, we were very much Pacific Island people living in a sort of Western Society, really Palagi dominated. For the few days that we were part of the community we were Samoan in a sense: sort of code switching or wearing different hats in different contexts...

I'd say that my life at the time as a teenager and an adolescent wasn't typical of a Pacific Islander at the time. I mean I swam for a start, not very many Pacific Island people swim, that exposure of the body and always being in the water. I did speech and drama, so you know quoting Shakespeare and growing up with poetry is probably not seen as the norm or something that other Samoan girls would be doing at the time. And the number of sports

that I played, and I also found in our Samoan church community people would look down at us in the sense that, because Mum and Dad allowed us to go home and get our homework done and ensured that anything to do with school they allowed us to participate in.

Well my other cousins and peers would be at the church hall meeting those cultural obligations. They'd be there to make cups of tea, be there all night and support the housie and what ever it is the Pacific church was doing at the time. We weren't quite seen as pulling or doing our bit and in a sense were questioning our authenticity as being Samoans or NZ Samoans. And the fact that we weren't fluent in the Samoan language, so those issues of, "Oh, well you might be successful at school and university, but you're still not Samoan because you're not fluent in the Samoan language, so *you really can't contribute* to the community in terms of church and fa'aSamoa".

Simone describes service (tautua) in a gerontocracy being a duty, and not an option. It also demonstrates a form of deference to age and seniority. She alludes to the possibility that her parents' decisions may have resulted in penalties for them in this Samoan church community. Almost all participants reported attending church when they were growing up. Many described the churches they attended in their youth as places where their ethnic, cultural and religious identities were developed and affirmed. Simone talks about her church community and the way it provided a link to "our normality". Pasifika churches have been described as the 'new villages' in a diasporic context (see Va'a, 2001). For example, Fairbairn-Dunlop (2003, p. 26) identifies the Pacific Islands Presbyterian Church (PIPC) with its emphasis on "Pacific solidarity" and "other churches became the home, community, source of identity and solace for many PI families". Similarly, Lee (2003, p. 43) argues that the churches, as well as extended family networks "have helped Tongans to cope with migration".

At the same time, the church was a source of pressure to comply with the norms and sanctioned ideals represented and recognised as fa'aSamoa. Macpherson and Macpherson (2001) write at length about how churches are contested sites of intergenerational struggle. Macpherson (2001) points out different denominations replicate Pasifika homeland governance structure,

theological preferences, gender divisions, Samoan language use and ways of worshipping in varying degrees<sup>6</sup>.

Tiatia's (1998) research identifies a powerlessness that many young people feel within a church context which reproduces gerontocratic and traditional Pasifika hierarchies. She writes:

The youth voice has been suppressed to such an extent that Island born church members subjugate, ignore and belittle the significance of the ideas and values the New Zealand-born wish to implement in order to cater to their own needs. (Tiatia, 1998, p. 9)

Pasifika churches are contested spaces where cultural continuity and change and the politics of cultural reproduction are sometimes explicitly struggled over and stressfully renegotiated. Identity politics are keenly felt in these spaces.

Simone identifies that church was a place where you could “actually practise the cultural rituals of fa’aSamoa as we know it today”. The next story also reflects on fa’aSamoa and the way it is imagined and continues to be practised in Aotearoa.

The following story is told by Tama whose family took active measures to keep external influences away from their home. He describes his upbringing, and the way his family life was revolving around church activities and extended family networks.

*Story: Tama Does the Dishes until Midnight*

I'm one of seven children, born and raised in Mangere in a very strong, staunch Church community. First language at home was Samoan. I distinctly remember not being able to speak a lick of English by the time I hit school.

What was really important in our family was fa’aSamoa... My parents wanted what the Western (what the Palangis) were saying was good about New Zealand. But they also wanted to retain their Samoan-ness. When I look back as to what kept us together, what was keeping us together in our

---

<sup>6</sup> For example, the Samoan Congregational Christian Church or Ekalesia Fa’apotopotoga Kerisiano o Samoa (EFKS) “conducted all of its activities in the Samoan language and according to Samoan theological organisational and theological models” (Macpherson and Macpherson, 2001, p. 30)

neighbourhood in Mangere - Mangere wasn't easy I wouldn't think - so fa'aSamoa in the New Zealand context was really, really important.

To be Palangi means that you really *sold your soul*, you would forget your Samoan-ness, and I think for my parents it was always a threat.

This insular pro-Samoan approach was rejected by Tama who admitted he was, "Probably least receptive to it. I chose not to go to Sunday school which was sacrilege at a young age". Yet he also acknowledges:

Looking back now I realise why my parents did that. They sort of shoved your identity down your throat whether you wanted it or not. You know, it was there... I am really glad about what they did because it gave me one a sense of identity. Not only the spiritual kind but also that "Samoan-ness" - I think that Church was a vehicle that really hammered it home with us.

Tama's narrative shows how integral the church community was as a source of cultural and symbolic resources. Church and family were seen as tightly intertwined, and each to be integral and mutually sustaining sources of Samoan identity. Tama explains that while this provided good grounding for identity, at the same time, he experienced difficulties as he moved into dominant social spaces, such as school. He started primary school without any English comprehension. Later, as a high school student, he was often frustrated as expectations from home and school seemed contradictory and values and ideas from the different cultural spheres would collide. The following narrative illustrates this.

Much to my family's surprise I got a diligence award. I think I got an academic award year ten, 3<sup>rd</sup> form. I think I freaked the shit out of my parents. They thought, 'Tama's not going to amount to much'.

They just thought I was this... you know, and I didn't think I was that bright actually. Like many good Samoan families they beat that sort of stuff out of you. They say how silly and stupid you are. And I think that's part of that reverse psychology too. Where they think that by being so hard on you it will drive you.

I always remember when I was in year thirteen and I became Head Boy. The Principal called me into his office asking, "Tama you probably want to call your parents"... I called from the office and told my father and his response to me was:

"What bus are you coming home on?"

So they never ever acknowledged any success. I found that really difficult. But I think I realised, years later, that that was just their way of not being able to humble you, keep you - you know - keep..... And I think silently that really drove me - that really, really drove me - that sort of ignoring of, um, that just ignoring of any acknowledgement of any - anything else - really, really, silently, really pushed me...

I remember vividly coming home and saying to my parents, "Oh can you come to prize giving?"

Because my parents had told me all the way since school that for them the pinnacle of, the reason why they came to NZ, was to see one of their kids get a prize at prize giving.

Well, I distinctly remember on a Thursday afternoon giving my mother this letter and her just bawling her eyes out on the side of the road. And then her sort of wiping her tears away, and sort of not saying much to me. But I knew then that they were quite proud. I think that all through my secondary school years, from year 10 to 13 that really drove me.

They didn't say well done, son. Or give me a pat on the back. I love you or anything... But I think from then, I think, they in their very silent way really, really supported me.

Tama demonstrates an ability to translate and interpret the meaning behind his parents' behaviour. The indirect<sup>7</sup> communication style adopted by his parents is understood by Tama, who had a sense that his parents were quietly proud. He also recognised that they had a desire

---

<sup>7</sup> A preference for "indirect verbal interaction" has been noted among collectively oriented cultures, in contrast to the preference among individualistic cultures for "straight talk" (Ting-Toomey, 1988).

to humble him. Humility was described as a core Pasifika value by many participants. It is expected of young people who do not traditionally have high status. Tama is also aware that in some aspects of his life in New Zealand, and more specifically at school, his parents were powerless to humble him which perplexes them. This capacity to interpret makes Tama very skilled in dealing with cross-cultural or intercultural dynamics. It hard to know whether this is retrospective positioning, or an inter-textual ability (to interpret according to more than one cultural text and to make sense of, or connect across the relational space in-between these different texts) that he acquired at a young age.

Tama is aware of the disjuncture between his status at school as a school leader and his status at home as a youthful male and younger son. There are two different hierarchies he must contend with: the school's hierarchy which is child- or youth-centred and merit-based, and the one he experiences at home, where his age is associated with relatively low status, requiring humility, service and respect. He learns to play different roles and draw from quite different cultural texts about how to behave in different situations. The disjuncture between power configurations, and the meritocracy at school and the gerontocracy at home, is frustrating for him.

You know here I am at school, I'm supposedly this leader and yet I go home and I'm a younger son, and told to do the dishes the day before my bursary English exam. All my other Palagi mates are studying, and I was only one of two guys in my stream of bursary! And here I am doing dishes at church till one in the morning!

I mean I think I've arrived at 17, as being this young school leader. And I was probably the first Pacific School Captain the school had ever had. Yet, hey, my other Palagi mate, and he was my Deputy Captain, you know had BBQ's galore and his parents were proud.

And here I was thinking, we go home and have a rosary. That was the extent of our celebration. Yeah, so I wasn't depressed but I think I was *'Really, gees what is this?'*

This frustration is heightened by his awareness that his parents may be rich in Samoan cultural capital but they lack Palagi cultural capital or understanding of how to support him academically at school. He recognises that other Palagi parents appear to be more

institutionally savvy and supportive. His Palagi mates seem to have a seamless cultural capital transfer where their home environments mirror the values and ideas of school.

Tama talks about struggling with the way his parents' actions feel unjust or unfair, or even unwise, using a Palagi yardstick. Tama still shakes his head about being forced to do church dishes the night before an exam. Yet, at the same time, he has enough understanding of his parents' approach to be able to feel motivated and supported by them. Tama concludes that: "They pushed me in an indirect way and some would say, quite mean, in many ways. But looking back now I know what they were trying to do, they hardened me up in many ways". At the same time, however, Tama identifies the huge pressure that he and many of his peers faced:

Because I think when our parents came, I think that was their way of trying to *keep it real* you know. Which means no Palagi friends, no Maori friends; don't speak any English. Because you would lose your Samoan-ness!

So, we want you to have the good stuff - but you have to *keep it real*. How you did that? I don't know!

I think that's why a lot of my mates went off the rails really.

Tama sees that his own parents set very narrow parameters around what kind of behaviour, conduct and orientation was considered Samoan and therefore acceptable. In order to be Samoan in his parents' eyes, maintaining a particular formula of Samoan-ness was necessary. They required rigid replication of the doxa Samoan identity and behaviour believed to be most authentic. This meant discounting many of the influences encountered on a daily basis in New Zealand and devaluing their diasporic lived experiences. It involved being extremely selective about what could be adopted from New Zealand society, privileging things that were discursively constituted as Samoan - and rejecting the rest.

However, Tama's exposure to school and the values and norms he became familiar with in New Zealand society, made fulfilling his parents' expectations difficult. Tama suggests that having to "keep it real" within these rigid doxa ideals of Samoan-ness and fa'aSamoa in a deterritorialised and diasporic context was almost impossible. The disjuncture between this unrealistic, often nostalgic, and narrow discursive constitution of Samoan-ness in relation to actual Aotearoa-based diasporic realities, he believes, was why many of his mates "went off the rails".

This highlights the way that fixed or forced identities are associated with inclusion / exclusion criteria. It also highlights the ways that representations privileged as authentic and truly fa'aSamoa were used to monitor and regulate identity performances, either granting them symbolic recognition and validation or refusing to recognise them. Tama himself is convinced:

Fa'aSamoa takes on a different shape in this context of Aotearoa.

This is echoed in the literature. Va'a (2001, p. 3) writes about the impact of deterritorialisation upon fa'aSamoa, writing:

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

Suaali'i (2006, p. 273) writes:

Monolithic claims of a spirit of faa Samoa, about what the Faa Samoa is and about what being Samoan means, are problematic to the project of opening up the continent and contested terrain of the faa Samoa.

Both Tama and Simone embraced and transcended the values and philosophies of fa'aSamoa. Both expressed emotional affinities as well as concerns about the rigid limits set by this set of discourses.

Fa'aSamoa was seen to be the source of rich cultural resources. Pasifika churches provided cherished opportunities for Pasifika solidarity and community. But both churches and fa'aSamoa were also sites of struggle. Failing to meet the doxa ideals and authenticated norms resulted in penalties and exclusion. Hall (1996, p. 5) argues that:

Identities can function as points of identification and attachment only *because* of their capacity to exclude, to leave out, to render 'outside', abjected. Every identity has its 'margin', an excess, something more.

Tama and Simone both adopted behaviour and practices considered to be outside the limits of what is constituted as "Samoan". Both had their authenticity, identity and right to be recognised and belonging challenged. Simone used the term "code-switch" in her identity talk, and Tama

talked of moving between school and home as disjunctive cultural spaces. This was not an effortless transition, characterised by ease and fluidity; it was negotiated with cross-cultural capital and skills and bearing the burden of disparate cross-cultural pressures.

Both Tama and Simone work hard to ensure that a double jeopardy or lose / lose dynamic does not ensue. Simone explains:

That's something that I've always battled with but - oh maybe it's not battled with - but have been challenged to find balance between the two. I think I've come out all right at the end of it, bit of a struggle.

When I ask Simone if she feels accepted by other Pasifika peoples, she says:

I know with some Island-born people I'll never be accepted, it wouldn't matter how many degrees I had, what post I had in New Zealand society or what job I had, the fact that I didn't learn the language just counts for, you know, I'm *nothing*. And I don't know, most people think I'm all right. I feel pretty much accepted. It's just *that generation*. And if they're in positions of power you haven't got a hope in hell of ever getting any respect or being accepted by them.

Simone realises that her New Zealand cultural capital does not necessarily travel. Nor will it be recognised or converted into symbolic capital in some Pasifika cultural spaces. She also recognises that without being able to speak a Pasifika language, to some people, she will "count for nothing". She goes on to say:

The Pacific Island community they're accepting in terms of what you can do for them and how well you make them look. Or how successful you make them look, in terms of what you are able to do and your status, in terms of a University qualification.

But in terms of actual fa'aSamoa and the cultural context - they are still able to use the language as the tool to decide whether they want you to be part of - you know - to be accepted or to be seen as *at the same level*. But I'm really lucky in terms of my own community that they see that we don't have the language but we've got other sorts of skills that we can bring to the

community. I don't know if I'd have that same acceptance if I moved somewhere else and was part of another church community.

Simone recognises that her own community accepts that she has other skills, but not having the language, as Salote noted in the previous chapter, is always going to be a barrier to acceptance or validation that she is "at the same level". This sense of fractured or partial acceptance, but not full or whole hearted recognition, was a recurring theme.

### *NEGOTIATING VOICE WITHOUT LANGUAGE*

The importance of speaking Pasifika languages was another key theme. The majority of participants (ten of fourteen) I interviewed did not speak their own Pasifika language fluently. Hurtado and Vega (2004, p. 150) write: "Shift happens, shift is inevitable". Their research on language shift among second generation migrants supports and extends other work showing that language shift among second generation populations is a "systematic, predictable and comprehensible phenomenon" (Hurtado and Vega, 2004, p. 150).

However, some people in diasporic Pasifika social spaces lamented this shift and it was often considered unacceptable. Speaking a Pasifika language was an influential form of Pasifika cultural capital associated with advantage and profit. Consistent with the research findings (Lee, 2003; Poutasi, 1999; Tiatia, 1998) it was also considered an important signifier of an authentic doxa Pasifika identity. Anae (2001, p. 110) suggests that the "Inability to speak Samoan, or *Leo fa'asamoa*" was a "prime source of identity confusion". Poutasi (1999, p. 5) argues that:

The ability to speak *gagana Samoa* differentiates those who are perceived to be 'full' Samoans from those who are perceived to be either culturally destitute or as possessing a tenuous or less legitimate connection to being Samoan.

As one of the participants, Isabella, said:

At the end of the day I'm NZ-born. I don't have a language. You know this is what you'll hear all the time, you'll hear the, 'I do have a language / I don't have a language' stuff. And you know I'm a star without stars...

And I've had that slung at me, as you do! That *oh you're a Pacific person but you don't even have a language*, oh you don't speak your own language...*You're not really Pacific.*

Not speaking a Pasifika language was associated with in-authenticity, a lack of legitimacy, and a basis for exclusion. The ten participants I interviewed who could not speak their own language talked about being on the receiving end of many challenges from other Pasifika peoples. As Tiare says:

A lot of it, like, "How can you call yourself Pacific without the language?" And I just hear traditional voices just trying to protect the language and grow it. And also feeling quite threatened of a New Zealand born who they possibly perceive as someone who can walk in both worlds in confidence.

I'm just trying to understand it and appreciate things. You try to understand why people are like that. I used to really wear it closely to my chest and get really, really angry and get upset and ruminate over it and never get much sleep. But you know after like 15 or 16 times of it being done to you, it's impossible to personalise it as much as you did the first few times.

When Tiare talks about "it being done to you", she is talking about the discomfort of identity challenges and situations where your ability to identify is challenged and you are deliberately misrecognised or excluded. The following story told by Tiare illustrates how her inability to speak the Cook Islands language results in humiliation and rejection.

*Story: The Role Model Who Wasn't*

We were asked to go down to Napier to speak to a whole lot of High School students who were on the fringe of leaving school and choosing a career pathway and that sort of thing. We were asked to be motivational speakers. It was only for forty minutes. The guys that were asked to come down were the Adeaze guys, the two brothers. They were the men that were there as motivational speakers. So feeling quite honoured really, kind of like pleased to be there!

This woman afterwards came up to me. She said, “How can you call yourself Cook Islander when you don’t know your language?” Then she did this real patronising thing like, “Oh, your parents probably didn’t teach you.”

And I just really wanted to *do things* to her. I was *so* angry with her.

So, anyway, I came home and I told my dad. He knew her as well. And I told him: “I said to her, Dad, that she can’t deny the blood that runs through my veins. Because you know, I am Cook Islands’. I’m of your line.”

He says, “Yes, but you must understand where she’s coming from, that she has every right to say what she says.” So he was agreeing.

And I said, “Well it’s your fault because you’re the one that never taught me.”

And he said, “Yes, but I thought I was doing you a favour.” He seriously thought that!

In this story, Tiare calls on genealogy to determine her right to identify as a Cook Islander. Yet Tiare’s inability to speak the language puts her outside of the limits of what is privileged and constituted as Cook Islander for this particular elder. Even though Tiare’s father is from an ariki (chiefly) family, this counts for nothing in the dynamic that occurs. Tiare is deliberately mis-recognised (Wacquant, 2008, p. 265) because she does not speak the language. Tiare says:

It was just really in my face, that I was New Zealand-born Polynesian who couldn’t speak her language and it was a real put down.

While Tiare identifies as a Cook Islander in this situation, she is not identified back. Hall (1996) argues that identities matter so much because identity is where the psychic and social meet. Identities are connected to deeply personal feelings about belonging, exclusion, acceptance and rejection in the social world. Butler (1995) suggests that identity carries the burden of recognition. In many ways, it is the politics of recognition that Tiare is talking about. She says:

I feel more accepted in the *Papa'a*<sup>8</sup> world than the Pacific world... I don't feel fully accepted by your traditional lot. I wonder what it will take to prove myself worthy. Or how much submitting it requires (on bended knee)...

I do believe there is a significant amount of gate-keeping that goes on. Maybe that's a power thing? Because they know that they carry this wealth of knowledge...

The wealth of knowledge, along with proficiency in Pasifika languages can be considered key forms of Pasifika cultural capital. Tiare recognises that there is a power dynamic involved. She suggests that she feels more accepted in the Papa'a world, and like other participants before her, explains that she does not feel "fully accepted" by the "traditional lot". This echoes Simone's sentiments, and other participants' awareness, that they may achieve partial recognition but not full acceptance. All of the participants who could not speak the language expressed some regret and sadness associated with this. Participants who could not speak the language talked about having to find other strategies to negotiate inclusion and belonging. Margaret said, of not being able to speak Samoan:

You have to find other strategies; you have to, I think you have to become more hypersensitive in terms of what's going on so that you can work out what's going on around you. If you can't understand the language then you have to become more strategic in terms of finding out what's going on and like even within my own family now, often I know more about what's going on than anybody else. Even between my dad and my uncles and my cousins, because I'll find out from one person, then I'll go and talk to someone else, not gossiping but I'll just get the whole picture.

To compensate and cope with her lack of language, Margaret deploys other strategies which she explains involves a heightened awareness and interest in family matters and she finds ways of connecting that are possible for her given her lack of language. Tiare, in the previous chapter, also talked about drawing upon her cultural knowledge instead of language. Bill talks about being at a family funeral. He says:

---

<sup>8</sup> Papa'a – person of European descent or gloss for Western things (Cook Islands)

I looked at my cousin speaking about his father and I heard him speak in Cook Island Maori at the beginning and I thought, yes you are a successful lawyer, you've gotten out and have all of those kinds of 'get ups'. But actually, your father and your mother (who was European), did you a bit of a disservice *like my parents did* by not encouraging more of the use of the language and stuff... I just sat there next to my cousin and she said: "Do you want me to translate for you?"

And I said, "No, I can understand". But then I just thought, yeah, this is one area where we haven't been well equipped.

The awareness of a lack of cultural capital and not feeling well equipped, or less accepted in Pasifika settings, was relatively common. In the intergenerational cultural politics of reproduction, second-gen participants faced penalties and the stress of negotiating inclusion, when their own life experiences and behaviours set them outside the limits of what might normally be accepted as Samoan or Tongan or Cook Islands or Pasifika.

### *SYMBOLIC STRUGGLE*

Tiare and I had quite a long conversation about an incident at a workshop where there was a relatively public interplay of intergenerational conflict. She tells me her story and in response, I tell a long story about my own experience.

#### *Story: Rehearsing Division*

The lecturer on the first day created this facilitated discussion around who we are and what our strengths are. And there was this huge division amongst the group. A whole lot of things were said, and subtly said, about NZ-born or from those with a more traditional up-bringing. And I really just kind of picked up on that and I started to become really angry (just internally) thinking 'Yeah, who the hell do they think they are they're always bagging us?' It was almost quite patronising, "Oh you know, the NZ-born what do they know? And they're just *young*. Don't have enough of the language or culture, and so that was the kind of tone.

At the end of it I became pretty angry and I decided I just needed to just *stop this*. So I thought I'll just have a chat with one of the support people and I said "This is happening and this is not ok blah blah blah. This needs to stop! Someone needs to address this issue."

And she never answered me, she took me on this huge journey and I love this woman, for the way that she responds and it was kind of random. We went on this - and then I realised - I had this epiphany that this needs to happen. It's almost like when we talk about respect that *that's* what it is. It was like that I needed to, as part of that group NZ-born children, I needed to respect where they were coming from even though I found it quite offensive. I had to allow it to take its course and its journey.

What's been interesting, like in the next workshops, I was kind of ok with that, but through the next few workshops that divisional stuff was really addressed. Which was really amazing - that there was awareness from the traditional who were bagging the NZ-born about the way they are. They become aware of the hurt that they impart or some of the division that they create. Yeah it was amazing right at the end of the three days. We had this real open discussion and it was facilitated really, really, well. But it was about that. There were tears, real emotional apologies and it kind of just needed to, that needed to happen. I think it needed to be talked about quite bluntly and in a real *rehearsing division* kind of way. It certainly came to the surface in the 1<sup>st</sup> workshop and then in the 2<sup>nd</sup> workshop it was just a natural thing. I don't think it was the intention of the facilitators or lecturer but it just unfolded.

But when I saw this process unfold and really reflected on it and I thought well I'm always going to be confronted by this attitude of you don't know enough, you don't speak the language unless we go through this journey together, and sit at the same table and sit on the same mat and that sort of thing. I'm always going to have those tension-filled experiences, if that makes sense, and there's no other way around it really. We need to, unless we sit on a mat and really hash these things out and get really deep and personal.

And I'm happy with that, we're always going to have this people practising the division with their tongues and rehearsing it over and over again. So there is that and maybe they feel that they need to protect themselves some way? Or feel less threatened by these very savvy, I think they're quite savvy, and that we navigate quite swiftly in NZ in terms of the systems. But we also have an insight enough more than our Palangi colleagues, to survive I think, in the Pacific systems.

**Karlo:**

It's interesting that you told me that story Tiare, because a friend of mine did that leadership course a few years ago. She talked to me about how they got a bollocking by the traditional lot. Actually it was Ahiohio, who is absolutely, you know, a creator of those sorts of divisions. You know how some people can do it, but Ahiohio took it to a whole other destructive level. I asked her what happened, did any one get up and speak? And she said, "Oh no, we were all just too faka'apa'apa<sup>9</sup>, like too respectful. We just all kept quiet.

**Tiare:**

Interesting isn't it because I remember at our first work shop we had one person come and she came to basically speak about her experience of the course, and where she is now basically. And she said that she hated it... She said it was just revolting and she wanted to cry and leave and they were really mean to her.

The facilitators of the course have commented on this being an incredible group, and that we have been open to going really deep and sharing our feelings. What we have in our group is a real mix of this generation (NZ-born) and the traditional. There's enough of us to find that balance I think, and enough of us, and in fact I must admit that NZ-born are much more, I think if it wasn't for the way in which we responded then maybe that whole process of coming to the mat and being ok and resolution possibly wouldn't have happened. Because when I look at my colleagues and they're standing up and saying, we want your help, we respect you and tears are flowing. And

---

<sup>9</sup> Faka'apa'apa – Tongan word for respectful.

they're saying, "We know that sometimes we get it wrong and we embrace you but we are trying to get it right. And we really want you to teach us. And time and time again I've heard them get up in our group and say this. And I've never once heard the traditional group say, "Well, we need you guys too."

But there has been this kind of softening and without it we wouldn't have been able to dialogue on that last day. But I think it has taken the grace of our group to get to that place which is an interesting process. Almost as though we have to show submissiveness because that is kind of, at the end of the day, what traditional Pacific expect aye, is submissiveness?

**Karlo:**

I had heard that had happened. Funny, I was at a conference and it was a Pacific education one. I wasn't used to being around the education sector. Anyway, Ahiohio was there. They were talking about *who* was a Pacific person? He stood up. (I was there to write the document. That was my job, contracted to sit there, type it up and turn it into some guidelines). And he stood up and said, "We've really got to start thinking seriously about what we mean by Pacific. I mean, who is in? And who is out? Because we are letting in all these people who can't even speak the language. And they can't do this. And they can't do that. And we really need to get down to the nuts and bolts of who is in and who is out."

And I stood up and said, "I know I'm here just to take the minutes, but I can't put up with that. I just can't put up with that."

And he said, "Can't you at least give the dignity of completing what I have to say?"

And then I said, "You shall have the dignity of completing what you have to say and then I will stand up and disagree with that."

So I sat down and he finished and then I stood up and said "I can't believe that you have the absolute sheer arrogance and audacity to stand up and say that people are *out* because they don't speak the language". I said, "Do you know

fifty percent of our young people can't speak the language. Fifty percent! So you are disinheriting and dispossessing fifty percent of our young people." I said, "How can you? I don't even understand how you can rationalise that?"

Anyway, it was funny because he didn't even have a particularly good comeback. And I had all these people come up to me afterwards who said to me that they were so grateful that somebody said it; a range of people, like Palangi lecturers as well as Pacific people there. And then one woman came up to me and said that she was so offended. She was part-Pacific, like there was only one white person there really. This Pacific woman said to me that she was so offended, so deeply offended by what Ahiohio said, that she just couldn't even be in his presence. And that she was going to skip the dinner in case she had to sit next to him.

I said to her, "Don't worry about Ahiohio. He's just like that." And then I said to her, "Anyway the reason why he likes to say that is because that's where his power is you know. He doesn't have power in the other space." And then Ahiohio was sitting there (he was quite close). And he said to me, "The reason why you like to talk about non-Pacific, New Zealand-born blah-blah is because that's where *all* your power is."

I just started laughing and I said, "You know what Ahiohio. This woman just came up to me and said that she was so offended by you that she wouldn't even sit next to you at dinner, and I said to her, don't worry about him that's where all his power is." Like straight to his face. But the funniest part of this story is, I think; which is where the whole complexity of it emerges - is that I lost my wallet while I was there. I lost it. I left it behind in a shop. I got it back eventually, but I was there with my nanny and my kids and had lost my wallet. I had no money and was totally freaked out thinking, "What the hell am I going to do? Who can I borrow money off?" Ahiohio, he was first person I thought of, because of the connection as Tongans. Like, we know each other. And that's the weird thing, like I had all these other people who I'd connected with and who I agreed with, but he was the immediate person who I wouldn't feel an ounce of shame or embarrassment about going to borrow money off.

**Tiare:**

But obviously there's a real maturity there you know that you can have those real robust discussions.

**Karlo:**

You see, no. This is the thing! This is the thing! I was thinking I don't have that pull-back of *respect*, that thing, like when my friend said to me that they were too respectful. Oh, I just thought there's just no way that I would have kept quiet. Now if I had stood up in your group and started to have a go at that person, whoever it was, you would have never got your balance. Because it would have just become more adversarial, so that's what I'm reflecting around as you talk.

This discussion is about symbolic struggle in action. Who is in? Who is out of the Pasifika imaginary? Who and what is cherished and beloved, centred and privileged? And what is considered of low value or outside the discursive limits? The different ideas at play, including that one must be respectful as opposed to having a clearly enunciated opinion and voice, and being silenced and feeling disempowered with very few options and resources or opportunities for assertion. Tiare talks about the rehearsal of division, the rhetoric of difference and the negative representations of the second generation. She analyses the situation and sees that respect was necessary for the older generation to come to terms with the impact of their rejection of the NZ-born population. I tell another story, of confrontation and vocal symbolic struggle that was played out publicly. My own sense, to disregard silence, submission and respect because I felt it was not earned or owed is quite different from the strategies taken by my friend and by Tiare.

This long passage also illustrates the difficulties of gaining acceptance when strict limits and boundaries are placed around "who is in" and "who is out". In many senses, the participants – and my own self in this case – are casualties of boundary wars in symbolic struggle. Tupuola (2004) refers to edgewalkers and Teaiwa (2001) refers to being on the edge. I see that as being similar to being on the cusp of the discursive limits of what is currently constituted or centred as authentic Pasifika identities. In many ways, the second-gen participants provided threats to the stability of who we imagine ourselves to be as a collective. These "inauthentic" or "improper" representations were represented as diluting or contaminating the pure imaginary. The

contested terrain of who we are, how we are imagined and who is included and who is excluded is the intergenerational politics of cultural reproduction in a diasporic context.

It is Tiare, who argues that we must sit on the same mat and hash this out. It is Tiare who identifies that this tension is generated in-relation to each other and that the relational space between the two generations will be tension-filled. She also identifies the dynamics of power. For example, the second-gen was numerically dominant in this workshop but was seen to be culturally weak and low status in terms of their youth and lack of cultural capital. In a space governed by principles of respect for elders and the expectations of submission and service, there were highly constrained options of response, like silence, conformity, deference, or the alternatives route of conflict associated with penalties, and potentially even more marginalisation. My assertion in my story was that the stakes were too high to leave people behind because they did not fit or comply with what Pasifika people were supposed to be. I lost my wallet later at the conference and found that the only person I felt comfortable to borrow money from was the adversary that I had challenged. This did leave me wondering about the nature of “family” where there is infighting but connections are still strong. This lends support to Teaiwa and Mallon’s (2005) description of ambivalent kinship.

#### *NEGOTIATING BELONGING AND RECOGNITION FROM BEYOND THE LIMITS*

Amidst symbolic struggle was the challenge of negotiating acceptance while living out change. Many participants talked about the way they tried to earn acceptance. As Lilomaiva-Doktor (2009, p. 8) writes, from a Samoan perspective:

“Being kin” is not enough—one has to *live* it through participation, reciprocity, and obligation, whether one resides in one’s birth village or away from it. One may be part of a kindred, but if not maintained and expressed in *tautua* (service) and *vā fealoa’i* (balanced social space), the *‘āiga* loses legitimacy.

Bearing witness to the above quotation, participants referred to an expectation that to engage in relationships with Pasifika community and family networks requires considerable effort and labour. As Alipate explained:

You know, looking after other people, just being generous with your time if you can - *this is coming from an accountant who charges by the hour!* But trying to look after, I guess, just more than your nuclear family a little bit... it's good to have the connectedness with the other family and extended cousins.

Emphases on service, respect, duty, rather than individual gain, were articulated by participants as important governing principles. Social and cultural capital took time to accumulate. A track record of labour and service to the collective was closely associated with the granting of symbolic capital and status. As Salote said:

I just totally believe that Pasifika people want to see results, they want to see...you know stop talking and like show us what you can do. And then you've got to prove it and it's a long journey but once you do it, then you build up your credibility. But the unfortunate thing is when you do one thing naughty! That's it, *laters, you're outta there!*

So, I know it's terrible. You've got to be really resilient, that's for sure, and you've got to really just know who you are. If you've got a real identity issue and you don't know who you are [laughter] you're doomed from day one.

Salote alludes to the ruthlessness of a community which wants to see results from its young people and demands hard work before symbolic recognition is granted. A number of the participants talked about needing to work hard to obtain recognition and acceptance in Pasifika social spaces. They were expected to meet their obligations and to participate in communally oriented life. This required some compliance with what was considered to be appropriate in those spaces and recognises that there were rewards for complying with what presents itself as legitimate and most authentic (Bourdieu, 2008). As Salote alludes, tolerance for deviation from the sanctioned norms was low: "if you do one naughty thing" that's it, "you're outta there".

Yet what about those who would not or could not comply? As Lola explained:

There was no one really like me around. Because all the Samoans were (that I knew, even if they were New Zealand-born)... had that whole fa'aSamoan up-bringing. And then all the Palagis assumed I was Samoan and different and really didn't engage in that.

I sort of think about my crisis of identity that I went through as a teenager, about who am I and where do I fit...

Lola explains that, with maturity, she arrived at a point of “crystallising my own identity”. This involved accepting that:

I am not ‘a-go-to-church-every-Sunday’ and ‘sing-the-gospel’ Samoan. And I’m useless at sports and I do have views about gender and homophobia and about certain political things...

I really was able to practise my own persona and figure out where I fit in all of that, that I’m not Palagi, that *I’m this type of Samoan...*

I really do strongly identify myself as Samoan, even though my dad’s white... I suppose for ages I didn’t feel like a real Samoan, because I’m so fair and because I don’t speak Samoan, and had quite a different up-bringing, and I have different views. But it’s been a gradual process I suppose over the last ten years, so many aspects of my life are Samoan first and Palagi second. And to be successful in the Palagi world and being able to navigate the Palagi world - it’s fine. It doesn’t detract from my identity as a Samoan.

In Pasifika social spaces, Lola recognises that she is challenged about whether she has the right to claim a Samoan identity.

Although I’d still meet a whole lot of Samoans who will say that I’m not a real Samoan. And people will say that you’ve been successful because you’re not a *real Samoan*. You know, because you’ve been raised by Palagi and you don’t speak Samoan and serve the Palagi. I’ve met many Samoans who think that. But that’s part of maturity I suppose, isn’t it, to cast them off.

Lola talks about the importance of not internalising these negative discourses, but rather being: “Fiercely proud of being Samoan and claiming it!” This involves claiming and owning a Samoan identity, even when you depart from the doxa of Samoan-ness and even though others might challenge your right to identify.

Isabella has her own response to these sorts of identity challenges:

I used to really get: "You're not really Pacific or you know you don't have your language, so therefore you're not!"

You know, I'm really clear that *I am*, actually that *I am*. If you really want to talk numbers, do the numbers and then come back to me and tell me how many Pacific people in New Zealand are just like me, because there are plenty, yeah, over half! Yeah, so then you're telling all of them too that they're not Pacific enough?

There was a strong insistence from a number of participants that NZ-born and multi-ethnic versions of Pasifika were just as valid as other ways of being Pasifika. Sometimes, particularly for multi-ethnic participants, their 'mixed' embodiments were associated with negativity and racism. As Margaret says:

All of our experiences are just as important, you know, and my experience is just as important as someone that was born in Samoa and vice versa.

Yet she also acknowledges:

I'm really aware of the kind of stigma attached to being half-caste. I feel that. It doesn't hurt my feelings or anything. But I'm still aware of it... I was talking to someone about it the other day and how it was a factor in something, and they thought I was just being silly. But I know, you have to earn your stripes a lot more than you would do if you were full Samoan. And there's less room to make mistakes too. Because people are going to be watching you hoping that you do...

The final story told is by Alipate which illustrates an incident of being mis-recognised and deliberately excluded as a Tongan. Alipate explains his background.

*Story: More Tongan than I Thought: Alipate*

My father's from Tonga and he came to New Zealand to go to University, he was the first in his family to come in the 60's... Mum and Dad are both university educated. I guess I had a really happy childhood. No problems.

My dad didn't want me to learn how to speak Tongan. There were no other Pacific Islanders at primary school. There were a couple of other families at high school, half-caste Tongans and some Rarotongans as well, no Samoans.

We pretty much grew up and didn't really know too much about the Tongan culture. Just that I was half Tongan obviously, and went to various family things...

A lot of Tongans would be introduced to me and they would go, oh yeah, you're the Palangi one.

I'd be like, "Oh yeah," didn't really mind.

But this guy, and he's a smart guy, and I really respect him. He said "Guys, he's probably more Tongan than you, the way he was brought up."

He used to come down to the farm and I'd organise the meat and set it all up. You know, looking back, my dad brought me up real - not - he didn't speak to me in Tongan - but you know, basically, respect your father. He used to tell me all these stories. "Don't hit your father," and all this.

And I used to go, "Why is he telling me all this?" But the more I learn about the Tongan side of things, it was real important for him to do that. Just the way he used to teach us. It used to really annoy me! He would never tell me what to do. He would just tell me off when I did it wrong.

When I was at uni, I had to start learning more about Tongan stuff. So, I found out that I was more Tongan than I thought, but I just wasn't brought up in the language. When I went to uni, I made a real conscious effort to explore that side, which I guess you do at that age. I joined the Tongan Students' Association and I made a lot of lifelong friends through that. They're probably my best friends now.

Then I went to Tonga. I made my dad take me to Tonga. He hadn't been to Tonga since I was about four... And it's just coming out now. He was telling me all the things that happened. He's pretty bitter about it. Like the family things. And that really influenced how he brought me and my brother up. He's pretty dark on it all.

But I basically told him that I totally understand and respect that. But he has to respect why I can't go on with it. And, why, potentially I want to bridge the gap back...

So I think, my dad always says: “Don’t be like a Tongan,” you know. There are certain things he doesn’t like. But he’s actually, he can’t help it. It’s him. He is a Tongan. You know it’s just one of those things, it’s kind of a denial but actually it is just part of us.

When I went to Tonga with him, it was great to meet all my cousins over there and see the family homes. Then I went back by myself and got to meet the boys and play rugby with them. I went and connected with them that way and now I just relax.

I talk Palangi, I don’t talk Tongan. But I also know that I’m accepted and part of the family. They come to me for help a lot now. They see me, as maybe - not that I want to take anything from my dad - I just think that they come to me for help sometimes because I’m a little bit more relaxed about it.

Despite the sentiment of denial of Tongan culture in this narrative, this is complicated, ambiguous, and is certainly not fully realised. As Alipate acknowledges, while his father articulates a denial of Tongan culture, his actions and practices belie adherence to some practices which are considered typically Tongan. “He can’t help it. It’s him. He is a Tongan”.

The pressure to perform a particular version of Tongan identity leads to Alipate choosing to claim an identity as “Tongan but not *a* Tongan”, saying in response to my question about what ethnicity group he identifies with:

I think ethnic group I’d say Tongan, I’d always say Tongan. I’d say Tongan New Zealand. But I don’t think New Zealand’s an ethnic group, so Tongan-Palangi maybe? But I think of myself as a New Zealander. It’s like Sione told me once, I’m not, I’m Tongan - *I’m Tongan but I’m not a Tongan*, this is before he got smart and started doing his post grad studies.

Alipate makes a joke here, because we both know Sione whom he refers to. We also all (Alipate, Sione and myself) have one Tongan parent and one Palangi parent. So our status as Tongans is further complicated by that. When I ask Alipate which ethnic group he identifies with primarily, he responds with: “Do you choose one?” I immediately see how my question is loaded towards a singular answer which isn’t really very sensitive given my own complicated ethnic positioning. I respond: “You don’t have to, you definitely don’t have to”. But the question has already been asked, and regrettably it does ask the participant to “choose”.

His response, like so many responses from participants with a slip of the tongue “I’m not, I’m Tongan” and then second time around, clearer, more sure, shows the way in which it is difficult to articulate something that troubles the binary, or perhaps it is just difficult to do identity talk with all of its possible slips and lack of accommodating language. But Alipate, guided by Sione’s thinking on the matter, has found a tricky linguistic device which provides a way to describe both belonging and not quite fitting. “I’m Tongan, but not *a* Tongan”.

I immediately knew what Alipate meant. Perhaps this is where my insider positioning of shared meanings and experiences do me a disservice? If I was another interviewer who was not also, in many ways “Tongan but not *a* Tongan”, I may have asked Alipate to further explain this rationale. But I understood exactly what he meant and did not ask him to elaborate.

## CONCLUSION

The second-gen identity narratives of relational space with first generation or island-born Pasifika peoples shows how these dynamics were patterned by power relations, hierarchies, politics of inclusion and exclusion. These spaces privileged Pasifika forms of capital which often disadvantaged young NZ-born Pasifika peoples. Language, age, cultural knowledge, gender, genealogy, family, service, these were all forms of capital in Pasifika social spaces. Participants had *some* of these forms of capital, in varying volume and degrees. Speaking your own Pasifika language was an influential form of cultural capital in Pasifika social spaces. It was associated with *doxa* Pasifika identities. The second generation without the ability to speak their own Pasifika languages in some situations struggled for recognition, identification and inclusion.

The narratives showed that for the second generation participants I interviewed, acceptance within Pasifika social spaces was not always easy to gain. They might *identify* but to be *identified* back was never a given. It was possible for the second-gen to find their identities just as fixed and framed negatively within island-born Pasifika discourses. Many second generation participants operated beyond the limits of what was constituted as Pasifika. This threatened discursive rules and resulted in mis-recognition (Wacquant, 2008), identity challenges, exclusion and penalties for non-compliance. Butler (1995, p. 440) refers to the importance of “recognisability in both linguistic and political terms” in relation to identities. For second generation participants, not being able to speak in their Pasifika language meant little recognisability in linguistic terms.

The second generation participants were faced with the challenge of grappling with how subjects are “formed ‘in-between’, or in excess of, the sum of the ‘parts’ of difference” (Bhabha, 1994, p. 2). The participants I interviewed did their best with the resources they had. They had to find other ways of belonging and to renegotiate the very terms of inclusion. They had multiple strategies, including deploying biological and strategic essentialism, making genealogical claims, pointing to shared skin colour. They spoke of willing hearts, dutiful service, deference and respect. Some offered their Palangi cultural capital, which could often be in limited supply, in Pasifika social spaces. At times, this was considered prestigious. At other times, it was rejected as insufficient.

Macpherson (2001, p. 73) argues that, “In Aotearoa, new social spaces encouraged individuals to deconstruct all forms of orthodoxies and traditions openly”. However, the range of

possibilities, and the ability to contest more openly, does not detract from particular cultural identities, values, ideas, and ways of behaving having a hegemonic “doxa” status over others. One could argue that, to some extent, adherence to “doxa” identity ideals may be monitored and regulated more rigidly in diasporic spaces fuelled by nostalgia and the desire to “authentically” reproduce Pasifika homelands.

This ambivalence - the potential spaces in-between choices - and the ability to bridge this space or re-weave new discursive meanings across it, and the constraints or agency to do so, these were the defining issues facing many of the second generation participants.

Relationships with the Pasifika island-born generation provided important opportunities and resources for constructing identities and a sense of place and self (positioned and connected to others) in the world. These relationships could also be battlegrounds, annihilating and erasing. Powerful and enduring public narratives about what Pasifika people were supposed to be were deployed and retold and rehearsed again and again, in reaction to the performative fluidity of the second-gen. The rhetoric of difference was often wielded in ways that sought to exclude and punish this generation for trying to change the Pasifika identity story. While in many ways, the second generation may have been invested in subverting the established orders which placed them at the margins of these spaces, at the same time many participants desired the benefits, belonging and rewards associated with compliance.

To recognise and identify the second generation as Tongan (Samoan, etc) required a revision, a shifting of the discursive criteria and extension of its limits. The numerous stories of identity challenges relayed by second generation participants touched on threats from those who protected what was centred in Pasifika spaces and maintained cultural boundaries. Yet, by their very inclusion, discursive rules constituting Tongan-ness or Samoan-ness and so on were broken.

The majority of participants I spoke to were claiming their ground, labouring hard to acquire Pasifika social, cultural and symbolic capital, in some cases negotiating turf for belonging and to tell new stories. These narratives sat alongside the old ones, vying for recognition and space to be heard and claimed. Bhabha (1994, p. 162) writes, “The very possibility of cultural contestation, the ability to shift the ground of knowledges, or to engage in the ‘war of position’, marks the establishment of new forms of meaning, and strategies of identification”.

For those willing to engage in the battles of cultural reproduction, this involved claiming their right to signify, to identify and to be symbolically recognised. The stakes were high, involving the way that we imagine ourselves, through struggles over the production of social meaning including the politics of changing or shifting the story – of opening up a space of relating, (re)negotiating the va.

## REFERENCES

- Allen, G. (2000). *Intertextuality. (The New Critical Idiom)*. London: Routledge.
- Anae, M. (2001). The New Vikings of the Sunrise: New Zealand-borns in the Information Age. In P. Spoonley, C. Macpherson, & M. Anae (Eds.), *Tangata o te Moana Nui: The Evolving Identities of Pacific peoples in Aotearoa, New Zealand* (pp. 101-121). Palmerston North, NZ: Dunmore Press.
- Appadurai, A. (1991). Global Ethnoscapes: Notes and Queries for a Transnational Anthropology. In R.G. Fox (Ed.), *Recapturing Anthropology: Working in the Present* (pp. 191-210). Santa Fe, New Mexico: School of American Research Press.
- Bhabha, H. (1994). *The Location of Culture*. London: Routledge.
- Butcher, M. (2004). Universal Processes of Cultural Change: Reflections on the Identity Strategies of Indian and Australian Youth. *Journal of Intercultural Studies*, 25(3), 215- 231.
- Butler, J. (1988). Performative Acts and Gender Constitution: An Essay in Phenomenology and Feminist Theory. *Theatre Journal*, 40(4), 519-531.
- Butler, J. (1995). Collected and Fractured: Response to Identities. In: K.A. Appiah & H.L. Gates (Eds.), *Identities* (pp. 439-449). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1985). The Social Space and the Genesis of Groups. *Theory and Society*, 14(6), 723-744.
- Bourdieu, P. (2008). Outline of a Theory of Practice. In S. Seidman & J.C. Alexander (Eds.), *The New Social Theory Reader* (2<sup>nd</sup> Edit., pp. 80-87). London, New York: Routledge.
- Eastmond, M. (2007). Stories as Lived Experience: Narratives in Forced Migration Work. *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 20(2), 248-264.
- Evans, M. (2001). *Persistence of the Gift: Tongan Tradition in Transnational Context*. Ontario: Wilfred Laurier University Press.
- Fairbairn-Dunlop, P., & Makisi G. (2003) *Making our Place: Growing up PI in New Zealand*. Palmerston North, NZ: Dunmore Press.
- Gershon, I. (2000). How to Know When Not to Know: Strategic Ignorance When Eliciting for Samoan Migrant Exchanges. *Social Analysis* 44, 84–105.
- Gershon, I. (2007). Viewing Diasporas from the Pacific: What Pacific Ethnographies Offer Pacific Diaspora Studies. *The Contemporary Pacific*, 19 (2), 474–502.
- Gurevitch, V.D. (1990). The Dialogic Connection and the Ethics of dialogue. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 41(2), 181-196.
- Hall, S. (1996). Introduction: Who needs 'Identity?' In S. Hall & P. du Gay (Eds.), *Questions of Cultural Identity* (pp. 1-17). London: Sage.

- Health Research Council of New Zealand. (2004). *Guidelines on Pacific Health Research*. Auckland, New Zealand: Author.
- Hurtado, A. and L. A. Vega (2004). Shift Happens: Spanish and English Transmission Between Parents and Their Children. *Journal of Social Issues*, 60(1), 137-155.
- Lee, H.M. (2003). *Tongans Overseas: Between two shores*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Lilomaiaava-Doktor, S. (2009). Beyond "Migration": Samoan Population Movement (*Malaga*) and the Geography of Social Space. *The Contemporary Pacific*, 21(1), 1-32.
- Macpherson, C. (1996). Pacific Islands identity and community. In P. Spoonley, D. Pearson and C. Macpherson (Eds.), *Nga Patai: Racism and ethnic relations in Aotearoa/New Zealand* (pp. 124-143). Palmerston North, NZ: Dunmore Press.
- Macpherson, C. & Macpherson, L. (1999). Changing Contours of Migrant Samoan Kinship. In R. King and J. Connell, (Eds.), *Small Worlds Global Lives: Islands and Migration* (pp. 277-295). London: Cassell.
- Macpherson, C. (2001). One Trunk Sends out many Branches: Pacific Cultures and Cultural Identity. In: C. Macpherson, P. Spoonley & M. Anae, (Eds.), *Tangata O Te Moana Nui: The Evolving Identities of Pacific Peoples in Aotearoa / New Zealand* (pp. 66-80) Palmerston North, NZ: Dunmore Press.
- Morrison, S. & Vaioleti, T. (2008). *Ko te Tangata: An analysis of key government policy documents and strategies to identify trends that will influence Māori and Pacific progress within the Adult and Community Education (ACE) sector and professional development (PD) opportunities within ACE*. Retrieved March 15, 2009, from Tertiary Education Commission Web Site:
- Noble, G., Poynting, S. & Tabar, P. (1999). 'Youth, Ethnicity and the Mapping of Identities: Strategic Essentialism and Strategic Hybridity among Male Arabic-speaking Youth in South-western Sydney'. *Communal/Plural* 7(1) 29-44.
- Onwuegbuzie, A.J., & Teddlie, C. (2003). A Framework for Analyzing Data in Mixed Methods Research (pp. 351-384). In A. Tashakkori & C. Teddlie (Eds.), *Handbook of Mixed Methods in Social and Behavioural Research* (pp. 351-384). Sage: Thousand Oaks, London, New Delhi.
- Plummer, K. (1995). *Telling Sexual Stories: Power, Change and Social Worlds*. London, New York: Routledge.
- Portes, A., Rumbaut R.G. (2001). *Legacies: The Story of the Immigrant Second Generation*. Berkley: University of California Press.
- Poutasi, C. M. (1999). *How does the ability/inability to speak the Samoan language impact upon New Zealand raised Samoan women and their identity as a Samoan?* Unpublished manuscript.

- Refiti, A. (2010) Reanimation, upgrades, and ancestors in the work of Rosanna Raymond.  
Retrieved June 20, 2010, from Borderzones.ca : The Ideas Behind the Exhibit web site:
- Said, E. (2001). *Power, Politics and Culture: Interviews with Edward W. Said*. Edited and with an Introduction by Gauri Viswanathan. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Sewell, W. H. (2005). The Concept(s) of Culture. In G.M. Spiegel, (Ed.), *Practicing History: New Directions in Historical Writing after the Linguistic Turn*. (pp. 76-96) New York: Routledge.
- Small, C. (1997). *Voyages from Tongan villages to American suburbs*. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press.
- Somers, M. (1994). The narrative constitution of identity: A relational and network approach. *Theory and Society*, 23, 605-649.
- Spivak, G. (1990). *Post-colonial Critic*. London: Routledge.
- Spoonley, P., & Fleras, A. (1999). *Reclaiming Aotearoa: Indigenous Politics and Ethnic Relations in New Zealand*. Auckland: Oxford University Press.
- Stevenson, K. (2008). *The frangipani is dead: contemporary Pacific art in New Zealand, 1985-2000*. Wellington, New Zealand: Huia.
- Sua'ali'i-Sauni, T. (2006). *Le Matuamoepo: competing 'spirits of governing' and the management of New Zealand-based Samoan youth offender cases*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Auckland: Auckland.
- Swinburn, B., I. Caterson, et al. (2003). Diet, nutrition and the prevention of excess weight gain and obesity. *Public Health Nutrition* 7(1A): 123-146.
- Tashakkori, A., & Teddlie, C., (2003). The Past and Future of Mixed Methods Research: From Data Triangulation to Mixed Model Designs. In A. Tashakkori & C. Teddlie (Eds.), *Handbook of Mixed Methods in Social and Behavioural Research*. (pp. 671-702) Thousand Oaks, London, New Delhi: Sage.
- Teaiwa, T. (2001). L(o)osing the Edge. *The Contemporary Pacific* 13 (2), 343-357.
- Teaiwa, T.K. & Mallon, S. (2005). Ambivalent Kinships? Pacific People in New Zealand. In J. Liu, T. McCreanor, T. McIntosh, & T. Teaiwa (Eds.), *New Zealand Identities: Departures and Destinations* (pp. 207-229). Wellington, NZ: Victoria University Press.
- Tiatia, J. (1998). *Caught Between Cultures: a New Zealand-born Pacific Island perspective*. Auckland: Christian Research Association.
- Ting-Toomey, S. (1988). Intercultural conflict styles: A face-negotiation theory. In Y. Kim & W. Gudykunst (Eds.), *Theories in intercultural communication* (pp. 213-235). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Tupuola, A. (2004a) Editorial: Cultural ways of knowing within global contexts. *Journal of Intercultural Studies*, 25, (1) 3-6.

- Tupuola, A. (2004b). Pasifika edgewalkers: complicating the achieved identity status in youth research. *Journal of Intercultural Studies*, 25, (1) 87-100.
- Wacquant, L. (2008). Pierre Bourdieu. In R. Stones (Ed.), *Key Sociological Thinkers* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed., pp. 261-277). Houndmills, Basingstoke Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillian.
- Waldinger, R., Lim, N., & Cort, D. (2007). Bad Jobs, Good Jobs, No Jobs? The Employment Experience of the Mexican American Second Generation. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 33(1), 1- 35.
- Werbner, P. (2004) Theorising Complex Diasporas: Purity and Hybridity in the South Asian Public Sphere. *Britain Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 30(5), 895-911.
- Williams, L., Labonte, R., & O'Brien, M. (2003). Empowering social action through narratives of identity and culture. *Health Promotion International* 18(1), 33-40.
- Va'a, L.F. (2001). *Saili Matagi: Samoan Migrants in Australia*. Fiji: Institute of Pacific Studies and National University of Samoa.